

# Under Bondage

To The Law Of Christ

~ THE ONLY REAL  
**FREEDOM**

Jesus Christ Is Lord Over All Men  
Through His Gospel -- Including  
The Matter Of

Divorce And Remarriage

(John 8:32; Matt. 28:18-20; 19:9;  
Mark 16:15; Rom. 7:1;4)

**Thomas B. Warren, Ph.D.**

# Under Bondage

To The Law Of Christ

-- THE ONLY REAL  
*FREEDOM*

**John 8:32**

Thomas B. Warren, Ph.D.

National Christian Press  
7158 Highway 57 West  
Ramer, TN 38367

[www.nationalchristianpress.com](http://www.nationalchristianpress.com)  
[bartwarren@yahoo.com](mailto:bartwarren@yahoo.com)

**UNDER BONDAGE**  
TO THE LAW OF CHRIST  
-- THE ONLY REAL  
**FREEDOM**

Copyright, 1989

**National Christian Press, Inc.**

Printed in the United States of America

All rights in this book reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from an official representative of National Christian Press, Inc., Jonesboro, AR 72403.

ISBN 0-934916-02-0

Printed By

Sain Publications

217 E. Jefferson •• Pulaski, TN 38478  
(615) 363-6905 or 363-8868

# Foreword

It is with great pleasure that I write the foreword to this latest book of Brother Thomas B. Warren. It was my privilege to read Brother Warren's manuscript of *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock* as it was being written. That book was a total devastation of Brother James D. Bales' book, *Not Under Bondage*. Utilizing the truth that any doctrine which implies a false doctrine is itself a false doctrine, Warren refuted the doctrine affirmed in Bales' book. Warren showed that Bales' position involves at least twenty-six false doctrines on marriage, divorce, and remarriage. Warren rightly concluded that, since Bales' doctrine implies false doctrine, Bales' doctrine itself is false. There is no better way to refute a doctrine.

In response, brother Bales denied twenty-five of the twenty-six positions which Warren ascribed to him (as having been taught in *Not Under Bondage* and others of Bales' writings). This present book shows from BALE'S OWN WRITINGS that he now teaches a number of crucial doctrines which he formerly vehemently condemned. Therefore, it follows, that by Bales' own pen, he confirms what Warren affirmed in *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*.

This present book, along with *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*, shows the simplicity of Matthew 19:9 and the absurdity of Bales' thesis on divorce and remarriage.

For many, many years Brother Bales was rightly regarded as one of the strongest defenders of the faith of God's word, but now he is faced (by his present teaching on divorce and remarriage) with logically denying much truth which he formerly taught. This present book documents and explains the truth of this fact.

I close with a loving plea to all men to love God, to love Christ, to love His truth, to love His special people (the church), and to love all men everywhere. When one truly loves God, he will keep His commandments. He will not allow himself to be more concerned for human friendships that he is for the truth of God. May all men love, proclaim, and defend the truth (John 8:32). May God bless the study of all people.

-Andrew M. Connally

# Preface

In order for any reader to gain the basic message of this book, he must understand and accept this truth: any proposition which *implies* a false proposition is itself false. For example, consider the following argument: "*If Richard M. Nixon can veto potential laws which the Congress of the United States has passed, then Richard M. Nixon is still the president of the United States. But Richard M. Nixon is not still the president of the United States. Therefore, it is false that Richard M. Nixon can veto the potential laws which the Congress of the United States has passed.*" This is the case because that proposition implies a false proposition.

One of the basic thrusts of the *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock* (written by Thomas B. Warren) is: since the doctrine on divorce and remarriage which is taught by Dr. James D. Bales implies doctrine which is false, it follows that the doctrine on divorce and remarriage which is taught by James D. Bales is false.

