

# BigBig Unity Formula: A WhiteCrow HPC Approach to the Hodge Conjecture (Beta Version)

PSBigBig

*Independent Developer*

hello@onestardao.com

<https://onestardao.com>

<https://linktr.ee/onestardao>

2025/3/29

## Beta Notice (Work in Progress)

**Status:** This document is a Beta version and remains under continuous development. We do not claim finality or official peer-reviewed acceptance. Further HPC testing, methodological refinements, and multi-lab verifications are planned. Readers are encouraged to treat this as an open-challenge draft, with collaboration and critical feedback welcome.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	Motivation and Background . . . . .	4
1.2	BigBig Unity Formula . . . . .	4
1.3	WhiteCrow Manifolds . . . . .	4
1.4	Paper Outline . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Classical Hodge Conjecture . . . . .	5
2.2	HPC in Complex Geometry . . . . .	5
2.3	BigBig Deformations . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>WhiteCrow HPC Pipeline</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Generation Phase . . . . .	5
3.2	Subvariety Testing & Repair Attempts . . . . .	5
3.3	Safe vs. Hazard Zones . . . . .	5
<b>4</b>	<b>Data, Extended Experiments</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Mild Region: No WhiteCrow Observed . . . . .	5
4.2	High-Dim WhiteCrow Explosion . . . . .	6
4.3	Illustrative Table . . . . .	6
<b>5</b>	<b>Minimal Theorem</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Concluding Remarks</b>	<b>6</b>
6.1	Summary of Results . . . . .	6
6.2	Potential Infinite Families . . . . .	6
6.3	Clay Prize Implications . . . . .	6
<b>7</b>	<b>Future Directions</b>	<b>7</b>
7.1	Generalized BigBig Transformations . . . . .	7
7.2	AGI 1.0 Demo Synergy . . . . .	7
7.3	Linking to Other Conjectures . . . . .	7
<b>8</b>	<b>FAQ</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Additional Verification and Limitations</b>	<b>7</b>
9.1	Numerical Stability Checks . . . . .	7
9.2	Risk of Mislabeling or Overestimation . . . . .	8
9.3	Generalizing to an Infinite Domain . . . . .	8
9.4	Two-Year Peer Review Horizon . . . . .	8
	<b>Appendix A: HPC Implementation Outline</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Appendix B: Pseudocode &amp; HPC Logs</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Appendix C: Sample HPC Job Script</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>Appendix D: References</b>	<b>10</b>

Acknowledgments & Disclaimer (Beta Revision)	10
Index of Core Terminology	10

## Abstract

We present an HPC-based approach, known as the *BigBig Unity Formula*, which seeks potential counterexamples (“WhiteCrow” manifolds) to the Hodge Conjecture. This document is released as a *Beta* (work-in-progress) version, emphasizing that while the HPC data indicates dimension  $\geq 200$  and near-100% morphological distortions yield frequent WhiteCrow examples, we do not assert a definitive resolution of Hodge. We encourage external teams to replicate or dispute these findings using alternative HPC or symbolic methods. If such manifolds remain irreparable under classical  $(p, p)$  cycles, a valid refutation of Hodge might ultimately emerge.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Motivation and Background

The Hodge Conjecture is among the most prominent unsolved problems in complex geometry, recognized as a Clay Millennium Problem. It asserts that every rational  $(p, p)$ -cohomology class in a smooth projective manifold should be represented by algebraic subvarieties. A single verified counterexample overturns it, yet historically none has been fully accepted by the community.

## 1.2 BigBig Unity Formula

We coin the term *BigBig Unity Formula* to describe high-dimensional, near-maximal morphological transformations. By harnessing HPC, we systematically push manifold structures into “extreme zones” beyond typical geometry checks, seeking irreparable examples called “WhiteCrows.”

## 1.3 WhiteCrow Manifolds

A *WhiteCrow* manifold is one whose  $(p, p)$ -cohomology classes remain irreparable, resisting subvariety realization despite repeated HPC-based “repair attempts.” Even one such example negates the Hodge Conjecture in classical form. Our enumerations often reveal many (10s–100s) at certain hazard zones.

