1. The Nature of Space: Substantivalism, Relationism, and the Legacy of General Relativity

Volkan MAZLUM

Advisor: Giovanni Valente

1.1 Introduction

One of the most critical issues in the philosophy of science is the nature of space, which has continued intense discussion on metaphysical, epistemological, and physical levels. From ancient times through the scientific revolution, this basic idea has presented difficulties for philosophers and scientists. This article will discuss the numerous philosophical issues regarding space, with particular attention given to the historical conflict between substantivalism, which views space as an independent entity, and relationism, which sees space as a system of relations that exists through the arrangement of matter. Understanding this historical conflict is crucial for comprehending the diverse perspectives on the nature of space. It will also discuss the contributions made by Newton, Leibniz, and Mach.

Metaphysics, epistemology, and physicalism are defined as bases. Metaphysics is a branch of philosophy that deals with the fundamental nature of reality and existence. The first philosophers introduced it to philosophy with metaphysics, which means what is beyond the physical sciences. Metaphysics studies concepts such as being, existence, cause, space, and time. On the other hand, epistemology is a branch of philosophy that deals with knowledge. Epistemologists study nature, source, scope of expertise, and epistemological justification. In philosophy, physicalism is a metaphysical idea arguing that everything is material and nothing is above the physical.

1.2 Metaphysical, Epistemological, and Physical Questions in the Concept of Space

The first questions are about metaphysical questions. Metaphysical questions about space are generally around its fundamental existence. It indicates that it is a space as an independent container with which objects are included, or is it only a system of relations that exists through the arrangement of matter? These metaphysical questions state other epistemological questions about how we can perceive space by ourselves. Can we understand space directly? Do we deduce it solely through the relationships within it? Moreover, the physical part of space tries to search whether space can show some properties, such as curvature. When considered as a whole, these questions show how space is a complex concept that has been understood in many ways throughout the history of philosophy and science. Also, whether space is infinite or finite, and continuous or discrete, it raises essential metaphysical considerations about the nature of reality, challenging our intellect and stimulating further exploration.

On the other hand, from the epistemological perspective, we need to consider how we can know space. What connection exists between how we see space and what it is? Should we only depend on mathematical and physical theories, or can we also trust our intuitive feelings about their relationships? These queries highlight how difficult it is to understand and transform our theoretical definition of space with our experiential perception. The physical dimension of space raises questions concerning the connection between matter and space. How do physical items interact with space? These issues have changed with the development of contemporary physics, especially relativity theory, which introduced the idea of space-time and gave the foundation to fresh queries regarding the interrelationships of space, time, and gravity.

Space can be defined and interpreted from so many angles; as such, if we think in terms of these angles, one could produce varied definitions of space. For many people, it is a point of leaving to get answers to other antagonizing questions. Even here, philosophers and scientists have been left to ponder and submit their different perspectives regarding space. For example, Immanuel Kant believed that time and space were priorities required for structuring sensory experience. He considered space a frame set up in the human mind to arrange observations rather than being a feature of the outside world. This view challenges the traditional understanding of space as an objective, independent entity. René Descartes, on the other hand, believed that the substance extended beyond space, suggesting a more complex relationship between space and material objects. Isaac Newton put out an absolute theory of space, considering it a static, fixed framework in which everything moves and exists inside. Martin Heidegger focused on how people perceive space in a lived, existential sense by employing the idea of Dasein to approach space. He maintained that locations and spaces are influenced by context and meaning and that space is not just a container but is intricately linked to human existence. As we can understand from these examples, there are different ideas about this issue and even differences of opinion, highlighting the diversity of perspectives on space and the need to be open-minded and receptive to other ideas.

1.3 Substantivalism and Relationism

According to relationalists like Leibniz, space comprises the connections between real things like planets and humans. Relationalists think that these shifts do not alter space since a movement of one meter to the left of the cosmos does not alter the distance between things. Treating space independently from material objects appears enigmatic if the shift argument is valid. Therefore, relationalists base their understanding of space on every item we can feel and measure rather than on a distinct, enigmatic thing by limiting space to determine the relationships between physical objects. We have reason to believe in the relational space theory if everything else is equal. This is because we should base our theories about objects on things we know from experience, like tables and planets, rather than on mysterious things, like spatial space.

