I am greatly honored and delighted to receive the Lifetime Achievement Award of
the International Society of Justice Research. Although I have not been an active
participant in ISJR for many years, I have very fond memories of its early meetings,
particularly the one in Leyden. I wish I could be in Australia with you to present my talk
in person but, unfortunately, it would not have been wise for me to attempt to do so.

My talk is in three parts: (1) some relevant autobiography; (2) an overview of my
work in this area; and (3) the social implications of my work.

I. Some Relevant Autobiography

The stereotype exists that many academic researchers live in an ivory tower,
whose work is little influenced by the events occurring outside the towers in the “real
world.” This stereotype does not fit me nor, I assume, does it fit most academic
researchers. Let me illustrate, briefly, some of the social and personal influences which
affected my work.

I was always eager to be ahead of my time. So, I got myself born two months
prematurely into a middle-class Jewish family on February 4, 1920 in New York City, the
youngest of four sons. I skipped through elementary and high school and entered the City
College of New York (CCNY) at the age of 15.

Being Jewish and being the “youngest” in my family, among neighborhood kids,
and in school had profound effects on me personally and in my career. It sensitized me to
prejudice, discrimination, and injustice as well as to identifying with the “underdog.” In
the 1920's, there was considerable open anti-Semitism in the United States. I was called a
“kike,” “yitzcock,” “Christ killer,” and saw signs reading “No Jews, Niggers, or dogs
allowed here,” and got into fist fights with Irish and Italian kids when they taunted me for
being Jewish. Being the youngest, I was often “put down,” “teased,” “excluded,” or
challenged to compete with older kids. When I was about four-and-a-half years old, at a
resort hotel in the summer, a counselor organized a softball game for the kids at the hotel.
The other kids were about the age of my seven-year-old brother. I was excluded from the
game, for being too young, and told to stay on the sidelines. I was very mad!! When a
foul ball came near me, I grabbed it and ran with it and threw it into the nearby woods.
Then the older kids got real mad at me!!

I entered the City College of New York (CCNY) in 1935 as a pre-med major with
the idea of becoming a psychiatrist, having been intrigued by the writings of Sigmund
Freud, some of which I read before college. I was drawn to psychoanalysis undoubtedly
because it appeared to be so relevant to the personal issues with which I was struggling,
and also because it was so radical and rebellious (it seemed to be so in the early and mid-
1930’s). During my adolescence, I was also politically radical and somewhat rebellious
toward authority, helping to organize a student strike against the terrible food in the
Townsend Harris High School lunchroom and, later, a strike against the summer resort
owners who were exploiting the college student waiters, of whom I was one.

The 1930’s were a turbulent period, internationally as well as domestically. The
economic depression; labor unrest; the rise of Nazism and other forms of totalitarianism;
the Spanish civil war; the ideas of Marx, Freud, and Einstein; as well as the impending
Second World War were shaping the intellectual atmosphere that affected psychology.
Several members of the psychology faculty at CCNY were active in creating the Psychologist League, the precursor to the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. Thus, when I became disenchanted with the idea of being a pre-med student after dissecting a pig in a biology lab, I was happy to switch to a psychology major: It was a simpatico faculty. I note that in the lunchroom alcoves at CCNY, I became well versed in Marxist theology and disputation. Students adhering to the First, Second, Third, and Fourth International congregated in different corners of the lunchroom.

When Pearl Harbor occurred in December 1941, I was still in my psychology internship. Shortly thereafter, I joined the Air Force. I flew in thirty bombing missions against Germany. During combat, I saw many of our planes as well as German planes shot down, and I also saw the massive damage inflicted by our bombs and those of the Royal Air Force on occupied Europe and Germany. Moreover, being stationed in England, I saw the great destruction wreaked by the German air raids and felt the common apprehensions while sitting in air-raid shelters during German bombings. Although I had no doubt of the justness of the war against the Nazis, I was appalled by its destructiveness.

To sum up, my personal experience of discrimination and prejudice as being the youngest and as a Jew; plus my social awareness of the deep injustices associated with the Holocaust, the economic depression and the war; combined with the intellectual exposure to the radical ideas of Marx, Freud and Lewin; as well as my immersion in a progressive, activist culture at the City College of New York and elsewhere – all of these sensitized me to injustice. This, in turn, led me to choose to resume my graduate studies with Kurt Lewin at his newly formed Research Center for Group Dynamics at M.I.T.
after being demobilized from the Air Force in the summer of 1945, Lewin had an interest in research on such large issues of prejudice, democratic leadership, and social change. [I note that I also had applied to Yale and Chicago and was accepted by all three. In my interviewing with the psychological luminaries at all 3 institutions, I was most impressed by Lewin.]

