
Higher dimensional analogues of the map colouring problem

Bhaskar Bagchi and Basudeb Datta¹

Abstract

After a brief discussion of the history of the problem, we propose a generalization of the map colouring problem to higher dimensions.

The map colouring problem was originally posed by Francis Guthrie in 1852. It asks for the minimum number of colours required to colour all possible maps (real or imagined) if one wishes to ensure that neighbouring countries receive different colours. Clearly one may imagine any number of countries sharing a common point in their boundary. So, in this problem, two countries are to be considered as neighbours only if their boundaries share an entire linear continuum. Clearly, four colours are required since there are maps with four mutually adjacent countries (as in the usual planar drawing of a tetrahedron). Francis guessed that four colours always suffice for his problem. This came to be known as the four colour conjecture.

Beginning with Augustus de Morgan (to whom Francis' brother Frederick first communicated the problem), innumerable mathematicians - both professionals and amateurs - tried their hands at the problem. Many possible approaches, reformulations, partial results as well as several wrong proofs resulted. One preliminary observation that could be made was that six colours always suffice. To see this, one may proceed as follows. The map to be coloured may well be taken as drawn on the surface of a ball (as in a globe) rather than on a sheet of paper. A little thought shows that, without loss of generality, the countries may be taken to be the faces of a convex polyhedron inscribed in the ball. Then we can invoke Euler's formula $v - e + f = 2$, where v , e , f are the number of vertices, edges and faces of the polyhedron. Using this formula, it is not hard to see that, in any map, there must be a country with five or fewer neighbours. Now, with six colours in hand, one may proceed to colour all maps inductively, as follows. Assume we already know how to colour all maps with fewer countries using six colours. Pick out a country with five or fewer neighbours in the given map, and momentarily forget it. By our assumption, the rest of the map can be coloured using the six colours. Since the forgotten country has at most five neighbours, at most five of the colours have been used to colour these neighbours. So, there is a left over colour which can now be used to colour the forgotten country, thus completing the six-colouring of the given map. For an alternative proof of this "six colours theorem", which avoids Euler's formula, read on!

The first significant progress on the four colour conjecture was made by A. B. Kempe, when he published a wrong proof of the conjecture in 1890. This may sound like sarcasm, but Kempe's work contained a very fruitful idea which led to the eventual resolution of the problem. In 1890 itself, P. J. Heawood pointed out the flaw in Kempe's argument, but he also showed that Kempe's logic may be modified to prove that five colours always suffice. The argument begins as in the proof of the six colours theorem sketched above. But, if the forgotten country has five neighbours who have received all five colours in the colouring of

¹Research partially supported by grant from UGC Centre for Advanced Study.

the rest of the map, then Kempe's argument gives a method to recolour them, so that one of the colours is freed for use on the forgotten country.

Finally, in 1976, K. Appel and W. Haken collaborated with a Cray supercomputer (taking more than a thousand hours of computer time) to prove the four colour conjecture (see [2, 3, 4]). Their work made no use of the huge superstructure of theories created during the twentieth century. Instead, they went back to a vastly elaborated version of Kempe's original idea! Perhaps there is a moral lurking here! Much has been made of the fact that Appel and Haken's proof is not a "human" one, and nobody can possibly verify it manually. But we think that the real problem lies elsewhere. If there was a prior theoretical proof that one only needed to check a million cases (say) to settle the question one way or the other, then, we think, most mathematicians would have happily left these million verifications to a machine. Unfortunately, the situation with the Appel-Haken proof is not like that. Until the computer stopped and came out with its verdict in favour of the four colour conjecture, there was no guarantee that the program would ever halt. It was rather like the celebrated halting problem of Turing acted out in real life. The proof consists in finding a finite "unavoidable set of reducible configurations". (A set of configurations is unavoidable if there is a proof showing that any hypothetical counterexample to the four colour conjecture must contain one of them. A configuration is reducible if, whenever a counterexample contains it, there is a well defined procedure to create a smaller counterexample by eliminating it.) The program halted precisely because it found such a set. Of course, one may ignore the mechanical genesis of this list, and get its authenticity verified (necessarily by another machine, since the list is so large). Such a verification constitutes an airtight proof which ought to keep everybody happy. But the question remains: why does such a set exist? Is it mere happenstance, or is there a good theoretical reason for its existence? So, the search for a "human" proof is still on.