It will be of some value, perhaps, to look at just a bit of history in regard to the problem of divorce and remarriage, remembering all the while that no impenitent fornicator will spend eternity with God in heaven (Rev. 21:8). It was, as I recall, in the Spring of 1976 during the Harding University "*Preacher Forum*" when, in responding to a brother's affirmation that all men are amenable to Matthew 19:9, that brother James D. Bales argued that neither "*mixed marriages*" (marriages in which a Christian is married to a non-Christian) nor marriages which involve two non-Christians are governed by the instruction of Jesus which is set out in Matthew 19:9.

During the Harding University "*Preacher Forum*" of 1977 brother Bales and brother Roy Deaver discussed this matter in more detail.

From April, 1977 to at least 1985, brother Bales did a great deal of writing on this problem. In 1979, he published his book, "*Not Under Bondage*. The basis thesis of this book was: (1) that "*mixed marriages*" and the marriages of non-Christians are not governed by Matthew 19:9 and (2) that no unmarried Christian is amenable to Matthew 19:9. The basic

thrust of Bales' effort in this book was his attempt to prove that the Bible teaches these two points. His effort involved his affirmations that the following propositions are true: (1) only Christians are under (amenable to) the New Covenant; (2) non-Christians are under "*the law on the heart*" which, Bales implies, is a law which is DIFFERENT FROM and OTHER THAN the law (gospel) of Christ, (3) Matthew 19:9 is a part of the law of Christ, (4) Matthew 19:9 is NOT a part of "*the law on the heart*," (5) only marriages in which a *Christian* is married to a *Christian* are marriages which are governed by Matthew 19:9, (6) marriages in which a non-Christian is married to a non-Christian are NOT governed by Matthew 19:9, (7) marriages in which a non-Christian is married to a Christian are marriages which are not governed by Matthew 19:9; i.e., marriages in which a *Christian* is married to an *alien sinner* are not governed by Matthew 19:9, (8) all marriages except those in which a Christian is married to a Christian are governed by "*the law on the heart*" (a law which, Bales implies, is *different from* and *other than* the law of Christ [the New Covenant, the gospel, the faith]).

Bales also contends that Matthew 19:9 teaches that the *guilty* party (in a case of fornication) is just as free to marry again as is the *innocent* party. Obviously, this proposition implies that if any husband or wife wishes to be married to someone other than his/her spouse (and still be pleasing to God), all they have to do to become eligible (to divorce his/her spouse and to marry someone else) in God's sight is to commit fornication! Brother Bales teaches this doctrine. This implies that the divorcing and marrying again does not have to stop -- according to the law of Christ (the New Covenant) -- even when one *Christian* is married to another *Christian*. In the final analysis, this means -- given the doctrine of brother Bales -- that there is NO MARRIAGE which is *not* pleasing to God! It follows, therefore that movie "*stars*" (and others) who "*flit*" from one spouse to another throughout their adult lives are pleasing to God in doing so. Recently, one actress, in commenting on the number of husbands she herself had had during her life of about seventy years, said something like this, "*One husband every ten years, five husbands during a lifetime, that's about right!*" The doctrine taught by brother

Bales implies that what the actress said is in harmony with what Jesus and Paul taught. But this is simply not true.

If the Bales doctrine, which is described just above, is true, then it follows that down through the years those who have *opposed* such multiple marriages ("*serial polygamy*") have been wrong. But Matthew 19:9 still stands as Jesus stated it. The Bible still teaches that all impenitent adulterers will be eternally lost.

In times past brother Bales has been a stalwart teacher of the truth. He has written many books and many articles. Most of those books and articles contain crucial truth which brother Bales has not *explicitly* repudiated. He has *implicitly* repudiated much of it, but he has *explicitly* repudiated little of it.

