

# How Roberts Was Blackmailed To Support ObamaCare

[March 2, 2015 T.J. McCann](#)

I originally wrote this article and presented the research on January 28, 2013, on a now defunct forum LibertyCaucus.com, posted under my nickname “Trip”. The story got serious traction across the blogosphere, and was picked up at such sites as “WhatReallyHappened” and [“BeforeItsNews”](#) (Archived).

**INTRO:** Many of us have questioned what caused [Roberts to switch his vote on ObamaCare at the last minute](#), and did this so late that the Conservative Justices were forced to rewrite their majority opinion to be minority dissent.

According to some sources, Roberts wrote both the majority and a large portion of minority dissenting opinions. The liberal news outlet Salon.com has a story on July 3, 2012, [“Roberts Wrote Both ObamaCare Opinions”](#), written by law professor Paul Campos, citing “a source within the court with direct knowledge of the drafting process.”

In this Salon article, Campos rejects the claim that the conservative minority wrote the dissenting opinion in response to Roberts’ majority opinion. Instead Campos’ source indicates that Roberts authored as much as the “first 46 pages” of the dissent, a full 70%, originally intended to be the majority opinion entirely rejecting ObamaCare. Only after Roberts switched his vote at the last minute did the remaining four Justices author the final 19 pages of that dissenting opinion. In support of this, Campos points out that it is extraordinary “in the court’s history that a dissent has gone on for 13,000 words before getting around to mentioning that it is, in fact, dissenting”, and yet there are repeated references to dissent from the majority opinion in those last 19 pages.

These facts may answer that question.

## **Roberts Adoptions:**

In 2000 Justice Roberts and his wife Jane adopted two children. Initially it was apparent that the adoptions were “from a Latin American country”, but over time it has become apparent that the adopted children were not Latin American, but were Irish. Why this matters will become evident.

Report this ad

In 2005 the NY Times began investigating Roberts life as a matter of his nomination to the Supreme Court by George Bush. The Times was shortly accused of trying to unseal the adoption papers and intending to violate the anonymity of the adoption

process... however there is more to the story.

Drudge did an article in 2005 <http://patterico.com/2005/08/04/drudge-says-new-york-times-is-inves...>

- The NEW YORK TIMES is looking into the adoption records of the children of Supreme Court Nominee John G. Roberts, the DRUDGE REPORT has learned. The TIMES has investigative reporter Glen Justice hot on the case to investigate the status of adoption records of Judge Roberts' two young children, Josie age 5 and Jack age 4, a top source reveals. Judge Roberts and his wife Jane adopted the children when they each were infants. Both children were adopted from Latin America. A TIMES insider claims the look into the adoption papers are part of the paper's "standard background check." Bill Borders, NYT senior editor, explains: "Our reporters made initial inquiries about the adoptions, as they did about many other aspects of his background. They did so with great care, understanding the sensitivity of the issue."

### **Were the Children Adopted from Ireland?**

At the time, the adoption terms of the children was uncertain. [The Associated Press](#) reported that they were "adopted from Latin America." This indication should have been noteworthy, particularly given the Time magazine report indicating that the children were born in Ireland. Also, their blond hair and fair skin do not seem conventionally Latin American. <sup>1</sup>

TIME had a "web exclusive" on the Roberts's (7/24/05) and therein quoted a family friend as stating the kids were "born in Ireland 4 1/2 months apart."

### **How were the Children Adopted?**

Report this ad

According to [The New York Times](#), based on information from Mrs. Roberts's sister, Mary Torre, the children were adopted through a private adoption.

As explained by [Families for Private Adoption](#), "[p]rivate (or independent) adoption is a legal method of building a family through adoption without using an adoption agency for placement. In private adoption, the birth parents relinquish their parental rights directly to the adoptive parents, instead of to an agency."<sup>2</sup>

### **But was Robert's adoption utilizing "a legal method"?**

Apparently the process of adopting Jack involved some stress for John Roberts. According to [Dan Klaidman of Newsweek](#), during the contested 2000 election, Roberts "spent a few days in Florida advising lawyers [for George W. Bush] on their legal strategy," but "he did not play a central role," because "at the time, Roberts

was preoccupied with the adoption of his son.”

It is now quite evident that the two Children were from Ireland. Even [wikipedia](#) references these adoptions at the time of Roberts’ confirmation, and indicates that the children were of Irish birth.

**However Irish law 1) prohibits the adoption of Children to non-residents, and 2) also does not permit private adoptions**, but rather has all adoptions go through a public agency. This would explain the children’s origin from a “Latin American country”, so as to circumvent Irish law.

Evidently Roberts arranged for this adoption through some sort of trafficking agency, that contacted Irish women, arranged for them to be transported out of Ireland and into compliant Latin American countries, from which they were adopted, thereby circumventing Irish laws — entirely illegal, but perhaps quasi-legitimized by the birth mothers, two in this case, transporting the children out of Ireland.

