

Erik Whipkey  
Phi. 489  
Helman  
Prospectus

Topic:

For my paper I plan on discussing the conflict between Leibniz's view of pre-established harmony versus the views held by occasionalists. For this I plan to use an excerpt from the letters to Arnauld, excerpts from his New System of Nature, along with his replies to Foucher and Beauval. For Secondary sources I will use the article by R.S. Woolhouse "Leibniz's reaction to Cartesian Interaction"

Method:

Simon Foucher described Leibniz's theory of pre-established harmony as "Occasionalism with all the adjustments made at once. With this paper I would like to explore the topic of Occasionalism to see exactly how it differs from Leibniz's pre-established harmony. I will argue that having all of the adjustments made at once is a possible solution to the problems that Leibniz has with Occasionalism.

Woolhouse argues that there are differences between the two theories that involve the fact that Leibniz did not believe in psycho-physical laws. I disagree with his and Leibniz's view that his theory is not occasionalist, but that it is an improvement of the occasionalist theory for mind body interaction. I will also argue that for Leibniz's system that it was a necessary improvement to make because of the nature of monads especially with the fact that they have no doors or windows and therefore have no way for them to be interacted on.

Finally in this paper I want to make the argument that within this pre-established harmony there is a coordination in it, not necessarily minds and bodies themselves that enables movement and things of that nature. So I will argue that because of the pre-established harmony

that when I make the decision to move my arm, and my arm moves, that both of those actions coincide because both were in my notion to do so.