Because of my sincere hope that brother Bales might come to see the truth on the matter of divorce and remarriage without my having to say very much more about the subject, I delayed my response to the great mass of material which he was writing on the subject during the period of 1977-1979. Then I wrote my book *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*. It is my firm conviction that this book: (1) refuted the doctrines which Bales had taught (both explicitly and implicitly) on divorce and remarriage in his book *Not Under Bondage* and others of his writings and (2) demonstrated that all men are under (amenable to) the law of Christ, that Matthew 19:9 is a part of the law of Christ (the gospel, the faith, the New Covenant), that, therefore, all marriages today are governed by Matthew 19:9, and that, in a case of fornication by one marriage partner, only the *innocent* party is free (with God's approval) to put away his/her spouse and marry again.

A crucial purpose of my book, *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*, was that of proving brother Bales' doctrine to be out of harmony with plain Bible teaching by proving that his doctrine on divorce and remarriage *implies* doctrines which are clearly false and that, therefore, Bales' doctrine itself is false. I am altogether confident that this goal was reached in *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*. Since any doctrine which implies a false doctrine is itself false, it follows -- since Bales' doctrine implies false doctrine -- that Bales' doctrine on divorce and remarriage is false and, thus, should be rejected by all.

In response to this section of *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*, brother Bales contended that he did not believe twenty-five of the twenty-six points which had been used in proving that his doctrine *implies* false doctrine (and, thus, is false itself).

It must be noted that I did not say (in *Lock*) that Bales BELIEVED the twenty-six points. What I DID say was this: the various doctrines which have been explicitly taught by Bales DO IMPLY the twenty-six points of doctrine which I charged him with implying. If Smith, for example, teaches doctrine X, and if doctrine X implies doctrine Y, then (by teaching doctrine X) Smith has taught doctrine Y whether he actually believes doctrine Y or not. Many people imply doctrines which they themselves do not believe. Thus, the point is not: does brother Bales BELIEVE the twenty-six points of doctrine which I showed (in *Lock*) are implied by what he has explicitly taught.

The question is: is it actually the case that the doctrines which Bales has *explicitly* taught really do *imply* the twenty-six points which I charged him with having taught (by implication at least) in his various writings?

Obviously, either (1) what Bales has taught implies the twenty-six points (more could be listed) which I have charged him with teaching or (2) what he has taught does *not* imply them. If, in his efforts to demonstrate that the doctrine which he has taught on divorce and remarriage is true, he really has implied those twenty-six points of doctrine (there is no doubt whatever in the mind of this author that he has done so), then every honest person who comes to understand that such is the case will reject the doctrine which he has taught (and continues to teach).

Another crucial element of this present book involves the fact that many crucial (that is, truly fundamental) truths which Bales has taught (in years gone by) are doctrines which he now must (if he is to be logically consistent -- and, thus, avoid affirming logical contradictions) repudiate if he is to continue to teach his present doctrine on divorce and remarriage.

This book is sent forth in love of brother Bales, of all other human beings, and of God. Brother Bales well

understands that no man becomes the enemy of another man just because he sincerely tries to teach that other man some crucial truth (Gal. 4:16; 1:10). As a matter of fact, brother Bales himself has done a great deal of teaching of this very sort.

I wish with all my heart that the need for this present volume has not arisen. But it has arisen. Since my book *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock* was published in 1980, brother Bales has continued to write, on the subject of divorce and remarriage, a number of articles, booklets, and books. This continued writing by brother Bales (which includes his denial that what he has taught explicitly actually does imply the twenty-six points which I charged [in *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*] him with teaching) seems to necessitate the writing of this present volume. This is the case in spite of the fact that I have other books (on subjects other than divorce and remarriage) which I want very much to finish as soon as possible.

The urgency of dealing with the doctrines which have been advanced by brother Bales is seen by all who see (correctly) that the doctrines of Bales on divorce and remarriage undermine a number of foundational truths of the gospel of Jesus Christ. This fact is discussed throughout this book. There is discussion of one special problem in chapter 2. Other problems are discussed throughout the book.