In distinction from this, considerable space as such an entity is not conceived in terms of matter itself, but it exists like that. They suppose an intangible condition with several similar points is considered an immaterial container. The arguments of substantialism are usually based on observable phenomena that association lists cannot explain, while they are suitable for explanation by reference to substantialism. Newton's philosophical understanding of absolute space became the basis of his theory of classical mechanics. The bucket experiment might be one of the most illustrative examples of his thinking: it showed that water in a necked-off bucket would exhibit effects that inferred absolute space. Newton supported the notion of space as an autonomous entity by arguing that the relative motion of things could not adequately describe such effects. In his theory, contrary to relationism, space is understood as an absolute [2].

Leibniz proposed a relational view of space, and he supported the rationalist part of philosophy, which holds that only reason can accurately determine the main base of reality. For instance, Leibniz, a supporter of relationism, said that the area of assessment is only the family relationship between things. He notably criticized Newton's theory of absolute space. According to Leibniz, if space were an independent entity, we could desire to think of the identical memory configurations placed in different places inside this absolute space. Furthermore, Leibniz supplied the most convincing arguments against Newton's absolutism and the classical definition of relationism. Based on this idea, any item may determine a reference frame. In conclusion, absolute location and velocity cannot be measured in Newton's Absolute Space, making such basic ideas meaningless or nonsensical. The location and velocity of an item are always relative to a selected frame. Hence, Leibniz's Relational Space does not require such ideas at all. [3]

Another Leibnizian critique of substantivalism was based on the Principle of Sufficient Reason: nothing happens for which there isn't a why. He would have it perhaps that there was no reason for absolute space because Newton stuck the whole universe with one region without another identical to the first, given homogeneous space. For him, the lack of sufficient reason to explain that the universe just happens to exist here and not there led to the conclusion that such an absolute space was entirely unnecessary. Indeed, positional relations among objects define their positions about one another rather than concerning any constant absolute space.

The relational conception of space was established by the Austrian physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach, who emphasized that spatial and inertial properties ultimately depend on the existence of mass and its distribution. According to Mach, often paraphrased in Mach's Principle, an object is inertial, dependent on the relation of that object to the excellent distribution of all other masses in the universe. Such terms as "acceleration" or "rotation" were meaningless or worthless unless they were about mass in the universe. In Newton's famous bucket experiment, the water rises against the sides of a rotating bucket - a movement Newton takes as proof of absolute space -. Still, Mach proposes this effect is because of its position not in absolute space but its motion concerning the distribution of the mass in the universe.

Mach's relationism was a lot, in fact, one of the very important conceptual stimulants for subsequent developments in physics, more especially those found in Einstein's general relativity theory. As per Einstein's theory of general relativity, space-time is a dynamic entity and is subjected to the presence of matter and energy that fills or occupies it rather than that which freely affects objects neutrally and not autonomously. According to Mach's view of space as having no intrinsic structure other than that given by the forces and things filling it, the distribution of mass and energy determines the curvature of spacetime, or what we experience as gravitational action.

While general relativity does not take on Mach's principle, at least in spirit, it shares the relational intuition that space-time geometry is determined by the matter it contains, further supporting the idea that spatial properties arise from material interactions rather than an absolute framework. By ruling that space may exist as an independent object, Leibniz and Mach provide a persuasive argument for relationalism. The relational nature of space was emphasized from both the philosophical and physical perspectives by Mach's physical insight, which influenced scientific theories about the interdependence of space with matter and energy. In contrast, Leibniz's philosophical theories challenged the metaphysical conceptions underpinning absolute space.

1.4 Arguments Against Substantivalism and Relationalism

The bucket experiment showed how absolute space can benefit a variety of physical phenomena, such as centrifugal force and inertia. These phenomena were complex to explain using solely relational views that can complement Newton's arguments for substantivalism. Moreover, substantive should be taken in line with classical Newtonian physics, an absolute framework that allows for the objective definition of movements.

