

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mWO7U0CSPRU>

Impeachment of Supreme Court Justice

David Martin World

Feb 20, 2023

Where's the January 2022 Commission and Investigation

0:02
hey everybody good good Monday afternoon
0:04
it is the 20th of February we are
0:08
cruising through this month eight days
0:11
to go and um and I'm here again Kim as
0:15
much
0:17
Kim is uh not here she is still in
0:20
Australia and she's in her favorite
0:22
place in Australia right now and and so
0:25
I'm here with you again and I have a
0:28
another topic that I want to talk to you
0:30
about which is something that has been
0:33
fascinating me in the last little while
0:35
as I have seen a number of people
0:38
communicating
0:40
on the relative merits of the language
0:43
that we have used associated with the
0:46
particular
0:48
interventions that have taken place over
0:50
the last three three years plus a couple
0:52
months now of of the whole covid
0:54
situation and I specifically want to

0:56
address a topic which has to do with the
1:00
statutory basis
1:02
for police power Intervention when it
1:05
comes to any form of an emergency but I
1:08
want to start off with a very very
1:10
simple
1:12
examination of some things that have
1:14
taken place which unfortunately against
1:16
the backdrop of the statutes here in the
1:18
United States
1:19
have shown that the insufficient
1:22
behavior of the Judiciary as an
1:25
independent branch of the government has
1:27
made the entire
1:29
exercise of this emergency something
1:32
that is incapable of being adjudicated
1:34
for its merits as a matter of law
1:38
and so I'm going to start with a
1:40
suggestion which is where I'm going to
1:42
conclude my presentation that I think we
1:44
should actually begin a movement
1:46
which seeks the impeachment of Justice
1:49
Sotomayor and the reason why I'm going
1:52
to get to Across The Arc of this entire
1:55
presentation but I want to start with
1:58
the end which is I think that we need to
2:00
pursue the cut the consideration of an
2:03
impeachment of a Supreme Court Justice
2:04
which by the way has only been attempted
2:06
a couple times in history we got a house
2:09
vote back in the 1800s that actually
2:12
succeeded in getting a house vote for
2:14
impeachment unfortunately the senate in
2:17
that particular instance decided to not
2:20
find for the uh for the impeachment but
2:22

we did get a house impeachment once
2:25
of a Supreme Court Justice but I think
2:27
it's time to think about that again and
2:28
the reason for it goes down to a very
2:31
simple set of issues that I'm going to
2:32
cover here
2:33
let's start with what police Powers
2:36
actually mean when it comes to a public
2:39
health emergency and I'd like to call
2:41
your attention
2:42
and I'm going to do my best to navigate
2:44
popping up references and speaking to
2:48
you so I apologize in advance because I
2:50
care so much about making sure you have
2:52
references that I'm going to go ahead
2:54
and pop some of those in if you're
2:57
watching on YouTube and if you're
2:58
watching on some of the other platforms
2:59
you're going to see those I don't know
3:01
that the references are going to pop up
3:02
into Facebook but you can see them on
3:04
YouTube
3:05
police powers are an interesting thing
3:07
and if we go back and examine with
3:10
respect to Public Health the vast
3:13
majority of what we call police power's
3:14
actions are refined since 1905 with the
3:18
Supreme Court case of the Jacobson case
3:20
in Massachusetts
3:23
but it's important to understand
3:25
that they went through a significant
3:27
Evolution and most notably as you'll see
3:30
in the article I'm posting there is an
3:33
enormous amount of revisiting of police
3:36
Powers when it came to the war and
3:38
Supreme Court several decades ago and

3:40
then obviously in the wake of the
3:43
anthrax attacks in 2001 which gave us
3:45
the context for the development of the
3:48
medical countermeasures and the prep act
3:51
activities of the 2005-2006 time frame
3:54
but it's important to realize that under
3:57
the structure of what constitutes a
4:00
police power it is important to
4:02
understand that each and every doctrine
4:05
of police power is actually reserved for
4:08
very very limited use
4:12
and I wanted to make sure that you see
4:15
the subsection of uses for which police
4:19
powers are in fact helpful and I'm going
4:23
to read this to you because it's
4:24
important to actually have the the the
4:25
written record of this the application
4:28
of police power has traditionally
4:30
implied a capacity to one promote the
4:33
public health morals or safety and the
4:35
general well-being of a community two
4:37
enact and enforce laws for the promotion
4:40
of general welfare three regulate
4:43
private rights in the public interest
4:45
and four extend measures to all great
4:49
public needs and the reason why I'm
4:50
going to point this out is because I'm
4:52
going to submit to you throughout this
4:53
presentation that kovid did not give
4:57
evidence of and certainly did not invoke
5:00
an appropriate use of police powers and
5:03
the reason for that
5:04
is that every one of the interventions
5:07
that was suggested by the police state
5:11
if you will the CDC enabled and
5:15

