

JADARA

Volume 4 | Number 3

Article 7

October 2019

Keynote Address

James F. Garrett
None

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara>

Recommended Citation

Garrett, J. F. (2019). Keynote Address. *JADARA*, 4(3). Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara/vol4/iss3/7>

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

JAMES F. GARRETT, PH.D

I always start with an apology, and that is that I do not have a prepared text. That has both its advantages and disadvantages. I felt that we got a very warm welcome to town last evening at about 12:30 in the morning. I made a rather serious error by not looking at my clock, because if you have walked down the street here, you will see signs which say, "Turn off your two-way radios--this is a blasting area." This is going on all over town. As a Federal employee, I might feel that someone went to very great trouble here. The Planning Committee really is to be congratulated for such a rousing start for this particular convention.

I have to tell you of the topic under discussion, which is the next decade of the deaf. I think we should realize that the past decade has probably been one of the most glorious in achievements for the deaf that we have ever seen. It was almost the golden ten years, particularly as it related to the area of the integration of the deaf and the creation of opportunities for the deaf in our present society.

You might be interested to know that one of the very first Research and Demonstration Projects approved under the new Vocational Rehabilitation Act was at the New York State Psychiatric Institute. It had to do with the problem of the mental health of deaf people and, in reality, pushed aside so many of the erroneous ideas we had regarding the adjustment of deaf people and set straight perhaps 50 years of misconceptions about the whole problem of the adjustment of deaf people. But at the same time, it pointed out a very fundamental problem concerning the adjustment of the deaf and that is the fact that such a large number of the so-called adolescent, late adolescent, and young adult deaf more or

less disappear from the scene and seem to go underground and almost remind you of our present United States Hippie culture in the sense that they were so hard to find.

This was followed, as you know, by work at Michael Reese Hospital in Chicago with Dr. Grinker and Dr. Vernon and at the Lively Employment Program with Drs. Schlesinger and Meadow, who sought for the first time the broadening of alternatives for deaf people, so far as vocational preparation was concerned, after high school. No one was satisfied with the alternative which was presented by Gallaudet College. It meant putting square pegs into round holes in order to secure a higher education, and, so, through experimentation, both in the New England area and in the Southwest, we laid the groundwork for the Institution here in Rochester, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf--presenting the first of many alternatives for deaf people other than strict vocational training. We have also seen the development and growth of the Regional Vocational and Technical Schools for the post-secondary school-age deaf. As I came in I noticed a little picturization of that particular program. Beyond that, we see the potential for counseling and referral services for the deaf, and, interestingly enough, these are not in the traditional settings for serving the deaf, but rather are in the group of organizations and agencies which in the past were almost the antithesis of service to deaf people, our speech and hearing centers. So we see the programs of the Pittsburgh Hearing and Speech Center Society and The Western Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, The Seattle Hearing and Speech Center Program, and the Kansas City Speech and Hearing Society program, pointing the need perhaps--I will comment on this later--that would exist in every large metropolitan area. We see the concentration on diagnostic evaluation and adjustment programs. Evidence of this is in the early work of Stahl Butler in Lansing and the work that Larry Stewart and others have done in Hot Springs; the work of Cliff Lawrence at Morgan Memorial in Boston, and the work of Clyde Mott at the Seattle Speech and Hearing Center. We have seen the development of the professionalization of the work of interpreters for the deaf with the Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf under Al Pimentel. We see 25 State Associations developing programs in this field.

Incidentally, in this area, as a classics student I much prefer "fancy" words and I do think that if you really want to make

money in this field, why, you ought to use the more classic word; you know, "dactylogy," rather than "interpreters," because "interpreters" is a word everybody understands and it comes, therefore, at a cheaper price. A word like dactylogy, first of all, no one could spell, and secondly very few understand. Therefore, if we were to raise the employment level of hearing people who work with the deaf, why, if you do not mind, be a dactylogist rather than an interpreter. But here was, I think, a tremendously significant area of work.

I am impressed with one factor and have been concerned with it over many years and that has been the question of an effective voice for deaf people. I think that the Council of Organizations Serving The Deaf under Merv Garrison and now under Ed Carney may well be that voice. I think that it represents the development of a coordinated voice for deaf people. I think this is extremely important in this day and age of the consumer and his role and relationship to rehabilitation services.

Probably the most dramatic thing we have done over the past ten years, the one that perhaps has more sex to it than anything else, is, of course, the National Theatre of the Deaf with David Hayes, and I think one should understand that long before David Hayes and the Eugene O'Neill Foundation became interested in this problem, there were efforts, obviously abortive, which went on for some five years before that. Several of us can show you the scars of trying to raise funds for the theatre arts as they relate to the deaf. Impressive too, I think, has been the joint action and the joint effort between the field of Audiology and the field of Education of the Deaf and the Rehabilitation of the Deaf: The work with the American Speech and Hearing Association and the Conferences of Executives of Schools for the Deaf. It is not often that in public appearances I have had something positive to say with reference to the Conference of the Executives of the Schools for the Deaf, but I think that this has been a very positive and a very fruitful relationship between the two.

