This week I read Mark Drolsbaugh’s *Deaf Again* and began working through Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

I was excited to read *Deaf Again* because I have heard this is a book that is often praised in Deaf culture. It was recommended for me to read by some members of my group and some of my hearing friends who have studied ASL in the past are also familiar with it. I expected this to be a phenomenal book, but it was only “okay”.

Here are the three main things that stood out to me the most as I read through this book.

1. **The writing style**
2. **Drolsbaugh’s religious preferences (or lack thereof)**
3. **Drolsbaugh’s views on hearing culture vs. Deaf culture**

**The Writing Style**

At times, this book was absolutely painful to read. It was approximately 186 pages long, but it could have easily been told in 100 pages or less. I wanted to give up on reading it multiple times because it was boring, but the content itself wasn’t that bad. The story was extremely relatable because Drolsbaugh was deaf but grew up in a hearing world just like me. Drolsbaugh was also from Philadelphia, so I was familiar with most of his references. However, Drolsbaugh was EXTREMELY repetitive. He mentioned the same hardships and difficult times he had in school over and over again. Reading it the first time it was powerful, but by the fifth time reading it, it was getting annoying.

In chapter 5 when he trails off and starts talking about playing baseball with the neighborhood kids. He tells a story about his black friend, Sekou and how they were the only black family in town and faced a lot of prejudice for it. I get that he was trying to compare that with his experiences being the only deaf kid in town, but it wasn't a smooth transition. Right before he got to this story he was telling me about his religious experiences and I wanted to know more but he just stopped to tell this story.

Drolsbaugh also spent about half of chapter 7 explaining the illness of his grandparents. It felt irrelevant to the rest of the story.
Most of the first 7 chapters included his experiences with elementary school. I didn’t mind reading these stories but I don’t think he needed 7 chapters to explain it all. I was getting bored with it because it was so repetitive. I felt like he could’ve summed it up within 3 chapters or less.

Drew: Okay, but let’s step back a second and work this out a bit: try to articulate a network of controlling values here concerning the text. I feel like something is going on, but it is covered over in familiarity for you and so is hard to see. You’ve written a lot of words, but have skirted over what might be important. What is the context that triggered him to write this? What purpose is he striving to fulfill and with what audience (their controlling value)? I invite you to find a way to evaluate the book outside the criteria you are applying. Maybe you aren’t a member of the audience the book is addressing.

I think that Drolsbaugh’s main argument or controlling value is that when we force deaf children to be hearing we are forcing them to be someone that they are not. We should celebrate and embrace their differences rather than do what Drolsbaugh would refer to as “making them hearing.” The context then I think would be “By trying to make everyone more like us, we lose out on the ability to celebrate unique cultures and to learn from them and we hurt those who belong to those cultures and who can benefit from them the most” (I feel like this is an awkward way to phrase it. I know what I’m trying to say here...but I’m having trouble wording it). I think that his purpose in telling and re-telling these stories is to show how tedious and painful trying to be hearing was for him at school with things like speech therapy, lip-reading, and missing out on conversations with his classmates and teachers. It’s almost like he had to repeat the stories over and over again to create the emotional effect and to make the reader feel his boredom and the pain he felt in trying to be hearing. I don’t think I’m really the audience he is addressing...I think Drolsbaugh would say I’m part of the problem because although we had similar experiences with school, I wanted to be hearing and I viewed speech therapy as being something that was helping me. I rejected the opportunity to learn ASL because I actually wanted to be more like my hearing peers rather than belonging to the Deaf community/culture.

Drolsbaugh also spoke as he wrote. There were many times when Drolsbaugh wrote things like “I’m writing this book to...” Or “As you can see through this book I am writing”[1] Yes, we get it, you wrote the book which we are reading. There’s no need to make a formal announcement about it...
However, a part of me is thankful that this book was so poorly written. This might be a shock to my classmates reading this, but I tend to write A LOT when I blog, share a story, write my research journal, write an email… etc. Someone has mentioned to me recently that this could be a result of me not being able to hear in the past. I write a lot to make up for what I cannot hear. Drolsbaugh seems to fall in the same category as me. In his book he explains how when his mother was with deaf friends they would talk for forever. He refers to this as “Deaf Chat Syndrome” (DCS). They did this because it was their only chance to actually talk and communicate with someone they could understand and vice-versa. When you only have one person who can understand that you may only see once a month or so, you’re going to have a lot of catching up to do (Drolsbaugh 20-21).

