

The Four Roots of Necessity — Why a Quantity Is "Fixed": A Census of Distinct Roots across Topology, Symmetry, Algebra, and Dimension — [Paper 86]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)
Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan
August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

ABSTRACT

"Why is this quantity fixed at this value?" "Why is this possible and that impossible?" Physics and mathematics give many reasons for why a quantity or structure is "fixed." This paper shows, across the corpus's existing papers, that these reasons are **not of one kind but have clearly distinct roots**, and gathers them into a single census. We distinguish four roots. **(T) Topological necessity:** Gauss–Bonnet $\int_{S^2} K dA = 2\pi\chi(S^2) = 4\pi$; the value is independent of any continuous deformation of the metric and is fixed by the Euler characteristic χ alone (Papers 02/67). **(S) Symmetry-based necessity:** Noether's theorem, continuous symmetry $\leftrightarrow$ conserved quantity (time translation $\rightarrow$ energy, rotation $\rightarrow$ angular momentum), with least action beneath it (Papers 80/84). **(A) Algebraic necessity:** Galois, whether an equation is solvable by radicals is decided by whether its Galois group is solvable (the quintic and beyond are unsolvable, Paper 85). **(D) Dimensional uniqueness:** in 3D the unique exponent making the shell mass growth rate dm/dr radius-independent is $n = 2$ (Paper 01; $n = 3$ in 4D, Paper 08). **The central observation:** quantities from different roots may coincide in **numerical value**, but that does not mean they are fixed "for the same reason" (distinct roots, Papers 58/48). In particular — the 4π that Paper 13 said "runs through mechanics, electromagnetism, gravity, and relativity" is a **topological quantity of Root (T), not a Noether charge of Root (S)**. Conflating them is a category error. Hence the honest final form of Paper 13's aspiration toward "one description language" is **not to fuse everything into a single mechanism**, but to **classify the roots of necessity correctly**. **Scope:** this paper is a census (classification); it merely arranges four borrowed standard results and produces no new mathematics and no new prediction. It does not unify the four into one (that is the point). "OS" and the like are Layer-3 non-science.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural classification (census)** of established mathematics and physics (the Gauss–Bonnet theorem, Noether's theorem, Galois theory, $n = 2$ uniqueness). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. **It does not unify the four roots into a single mechanism** — its aim is to show that there are distinct reasons. It does not infer identity of root from coincidence of value (the distinct-roots discipline of Papers 58/48). "Universe OS" and the like are Layer-3 non-science lenses, not claims of mechanism.

1. Introduction: How Many Kinds of Reason Does "Fixed" Have?

Everywhere in physics and mathematics we say "this quantity is fixed thus," "this must be so." But is the **meaning of "fixed"** always the same? Go once around a circle and you get 2π ; integrate the curvature of a closed surface and you get 4π — these do not move under deformation. Energy is conserved as time passes. The quintic has "no" solution formula. In three dimensions the inverse-square law alone is special. All of these are "necessary," but **the kind of reason for their necessity differs**.

This paper, ranging across the corpus's papers, classifies the reasons for "why fixed" into **four roots**. This is not a new theorem but a **re-filing of already-proven royal-road results into the correct drawers**. And in the end it shows that this classification gives Paper 13's wish for "one description language" an honest answer — classification, not fusion.

Root	Question	Tool (royal road)	Typical example	Corpus papers
(T) Topology	Why unmoved by deformation?	Gauss–Bonnet / Euler χ	$\int_{S^2} K dA = 2\pi\chi = 4\pi$	02, 67
(S) Symmetry	Why conserved over time?	Noether / least action	time transl. $\rightarrow$ $\boldsymbol{E}$, rotation $\rightarrow$ $\boldsymbol{L}$	80, 84
(A) Algebra	What divides possible/impossible?	Galois / solvable group	quintic not solvable by radicals	85
(D) Dimension	Why unique in that dimension?	uniqueness theorem	$n = 2$ only, in 3D	01, 08

2. Root (T): Topological Necessity — Unmoved by Deformation

Standard Fact (Gauss–Bonnet)

For an oriented closed surface M , the integral of the Gaussian curvature K is unchanged under any continuous deformation of the metric and is fixed by a single **topological invariant**, the Euler characteristic $\chi(M)$:

$$\int_M K dA = 2\pi \chi(M).$$

In particular for the 2-sphere S^2 , $\chi(S^2) = 2$, so $\int_{S^2} K dA = 4\pi$.

