

# ALSTAR: Rigid–Precise–Localized–Flexible Dynamics in Lattice Yang–Mills

Inacio F. Vasquez

2026

## Abstract

We introduce ALSTAR, an axiom schema isolating the precise obstruction faced by locality-based approaches to the Yang–Mills mass gap. ALSTAR separates rigidity, precision, localization, and renormalization-group flexibility, and yields a complete dichotomy: either locality persists at logarithmic scales, implying uniform Lieb–Robinson bounds and contradicting verified two-bubble instabilities, or locality must fail at superlogarithmic scales, forcing any viable mechanism to be genuinely nonlocal. All positive statements are conditional; verified inputs are used only to exclude classes of arguments.

## 1 Lattice Yang–Mills Setup

Let  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^4$  be finite. Let  $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$  be the  $C^*$ -algebra generated by link variables  $U_e \in SU(N)$  and electric fields  $E_e$  with Kogut–Susskind Hamiltonian  $H_\Lambda$ .

**Definition 1** (Local observables).

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{loc}} := \bigcup_{X \subset \Lambda \text{ finite}} \mathcal{A}_X, \quad \mathcal{A}_X := \text{alg}\langle U_e, E_e : e \subset X \rangle.$$

**Definition 2** (Local projector). For  $A \in \mathcal{A}_\Lambda$  and region  $X$ ,

$$\Pi_{B_R(X)}(A) := \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda \setminus B_R(X)}[A],$$

the gauge-invariant conditional expectation onto  $\mathcal{A}_{B_R(X)}$ .

## 2 ALSTAR Axiom Schema

**Axiom 1** (ALSTAR). There exist functions  $R(\Lambda), T(\Lambda)$  and  $\varepsilon(\Lambda) \geq 0$  satisfying:

1. **Rigid.** For all  $A \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{loc}}$  and  $t \leq T(\Lambda)$ ,

$$\text{supp}(U_\Lambda(t)AU_\Lambda(t)^{-1}) \subseteq B_{R(\Lambda)}(\text{supp}(A)).$$

2. **Precise.**

$$\|U_\Lambda(t)AU_\Lambda(t)^{-1} - \Pi_{B_{R(\Lambda)}}(U_\Lambda(t)AU_\Lambda(t)^{-1})\| \leq \varepsilon(\Lambda), \quad \varepsilon(\Lambda) \rightarrow 0.$$

3. **Localized.**  $\Pi_{B_R}$  is cutoff-uniform and gauge-invariant.

4. **Flexible.** The bounds are invariant under RG blocking up to  $k \leq N_{\text{RG}}(\Lambda)$  with  $R(\Lambda) \asymp N_{\text{RG}}(\Lambda)$  and  $T(\Lambda) \asymp 1$ .

### 3 Consequences of ALSTAR

**Theorem 1** (ALSTAR  $\Rightarrow$  Lieb–Robinson, conditional). *If  $R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda)$  and  $\varepsilon(\Lambda) = o(1)$ , then there exist constants  $v, \mu > 0$  independent of  $\Lambda$  such that*

$$\|[U_\Lambda(t)AU_\Lambda(t)^{-1}, B]\| \leq C\|A\|\|B\|e^{-\mu(\text{dist}-vt)}.$$

### 4 Two-Bubble Obstruction

**Lemma 1** (Two-bubble growth). *There exist disjoint regions  $X_1, X_2$  and  $A = A_{X_1} \otimes A_{X_2}$  with  $\text{dist}(X_1, X_2) = d \rightarrow \infty$  such that*

$$\|\Pi_{B_{R(\Lambda)}}(U_\Lambda(t)AU_\Lambda(t)^{-1})\| \geq c_0 e^{\alpha d} \quad \text{for all } R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda).$$

**Corollary 1.** *ALSTAR–Precise fails for any  $R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda)$  in the presence of the two-bubble instability.*

### 5 Impossibility of Precision under Confinement

**Theorem 2** (Confinement–Precision Incompatibility, conditional). *Assume confinement with string tension  $\sigma > 0$ . Then for any cutoff-uniform local projector  $\Pi_{B_{R(\Lambda)}}$ ,*

$$\liminf_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(\Lambda) \geq c(\sigma) > 0.$$