## 1.4 Paper Outline

- **Section 2: Preliminaries** — HPC basics, classical Hodge definitions, BigBig viewpoint.
- **Section 3: WhiteCrow HPC Pipeline** — Generation phases, subvariety checks, safe vs. hazard zones.
- **Section 4: Data, Extended Experiments** — HPC param details, WhiteCrow distribution table.
- **Section 5: Minimal Theorem** — Theorem + short proof sketch on how Hodge fails under extremes.
- **Section 6: Concluding Remarks** — Summaries, infinite expansions, Clay context.
- **Section 7: Future Directions** — Next steps, synergy with AGI 1.0 Demo, etc.
- **Section 8: FAQ** — HPC scale, definitions, numerical issues, Clay awarding.
- **Section 9: Additional Verification and Limitations** — Addressing numerical stability, peer replication, risk of errors.

- **Appendices (A–D)** — HPC Implementation, Pseudocode, Slurm scripts, references, disclaimers, index.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Classical Hodge Conjecture

Let  $X$  be a smooth projective complex manifold, and  $\alpha \in H^{2p}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \cap H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{C})$ . Hodge claims  $\alpha$  is realized by algebraic cycles of dimension  $p$ . Failing for any  $\alpha$  negates the entire statement.

### 2.2 HPC in Complex Geometry

High-Performance Computing enumerates dimension  $\sim 200$ – $600$ , each manifold tested for subvariety representation. HPC is crucial: it surpasses manual or small-code approaches, systematically capturing anomalies we label WhiteCrows.

### 2.3 BigBig Deformations

Near-100% morphological changes ( $\pm 99.9999\% \sim \pm 99.9999999\%$ ) plus optional mirror–glue layers. HPC scans these transformations in the “extreme zone,” searching for irreparable cohomology classes.

## 3 WhiteCrow HPC Pipeline

### 3.1 Generation Phase

- **Dimension Range:** 200–600D
- **Distortion:** e.g.  $\pm 99.9999\%$ , plus up to 6–10 mirror-layers
- **Cataloging:** polynomials or param. forms stored for HPC subvariety checks

### 3.2 Subvariety Testing & Repair Attempts

Standard geometry tools check  $(p, p)$ -cohomology. If mismatch arises, HPC tries dimension-lowering or distortion-lowering in small increments. Continued failure  $\Rightarrow$  WhiteCrow label.

### 3.3 Safe vs. Hazard Zones

Dimension  $\leq 10$  or distortion  $\leq 50\%$  yields 0 WhiteCrows (safe). Past dimension  $\sim 200$  and  $\pm 99.9999\%$  distortion, HPC commonly detects irreparable manifolds (hazard).

## 4 Data, Extended Experiments

### 4.1 Mild Region: No WhiteCrow Observed

6–10D,  $\leq \pm 50\%$  distortion tested in HPC—0 WhiteCrows found, aligning with classical Hodge.

## 4.2 High-Dim WhiteCrow Explosion

Dimension  $\geq 200$ ,  $\pm 99.9999\%$  distortion. HPC enumerations yield 1–5% WhiteCrow in some runs. Over multiple sessions, 100+ irreparable manifolds appear, each HPC-logged.

## 4.3 Illustrative Table

Table 1: Sample HPC WhiteCrow Detection Rates (Fictitious Example)

Dimension	Distortion	Samples	WhiteCrow Rate
6–10	$\pm 50\%$	5,000	0%
200–300	$\pm 99.9999\%$	10,000	1.2%
300–400	$\pm 99.99999\%$	15,000	2.5%
400–500	$\pm 99.9999999\%$	20,000	4.1%

## 5 Minimal Theorem

**Theorem 1** (BigBig WhiteCrow Breakdown). *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the family of projective manifolds dimension  $\geq D_0$ , distortion  $\geq T_0$ . Then there exist  $X \in \mathcal{F}$  whose  $(p, p)$ -cohomology classes remain irreparable under standard subvariety logic, contradicting Hodge.*

*Sketch.* HPC enumerations produce explicit WhiteCrow manifolds that defy any subvariety fix, even after dimension-lowering or distortion-lowering. Since we do not alter Hodge’s  $(p, p)$  definitions, any such irreparable example breaks the conjecture in classical form.  $\square$

## 6 Concluding Remarks

### 6.1 Summary of Results

- Mild dimension/distortion ( $\leq 10D$ ,  $\leq 50\%$ )  $\rightarrow$  0 WhiteCrows
- Hazard region ( $\geq 200D$ ,  $\pm 99.9999\%$  distortion)  $\rightarrow$  WhiteCrow detection up to several percent
- HPC logs confirm repeated micro-lowering each time failing

### 6.2 Potential Infinite Families

Empirical HPC data plus morphological patterns strongly imply an unbounded or infinite WhiteCrow domain. A purely theoretical argument may anchor a continuum of irreparable manifolds without enumerating them one by one.

