A Geometric Three-Basin Multiverse from Modal Theory and General Emergence Mechanics

Exactly Three Universes from a Single Z_3 Orbifold Structure

Peter Baldwin
Independent Researcher
peterbaldwin1000@gmail.com

April 2026

Abstract

Modal Theory (MT) and General Emergence Mechanics (GEM) together imply a natural and geometrically constrained multiverse structure. The Z_3 orbifold potential of MT produces exactly three degenerate vacuum basins prior to chiral symmetry breaking. The loop-suppressed bias term selects the 255° minimum as the unique global attractor of our observable universe, but the remaining basins at 60° and 180° are not eliminated — they are real features of the vacuum landscape. In GEM, each basin constitutes a distinct coherence shell with its own persistence threshold P_{min}, relaxation timescale τ_{shell}, effective stiffness κ_{eff}, and correlation length ξ. These differences imply distinct effective physics in each basin. Unlike string-theoretic landscape proposals, which permit vast and largely unconstrained numbers of vacua, the present framework predicts *exactly three* universes, each fully determined by the same geometric structure that generates the fermion generational hierarchy, CP violation, and the arrow of time in our own universe. The inter-basin barriers correspond to infinite persistence-depth walls in GEM language, rendering direct observational access between basins impossible while preserving the full mathematical reality of all three. A refined ontological boundary is proposed: outside any given universe lies either sub-threshold excitations that fail to persist, or trans-basin structures that persist in a geometrically distinct vacuum.

Keywords: Modal Theory, General Emergence Mechanics, multiverse, Z_3 orbifold, vacuum basins, persistence threshold, emergent physics, coherence shell, cosmology, quantum gravity

Note. This paper presents a theoretical derivation of multiverse structure from the existing MT/GEM framework. It does not claim observational confirmation of the additional basins, which by construction lie beyond the persistence boundary of our universe.

1 Introduction

The question of whether additional universes exist beyond our own has historically been treated either as untestable metaphysics or as an unavoidable consequence of specific theoretical frameworks such as eternal inflation or string theory. The string landscape [6] admits an estimated 10^{500} or more distinct vacua, rendering the multiverse effectively unconstrained and, critics argue, unfalsifiable.

Modal Theory [1] offers a radically different starting point. Its Z_3 orbifold structure produces not an arbitrary landscape but a geometrically constrained set of exactly three vacuum basins. The chiral bias term selects one as the preferred minimum of our universe. The other two are not artifacts or approximations — they are real features of the same potential that generates our observable physics.

General Emergence Mechanics [2] provides the language in which the consequences of this structure can be articulated. In GEM, each vacuum basin constitutes a coherence shell with its own dynamical properties. The persistence threshold $P > P_{\min}$ separates stable entities from transient excitations within any given shell. Between shells, the orbifold barriers constitute infinite-depth walls in persistence space.

The result is a three-member multiverse that is:

- *Exactly constrained* — three universes, no more, no less,
- *Fully geometric* — each basin determined by the same Z_3 structure,
- *Internally consistent* — each universe has self-consistent persistence mechanics,
- *Ontologically bounded* — inter-basin access is forbidden by infinite depth barriers.

2 The Z_3 Orbifold and Three Vacuum Basins

2.1 The Symmetric Potential

The Modal Theory Lagrangian for the relative phase $\theta = \Delta\theta$ between the two scalar fields Φ_1 and Φ_2 is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi_2)^2 - g_{\text{mode}}\, \Phi_1 \Phi_2 \cos(\Delta\theta) + \lambda(\nabla\Delta\theta)^2, \tag{1}$$

with $g_{\text{mode}} = 4\pi G$. The Z_3 orbifold identification

$$\theta \;\sim\; \theta + \frac{2\pi}{3} \tag{2}$$

forces the symmetric sector of the effective potential to depend only on 3θ, producing the pre-bias symmetric potential

$$V_{\text{sym}}(\theta) = -g_{\text{mode}} \cos(3\theta). \tag{3}$$

This potential possesses three exactly degenerate global minima at

$$\theta = 60^\circ, \quad 180^\circ, \quad 300^\circ, \tag{4}$$

related by the Z_3 symmetry $\theta \mapsto \theta + 120^\circ$.

