# FD-01: The Forced Emergence of $K_4$

## From Self-Referential Distinction to Complete Graph

Johannes Wielsch

Independent Researcher

https://github.com/de-johannes/FirstDistinction

December 2025

**Abstract**

We prove that the complete graph $K_4$ emerges necessarily from the concept of distinction in constructive type theory. Starting from a single unavoidable premise—that something can be distinguished from something—we show that exactly four distinctions are forced into existence by logical necessity. These four distinctions, each distinguishable from every other, form the complete graph $K_4$ with 4 vertices, 6 edges, and Euler characteristic $\chi = 2$. The proof is fully formalized in Agda under `-safe -without-K` (zero axioms, 7,938 lines). We prove that $K_3$ fails to achieve closure, $K_5$ is not forced, and $K_4$ is the unique stable structure. This establishes $K_4$ as the minimal non-trivial graph that can exist without external specification.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Central Question

What is the simplest mathematical structure that *must* exist—not by convention, axiom, or external specification, but by logical necessity alone?

This paper answers: the complete graph $K_4$.

## 1.2 The Argument in Brief

1. To make any statement, one must distinguish between alternatives
2. The concept of distinction is *self-presupposing*: to deny it, one must distinguish the denial from its opposite
3. From this single unavoidable premise, we prove exactly four distinctions are forced
4. These four distinctions, connected pairwise, form $K_4$
5. At $n = 4$, the system achieves *closure*: every pair has a witness
6. $K_3$ fails (incomplete), $K_5$ is unnecessary (not forced), $K_4$ is unique

## 1.3 Methodology

All proofs are formalized in Agda [1], a dependently-typed proof assistant, under:

- `-safe`: No axioms, postulates, or unsafe features
- `-without-K`: No uniqueness of identity proofs

Complete source: https://github.com/de-johannes/FirstDistinction

## 2 The Unavoidable Premise

### 2.1 Self-Presupposition

**Definition 2.1** (Distinction)**.** A distinction is a separation between two alternatives. Formally, an inhabited type with decidable equality:

$$\mathsf{Distinction} : \mathsf{Set} \tag{1}$$

with constructors $\varphi$ (one pole) and $\neg\varphi$ (the other).

**Proposition 2.2** (Unavoidability)**.** *The concept of distinction cannot be coherently denied.*

*Proof.* To assert "distinction does not exist," one must distinguish that assertion from "distinction exists." The act of denial presupposes the capacity to distinguish, hence presupposes what it denies. The concept is self-presupposing. □

*Remark* 2.3. This is not a proof that physical distinctions exist. It proves that *within any discourse*—including mathematics—the concept of distinction is foundational and unavoidable.

### 2.2 Formalization in Type Theory

In Agda (lines 1823–1850):

```
data Distinction : Set where
  phi      : Distinction
  not-phi  : Distinction
```

This type has exactly two inhabitants, representing the two poles of any mark.

## 3 The Genesis Chain

### 3.1 Why Not Stop at One?

**Definition 3.1** (First Distinction)**.** Let $D_0$ denote the first distinction: $\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi$.

**Question:** Why is $D_0$ not sufficient?

**Answer:** To *recognize* $D_0$ as existing, we must distinguish it from the hypothetical scenario where no distinction exists. This act of recognition is itself a distinction.

### 3.2 The Forcing Mechanism

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 3.2** (Genesis Forcing)**.** *Starting from $D_0$, three additional distinctions are forced:*

$$D_0 : \textit{The first distinction} \qquad (\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi) \tag{2}$$

$$D_1 : \textit{Meta-distinction} \qquad (D_0 \leftrightarrow \textit{absence of } D_0) \tag{3}$$

$$D_2 : \textit{Pair witness} \qquad \textit{witnesses } (D_0, D_1) \tag{4}$$

$$D_3 : \textit{Closure} \qquad \textit{witnesses } (D_0, D_2) \textit{ and } (D_1, D_2) \tag{5}$$

*Proof sketch.* **Step 1:** $D_1$ is forced because recognizing $D_0$ requires distinguishing it from no-$D_0$.

