In the 2005 Journal of Political Philosophy article “Defending Deaf Culture: The Case of Cochlear Implants,” Robert Sparrow of Monash University explores the political and cultural implications surrounding issues related to the Cochlear Implant controversy, such as government funded research, and the rights of parents whose children are born deaf. While Sparrow’s ultimate contention favors cultivating respect for Deafness as a minority culture deserving rights equal to that of the majority, he concedes that the ethicality of cochlear implants, especially in children, is contingent upon an acceptance of Deafness as a culture instead of a disability as well as an understanding of culture’s function within our multi-cultural society.

Ultimately, however, the decision of ethicality regarding the use of Cochlear implants in children is contingent upon one’s understanding of Deafness as a culture and not a disability. To this Sparrow argues that to label individuals who cannot hear as disabled conjures several questions about the organization of our society, the way in which the majority perceives the minority, and the way in which the definition of “normal” functions within the context of human bodies.

The acceptance of Deafness as a culture instead of a disability is essential to understanding the

These theories regarding culture and the Cochlear controversy can be directly applied, if not proven by the conflicts presented in Sound and Fury, released four years prior to the publication of Sparrow’s article. The 2001 documentary follows the journey of two families and their decision regarding the implantation of their deaf children.  
 If, as Sparrow contends, culture provides the context of choice and an individual’s concept of right and wrong then it is only to be expected that the opinions of a family whose loyalties are exclusively devoted to Deaf culture would conflict with those of a family whose feet are firmly planted in the Hearing world.