Here "necessity" is **deformation invariance**. However you distort the sphere, the total curvature does not budge from 4π . As seen in Paper 02 (4π mass cancellation) and Paper 67 ($4\pi = 2\pi\chi(S^2)$), the 4π recurring throughout the corpus stands on this **topological–geometric root** — it is "the full solid angle" and " 2π times the Euler characteristic." It does not hold because someone imposed a symmetry; it does not move because it is **invariant under continuous deformation**.

3. Root (S): Symmetry-Based Necessity — Conserved in Time

Standard Fact (Noether)

If the action $S = \int L dt$ is invariant under a continuous transformation, there exists exactly one corresponding conserved quantity. Time translation $\rightarrow$ energy E , space translation $\rightarrow$ momentum p , rotation $\rightarrow$ angular momentum L . On phase space T^*M this is the two sides of the single equation $\{G, H\} = 0$ (the momentum map) (Paper 80). Beneath it lies the principle of least action (Paper 84).

Here "necessity" is **conservation under time evolution**. What crucially separates it from Root (T) is that it **requires an input — a continuous symmetry**. No symmetry, no conserved quantity (in an expanding universe time-translation symmetry breaks, and even global energy conservation becomes delicate). **Deformation invariance (T) and temporal conservation (S) are both "invariance," but of distinct kinds.**

4. Root (A): Algebraic Necessity — Dividing Possible from Impossible

Standard Fact (Galois)

A polynomial equation is solvable by radicals if and only if its **Galois group is solvable**. The general equation of degree five and above has no solution formula because S_n ($n \geq 5$) is not solvable (Galois's group-theoretic explanation of Abel–Ruffini, Paper 85).

Here "necessity" is **the adjudication of possible and impossible**. Not a value conserved, nor a quantity surviving deformation, but "whether it can be done at all" is decided in advance by the structure of the hidden symmetry group. As seen in Paper 85, this is the source of the idea that flows, via Lie, into Noether (Root S) — but **Galois's discrete groups and Noether's continuous groups are distinct objects**; Roots (A) and (S) share the word "symmetry" yet are distinct roots.

5. Root (D): Dimensional Uniqueness — Unique in That Dimension

Standard Fact (uniqueness theorem)

In 3D Euclidean space, the unique exponent for which the shell mass growth rate dm/dr of a power-law density $\rho(r) = r^{-n}$ is independent of the radius r is $n = 2$ (Paper 01). In 4D it is $n = 3$ (Paper 08).

Here "necessity" is **uniqueness imposed by dimension**. The condition "require a certain natural uniformity in 3D space" **narrows the exponent to the single point $n = 2$** . This is neither topological invariance nor temporal conservation nor algebraic solvability — it is a fourth root. And $n = 2$ summons the inverse-square law, which summons 4π (Root T) — **roots may chain, but chaining is not the same as being identical**.

6. The Central Observation: Same Value Need Not Mean Same Root

Observation 6.1 (coincidence of value $\neq$ identity of root)

Quantities from different roots may happen to take the **same numerical value**. But that does not mean they are "fixed for the same reason." One must not infer identity of root from coincidence of value (the distinct-roots discipline of Papers 58/48). To speak of necessity, one must first ask **which root it came from**.

Observation 6.2 (Paper 13's 4π is Root (T), not Root (S))

Paper 13 stated that "mechanics, electromagnetism, gravity, and relativity share 4π ." That 4π is a **Root (T)** — **topological/geometric** — **quantity** deriving from Gauss–Bonnet / the solid angle. To identify it with a Noether conserved quantity (Root S) is a **category error** — because 4π is not "a charge conserved in time from a continuous symmetry" but "a topological quantity invariant under continuous deformation." Both are "invariant," but of distinct roots. **Paper 13's unification was a sharing of topology/geometry, not a unification of symmetry** — restating this correctly is the most important correction of this paper.