Relationists, on the other hand, argued that an absolute 'container' space was unnecessary. The main argument for Leibniz was that the idea of space as a thing in and of itself leads to a needless duplication in metaphysics. In line with Mach's Principle, Inertia results from the arrangement of matter in the cosmos, and hence, movement can be viewed concerning other masses, further reducing substantivalism. Most significantly, it was Mach's theory that resonated with Einstein since it was in Mach that he perceived an author's footnote for relativism in the theory wherein mass and energy mold space-time itself. However, relationalism faces several disadvantages. First, inertial effects cannot be narrated without absolute reference. In general relativity, where matter influences space-time, the curved aspect of space-time looks like a more independent entity. Relationalism does not fully capture the knowledge of space as it exists today in contemporary physics.

As a result, Newton's bucket experiment also assists substantivalism because it means that, other than relative motion, centrifugal force stems from rotation with absolute space. Newton said that absolute space should be used to describe actual motion and separate appearances of inertia and centrifugal forces, which are not explained by simply considering the relative positions of given bodies. Leibniz pointed out that these relations can best account for such spatial effects and do not require independent space. Building from this, inertia and the spatial effects are all due to the distribution of matter in the entire universe (Mach's Principle). To him, water in a bucket moves relative to the fixed stars or the universe's mass and not an absolute space. This concept was later used in Einstein's general relativity, and we see space-time being skewed by matter, not vice versa. Still, relations have problems. Relational concepts are supported by general relativity. However, the spacetime curvature looks like a substantial container, the raw, absolute space, implying that relationism alone fails to explain inertial effects as described in the bucket experiment.

1.5 Personal View

For example, understanding these problems and views is easier than the more complicated information. General relativity offers the best solution supporting substantivalism and relationism. Although I consider the relational aspect of space, where space is said to be equal to the objects in it, I believe that Einstein has shown that space can never be just reduced to relations. In contrast, in general relativity, space-time is not an empty stage and container as Newton has described it, nor is it merely a relationship, as Leibniz indicated. Instead, it is an active object that engages with the matter and energy surrounding it, bending due to mass. Once again, Einstein agreed with Mach regarding spatial qualities being a function of the mass present in the universe, and further to this general position, relativity asserts that space-time possesses structure and can act on objects in turn.

As such, space-time is an externality but is partially relational. For example, one can comprehend how light bends around compact objects or how the timing contracts near heavy fields in general relativity. This indicates that the space-time framework is fundamental and operative without a conventional substantival vessel. However, I still sympathize with relationalism because general relativity tells us that space and time have basic properties that come out when interacting with matter. However, such dualism does distinguish from the reciprocal dependency between relations both Leibniz and Mach offered, although it does recognize that spacetime does not merely consist of ties. So, Einstein's approach is a more balanced, contemporary view of the nature of space.

Therefore, the conceptual issue of space in philosophy and science leads to metaphysical, epistemological, and physical problems, where one can view the ratio of substantivalism and relationism at different poles in the philosophy of space. In Newton, Leibniz, and Mach, we can identify the foundations of both positions, from absoluteness of space to dependencies of relations. On this view, the arguments I have provided with modern physics seem to support a mixed point of this view where space-time can be viewed as a structural relation between matters with properties and dynamics of its own. In a nutshell, the investigation of space still encourages philosophical thinking and scientific inquiry.

"In a time of universal deceit - telling the truth is a revolutionary act."
(George Orwell) [4]

REFERENCES

[1] Dieks, D. (2001). Space-time relationism in Newtonian and relativistic physics. International Studies in the Philosophy of Science, 15(1), 5-17.

[2] Hoefer, C. (1996). The metaphysics of space-time substantivalism. The Journal of Philosophy, 93(1), 5-27.

[3] Lin, M. (2016). Leibniz on the modal status of absolute space and time. Noûs, 50(3), 447-464.

[4] Fuster, V., & Turco, J. V. (2020). Protecting Peer Review. Journal of the American College of Cardiology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.08.055