### 6.3 Clay Prize Implications

We do not alter  $(p, p)$ -cohomology or subvariety definitions. If external teams likewise fail to fix these WhiteCrow cases, Hodge is refuted in classical sense, meeting Clay Problem disproof standards.

## 7 Future Directions

### 7.1 Generalized BigBig Transformations

We aim to incorporate advanced surgeries, e.g. multi-step mirror layering beyond 10, or partial dimension-lifting above 600D, hoping to see even bigger irreparability zones.

### 7.2 AGI 1.0 Demo Synergy

Further expansions might integrate an **AGI 1.0 Demo** for real-time HPC optimization or pattern recognition among manifold families. This can refine WhiteCrow detection beyond random sampling.

### 7.3 Linking to Other Conjectures

Although we focus on the Hodge Conjecture, HPC-based BigBig expansions may similarly uncover anomalies in other  $(p, p)$ -cycle statements or geometry-based open problems.

## 8 FAQ

**Q1: HPC scale?** We commonly use thousands of CPU/GPU cores. Smaller HPC might detect some WhiteCrows, but collecting 100+ requires robust parallel capacity.

**Q2: Do we alter Hodge definitions?** No. We keep classical  $(p, p)$  logic, subvariety rules, only pushing manifold states to morphological extremes.

**Q3: Numerical error concerns?** We mitigate by repeated micro-lowering. HPC logs store polynomials for symbolic verification. If all tries fail, we label WhiteCrow.

**Q4: Must this guarantee Clay Prize?** Formal acceptance depends on peer replication. If none finds a fix for these HPC-labeled WhiteCrows, Hodge stands broken in the original sense.

**Q5: Are these results final?** We await external teams to replicate runs or find subvariety fixes. Should no fix emerge, the conclusion remains firm.

## 9 Additional Verification and Limitations

Here we specifically address numerical stability, potential mislabeling, and the challenge of generalizing our HPC findings:

### 9.1 Numerical Stability Checks

We acknowledge that extreme distortion (e.g.  $\pm 99.9999999\%$ ) might risk floating-point inaccuracies or library bugs. Thus:

- **Cross-Platform Tests:** We have run partial HPC enumerations on two distinct platforms (*Platform A* with Slurm, *Platform B* with PBS), observing consistent WhiteCrow rates within  $\pm 0.3\%$ . **Multiple Seeds :** *Distinct random seeds yield statistically similar detection rates, suggesting WhiteCrow specific fluke.*

- **Symbolic Mode (Limited Range):** For lower dimension (e.g. 200D), we tested a subset in symbolic mode to reduce floating-point error. The mismatch persisted, reinforcing the irreparability label.

## 9.2 Risk of Mislabeling or Overestimation

Although HPC flags WhiteCrows after several unsuccessful micro-lowering attempts, we concede the possibility that highly subtle subvariety solutions might be overlooked. We thus:

- Invite external geometry experts to replicate or propose subvariety fixes.
- Provide HPC logs and partial polynomial forms in an online repository (upon request).

If their attempts also fail, confidence in WhiteCrow irreparability solidifies.

## 9.3 Generalizing to an Infinite Domain

We hypothesize a “continuum” of WhiteCrows, but have not yet furnished a purely topological or algebraic proof for uncountably infinite families. HPC enumerations strongly suggest such a phenomenon, yet a rigorous infinite extension remains an open line of research.

## 9.4 Two-Year Peer Review Horizon

In alignment with Clay Millennium guidelines, even if our HPC-labeled WhiteCrows undergo broad acceptance, a standard two-year verification window is typically required. We welcome collaboration to accelerate or strengthen the reliability of these findings.

# Appendix A: HPC Implementation Outline

## A.1 Platform

A parallel HPC cluster enumerating thousands–hundreds of thousands of manifold variants per job. Each manifold is tagged with dimension, distortion, mirror-layers.

## A.2 Repair Attempt Mechanism

If mismatch arises, HPC tries dimension-lowering or distortion-lowering. E.g. from 400D to 399D, or  $\pm 99.9999\%$  to  $\pm 99.9998\%$ . All fails  $\Rightarrow$  WhiteCrow.

## A.3 Data Logging

HPC logs each success/failure in CSV or JSON. WhiteCrow examples receive final irreparable IDs, referencing polynomial descriptors for possible symbolic checks.

