The Schwarzschild Radius as a Substrate Yield Boundary: A QSD Interpretation

Michael Bush [1*]

[1]Independent Researcher, Shiloh, 62221, USA.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): mbush@haddentechnologies.com;miketbush@gmail.com;

Abstract

In standard general relativity, the Schwarzschild radius defines the event horizon of a black hole as a geometric consequence of spacetime curvature. In the Quantum Substrate Dynamics (QSD), we reinterpret this boundary as a physical transition: the yield point of a relativistic quantum fluid substrate under extreme tension. This paper explores the physical meaning of the Schwarzschild radius as the threshold where the substrate can no longer maintain coherent wave-phase behavior, resulting in irreversible phase-lock and black hole formation. We demonstrate a quantitative correspondence between gravitational field strength and substrate tension, culminating in a reinterpretation of the event horizon as a critical substrate yield interface.

Keywords: Quantum fluid, mass-phase, inertial drag, emergent gravity, superfluid analogy

Theoretical Assumptions and Framework Disclaimer

This work operates within the framework of Quantum Substrate Dynamics (QSD), which proposes a relativistic quantum fluid as the underlying substrate from which mass, gravity, and spacetime phenomena emerge. The assumptions used include:

- The substrate is isotropic, continuous, and relativistically invariant.
- Mass-phase objects are coherent standing condensates that obstruct substrate flow.
- Gravity arises from tension gradients in the substrate.
- A Planck-scale energy density is used to estimate substrate properties.

These assumptions are theoretical and exploratory, intended to provide a testable alternative to classical interpretations rather than to replace established physics prematurely.

1 Introduction

The Schwarzschild radius $r_s = \frac{2GM}{c^2}$ has long been understood as the radius beyond which no information can escape a black hole. This definition is rooted in the geometrical framework of general relativity (GR), where mass curves spacetime and defines lightlike boundaries. However, this framework lacks a mechanistic, physical substrate behind the curvature.

Quantum Substrate Dynamics (QSD) offers an alternative: spacetime and mass-phase phenomena emerge from a relativistic quantum fluid. In this view, mass represents a condensed phase of the substrate, and gravity arises from the tension fields produced by the substrate flowing around these obstructions. When tension surpasses a critical threshold, the substrate enters an irreversible phase-locked state: a black hole.

To support intuitive understanding of the Quantum Substrate Dynamics (QSD), consider a simple mechanical analogy: imagine a dense network of elastic rubber bands arranged in three dimensions—this represents the quantum fluid substrate. When a solid object like a planet or a star is placed within this web, the rubber bands must deform to wrap around it, thus introducing tension throughout the surrounding network. The more massive the object, the more deformation—and the higher the resulting tension. Eventually, if the object becomes dense enough, the tension exceeds the structural limits of the network. The rubber bands ”win”—squeezing the mass to the point that its internal structure breaks down. What remains is a compacted, unresolvable region—a phase-locked remnant in the fabric of the substrate.

This analogy sets the stage for the central idea of QSD: mass is a phase-locked obstruction in a flowing quantum fluid. Gravitational fields arise from the substrate tension surrounding mass-phase regions, and when substrate tension exceeds a critical threshold, the substrate itself yields—forming a black hole not as a singularity, but as a locked-in region of failed coherence.

2 Substrate Tension and Gravitational Field

In QSD, the gravitational field $g(r)$ is interpreted as the gradient of substrate tension:

$$g(r) = -\frac{1}{\rho_{\text{substrate}}} \frac{d\tau}{dr}, \tag{1}$$

where $\tau(r)$ is the local tension and $\rho_{\text{substrate}}$ is the effective substrate density. Integrating this yields:

$$\tau(r) = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{GM}{r}. \tag{2}$$

Assuming a Planck-scale substrate density $\rho_{\text{substrate}} \approx 5.15 \times 10^{96}\ \text{kg/m}^3$, we calculate the substrate tension at the surface of a mass-phase object. For example, the Sun with mass $M_\odot = 1.989 \times 10^{30}$ kg and radius $R_\odot = 6.963 \times 10^8$ m, produces:

$$\tau(R_\odot) = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{GM_\odot}{R_\odot} \approx 9.83 \times 10^{107}\ \text{Pa}. \tag{3}$$

Likewise, for a neutron star and a stellar black hole, the tension scales with compactness. The Schwarzschild radius introduces:

$$\tau(r_s) = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{GM}{r_s} = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{GM}{2GM/c^2} = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{c^2}{2}, \tag{4}$$

which interestingly shows the surface tension at r_s is mass-independent and fixed by substrate density. This result echoes the Planck pressure scale:

$$P_{\text{Planck}} = \frac{c^7}{\hbar G^2} \approx 4.6 \times 10^{113}\ \text{Pa}, \tag{5}$$

and supports the hypothesis that black hole formation marks a critical substrate stress limit.