For me personally I never had any deaf friends, but like Drolsbaugh and his deaf mother, I struggled to communicate with people in the hearing world until I got my first cochlear implant in 2014. For over 20 years, writing was all that I had. My family and I often feel that this helped to pave the way for my career in writing/social media – I communicate best in writing but still sometimes struggle to communicate effectively verbally because for so long this was all I had. I could talk, but I couldn’t hold a great conversation verbally because I couldn’t hear the person on the other end of that conversation. I think this too, affects my writing. I need to be more conscious of my writing so I don’t fall into the same traps of Drolsbaugh with over-writing/repetitiveness so I don’t end up boring my readers the way Drolsbaugh bored me as a reader of his work.

**Drolsbaugh’s Religious Preferences (Or Lack Thereof)**

Prior to reading *Deaf Again* I have read Tracey Morse’s dissertation titled *Saving Grace: Religious Rhetoric in the Deaf Community* and I also began reading Douglas C. Baynton’s *Forbidden Signs* (although I haven’t made it past the introduction yet). These books focus a lot on how ASL was viewed as being highly important by manualists who were headed by Thomas Gallaudet (whom Gallaudet University, a deaf university is named after). They pushed for ASL to be taught to deaf individuals because they believed it brought them closer to God because they believed that sign language came before spoken language and was invented by God. They also thought that the deaf needed sign language to be able to understand church sermons and to have God’s word be made accessible to them. Manualists like Thomas Gallaudet (who was not even deaf) felt it was their duty to bring God’s word to the deaf so that they would know God and be saved.
Although Drolsbaugh grew up in the hearing world and wasn’t exposed to deaf culture until he was in his 20’s, I projected that he’d be a Christian given the rich history between Christianity and deaf culture. However, it turns out that Drolsbaugh actually questioned most organized religions. He grew up in a unique situation where his grandparents were Jewish and yet he was still exposed to Catholicism after dating a catholic girl. Although he was forced to go to the synagogue with his family and enrolled in Hebrew school as a child, he didn’t get much out of it since he couldn't hear the sermons and his parents discouraged him from signing and he didn’t have an interpreter available for the sermons. However, Drolsbaugh always “got by” at the synagogue and with Hebrew school by pretending he knew what was going on. He explains this by stating, “Did I ever speak up? Of course not. Due to the earlier professionals, it was already ingrained in my mind that deafness was bad” (Drolsbaugh 31).

I used to do the same thing in a way with my early church experiences. I grew up going to the Pitman Church of the Nazarene. I believed it was a good church and a good experience because my parents and sister told me it was. I could never actually hear the sermons. Sometimes I could follow what was going on in youth group, but not always. Youth group felt more like a time to hang out with other Christians my age. I felt as though it was my responsibility to try and pretend I could hear rather than making a fuss over not being able to hear.

Drew: This strikes me as interesting, especially in relation to this sentence you wrote above: “I rejected the opportunity to learn ASL because I actually wanted to be more like my hearing peers rather than belonging to the Deaf community/culture.”

An interpreter wouldn’t have done me any good since I couldn’t sign. I didn’t think there was any alternatives to me. I just accepted it and never questioned it. To be honest, I never really thought about it until I read Drolsbaugh’s book. It’s not a problem for me now that I have cochlear implants (I also go to a different Baptist church now which is much smaller and I have a very passionate pastor that screams his sermons, so it’s not that much of an issue even without my implants).

Drolsbaugh was exposed to several other religions, too. His was exposed to Quakerism since he went to a Quaker school as a child, but he never mentioned much about what that experience was like; instead, he got distracted and drifted off to tell a story about playing baseball as a child (another example of how poor his writing skills are…the book is wildly disorganized). He was also exposed to Catholicism through his catholic girlfriend and later in life took an interest in
Eastern Philosophy including Zen Buddhism and Taoism. He liked the Eastern Philosophy because of the way it taught him to question the meaning of some things and develop a sense of self-actualization (which for him was realizing he belonged in the Deaf world, not the hearing world). However, he never really worshipped Buddha or any God; it was more of an experience and a way for him to find inspiration. There was one thing he said about religion that stood out to me though. He said, “In a strange way, I’m actually glad I’m deaf. Perhaps if I weren’t deaf, I might have developed a true bias favoring the first religion I was exposed to. Perhaps if I were hearing, the first morsel of religious dogma thrown my way might have been unconditionally accepted as Absolute Truth” (Drolsbaugh 68). This was interesting because Drolsbaugh seems to be saying that through his deafness, he wasn’t able to understand a lot of the sermons and aspects of religion he was exposed to; he had to in a way seek out information on the religions on his own. Drolsbaugh doesn’t think this would be possible if he was hearing (or at least not as easy).

