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We present a framework for investigating effective dynamics of SU(3) color charge. Two- and three-body effective interaction terms inspired by the Heisenberg spin model are considered. In particular, a toy model for a three-source “baryon” is constructed and investigated analytically and numerically for various choices of interactions. VPython is used to visualize the nontrivial color charge dynamics. The treatment should be accessible to undergraduate students who have taken a first course in quantum mechanics, and suggestions for independent student projects are proposed.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is quite notable that one can earn a college degree in physics without significant exposure to two of the four known fundamental interactions. Gravity and electromagnetism are covered in any introductory sequence, and at least one semester is typically devoted to an in-depth study of electromagnetism. While an investigation of gravity as a field theory is typically reserved for a course on general relativity, it is quite notable that one can earn a college degree in physics without significant exposure to two of the four known fundamental interactions. Gravity and electromagnetism are covered in any introductory sequence, and at least one semester is typically devoted to an in-depth study of electromagnetism. While an investigation of gravity as a field theory is typically reserved for a course on general relativity, it is

Before defining of color charge, it is useful to review some basic aspects of the theory of quantum spin. Here we present some fairly standard material on the quantum mechanics of spin from which our treatment of SU(3) sources and interactions will follow completely by analogy. Specifically, we require the basic properties of several interacting, spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ degrees of freedom.

A. One spin

A single spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ degree of freedom $|\chi\rangle$ belongs to the fundamental representation of SU(2) and can be represented by a two-component column vector

$$|\chi\rangle = a |\uparrow\rangle + b |\downarrow\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

for some complex numbers $a$ and $b$ satisfying $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$. Here the symbol $\equiv$ stands for “represented by” in the sense that the abstract two-dimensional quantum state may be represented by a familiar two-component column vector. Operators acting on these states will be represented by $2 \times 2$ matrices, and the action of operators on states translates to ordinary matrix multiplication in this representation.

Given a state $|\chi\rangle$, the expectation value of observables such as the three components of spin can be computed as the inner product $\langle \hat{S}^\nu | \hat{S}^\nu | \chi \rangle$. The spin operators are $\hat{S}^\nu = \frac{h}{2} \sigma^\nu$, where $\nu = x, y, z$ and the Pauli matrices $\sigma^\nu$ given by

$$\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

To generate nontrivial dynamics, the spin must interact with other spins or external magnetic fields. Postponing discussion of multiple sources to the next subsection, the interaction of a single spin with an external magnetic field is encoded in the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_1$,

$$\hat{H}_1 = -i \hat{A} \cdot \hat{S},$$

where $\lambda$ is a constant related to the magnetic moment of the source and $\hat{B} = B_x \hat{x} + B_y \hat{y} + B_z \hat{z}$ is an applied magnetic field.
We employ the shorthand \( \hat{\mathbf{S}} = \hat{S}_x \hat{\mathbf{x}} + \hat{S}_y \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \hat{S}_z \hat{\mathbf{z}} \) where each coefficient \( \hat{S}_k \) is actually a \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix given by \( \frac{\hbar}{2} \) times Eq. (2). Thus, the Hamiltonian Eq. (3) takes the form,

\[
\hat{H}_1 = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} B_x & (B_x - i B_y) \\ (B_x + i B_y) & -B_z \end{array} \right).
\]

As a simple example, let us take \( B \) to be a constant. The fundamental problem in quantum mechanics is to obtain the time-dependent expectation value of observables \( O(t) = \langle \chi(t) | O | \chi(t) \rangle \) for some initial state \( | \chi(0) \rangle \equiv | \chi_0 \rangle \). For a general state given by Eq. (4), the spin expectation values can be computed by using the Pauli matrices,

\[
\langle \chi(t) | \hat{S}^x | \chi(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left( a^*(t)b(t) + b^*(t)a(t) \right), \quad (5)
\]

\[
\langle \chi(t) | \hat{S}^y | \chi(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2i} \left( a^*(t)b(t) - b^*(t)a(t) \right), \quad (6)
\]

\[
\langle \chi(t) | \hat{S}^z | \chi(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left( |a(t)|^2 - |b(t)|^2 \right). \quad (7)
\]

Explicit forms for the complex amplitudes \( a(t) \) and \( b(t) \) are obtained at arbitrary times by solving the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

\[
i\hbar \frac{d |\chi(t)\rangle}{dt} = \hat{H} |\chi(t)\rangle. \quad (8)
\]

In the present situation, Eq. (8) reduces to a system of two coupled (linear) differential equations for \( a(t) \) and \( b(t) \),

\[
i\dot{a}(t) = -\frac{\hat{J}}{2} \left[ B_x a(t) + (B_x - i B_y) b(t) \right],
\]

\[
i\dot{b}(t) = -\frac{\hat{J}}{2} \left[ (B_x + i B_y) a(t) - B_z b(t) \right]. \quad (9)
\]

Let us take \( B_x = B_0, B_y = B_2 = 0 \) and take an initial state given by Eq. (10) with \( a(0) = 1 \) and \( b(0) = 0 \). Then Eq. (9) gives

\[
|\chi(t)\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\omega t) \\ -\sin(\omega t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)
\]

with \( \omega = \frac{\hat{J}B_0}{2} \). One may then show

\[
\langle \hat{S}^x(t) \rangle = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \sin[2\omega t],
\]

\[
\langle \hat{S}^y(t) \rangle = 0,
\]

\[
\langle \hat{S}^z(t) \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2} \cos[2\omega t], \quad (11)
\]

so that the spin precesses about the external magnetic field. While this is not a particularly complicated example, the steps involved in obtaining Eqs. (11) are virtually identical to those we will take with SU(3) sources in later sections.

