



Justice in Transportation Justice from the Perspective of Shahid Motahhari and Comparing it with Transportation Policies

Mohsen Ramezani Gol Afzani

Masters student, Transportation Planning Department, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

ABSTRACT

The present study deals with the survey of the theories and notions proposed by Shahid Motahhari regarding justice as well as offering a criticism of the ideas opined by the western thinkers from Shahid Motahhari point of view. In the end there is provided an analysis and evaluation of the transportation systems considering the public and personal transportation methods.

Keywords: *Shahid Motahhari, Justice, public transportation, personal transportation, capitalism, Marxism*

Corresponding author: Mohsen Ramezani Gol Afzani

INTRODUCTION

After dealing with the survey of the ideas and notions proposed by some of the thinkers regarding justice and adapting them with the expansion of two transportation policies, the current research paper intends to investigate the perspectives held by the martyred professor Morteza Motahhari in this regard due to them being highly extensive and fascinating.

But, as the works by this virtuous martyr are completely well-known to the readers, the method used by this professor in discussing the various issues, investigating the theories proposed by various thinkers and by various schools of thought as well as in criticizing these works and, finally, expressing his own perspectives are based upon his complete recognition of the Islamic premises.

Due to the same reason, the theories by thinkers like Marx and Feuerbach and the Marxist and capitalists' systems intellectual basics are reviewed along with the presentation of Professor Motahhari's analyses. Then, based on these evaluations, the two modes of transportation are evaluated from another perspective through taking advantage of travel time function.

But, it is worth mentioning that the present article does not exclusively introduce some of the Professor Motahhari's criticisms on the western thoughts; rather, in order to gain a more complete insight regarding the Marxist and capitalist theories as well as to investigate their match or mismatch with the traffic policies, their theories will be directly excerpted from their books in our next article.

What is justice?

The previous chapters dealt with the definition of justice from the perspective of the holy Quran and the Islamic narratives as well as from the point of view of some thinkers but, now, herein it is deemed appropriate to state the definition provided

by Professor Motahhari regarding justice so as to be able to gain a subtler understanding of his reasoning in topics related to justice. Martyr Motahhari totally expresses four meanings and/or four use cases for justice.

A. Being Balanced

"If we consider a system in which different components and dimensions are applied and it is intended to serve a special goal, so certain conditions should be observed therein in terms of the amount each component is required as well as in terms of the quality of the components' interrelationships and it is only under such circumstances that the system can survive and produce optimum results and play the intended role. For instance, if a society wants to strive and survive it has to be equilibrated meaning that everything should be existent therein to the extent it is required, usually an equal rate. A balanced society is in need of many economic, political, judicial and educational measures to be fulfilled and these works and measures should be apportioned between individuals and individuals should be appointed to the rate it is envisaged necessary and required. In regard of the social equilibrium, the necessary thing that should be taken into consideration is the people's requirements and budgets should be spent appropriately according to such requirements. Expediencies appear here, to wit the public expediency, a sort of urgency wherein the survival and the stability of the "whole society" and the objectives that are to be accomplished by this whole are taken into consideration. In this regard, "parts" are but means, they do not feature exclusive and independent accounts.¹

B. Second Connotation of Justice, Parity and Denial of Any Sort of Discrimination

Sometimes it is said that a person is just. It means that s/he does not give more superiority to any one so here just must mean equality.

Such a definition requires explanation. If it is intended that justice requires one not to observe any sort of entitlement and consider everything and everyone equally such a fairness and justice is an objective example of injustice. If awarding everyone equal share should be considered as justice then refusing to give everyone an equal share of something should, as well, be considered as justice. There is a popular saying that has seemingly stemmed from such a theory: "treating everyone with equal share of tyranny is also a sort of justice".

But, if it is intended that justice means observing equality in regard of the equal entitlements then it seems a correct meaning; justice entails exercising such an equality and such an equality is a means of justice; but, justice, in this sense, refers to a third connotation that will be mentioned.²

In explaining this connotation in transportation domain, the struggles and quarrels between the legislating managers can be pointed out some of whom believe that the transportation development and growth diagram should be vertical to personal transportation based on the individuals' parity which means everyone should use public transportation but in the opposite side there are those who believe that an individual can freely and based on entitlement of the rights s/he has acquired as well as based on the efforts s/he has made to provide oneself with a vehicle can use his or her own personal vehicle for movement up and down the city. This is why a concrete and clear-cut law expressive of a single trend cannot be enacted.

