Substrate Mechanics: A Framework Overview

Emergent Gravity, Inertia, Mass-Energy, and Lorentz Invariance
from a Hyper-Elastic Vacuum Continuum

Troy Jensen
Independent Researcher
troy@principia.academy

2026

Abstract

Substrate Mechanics (SM) is a mechanical ontological framework treating the vacuum as a real, continuous, hyper-elastic medium. Spacetime geometry, Lorentz invariance, gravity, inertia, and mass-energy are not postulated but derived from a single substrate displacement field $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. A central result—Lemma LM-01, the Substrate Variable Bridge—establishes $\sigma = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}$ and $V_{\text{comp}} = -\int \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\, d^3x$, from which rest energy $E_0 = \mu V_{\text{comp}}$ and inertial mass $m = \rho V_{\text{comp}}$ are derived without free parameters. Four published results are summarized and connected to this foundation: (i) gravitational lensing as anisotropic refraction, (ii) Lorentz invariance as dynamic phase coherence, (iii) Shapiro delay as constitutive optical retardation, and (iv) galactic rotation curves from vacuum mode scarcity. Additional canonical results include kinetic energy as compression excess and the photoelectric threshold as a mode liberation condition. Open frontiers—the substrate action $S[\mathbf{u}]$, derivation of G, and determination of a_0 from triple-point thermodynamics—are identified as the framework's next targets.

1 Introduction

Standard physics rests on two ontologically incompatible frameworks: General Relativity (GR), which treats spacetime as dynamical geometry, and quantum mechanics, which operates on an effectively fixed background. Unification efforts have largely attempted to quantize gravity or geometrize quantum theory. Substrate Mechanics (SM) takes a third path: both frameworks are effective descriptions of a single underlying mechanical substrate.

The core proposal is conservative: *the vacuum is a real, continuous, hyper-elastic medium.* Matter, radiation, and the forces between them are mechanical phenomena in this medium—not imposed symmetries or geometric axioms. This is structural realism taken literally. It does not claim GR is wrong. It asks why GR works, and finds mechanical answers.

This overview reports the current canonical state of SM, organized by an explicit epistemic tier structure. Tier 1 contains foundational derivations anchored directly to continuum mechanics. Tier 2 contains canonical results derived from Tier 1 or observationally degenerate with established theories in their stated regimes. Tier 3 contains open research targets not yet elevated to canon.

2 Core Ontology

2.1 The Vacuum as Physical Substrate

The vacuum is not empty space or abstract geometry. SM asserts it is a real, non-particulate, continuous medium that is ontologically prior to matter and fields. It supports deformation, elastic response, phase transitions, and wave propagation.

Crucially: matter and clocks are made *of the same medium.* An observer cannot detect motion through the vacuum using instruments built from it—not because there is no preferred frame, but because all measuring devices self-adjust. This is why Michelson-Morley null results do not falsify SM.

2.2 Constitutive Properties

The vacuum phase is characterized locally by:

- mass density $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- shear modulus $\mu(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- displacement field $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$
- internal orientation order parameter $\hat{n}(\mathbf{x}, t)$

The medium supports both longitudinal (compressional) and transverse (shear) modes. The observed speed of light $c = \sqrt{\mu/\rho}$ is the shear-wave speed of the undisturbed vacuum phase—a material property, not a postulate.

2.3 Phase Structure

The universe is assumed to sit near a thermodynamic triple point between three coexisting phases:

Phase	Character	Role
Vacuum	Solid-like	Supports shear (light)
Dark	Amorphous	Pressure-bearing, no EM
Baryonic	Folded/locked	Particles

Particles are metastable topological folds—not fundamental entities. Stability arises from phase-boundary resonance conditions and topological closure.