### B. Multiple spins

A single spin can only interact with external magnetic fields which couple to its magnetic moment. When brought into the vicinity of another spin, the two spins may also interact with each other. Before addressing interactions, we summarize the formalism for representing a system of two spins. Given two spins in quantum states \( |\chi_1\rangle \) and \( |\chi_2\rangle \), the total quantum state is constructed by forming a tensor product of the individual spin states,

\[
|\chi\rangle = |\chi_1\rangle \otimes |\chi_2\rangle. \quad (12)
\]

It is convenient to represent the tensor product as a Kronecker product so that

\[
|\chi_1\rangle \otimes |\chi_2\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ b_1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} a_2 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a_1a_2 \\ a_1b_2 \\ b_1a_2 \\ b_1b_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)
\]

Operators acting on the full state are built from single-spin operators and must have the same overall dimension as the total Hilbert space. For example, the expectation value of the \( x \)-component of the first particle’s spin can be obtained from the inner product

\[
\langle \chi | \hat{S}^x \otimes \hat{I} | \chi \rangle, \quad (14)
\]

where \( \hat{I} \) is the identity operator, represented in this context by the \( 2 \times 2 \) identity matrix. The total \( x \)-component of spin for the two-spin system is represented by

\[
\hat{S}^x = \hat{S}_1^x + \hat{S}_2^x = \hat{S}^x \otimes \hat{I} + \hat{I} \otimes \hat{S}^x. \quad (15)
\]

The simplest phenomenological interaction for two spins is known as the Heisenberg Hamiltonian, which takes the form

\[
\hat{H}_2 = -\hat{J} \hat{S}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_2, \quad \text{where the dot product is shorthand for}
\]

\[
\hat{H}_2 = -\hat{J} \left[ \hat{S}^x \otimes \hat{S}^y + \hat{S}^y \otimes \hat{S}^x + \hat{S}^z \otimes \hat{S}^z \right]. \quad (16)
\]

Here \( \hat{J} \) is an effective interaction energy, and the explicit representation of \( \hat{H}_2 \) takes the form of a \( 4 \times 4 \) matrix. Proceeding in this manner, one can construct spin systems of any size with arbitrary interactions. However, the resulting Hamiltonian grows explosively in size with the dimension being \( 2^N \), representing a practical upper limit on the sizes of quantum spin systems which can be simulated effectively on classical computers. In the present work, we consider small systems with \( N \leq 3 \).

### III. COLOR CHARGE

Up to this point, we have not made any significant reference to the group SU(2) or its properties. Formally, the Pauli matrices in Eqs. (2) are the generators of SU(2), which is the group of \( 2 \times 2 \) unitary matrices with unit determinant. In other words, every such matrix can be represented by a linear combination of the Pauli matrices and the \( 2 \times 2 \) identity matrix. The group SU(3) is simply the group of unitary \( 3 \times 3 \) matrices with determinant equal to one. Some familiarity with the Pauli matrices, perhaps gained through a study of spin, provides some
valuable intuition for the mechanics of working with objects in SU(3).

In place of the Pauli matrices, the eight generators of SU(3) are known as the Gell-Mann matrices \( \lambda^{(a)} \). The actual generators are of more immediate use for our purposes and differ from the Gell-Mann matrices by a simple factor of \( \frac{1}{2} \) via \( i^{(a)} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{(a)} \).

For brevity, we shall refer to the \( \hat{t}^{(a)} \) as the Gell-Mann matrices. By analogy with spin, a single source of SU(3) “color” charge belongs to the fundamental representation of SU(3) and is represented by a three-component vector

\[
|\psi\rangle = \alpha |r\rangle + \beta |b\rangle + \gamma |g\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(21)

Here the basis states corresponding to “up” and “down” in SU(2) are known as “red,” “blue” and “green.” The relationship of these basis states to color will be explored below. It is useful to label explicitly the three basis vectors which span the color space

\[
|r\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |b\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |g\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

(22)

Just as each Pauli matrix corresponds to a component of spin, each Gell-Mann matrix corresponds to a component of color charge, \( q^{(a)} \) with

\[
q^{(a)} \rightarrow \langle \psi| \hat{t}^{(a)} |\psi\rangle.
\]

(23)

Color charge is a type of generalization of electric charge possessed by quarks. In addition to color charge, quarks also have electric charge, flavor and spin. We will use the term “quark” to refer to point sources of color charge, but we are only considering the color charge degree of freedom. Note that the color charge is actually an eight-dimensional vector which lives in the abstract “gauge space” rather than in real space. Using Eq. (22), one may show that at most only two components are nonzero for each of the three basis states in Eq. (22). Denoting \( Q_{r}^{(a)} = \langle r| \hat{t}^{(a)} |r\rangle \), and similarly for \( |g\rangle \) and \( |b\rangle \), the matrix multiplications using Eq. (20) yield

\[
Q_{r} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{e}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{3}} \hat{e}^{(8)},
\]

(24)

\[
Q_{g} = -\frac{1}{2} \hat{e}^{(3)} + \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{3}} \hat{e}^{(8)},
\]

(25)

\[
Q_{b} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \hat{e}^{(8)}.
\]

(26)

where \( \hat{e}^{(a)} \) is a unit vector in the \( a \) direction in gauge space. We note that the vanishing of all but the third and eighth components of charge in Eqs. (24), (26) is analogous to the \( x \) - and \( y \)-components of spin expectation values being zero for the basis states \( |\uparrow\rangle \) and \( |\downarrow\rangle \). While \( \sigma^{z} \) is the only diagonal Pauli matrix (corresponding to the only nonzero component of spin in the z-basis), there are two diagonal Gell-Mann matrices, \( \hat{t}^{(3)} \) and \( \hat{t}^{(8)} \). As diagonal matrices, the corresponding color charge operators will commute and thus can be observed simultaneously. That is, \( q^{(3)} \) and \( q^{(8)} \) correspond to well-defined quantum numbers. A plot of the color charge vectors \( Q_{r,g,b} \) is shown in Figure 1.

