

Fr. Perozich comments —

I send this to you because it lays out Catholic distinctions which do not always come to my mind at the moment of an argument wherein I am frustrated at knowing that I am being buffaloed but do not have a good refutation at the moment.

Fr. Jim Sichko came to St. Theresa in Kihei, Maui for its advent retreat. I did not go, but all the reports shared with me of what he said to the people were very positive and completely Catholic.

Fr. Sichko is a priest of the diocese of Lexington with its Bishop John Stowe, OFM, one of the most outspoken homosexual promoting bishops in the United States.

The bolding of the text below is my own doing to highlight some points.

Insight from Fr. Longenecker about about a devious tweet by a priest. Wherein Fr. Z also rants. – UPDATED

Posted on 30 December 2019 by Fr. John Zuhlsdorf

UPDATE 31 Dec 2019:

Fr. Sichko's response...



Originally Published on: **Dec 30, 2019**

Over at his place, [Fr. Dwight Longenecker](#) has a post which challenges, by asking, whether every family is a “Holy Family”. He has reacted to some unfortunate tweets by a priest of the Diocese of Lexington, Fr. Jim Sichko. Sichko wrote on Twitter:



Not good. A “family” that is founded on sodomy is not a “family” and it is not holy. Using that term, “family” in such a context is corrosive.

Sichko throws some other confusing terms in, like, “sanctioned... unlicensed”. Who knows what he means.

I think we can all grasp that all sorts of people can form close groups like a family, bound together in charity. We can, with great care, use “family” equivocally. I don’t think many will object to that. There is a phrase from English law: “Everything which is not forbidden is allowed”. I think that, within proper limits, that’s not such a bad way to look at even oddly shaped “families”.

If a married man and woman can adopt children and form a family, then why not even other sorts of adoptions, provided that, again, true charity and holiness are pursued and, of course, not actively violated. I have in mind, just as an example from pop culture, the charming movie *The Blind Side* based on a true story about a southern protestant white family who adopt a seriously huge black kid (future NFL) who has no home or real family other than in the mere biological sense.

Active violation of charity and of the truth of nature and what it means to be family is what is going on when homosexual sodomy is a component of the relationships. Sadly, this *does* have to be spelled now, even for some tweeting *clergy*... even non-Jesuit tweeting clergy for a change.

What is deeply troubling is that a Catholic priest – and not even a Jesuit! – will not adhere to the truth when talking about people who merit compassion and charity without... well... muddling completely the concept of marriage and family.

Unmarried people aren’t like the Holy Family. They don’t form holy families properly understood. They might be on their way to forming a family which is holy, through – for example – striving to be continent, but if they are just living together, nope, sorry, not yet. Homosexual “couples”, if they are having physical

relations... nope, sorry, not at all. This is friendship that has been twisted or it is mutual *use*, which cannot, by definition, be holy.

No one will quibble much with single parents doing their best, I think. Some are single because of mistakes in the past. Others are single because disease or accidents or war took one of them. Let's leave aside the profoundly selfish women who, shunning marriage and natural relations, simply want what they want, namely a baby, and they opt for the artificial insemination thing. Babies aren't pets or new hand bags.

What is at the heart of the problematic scenario Fr. Sichko paints is the old Senecan adage that *errare humanum est, perseverare autem diabolicum...* to err is human, but to persevere in error is diabolical. To call something wrong right because you *will* it so is diabolical. It is the overturning of truth, the fruit of the "father of lies".

People get themselves into all sorts of trouble and difficult situations. But to persevere in them, to refuse to takes steps to correct them, that's not good.

Back to Fr. Longenecker and his good insight.

At his place he posted this, which rings true.

[...]

[Sichko's tweet] pretended to be a message to raise our awareness and compassion for those who live in irregular and difficult family situations. However, anybody can see that it was really a lame attempt to to normalize homosexual unions by putting gay couples into a victim category.

The tactic works like this:

1. paint someone or some group as a victim of discrimination
2. push some guilt buttons to raise "compassion" for that group. *Note that this is not true compassion. It's just guilt wearing a compassion mask so the person doesn't feel so guilty anymore*
3. Raise the compassion to the level of advocacy

4. Advocacy must mean acceptance
 5. Acceptance must mean condoning
 6. Condoning must lead to celebrating.
- [...]

That's a good summary.

What's next? There is another step, you know.

What's the phrase from English constitutional law?
"Everything which is not forbidden is allowed"?

What Fr. Sichko supported in his tweets, and what Fr. Longenecker exposed, is the twisting of that flexible and charitable principle into another paradigmatic phrase, which reflects the totalitarian objectives of those who push the homosexualist agenda, namely, the next phase of the scheme:

"Everything not forbidden is compulsory."

As Fr. Longenecker points out, by creeping incrementalism they move from victimhood to celebration. In one more step, with the totalitarian jack boot bearing down, celebration will be forced. Even *participation*.

To be *candid* a few priests and bishops will have to be put up against the wall, "pour encourager les autres", as Voltaire explained.