3 LM-01: The Substrate Variable Bridge

A single lemma connects all SM derivations to the continuum displacement field $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. We call it the *Substrate Variable Bridge.*

Lemma LM-01. For a compressible elastic vacuum, the local dilatation $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the total compressed volume V_{comp} around a localized fold are:

$$\sigma = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} \tag{1}$$

$$V_{\mathrm{comp}} = -\int_{\Omega} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}\, d^3x \tag{2}$$

The sign convention ensures $\sigma > 0$ for compression (inward displacement gradient) and $V_{\mathrm{comp}} > 0$ for net compressed regions (bound topological folds).

LM-01 is not a model assumption. It is the standard kinematic relation between displacement and volumetric strain in continuum mechanics, applied to the vacuum substrate. Its role in SM is to bridge the geometric displacement field to the thermodynamic and inertial variables used in higher-level derivations. All Tier 1 and Tier 2 results that reference V_{comp} or σ depend on this lemma.

4 Tier 1: Foundational Results

4.1 Inertia as Compressed-Space Flux Resistance (CC-01)

Let $\mathbf{F}_{\mathrm{resist}}$ denote the restoring force on a compressed fold when displaced. The fold's compressed volume V_{comp} defines a flux of displaced medium that must relocate for the fold to move. Resistance to this relocation is the origin of inertia in SM.

Formal definition (Tier 1):

$$m \equiv \rho\, V_{\mathrm{comp}} \tag{3}$$

This is a *definition*, not a derivation—it establishes what mass *is* in SM: the product of substrate density and the compressed volume committed to a fold. Equation (3) is the inertial anchor for all subsequent mass-energy results.

4.2 Lorentz Invariance as Dynamic Enforcement [2]

SM treats matter as self-stabilized standing-wave structures in the medium. For such a structure to translate while maintaining internal phase coherence, its wavevectors must Doppler-split and its envelope must adjust. The only self-consistent solution is:

$$\ell \to \ell/\gamma, \quad \tau \to \gamma\tau \tag{4}$$

Length contraction and time dilation emerge as *phase coherence conditions*, not spacetime symmetries. Lorentz invariance is dynamically enforced, not postulated.

4.3 Gravitational Lensing [1]

Near a mass, vacuum density and shear modulus vary, establishing a refractive index profile $n(r)$. Anisotropic ray optics on this profile reproduces the full Schwarzschild deflection angle:

$$\delta\phi = \frac{4GM}{c^2 b} \tag{5}$$

where b is the impact parameter. No spacetime postulates are required. *Lensing does not uniquely imply curvature.*

5 Tier 2: Canonical Results

5.1 Mass-Energy as Elastic Cost (CC-03)

Given LM-01 and the CC-01 definition $m = \rho V_{\text{comp}}$, the rest energy of a topological fold follows directly from the elastic energy stored in its compressed volume:

$$E_0 = \mu\, V_{\text{comp}} \tag{6}$$

Equation (6) is *rest energy as elastic cost*: the energy required to maintain the substrate compression constituting a particle. Combined with the inertial mass definition:

$$\frac{E_0}{m} = \frac{\mu}{\rho} = c^2 \tag{7}$$

Mass-energy equivalence $E_0 = mc^2$ is recovered as a ratio of substrate moduli. The factor c^2 is not a conversion constant—it is the squared shear-wave speed of the vacuum medium, emerging from the same constitutive parameters that define the speed of light.

5.2 Kinetic Energy and the Photoelectric Effect (CC-10)

For a moving fold at velocity v, the compression excess relative to the rest configuration produces an energy increment. In the weak-velocity limit this reproduces $\frac{1}{2}mv^2$; at relativistic velocities the full Lorentz kinetic energy is recovered via wave-stability arguments consistent with the CC-01/Lorentz derivation.

The photoelectric effect emerges as a mode liberation condition: a photon (open shear-mode pulse) carries energy $E = hf$, where f is the pulse repetition frequency. Threshold behavior arises because a bound compression mode (electron) cannot be liberated unless the incoming shear-mode energy exceeds the fold's binding elastic cost E_0^{bind}. Frequency determines liberation; intensity does not—in precise agreement with observation.

