

# UNFORGIVABLE SIN, STEP BY STEP EXPLANATION

Clifton A. Emahiser's Teaching Ministries  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830  
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571  
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

It is simply amazing the concocted ideas that some dream up for which they theorize to be the unpardonable sin! After listening to a professed teacher on television on this subject, I decided that I needed to write him a letter concerning his error. Then the thought came to me, while I was at it, that I should write an article explaining it to everyone at the same time, killing two birds with one stone, so to speak. In order to accomplish this, it will be necessary to start at ground-zero, assuming that all who read this are unenlightened novices in this area of Biblical theology.

To start with, this television rancher-teacher has several faulty premises on which he bases his flawed conclusions, a problem which the reader of this paper might also have. Among the many inaccurate and unBiblical positions this man holds, a few should be pointed out. (1) he uses the terms "jew" and "Israelite" synonymously supposing they are one and the same entity; (2) he also reduces everyone to a category of either being a "jew" or "gentile", falsely believing – as well as teaching – that the definition of the Latin term "gentile" means "non-jew", a definition the original Latin never had, nor did any of the writers of the New or Old Testaments ever use, and (3) he holds to the false doctrine of a trinity of three gods, God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, and that somehow the unforgivable sin is blasphemy against the latter one. In addition to these three flawed premises, he is totally oblivious of the fact that at Jer. ch. 24, Jeremiah separates the citizens of Judaea into two classes, (1) "good-fig-Judahites", and (2) "bad-fig-jews". And once the reader becomes aware of who the "bad-fig-jews" are, he is getting closer to the appropriate meaning of our subject.

This rancher-teacher first went to Matt. 12:31-32 and read the passage and said that anyone who would commit the unpardonable sin is doomed forever to the lake of fire. (You will need to read all these scriptures as we go along.) He next implied that the condemning unpardonable sin was unbelief. In order to find support for his untenable position, he next read Heb. 3:15-19, applying it to jews only, and again claiming it was the sin of unbelief. He next commented that many people go through life afraid they have committed the unpardonable sin, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, the vilest sin of all, and again asserts that it is the sin of unbelief. He then reads Eph. 2:11-13 trying to gain further support, but those three verses mention absolutely nothing about unbelief. His incorrect premise is a result of not truly understanding verse 12 of Eph. 2.

He falsely applies verse 12 to what he terms “gentiles”, but rather verse 12 is directed to the lost tribes of Israel. Thus, he incorrectly assumes that the Gospel is being offered to the gentiles (as he puts it) because of the jews’ unbelief. He cites a parable of Christ at Matt. 21:33-40, 45. This rancher-teacher concludes correctly that Yahshua’s words were directed toward the jews, and that at verse 45, the jews understood He was speaking of them. All of these conclusions are based upon this rancher-teacher’s belief that the jews are God’s chosen people, and also in a trinity. In so many words he says that the jews rejected the overture of the Father by killing the prophets; they rejected the overture of the Son by killing the Christ; and that they also rejected the overture of the Holy Spirit at Acts chapters 6 & 7. He finally points out that Stephen was full of the Holy Spirit, and in the stoning of Stephen the jews rejected the overture of the Holy Spirit in unbelief at Acts 7:54-60. Such teachings change the context into a pretext!

If the unpardonable sin is the sin of unbelief – which it isn’t – there will be no forgiveness in this life or the next. Yet this rancher-teacher in his very next breath claims that the jews will repent and be in the millennial Kingdom. Let’s take a very close look at Matt. 12:31-32: “<sup>31</sup> **Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy *against* the *Holy Ghost* shall not be forgiven unto men.** <sup>32</sup> **And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.**” The reader should take note that the one who blasphemes in this manner is condemned in this age as well as any future age. Therefore, the sin of unbelief is not the unpardonable sin! It is much more serious than that! This sin of blasphemy is so vile, and without remedy, that unbelief would look lily-white in comparison.

