

**SORIN BAICULESCU, *SPACE OF EXPERIENCE*  
(bilingual edition), București, Editura Amurg sentimental, 2013**

It's about an exposition of the integrative conception of the fine researcher Sorin Baiculescu (mathematics, biology) after decades of work. Surpassing the habitual professional fragmentary approach, the book discloses the *space* of the human experience. And it appears that this space is polymorphic: on the one hand, there is the common representation of space through the ordinary experiences of man (and, following Kant, this space is an *a priori* intuition resulting from the sensibility of the human being); on the other hand, there are the "specialized" spaces constructed as /within the "world 2" and "world 3" of Popper: the metrical space, the complex space (corresponding to the complex numbers), the symbolic space and the space of consciousness. But these spaces have a different nature to one another and thus they are not intersecting and, more, they are tangent to the common space of experience: or, this common space contains the other ones only at the level of the inherently fragmented culture.

If so, the experience of the knowledge of things (every kind of things) is "incomplete", just because it is fragmented according to the different spaces *which are not natural, but cultural*. There are, therefore, different things as objects of different approaches in different spaces. And, once more, it is suggested that the common experience of space is superior to that of different mathematical spaces.

This idea is all the more important as the book contains mathematical demonstrations of the understanding of these spaces and, especially, of the biological complexity (structures, systems). Actually, the author starts from René Thom's geometrical structuralism, but he shows that the common space of experience differs from that constructed by the French mathematician: while the geometrical space is homogenous, the "real" space of the human experience is never homogenous in its integrality, but only at local level. And: although the space of the human experience is continuous and has an organizing potential, this is just because the knowledge of things – this knowledge "creating" the objective phenomena filling the space of experience – is discontinuous. As a result, the space of experience is finite (obviously, not according to the length of the human life, but according to the human understanding/ to the knowledge of things).

However finite, the space of experience emphasizes the whole richness of the variability of the laws of being, their invariance appearing only in the metric, complex, symbolic spaces and in the space of the consciousness.

There are many "openings" of this representation of the space of experience. For example, the fact that the *becoming* – the other, dynamic aspect of existence, the first being the *being* as such – is not exclusively physical but also thought and projected, is related (actually, it pertains) to the *epistemological constructivism* professed: the main characteristics of the space of experience, order and continuity, are put by man through his experiences, and thus all the forms and expressions man discovers and constructs in the mathematical and psychological spaces are *specific only to the spaces they belong to*, and need the meta-understanding of the space of experience.

Some epistemological conclusions related to the field of theory corresponding to the space of experience seem to be opposite to the desired unitary /unified theory of everything: those conclusions highlight that since there are four different spaces, they correspond to four theories and cannot be reduced to a single one. But, I add, since the possibility to unify the sciences disappears, the unitary and unifying principle is nevertheless methodological.

This rapid note concerning the book of *Spaces of Experience* could not show just the mathematical demonstrations and connections which are, as in every scientific analysis of this type,

the core without which the hypothesis has no relevance. For this reason, from now on the scientific community the author belongs to has to further construct “the space” of its theory.

Ana BAZAC