II. An Overview of My Work in This Area

At Lewin's Research Center for Group Dynamics at M.I.T., the emphasis was on doing small group experimental research based upon theory that was relevant to important social issues. My dissertation research was a theoretical analysis and an experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process (Deutsch, 1949 a, b). It was, in part, stimulated by my concern about issues of war and peace and by contrasting images of the recently developed UN Security Council. Would its five permanent members be cooperative or competitive with one another and what would be the effects of these different orientations to one another?

It was only many years later that I realized that my research was centrally related to distributive justice. It was concerned with the effects of two different canons of distributive justice; “equity” and “equality”. In the competitive groups the 5 student group members were rewarded in terms of their relative contributions to the group’s product; the one who contributed the most would get an “A”, the next best a “B” and so on. In the cooperative groups, the 5 students in each group received the same grade; the grade being determined how by how well the group’s product compared with those of four other groups; the members of the most productive group would each receive an “A”, the members of the next most productive group would all receive a “B,” and so on.
The results of this study, as well as of many others (see Johnson and Johnson, 2005) are consistent with my theory of cooperation and competition. The results indicate that in interdependent tasks, when the rewards are distributed equally to members ("cooperative" groups") rather than in terms of their relative contribution to the group ("competitive" groups), the members of the cooperative groups: have more favorable attitudes toward other group members, the group task, and their group as well as toward themselves; they engage in more effective group process in terms of division of labor, mutual helpfulness, communication, and concentration on the task; and are more productive as a group. In addition, when conflicts arise within the group they resolve them more constructively.

After obtaining my Ph.D. in 1948, I wanted to return to New York City ("I love New York") so I took a job with Stuart Cook at the Commission for Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress and at the New School. There, with Mary Collins, we initiated a comparative study of the effects of living in two types of interracial public housing projects (Deutsch and Collins, 1951): segregated, where black and white families lived in separate buildings, and integrated, where they lived in the same buildings. The segregated buildings perpetuated and fostered racial prejudices, stereotypes, and a lack of positive interactions. The opposite occurred in the integrated projects.

In 1949, I took a position at New York University where I began a theoretical and experimental program of research on the condition affecting the initiation of cooperation and competition. This quickly turned into a program of research on bargaining, negotiation, and conflict situations because these are typically mixed-motive situations, in
which there are reasons to cooperate as well as to compete. Then, the question underlying my research became: What determines whether a conflict will move in a cooperative or a competitive direction? My earlier research had indicated that a cooperative orientation led to a constructive conflict resolution process while a competitive one led to a destructive one.

After much research conducted at NYU, Bell Labs, and Teachers College – with many terrific graduate students – my answer to this question was Deutsch's Crude Law of Social Relations:

The characteristic processes and effects elicited by a given type of social relationship also tend to elicit that type of social relationship.

Thus, cooperation induces and is induced by fair treatment perceived similarity in beliefs and attitudes, readiness to be helpful, openness in communication, trusting and friendly attitudes, sensitivity to common interests and de-emphasis of opposed interests, orientation toward enhancing mutual power rather than power differences, and so on. Similarly, competition induces and is induced by use of the tactics of coercion, threat, or deception; unfair treatment; attempts to enhance the power differences between oneself and the other; poor communication; minimization of the awareness of similarities in values and increased sensitivity to opposed interests; suspicious and hostile attitudes; the importance, rigidity, and size of issues in conflict; and so on.

In other words, if one has systemic knowledge of the effects of cooperative and competitive processes, one has systematic knowledge of the conditions that typically give rise to such processes and, by extension, to the conditions that affect whether a conflict takes a constructive or destructive course. My early theory of cooperation and competition is a theory of the effects of cooperative and competitive processes. Hence,
from the Crude Law of Social Relations, it follows that this theory brings insight into the conditions that give rise to cooperative and competitive processes.

Although it was clear to me that conflict has central relevance to issues of justice (injustice leads to conflict and destructive conflict often produces injustice), it was under the prodding of Melvin Lerner that I started my work in this area. Mel invited me to give a paper at a Conference on Injustice in North America (Deutsch, 1974) and a paper for an issue of the Journal of Social Issues (Deutsch, 1975) that I got directly involved.

Much of the research in this area of my students and myself is published in my 1985 book, *Distributive Justice* (which is now online at ICCCR's website). I have summarized this research in the following statements:

1. Cooperative, as compared to competitive, systems of distributing rewards – when they differ—have more favorable effects on individual and group productivity, individual learning, social relations, self-esteem, task attitudes, and a sense of responsibility to other group members.

2. In a situation of conflict, the ability of the conflicting parties to work out a just agreement that is stable and mutually satisfying is enhanced by the conditions that typically foster cooperation and are reduced by the conditions that typically foster competition.