C. Observing the People's Rights and Granting Everyone Whatever the Right They Deserve

"And, injustice includes trampling down the rights and abusing and occupying the others' rights. The real meaning of the mankind's social justice that is a sort of justice that is to be observed in all the human regulations and revered by the entire humanity is the same meaning. Such a justice relies on two things:

One is the rights and the priorities meaning that the mankind finds some sort of right and superiority in respect and in comparison to one another. For instance, a person who produces something via making effort finds some sort of superiority over that product and such a priority is derived out of the person's work and activity. Also, a child born by a mother has superiority over her milk and such a priority stems from purposive creation system that has yielded that milk for the child.

Another feature of the human nature is that he is created in such a manner that he necessarily employs some sort of thoughts that are called relational thoughts. It is via making use of such relational thoughts that the individual, as the means of an action, accomplishes his natural intentions. Such thoughts are a series of "compositional" ones that determine the "dos". For specimen, if the society members want to more appropriately achieve felicity they should observe the priorities and rights and this is the general meaning of the human justice that is affirmed by every individual's conscience and its opposition, injustice and tyranny, is accordingly condemned."³

And, this definition is in fact a decisive response in support of confirming the restrictive policies practiced in persona transportation which is dealt with in the ending section of the present research paper.

D. Observing Entitlements in Exuberating Existence and Non-denial to Exuberate and Impart benevolence to Whatever the Thing Deserving to be Existent or Get Perfect

Every being, in whatever the rank, enjoys certain entitlement unique to itself in terms of the capability to be exuberated. The holy quintessence of the God, as the absolute perfection and the uttermost goodness, is the utmost bountiful in every respect. He bestows upon every being whatever existence and perfection of existence s/he deserves and does not thriflily refuses such a bestowal. Corresponding to this theory, divine justice in the creation system means every being received whatever s/he deserves of existence and perfection. Injustice, here, means refusing to bestow and withdrawing from donating existence to whatever the being capable and competent thereof.

From the perspective of the divine scholars, the adjective "justness" the way it is used in describing the God's essence and proved as a perfection characteristic for the quintessence of the divinity denotes the same meaning and the adjective "injustice" which is a defection and therefore it is held that the God is far from being described by such an adjective denotes the same meaning which was pointed out.

The scholars believe that no single being has a right over the God the fulfillment of which is regarded as a "duty" or "responsibility" to be fulfilled by the God and the God should not be recounted as just in that He accomplishes His duties in respect to the others with uttermost precision. The God's justice is equal to his objective benevolence and generosity; meaning that the God's justice captures the idea that the God does not thriflily withdraw His generosity from any being featuring the competency and the likelihood to be enjoyed thereof".⁴

Rejecting the Deniers' Theory

Martyr Motahhari in rejecting the theory raised by Marxists who generally deny evolution in its entirety and used to say evolution is not a sensible concept because there is no common goal shared by the various communities and up and down are meaningless and conventional poses a fault. His Highness orders:

"They say that justice is a relative concept meaning one thing is just for some people and it is unjust for others and that justice is not an absolute term to be able to say where it exists and where it does not or to say that it exists somewhere to a greater extent and it is existent in another place to a lesser extent. Such a saying is repeatedly uttered by them. If anyone accepts such a saying, then s/he cannot realize justice as a common objective". He says "if felicity or justice is the common objective of the various communities it would not be possible to determine the degree to which the communities are near these objectives because felicity or justice are highly abstract and ambiguous concepts and therefore they are to be used to convey special meanings in every social system. Thus, the common objectives sought by different communities do not bear similar meanings and the societies cannot be assessed accordingly so as to figure out if they are getting perfect or if they are retrograding".

If we accept such a fault, the result would be taking "common justice" as something meant literally while a spiritual commonality should be at work in perfection. These [Marxists] who consider every concept as relative should accept such a fault.