Early in the game, mathematicians had realized that the infinite variety of shapes and sizes of countries is not relevant to the problem. What matters is the knowledge of which pairs of countries are neighbours. In order to forget the inessential, they used the notion of a graph. In simple terms, a graph is a picture consisting of finitely many dots (called vertices) in which some pairs of dots are joined by (possibly curved) line segments, called edges. Obviously, an edge joining the vertices x and y intersects an edge joining the vertices x and z at least in the common vertex x . A graph drawn in the plane is called planar if the edges have no further intersections. Each country in a map may be represented by a dot in its interior (perhaps its capital city). Clearly, whenever two countries are neighbours, the corresponding dots may be joined by a line segment (perhaps curved) which meets their common boundary at a point not lying on any other country, otherwise staying in the interior of these two countries. A planar graph results. If one can colour the vertices of this graph in four colours so that neighbouring vertices (i.e., those joined by an edge) receive different colours, then one may transfer the colours from the vertices to the corresponding countries, resulting in a proper four - colouring of the map. Conversely, given any planar graph, one may suitably blow up the vertices into countries, to create a corresponding map. Thus, we have the mathematician's favourite version of the map colouring problem: show that the vertices of any planar graph can be properly coloured using four colours.

So what should be a 3-dimensional version of this problem? One might try to define a "spatial graph" as a graph which may be drawn in three dimensional space without undue intersections. Unfortunately, a moment's thought shows that all graphs are "spatial". Indeed, one may take any (finite) number of points in space "in general position", i.e., such that no four of them are on a common plane. Then one may join each pair of these points

by a straight line segment. No two of these segments will then meet, except at a common vertex. The same observation goes for all higher dimensions since the three dimensional space embeds in all Euclidean spaces of higher dimensions.

Is that the end of the road as far as our search for a higher dimensional analogue of the map colouring problem goes? Not quite! After all, the attempt to abstract away the irrelevant geometric details of shape and size by going to planar graphs is not a very successful one. Indeed, any (sufficiently complicated) planar graph is visually indistinguishable from a map. Consider the following problem instead. Consider a finite set of non-overlapping discs in the plane. That is, any two of them are either disjoint or (externally) tangential. In other words, no two of them have any common interior point. Question: what is the minimum number of colours needed if we are to colour these discs in such a way that touching discs are given different colours? Does not that look like a much simpler problem which should have a fairly straightforward answer? Notice that, given such a set of discs, one can again form a planar graph (apparently of a very special kind) by joining the centers of each pair of touching discs by straight line segments. So, if Appel and Haken are to be believed, then in this problem also the answer should be four. (One can easily have four mutually touching discs in the plane, say by taking three equal mutually touching discs and then placing a fourth small disc in the niche created by them.) An amazing theorem due to Paul Koebe, E. M. Andreev and William P. Thurston (see [1, 6, 9]) says that every planar graph can be redrawn as the graph of a set of non-overlapping discs. Thus, our innocent looking problem of colouring discs is equivalent to the map colouring problem! Now, it is obvious how one may reprove the “six colours theorem” (albeit using the powerful K-A-T theorem). Given any finite set of non-overlapping discs in the plane, choose the smallest one. Say its radius is of unit length. Then, the discs touching it are equal or larger, so that it is obvious that at most six discs touch the smallest one. Moreover, if six discs do touch the smallest disc, then these neighbouring discs must be unit discs as well. We may assume that our set of discs is “connected” (in the sense that a point particle may go from one disc to any other, all the time staying within the discs in the set). Now, is it possible that all the discs have six or more discs touching them? If so, then the above argument shows that all the discs must be of the same size, and each must have exactly six neighbours touching it. But this is impossible since it is intuitively clear that, in this case, a disc in the periphery (technically, a disc touching the boundary of the convex hull of all the discs) would have at most four neighbours! Thus, we have shown that, given any finite configuration of non-overlapping discs in the plane, there is at least one disc which touches at most five others. Now, one may complete the proof of the “six colours theorem” as before. As promised, we have avoided any use of Euler’s formula.

Now, it should be clear how one can generalize the map colouring problem to arbitrary dimensions. For $d \geq 1$, let $\chi(d)$ be the smallest number such that any (finite) set of d -dimensional non-overlapping closed balls (not necessarily of the same size) in d -dimensional Euclidean space may be coloured in $\chi(d)$ colours so that any two touching balls receive different colours. Thus, we have $\chi(1) = 2$ (trivial!) and $\chi(2) = 4$ (Appel and Haken!). What is the value of $\chi(3)$?

