Leaning on the Highest Judge

Predisposition to an opinion

The deference of Jesus of Nazareth, in dependence on the wisdom of his Father, leads me to thoughts about opinions. Undoubtedly, some of the complainants that appear in our courts will try to sway the court to adopt a certain opinion of theirs. Sometimes, the motivation will be, substantially, self-serving on the part of the complainant. Hopefully, this will consist of a small fraction of the complaints. But whether it is small, or large; we must have a body of rules and laws that cannot be adjusted for the sake of unconnected agendas. These types of rules and laws are the things that Jesus received from his Father. In that respect, the Senate and House of Representatives, with the support of the Office of the President of the United States of America; together, serve as an extension of this principle for the sake of national legislation. We, who are of the court, depend on you; as Jesus depended on his Father.

In the laws of the nation, provided by you, we need to be able to clearly identify your intent in framing the law. For, some complainants will be sincere about the value of their cause, even though others will come with an agenda. The latter group reminds me of the one that fills the office of the highest spiritual Adversary. This Bible introduced us to this adversary, in the temptation of Job, the man. The highest Adversary does not limit itself to persuading individuals. This Adversary also plays a part in trying to sway the judgment of the Highest Judge. The Adversary failed to achieve this goal, and was disbarred from practicing as a prosecuting attorney in the court of Heaven; according to the report of a certain eyewitness.

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceive th the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. (Revelation 12:7-9)

In like fashion, with certain legal proceedings (more so than lawyers, hopefully), there will be times when we must dismiss an agenda--whether it is a person or a group--from any further consideration in the courts of this land. However, there will be times when we must give a full hearing to ones who come to us with an opinion about how justice is best served. Among these are the "friend of the court" briefs that interested parties submit. If vigilance is not maintained, and respect of persons is allowed to work its way into the deliberations, then there is a strong possibility of a growth infesting the mind of a judge. This infestation can come into the court packaged as a friend-of-the-court brief.

Generally speaking, a predisposition to an opinion is harmful. To analyze this premise, and to strengthen my resolve in avoiding them, I pondered a strong example of a

predisposition to an opinion, as could have been enacted in the presence of the Highest Judge. The name of the example is, Judas Iscariot.

Some people, including some Bible scholars, say that Judas Iscariot deserves the greatest of condemnation. Typically, the basis for this opinion is the level of Judas' betrayal. To analyze this opinion, I will take you through a possible trial of Judas Iscariot.

First, the evidence tells us that Judas was one of the individuals in the elite group of disciples. As a member of the elite group (also known as the apostles), Judas was given work assignments that were of the same kind as those that were given to all the other members. This is one of those work assignments.

And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits; (Mark 6:7)

Occasionally, I think about the question of which disciple received the assignment to pair with Judas. It might be interesting if it was Simon Peter. If so, then Simon Peter could have learned how to deal with aberrant agendas. It does not seem that the sons of thunder, James and John, would have allowed anything to separate them; but, this, too, would produce some good apostolic work experience. Either of these sons might be swayed by the familiarity of their family ties, and render their service only based on the preferences of their family history. However, I really do not think that they would have allowed this to sway them; considering the magnitude of the call to judgment that they had before them. It is my opinion that they would have rendered their spread of blessings, impartially; based on the evidence of need, and not based on personal preference.

In whatever case; with the pairing of Judas, there is no record of any discord between Judas and whoever else was the other part of the pair. I stress this point because it indicates that Judas was a fully accepted member of the group of twelve initial apostles. Holding that to be true, let us quickly proceed through some other points of evidence for Judas.

- 1. It was prophesied (we may call it a promise) of Judas, that he would be allowed to sit as a judge in the kingdom of Jesus Christ.
 - And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. (Matthew 19:28)
- 2. The placement of the disciples, sitting on thrones for judging the twelve tribes, is very significant. By doing this, Jesus had removed himself from the place of direct judgment over these tribes. (Maybe, from time to time, he would submit a "friend of the court" brief.) In fact, as you read, previously, in the matter of the inheritance of

the brothers; Jesus directly indicated that he was not a sitting judge in the court of God's righteousness for the purpose of judging legal matters of the citizens of Israel. At that time, this sort of judgment was still being done by the priests--the high priest, in particular. Moreover, for the authorization of the actions of the high priest, the ultimate responsibility for spiritual legalities rested in the seat of Moses; which seat they misused, from time to time.

Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, Saying

The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.

But all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, And love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, And greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. (Matthew 23:1-7)

3. Jesus' assignment--as he himself states it--was to give the disciples the evidence of the need for their participation in the coming Kingdom of God, with man.

For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. (John 17:8)

In a sense, Jesus was behaving as a friend of the Highest Court. An integral part of this evidence is the broad range of forgiveness that Jesus provided to the world. The range of forgiveness that he provided must surely have been comprehensive enough to include Judas' very serious failure. We have reserved this evidence as the conclusion of this matter.

4. Judas really did not have a way to avoid what would happen. Again, this is included in the evidence that Jesus presented.

While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled. (John 17:12)

5. Judas had an accomplice; one that was able to manipulate even the strongest of men. This accomplice tried to manipulate another apostle, Simon Peter, at one point in the disciples' walk with Jesus, in the earth.

And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. (Luke 22:31-32)

This accomplice was a significant contributing factor to the actual damage to the body of Christ, which Judas would instigate against the person of Jesus of Nazareth. However, please note that Judas did not personally inflict the damage. The accomplice was only empowered to persuade Judas to instigate the damage.

And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly. (John 13:27)

6. Finally, in the case of Judas Iscariot, we have the actual testimony of the friend of the Highest Court, Jesus Christ. In his brief discussion of how judgment might occur, for such a matter as would be perpetrated by Judas, Jesus said the following:

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. (Matthew 12:32)

The words that dispel the opinion that Judas was forever separated from God, are these: whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him. Therefore, the predisposition has no authority in the kingdom of Christ.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

This example from the life of Jesus Christ, tells me of the great importance of reviewing all the evidence, setting aside personal grievances, and rendering a verdict based on the sum total of what is set before the judge, in the case. By doing this, a judge eliminates the predisposition to an opinion.