5.3 Shapiro Delay [3]

The same refractive index profile used for lensing predicts a radar time delay for signals passing near a compact mass:

$$\Delta t = \frac{2GM}{c^3} \ln\left(\frac{4r_E r_R}{b^2}\right) \tag{8}$$

This closes the classical weak-field consistency loop: the same constitutive profile accounts for both angular bending and temporal lag without additional parameters.

5.4 Galactic Rotation Curves and Dark Matter [4]

Baryonic structures act as endothermic phase sinks, depleting surrounding vacuum modes over cosmological timescales. SM introduces the Mode Scarcity Field $\Xi(r)$ encoding the fractional reduction in available vacuum modes at radius r:

$$g_{\text{ic}}(r) = -\alpha c^2 \frac{d \ln \Xi(r)}{dr} \tag{9}$$

Combined with Newtonian gravity, this predicts flat rotation curves without invoking a dark matter particle. Validated against the SPARC dataset [5]: 175 galaxies, 3391 data points, RMS scatter 0.332 dex—competitive with standard MOND fits. The characteristic acceleration scale $a_0 = cH_0/6$ is consistent with Brodie (2026) [6]; its derivation from triple-point thermodynamics is a Tier 3 target.

5.5 Gravity as Emergent Entropic Force (CC-08, partial)

A stable compressed fold reduces local vacuum entropy by committing substrate modes to locked topological configuration:

$$S_{\text{vac}}(r) = -\alpha k_B \ln \Xi(r) + \text{const} \tag{10}$$

The resulting asymmetric fluctuation pressure on a nearby test body:

$$\Delta P_{\text{grav}}(r) \propto -\frac{dS_{\text{vac}}}{dr} \tag{11}$$

provides gravity as a substrate-mechanical Casimir mechanism. This connects independently to Jacobson (1995) [7] and Verlinde (2011) [8]; the $\Xi \leftrightarrow S_{\text{vac}}$ identification is canonical (Tier 2). The quantitative derivation of G from substrate constants remains Tier 3.

6 Canonical Tier Map

SM claims are organized by derivation depth:

Tier	Content	Gating condition
1	$c = \sqrt{\mu/\rho}$, Lorentz, lensing, CC-01 (inertia def.), LM-01	Continuum mechanics directly
2	$E_0 = \mu V_c$, $m = \rho V_c$, KE, Shapiro, $\Xi(r)$, S_{vac}	Derived from T1 or obs. degenerate
3	$S[\mathbf{u}]$ action, G derivation, a_0 from thermo, c_L/c ratio	Open research targets

Tier 3 items must not be cited as Tier 1 or 2 support.

7 Empirical Validation Summary

Phenomenon	**SM Result**	**Status**
Lorentz invariance	Phase coherence	Published [
Gravitational lensing	Anisotropic refraction	Published [
Shapiro delay	Constitutive retardation	Published [
Dark matter / RAR	Mode scarcity $\Xi(r)$	Published [
Mass-energy equiv.	$E_0 = \mu V_{\text{comp}}$	Canon (CC-
Photoelectric effect	Mode liberation	Canon (CC-
Entropic gravity	$\Xi \leftrightarrow S_{\text{vac}}$	Canon, part
G from first princ.	From ρ, μ, k_B	Tier 3 (T3-
a_0 derivation	Triple-point thermo	Tier 3 (T3-

8 Falsifiable Predictions

SM generates the following testable predictions distinguishing it from both ΛCDM and standard MOND:

1. **Age dependence:** Older galaxies show stronger g_{ic} relative to g_{rel}, testable by stratifying SPARC on stellar population age.
2. **Parameter-free G:** Newton's G should be expressible as a function of ρ, μ, and k_B alone—a zeroth-free-parameter prediction once $S[\mathbf{u}]$ is written.
3. **Submillimeter deviations:** Near high-density objects at sub-micron scales, substrate-dependent corrections to $1/r^2$ should be observable.
4. **Dark energy as mode proliferation:** Regions of net vacuum mode creation should exhibit repulsive gravitational behavior, identifying dark energy with substrate anti-sink dynamics.
5. **Photoelectric threshold from E_0:** The ionization threshold hf_0 for bound folds should equal the fold's elastic binding cost $E_0^{\text{bind}} = \mu V_{\text{comp}}^{\text{bind}}$, connecting atomic physics to substrate constants.

9 Open Frontiers (Tier 3)

Three problems gate the framework's next advancement:

T3-1: Substrate action $S[\mathbf{u}]$. A hyperelastic action of the form

$$S[\mathbf{u}] = \int \left[\tfrac{1}{2}\rho|\partial_t \mathbf{u}|^2 - W(\mathbf{F})\right] d^3x\, dt \tag{12}$$

would provide Noether currents for momentum (CC-02 promotion path) and enable a full constraint audit of SM's conservation laws.

T3-2: Quantitative G derivation. Given $S[\mathbf{u}]$, the gravitational constant G should follow from ρ, μ, and the fold formation entropy cost, closing the parameter-free gravity loop.

T3-3: a_0 from triple-point thermodynamics. The characteristic acceleration scale of MOND-like behavior should be derivable from the thermodynamic balance at the triple point—connecting the cosmological horizon, the vacuum phase stiffness, and the galactic-scale depletion rate. This would make the $a_0 = cH_0/6$ result a derivation rather than an observation.

10 Status and Limitations

SM is a framework in active development. Its intended regime is weak to moderate stress (linear or weakly nonlinear continuum behavior). Strong-field limits, black hole interiors, and complete phase collapse are acknowledged boundaries rather than failures.

Current limitations: (i) the substrate action $S[\mathbf{u}]$ is not yet written—Noether currents and momentum conservation (CC-02) depend on it; (ii) photon topology (CC-04) requires a formal open/closed mode definition; (iii) strong-field Schwarzschild compatibility remains to be demonstrated formally; (iv) quantum gravity connections are exploratory (Tier 3).

Four published preprints and a growing canon of distillation candidates are available at https://principia.academy.

Methodology Note

These results were developed using the *Principia* multi-agent adversarial pipeline: a structured system of validator, advocatus, entropy, steel-maner, synthesizer, and archivist agents that independently attack, defend, and synthesize each claim before it is elevated to canon. A concrete example of pipeline value: two independent frontier AI models (Kimi and DeepSeek) hallucinated the same fictitious citation during the Shapiro Delay review—identical title, identical fake arXiv number, different models. The verification step caught it before publication. The pipeline is available at https://principia.academy.

References

[1] T. Jensen, *Gravitational Lensing as Anisotropic Refraction in a Hyper-Elastic Continuum*, Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18736403

[2] T. Jensen, *Dynamic Enforcement of Lorentz Invariance via Substrate Stress Feedback*, Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18736487

[3] T. Jensen, *Shapiro Delay as Constitutive Retardation in a Hyper-Elastic Continuum*, Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18820856

[4] T. Jensen, *Dark Matter as Energy-Depleted Space: Rotation Curves from Substrate Mode Scarcity*, Zenodo, 2026. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18736625

[5] S. McGaugh, F. Lelli, J. Schombert, *Radial Acceleration Relation in Rotationally Supported Galaxies*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 201101 (2016).

[6] K. Brodie, *MOND from Two-Horizon Entropy Sharing*, github.com/KeithBrodie/SPARC-rotation-paper (2026).

[7] T. Jacobson, *Thermodynamics of Spacetime: The Einstein Equation of State*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1260 (1995).

[8] E. Verlinde, *On the Origin of Gravity and the Laws of Newton*, JHEP 04, 029 (2011).