FIG. 1: Graphic depiction of the vectors \( Q_{r}, Q_{g}, Q_{b} \) and corresponding “anticolors,” \( Q_{\bar{r}}, Q_{\bar{g}} \) and \( Q_{\bar{b}} \). Only the \( q^{(3)} \) and \( q^{(8)} \) components are nonzero.
\( \mathbf{Q}_r = -\mathbf{Q}_s \). Our VPYTHON visualization routine colors the sources by mapping the angle from the positive \( q^{(3)} \) axis to a particular hue angle on the color wheel. In the Hue-Saturation-Value (HSV) color model, a hue is defined by an angle \( \theta \) with red, green and blue corresponding to \( \theta = 0^\circ \), \( \theta = 120^\circ \) and \( \theta = 240^\circ \), respectively. The vectors \( \mathbf{Q}_{r,s} \) in Figure 1 correspond to angles \( \phi_r = 30^\circ \), \( \phi_s = 150^\circ \) and \( \phi_b = 270^\circ \), respectively, as measured from the \( q^{(3)} \) axis in the \((q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})\) plane. The colors depicted in Figure 1 are obtained by calculating the corresponding hue angle \( \theta = \phi - 30^\circ \), so that
\[
\tan(\theta + 30) = \frac{q^{(8)}}{q^{(3)}}. \tag{27}
\]

We take as our initial state a combination of all three basis quarks,
\[
|\psi\rangle = |r\rangle \otimes |g\rangle \otimes |b\rangle, \tag{28}
\]
which has no net color charge. This state is meant to mimic that of a baryon, which is also colorless. It should be noted that actual baryons are in a color singlet configuration, which is a totally antisymmetric superposition state analogous to the spin singlet state \(|0,0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|1\rangle \downarrow - |1\rangle \uparrow)\). Explicitly,
\[
|\psi_{\text{singlet}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (|rgb\rangle - |rbg\rangle + |gbr\rangle - |gbr\rangle - |brg\rangle + |bgr\rangle), \tag{29}
\]
where we have employed shorthand notation \(|rgb\rangle \equiv |r\rangle \otimes |g\rangle \otimes |b\rangle\), and similarly for other terms, for brevity. The significance of naturally-occurring bound states employing the singlet color configuration cannot be understated, and this is intimately related to isolated color charge being essentially unobservable to realistic experiments. Indeed the singlet configuration is invariant with respect to gauge transformations in SU(3), whereas the simple product state \(|\psi\rangle\) is not. By using superposition to take full advantage of the underlying symmetry, we will see that the singlet configuration actually possesses a lower ground state energy for our choice of effective interactions. Because gauge transformations amount to a redefinition of color charge components, gauge invariant dynamics require net color charge itself to be effectively unobservable, much like the scalar and vector potentials in electromagnetism. Unless otherwise noted, we will consider the product state \(|\psi\rangle\) as the initial state for simplicity. This theoretical choice is for pedagogical simplicity, but the resulting calculations are not entirely decoupled from experimental reality. While actual quarks are found in the singlet state, nothing forbids simulating non-singlet states using cold atoms and artificial gauge fields.

**IV. INTERACTIONS**

**A. Two-body terms**

In this section we explore effective interactions between the three quarks in the product state \(|\psi\rangle\), given by Eq. (28). It should be noted that the strong nuclear interaction is highly modified by quantum processes in a process known as renormalization. A naive exploration of the corresponding classical Lagrangian leads to the prediction of a Coulomb-like potential. The interactions between sources and the mediating fields result in a highly-modified confining potential which makes it effectively impossible to separate two quarks in experiments. In what follows, we consider a reduced model in which the sources interact directly through phenomenological interactions which are motivated below.

Looking to the Heisenberg Hamiltonian in Eq. (16) for inspiration, we can postulate the existence of an effective two-body interaction between two color sources of the form
\[
\hat{H}_{2b} = J \sum_{a=1}^{8} \hat{q}^{(a)} \otimes \hat{q}^{(a)}, \tag{30}
\]
for some constant \( J \). A possible motivation for such an expression can be seen by considering what the interaction energy behaves for several simple situations. First, consider two arbitrary states in the state \(|\psi\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle\). The interaction energy is given by the expectation value of Eq. (30)
\[
E_{\text{int}}[\psi] = \langle \psi | \sum_{a=1}^{8} \hat{q}^{(a)} \otimes \hat{q}^{(a)} | \psi \rangle. \tag{31}
\]

One property of the tensor product is that \( [\hat{A} \otimes \hat{B}] [|\chi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle] = (\hat{A} |\chi\rangle) \otimes (\hat{B} |\phi\rangle) \), so the interaction can be written
\[
E_{\text{int}}[\psi_1, \psi_2] = J \mathbf{Q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_2, \tag{32}
\]
where the components \( Q_{1,2}^{(a)} \equiv \langle \psi_{1,2} | \hat{q}^{(a)} | \psi_{1,2} \rangle\). Eq. (32) is formally a generalization of the Coulomb potential in which the notion of “like” and “opposite” charges has been generalized to an inner product of color charge vectors in gauge space. By treating only the color degree of freedom, we do not have any information about the variation of the interaction energy with spatial separation of sources. However, on general grounds one may expect an inverse-linear dependence on source separation \((J \propto R^{-1})\) in three spatial dimensions before including the effects of dynamical gluons. For \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_2 > 0 \), this interaction energy is lowered by increasing the separation, so the resulting force is repulsive. Conversely, if \( \mathbf{Q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_2 < 0 \), the interaction energy is lowered by decreasing the separation between sources, and the resulting force is attractive.