About justice, we sometimes say that justice incorporates being compliance with the existing laws, however the Persian term "داد" which is said to have been derived of "دات" bears the meaning of law so *ش* just work should be taken as meaning doing something consistent to the extant law and because rules and regulations are variable, thus the justice should be envisioned as something changeable. For instance, up to the several days ago that the law of "landlord and peasant" was in practice and the peasants had a specified share of the harvest

as decreed by the law, it was considered fair enough and the poor peasants had to take exactly the same specified quotient of the harvest and any more than that was against the law; then, after the law was changed and the peasants were granted a greater share of the harvest [as an example], if the landlord wants to give a peasant the same share as it was common before it is injustice and an act of tyranny though it being in accordance with justice based upon the previous law.

If we consider justice as agreement to the existent rules and regulations, justice becomes variable because the law changes. But, if we make use of the Arabic connotation of justice [not from its Persian equivalent] this would render law as something pending on justice and justice as something dependent on right and right is something natural, real and objective, something that is quite separate from the human conventions so the issue will take another form and it will be changed as stated in the following words: "justice is 'اعطاء كل ذي حق حقه', meaning justice is 'giving every being the right s/he is entitled to'. This means that the individuals within the context of creation and nature have certain rights which are more superior to what is stipulated in the statutory provisions and such entitlements originate from the nature and the universe and the very existence of the beings so justice means every being should achieve what s/he really deserves.

So entitlement is the scale with which justice should be measured and justice is the scale based upon which the law should be calibrated; that means the law can be fair or it can be unfair but it, by no means, should be taken as connoting that the justice is a subsidiary of the law. Corresponding to the foresaid definition of justice, the examples of justice may change but justice does not undergo any changes. As an specimen, an individual might have a given share today, and it might be increased or decreased tomorrow but it does not bear the idea that the justice has changed".⁵

Profit-Mindedness and Love for Money as Opposites of Justice-Seeking

In elaborating the prophecy of the divine apostles, ShahidMotahhari introduces encouraging towards justice and not profit-mindedness as part of their mission. His Highness orders that "[the prophets] do not say because there is a profit in here, so go after it. The essence of prophets' invitation is by any means [promoting] profit-mindedness or [saying] because it is profitable one should be doing so. For instance, saying if somebody has taken away a property belonging to someone, then s/he should be going after it to take it back and not for respecting or upholding the right itself. There are two issues. It is sometimes said that it is your money and one cannot ignore money and the other person has taken your money or a property belonging to you so go and take it back. This is called money-adulation. Another time, it is said that a right has been trampled at which time a person might be willing to take it as far as his or her blood being shed even for getting back one dinar while the same person might be at the same time willing to spare a hundred dinars for the sake of God so money does not have a high value for the person and the issue is not related to money at all.

It is sometimes objected by some individuals that why Imam Ali and Her Highness Zahra (peace be upon them), who did not essentially value worldly matters, disvalued the entire money and the entire wealth of the world and ordered that this world of yours to me is cheaper than a goat's sneeze, look for the worldly matters in the incident of Fadak? Let them take it away! Did it worth a woman, the Apostle's daughter, with that modesty, glory and chastity, to attend the prophet's mosque and deliver an eloquent speech to express that they have taken away her property? Do this world's properties and belongings worth it? The answer is that the ones who think it this way

have taken it wrong. Once the issue is chasing the worldly matters; yes, Her Highness Zahra (peace be upon her) wants to donate Fadak to a person like an amount of oat contributed to a person, but, once the issue has something to do with serving justice and taking back the right which has been trampled. It is here that there is no difference made between one's own right and those of the others.

Here, a person will be held liable if s/he does not take a measure. Here, it means that a person has debased right and justice and rendered it helpless. So, these cases are quite different in the objectives they pursue.

Such an apparent conflict can also be seen in Amir Al-Mu'menin's doings to wit [His Highness does not give value to the worldly matters] where the issue is related to the materiality and money but where the issue is about right, then, even the tiniest amount matters to him. How is it that a person who speaks a lot with people and all the time insists that the world does not worth a thing and his all sermons are criticisms of materialism, does not allow himself to keep the candle belonging to the treasury house of the people burning even for a minute more so he puts it out. Is it not consuming a property belonging to this world and therefore devoid of value? If the worldly matters do not have a value so this candle should not, as well be valued; what is it that is valued and important? No, there are two accounts of the same issue, and these accounts should not be mixed".⁶

The relationship between these utterances and the transportation foundations and their relevant decision-making has been completely mentioned in the ending section of the current research paper.