So, being deaf for him means having access to a way of reading the world, a “strength” that emerged out of what might be interpreted as a deficit or weakness.

I can’t help but think about Deaf culture especially in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s though. Obviously, things must have changed since then, but back in the day, based on the readings from Morse and Baynton, it seems like Christianity was almost forced onto deaf children. They were almost taught that they needed to sign to be closer to God so that they wouldn’t go to hell. In the past, sign language and Deaf culture brought the Deaf closer to God, but now in more present times, Drolsbaugh seems to argue that Deafness allows individuals to be more open-minded and to make their own decisions regarding religion.

In Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire states:

Fatalism in the guise of docility is the fruit of an historical and sociological situation, not an essential characteristic of a people's behavior. It almost always is related to the power of destiny or fate or fortune - inevitable forces - or to a distorted view of God. Under the sway of magic and myth, the oppressed (especially the peasants, who are almost submerged in nature) see their suffering, the fruit of exploitation, as the will of God - as if God were the creator of this "organized disorder” (Freire 43-44).
It seems like here Freire is saying that for those who believe in God and are oppressed they may view the oppression as being something inflicted by God or something that was his will. This is interesting because many Deaf individuals feel they are oppressed and they embrace sign language feeling that it brings them closer to God. It would make sense then if they viewed the oppression they face from their deafness as being a part of God’s will since God made them deaf.

In contrast, Drolsbaugh is not a Christian. He still feels oppressed, but he sees the oppression as something that was brought on from the hearing world. Drolsbaugh views his oppression as something he can rise above and overcome, not simply as an act of God or a part of God’s will.

**Drolsbaugh’s Views on Hearing Culture VS. Deaf Culture**

As someone who is deaf but always lived in a hearing world, the first half of the book was a little annoying for me. Drolsbaugh seems to be complaining about the hearing world and pointing fingers at everyone who tried to push him to succeed in this world. While I related to much of what he said, it still made me feel a little awkward because I, too, grew up being taught that “deafness is bad” and I was praised for things like being able to hear certain words and frequencies, pronouncing a word correctly after I’ve struggled with it so many times in speech therapy, and I was always expected to wear my hearing aids.

However, there is one part where Drolsbaugh’s voice really shined through and I really considered his argument and his side. Drolsbaugh states:

> I didn’t know what I was missing – that’s what I now tell everyone who argues against my belief that deaf children should have the opportunity to interact with others like themselves. I had many non-culturally deaf people tell me that they are doing great in the hearing world, getting by on oralism and never signing, and that they are happy and successful doing so. I, too, was once like that. I was proud of my status as the only deaf graduate of GFS; I was proud of my job at the supermarket; I was proud of my ability to interact with hearing people quite well. And I just didn’t know what I was missing” (Drolsbaugh 121).
Hearing this (no pun intended) from someone who’s background is so similar to my own, I couldn’t just read it and forget about it. I never knew much about Deaf culture growing up. I was offered to learn ASL at a young age, but didn’t want to; I always wanted to be hearing. However, what if I had chosen differently? Am I missing out on things for my decision to be a part of the hearing world? I can’t get back my time in high school when I was the awkward kid in the corner not saying anything to anyone because I had no idea what was going on and I can’t get back all of those times spent at the movies with friends not knowing what the movie was about or if it was good bad or indifferent, but I can always choose now to learn about Deaf culture – and possibly make the decision to join Deaf culture – if they allow me to be a part of it.

One thing that Drolsbaugh (and I’ll argue many other members of the Deaf community) need to be cautious of is not becoming oppressors themselves against those who oppress them. Freire states:

Because it is a distortion of being more fully human, sooner or later being less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so. In order for this struggle to have meaning, the oppressed must not, in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both (Freire 26).

