

“Does our law condemn a man before he has heard him.” (Nicodemus to his fellows, in Jn. 7: 40 – 53). “If we Americans are a community, and not a free-for-all group of individuals, then, is not a denial of due process of law to one of us persons a denial of due process of law to all of us persons?” (Anonymous)

Professor [Alan] Dershowitz: You are recognized world over as the greatest defender of “due process of law.” I need your help from afar. And unless you help me, then my California license to practice due process of law gets jeopardized because, by virtue of the moral principle that gives rise to the constitutional dictate of due process of law, I am required to non-violently block an entrance to a Planned Parenthood abortion or death clinic in order to try and raise up the death of due process of law in our Constitution. Here is an introduction to my below letter to Chief Justice Roberts (and his fellows): Suppose a nation-state, judicial tribunal drags before it your client, person “x,” and says this to “x”: “Only persons who meet the qualifications of “a” persons are exempt from “z” (death by legally authorized, medically- performed execution). And, since we find that you don’t qualify as an “a” person, then you are consigned to “z.” As due process counsel for “x,” would you not demand to beyond the kingdom of God, that “x” be given an opportunity to argue that he qualifies absolutely as an “a” person? And was not Dred Scott at least afforded his constitutional due process right to be heard on his claim to liberty from enslavement? Why, then, do you remain silent before the great injustice that occurred in Roe v Wade? Was not Jane Roe’s fetus deprived of his right to argue that he qualifies as a 5th (14th) Amendment, due process clause person? And surely you are not of the low opinion that the Texas Attorney General in Roe v Wade was a constitutionally valid guardian ad litem, due process of law substitute for Jane Roe’s fetus, even if he was competent (and we know he was not; and we know also that he was conflicted-see Roe v Wade, 410 U. S. 113, 157 n. 54).