**Step 2:** With $\{D_0, D_1\}$, we have the pair $(D_0, D_1)$. These are not identical (one is about $\varphi/\neg\varphi$, the other about presence/absence of $D_0$). To witness their difference requires a third perspective: $D_2$.

**Step 3:** With $\{D_0, D_1, D_2\}$, we have three pairs:

- $(D_0, D_1)$: witnessed by $D_2$ ✓
- $(D_0, D_2)$: no witness yet
- $(D_1, D_2)$: no witness yet

The pairs $(D_0, D_2)$ and $(D_1, D_2)$ are *irreducible*—they cannot be witnessed by elements of $\{D_0, D_1, D_2\}$ without circularity. This forces $D_3$.

**Step 4:** With $\{D_0, D_1, D_2, D_3\}$, all $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ pairs are witnessed. The system is *closed.*

Full proof: lines 1823–3025 of `FirstDistinction.agda`. □

### 3.3 The Captures Relation

**Definition 3.3** (Captures)**.** A distinction $D_k$ *captures* a pair $(D_i, D_j)$ if $D_k$ emerged specifically to witness the relation between $D_i$ and $D_j$.

**Lemma 3.4** (Irreducibility)**.** *A pair $(D_i, D_j)$ is* irreducible *with respect to a set $S$ if no element of $S \setminus \{D_i, D_j\}$ captures it.*

**Theorem 3.5** (Closure Criterion)**.** *A set of distinctions is* closed *if every pair is captured by at least one element outside the pair.*

## 4 Memory Saturation

### 4.1 The Memory Function

**Definition 4.1** (Memory)**.** The *memory* of $n$ distinctions is the number of pairs:

$$\text{memory}(n) = \binom{n}{2} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \tag{6}$$

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 4.2** (Memory Values)**.**

$$memory(1) = 0 \qquad \textit{(no pairs—trivial)} \tag{7}$$
$$memory(2) = 1 \qquad \textit{(single pair—minimal)} \tag{8}$$
$$memory(3) = 3 \qquad \textit{(three pairs—incomplete)} \tag{9}$$
$$memory(4) = 6 \qquad \textit{(six pairs—saturated)} \tag{10}$$

### 4.2 Saturation at $n = 4$

**Theorem 4.3** (Saturation)**.** *With four distinctions, every pair has* two *potential witnesses among the remaining elements:*

| *Pair* | *Witnesses* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| $(D_0, D_1)$ | $\{D_2, D_3\}$ | *2* |
| $(D_0, D_2)$ | $\{D_1, D_3\}$ | *2* |
| $(D_0, D_3)$ | $\{D_1, D_2\}$ | *2* |
| $(D_1, D_2)$ | $\{D_0, D_3\}$ | *2* |
| $(D_1, D_3)$ | $\{D_0, D_2\}$ | *2* |
| $(D_2, D_3)$ | $\{D_0, D_1\}$ | *2* |

*This redundancy ensures stability: no single element is indispensable.*

# 5 Construction of $K_4$

## 5.1 From Distinctions to Vertices

**Definition 5.1** ($K_4$ Vertices)**.** Map each genesis distinction to a vertex:

$$\text{vertex} : \mathsf{GenesisID} \to \mathsf{K4Vertex} \tag{11}$$

$$\text{vertex}(D_0) = v_0 \tag{12}$$
$$\text{vertex}(D_1) = v_1 \tag{13}$$
$$\text{vertex}(D_2) = v_2 \tag{14}$$
$$\text{vertex}(D_3) = v_3 \tag{15}$$

## 5.2 Edge Construction

**Definition 5.2** ($K_4$ Edge)**.** An edge connects two *distinct* vertices. In Agda (lines 2360–2373):

```
record K4Edge : Set where
  field
    src tgt : K4Vertex
    distinct : Not (src == tgt)
```

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 5.3** (Six Edges)**.** *$K_4$ has exactly 6 edges:*

$$E(K_4) = \{(v_0, v_1), (v_0, v_2), (v_0, v_3), (v_1, v_2), (v_1, v_3), (v_2, v_3)\} \tag{16}$$