Fr. Dwight Longenecker's full response to Fr. John Sichko's deception.

IS EVERY FAMILY A HOLY FAMILY?

My attention was drawn to a tweet by a priest in Kentucky called Fr Jim Sichko. I tried to verify the tweet, but when I looked him up it seems he has blocked me from his account. I can't understand why because to the best of my memory I can't remember ever crossing swords with him.

But anyway, the tweet was a load of sentimental nonsense along the lines of, “Let us all remember during this time of the Holy Family that all families are holy. Some are heterosexual and some are homosexual. Some are single mothers and some are poor, divorced or widowed.”

I certainly don’t want to judge anyone on the basis of one tweet, and tweeting is a fun and dangerous business because of its brevity it is so easy to misunderstand what someone means. However, it was pretty hard not to see this tweet for what it was.

It pretended to be a message to raise our awareness and compassion for those who live in irregular and difficult family situations. However, anybody can see that it was really a lame attempt to to normalize homosexual unions by putting gay couples into a victim category.

The tactic works like this:

- 1. paint someone or some group as a victim of discrimination*
- 2. push some guilt buttons to raise “compassion” for that group. Note that this is not true compassion. It’s just guilt wearing a compassion mask so the person doesn’t feel so guilty anymore*
- 3. Raise the compassion to the level of advocacy*
- 4. Advocacy must mean acceptance*
- 5. Acceptance must mean condoning*
- 6. Condoning must lead to celebrating.*

Let’s analyze this a bit. A person or a family is not automatically “holy” simply because they are unusual. This error is similar to the one so prevalent within Catholicism in which people assume that the poor are holy simply and only because they are poor. Being poor in and of itself does not make a person holy. Being a member of a persecuted group in and of itself does not make a person holy.

We know this because some persecuted and poor people become bitter, greedy, dishonest, spiteful and cruel because of their condition.

Likewise being part of the establishment, being “normal” or well off and respectable doesn’t make you either holy or sinful. We know this because there are plenty of wealthy, well educated and “nice” people who are actually greedy, spiteful, selfish and nasty beneath the surface while there are others who are generous, kind, loving and genuinely holy.

Man looks on the outward appearance. God looks at the heart.

The members of a family are not holy simply because they are normal and respectable, but neither are members of a family holy simply because they are unusual, unconventional or struggling in some way.

The idea that all families are “holy” is sentimental nonsense, and people who use this sentimental form of argumentation usually do so (consciously or unconsciously) as a form of emotional blackmail. You know how it goes...”If you don’t sympathize with this person I am telling you to sympathize with then you are a bad person and we are going to attack you...”

So are all families holy?

Is a family where the father is a serial adulterer who then takes his well scrubbed nice looking family to church for Christmas Eve a “holy family” I don’t think so.

Is an affluent family where the self centered mother has had a string of affairs a holy family just because they are neat and clean and go to church and give lots of money? No.

Is a drug addicted prostitute who beats her kids and gives her daughter to her pimp a holy family? Nah.

Are gay men who pay a woman to be a surrogate for their child conceived through masturbating into a test tube a holy family? Nope.

Is a family where the teenage kids are rebellious, promiscuous drug addicts a holy family? No.

Do lesbians who have pretended to make a marriage and have children through sperm donation a holy family? Negative.

Is a white supremacist who raises his kids to hate n***ers and Jews the leader of a holy family? Nope.

My point is, there are lots of families who are definitely NOT holy—and their outward appearance has nothing to do with it. They might appear to be happy, normal church goers or they might appear to be filthy low life. They might be super successful and warrant our admiration or they might be pitiful and poor and warrant our pity.

But none of that has anything to do with holiness.

Their holiness or lack of it has nothing to do with their outward appearance.

Does that mean we judge them and condemn them?

No. However, we can judge their actions, and certain actions reveal a lack of holiness.

So what is “holiness” anyway? To be sinful is to have “fallen short of the glory of God.” (Romans 3:23) What is the “glory of God” It is a human being fully alive (St Irenaeus) What does it mean to be “fully alive”? It is to be full of grace. Who is “full of grace”? The Blessed Virgin Mary of course.

She is full. She is whole. She is complete. She is “holy.”

The Blessed Virgin and all the saints show us what “wholeness-holiness” is.

The members of the families I outlined above are not holy because they are not whole. They’re broken. They’re wounded. They’re devastated by sin and selfishness.

We look on them with pity not with blame.

Furthermore, we look to ourselves and our own broken, dysfunctional and unhappy families and we pray for peace, healing and the wholeness that only God’s grace through the saving work of Christ can bring.

Fr Jim is right to draw our attention to the parlous state of the family in our society today, but **he’s wrong in saying all families are holy.**

The beautiful thought, however, is that although our families are not holy—they can be.

Through repentance, reconciliation, renewal and release all of us can attain holiness, but that is a long, hard journey...

The journey that begins in a moment of self surrender and a pilgrimage that takes a lifetime to complete.