2.2 Symmetry Breaking and Basin Selection

The loop-suppressed chiral bias term breaks the Z_3 degeneracy. The full effective potential is

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\theta) = V_{\text{sym}}(\theta) + \delta V_{\text{chiral}}(\theta), \tag{5}$$

where

$$\delta V_{\text{chiral}}(\theta) \approx \kappa\, \rho_0^4\, B(\theta), \quad B(\theta) = -\sin\theta + \sqrt{3}\cos\theta, \tag{6}$$

with $\kappa \sim y_{\text{eff}}^4/(64\pi^2)$ generated at one loop. With $\kappa \ll g_{\text{mode}}$, this bias is a small perturbation on the symmetric sector. It tilts the three wells, lifting two relative to one, and selects the unique global minimum at

$$\theta^\star = 255^\circ, \tag{7}$$

which emerges dynamically rather than being imposed by hand [1].

2.3 The Relic Basins

The crucial observation for the present paper is this: the chiral bias lifts and tilts the three wells, but it does not destroy the other two. The basins at 60° and 180° remain as local minima of the effective potential — metastable relic configurations of the vacuum landscape. Their persistence as local minima is protected by the orbifold barriers, which are large compared to the bias term:

$$\Delta V_{\rm barrier} \sim g_{\rm mode}\rho_0^4 \gg \kappa\rho_0^4 \sim \delta V_{\rm chiral}. \tag{8}$$

The three basins are therefore not equally deep after symmetry breaking, but all three remain dynamically real.

3 Each Basin as a Distinct Universe

3.1 GEM Shell Properties per Basin

In GEM [2], the effective shell free energy near any local minimum θ_i is

$$F_i[\phi] = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}|\nabla\phi|^2 + V_i(\phi)\right], \tag{9}$$

where $V_i(\phi)$ is the effective potential expanded around the i-th minimum. The local stiffness at each minimum is

$$\kappa_i = V''_{\rm eff}(\theta_i), \tag{10}$$

and the characteristic relaxation timescale is

$$\tau_i = \frac{\gamma}{\kappa_i}. \tag{11}$$

The correlation length governing spatial persistence is

$$\xi_i = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa_i}}. \tag{12}$$

3.2 Numerical Estimates of Basin Properties

The second derivatives of $V_{\rm eff}$ at the three minima can be estimated from the MT potential structure. At the symmetric level, $V''_{\rm sym}(\theta) = 9g_{\rm mode}\cos(3\theta)$, evaluated at the three symmetric minima gives:

$$V''_{\rm sym}(60^\circ) = 9g_{\rm mode}\cos(180^\circ) = -9g_{\rm mode}, \tag{13}$$

$$V''_{\rm sym}(180^\circ) = 9g_{\rm mode}\cos(540^\circ) = -9g_{\rm mode}, \tag{14}$$

$$V''_{\rm sym}(300^\circ) = 9g_{\rm mode}\cos(900^\circ) = -9g_{\rm mode}. \tag{15}$$

These are the symmetric-sector curvatures at the pre-bias minima. The bias term and gradient stiffness shift these values, with the 255° minimum acquiring a small positive curvature as shown in MT v10 [3]:

$$\kappa_{255^\circ} \approx \Lambda^4(1 + 288\epsilon) > 0. \tag{16}$$

The relic basins at 60° and 180° acquire different curvatures under the bias perturbation, producing inequivalent shell properties. From the instanton path analysis of the Z_3 flavour sector [4], the effective curvatures at the relic minima are estimated as:

$$\kappa_{60^\circ} \approx 9.2\, g_{\rm mode}\rho_0^4, \quad \kappa_{180^\circ} \approx 9.0\, g_{\rm mode}\rho_0^4, \quad \kappa_{255^\circ} \approx \Lambda^4(1 + 288\epsilon). \tag{17}$$

These inequivalent curvatures imply distinct relaxation timescales, correlation lengths, and persistence thresholds in each basin — and therefore distinct effective physics.

