


# Avoiding the Partialist Fallacy and Scaling Out to the All-inclusive Embodied Mind: A Mereological Supplement to Michael Levin’s “Experimentally-Grounded Framework for Understanding Diverse Bodies and Minds”

**Theodore Walker Jr.\***

Associate Professor of Ethics and Society, Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, USA

**\*Corresponding author:** Theodore Walker Jr., Associate Professor of Ethics and Society, Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, USA

**Submission:**  May 22, 2024

**Published:**  June 05, 2024

Volume 7 - Issue 1

**How to cite this article:** Theodore Walker Jr.\*. Avoiding the Partialist Fallacy and Scaling Out to the All-inclusive Embodied Mind: A Mereological Supplement to Michael Levin’s “Experimentally-Grounded Framework for Understanding Diverse Bodies and Minds”. Examines Mar Biol Oceanogr. 7(1). EIMBO. 000653. 2024. DOI: [10.31031/EIMBO.2024.07.000653](https://doi.org/10.31031/EIMBO.2024.07.000653)

**Copyright@** Theodore Walker Jr., This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

## Introduction

Marine biology is essential to the emerging study of diverse intelligences. Theory of cognitive scaling and the framework advanced in Michael Levin’s “Technological Approach to Mind Everywhere: An Experimentally-Grounded Framework for Understanding Diverse Bodies and Minds” [1] should be supplemented by explicitly recognizing mereological and related distinctions (whole and part, all, some, none ... contingent and necessary). Ultimately, mereology distinguishes whole of reality from parts of reality.

An adequate theory of reality (of reality as such) must include conceptually distinguishing the whole of reality from some parts and all parts. Unlike contingent parts of reality, the whole of reality exists necessarily. To be sure, for any of us who are parts of the whole of reality, verbally denying the existence of the whole of reality can yield only self-refuting nonsense. No sensation, no observation, no experience, and no experimental outcome can deny the reality of the whole of reality. Instead, our every experience necessarily confirms (by exemplifications) that we are partly-inclusive parts of reality, among variously-inclusive parts of reality. And mereological use of language confirms (by definition and logic) that all parts of reality are included as variously less-than-all-inclusive parts of “the one all-inclusive whole of reality” [2,3].

Similarly, an adequate theory of value (of value as such) must include “explicit recognition” of “the whole of which all lesser values are parts” [4]. Accordingly, in moral theory, failure to recognize the all-inclusive value of the whole has been labeled the partialist fallacy. This label refers to fallaciously claiming that there could be real parts of no whole of reality (a self-refuting claim). Like fallaciously advancing a parts-of-no-whole conception of reality, to fallaciously advance a parts-of-no-whole theory of value is to commit the “partialist fallacy” [5]. Avoiding the partialist fallacy allows conceptually scaling all the way (up, down, in, out, throughout) to “the one all-inclusive whole of reality” that is greater than the sum of all parts of reality.

A comprehensive understanding of “diverse bodies and minds” (Levin) must include recognizing that the all-inclusive embodied mind is “the intelligent universe” [6] and “the one

universal individual" [7] who, logically-necessarily-existentially, is "that than which none greater can be conceived" (Anselm).

\*Another fallacy worth avoiding is labeled "the zero fallacy" [8] for fallaciously claiming to have observed the absolute zero of creativity. From least-inclusive to all-inclusive reality, there is "shared creative experience" [9-13].

## References

1. Levin M (2022) Technological approach to mind everywhere: An experimentally-grounded framework for understanding diverse bodies and minds. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience* 16: 1-43.
2. Ogden SM (1984) Process theology and the wesleyan witness. *Perkins School of Theology Journal* 37(3): 18-33.
3. Hartshorne C (1967, 1973) *A natural theology for our time*. Open Court Publishing, USA, pp. 1-145.
4. Hartshorne C (1975) *Beyond humanism: Essays in the philosophy of nature*. Peter Smith Books, USA.
5. Gamwell FI (1984) *Beyond preference: Liberal theories of independent associations*. University of Chicago Press, USA, pp. 1-192.
6. Hoyle F (1984) *The intelligent universe: A new view of creation and evolution*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Publishing, USA, pp. 1-256.
7. Hartshorne C (1953) *Reality as social process: Studies in metaphysics and religion*. Free Press Publishers, USA, pp. 1-223.
8. Hartshorne C (1997) *The zero fallacy and other essays in neoclassical philosophy*. Open Court Publishing, USA, pp. 1-268.
9. Hartshorne C (1970) *A philosophy of shared creative experience*. Creative Synthesis and Philosophic Method. Open Court Publishing, USA, pp. 1-18.
10. Levin M (2005) How to scale up scientifically. *Pharmaceutical Technology*, 2005(1): 4-13.
11. Levin M (2019) The computational boundary of a "Self": Developmental bioelectricity drives multicellularity and scale-free cognition. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10: 1-24.
12. Pio-Lopez L, Johanna B, Jennifer VL, Michael L (2023) The scaling of goals from cellular to anatomical homeostasis: An evolutionary simulation, experiment and analysis. *Interface Focus* 13(3): 20220072.
13. Whitehead AN (1978) *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology*. In: David RG, Donald WS (Eds.), *Free Press*, USA, pp. 1-413.