CONCLUSION

Analyzing and Evaluating the Transportation Policies in regard of the Public and Personal Transportation based on ShahidMotahhari's Perspectives

If there is talk of the worldly matters then no one can object to the people's use of their personal vehicles; but, because the issue pertains to the trampling of the society members' rights then proper position should be adopted against it because persona vehicles, on the one hand, create various pollutions that endanger the individuals' health and, on the other hand, make the people waste a lot of time in traffic jams in cases like a patient being stuck in traffic and not being able to reach to a hospital on time and therefore lose his or her life or when, as a specimen, a university student cannot get to his or her class or examination on time which, in fact, results in the wastage of time, money and effort. Also, from another respect, this might result in the expansion of aristocracy and capitalistic systems meaning that s/he who has money can easily use his or her personal car to travel from a point to another but the low-income class of the people are condemned to use public transportation which is not ubiquitous and available everywhere and at the same time it is not comfortable due to its being always crowded and congested and it is, on the other hand, variable in its departure time. Some may pose the objection that time variability of the personal vehicles when being in traffic is limited whereas in-traffic wasted time for the individuals using public transportation is lower because of the public transportation means' use of special routes. In response, it has to be said that it is true that both of the transportation modes might have equal shares of time wastage and delay regarding being stuck in traffic and perhaps such an in-traffic wasted time be lower for the public transportation vehicles but there are other factors highly important at travel times like getting to a public transportation vehicle, passengers' waiting time for getting on as well as public transportation means lower speeds in comparison to the personal transportation

vehicles. So the travel time is a function of these and other factors.

In fact, the formula indicating the travel time function for both of the public and personal transportation vehicles is as stated below:

$$t_{tu} = t_T + t_p + t_{a1} + t_{a2}$$

$$t_{tv} = t_T$$

Where, t_{tu} is to the total travel time by a public transportation vehicle, t_T is the time wasted in traffic, t_p is the passengers waiting time for the public transportation vehicle to come, t_{a1} is the time when the passenger gets to a public transportation vehicle and t_{a2} is the travel time between the source and the destination by the public transportation vehicle.

As it is observed, the total time spent on travelling from a source to a destination is a lot higher for the public transportation time in respect to a personal vehicle. This means that when two persons take the same route from the same source to the same destination, one by public transportation and the other by personal car the one using the personal vehicle can get to the destination a lot earlier than the other using public transportation vehicle. So, if the proactive rules are not enacted against the use of personal transportation means we are in fact helping the development and expansion of capitalism based on which s/he who has more capital and therefore can afford buying a personal vehicle and manage its expenditures like fuel and maintenance then s/he can perform his various activities comfortably and in the shortest possible time and, quite astoundingly, there should be no importance given to the accomplishment or non-accomplishment of the various affairs by less-affording and low-income individuals.

Also, concerning the dependency of justice on law, there is still this fault raised as well in transportation that if such a theory is true then we should consider as just the law that allows for getting around the law itself through making monetary payments in which case we are bearing witness to the problem that some wealthy individuals enter the banned traffic zones via making payments and/or park their cars where parking is restricted. Such a theory does not have a foundation in Shahid Motahhari's thoughts which are based upon the theories of Islam; surprisingly, this same idea is also condemned from the perspective of the Marxists who are supporters of working class. In my opinion, this notion will be even refuted by the capitalists because if we take in to consideration some of the threats that the use of personal transportation vehicles brings about as well as the negative effects that they exert on the individuals' mental and psychological comforts when stuck in heavy traffics then the issue is not a matter of being a capitalist or non-capitalist and the entire people are infringed by such a justice-contradicting law.

REFERENCES

1. Ibid
2. Ibid
3. Ibid
4. Motahhari, Morteza, "a criticism of Marxism", p.820
5. Motahhari, Morteza, "Divine Justice", p.7
6. Motahhari, Morteza, "the history of philosophy", p.897