The above reasoning applies to any color states \(|\psi_{1,2}\rangle\), but let us specialize to the pure red, green and blue states in Eq. (28) where the only nonzero color charge components exist in the two-dimensional \((q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})\) plane. From Figure 1 it is clear that the inner product of a quark’s color charge vector with that of its antiquark will be maximally negative. As with electrons and protons, Eq. (32) predicts that particles and their antiparticles should attract via the strong interaction.

Without loss in generality, consider \( \mathbf{Q}_r \). The angular displacement between \( \mathbf{Q}_r \) and either \( \mathbf{Q}_s \) or \( \mathbf{Q}_b \) is \( 120^\circ \), and since cos \( 120^\circ < 0 \), there will be an attractive force between the red
and blue and between the red and green color source. Identical reasoning can be used for the other quarks to show that there is mutual attraction between any two of these quarks. This type of calculation is based on a simplified, effective interaction. Consequently, the predictions should not be trusted for accurate results given the qualitative changes to the interactions when dynamical gluons are included in the theory. However, it is worth noting the qualitative features of quarks being mutually attractive and a three-particle bound state seeming plausible at this level are consistent with reality. Furthermore, these types of calculations are essentially equivalent to the tree-level calculations one can perform in quantum chromodynamics that do not take into account quantum fluctuations.

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (30) acts on states of two color sources. In a system of three sources, this pairwise interaction would contribute to each of the three possible pairings, so the appropriate operator for a system of three sources is

$$\hat{H}_{\text{pairs}} = J \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} [\hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_1 \cdot \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_2 + \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_1 \cdot \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_3 + \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_2 \cdot \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_3].$$

(33)

Here the notation is shorthand with appropriate identity operators not explicitly written. For example,

$$\hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_1 \cdot \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}_3 \equiv \hat{t}^{(\alpha)} \otimes I \otimes \hat{t}^{(\alpha)}.$$

(34)

The corresponding interaction energy takes the form

$$E_{\text{int}}[\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3] = J (\mathbf{Q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathbf{Q}_1 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_3 + \mathbf{Q}_2 \cdot \mathbf{Q}_3).$$

(35)

Let us calculate explicitly the interaction energy for the state $|\psi\rangle = (r) \otimes |g\rangle \otimes |b\rangle$. Eqs. (35) and (24)–(26) give

$$E_{\text{int}}[r, g, b] = J (\mathbf{Q}_r \cdot \mathbf{Q}_g + \mathbf{Q}_r \cdot \mathbf{Q}_b + \mathbf{Q}_g \cdot \mathbf{Q}_b) = -\frac{J}{2}.$$  

(36)

Now consider the singlet state in Eq. (29). It was claimed above that this is the actual color state realized by three quarks within a baryon and that it minimizes the interaction energy. Though we cannot prove this statement for the full theory of quantum chromodynamics, we can show that the singlet does correspond to a lower energy than the simple product state for interactions given by Eq. (33). For a superposition state such as $|\psi_{\text{singlet}}\rangle$, we must use Eq. (33) rather than the “classical” limit given by Eq. (35). To see this, let us explore a single term that arises as $\hat{H}_{\text{pairs}}$ acts on the first term of the singlet state,

$$\hat{t}^{(1)} \otimes \hat{t}^{(1)} \otimes \hat{I} \langle (r) \otimes |g\rangle \otimes |b\rangle = \frac{1}{4} |g\rangle \otimes |r\rangle \otimes |b\rangle.$$  

(37)

If we were considering the product state $|rgb\rangle$, such a term would vanish upon taking the inner product with $|rgb\rangle$. However, the singlet state contains a term $1/\sqrt{6} |rgb\rangle$, so this term does contribute to the energy. The Gell-Mann matrices are fairly sparse, so most such cross terms still vanish. However, there are a number to keep track of, and after either a fairly careful accounting or a few minutes with a computer algebra package, one finds

$$E_{\text{int}}[\psi_{\text{singlet}}] = -2J.$$  

(38)

which is, as advertised, a lower energy than the bare product state. Using terminology loosely, one can think of a state such as $|rgb\rangle$ being “classical” in the sense that a measurement of $q^{(3)}$ or $q^{(8)}$ on any of the three sources would always return the same answer, since each quark is in a simultaneous eigenstate of both $q^{(3)}$ and $q^{(8)}$. The singlet state gives an expectation value of zero for each charge component for each source. However, as with any quantum mechanical observable, an individual measurement of $q^{(3)}$ and $q^{(8)}$ would return one of the operator’s eigenvalues as a result. The measurement forces one source to “pick” one of the three positive color charge eigenstates. Because the singlet state is entangled, the measurement of source one also affects the state of sources two and three. Entanglement is sometimes viewed as one of the fundamentally “quantum” features systems can exhibit, and the singlet state is in some sense more inherently “quantum” than the product state. The singlet is also possesses a higher degree of symmetry than the product state, being antisymmetric with respect to the exchange of sources, $|\psi_{\text{singlet}}(r, b, g)\rangle = -|\psi_{\text{singlet}}(r, g, b)\rangle$. Though beyond the scope of this work, one may show that it is invariant with respect to SU(3) gauge transformations which redefine the color charge components.