### **FORNICATION = BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE SPIRIT**

Now that we have discussed what the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit isn’t, let’s examine what it truly is according to Scripture. We will begin at 1 Cor. 6:18-19 where Paul says: “<sup>18</sup> **Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.** <sup>19</sup> **What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost *which is* in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?”**

In the simplest definition possible, fornication is race-mixing. Adultery can also mean race-mixing, but fornication is more specific. Therefore, anyone who fosters, orally or in writing, miscegenation of the Adamic with the non-Adamic, blasphemes against the Holy Spirit. Some people might not like this explanation, but I didn’t write the Book, so I apologize not! Paul stated at 1 Cor. 3:17: “**If any man defile the temple of God [*sexually uniting his seed with an alien race*], him [*/her ensuing offspring*] shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which *temple* ye are.**”

To show you that the term fornication is separate from the term adultery all we need do is go to Gal. 5:19-21 where Paul said: “<sup>19</sup> **Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these*; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,** <sup>20</sup> **Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,** <sup>21</sup> **Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the**

**which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.**" Notice here that Paul uses both the terms fornication and adultery, and he wasn't wasting words in doing so. For our purpose here we will notice that fornication is in the same category with witchcraft! So it would appear that most of today's churches would be better designated as covens (assemblies of witches and warlocks).

We are told at 1 Sam. 15:23 (where Samuel addresses king Saul): "**For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of Yahweh, he hath also rejected thee from being king.**" We are told in Rev. ch. 12 of the rebellion of Satan and the third part of the angels (= stars) under him who were all cast to the earth to persecute the woman (Adamic-Israel). Thus, Satan was the first warlock practicing witchcraft. And because, as Paul explained at Gal. 5:19-21, witchcraft and fornication go hand in hand, Satan and his fallen angels committed fornication first with animal-kind and later with Adam-kind at Gen. 6:1-4. Thus, the non-Adamic races are not created beings but rather the products of a mixture of angel-kind with animal-kind (See *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, ©1996, on page 247, a translation of 1Q23, fragments 1 and 6). This is presented in detail in *Watchman's Teaching Letter* #114.

At Ecc. 3:21 we read: "**Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?**" From this verse we can substantiate that there are Adamic-people as opposed to beast-people. And for anyone who contradicts this, it becomes necessary to quote Jer. 31:27: "**Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man** [#120 *Adam-kind*], **and with the seed of beast** [#929 *beast-kind*]." This is a prophecy that is being fulfilled today en masse. But in order to grasp this, one must first understand that the "house of Israel" and the "house of Judah" are White-Caucasian people. It is an incorrect premise to conclude that because of various ethnic backgrounds (such as Irish, German, Danish etc.) that the White-Caucasian people are of a mixed-racial group, for they are all of pure Israelite extraction, and not to be confused with the bad-fig-jews! Once comprehending these things, one can begin to see just how vile a sin fornication is!

We should take into consideration Heb 12:16 where Paul says: "**Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.**" Any time a White-Caucasian commits fornication, that person is selling their birthright by flushing it down the toilet. And the product of such a union is a biblical-bastard (mamzer), a mutation of genetic confusion which can never be corrected in this age or the next! This is not a game of tinker-toys, for it is no small matter! What is it that Esau did? He married Hittite wives of the Cain-satanic-seedline. Now don't go quoting Gen. 4:1 to me, for that is a corrupt passage as described by the 12-volume *The Interpreter's Bible* and *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible* by Charles M. Laymon, commenting on Gen. 4:1. The Aramaic (not bad-fig-jewish) Targums spell Gen. 4:1 out quite clearly: that Eve committed fornication with Satan producing Cain! That is why Yahweh told Cain at Gen. 4:7: "**If thou doest well, shalt**

**thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door** [*of the birth canal*] ...” Thus, Cain was a genetic misfit without the Holy Spirit breathed into Adam, of which Paul says our bodies are the temple. And being dead to the Spirit, he had no compunction about killing his halfbrother, Abel. That is also the reason Eve said at Gen 4:25: “ ... **For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead** [*in place*] **of Abel, whom Cain slew.**” Had Cain been Adam’s son, Eve would have said “For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead [*in place*] of Cain ...” But by stating “instead of Abel” at Gen. 4:25 – as Eve did – she included Abel in Adam’s genealogy while excluding Cain.