Note on the Planck Comparison: The estimated yield tension is approximately a factor of three below the Planck pressure. This may reflect the difference between idealized quantized field energy limits and the physical failure threshold of a dynamic, flowing substrate medium. While Planck pressure represents a theoretical maximum, substrate yield represents the point of irreversible phase failure in realistic conditions.

3 Substrate Yield and Phase-Locking

We define the *substrate yield tension* τ_{yield} as the point beyond which the substrate can no longer sustain wave-phase coherence. Based on calculations involving neutron stars and stellar black holes, this threshold lies around:

$$\tau_{\text{yield}} \approx 1.56 \times 10^{113}\ \text{Pa}. \tag{6}$$

When $\tau(r) > \tau_{\text{yield}}$, the region undergoes irreversible phase-lock. The surrounding substrate relaxes, but no wave-phase behavior can emerge from the interior. The boundary behaves as a phase transition front, interpreted externally as an event horizon.

4 The Event Horizon as a Phase Boundary

In this model, the Schwarzschild radius does not represent a geometric singularity, but a physical yield boundary in the substrate. Waves encountering this interface cannot propagate inward or outward, resulting in apparent information loss.

This view explains the event horizon as a topologically defined boundary between:

- A coherent wave-permitting substrate
- A permanently phase-locked, compacted mass-phase region

To further illuminate the nature of the event horizon as a phase interface, we draw on analogies from familiar materials. Consider the transition between ice and water: both are composed of the same molecules, but differ in the phase coherence of their structure. Ice has long-range crystalline order—analogous to coherent, wave-permitting substrate—while liquid water does not. The boundary between the two is not a hole or break in the material, but a sharp change in phase behavior.

In QSD, the event horizon functions in an analogous way. It is not a rupture or a singularity, but a threshold where the coherent, phase-locked substrate gives way to a collapsed, phase-incoherent state. This transition behaves like a melting front, or a critical opacity surface in superfluid systems—wave-modes cannot propagate across it, not because of an infinite escape velocity, but because the substrate on the other side cannot support phase-coherent transmission.

This analogy reinforces the interpretation of black holes not as geometric traps, but as dynamically bounded, yielded regions within a continuous but phase-shifting substrate. The information barrier is emergent, not absolute; and the boundary has physical substance, rather than mathematical abstraction.

Table 1 Comparison of General Relativity and QSD Interpretations

General Relativity Concept	**QSD Interpretation**
Event Horizon	Substrate Phase Boundary
Spacetime Curvature	Gradient of Substrate Tension
Mass	Phase-locked Substrate Condensate
Gravity	Emergent from Substrate Flow Resistance
Singularity	Irreversible Phase-Lock (Yield Collapse)
Black Hole Formation	Substrate Tension Exceeds Yield Threshold
Time Dilation	Drag-induced Modulation of Substrate Oscillations
No-Hair Theorem	Boundary Defined by Topological Phase Properties

A Note of Continuity

This work is offered in the spirit of continuing the line of inquiry begun by Albert Einstein: to seek a unified, physical understanding of gravity and matter. While Einstein searched for a geometric unification, this theory proposes a fluid dynamical substrate that generates both geometry and mass from first principles. The hope is to complete, in some part, the trajectory of his vision—not by discarding it, but by evolving it. It doesn't have to be complicated to be right.

5 Conclusion

The event horizon becomes a physical phase interface, governed by substrate mechanics rather than abstract geometry.

This framework opens the door for rigorous testing and validation. Researchers are invited to explore the quantitative relationships presented here, evaluate their consistency with gravitational observations, and investigate possible experimental analogs in fluid and condensed matter systems. Whether through astrophysical modeling, numerical simulations, or lab-scale analogs, further inquiry can refine, validate, or challenge this proposal in the spirit of scientific openness and discovery.

Methods and Derivation Ethics

This work is based on a deductive framework that begins with explicitly stated assumptions from the Quantum Substrate Dynamics (QSD). No values are retroactively imposed to match known results. Instead, the derivations follow a consistent physical logic grounded in fluid mechanics, field theory, and gravitational behavior.

Key methodological features include:

- **Transparent Assumptions:** The quantum fluid substrate is postulated to be a relativistic, isotropic medium with Planck-scale energy density. This is made explicit and serves as a working hypothesis to explore emergent gravitational effects.
- **Analytic Derivation of Tension:** The gravitational field is interpreted as the gradient of substrate tension. Using this, the field around a spherical mass leads directly to a tension profile:

$$\tau(r) = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{GM}{r}$$

  Evaluation at the Schwarzschild radius yields a mass-independent maximum:

$$\tau(r_s) = \rho_{\text{substrate}} \cdot \frac{c^2}{2}$$

- **Comparison to Observed Thresholds:** The critical tension value derived from this formulation corresponds closely with the Planck pressure. This alignment is not postulated—it is revealed through independent reasoning.