A similar situation arises with the ground state of the one-dimensional Heisenberg antiferromagnet, which is composed of $N$ spin-$1/2$ degrees of freedom with interactions between nearest neighbors described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{Heisenberg}} = J \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} [\hat{S}_j^x \hat{S}_{j+1}^x + \hat{S}_j^y \hat{S}_{j+1}^y + \hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_{j+1}^z].$$

(39)

A plausibly simple candidate for a ground state is the Néel state, $|\uparrow \downarrow \uparrow \cdots \uparrow \downarrow \rangle$. One reason this cannot be the ground state is shown by observing the inversion symmetry of $\hat{H}_{\text{Heisenberg}}$ is not respected by this state. That is, another equally good candidate is $|\downarrow \uparrow \downarrow \cdots \downarrow \uparrow \rangle$. A more problematic feature of the Néel state is that while it minimizes the energetic contribution from the $\hat{S}_j^z \hat{S}_{j+1}^z$ terms, it is not even an eigenstate of the full Hamiltonian. To see this, note that the first two terms in Eq. (39) may be recast as

$$\hat{S}_j^x \hat{S}_{j+1}^x + \hat{S}_j^y \hat{S}_{j+1}^y = \hat{S}_j^+ \hat{S}_{j+1}^- + \hat{S}_j^- \hat{S}_{j+1}^+,$$

(40)

where $\hat{S}_j^\pm \equiv \hat{S}_j^x \pm i\hat{S}_j^y$ are the spin raising/lowering operators. Each term raises (lowers) a particular spin and lowers (raises) its right neighbor. This process is analogous to the example for the three-source SU(3) color charge system considered above in the singlet state. However, the equivalent “singlet” state for the case of $N$ spins is substantially more complicated than that of three SU(3) color charges, and a fairly elaborate technique known as the Bethe ansatz must be used to obtain the ground state.

B. Three-body interactions

In addition to the two-body interactions which arise at the classical level, higher-order interactions are also possible for-
mally. Indeed, the full theory of quantum chromodynamics leads to many-body interactions between sources of color charge. The effective interactions considered here amount to neglecting the dynamics of the mediating fields, known as gluons. Including dynamical quantum mechanical degrees of freedom for these mediating fields amounts to a legitimate quantum field theory and is necessarily much more complex than the idealized model presented here.

In a system of three sources, one would expect such terms to have the general structure

\[ \hat{H}_{3\text{-body}} = \sum_{a,b \gamma} g_{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^a \otimes \tilde{r}^\beta \otimes \tilde{r}^\gamma, \]

where \( g_{a \beta \gamma} \) is some tensor of coefficients. The interactions in quantum chromodynamics, or any gauge theory, are highly constrained by symmetry considerations. As a group, SU(3) possesses sets of numbers known as structure constants defined by

\[ [\tilde{r}^a, \tilde{r}^\beta] = i \sum_{\gamma} f^{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^\gamma, \]
\[ \{\tilde{r}^a, \tilde{r}^\beta\} = \frac{1}{3} g^{a \beta} + \sum_{\gamma} d^{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^\gamma, \]

where \([A, B] \equiv AB - BA\) is the commutator and \([A, B] = AB + BA\) is the anticommutator. The Kronecker delta is defined by \( \delta^{ab} = 1 \) for \( a = b \) and \( \delta^{ab} = 0 \) otherwise. By virtue of the antisymmetry (symmetry) of the commutator (anticommutator) with respect to indices, one may verify that the \( a^{a \beta \gamma} \) are totally symmetric while the \( f^{a \beta \gamma} \) are totally antisymmetric with respect to the indices \( a, \beta, \gamma \). There are a total of \( 8^3 = 512 \) possible index combinations for each, but most turn out to be zero. The following values are obtained

\[ d_{118} = d_{228} = d_{338} = -d_{888} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \]
\[ d_{146} = d_{157} = d_{256} = d_{344} = d_{355} = \frac{1}{2}, \]
\[ d_{247} = d_{366} = d_{377} = -\frac{1}{2}, \]
\[ d_{448} = d_{558} = d_{668} = d_{778} = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}, \]
\[ f_{123} = 1, \]
\[ f_{147} = f_{246} = f_{257} = f_{345} = \frac{1}{2}, \]
\[ f_{156} = f_{367} = -\frac{1}{2}, \]
\[ f_{458} = f_{678} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}. \]

Aside from entries which may be obtained from symmetry via cyclic permutations, \( d_{a \beta \gamma} = d_{\beta \gamma a} = d_{a \gamma \beta} \), \( f_{a \beta \gamma} = f_{\beta \gamma a} = f_{a \gamma \beta} \), \( f_{\beta \gamma a} = -f_{a \gamma \beta} \), and \( f_{\gamma \beta a} = f_{\beta \gamma a} \), all other components are zero.

One may compute gauge scalars (or pseudoscalars) from these structure constants of the forms

\[ \sum_{a, b \gamma} d_{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^a \tilde{r}^\beta \tilde{r}^\gamma, \]
\[ \sum_{a, b \gamma} f_{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^a \tilde{r}^\beta \tilde{r}^\gamma. \]

The symmetric scalar resemble the component form of the ordinary scalar products between two three-dimensional vectors,

\[ A \cdot B = \sum_{i, j} \delta_{ij} A_i B_j, \]

which is invariant with respect to three-dimensional rotations. Accordingly the expressions in (52) provide suitable candidates for interaction terms involving three \( \tilde{r}^a \) operators. Such interactions involve all three states and are fundamentally different from familiar two-body interaction. In quantum chromodynamics, three-body interaction terms between the mediating gluon fields appear in the definition of the Lagrangian, which should result in effective three-body interactions between sources at the level of the effective model presented here. It should be noted that the combination involving the asymmetric structure constants should also contain factors which depend on the spin on the sources, as it is not gauge invariant by itself. Indeed, the gauge scalar obtained from \( f_{a \beta \gamma} \) is analogous to a pseudoscalar obtained from an ordinary vector cross product. Our focus is on exploring dynamics with minimum complications, so we will adopt both terms as possible forms for three-body interactions.