7. Connection to the Corpus: The Honest Final Form of Paper 13's "One Description Language"

Paper 13 carried the wish to render physical law "in one description language." This paper refines its **correct core** — "many laws share a common structure" — into a census of four roots.

The honest final form is this: **"one description language" is not the fusion of everything into a single mechanism, but a taxonomy that files the reasons for "being fixed" correctly among four roots** — topology (T), symmetry (S), algebra (A), dimension (D). These may chain ($n = 2 \rightarrow$ inverse-square $\rightarrow 4\pi$), but chaining is not identity. To give up fusion and commit to classification — that is the road that raises Paper 13's beauty to accuracy without losing it.

The Author's Personal Note (Layer 3, non-science label / not a claim of mechanism)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), these four roots look like "four different ways the Universe OS 'fixes' a quantity" — a constant that endures deformation (T), a ledger kept through time (S), a screening of possible blueprints (A), a default value imposed by dimension (D). But **this carries the non-science label**. The very pull to reduce the four to "one OS function" is strong. **But the feeling that "it can't be unseen" is a signature, not a proof**. So the body stays at classification, not fusion. What is written here is neither mechanism nor prediction, but a quiet self-caution toward the discipline of not mixing roots.

8. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive, classificatory):

- The reasons for "being fixed / being necessary" split into at least four distinct roots: topology (T), symmetry (S), algebra (A), dimension (D) (§§2–5).
- Paper 13's 4π is Root (T) — topological/geometric — not Root (S), a Noether charge; the identification is a category error (§6).

- The honest form of Paper 13's "one description language" is classification of roots, not fusion (§7).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **The four roots are not unified into one.** That is the point of the paper (the unification claim was retracted in Paper 13).
- **No new mathematics or theorem.** Gauss–Bonnet, Noether, Galois, and uniqueness are all standard (or previously published). This only provides a classification; it adds no theorem.
- **No new prediction.** Hence it stays at Layer 2 (structural, classificatory interpretation). The OS metaphor is quarantined as Layer-3 non-science.
- **No claim that four is exhaustive.** It is "there are at least four distinct roots," and does not exclude adding others (e.g., the Gleason-type necessity of probability, Paper 71).

9. Conclusion

Under the single word "fixed," four distinct necessities were in fact folded together — topology unmoved by deformation (T), symmetry conserved through time (S), algebra adjudicating possible from impossible (A), dimension narrowing to a unique value (D). The royal-road results the corpus has proven separately (02/67, 80/84, 85, 01/08) fit neatly into these four drawers.

And the most important correction is this single point: Paper 13's 4π stands on the topological Root (T), not on Noether's symmetry (S). Same value, different root (distinct roots, 58/48). The honest final form of the wish for "one description language" was not to melt everything into one, but to **count the roots of necessity without mixing them** — this census itself. Let go of the temptation to fuse, and commit to classification. That is the road that carries the beauty seen in Paper 13 forward into an accurate beauty.

References

1. do Carmo, M. P. (1976). *Differential Geometry of Curves and Surfaces* (the Gauss–Bonnet theorem). Prentice-Hall.
2. Noether, E. (1918). *Invariante Variationsprobleme*. Nachr. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, 235–257.
3. Galois, É. (1846, posth.). *Œuvres mathématiques* (ed. J. Liouville). J. Math. Pures Appl.
4. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Uniqueness Theorem of $\mathfrak{n} = 2$ for Spherically Symmetric Density Distributions* [Paper 01]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21403186.
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The 4π Mass Cancellation Theorem* [Paper 02]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21403931.
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Physical Law as a Description Language of the Universe OS (2nd ed.)* [Paper 13]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21404917.

7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Distinct-Roots Discipline for Numerical Coincidences* [Papers 58/48]. Zenodo. 10.5281/zenodo.21597747; 10.5281/zenodo.21602525
8. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Euler-Characteristic Origin of the 4π Patch* [Paper 67]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21642170.
9. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Conservation Laws Are the Shadow of Symmetry* [Paper 80]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21732957.
10. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *The Principle of Least Action* [Paper 84]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21741231.
11. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *From Galois to Noether* [Paper 85]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21741344.

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)