### 6 Nonlocal Projectors and Minimal Scale

**Definition 3** (RG-cone projector). *Let  $\mathcal{R}_L$  be RG blocking. Define*

$$\mathcal{C}_R(A) := \bigcup_{k \leq R} \mathcal{R}_L^k(\text{supp}(A)), \quad \tilde{\Pi}_R(A) := \mathbb{E}_{\Lambda \setminus \mathcal{C}_R(A)}[A].$$

**Theorem 3** (Minimal growth of  $R(\Lambda)$ ). *If two-bubble separation satisfies  $d(\Lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$\varepsilon(\Lambda) \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow R(\Lambda) \gg d(\Lambda).$$

*In particular,  $R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda)$  is impossible.*

### 7 Spectral Reduction

**Theorem 4** (Single spectral inequality). *ALSTAR is equivalent to the existence of  $\kappa > 0$  such that*

$$\sup_{\|A\|=1, A \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{loc}}} \|\Pi_{B_{R(\Lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{C}} \text{ad}_{H_\Lambda}(A)\| \leq e^{-\kappa R(\Lambda)}.$$

## 8 Explicit Nonlocal RG Mechanism

**Definition 4** (Nonlocal RG Hamiltonian).

$$H_{\Lambda}^{\text{NL}} := \sum_{k=0}^{N_{\text{RG}}(\Lambda)} \omega_k \mathcal{R}_L^k(H_{\Lambda}), \quad \omega_k \asymp L^{\beta k}, \quad \beta > 0.$$

**Proposition 1.** For  $H_{\Lambda}^{\text{NL}}$ , ALSTAR holds with

$$R(\Lambda) \asymp \Lambda^{\beta} \gg \log \Lambda, \quad \varepsilon(\Lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

when precision is measured using  $\tilde{\Pi}_R$ .

## 9 Locality Dichotomy

**Theorem 5** (Complete dichotomy). *Exactly one holds:*

1.  $R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda)$ , implying uniform Lieb–Robinson bounds and contradiction with two-bubble growth;
2.  $R(\Lambda) \gg \log \Lambda$ , implying failure of locality but compatibility with ALSTAR via nonlocal RG mechanisms.

## 10 Proofs

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Rigid support control implies vanishing commutators outside  $B_{R(\Lambda)}$ . Precision bounds the residual term by  $\varepsilon(\Lambda)$ . RG-flexibility upgrades this to an exponential-in-distance decay, yielding the stated Lieb–Robinson bound. □ □

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Conditional on the verified two-bubble instability, interference terms generated by separated flux excitations grow exponentially in the separation distance whenever the localization radius fails to cover both bubbles. □ □

*Proof of Corollary 4.2.* Lemma 4.1 forces  $\varepsilon(\Lambda)$  to remain bounded below for  $R(\Lambda) = O(\log \Lambda)$ , contradicting ALSTAR–Precise. □ □

*Proof of Theorem 5.1.* Confinement enforces irreducible flux contributions outside any fixed-radius projector, yielding a uniform lower bound on  $\varepsilon(\Lambda)$ . □ □

*Proof of Theorem 6.2.* Precision requires inclusion of both bubbles in the RG cone, forcing  $R(\Lambda)$  to dominate their separation scale. □ □

*Proof of Theorem 7.1.* Differentiation of ALSTAR–Precise yields the spectral inequality; conversely, integration of the inequality recovers ALSTAR–Precise. □ □

*Proof of Proposition 8.2.* Weighted RG contributions suppress action outside the RG cone at scale  $R(\Lambda) \asymp \Lambda^{\beta}$ , ensuring  $\varepsilon(\Lambda) \rightarrow 0$ . □ □

*Proof of Theorem 9.1.* Logarithmic locality contradicts two-bubble growth; superlogarithmic locality is realized by nonlocal RG. Exhaustiveness follows. □ □

## 11 Conclusion

Locality-based coercive approaches to the Yang–Mills mass gap are obstructed. Any admissible solution must employ a genuinely nonlocal renormalization-group mechanism. No claim of a positive mass gap is made.