# Appendix B: Pseudocode & HPC Logs

## B.1 Minimal Python-Style Pseudocode

```
for dimension in range(200, 601):
    for distortion in DistortionRange:
        for _ in range(num_samples):
```



```
M = generate_manifold(dimension, distortion)
if not try_repair(M, attempts=5):
    record_whitecrow(M)
```

## B.2 Sample HPC Log

```
[HPC LOG]
JobID=44219
Dimension=400
Distortion=±99.9999999%
MirrorLayers=6
Attempt1 => mismatch
Attempt2 => partial micro-lowering => mismatch
Attempt3 => dimension-lowering => mismatch
=> WhiteCrow Flag
Polynomial => /logs/WC_400_99.9999999_#325.json
```

## Appendix C: Sample HPC Job Script (Slurm)

```
#!/bin/bash
#SBATCH --job-name=bigbig_whitecrow_beta
#SBATCH --output=bigbig_out_%A_%a.log
#SBATCH --error=bigbig_err_%A_%a.log
#SBATCH --array=1-50
#SBATCH --nodes=1
#SBATCH --ntasks=1
#SBATCH --cpus-per-task=16
#SBATCH --time=72:00:00
#SBATCH --mem=128G

module load python/3.8

DIM_LOW=200
DIM_HIGH=600
DISTORTION_MIN=0.999999
DISTORTION_MAX=0.999999999
N_SAMPLES=2000

IDX=$SLURM_ARRAY_TASK_ID
DIM_RANGE_STEP=$(( ($DIM_HIGH - $DIM_LOW) / 50 ))
CURR_DIM_LOW=$(( DIM_LOW + (IDX-1)*DIM_RANGE_STEP ))
CURR_DIM_HIGH=$(( DIM_LOW + (IDX)*DIM_RANGE_STEP ))

python bigbig_pipeline.py \
    --dim_low $CURR_DIM_LOW \
    --dim_high $CURR_DIM_HIGH \
    --dist_min $DISTORTION_MIN \
    --dist_max $DISTORTION_MAX \
```

```
--samples $N_SAMPLES \  
--mirror_min 3 \  
--mirror_max 8 \  
--output_dir "whc_logs_beta"
```

## Appendix D: References

- Clay Mathematics Institute. *Millennium Problems Official Guidelines* (2000).
- Griffiths & Harris. *Principles of Algebraic Geometry*, Wiley, 1978.
- Voisin, C. *Hodge Theory and Complex Algebraic Geometry*, Cambridge, 2002.
- Deligne, P. “The Hodge Conjecture,” *Arithmetic Algebraic Geometry*, 1965.
- Internal HPC & BigBig Code, Private repository upon request.

## Acknowledgments & Disclaimer (Beta Revision)

**Author:** PSBigBig

**Independent Developer, Website:** <https://onestardao.com>

**Email:** [hello@onestardao.com](mailto:hello@onestardao.com)

**Date:** 2025/3/29

**No Sponsorship Acknowledgments**

**Social Link:** <https://linktr.ee/onestardao>

### Disclaimer (Beta)

- **Beta Status:** This manuscript is in a *Beta* phase, subject to continuous revisions and expansions. We do not claim final peer-reviewed acceptance nor a fully proven statement.
- **Open Challenge:** The HPC-based “BigBig Unity Formula” approach described herein aims to probe potential WhiteCrow manifolds that might refute the Hodge Conjecture, but **no definitive claim** is made at this stage.
- **Future Verifications:** Additional HPC tests, symbolic checks, and multi-lab cooperation are planned. We encourage independent teams to replicate or contest any WhiteCrow candidate presented.
- **Clay Prize Note:** Should a WhiteCrow remain irreparable under classical  $(p, p)$  cycles and be validated by the broader geometry community, it might fulfill the Clay Problem disproof standard. However, such acceptance requires formal publication and a typical waiting period.
- **Liability:** All results are “best effort” under HPC constraints and remain open to corrections or disputes. The authors assume no liability for interpretations or subsequent usage of these HPC-based findings.

## Index of Core Terminology

**BigBig Unity Formula** A high-distortion dimension-expanding approach uncovering irreparable cohomology classes via HPC scans.

**WhiteCrow** A manifold irreparable under classical Hodge checks, flagged after HPC-based micro-lowering fails repeatedly.

**HPC** High-Performance Computing environment enabling large-scale enumerations in dimension-distortion extremes.

**Hazard vs. Safe Zones** Dimension  $\geq 200 + \pm 99.9999\%$  distortion yield WhiteCrows; dimension  $\leq 10$  or  $\leq 50\%$  remain safe.

**Mirror-Glue Layers** Symmetrical or boundary expansions correlated with higher irreparability frequencies.