

2. Who is going to be the source of "influence" on that child while its mother is away at work? Who will nurse it when it cries, tend its bruised knees, warn it against the dangers that lie ahead? Does the nursery really care about the kind of TV being watched?

the "sitter" mother, but would not call the mother, "mother."  
4. It is an open secret that many, many wives are too tired after a "hard day at the office" to be the spiritual influence and companion that she needs to be.

3. Frequently such arrangements allow the child to spend most of its waking hours with someone other than its mother. I have even known children who called

5. We will not discuss the resentment, the temptations, etc. that come her way. But for two excellent lessons dealing with this entire subject,

see one by Horace Huggins, and another by James Cope in the 1979 Florida College Lecture Book.

If this results in the emphasis on the material at the expense of the spiritual (and the evidence seems overwhelming), it is worldliness. The world may "respect" it but it does not change it.

[To be continued...]

# NAVARRE MESSENGER

April 26, 2015

## Respectable WORLDLINESS

We meet on James M Harvell Rd next to the public library in Navarre. Call for directions and more information (850) 939-8109

### Assembly Schedule

#### Sunday

Bible Class for all ages\_9:00 AM

Morning Worship Service\_10:00 AM

Evening Worship Service\_6:00 PM

#### Wednesday

Bible Class for all ages\_7:00 PM

This entire publication and previous issues are available online at [navarrechurchofchrist.net](http://navarrechurchofchrist.net)

along with some more useful information

### Navarre church of Christ

8490 James M Harvell Rd  
Navarre, FL 32566

Place Stamp Here

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**VISITORS ARE WELCOME!**

Hiram Hutto

To trace the development of the word from which we discuss worldliness (kosmos) is an interesting, if somewhat disappointing, exercise. Initially it meant an ornament, then the ordered or beautiful arrangement of the universe, next the earth, then the inhabitants of the earth - most of whom are bad, and thus

finally the evil that characterizes the world. It started out beautiful and attractive, but ends up bad and ugly. Most sin is that way. It can take something good and lovely and misuse it so that the result is evil. And this is doubly demonstrated in the title of this article. Doubly, because it takes something good and misuses it; but then to compound the tragedy, the bad is endorsed and becomes re-

spectable so that something evil is portrayed as something good! "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil" (Isa. 5:20). But perhaps you wonder: Just what is respectable worldliness?

Let it be noted to begin with, by respectable worldliness I do not mean that such is respectable with God. The very concept behind worldliness

eliminates any idea of God's approval of it. John tells us that it "is not of the Father" (1 John 2:16), and James says, "friendship with the world is enmity with God" (James 4:4).

Just as goodness stems from the good, and kindness from the kind, so worldliness stems from the world ("the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," 1 Jn. 2:16). It has both its origin and fruition in the kind of thinking and/or action which springs from such considerations. Fundamentally, worldliness is an emphasizing (which often runs to obsession) of that which is temporal, material, physical (which frequently involves the sensual) at the expense of (and more often than not, to the exclusion of) that which is spiritual. It is the opposite of spirituality. Clearly this can involve "a multitude of sins." As a rule, however, worldliness is thought of in terms of that which is either immoral or tends to immorality, and, to be sure, there are

many worldly people who hate both God and all who would live godly. Yet there are many others to whom immorality is abhorrent, who nonetheless have little or no interest in God or spiritual things; who emphasize the material, the physical at the expense of, and all too frequently, to the exclusion of, the spiritual. All such are worldly. They "mind earthly things." And they do this, not only in their own lives, but so uphold it, exalt it, and encourage it, that such have come to be looked upon by most people as not only not degrading, but positively desirable, respectable.

By respectable worldliness, then, I do not mean the immoral, the vulgar, the sensual, but rather that which the world considers respectable, and this in areas that in themselves are honorable, noble, and upright. This has had its influence on the church. For example, I do not preach to many people who are murderers or bank robbers. I would like to think

that most assemblies to whom I preach are not characterized by too many adulterers (and one would be too many to be a part of the people of God) or drunkards. And chances are good that most in these audiences would find such repugnant. Yet they have been so affected by the world's standard of respectability that many are guilty of respectable worldliness, and without some intense vigilance, many more will be. Let me illustrate.

An industrious brother (concerned about the high cost of living, the needs of his family, the requisites of a good education for them) takes a second job. This he does, knowing when he does it that it will entail his being unable to assemble with the saints as the word of God teaches, and if not that, surely knowing that it will preclude his being available for any significant amount of his individual responsibilities in the church.

As the world looks on this type of individual, he has many respectable qualities. He is concerned about his family's financial welfare and future. He is no leech on society. He wants to provide for his own, and even the Bible endorses this (1 Tim. 5:8). But he attains one lesser goal at the expense of a more important one. The one he attains may be good, noble, and respectable, but it is "worldly" nevertheless, because it emphasizes the physical and material at the expense of the spiritual. And certainly he has not sought "first the kingdom of God and his righteousness" (Matt. 6:33).

And what shall I say about working mothers? First of all, I want to say, because the Bible shows, they do right to work! But the word of God also tells them where to work. It does not say, "good secretaries, excellent clerks, workers in factories." It says, "workers at home, keepers at home" (Titus 2:5). 1 Tim. 5:15 shows there is more to this

than sweeping floors and washing the dishes. It says, "guide the home." This is a spiritual endeavor, and to "farm it out" so as to increase income for things, is to exchange the spiritual for the material. How depressing that people no longer believe that the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world. What a tragedy that Christian mothers have allowed themselves to be cheated out of one of the noblest of tasks by having the false idea foisted upon them that they cannot be "fulfilled" unless they get out of the house and into the business world. So successfully (respectable) has this been done that 16 million USA mothers with children under 18 work outside the home. Forty per cent (40%) of the women who have children under 6 years of age leave them with somebody else while they go off to work. What is it that prompts such? Will it help them participate more in "church work"? Will it increase their opportunities to visit the sick, to attend Bible classes, and do many oth-

er activities in the Lord's work? I do not recall ever hearing anyone say, "I think leaving my children to someone else will help them and me grow spiritually." Quite a few just "took the job temporarily, till we get these unusual expenses paid." (And these turn out to be about as temporary as taxes!) I visit in some of these homes, and from what I observe, they certainly could not be said to be in any kind of dire financial circumstances. Most of them are in financial circumstances as good as most and better than many. Was it spiritual reasons that demanded they so do? And consider this:

1. The training of children is not the responsibility of the government. It is not the responsibility of the grandparents, and not the responsibility of baby sitters. It is the responsibility of fathers (Eph. 6:4) and mothers (1 Tim. 5:14). It is a spiritual activity and no part-time job.