In most cases, there is a huge divide between Deaf culture and hearing culture. The Deaf feel as though the hearing world is oppressive to them and their needs. They have an enormous sense of Deaf pride and are proud of their unique culture, but at the same time many members of Deaf culture tend to seclude themselves from mainstream society; they are close to those who are a part of Deaf culture, but not very welcoming to those who are outside of their culture, including deaf with a lowercase d individuals who live in the hearing world. Freire would argue that this is an example of the oppressed acting as oppressors, and so long as this cycle continues, the Deaf community and hearing communities will never be able to merge because the oppression will never end. The only way for true acceptance on both sides of the spectrum is by having the oppressed side act in a loving, accepting, and kind manner to the oppressor and to not further contribute to oppression.

Drew: to turn the other cheek.
I liked the way Drolsbaugh ended his book because he acknowledges that Deaf culture is important to him and so he and his wife have chosen to expose their hearing children to it. However, they also understand the importance of exposing their children to the hearing world since they are in fact, hearing. Drolsbaugh states, “We know they will make the best of both worlds and we want them to have the opportunity to learn from each” (Drolsbaugh 177). This was absolutely refreshing to hear because it’s often Deaf culture vs. hearing culture with no middle ground. My goal with my research and mission statement is to find that middle ground and to see if it can exist and if a person like myself can exist in both deaf and hearing worlds. It sounds as though Drolsbaugh is working towards love and acceptance of the different cultures and trying to break away from the oppression that exists with both cultures.

While Drolsbaugh may be helping to bring both the Deaf and hearing worlds together, he is still going to face many obstacles from other members of the deaf community, which I would argue includes himself (I see that Drolsbaugh is beginning to soften towards the end of the book with his views on cochlear implants and the hearing community, but I still see a very strong sense of Deaf pride in him and I’m not quite buying having Drolsbaugh support both deaf and hearing cultures fully…). Many members of the Deaf community are so proud of their deafness and love their Deaf culture that they don’t want anything to change.

This reminds me of Campbell’s argument in “The Impact of Science on Myth.”

Freire would view this as being fearful of freedom. He explains this idea by stating:

The oppressed, having internalized the image of the oppressor and adopted his guidelines, are fearful of freedom. Freedom would require them to eject this image and replace it with autonomy and responsibility. Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift. It must be pursued constantly and responsibly. Freedom is not an ideal located outside of man; nor is it an idea which becomes myth. It is rather the indispensable condition for the quest for human completion (Freire 29).

While I don’t think many members of the Deaf community (or anyone for that matter) would openly admit it, I think a part of them actually likes being oppressed. Oppression gives the Deaf their place and identity in Deaf culture. The Deaf need their own community of people to feel as if they belong and like they
are safe within a group of people that understands them. However, the Deaf community as a whole is not very accepting to members who are not Deaf. Some of it is fear and some of it also goes in line with Deaf pride and the feeling that the hearing don’t belong in their sacred culture (or even the deaf who live in a hearing world and/or are oralists).

Drolsbaugh argues against the notion that the Deaf community acts as oppressors to their oppressors. He states:

There are those who feel that Deaf culture shelters deaf people from the “real world” - but from my perspective, it strengthens us and allows us to make the most of both worlds. Participating in a core group such as the Deaf community provides a strong foundation of inner strength and self-esteem that helps people succeed anywhere they want to, including the mainstream (Drolsbaugh 182).

In theory, Drolsbaugh has the right idea and I would love to see this become reality. However, it’s not and I’m not sure if it ever will be. I will agree with Drolsbaugh in how he says the Deaf community strengthens the Deaf and builds up their self-esteem, however, I think it empowers them when they are with other Deaf individuals. I still see it as being seclusive and closing them off to the mainstream world. I see it as helping the Deaf to further distance themselves from the hearing world, I don’t see it as helping the Deaf to become closer to bridging the gap between the two cultures.

I also heard back from Tracy Morse this week. As I mentioned earlier in my blog, I have previously read her dissertation, “Saving Grace: Religious Rhetoric in the Deaf Community.” In her dissertation, Tracy explains how the reason why so many people pushed for the preservation of sign language in the past was because they believed it to be a language that allowed the Deaf to get closer to God. ASL was seen as closer to God than traditional English was. I found this completely fascinating because despite being a lifelong Christian, I never heard that before.