Now both the one seedliners and the Two Seedliners recognize the three sons by Eve as Cain, Abel and Seth. The Two Seedliners, however, would recognize Abel as the firstborn of Adam whereas the one seedliners would recognize Cain as Adam’s firstborn. Hence, it will be necessary to cite a similar Biblical situation. Such a passage can be found at Gen. 38 where twin sons are born to Judah by Tamar. It is recorded at verses 2-4 that born unto Judah by the Canaanite (daughter of Shua) were three sons, Er, Onan and Shelah. The usual Hebrew reckoning would be: (1) Er, (2) Onan, and (3) Shelah, with Er as Judah’s firstborn. But after Judah’s first wife died, leaving him a widower and Tamar (his intended daughter-in-law) an unwed lawful wifely candidate (though she played the part of a harlot to avoid a union with the half-breed Shelah) she bore for Judah the twin sons at verses 28-30. But the midwife of Tamar must have been aware of the half-breed status of the sons born by the Canaanite woman, and bound a scarlet thread on the hand of the twin she anticipated would be born first. Well, if Tamar’s twins were #s 4 and 5 to Judah, why did it matter which was born first? Like Cain, Er, Onan and Shelah were not counted as legitimate, lawful sons of Judah. Thus Pharez became Judah’s firstborn and Zerah his second, just as Abel was Adam’s firstborn with Seth taking Abel’s place upon his death by Cain’s murdering hand.

The revealing difference between a half-breed as compared to a purebred is described in parable form by Yahshua at Matt. 7:15-19, and I will amplify the wording for a better understanding: “<sup>15</sup> **Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.** <sup>16</sup> **Ye shall know them by their** [*racial*] **fruits. Do men gather grapes of** [*racial*] **thorns, or figs of** [*racial*] **thistles?** <sup>17</sup> **Even so every good** [*racial*] **tree bringeth forth good** [*racial*] **fruit; but a corrupt** [*racial*] **tree bringeth forth evil** [*racial*] **fruit.** <sup>18</sup> **A good** [*racial*] **tree cannot bring forth evil** [*racial*] **fruit, neither can a corrupt** [*racial*] **tree bring forth good** [*racial*] **fruit.** <sup>19</sup> **Every tree that bringeth not forth good** [*racial*] **fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.**” Why? Because it is the **SIN UNTO DEATH** for which there is **ABSOLUTELY NO REMEDY** in this world age or the next! The final outcome is on record and cannot be changed!

Cain was, therefore, a corrupt tree incapable of bearing good racial fruit. The only thing mamzers can do is to breed more mamzers (bastards), and this continues down-line forever, or until the corrupt family tree finally dies out. This brings us right back to our Matthew 12:31-32 reference to the unforgivable sin with verses 32 through 35 stating: “<sup>32</sup> **And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be**

forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the *world* to come. <sup>33</sup> **Either make the tree [racially] good, and his fruit [racially] good; or else make the tree [racially] corrupt, and his fruit [racially] corrupt: for the tree is known by his [racial] fruit. <sup>34</sup> O generation [race] of vipers, how can ye, being [racially] evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. <sup>35</sup> A good [racial] man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil [racial] man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.**” From this we can see that it was an impossibility for Cain and all of his descendants right up to the bad-fig-Pharisees and bad-fig-Sadducees to bring forth good things from an evil treasure. Nor can we expect any product of fornication to bring forth good things from an evil treasure! Cain is the first example of such a product! Such people are mule-people. A mule is half horse and half donkey (ass). Evidently that is where the expression “half-assed” came from (suggesting something which is good-for-nothing). One will notice in this last quoted passage that Yahshua Christ first spoke of the unpardonable sin, and then used the bad-fig-jews as a prime example. In my churchgoing days, the pastors seemed intensely preoccupied with what they termed “the original sin”, but I don’t remember them ever once identifying it as the unforgivable sin of fornication! Yet, the fornicator him/herself will survive with zero reward, but the works (products) of fornication will be judged and destroyed by fire! Just such a judgment is spoken of at Malachi 4:1 where it is stated: “... **and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith Yahweh of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.**”

