

Confinement of Quarks

In the SM of particle physics, quarks are assumed to be spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles. All other elementary fermions of the SM, i.e. leptons, *must* be elementary spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles, just like the often observed relatively stable hadrons, like the uncharged neutron and +electron-charged proton of the first (lightest) particles-family. Where it should be noted that the hadrons are build from 3 quarks each (proton uud and neutron udd).

Why must all possible stable fermions possess spin, i.e. intrinsic angular momentum, equal to $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$? This is most easily answered while proofing David Hilbert's 6th problem. This answer is given at <http://quantumuniverse.eu> at the link:

Is it possible to derive all axioms of physics from a mathematical analysis!?!

A mathematical representation of any allowed spin $s \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, 1\frac{1}{2}, 2\}$ is a representation with an integer $n(s) = 2s + 1$ amount of degrees of freedom. Solving David Hilbert's 6th problem requires writing down all possible space-time-like symmetries possible in the searched for only possible mathematical space. As explained in the solution of Hilbert's 6th problem the only possible space to describe always massive fermions is 4D-space-time-like!

This results in all possible continuous space-time-like transformations given by a 16 dimensional 4x4 matrix, which should be a tensor to comply to the CAP:

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{S} \tag{1}$$

The anti-symmetrical transformation-tensor A has just 6 degrees of freedom. These degrees of freedom can also be given with the following spin-representation:

$$\mathbf{A} \equiv \text{spin}1 \times \text{spin}\frac{1}{2} \tag{2}$$

The spin1 representation represents the EM-field (photon) and the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ charges as its sources.

Likewise, the 10 degrees of freedom of the symmetrical transformation tensor S can mathematically also be represented by the following spin-representation:

$$\mathbf{S} \equiv \text{spin}2 \times \text{spin}\frac{1}{2} \tag{3}$$

The spin2 representation just represents the spin2 gravitational-field (graviton) and the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ sources are just the (relatively) stable spin $\frac{1}{2}$ masses.

Here it should be noted that in fact the EM-field isn't specified completely without application of a gauge-symmetry. Non-relativistic the Coulomb-gauge is used and SR the Lorentz-gauge is used. The maximum allowed gauge-symmetry in the only possible mathematical-space to describe our reality, i.e. 4D-space-time, is:

$$U(1) \times SU(2) \times SU(3) \tag{4}$$

The U(1) x SU(2) gauge-symmetry describes the massless photon and the massive weak-nuclear forces, the charged W^\pm and neutral Z gauge-bosons, in which the neutral photon and the Z-boson appear mixed by the so-called Weinberg-angle.

The last possible gauge-theory in the 4D-space-time-like analysis is the most difficult one:

The [SU\(3\)-gauge symmetry](#) describes all possible quarks and all their possible interactions. In SU(3) S stands for Special, i.e. the determinant of the transformation matrix $\det(\text{SU}(3)) = +1$, the U for Unitary and the index three for the fact that any transformation-tensor is a 3 x 3 tensor.

In the [SM](#) of particle physics all (assumed spin $\frac{1}{2}$) [quarks](#) possess an additional property called [color-charge](#). This property follows completely from the SU(3)-gauge-symmetry. The name color comes from the mathematical fact that SU(3) has 3 linearly independent so-called [quark-color \(RGB\)](#) solutions.

The property [spin](#) of all the [quarks](#) is a result of compliance with the [CAP](#). The fact that [quarks](#) cannot be observed on their own, implies that the [spin](#) isn't spin $\frac{1}{2}$, but must be the only other allowed half-integer [spin](#) $s_{\text{quark}} = 1\frac{1}{2}$. And the always used “[iso-spin \$\frac{1}{2}\$](#) ” should be omitted as an invalid property of [quarks](#).

In this way confinement of [quarks](#) is a logical result of re-writing the [SM](#) in compliance with the [CAP](#), i.e. include *always demanded* curvature of 4D-space-time in the mathematical description of physics.

As a direct consequence of [CAP](#), [gluons](#) can't be elementary particles, but have to be compound particles build from an even amount (mostly 2) of [quarks](#). The combinations of 2 [quarks](#) must be such that the [gluon](#) carries [color-charge](#) to participate in the strong interaction in addition to mediating it. I.e. [gluons](#) exchange [color](#) of [quarks](#) inside an uncolored [hadron](#).

This is also why [gluons](#) aren't massless, but always possess rest-mass due to the non-zero masses of the constituent [quarks](#). Please remember that only the spin1 [photon](#) and the spin2 [graviton](#) are massless and as a result of that always move with the maximum allowed speed in any relativistic description!

At the website of [Edward Witten](#) he gives his view on quark confinement at the following link:

[Black Holes and Quark Confinement](#)

In this [PDF](#) he doesn't seem to have a clue why [quarks](#) are never observed as elementary particles, that is, without interactions with other [quarks](#). The main reason for this problem is the assumption that [quarks](#) are spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles with additional so-called [iso-spin](#) (also $\frac{1}{2}$) instead of using the correct derived fact that [quarks](#) are elementary spin $1\frac{1}{2}$ [fermions](#) and as a result of that fact cannot exist on their own as stable elementary particles.

[Back](#)