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 φ (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, χ) 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.