

PHYSICAL SYSTEMS

BOSTON STUDIES IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

Editors

ROBERT S. COHEN, *Boston University*
JÜRGEN RENN, *Max Planck Institute for the History of Science*
KOSTAS GAVROGLU, *University of Athens*

Managing Editor

LINDY DIVARCI, *Max Planck Institute for the History of Science*

Editorial Board

THEODORE ARABATZIS, *University of Athens*
ALISA BOKULICH, *Boston University*
HEATHER E. DOUGLAS, *University of Pittsburgh*
JEAN GAYON, *Université Paris 1*
THOMAS F. GLICK, *Boston University*
HUBERT GOENNER, *University of Goettingen*
JOHN HEILBRON, *University of California, Berkeley*
DIANA KORMOS-BUCHWALD, *California Institute of Technology*
CHRISTOPH LEHNER, *Max Planck Institute for the History of Science*
PETER McLAUGHLIN, *Universität Heidelberg*
AGUSTÍ NIETO-GALAN, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*
NUCCIO ORDINE, *Università della Calabria*
ANA SIMÕES, *Universidade de Lisboa*
JOHN J. STACHEL, *Boston University*
SYLVAN S. SCHWEBER, *Harvard University*
BAICHUN ZHANG, *Chinese Academy of Science*

VOLUME 264

For further volumes:

<http://www.springer.com/series/5710>

PHYSICAL SYSTEMS

Conceptual Pathways between Flat
Space-time and Matter

by

ORI BELKIND

University of Richmond, VA, USA

 Springer

Ori Belkind
University of Richmond
Department of Philosophy
28 Westhampton Way
23173 Richmond Virginia
USA
obelkind@richmond.edu

ISSN 0068-0346
ISBN 978-94-007-2372-6 e-ISBN 978-94-007-2373-3
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-2373-3
Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

Library of Congress Control Number: 2011938244

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

*This book is dedicated to my parents,
Ilana and Naaman.*

Preface

This book originates with the first course I took in graduate school. The course was in the Philosophy of Science, and it was taught by Arthur Fine at Northwestern University. It was not the first time I have read Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, but this time reading it I became intrigued with Kuhn's claim that the concept of mass is a primary example of a concept that has undergone a scientific revolution. According to Kuhn, the parameter m in Newtonian physics and in the Special Theory of Relativity might be referred to with the same word, mass. However, in fact, the mass concepts in the two theories operate within radically different paradigms, to the extent that they share no meaning and are incommensurable. Kuhn's view struck me as absurd, and I set out to refute him in a short seminar paper. To refute the incommensurability thesis, I tried to articulate what I took to be the overlap in meaning between Newtonian and relativistic mass. The task turned out to be more challenging than I originally thought, but I did come up with a vague account of the shared geometric-dynamic role that mass has in the two theories. It slowly dawned on me that my interpretation of mass deviates from the way in which mass was presented in physics textbook, and so I conceived the idea to write a dissertation on the concept of mass, which will make precise the account vaguely conceived for the seminar paper. I soon found myself reading and thinking about the nature of spacetime, since the semi-geometric interpretation of mass required an analysis of the foundations of spacetime, or at least a decent understanding of the philosophical debates about the topic. While preparing for my project, I began reading seventeenth and eighteenth century texts surrounding the publication of Newton's *Principia*, a reading that took off in its own direction, since I realized that knowing the rich history of Newtonian concepts is key to understanding the various subtle roles that mass originally had for Newton's physics and philosophy of science. Reading into the history and pre-history of Newton's physics also reshaped my project, since I now believed that central to understanding the concept of mass (and physical concepts in general) is the notion of physical system. Inspired by seventeenth century physics, I articulated a philosophical account of physical systems, which takes motion to be a fundamental entity, and systems to be structures in which the motion of composite systems are constructed out of motions of their parts.

The dissertation I ended up writing comprised of a strange mix of historical and philosophical analyses of the foundations of spacetime and mass in both the contexts of Newton's theory and the Special Theory of Relativity. The project, given its peculiar history, ended up touching on various topics in the history and philosophy of physics, from the philosophy of space and time, to the concept of mass, to the scientific method. The concept of mass was like a tied knot at the center of Newtonian physics and the Special Theory of Relativity. Untying this knot required a slow and careful process of disentangling various threads, until the foundation of Newtonian and relativistic physics came into view. (Or, at least what I hope is a novel way of viewing the foundations of classical theories.) Unwinding each thread required the tackling of thorny conceptual problems.

After completing the dissertation, I realized the many infelicities of the work I came up with. I was unhappy with the vague articulation of the connection between spacetime geometry and mass, and took upon myself to articulate my views of spacetime more clearly, beginning with the simplest of axioms that take uniform unidirectional motions to be the fundamental entities of spacetime, and proceeding to derive the known Galilean Spacetime and flat relativistic spacetime. I ended up rewriting most chapters, adding some that were not in the original project, and revising the rest to sharpen the views and make the arguments more cogent.

The project now lies in its final form. It no doubt reflects my peculiar way of thinking and idiosyncratic combination of historical and philosophical inclinations. But I hope the project would be of use to philosophers of physics, who might be interested in the notion of physical system ([Chapter 1](#)), the foundations of spacetime ([Chapters 2 and 3](#)), my semi-geometric interpretation of the concept of mass ([Chapter 6](#)) and the foundations of the Special Theory of Relativity ([Chapter 8](#)). The work might also be of interest to philosophers and metaphysicians who are interested in the metaphysics of time ([Chapter 4](#)), to historians of physics working on Newton's physics ([Chapters 5 and 7](#)), and to philosophers of science and epistemologists interested in scientific methodology ([Chapters 2, 7 and 8](#)).