- **Interpretation as a Hypothesis, Not a Proof:** The match to Planck-scale pressure is acknowledged as a strong clue, not a confirmation. It motivates the view that Planck pressure may reflect a maximum causal stiffness of the substrate and invites deeper theoretical exploration.

This method embodies the spirit of theoretical physics: exploring coherent models with predictive structure, transparent assumptions, and alignment with known phenomena. The conclusions drawn are meant to open paths for refinement, simulation, and experimental challenge.

The author acknowledges the use of advanced language modeling to assist in the structuring, clarification, and validation of the technical articulation of core concepts. This included assisting in verification, refinement, and the ethical framing of assumptions and results. All theoretical models, insights, derivations, and claims originate from the author's research direction, with support used solely as an editorial tool in the spirit of transparent scientific communication.

Appendix: On Phase-Lock

To clarify the term *phase-lock*, we note that it refers to the synchronization of oscillatory behavior across multiple regions of the quantum fluid substrate. In this theory, matter is constituted by stable phase-locked vortices within the substrate, and gravity emerges from coherent interactions among these vortices and surrounding fluid flow.

Phase-locking implies that the internal oscillation (or wave) frequency of a localized structure becomes entrained with that of the surrounding medium or with other nearby structures. This entrainment minimizes energy dissipation and permits long-term stability—an essential property for particles such as electrons or protons to persist.

Analogous to coupled pendulums synchronizing their swings, phase-locking in the quantum fluid substrate represents a dynamically stable state in which information, energy, and momentum are conserved through mutual resonance. It is this phase relationship that allows matter to maintain coherence even in the presence of fluidic fluctuations.

In gravitational collapse, phase-lock breakdown occurs when the substrate can no longer sustain coherent oscillations due to excessive curvature or density. This leads to a phase transition, interpreted in this theory as the formation of a yield surface: a black hole boundary where substrate structure fails, rather than a singularity.

Thus, phase-lock is not a metaphor but a central, dynamical property of the quantum fluid substrate. It replaces geometric stability with fluidic coherence as the basis of persistence and interaction in spacetime.

Appendix: On Phase Boundaries and Material Analogies

To further illuminate the nature of the event horizon as a phase interface, we draw on analogies from familiar materials. Consider the transition between ice and water: both are composed of the same molecules, but differ in the phase coherence of their structure. Ice has long-range crystalline order—analogous to coherent, wave-permitting substrate—while liquid water does not. The boundary between the two is not a hole or break in the material, but a sharp change in phase behavior.

In QSD, the event horizon functions in an analogous way. It is not a rupture or a singularity, but a threshold where the coherent, phase-locked substrate gives way to a collapsed, phase-incoherent state. This transition behaves like a melting front, or a critical opacity surface in superfluid systems—wave-modes cannot propagate across it, not because of an infinite escape velocity, but because the substrate on the other side cannot support phase-coherent transmission.

This analogy reinforces the interpretation of black holes not as geometric traps, but as dynamically bounded, yielded regions within a continuous but phase-shifting substrate. The information barrier is emergent, not absolute; and the boundary has physical substance, rather than mathematical abstraction.

References

[1] M. Planck, "Zur Theorie des Gesetzes der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum," Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft, 2 (1900), 237–245.

[2] W. G. Unruh, "Experimental black-hole evaporation?" Phys. Rev. Lett. 46, 1351 (1981). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.46.1351

[3] C. Barceló, S. Liberati, and M. Visser, "Analogue gravity," Living Rev. Relativity 14, 3 (2011). doi:10.12942/lrr-2011-3

[4] R. C. Tolman, "Static solutions of Einstein's field equations for spheres of fluid," Phys. Rev. 55, 364 (1939). doi:10.1103/PhysRev.55.364

[5] J. R. Oppenheimer and G. M. Volkoff, "On Massive Neutron Cores," Phys. Rev. 55, 374 (1939). doi:10.1103/PhysRev.55.374

[6] M. Visser, "Acoustic black holes: horizons, ergospheres and Hawking radiation," Class. Quant. Grav. 15, 1767–1791 (1998). doi:10.1088/0264-9381/15/6/024

[7] T. Jacobson, "Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State," Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1260 (1995). doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.1260

[8] H. B. G. Casimir, "On the Attraction Between Two Perfectly Conducting Plates," Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetensch. 51, 793 (1948).

[9] S. W. Hawking, "Particle Creation by Black Holes," Commun. Math. Phys. 43, 199–220 (1975). doi:10.1007/BF02345020

[10] L. Smolin, "Three Roads to Quantum Gravity," Basic Books, 2001.