Many of these beliefs stemmed from Gallaudet. Morse explains, “For Gallaudet, the deaf were lost souls who needed to be taught the importance of the bible and the gospel message of Christ’s birth, death and resurrection. Gallaudet wanted to convert deaf Americans through a common language of signs that they would learn at the first permanent school for the deaf” (Morse, 17). Furthermore, Morse quotes Douglas C. Baynton’s work, Forbidden Signs: American Culture and the Campaign Against Sign Language while explaining how many Americans believed
that sign language came before spoken language, so those who sign are viewed as being closer to God than those who only communicate via spoken language.

Morse discussed the differences between the manualists and the oralists. Manualists were people like Gallaudet who supported ASL and Deaf culture. Oralists had the opposite view and believed that the Deaf should learn to lip read and read, write, and speak vocally using traditional English. One of the biggest supporters of oralism was Alexander Graham Bell.

Drew: So interesting to see that there is any entire tradition to the opposing controlling values that structure the conflicts between deaf and hearing cultures.

Morse explains how there were some schools that were beginning to combine both methods of manualism and oralism but they were not very successful. Overall, in the 19th century most schools were leaning more towards having children learn how to speak and lip read. This sounds identical to the experiences that Drolsbaugh wrote about in *Deaf Again*.

In the section of chapter 2 titled “Oralism, Homogeneity, and Eugenics” Morse explains how during this time Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* was recently published and some people were beginning to break away from Christianity and creationism in support of Darwin’s theories of evolution. She compared the shift from manualism to oralism as being similar to the shift from creationism to evolution. The manualists were like the creationists – they believed sign language to have been created by God and it brought them closer to God. In contrast, oralists were more like those who supported evolution, or “Darwinians” because they believed in the survival of the fittest. They saw ASL as being something that would hold the deaf back from advancing in society. In order to thrive and be successful or even simply functional members of society, oralists believed that deaf individuals had to learn to speak, read, and write in standard English like their hearing counterparts.

Drew: consider that here you have the intertextual background, the presupposed value and set of practices that reinforce that value, which you have inherited and have reinforced through a desire to “reject” ASL in favor of “hearing.”

Here, Morse once again pulls from Baynton’s *Forbidden Signs: American Culture and the Campaign Against Sign Language* to say:

Baynton explains that fueling the oral movement in the late nineteenth
century was an American culture that “thought in terms of scientific naturalism, especially evolutionary theory” (9). Darwin’s theory was used to justify the oralists’ view that sign language was inferior to speech. It was common thinking in the nineteenth century that sign language was relied on by humans before they mastered speech (see Baynton “Savages” 98; Armstrong 16-18; Stokoe 55). For manualists, this view was interpreted in Protestant terms: sign language was an original language and meant “closer to the Creation,” not inferiority (Baynton “Savages” 98). However, for oralists, sign language was associated with lower evolution or “inferior races” (Baynton Forbidden 9). Oralists made arguments that deaf students needed to learn spoken English and lip reading or they would be viewed as animals or savages (Morse 51).

I don’t know how to feel or what to think about this – because I am on opposite sides of religion and my views regarding ASL. I am a creationist and I really don’t believe in evolution at all, but I support the oralists way of thinking. While I respect the Deaf community and find ASL to be a beautiful language, growing up I never thought it was right for me. I never embraced or desired to belong to the Deaf community. While I never viewed my deafness as a disability, I did at times feel like it held me back. I remember when I was a teenager seeing all of my friends get jobs at fast food places or retail stores, but I couldn’t get one until I was 20 and that was because I had an associate’s degree. When I started working I was always made to feel stupid because I couldn’t answer the phone or hear customers’ request or what they said their phone numbers were to pull up their rewards accounts. For these reasons I was seen as being a “terrible” worker and only permitted to work 3 hours a week. At one point the expense for traveling to work exceeded the amount of money I was making. I almost got fired because my boss felt I “just didn’t get it” even after 3 months of working there, so instead of giving her the benefit of firing me I just stopped showing up as a method of quitting.

