We must begin by trying to convince our adversary accepts, Our first task is to persuade the skeptic to accept the ordinary course of nature are produced by discernate personalities. Though we live in a thought-shy age and it is useless to begin our discussion with the Aquinate proofs of the existence of God, Nor are the miracles wrought by evil spirits entirely valueless. They have a certain apologetic value as testifying to an article of the Catholic Faith, the existence of "evil spirits that wander through the world for the ruin of souls."

The Pocket Oxford Dictionary defines a miracle as an "event due to supernatural agency." This definition covers every type of miracle from those wrought by God to those which are due to the agency of evil spirits. Now in arguing with a disintegrated modern, it is sound tactics to apply the Aquinate principle of the common premise to definitions, and to use words, not in the restricted sense current among theologians, but in the general sense in which the man in the street understands them. And for this reason until somebody supplies me with a word which covers all effects produced by all spirits, good or evil, I propose to use the word, "miracle," in the sense given to it by the Oxford Dictionary. As I am not a theologian I would prefer not to cross swords with "N.D.Jan" who criticizes my reference to our Lord as a "disincarnate personality." I do not wish to "smell of the fagot and I trust to the Editor of the Bulletin to censor phrases which are theologically rash. But perhaps some theologian will answer, in the Bulletin, the following question: "What distinction do theologians draw between the incarnation of our Lord on earth and His incarnation in the Eucharist? And do theologians use the term, 'incarnation,' in connection with the Eucharist? And if not, why is it incorrect to refer to our Lord as a 'disincarnate person?"