We have seen from a technical point of view a whole array of new methods and techniques for evaluating the capacity of deaf people. The Geist Interest Inventory, the Hiskey-Nebraska Scale, the deaf norms for the General Aptitude Test Battery, and the

Vocational Interest Inventory are examples. But I think the one area where we have made the most progress has been in the area of training, and probably this organization in itself is the greatest tribute to what has happened in the last ten years. I asked before I came in, "How many people are here?" I was quite overwhelmed, because I can remember back, to the very first effort that we made between Gallaudet College and the Catholic University of America to try to interest psychologists in work with the deaf. I do not mean the old hacks that have been working in the field for so many many years; I am talking about people with bona fide credentials as psychologists, and it was very difficult that first year to find 50 people, as Boyce Williams will remember, to take the initial training program which we ran over at Catholic University and at Gallaudet. And yet, look at what we have here today. We run so many programs for psychologists, for audiologists, for social workers, and Boyce William's favorite, religious workers for the deaf.

As I said on another occasion--we had to face very squarely the question of separation of church and state and we had to get legal opinion. I can assure you, that what we have been doing has been a perfectly legitimate thing to do. I think that Boyce used a divide and conquer technique. He started off with one religious group, went down about five or six and finally was down to the store-fronts of somewhere--I can not quite remember--but he had every self-appointed minister, I think, in the United States, learning how to sign and interpret. I think this is a tribute. But most of all, I think I am impressed with the increased Ph.D. man-power of the so-called "legitimate doctors" as opposed to a lot of the illegitimate ones: Those who earned--those who have earned the doctorate in the field of work with the deaf over the last ten years. I am particularly impressed with the number of young deaf people who are coming up in this field of service to the adult deaf and who are willing to qualify for that work, not because of the fact that they are deaf and that this is their sole qualification for the work, but rather the fact that they are not only deaf, but they are well-adjusted and well-trained individuals. I think that this is, perhaps, what bodes well for services to deaf people in my own thinking so far as the next decade is concerned.

Now, what of the next decade? What do the 70's seem to have to offer so far as the deaf are concerned? My personal feeling is that the next decade will be one of assimilation and will be one of change. So far as assimilation is concerned, I think that what we have to do, is to try to translate what we now know into improved services to people. We have interesting experimentation in the area of evaluation and referral centers, but we have this in only a few places. And how and where are we going to meet the needs of deaf individuals in the community? What we now have needs to be expanded and expanded markedly in the next decade, and I think that this will be one of the areas for change. That need has been demonstrated amply in counseling programs at all levels. All too often we have the concept that, "Well, all right, let us do something for these kids just before they leave high school," and this is too late. What we need are bona fide counseling programs at the elementary levels, at the high school levels, and (accept it on faith if you will) where we really need the programs--our really *good* counseling programs--is at the college level. All of these are areas of improvement and increase that we are talking about. We need not only service programs, but we need counseling programs which are experimental in nature and these we still do not have. We still do not know whether modern methods of counseling, group methods of counseling, other techniques, leaderless groups, what have you; *work with deaf people*: This is a prime need.

As a very minimum in terms of assimilation, we need to take our experiences with the development of a variety of work and training, at all levels of activity, and in all of our community. It is not enough to accept that we have three or four or five programs here which offer an opportunity for the integration of deaf people into junior colleges, into vocational schools, into colleges, into area vocational schools or into NTID or into Gallaudet or wherever else it might be. Rather, what we need to do, is take these experiences and see how we can multiply them into other settings. I would like to suggest here a reverse psychology and that is to get away from the concept of highly specialized programs for deaf people and find out what happens if we try to see *how little we need* by way of change within a University, within an organization, within a school, wherever it may be, in order to present opportunities for deaf people.

I would suggest that the next decade will be one of change and by this I mean that, from what we know now, we have the feeling that there will be much less provincialism in our services to deaf people which has been the case in the past. I suggest, for example, the necessity for the development of a program of total communication, of total community involvement, and of total family involvement in services to deaf people. I think what we need is a role of advocacy that is not emotional: One in which the consumer demands (and I am looking forward to what Larry is going to have to say on this); consumer demands made known through a really effective voice of deaf people that does not preach the past, that does not get itself hung up, fighting over again the oral versus manual method, but rather takes us away from there and uses what we know and builds on the facts and not the emotions of the past. Let us look, in other words, in work with the deaf, not to the past, but let us look to the future.

I see the decade as one of an assumption of responsibility for change: *Not* the passing on to the Federal Government of the responsibility for programming for deaf people; such as perhaps we see in either Gallaudet College or the NTID. I think what I am talking about is that the deaf must take over the reins--must take over the responsibility for their own future and that the deaf must see to it that there is an effective use of community resources, agencies, and funds to which they are as entitled as anyone else in the community. I am calling for a grass-roots program and not a program of federal manipulation. I also, think, and this is, I think, particularly important for this group, that there will be an integration with the hearing community and with the regular professionals. The deaf are at a point in their history where there no longer needs to be separatism, for what they are ready for is integration, and everything that has been done has been in that direction. I do not think that anyone should find his niche, at a professional level, solely in the Professional Workers with the Adult Deaf, but rather that this should be the springboard for interesting all of the variety of professions that are involved in this organization and see to it that they recognize and accept a responsibility and a concern for the welfare of deaf people.

And lastly, I see the next decade to be one of a challenge to us to serve the disadvantaged. The deaf who have been served thus far,

whether we like to accept it or not, are not the deaf who are in most need. Our problem and our challenge in the next ten years is to do a job and to do as good a job on those deaf who are most in need as we have been doing with the others that we have been serving. The deaf who are poor, who are hidden away in our inner cities and in our ghettos, and particularly the black deaf, are individuals who need service and who *must* be given equal opportunities to enjoy the fruits of everything we have learned.

And so, I see the next decade to be one of amalgamation, to be one of consolidation, and one of expansion, in which I hope we will see a more effective utilization of services and resources by the deaf.