In studying this book, the reader should be alert to note such obvious contradictions of plain Bible teaching—by brother Bales—as the following affirmations which have been made by him: (1) that only the church is under (amenable to) the New Covenant, (2) that the New Covenant is the same body of doctrine as the faith (of Jude 3), (3) that the faith includes the truth in all of its parts (thus denying "splitting" of the message of Jesus Christ to men now living into "gospel" and "doctrine" [New Covenant] which Bales has espoused since he has accepted his new doctrine on divorce and remarriage), (4) that the instruction to be baptized in the name of Christ is a part of the New Covenant. Since no one can get into the church without being baptized in the name of Christ, it follows from Bales' affirmation that no one can be

baptized. Further, since no one can be saved without being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38; Mk. 16:15-16; Acts 22:16; John 3:3-5; II Tim. 2:10; Gal. 3:26-27), it follows that Bales' doctrine implies universal damnation for all men living today. However, since Jesus taught that at least a few men will be saved (Matt. 7:13-14), it follows that Bales' doctrine is false. (Every doctrine which implies a false doctrine is itself false.) Study carefully Chapter 2 in this book.

On the subject of marriage, divorce, and remarriage (as set out in Matthew 19:6-9) the Lord has two laws. The basic law is: one husband, one wife, for life. This is His law, the original law, and it is still His law---what might be termed His "*Ideal Will*" in the matter. However, if and when one of the parties to the marriage violates this law (become guilty of sexual unfaithfulness), God has another law which steps in and takes over (that is, becomes applicable), and according to which the *innocent* party is given certain rights. This truth Jesus makes clear.

In responding to my book, *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*, Bales criticized my effort to show his doctrine (on divorce and remarriage) to be false by proving that his doctrine *implies* false doctrine. This book is written in response to his severe criticism. Because of his criticism, I urge the reader to look in the index of this book (on page 291) under the item, "*Logic*," and then to study carefully all of the citations listed there. These citations refer to instances in Bales' writings which prove that Bales himself again and again did in principle the very thing which I did (in *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*) in regard to Bales' explicit statements; that is, *he* (with other people's writings) showed that their *explicit* statements *implied* that which is false! There is no doubt that Bales has been a frequent user of this logical device to refute given doctrines. He was anxious to use this when he was proving another person's doctrines to be false. He seems not to want the same logical device to be used on *his* explicit statements! Either Bales' explicit statements imply what I said (in *Keeping The Lock In Wedlock*) they imply or they do not. I say that they do. Readers will have to decide for themselves whether such is the case. But let it be made clear: Bales knows as well as I do that every doctrine which implies a false doctrine is itself false! It is very inconsistent for

him to complain about my using this true proposition (Every proposition which implies a false proposition is itself false) when he himself has so frequently used it against denominationalists and various errorists within the Lord's church itself. Surely no honest reader will be foolish enough to overlook this very crucial truth.

Several years ago, I photocopied the first draft of this book and sent it to Roy C. Deaver for him to use as he saw fit in his written debate with brother Bales. In light of the fact that I regard Roy Deaver as one of the finest thinkers among God's people today, it is significant to me that in no case did he (a very careful, meticulous student of the Bible) tell me--or even hint--that I had incorrectly represented brother Bales by charging him with teaching (either explicitly or implicitly) that which he had not taught. (Of course, in spite of my great respect and admiration for brother Deaver, I do not hold that something is the case just because he said that it is. But, for me, for him to say it is very good evidence.)

The basic manuscript of this book has been finished (in rough draft) for a number of years (since no later than 1982). Its publication has been held up because of the hope of the author--a hope sincerely and lovingly held--that brethren could become united on this important problem without more books on the subject. However, it seems clear that the marriage, divorce, and remarriage question has--along with some other problems--opened "*the floodgates of apostasy.*" So, in the light of present circumstances, the author has decided to go ahead with its publication. Also, I have some other works which have been written in first draft. If, in the future, it seems to be wise to publish even more on this general subject, then -- the Lord willing -- such will be done.

--- Thomas B. Warren