V. DYNAMICS

Our goal in this section is to repeat the basic steps from Sec. II for a three-quark product state has the form

\[ |q_1, q_2, q_3 \rangle = |q_1 \rangle \otimes |q_2 \rangle \otimes |q_3 \rangle , \]

with time evolution generated by the Hamiltonian

\[ \hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\text{pairs}} + \Delta \hat{H}_{3\text{-body}}, \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \left[ \tilde{r}_1^a \tilde{r}_2^a + \tilde{r}_1^a \tilde{r}_3^a + \tilde{r}_2^a \tilde{r}_3^a \right] + \Delta J \sum_{a, \beta \gamma} g_{a \beta \gamma} \tilde{r}^a \otimes \tilde{r}^\beta \otimes \tilde{r}^\gamma, \]

where \( \Delta \) is a dimensionless parameter to control the relative strength of the three-body interaction terms. The task at hand is to solve the time-dependent Schrödinger equation for a given initial state and compute the expectation values of observables (i.e., color charge components). Before proceeding, we must obtain explicit representations of the initial state and relevant operators which are suitable for numerical or analytic analysis.

A. Two-body interactions (\( \Delta = 0 \))

Let us first consider the case \( \Delta = 0 \) so that only two-body interactions are at play. This case admits an analytic solution
for the color charge components through straightforward, if tedious steps. The general state of Eq. (55) is a tensor product of three color states and is represented by a $3^3 = 27$-dimensional column vector

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_{27} \end{pmatrix},$$

(58)

where the $c_i$ are complex numbers. For a simple product state of the three basis vectors, $|\psi_0\rangle = |r\rangle \otimes |g\rangle \otimes |b\rangle$, one finds $c_6 = 1$, with $c_i = 0$ for $i \neq 6$. In principle, it is possible to work out the action of the two-body Hamiltonian operator in Eq. (33) on the general state $|\chi\rangle$, obtaining a set of coupled differential equations for the coefficients $c_i$ via the Schrödinger equation

$$\frac{i\hbar}{\mathcal{h}} \frac{d}{dt} |\psi\rangle = \hat{H}_{\text{pairs}} |\psi\rangle.$$ 

(59)

Upon substituting Eq. (58) into Eq. (59), one may use the explicit forms of the Gell-Mann matrices in Eq. (20) to obtain the action of $\hat{H}_{\text{pairs}}$ on $|\psi\rangle$. The resulting 27 equations split into decoupled sets, so that only those equations involving $c_6$ are nontrivial. All others involve only quantities which have been initialized to zero and will never evolve into nonzero values. In what follows, we work in units where $\hbar \rightarrow 1$ for brevity. The dynamics of the system are then contained in the equations of motion

$$i\dot{c}_6 = \frac{J}{2} (-c_6 + c_8 + c_{12} + c_{22}),$$

(60)

$$i\dot{c}_8 = \frac{J}{2} (c_6 - c_8 + c_{16} + c_{20}),$$

(61)

$$i\dot{c}_{12} = \frac{J}{2} (c_6 - c_{12} + c_{16} + c_{20}),$$

(62)

$$i\dot{c}_{16} = \frac{J}{2} (c_8 + c_{12} - c_{16} + c_{22}),$$

(63)

$$i\dot{c}_{20} = \frac{J}{2} (c_8 + c_{12} - c_{20} + c_{22}),$$

(64)

$$i\dot{c}_{22} = \frac{J}{2} (c_6 + c_{16} + c_{20} - c_{22}).$$

We note that the six indices appearing above correspond to the six ways of ordering the red, green and blue sources in the product state $|q_1 q_2 q_3\rangle$. For the state $|grb\rangle$, we would have $c_{20} \rightarrow 1$ with all others zero, resulting in the same equations of motion. The singlet state corresponds to

$$c_6 = -c_8 = -c_{12} = c_{16} = c_{20} = -c_{22} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}.$$ 

(65)

This linear system can be solved explicitly for the nontrivial coefficients using the initial conditions $c_6(0) = 1$ with all others zero, giving

$$c_6(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{-iJt} - \frac{1}{6} e^{2iJt},$$

(66)

$$c_8(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{-iJt} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2iJt} - \frac{1}{3} e^{iJt},$$

(67)

$$c_{12}(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{-iJt} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2iJt} - \frac{1}{3} e^{iJt},$$

(68)

$$c_{16}(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{-iJt} - \frac{1}{6} e^{2iJt},$$

(69)

$$c_{20}(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{-iJt} - \frac{1}{6} e^{2iJt},$$

(70)

$$c_{22}(t) = \frac{1}{6} e^{Jt} + \frac{1}{6} e^{2Jt} + \frac{2}{3} e^{iJt}.$$ 

(71)

Expectation values of charge components follow from generalizing Eq. (23) to the case of three sources. For example, the charge components of the first source are given by

$$Q^{(a)}_1(t) = \langle \psi(t) | \hat{T}^{(a)} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I} | \psi(t) \rangle,$$ 

(72)

and will depend on the nonzero $c_i(t)$. Explicitly, setting all other coefficients to zero, we obtain

$$Q^{(3)}_1(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |c_{16}(t)|^2 - |c_8(t)|^2 - |c_{20}(t)|^2 + |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right],$$

(73)

$$Q^{(3)}_2(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ -|c_6(t)|^2 + |c_{12}(t)|^2 + |c_{20}(t)|^2 - |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right],$$

(74)

$$Q^{(3)}_3(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ |c_6(t)|^2 - |c_{12}(t)|^2 - |c_{16}(t)|^2 + |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right],$$

(75)

$$Q^{(8)}_1(t) = \sqrt{3} \left[ -\frac{1}{3} |c_6(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_8(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{3} |c_{12}(t)|^2 
+ \frac{1}{6} |c_{16}(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{20}(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right]$$

(76)

$$Q^{(8)}_2(t) = \sqrt{3} \left[ \frac{1}{6} |c_6(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{3} |c_8(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{12}(t)|^2 
- \frac{1}{3} |c_{16}(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{20}(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right]$$