There is a small but important question that needs to be answered. How do we know that $\chi(d)$ is finite? In other words, is it possible that in some dimension there are arbitrarily complicated sets of non-overlapping balls requiring unboundedly large number of colours? No! To see this, recall that the kissing number $\kappa(d)$ of d -dimensional Euclidean space is defined as the maximum number of non-overlapping equal balls which may touch a given ball of the same size. It is intuitively clear that $\kappa(d)$ is finite for each d . Indeed, the $\kappa(d) + 1$

unit balls in such a kissing configuration are contained in a ball of radius 3 (concentric with the central ball). Comparing (d -dimensional) volumes, one then sees that $\kappa(d) + 1 \leq 3^d$. Thus, $\kappa(d) \leq 3^d - 1$ for all d . (This is a very crude bound. For improved bounds, see Conway and Sloane [5].) The exact value of $\kappa(d)$ is known only for $d = 1, 2, 3, 4, 8$ and 24 . Indeed, we have $\kappa(1) = 2$, $\kappa(2) = 6$, $\kappa(3) = 12$, $\kappa(4) = 24$, $\kappa(8) = 240$ and $\kappa(24) = 196560$ (see [5, 7, 8]). Isn't that a surprise?

Now, given any finite set of non-overlapping balls in d -dimensional space, the neighbours of the smallest ball (say a unit ball) may be shrunk into unit balls, still remaining non-overlapping and still touching the smallest ball. This shows that there is at least one ball (namely the smallest) with at most $\kappa(d)$ neighbours. Therefore, as before, one may prove by induction on the number of balls that any finite set of non-overlapping balls in d -space may be properly coloured using at most $\kappa(d) + 1$ colours. Thus, $\chi(d) \leq \kappa(d) + 1$. Also, in space of dimension $d \geq 2$, one can construct a set of $d + 2$ mutually touching balls (one may take $d + 1$ equal balls with centers at the vertices of a regular simplex, having the side length of the simplex as their diameters, and then place a small ball in the middle touching all of them). Thus, $\chi(d) \geq d + 2$ for all $d \geq 2$. So, we have :

$$d + 2 \leq \chi(d) \leq \kappa(d) + 1 \leq 3^d, \quad \text{for all } d \geq 2.$$

In the magic dimensions $d = 1, 2, 8$ and 24 , it is known that, up to congruence, there are unique configurations attaining the kissing numbers. In these dimensions one may argue (exactly as we have done in the case $d = 2$) that $\chi(d) \leq \kappa(d)$, a slight improvement !

In our familiar three dimensional space, we have $5 \leq \chi(3) \leq 13$. What is the true value? We won't even hazard a guess. Happy hunting!

References

- [1] E. M. Andreev, On convex polyhedra in Lobačevskii spaces, *Math. of the USSR – Sbornik* **10** (1970), 413–440.
- [2] K. Appel and W. Haken, The solution of the four color map problem, *Scientific American* **237** (1977), 108–121.
- [3] K. Appel and W. Haken, Every planar map is four colorable. Part I: Discharging, *Illinois J. Math.* **21** (1977), 429–490.
- [4] K. Appel, W. Haken and J. Koch, Every planar map is four colorable. Part II: Reducibility, *Illinois J. Math.* **21** (1977), 491–567.
- [5] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [6] P. Koebe, Kontaktprobleme der konformen Abbildung, *Ber. Verh. Sächs. Akademie der Wissenschaften Leipzig, Math-Phys. Klasse* **88** (1936), 141–164.
- [7] J. Leech, The problem of the thirteen spheres, *Math. Gazette* **40** (1956), 22–23.
- [8] O. R. Musin, The kissing number in four dimensions, *Annals of Maths.* **168** (2008), 1–32.
- [9] W. P. Thurston, *Geometry and Topology of 3-Manifolds*, Lecture Notes, Princeton Univ., Princeton 1977–1978.

Bhaskar Bagchi

Theoretical Statistics and Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Bangalore 560 059, India.
E-mail: bbagchi@isibang.ac.in

Basudeb Datta

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012, India.
E-mail: dattab@math.iisc.ernet.in