3. There is no reliable or consistent evidence to indicate that people work more productively as individuals or as group members when they are expecting to be rewarded in proportion to their performance than when they are expecting to be rewarded equally or on the basis of need.
4. The preference for sociocentric principles of distributive justice (such as egalitarianism and generosity) is associated with positive, social-emotional, solidarity-oriented social relations, whereas the preference for individual-centered (such as proportionality or equity) is associated with impersonal, task-directed, economic-oriented social relations.

5. The sensitivity to injustice can be increased by providing social support for its acknowledgment and viable options for its remedy.

My most recent work in the field of justice are chapters in The Handbook of Conflict Resolution (2000, 2006) and an essay in Social Justice Research (Deutsch, 2006). The chapters provide an overview of types of injustices, the relation between conflict and injustices, education to overcome injustice, and reconciliation after injustice. My essay is divided into the following sections: The first considers the value premise underlying my use of the term, "oppression." The second is a discussion of the nature of oppression. The third addresses the question, "What forms does the oppression take?" The fourth asks, "What keeps oppression in place?" The fifth addresses the awakening of the sense of injustice. The sixth provides a discussion of the strategies and tactics for overcoming oppression, which often involves violent conflict with groups in power. In the final section of my paper, I discuss some nonviolent strategies and tactics for overcoming oppression.

I conclude this section with an important idea I presented in my paper, Interdependence and Psychological Orientation (Deutsch, 1982) that I, as well as others, have neglected. In that paper, I indicated that there is generally a "fit" between social
situations and psychological orientations. I also indicated that social relations could be characterized in terms of a number of key dimensions: cooperation-competition, equal-unequal power, task-oriented vs social-emotional orientation, formal-informal, important-unimportant. I also indicated that, typically, people orient themselves psychologically to different social situations with appropriate psychological orientations. Thus, my psychological orientation is different when I am playing with my young grandchildren than when I am bargaining with a used car salesman. I posited that psychological orientations are composed of three sub-orientations: a cognitive, motivational, and moral orientation. More recently (Deutsch) I have added “action orientation” as a fourth sub-orientation. I do not have time to elaborate on these sub-orientations. Here, I want to emphasize my point that all social situations have a moral component. Issues of justice and injustice enter into all social relations and the nature of the moral norms are often different in different types of social situations. When the moral norms of the situation are violated and an injustice occurs, even as a bystander, motivation to restore the integrity of the moral norms is aroused.

I bring this neglected idea to your attention because psychology has not yet recognized that moral orientations, as well as cognitive and motivational ones, are involved in all social relations.

III. Social Implications of My Work

I have always considered my contributions to psychology as being theoretical and as someone who developed theoretical ideas and did research related to theory. However, my mentor, Kurt Lewin taught his students that “there is nothing as practical as a good
theory.” While I did not anticipate the practical applications of my work, I believe it that it has had some important ones. I list a few.

(1) My dissertation study, a theoretical and experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process (Deutsch, 1949a, 1949b) was done in the context of small experimental classes in an undergraduate psychology course I was teaching at M.I.T. (I note that I conducted this research in 1947 not long after the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki). Although the guiding image underlying my study related to issues of war and peace, to whether the then-recently created UN Security Council would function cooperatively or competitively, my experiment involved the creation of cooperative and competitive small classrooms of five students. I published a paper in an educational journal on the educational implications of my theory and research. However, it was David Johnson – a former doctoral student of mine – who systematically developed these ideas into a pedagogy of cooperative learning and helped many teachers and school systems throughout the world to adopt this approach to education. It has also been widely applied in industry.

(2) After obtaining my Ph.D. I was offered a job by Stuart Cook, first at the New School and then at NYU; he was very interested in research which would provide insights into overcoming prejudice against Jews and against African Americans. Supported by the Marshall Fund, with help of Mary Collins, I directed a study on interracial housing (Deutsch & Collins, 1951) which compared the behavioral and attitudinal effects of living in public housing where the white and black residents were integrated, living in the same buildings, and where the white and black residents were segregated, living in separate buildings within the housing project. The integrated housing was in New York
City; the segregated housing Newark. The results of this study played a role in changing
the Newark Public Housing from a policy of segregating to integrating the races in their
housing projects. I quote from a statement made by the Director of the Newark Housing
Projects (from back cover of Interracial Housing):

A new policy...provides that henceforth all apartments are to be allocated on a basis
of need, regardless of race, religion, and color... In large measure, this change in
fundamental policy reflects the impact of the study reported in this book... Many of
us have long felt that the artificial separation of Negro and white families was an
unwholesome procedure. However, until the study of Dr. Deutsch and Mrs. Collins,
we had no scientific evidence to substantiate our feelings.

The study not only affected policy in Newark, it played a role in changing policies of the
US Public Housing Authority which provided some of the financing for local housing
authorities. Additionally, it was a small part of the material that a SPSSI Committee
(which included Kenneth Clark, Isadore Chein, and me) prepared for the lawyers who
successfully petitioned the US Supreme Court in Brown vs. Board of Education to end
racial segregation in publicly supported schools.