Property	Basin 60°	Basin 180°	Basin 255° (ours)
Vacuum phase θ_i	60°	180°	255°
$\cos\theta_i$	$+0.500$	-1.000	-0.2588
Relative depth	Lifted	Intermediate	Deepest (global min)
Effective stiffness κ_i	$\sim 9.2\, g_{\text{mode}}\rho_0^4$	$\sim 9.0\, g_{\text{mode}}\rho_0^4$	$\Lambda^4(1 + 288\epsilon)$
Relaxation time τ_i	Shorter	Intermediate	Our τ_{shell}
Correlation length ξ_i	Smaller	Intermediate	Our ξ
Persistence threshold	Higher	Intermediate	Our $P_{\min}$
CP analogue	$\cos 60° = +0.500$	$\cos 180° = -1.000$	$\cos 255° \approx -0.259$

Table 1: Comparative shell properties of the three MT vacuum basins. Each basin constitutes a geometrically distinct universe with self-consistent persistence mechanics. The 255° basin is the unique global minimum selected by the chiral bias and is identified with our observable universe.

3.3 Table of Basin Properties

4 Implications of Distinct Basin Physics

4.1 Different Effective Constants

In MT, the emergent physical constants of our universe — the fine-structure constant $\alpha^{-1} \approx 137$, the CP violation parameter $\varepsilon_{\text{CP}} \approx \cos(255°) \approx -0.259$, the baryon asymmetry $\eta \approx 6.1 \times 10^{-10}$, and the fermion mass hierarchy — all depend explicitly on the vacuum phase angle $\theta^\star = 255°$.

In a universe occupying the 60° basin, the analogous quantities would be determined by $\theta = 60°$. The CP analogue would be $\cos(60°) = +0.500$ rather than -0.259: a universe with a *positive* CP-like phase and a qualitatively different matter-antimatter balance. In the 180° basin, $\cos(180°) = -1.000$: maximal CP-like violation, and a universe with significantly different baryon asymmetry.

The fine-structure analogue in each basin would follow the same geometric derivation as in our universe but evaluated at the respective vacuum angle, yielding different effective electromagnetic coupling strengths and therefore different atomic physics, chemistry, and ultimately different conditions for complexity.

4.2 Different Arrow of Time

In GEM, the arrow of time emerges from the directional relaxation of the coherence shell toward the preferred vacuum minimum. The rate of this relaxation is governed by $\tau_{\text{shell}} = \gamma/\kappa_{\text{eff}}$.

In the 60° and 180° basins, different stiffness values κ_i produce different relaxation timescales. Time — as directional shell relaxation — flows at a different rate in each universe. This is not merely a coordinate rescaling: the Lyapunov descent

$$\frac{dF_i}{dt} = -\gamma \int d^3x \left(\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t}\right)^2 \leq 0 \tag{18}$$

proceeds at a rate set by κ_i, which differs between basins. Each universe has its own temporal rhythm, emerging from the same dissipative mechanism but at a basin-specific pace.

4.3 Different Persistence Conditions for Complexity

The persistence threshold $P_{\rm min}$ in each basin is set by the local shell depth, stiffness, and relaxation structure. A shallower or stiffer basin may support fewer stable configurations — a smaller set of persistent entities. The richness of chemistry, biology, and ultimately observers depends on how many distinct stable configurations the persistence threshold admits.

Our 255° basin appears to be the global minimum — the deepest well. This suggests it may support the richest persistence landscape: the widest range of stable configurations, the most complex chemistry, the greatest biological diversity. The other basins, being shallower, may support less complex persistent structures — or none at all recognisable to us.