*Proof.* Each edge $(v_i, v_j)$ with $i < j$ is explicitly constructed with a proof that $v_i \not\equiv v_j$ (established by pattern-matching impossibility). The count is $\binom{4}{2} = 6$. Lines 2368–2373. □

## 5.3 Completeness

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 5.4** ($K_4$ Completeness)**.** *For any two distinct vertices $v, w \in \{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, an edge exists connecting them.*

*Proof.* By exhaustive case analysis on all $4 \times 3 = 12$ ordered pairs $(v, w)$ with $v \neq w$. Each case returns the corresponding edge. Lines 2379–2420. □

# 6 $K_4$ Invariants

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 6.1** ($K_4$ Graph Invariants)**.**

$$V = 4 \quad \textit{(vertex count)} \tag{17}$$
$$E = 6 \quad \textit{(edge count)} \tag{18}$$
$$\deg = 3 \quad \textit{(degree of each vertex)} \tag{19}$$
$$F = 4 \quad \textit{(faces, as tetrahedron)} \tag{20}$$
$$\chi = V - E + F = 2 \quad \textit{(Euler characteristic)} \tag{21}$$

*Proof.*

- $V = 4$: Cardinality of `GenesisID` proven by bijection with Fin 4 (lines 1850–1870)
- $E = 6$: Explicit construction + completeness (Theorem 5.4)
- $\deg = 3$: Each vertex connects to $V - 1 = 3$ others
- $F = 4$: When embedded as tetrahedron in $\mathbb{R}^3$
- $\chi = 2$: Direct computation $4 - 6 + 4 = 2$

□

# 7 Uniqueness of $K_4$

## 7.1 Why $K_3$ Fails

**Theorem 7.1** ($K_3$ Incompleteness)**.** *Three vertices cannot achieve closure.*

*Proof.* With $\{D_0, D_1, D_2\}$, we have three pairs:

- $(D_0, D_1)$: witnessed by $D_2$
- $(D_0, D_2)$: witnessed by $D_1$
- $(D_1, D_2)$: witnessed by $D_0$

But this creates circular dependency: each witness is also a participant in a pair requiring witnessing. The pair $(D_0, D_2)$ is irreducible with respect to $\{D_0, D_1, D_2\}$, forcing $D_3$. Lines 2700–2750. □

## 7.2 Why $K_5$ Is Not Forced

**Theorem 7.2** ($K_5$ Superfluity)**.** *A fifth distinction is not forced by the genesis mechanism.*

*Proof.* At $n = 4$, all pairs are captured (Theorem 4.3). Adding $D_4$ would introduce 4 new pairs: $(D_0, D_4)$, $(D_1, D_4)$, $(D_2, D_4)$, $(D_3, D_4)$. But these pairs are *not irreducible*—each already has witnesses among $\{D_0, D_1, D_2, D_3\}$. No logical pressure forces $D_4$. Lines 2750–2800. □

### 7.3 The Uniqueness Theorem

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 7.3** ($K_4$ Uniqueness). *$K_4$ is the unique complete graph satisfying:*

1. ***Minimality:*** *Smallest $n$ for which closure is achieved*
2. ***Uniformity:*** *All vertices have the same degree*
3. ***Necessity:*** *Each vertex is forced by irreducibility*
4. ***Saturation:*** *Memory equals edge count: memory$(4) = 6 = E(K_4)$*

*Proof.*
- **Minimality:** $K_3$ fails closure (Theorem 7.1)
- **Uniformity:** In $K_n$, all vertices have degree $n - 1$. For $K_4$: $\deg = 3$
- **Necessity:** Genesis chain shows each $D_i$ is forced (Theorem 3.2)
- **Saturation:** $\binom{4}{2} = 6 = |E(K_4)|$

$K_4$ is the unique graph with these properties. Lines 7753–7800. □

# 8 Validation via Four-Part Structure

Each major claim is validated via four independent constraints:

**Machine-Verified**

**Theorem 8.1** (K4 Four-Part Validation). *The emergence of $K_4$ satisfies:*

1. ***Consistency:*** *Multiple derivation paths (captures, memory) agree*
2. ***Exclusivity:*** *$K_3$ incomplete, $K_5$ unnecessary—only $K_4$ works*
3. ***Robustness:*** *Structure stable under perturbation (any vertex can be removed temporarily)*
4. ***Cross-Constraints:*** *Graph properties (edges, degree, $\chi$) are interdependent*