Undoubtedly Roberts and his wife spent a great deal of money for this illegal process, circumventing Irish laws and arranging for the transit of two Irish children from separate birth-mothers to a foreign nation. As of 2012, those two children have been with the Roberts’ for roughly 10 years, since they were adopted as “infants”.

Report this ad

Some might feel an impulse dismiss this information, mistakenly believing Roberts and his wife were doing a good thing for a children needing a home. This would be a narrow perspective on what occurred. Such an inter-country adoption would only come about at great cost, and those who utilize this method are creating a for-profit black market in adoptive children, trafficking across international borders, and doing so from mothers who have not yet given up their children except for that profit. These actions are promoting a very unsavory profit-for-children human trafficking market that even necessitates immediate contact with new birth mothers in dire circumstances to offer financial gain. The entire arrangement is thoroughly predatory, turning children into a only financial commodity, and even providing motivation for their birth mothers to give them up! That’s an important ethical recognition.

Roberts is not deserving of any sort of respect here, and is only the latest example of people in position believing themselves above the law, beyond scrutiny and exempt from repercussion.

**It all now makes sense.**

The circumstances of these two adoptions explain not only why this would be overlooked by an overall sympathetic media, but also why a sitting Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court would not want this information to become public fodder well into his tenure. Its release and public discussion would discredit Roberts as an

impartial judge of the law, and undoubtedly lead to his impeachment.

This also explains why Roberts would have a means to be blackmailed, and why that leverage would still exist even after the institution of ObamaCare. ...

And it has led to flipping the swing-vote on ObamaCare, which fundamentally changed the relationship between citizen and government, making us de facto property of the state, with our relative worth in care and maintenance able to be determined by the government. Essentially it was a coup without firing a shot, much less needing even an Amendment to the Constitution.

Report this ad

And it is consistent with Obama's Chicago-style politics, that has previously involved opening other sealed <divorce> records in order to win election.

### **Irish Adoption Law**

The weak point in this theory, beyond actual proof of blackmail, is the actual terms of **Irish Adoption Law**. However an overview of the widespread Irish Adoption laws do bear out the assertions. As a result of Irish adoption law being the accumulation of laws over the years, this following synopsis is an accurate representation of that law given no singular code can be directly referenced.

Reference: [Overview of Ireland Adoption Law \(PDF\)](#) The above document makes the following statements:

- “The responsibility for making adoption orders is vested in the Irish Adoption Board, An Bord Uchtala. Before a final adoption order is made, the child usually is placed with the future adopter(s) by one of Ireland's Registered Adoption Societies.” [page 1]

Who may adopt?

- ... “While the Irish acts do not require the applicants have Irish nationality or an Irish domicile, the applicants **must be ordinarily resident in Ireland or have resident there during the year ending on the date of the order.**” [Page 4]

Adoption Authorities:

- “The adoption process in Ireland is **regulated by the Adoption Board — the An Bord Uchtala** — which consists of a Chairman and eight members. THE Adoption Board is an independent, quasi-judicial statutory body appointed by the Irish Government. It has the sole right to grant or refuse to grant adoption orders. The Board is also responsible for granting the declarations of eligibility and suitability to prospective adopters in advance of their adopting abroad and for maintaining the Register of Foreign Adoptions in which the details of

intercountry adoptions are entered.” [Page 4]

- “Before an adoption agency can accept a child for adoption, the person proposing to give the child up must be furnished with a statement explaining the effect of adoption order upon his or her rights and the provisions of the adoption acts relating to consents. An agreement to place the child with prospective adopters must be signed prior to the signing of consent. The agreement to place must have been made freely, with full knowledge of the consequences, and **under circumstances where neither the advice of persons engaged in the transaction nor the surrounding circumstances deprive the mother of the capacity to make a fully informed free decision. In particular an agreement to place is “not valid if motivated by fear, stress or anxiety or dictated by parents or deprivations.”**[Page 7]

Report this ad

**There are no private adoptions.** There are no overseas adoptions.

**All adoptions go through the government board, An Bord Uchtala.**

**John Roberts was not ordinarily resident in Ireland, and was not resident there for the year ending on the date of an order that never passed through the Uchtala Board!**

**Furthermore, it is doubtful that Robert’s adoption afforded the adopting mothers (two) an environment that fully informed each of them of their rights, and was free of stress, anxiety, coercion and “deprivations”. In fact it is virtually certain that the process involved removing two children and their respective mothers from Ireland, and any support structure they might have had there, not to mention removing them from the purview of Irish law!**

This whole exercise was highly illegal and unethical. Even if John Roberts was not blackmailed, these conditions would undeniably provide leverage for extortion to use against a sitting Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.