I would like to express my ocean-deep gratitude to Arthur Fine, who made this project possible on many levels, professional and personal. As my dissertation advisor, Arthur provided the bulk of intellectual freedom, institutional support and personal encouragement I needed to conceive, write, rewrite, and complete the project. I would also like to thank the Faculty Research Committee at the University of Richmond for providing financial support during the summers of 2005, 2006, 2008 and 2009 which aided in completing various parts of the project. Gratitude is owed to my colleagues at the philosophy department at the University of Richmond, Geoff Goddu, David Lefkowitz, Miriam McCormick, Del McWhorter, Nancy Schaubert and Gary Shapiro, who provided a congenial and supportive intellectual environment in the last 5 years. I benefited tremendously from conversations with and comments from Marc Lange, Andrea Woody, Geoff Goddu, Brannon McDaniel, Miriam McCormick, Wayne Myrvold, Bill Harper, Nick Huggett, Amit Hagar,

Eric Schliesser, Andrew Janiak, Sona Gosh, Kevin Scharp, Natan Berber, Ken Chung, Rob DiSalle, John Norton, Amy Au, Gideon Freudental, Craig Callender, Ed Slowic, and Paul Teller. Last but not least I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude for Michele Bedsaul's help in copy editing the manuscript and preparing it for publication.

Contents

1	Physical Systems and Physical Thought	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Quantum Mechanics and Particularism	7
1.3	Structural Assumptions and Conservation Laws	11
1.3.1	The Criterion of Isolation	13
1.3.2	The Rule of Composition	19
1.4	Structural Definitions	24
1.5	Conclusion	30
2	Interpretations of Spacetime and the Principle of Relativity	31
2.1	The Restricted Principle of Relativity	32
2.2	Conventionalism	40
2.3	The Geometric Approach to Spacetime	48
2.4	The Dynamic Approach to Spacetime	54
2.5	Conclusion	57
3	Primitive Motion Relationalism	59
3.1	Introduction	59
3.2	A Geometry of PUMs	63
3.3	Galilean Spacetime	71
3.3.1	Reconstructing Galilean Spacetime	71
3.3.2	Galilean Transformations	76
3.4	Flat Relativistic Spacetime	80
3.4.1	Reconstructing Flat Relativistic Spacetime	80
3.4.2	The Lorentz Transformations	83
3.5	Primitive Motion Relationalism vs. Standard Interpretations of Spacetime	89
3.6	Conclusion	90
4	The Metaphysics of Time	93
4.1	Introduction	93
4.2	The Flow of Time and Motion	101

4.3 The Conflict Between Presentism and Relativity 107

4.4 But Eternalism Is False Too 113

4.5 Primitive Motion Relationalism and the Metaphysics of Time 115

5 The History of Newtonian Mass 119

5.1 The Geometric Conception of Mass 121

5.2 The Dynamic Conception of Mass 129

5.3 Mach’s Critique of Newtonian Mass 136

6 Physical Systems and Mass 145

6.1 Primitive Motion Relationalism and the Expanded Reference Frames 146

6.2 The Stretching Parameter μ_0 and Newtonian Mass 150

6.2.1 The Quantity of Matter 153

6.2.2 Inertial Mass 156

6.3 Conclusion 161

7 Structural Assumptions, Newton’s Scientific Method, and the Universal Law of Gravitation 163

7.1 Hypotheses and Scientific Propositions 164

7.2 Structural Assumptions and Their Role in Inductive Reasoning 172

7.3 Newton’s Argument for the Universal Law of Gravitation 178

7.3.1 From the Area Law to the Centripetal Nature of the Force of Gravity 179

7.3.2 The Harmonic Rule and the Inverse Squared Distance Nature of the Gravitational Force 181

7.3.3 Deriving the Universal Nature of Law of Gravitation 184

7.4 Newton’s Scientific Method 189

8 The Special Theory of Relativity 191

8.1 The Expansion Factor μ_0 and Mass in STR 191

8.2 A New Interpretation of Mass in STR 199

8.2.1 Kuhn’s Thesis of Incommensurability 199

8.2.2 Field’s Indeterminacy of Reference 201

8.2.3 Invariance as a Mark of Objectivity 206

8.2.4 Einstein’s Mass and Energy as Two Manifestations of Substance 212

9 Conclusion 217

9.1 Spacetime 219

9.2 Mass 223

Bibliography 227

Index 233

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	Length contraction in Minkowski's geometric approach	49
Fig. 3.1	Event and parallel relations between PUMs	64
Fig. 3.2	Projection onto the spatial dimension	72
Fig. 3.3	Galilean paradigm of uniform motion	74
Fig. 3.4	Decomposition of motion intervals	75
Fig. 3.5	Stretching the spatial dimension relative to the temporal dimension .	77
Fig. 3.6	Simultaneity in relativistic spacetime	82
Fig. 3.7	Constructing spatial and temporal measures from light rays	83
Fig. 3.8	Stretching and contracting wavelengths	84
Fig. 4.1	Relations of coexistence in various reference frames	108
Fig. 7.1	From the <i>Area Law</i> to the centripetal nature of the gravitational force	179