This provides a GEM-native anthropic principle: we find ourselves in the 255° basin not because it was arbitrarily selected, but because it is the deepest basin, supporting the richest persistence conditions under which observers can arise.

5 The Inter-Basin Boundary in GEM Language

5.1 Orbifold Walls as Infinite Depth Barriers

In GEM, the persistence depth D measures the energy barrier to escape the local coherence shell. The orbifold barriers separating the three basins are large compared to the bias term:

$$\Delta V_{\rm barrier} \sim g_{\rm mode}\rho_0^4 \;\gg\; \kappa\rho_0^4. \tag{19}$$

In GEM depth language, these barriers constitute effectively infinite persistence-depth walls between the three basins. No configuration persistent within one basin can tunnel to another under ordinary conditions, because doing so would require crossing a depth barrier far exceeding the shell's characteristic relaxation energy.

This is the GEM account of why the other universes are inaccessible: not because they are spatially distant, but because they lie on the other side of an infinite persistence-depth boundary. The inter-basin wall is the deepest possible GEM barrier.

5.2 A Refined Ontological Boundary

In GEM v4 [2], the boundary of our universe was characterised as follows:

> *Outside the universe is that which fails to persist long enough to become a thing.*

The three-basin structure requires a refinement. There are now two distinct kinds of "outside":

1. **Sub-threshold outside**: configurations within our basin that fail to satisfy $P > P_{\rm min}$. These are virtual-like excitations, transient distortions of our vacuum phase that do not persist long enough to acquire stable identity. They are real at the level of local phase displacement but not observable as stable entities.

2. **Trans-basin outside**: configurations that persist stably in a different vacuum basin. These are not sub-threshold — they may be fully persistent within their own shell — but they are separated from our universe by an infinite depth barrier. They exist with full ontological standing in their own basin but are completely inaccessible from ours.

The refined ontological statement is therefore:

> *Outside our universe lies either that which fails to persist long enough to become a thing, or that which persists in a geometrically distinct vacuum basin, separated from ours by an infinite persistence-depth wall.*

6 Comparison with Existing Multiverse Proposals

6.1 String Theory Landscape

The string landscape [6] admits an enormous and essentially unconstrained number of vacua — estimates range from 10^{500} to vastly larger numbers. The physical constants in each vacuum are determined by the compactification geometry, which is not uniquely fixed by the theory. This has been criticised as rendering the framework non-predictive: with sufficiently many vacua, any observed value of any constant can be "explained" anthropically.

The MT three-basin multiverse is categorically different. The number of basins is exactly three, fixed by the Z_3 orbifold symmetry. The properties of each basin are fully determined by the same geometric structure that fixes our own physical constants. There is no free landscape to scan.

6.2 Eternal Inflation

Eternal inflation [7] produces a multiverse of bubble universes through repeated nucleation events in an inflating background. The number of bubble universes is infinite, and the measure problem — how to assign probabilities to observations across infinitely many universes — remains unsolved.

The MT framework requires no inflationary mechanism and no measure problem. The three basins exist as features of a single compact potential, and the selection of our basin by the chiral bias is a deterministic dynamical outcome, not a probabilistic nucleation event.

6.3 Many Worlds

The Everett many-worlds interpretation [8] produces a continuously branching multiverse through quantum measurement. The branches share the same physical laws and constants but differ in their histories.

The MT three-basin universes are not branches of the same history — they are geometrically distinct vacua with different effective constants, different arrows of time, and different persistence conditions. They are ontologically prior to any branching structure.

7 Falsifiability and Observational Constraints

By construction, the other basins are separated from ours by infinite persistence-depth barriers. Direct observation of the 60° or 180° universes is therefore impossible within the framework. This might appear to render the proposal unfalsifiable.

However, the three-basin structure makes several indirect predictions that are testable within our universe:

1. **Exactly three fermion generations**: The same Z_3 structure that produces three vacuum basins produces three and only three fermion generations via the geometric seesaw mechanism [4]. This is already consistent with observation. A fourth generation would falsify the Z_3 structure and with it the three-basin multiverse.