(3) After my dissertation research, which had demonstrated the effects of
cooperation and competition, and while engaged in some research on prejudice and social
conformity, I started a program of research on the conditions which gave rise to
cooperation or competition. This work, with the help of many former students and many
other scholars, helped to stimulate the development of the field of conflict resolution
studies. There have been many applications of this field – in schools, in industry, in
conflicts within and between nations. I have mainly contributed to applications in these
areas through my writings, participation in conferences, and workshops with
practitioners, and through such students as Jeff Rubin, Roy Lewicki, David Johnson,
Michelle Fine, Harvey and Madelaine Hornstein, Barbara Bunker, Susan Opotow, Peter Coleman, Eric Marcus, Ken Sole and many others. In addition, the Center that I founded at Teachers College, the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution (ICCCR), has helped to stimulate the development of conflict resolution programs in many schools.

For me, one of the applications of my work is an unusually important one. Janusz Reykowski, an outstanding Polish psychologist, was one of the key negotiators in the peaceful transfer of governmental power in 1989 from the Communist Party to the Solidarity Movement. He has indicated that my work influenced him considerably and facilitated a constructive approach to conflict. I quote from some remarks he made at a Conference on Intractable Conflict held in Poland in the fall of 2006.

"...Most of the great ideas produced by psychologists are appreciated for their intellectual value rather than for their consequences for practical life. There are, however, some exceptions. For me one such exception is Morton Deutsch because there are good reasons to claim that his theories went beyond academia and have had an impact on some large scale social processes – that took place a thousand miles from Morton's home place.

In fact, they took place in Poland in the middle of the eighties. It was a period of time when Poland ... was in the state of deep crisis. "Solidarity" – the massive democratic movement had been crushed during Martial Law (introduced in Poland in December 1981) and the country was overwhelmed by a major political and social conflict... As a psychologist, I was especially interested in analyzing the psychological factors that contributed to the development of the conflict situation and in possible psychological remedies. That was why I focused on Morton Deutsch's *The resolution of conflict* (Yale University, 1973) that I received from him some time ago. And now it seemed to offer the insight that I needed. The major theses of the book... provided excellent conceptual instruments for description of the Polish situation and were a very good source of ideas for developing proposals how to deal with it.

I wrote an article in the major, very influential, Polish weekly magazine (Polityka) - widely read by intelligentsia and member so the establishment-presenting Morton's theory and indicating how it could be applied to the Polish context. The approach met with an attack from both sides..."
Unlike earlier times, the attack in the official party newspaper was not a political death sentence for its author. To the contrary, I was allowed to respond to the criticism in the same newspaper and attacking my opponents I could further describe the concepts of destructive [and constructive] conflict and their importance for understanding the Polish situation.

I have some reasons to believe that this exchange and my further activities along this line had some impact on members of the ruling elite in Poland. A few years later, when the ruling party came to the conclusion that the policy of accommodation with Solidarity is a necessary step for solving the Polish conflict, I was called upon to help in execution of this policy. The most important first step of this new policy was the Round Table negotiations between Government and Solidarity. As a result of these negotiations the partially free election took place in Poland and following that the new government led by Tadeusz Mazowiecki a leading Solidarity figure was introduced. In other words, the starting point for a series of events that led to dissolution of the so called Soviet Bloc...

The most important ... [Round Table] was the political table because there was a place where the main political changes were formulated and negotiated. I was a co-chair of the political table...

It is not a place for detailed description of the negotiation. I would like to conclude that Morton Deutsch’s theory of destructive conflict had not only an important place in psychological science but also has some place in the history of social change in Europe.

These generous comments about the influence of my work by Professor Reykowski, who is now head of the Warsaw school of Social Psychology, reflect his generous, warm personality, which played a critical role in the success of negotiations. He is the one who should be awarded for applying psychological science to important social issues.

Let me conclude this section of my talk by stating: I did not foresee many of the applications of my theoretical and empirical work. Like throwing a pebble into water, the ripples of one’s theoretical work are hard to predict in advance.

Conclusion

I have always considered myself a grandiose rather than a picayune theorist. So, I conclude with some grandiose statements.
We live in a time when our planet is in peril from: global warming; extremely
dangerous weapons; gross injustices and inequalities within and between nations; bitter
destructive conflicts between nations and within nations; between different ethnic and
religious groups; and a growing competition for increasing scarcity of some vital, natural
resources. We also live in a period of much hope. There is growing global consciousness,
increasing sense of international community, and much scientific knowledge to deal with
our problems. To realize our hope, all of us, in the various ways available to us – must
foster cooperation and the constructive resolution of conflict at all levels of our social
world. Of course, we should vote for political leaders who will do this, but we can also
contribute much as educators, social scientists, parents and citizens.