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**Position Paper 2**

**Hume’s Thoughts**

Hume's thoughts were simple that testimony could not justify the fact that a miracle has happened. Even we as human beings think twice for believing or trusting anyone. It is human nature to question and doubt things that have not been witnessed by us. Hume’s views on the Indian Prince's story was that the lakes freezing in Northern Europe were not at all miraculous but somewhat an abuse of an experienced consistency (Hume 191-284). Since the Prince never saw it for himself, he was justified to deny what people told him. Technically he never experienced such a situation; the water never froze when it was very cold in India. How could he believe the fact that water got so hard that elephants could walk on it? The Prince had an unchanging experience of the water in India; the water never got hard even in winters.

**Factors Impacting the Prince Thoughts**

Yes, the knowledge that was being poured in front of the Prince was very much correct. The only thing that was stopping him from believing was his own experience. India also got very cold, so his idea of the cold was limited to what he had seen. He never saw the water freezing or even getting slightly hard where he lived. People tend to have belief in the things based on what they have seen in their life; the mind is only open to what it has seen. This impacted the Prince's belief. Beside that fact, the Prince had never been to Northern Europe in winters. However, He cannot claim that the frozen lakes in Northern Europe in the winter time are contradicting to his experience. Yes, it happened but the fact the Prince had never heard or seen such a thing made him deny it. It was a strange occurrence for him as he never believed in it, so that is how he reacted the way Hume thought was correct. Nonetheless, Hume suggests that the experiences that are universally understood like the dead staying dead are what should be kept in mind. If something went against that thought, then it can be called a miracle.

**Conclusion**

The Prince made a mistake because of not having the experience, to begin with. It might be a worldly fact, but he had seen it for himself. For him it was something against Mother Nature. Miracle or no miracle, what he had not seen could not be proven to him with the help of a simple testimony alone (Larmer 97-110). It took a lot of witnesses to make him believe what he had not seen. His idea of winters was what he had himself seen. Hume’s thoughts are in sync with the Prince here. He gave the same school of thought that testimony cannot provide evidence to a miracle that has occurred.
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