At 1 Cor. 10:8, Paul brings to memory an incident where Israel engaged in race-mixing where he wrote: “<sup>8</sup> **Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand.**” This was in reference to the occasion at Numbers chapters 24 & 25 where the men of Israel were enticed to commit interracial fornication with Moabite women. The Moabites descended from Lot’s incest with one of his two daughters, one son of which was named Moab and another son of the other daughter named Amon. By the time of the incident of Baalpeor, the Moabites were no longer a racially pure people. We can be quite sure of this as Paul called Israel’s sexual encounter with the Moabite women “fornication”. What we do know is, shortly before the Israelites arrived in the Transjordan, Sihon, a king of the Amorites, had defeated the previous king of Moab (Num. 21:26) and absorbed much of the Moabite territory as far south as the Arnon (*The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. K-Q, p. 414).

It is reasonable to assume that the Moabites mixed racially with the Amorites, as the women of the conquered became the booty of the conqueror. And how many times the Amorites had mixed their genetics would be hard to determine, but the Amorites are one of the Canaanite nations which are named at Genesis 15:19-21. Undoubtedly, the Amorites had even absorbed the genetics of Cain (Kenites, #7014).

**Amorites absorb Moabites:** What the serious Bible scholar must understand is that during the Joshua period, the Israelites destroyed the Amorites, who had absorbed the Moabites, killing and / or displacing both of them. Upon driving the Amorites (+ absorbed Moabites) out of the promised land, it is recorded at Joshua 18:7 that half of the tribe of Manasseh along with the tribes of Gad and Reuben moved into the former

land of Moab east of the Jordan. It was later, during the Judges period, that an Israelite lady from the conquered land of Moab by the name of Ruth journeyed with her mother-in-law Naomi back to Bethlehem. Ruth never told Naomi “your god will be my god”, rather “I will leave the jurisdiction of my judge, and your judge will become my judge”. That is because the term *elohim* is used for angels, judges, pagan gods, and the Almighty Yahweh Himself. And it has both a singular and plural meaning, and when used of Yahweh, it is always singular in spite of what others say to the contrary. The only sense in which Ruth was a Moabitess is that she was a Moabitess by geographic area rather than by Moabite genetics. But nearly all of nominal churchianity today use the story of Ruth to promote their perverted ideology of multiculturalism, and in doing so are guilty of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, of which our body is the temple.

Paul warned against this at 2 Cor. 6:14-17 (and I will use William Finck’s translation from his *Letters of Paul*): “<sup>14</sup> **Do not become yoked together with untrustworthy aliens; for what participation has justice and lawlessness? And what fellowship has light towards darkness?** <sup>15</sup> **And what accord has Christ with Beliar? Or what share the faithful with the faithless?** <sup>16</sup> **And what agreement has a temple of Yahweh with idols? For you are a temple of the living Yahweh; just as Yahweh has said, ‘I will dwell among them, and I will walk about; and I will be their God, and they will be my people.’** <sup>17</sup> **On which account ‘Come out from the midst of them and be separated,’ says the Prince, and ‘do not be joined to the impure, and I will admit you’.**” Knowing this, how dare anyone join their body (which is Yahweh’s temple) in sexual union with an impure alien! What is there about the words “be separated” that we don’t seem to understand?

A paper on the subject of fornication being the unforgivable sin would not be compete without some mention of Sodom and Gomorrah and the experience of the men of those cities demanding to use angels as mates in unnatural sexual intercourse. Even the name of Sodom has come down to us today as a symbolic, allegory for the act of sodomy. At 2 Peter 2:6 we read: “**And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned *them* with an overthrow, making *them* an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly.**” Paul also condemned homosexuality in these words at Romans 1:26-27: “<sup>26</sup> **For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:** <sup>27</sup> **And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.**”

As described by Peter and Paul, homosexuality is a very vile sin, even deserving death. Yet sodomy, as vile as it is – and I would not attempt to whitewash it in any way – the unforgivable sin of fornication by the mixing of race is by far the most reprehensible sin of all. At least homosexuality doesn’t create mule-people, which is “mamzer” from the Hebrew, and translated into English as “bastard”. **NO, THE UNPARDONABLE SIN IS NOT THE SIN OF UNBELIEF!**