2. **No additional vacuum selection**: If the bias term is correctly derived from one-loop physics, the 255° minimum should be the unique global attractor. Evidence of competing vacuum selection or a different preferred angle would constrain or falsify the framework.

3. **Relic imprints**: The relic basins at 60° and 180° leave signatures in our universe through the instanton paths connecting them to the 255° minimum. These paths generate the fermion mass hierarchy and mixing angles. Precision measurements of CKM and PMNS matrices therefore constitute indirect tests of the three-basin structure.

4. **No fifth force or new long-range interaction**: The inter-basin barriers are large. No residual long-range coupling between basins is predicted. Any observed fifth force would need to be accommodated within the single-basin structure.

8 Discussion

The three-basin multiverse emerging from MT/GEM is the most economical multiverse proposal in the existing literature. It requires no new assumptions beyond those already present in the MT/GEM framework, predicts an exact and finite number of additional universes, and connects that number to an independently motivated feature of our own physics — the three fermion generations.

The GEM language makes the ontological structure precise. Each universe is a coherence shell with its own persistence threshold, relaxation timescale, and effective stiffness. The boundaries between universes are infinite depth barriers. The richness of each universe's physics is set by its persistence conditions.

Several open questions remain. The precise physical constants of the 60° and 180° universes — their analogues of α, fermion masses, and cosmological parameters — require detailed calculation from the MT potential evaluated at those angles. Whether those basins support sufficient persistence complexity for chemistry or biology is an open question that follows from those calculations.

The deeper question — whether the other basins are occupied, in the sense of containing persistent structures analogous to matter — is not yet answerable within the present framework. The basins exist as dynamical features of the vacuum. Whether they contain persistent entities depends on whether their initial conditions admitted the formation of stable configurations above their respective persistence thresholds. This is a cosmological question that requires the full dynamical history of each basin to resolve.

9 Conclusion

Modal Theory's Z_3 orbifold structure implies exactly three vacuum basins. General Emergence Mechanics provides the language in which each basin constitutes a geometrically distinct universe with its own coherence shell, persistence threshold, relaxation timescale, and effective physics. The chiral bias term selects the 255° basin as our universe — the unique global minimum and, plausibly, the basin with the richest persistence conditions for complexity.

The other two universes, at 60° and 180°, are separated from ours by infinite persistence-depth barriers. They are ontologically real within the framework but permanently inaccessible. Their physical constants differ from ours in calculable ways determined by the same geometric structure that fixes our own.

This is a multiverse of exactly three members, fully determined, geometrically derived, and connected to testable predictions within our own universe. It is the minimal multiverse consistent with the Z_3 structure of MT — and, we suggest, the most economical multiverse proposal currently available.

References

[1] P. Baldwin, *Modal Theory: Self-Consistent Geometric-Dynamical Closure of a Two-Scalar EFT with a Unique* 255° *Attractor*, Zenodo (2026). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18756261

[2] P. Baldwin, *General Emergence Mechanics: Persistence, Coherence Shells, and the Three Axes of Stable Existence*, Zenodo (2026). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19756838

[3] P. Baldwin, *Modal Theory v10: Precision Geometric Closure*, Zenodo (2026). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18145492

[4] P. Baldwin, *The Z_3-Orbital Phase Space as a Flavor Generator: Deriving Fermion Hierarchy and Mixing Geometrically*, Zenodo (2026).

[5] P. Baldwin, *Toward a Gravitational Sector of General Emergence Mechanics*, Zenodo (2026). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19843738

[6] L. Susskind, *The Anthropic Landscape of String Theory*, arXiv:hep-th/0302219 (2003).

[7] A. H. Guth, *Eternal Inflation and its Implications*, J. Phys. A **40**, 6811 (2007).

[8] H. Everett III, *Relative State Formulation of Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29**, 454 (1957).

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

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