(77)

$$Q^{(8)}_3(t) = \sqrt{3} \left[ \frac{1}{6} |c_6(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_8(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |c_{12}(t)|^2 
+ \frac{1}{6} |c_{16}(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{3} |c_{20}(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{3} |c_{22}(t)|^2 \right]$$

(78)

Here $Q^{(1,2,3)}_i(t)$ is the color charge vector of the source which was initially red, green, blue. Using the explicit solutions for $c_i(t)$ in Eqs. (66)-(71), these expectation values reduce to

$$Q^{(3)}_1(t) = -Q^{(3)}_2(t) = \frac{1}{2} f(t),$$

(79)

$$Q^{(3)}_3(t) = 0,$$ 

(80)

$$Q^{(8)}_1(t) = Q^{(8)}_2(t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} f(t),$$

(81)

$$Q^{(8)}_3(t) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} f(t).$$ 

(82)
where \( f(t) \equiv \frac{1}{3} \left( 1 + 2 \cos \left[ \frac{2}{3} J_t \right] \right) \). Equations (79)–(82) predict oscillations in the charge components. Already this is a qualitatively different type of behavior than occurs in electrostatics in which the charge is a scalar which does not possess any dynamics. These oscillations describe a sort of flip-flop behavior with the color sliding along the directions defined by Figure 1 and switching between “positive” and “negative,” where “positive” corresponds to parallel to the color’s initial direction and “negative” being antiparallel. Such nontrivial charge dynamics also persists in the corresponding classical field theory, as has been demonstrated explicitly for the case of SU(2) dynamics.

**B. Three-body interactions (\( \Delta \neq 0 \))**

The case in which three-body interactions are included is significantly more complex, so we employ a numerical approach to make the treatment as accessible as possible. A JUPYTER notebook which makes heavy use of several convenient NUMPY functions is included in the supplemental material and allows the reader to recreate all cases studied here by simply changing parameters. To reduce the number of free parameters in what follows, we restrict attention to the antisymmetric three-body interactions, \( g_{a\beta\gamma} \rightarrow f_{a\beta\gamma} \), in what follows.

The basic steps required to obtain \( Q_{1,2,3}^{(a)}(t) \) are to (1) build the Hamiltonian generating time evolution, (2) construct an explicit vector representation initial state \(|\psi_0\rangle\), (3) solve the Schrödinger equation to obtain \(|\psi(t)\rangle\), and (4) compute appropriate inner products of the form \( \langle \psi(t)| \hat{O} |\psi(t)\rangle \) where \( \hat{O} \) is some 3-body operator corresponding to a component of one source’s color charge. Particularly helpful with steps (1) and (4) is the NUMPY function \( kron(A,B) \) which computes the Kronecker product of two matrices, \( A \) and \( B \). The Kronecker product provides an explicit representation of the abstract tensor product in Eqs. (55) and (57), so much of the tedious work can be performed behind the scenes, leading to a fairly compact program. The interested reader can find an explicit scheme for constructing appropriate single-site matrices in multi-site systems in Ref. [20], which also generalizes to operators which cannot be decomposed into a Kronecker product.

For an \( N \)-dimensional Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) with energy eigenvalues \( \epsilon_n \) and corresponding eigenstates \(|\phi_n\rangle\), Hermiticity guarantees that any state \(|\psi\rangle\) may be written as a linear combination of the eigenstates

\[
|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{N} c_n |\phi_n\rangle, \tag{83}
\]

where the coefficients \( c_n = \langle \phi_n | \psi_0 \rangle \) represent the overlap between the state \(|\psi_0\rangle\) and the \( n \)th eigenstate. Since the eigenstates have trivial time evolution \( |\phi_n(t)\rangle = e^{-i\epsilon_n t} |\phi_n\rangle \) as stationary states, the full time-dependence of an arbitrary state

\[
FIG. 2: Color charge components as a function of time for \( \Delta = 0.5 \) for (a) \( Q_1^{(a)}(t) \); (b) \( Q_2^{(a)}(t) \); (c) \( Q_3^{(a)}(t) \); Only the \( a = 3,8 \) components become nonzero, so other components are not shown.
\[ V = \Delta J \] for brevity, we find
\[
Q_1^{(3)}(t) = \frac{2 \sin \left( \sqrt{3} V t \right)}{3 \sqrt{3}} \left[ \cos \left( \frac{3 J t}{2} \right) - \cos \left( \frac{\sqrt{3} V t}{4} \right) \right] \tag{86}
\]
\[
Q_1^{(8)}(t) = \frac{2 \cos \left( \sqrt{3} V t \right)}{3 \sqrt{3}} \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\sqrt{3} V t}{4} \right) + \cos \left( \frac{3 J t}{2} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{3 \sqrt{3}} \] . \tag{87}
\]

Other source components can be obtained by applying a rotation of 120° to the vector with components \(Q_1^{(3)}(t), Q_1^{(8)}(t)\). Computer algebra software such as MATHEMATICA is quite useful in dealing with the significant algebra involved in obtaining Eqs. (86)–(87).

The reader could be forgiven for being mystified by the particular choices of three-body interaction coefficients \(f^{ab\gamma}\) and \(a^{ab\gamma}\). With the numerical approach, one is not bound to study highly symmetric and analytically tractable situations. Figure 3 depicts the numerical solution for the case in which the coefficients of the three-body interaction in Eq. (57) are replaced by random numbers \(f^{ab\gamma} \rightarrow \xi\). In this case we draw from a uniform distribution \(\xi \in [0,0.01]\). For short times, the system essentially follows the two-body solution. Gradually, however, the random three-body couplings cause the other charge components to become nonzero. The reader may verify using the provided program that using only two-body couplings with random values is not sufficient to turn on the components with \(\alpha \neq 3, 8\).