*Proof.*
- **Consistency:** Both "captures" analysis and "memory saturation" yield $n = 4$
- **Exclusivity:** Proven impossibility: $K_3$ forced to expand, $K_5$ has no forcing
- **Robustness:** Any three vertices of $K_4$ still form connected subgraph
- **Cross-Constraints:** $E = \binom{V}{2}$, $\deg = V - 1$, $\chi = V - E + F$

Lines 7846–7900. □

# 9 Graph-Theoretic Properties

## 9.1 Symmetry

**Theorem 9.1** (Automorphism Group). *The automorphism group of $K_4$ is the symmetric group $S_4$, with $|S_4| = 24$ elements.*

All vertices and edges are equivalent under graph isomorphism. There is no preferred vertex.

### 9.2 Planarity and Embedding

**Theorem 9.2** (Non-Planarity)**.** *$K_4$ is the largest complete graph that is planar. $K_5$ and beyond require higher dimensions.*

$K_4$ embeds naturally in $\mathbb{R}^3$ as a regular tetrahedron, with:

- 4 vertices (corners)
- 6 edges (lines)
- 4 faces (triangular)

This embedding has Euler characteristic $\chi = 2$, matching the 2-sphere $S^2$.

## 10 Implications

### 10.1 What Is Proven

1. From self-referential distinction, exactly 4 entities are forced
2. These form the complete graph $K_4$ with specific invariants
3. $K_3$ fails to close, $K_5$ is not forced, $K_4$ is unique
4. The proof is machine-verified with zero axioms

### 10.2 What This Does Not Prove

1. That $K_4$ structure *is* physical spacetime
2. That the 4 vertices correspond to physical entities
3. That this derivation explains observed physics

The mathematics is proven. Physical interpretation is separate.

### 10.3 Philosophical Implications

If accepted, this result suggests:

- The number 4 is not arbitrary—it is forced by logic
- Complete graphs have a foundational status
- Structure can emerge from minimal premises

## 11 Related Work

- **Spencer-Brown (1969):** *Laws of Form* [2]—distinction as primitive
- **Category theory:** Initial objects and universal properties
- **Homotopy type theory:** [3]—constructive foundations
- **Graph theory:** Complete graphs and their properties [4]

Our contribution: machine-verified proof that $K_4$ is *forced*, not chosen.

## 12 Verification

### 12.1 How to Verify

```
git clone https://github.com/de-johannes/FirstDistinction.git
cd FirstDistinction
agda --safe --without-K FirstDistinction.agda
```

If compilation succeeds (zero warnings, zero errors), all proofs are valid.

### 12.2 Proof Statistics

| **Metric** | **Value** |
|---|---:|
| Total lines | 7,938 |
| Genesis section | Lines 1823–3025 |
| $K_4$ construction | Lines 2323–2650 |
| Uniqueness proofs | Lines 7753–7845 |
| Axioms | 0 |
| Postulates | 0 |

## 13 Conclusion

We have proven, with machine verification under the strictest settings (`-safe -without-K`), that:

- The concept of distinction is self-presupposing and unavoidable
- From this single premise, exactly four distinctions are forced
- These form the complete graph $K_4$ (4 vertices, 6 edges, $\chi = 2$)
- $K_4$ is the unique structure satisfying minimality, closure, and saturation

The result establishes $K_4$ not as a choice among many graphs, but as the *necessary* structure emerging from the most primitive concept available: that something can be distinguished from something.

## Acknowledgments

This work benefited from AI assistance (Claude, ChatGPT, DeepSeek, Perplexity) for proof structuring and LaTeX formatting. All mathematical content is the author's responsibility.

## References

[1] The Agda Team. *Agda Documentation*. https://agda.readthedocs.io/

[2] G. Spencer-Brown. *Laws of Form*. Allen & Unwin, 1969.

[3] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.

[4] D. B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, 2001.