Drolsbaugh and I really clash on things here. Whereas Drolsbaugh viewed his time working at a grocery store as being “not bad for a deaf guy” (Drolsbaugh 78) I always saw working in retail or at the deli as being temporary because I always wanted more. Drolsbaugh also seen himself as a victim and felt that if everyone would just allow him to sign and sign with him, his life would be so much easier. I never wanted everyone to have to learn sign language for me though. I don’t think Drolsbaugh is wrong in what he is saying (we should be more accommodating to the Deaf community and more accepting), but it always seemed easier to me to
find ways to “get by” in the hearing world rather than having everyone cater to me and my specific needs. For me ASL was never the solution. Instead, finding ways to hear better was the solution which I achieved through hearing aids, lipreading, and later in life, cochlear implants.

When we look at the conversation of Christianity and creationism vs. evolution, very few people would ever deny the fact that evolution seems to be winning the debate or argument. The attendance in church (especially by the younger generations) have been on a decline for years and more and more individuals are choosing science and evolution over traditional Christian religious teachings. What does this mean for ASL? Did the oralists “win”? Is ASL a thing of the past?

Hardly.

While Deaf individuals like Drolsbaugh may not embrace the rich religious history that is connected to ASL, it is still very much a thriving language. Also, there still are manualists who believe that signing will bring them closer to God. In my most recent e-mail to Morse, I asked her, “Do you know if their are any Deaf churches that refuse to preach using oralism? I'm curious as to whether you ran across any situations like that in your research.”

This is the response I received:

There are several Deaf churches that only use sign language. Some are more welcoming to hearing visitors than others. I did an observation of a Deaf congregation that met on Sundays in a funeral home chapel in Tucson, AZ. They were technically a ministry of a larger hearing church that met in the church building. On one occasion the Deaf preacher was asked to preach to the hearing congregation. His son voiced for him while I interpreted all other aspects of the service for the Deaf congregants. It was an interesting dynamic.

When I lived in Florida, I did a lot of interpreting at the First Baptist Church of Brandon—a hearing church with a large deaf ministry that included an after school program for deaf kids and their siblings. They have an adult Sunday school class for deaf members and an interpreted service.

I thought that it was interesting how there still are some purely manualist churches around. However, I can’t help but feel a little saddened by Morse’s response. I
have previously attended a church service at Solid Rock Baptist Church in Berlin, NJ which has a huge Deaf ministry (although I only visited once and never actually participated or became involved with this ministry). I know that they are only trying to help the Deaf, but I still feel like there’s a huge separation between the Deaf and hearing communities when you create separate ministries for the Deaf. Can’t they just get an interpreter for the Deaf and allow them to co-exist with the hearing congregation?

This was my reply to Morse:

Hi Tracy,

Thank you so much for your reply. Baynton's Forbidden Signs is on my to-read list! I have completed the introduction for the book so far, but had to pause to read Mark Drolsbaugh's Deaf Again since my library is borrowing it from another library for a very limited time. Have you read it? I heard it was required reading in many ASL/Deaf studies courses. I thought it was okay. It was interesting to me that Drolsbaugh seemed to embrace Deaf culture later in life but he didn't mention anything about how ASL was viewed as a language that brought people closer to God. Drolsbaugh actually mentioned that he was more interested in Eastern philosophy and took up Buddhism for part of his life. I wish he would've explained more with that because I found it to be really interesting.

Your experiences with the Deaf ministries and congregations/church programs are fascinating. I'm surprised to hear that some Deaf churches are still operating strictly with sign language. I know of a few churches with Deaf ministries around the New Jersey/Philadelphia area, but haven't ever been involved with them. I currently attend Washington Baptist Church in Turnersville, NJ. It is a hearing church, but my Pastor would like to make it more deaf-friendly eventually, we just don't have the funds or the need at the moment (I'm the only deaf member of the congregation). I've asked him to put me in touch with a local Deaf pastor/congregation if possible, so hopefully I'll be able to explore that a little bit more soon.

One thing I can't help but wonder with the Deaf congregations and ministries is if it causes more of a separation between the Deaf culture and hearing culture. With your involvement and observations of these ministries, did they feel like they were separated from the rest of the hearing members of the church? Do you think it's more helpful for them to have their own community within the church, or would it be better to just offer them sign language interpreters and group everyone together?
Thanks,

Kimberly

I am hoping to hear from both Morse and my pastor, Pastor Lex DeLong soon.