C. Visualization

The plots in Figures 2 and 3 are not the most lucid ways of depicting the dynamics. From Eqs. (86)–(87) we see that the dynamics should be in general quasiperiodic. The linear combination of trigonometric functions \(a \cos(\omega t) + b \sin(\omega t)\) will only itself be periodic if the ratio \(\frac{\omega}{\omega'}\) is a rational number. This periodicity is satisfied for \(\frac{\omega}{\omega'} = \Delta_n = 2\sqrt{3}/n\) for any integer \(n\). Figure 4 shows several examples of periodic (closed) orbits. Even in the quasiperiodic case, the angular separation between two color charge vectors is always 120°. It is interesting to note that for \(n\) divisible by 3, the three trajectories coincide resulting in a single closed curve along which all three color charges move in the \((q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})\) plane. Additionally, the point \(n = 1\) results in the same dynamics as \(\Delta = 0\). For general values of \(\Delta\) not corresponding to \(\Delta_n\), the quasiperiodic dynamics leads to space-filling curves that never close.

The provided JUPYTER notebook also makes use of VPyTHON22 routines to animate the dynamics with the color charge trajectories traced in real time. While Figure 4 depicts the individual trajectories, the VPyTHON visualization shows the individual color charges with the color assigned according to \((q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})\) coordinates as described in Sec. III with Eq. 27.
FIG. 4: Periodic orbits in the $(q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})$ plane for various values of $n$ and $\Delta_\phi = 2\sqrt{3}/n$. The case where $n$ is a multiple of 3 is particularly degenerate, with all three source vectors moving along the same closed curve. The initial state of each source (red, blue, green) fixes the color of the trajectory.

FIG. 5: Snapshots of the VPYTHON animation for periodic orbit. The color charges evolve under a periodic orbit with $n = 19$. Each arrow direction follows the orientation of that source’s color charge vector in $(q^{(3)}, q^{(8)})$ space.

VI. DISCUSSION

We have presented a reduced, $(0 + 1)$-dimensional effective model for the strong interaction in which the components of color charge can be computed as a function of time for a given initial state. Both two- and three-body interactions have been considered, and several choices resulted in compact, analytic solutions. More general types of interactions and initial states have been treated numerically.

That is, whenever a color charge arrives at an angle $\phi = 30^\circ$, it is colored in red with continuous changes in color throughout the evolution according to the value of $\phi = \tan^{-1} \frac{q^{(8)}}{q^{(3)}}$. It should be emphasized that the actual dynamics being investigated are of each source’s components of color charge. That is, the sources themselves are not moving in real space. To make this more transparent, we fix the three sources at points in space and attach a vector to each source representing its color charge vector. This vector will change magnitude, direction and color in the visualization while the sources remain fixed in place. Several screenshots of the resulting animation for a periodic orbit with $n = 6$ are shown in Figure 5. In the second panel, one observes a color change in process (for example, what began as the green charge is turning into a red charge). The anti-colors form Figure 1 emerge in the third panel.
tation of actual quarks. The attached JUPYTER notebook allows one to investigate symmetric three-body interactions, as well as the antisymmetric three-body terms considered here. A much larger phase space is accessible to the curious student than what has been presented.

Another possible line of inquiry is examining how the time required for the off-diagonal charge components to become comparable in magnitude to $q^{(3,8)}$ depends on the relative strength of asymmetric interactions, such as the random couplings considered here. Lastly, investigation of dynamics resulting from the singlet initial configuration is another line of inquiry not developed in this work. The color charge expectation values vanish for all components of all sources at arbitrary time when the initial state is the singlet. That does not imply that nothing interesting happens. One might look to two- or three-point correlation functions of the charge components for nontrivial dynamics.

---

* Present address: Joint School of Nanoscience & Nanoengineering, 2907 E Gate City Boulevard, Greensboro, NC 27401
1 Electronic mail: [jlancas2@highpoint.edu](mailto:jlancas2@highpoint.edu)
3 Here “nonabelian” refers to the nonabelian (or, noncommutative) nature of the gauge group, SU(3). For two elements $a, b \in$ SU(3), in general one has $ab \neq ba$ where $\circ$ denotes the binary operation of the group. Electrodynamics also possesses a gauge symmetry, but the relevant gauge group is the abelian group U(1) in which elements $a$ may be parameterized by a phase $\phi$ as $a \rightarrow e^{i\phi}$ and the group operation $\circ$ takes the form of ordinary multiplication, which is commutative, or “abelian.”
4 Classically, a spin can be thought of as a small loop of current which creates a magnetic field. The interaction of two spins with each other can be pictured as the interaction of one spin with the magnetic field created by the other (or vice versa).
6 The group SU(N) contains $N^2-1$ generators, which gives 3 generators (Pauli matrices) for SU(2) and eight (Gell-Mann matrices) for SU(3).
13 This is a big omission. Unlike electromagnetism, chromodynamics is qualitatively altered by virtual processes related to gluon exchange. In electromagnetism, such effects are weak and only alter to serve to make the electromagnetic interaction weaker at low energies. Quite the contrary, the strong force becomes much stronger at low energies and we are essentially working in the high-energy limit by using such expressions.
18 Note that the equivalent problem in electrostatics is the trivial scenario of two electric charges separated by a fixed distance in which no dynamics occur in any measurable variable.
21 Python array indices start with 0 instead of 1, and the actual program uses shifted indices so that $\tau_a[::;::0]$ corresponds to $\tilde{t}^{[1]}$, and so on in this way. An alternative is to package the identity matrix as $\tau_a[::;::0]$ so that the Gell-Mann matrix labels line up with the array indices. Since we have to perform a sum over terms like $f^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \tilde{t}^{[\alpha]} \otimes \tilde{t}^{[\beta]} \otimes \tilde{t}^{[\gamma]}$, we chose to live with the offset to keep the array indices consistent among the coefficients and matrices.