Department of Health and Human Services

5:16

enabled police state every one of those

5:20

in fact had nothing to do with the

5:22

promotion of Public Health morals or

5:24

safety and the general well-being and

5:27

they didn't because of a very particular

5:29

definition problem that definition

5:32

problem is going to be something that

5:34

we're going to spend a lot of time

5:35

talking about so what I want to do is I

5:38

want to take you into the reason for

5:41

today's version of this show and I'm

5:43

going to come back to why we should

5:44

impeach Sotomayor in a minute

5:47

most of you may have seen that in the

5:49

last few days there has been a very

5:52

interesting conversation happening

5:53

around the federal mandate for health

5:55

care workers to continue to be subjected

5:57

to the mandatory CMS requirements for

6:00

injections

6:02

and for those of you not familiar this

6:04

particular

6:06

um this particular incentive and and

6:08

motivation to keep this in place is

6:11

actually scheduled to go through

6:12

November of 2024. so it's a long Horizon

6:15

long after the now proposed may end of

6:19

The Declaration of a state of emergency

6:21

the reason why this particular topic is

6:25

so problematic

6:27

is because we have inside of

6:31

the root the the consideration of

6:34

mandates back in the uh January of 2022

6:39

we have a very interesting problem and

6:41

the problem focuses around Justice

6:44
Sotomayor now some of you will remember
6:46
this some of you won't
6:48
but the statements that were made by
6:51
Justice Sotomayor inside of the
6:56
um inside of the Supreme Court
6:58
consideration of the mandates gave rise
7:01
to a very unusual development and the
7:04
unusual development was actually
7:06
something and I'm going to go ahead and
7:08
show you the the the way in which
7:10
mainstream media in this case CNN
7:12
reported this particular event
7:15
what happened was during the supreme
7:17
court hearing Justice Sotomayor made the the
7:20
statement that a hundred thousand
7:23
children were at risk of serious
7:27
conditions many of which are on
7:29
ventilators so
7:30
um at the hearing what she said was that
7:34
covid-19 was directly impacting and it
7:38
says we have over a hundred thousand
7:39
children which we've never had before in
7:41
serious condition and many on
7:43
ventilators now this is a lie Justice
7:46
Sotomayor was not off by a little bit
7:49
she was off by actually a massive amount
7:52
as a matter of fact if you go down and
7:54
look at the federal data at the time
7:56
that that sentence was said in the
7:59
Supreme Court in the consideration of
8:01
the CMS mandate
8:02
at that point in time under 5 000 people
8:06
under the age of 18 were hospitalized
8:09
with confirmed or suspected cases of
8:12
covid-19 and if you actually look at the
8:14

actual data behind that you find out
8:16
that we were probably somewhere in at
8:18
best two orders of magnitude maybe more
8:21
off of her statement but it's important
8:24
to realize that both Sotomayor and
8:27
Breyer both misled the public in the
8:30
public hearing around whether or not the
8:33
CMS mandate should be in place and what
8:35
makes that more problematic is the
8:38
allegation that she and others made at
8:41
the Supreme Court was that somehow or
8:43
another the injection would stop
8:45
infection or transmission the argument
8:47
explicitly said that health care workers
8:50
needed to have these injections because
8:53
they because they were in contact with
8:55
these cases needed to make sure they
8:57
were protected from once again the
9:00
Supreme Court's words and would not
9:02
transmit once again the Supreme Court's
9:04
words
9:05
the alleged covid-19 stars cov2 now the
9:10
fact is
9:11
that we know that the data at the time
9:14
was not available to suggest that there
9:18
was any Interruption of infection or
9:20
transmission in fact to the contrary
9:21
this was not a police Powers exercise
9:25
this specifically was a symptom
9:29
mediation symptom reduction personal
9:32
elective medical treatment it was not a
9:36
public health matter
9:38
many people have long debated about
9:40
whether the term that is used to
9:42
describe these things which I will not
9:44
say because of the platforms we're on

9:47
many people described whether or not the
9:49
term is appropriately used or not and
9:51
the fact of the matter is under the
9:52
statutory definition which has to do
9:54
with immunity
9:56
and under the statutory definition which
9:58
has to do with the disruption of
10:00
infection or transmission which happens
10:02
to be the definition out of the 1986 act
10:05
and reiterated in most State acts what
10:08
we find is that the injection that was
10:10
being promoted does not do anything
10:13
except limit the drain of public
10:17
resources with respect to
10:18
hospitalizations in the event that those
10:21
hospitals are directly part of the CMS
10:23
system so we need to be very precise
10:27
the injection had nothing to do with
10:30
infection or transmission which is the
10:32
basis upon which the police power's laws
10:34
exist
10:35
it had nothing to do with that it had
10:37
everything to do with symptom reduction
10:39
and not symptom reduction for the
10:41
benefit of a person it was symptom
10:43
reduction for the benefit of the
10:45
commercial Hospital organizations that
10:48
would be exposed to large amounts of
10:50
census
10:51
in other words there's not a public
10:54
health measure at all this was a
10:57
resource utilization measure which was
10:59
an elective medical procedure to
11:02
specifically limit hospitalizations and
11:05
severity of disease and it's important
11:07

that we understand that because police
11:09
powers do not authorize any of those
11:12
things that is not the promotion of the
11:15
public welfare under any stretch of the
11:17
imagination
11:19
now because Justice Sotomayor lied
11:23
when she was considering this case
11:26
so much so that we see that Dr Rochelle
11:30
wolenski director of Center for Disease
11:33
Control actually had to come on and
11:36
vastly correct not subtly correct vastly
11:40
correct the overstatement made by
11:43
Sotomayor where she said that in an
11:46
interview on Fox the actual number of
11:48
children in the hospital with confirmed
11:49
cases was under 3 500. now let's look at
11:53
these numbers just for a second
11:55
remember was still under 5 000 as of
11:58
Monday and then a few days later when
12:01
volensky came on she said it was under 3
12:03
500. you know what's missing from all
12:05
this
12:07
both of these are Under
12:09
some number
12:11
she didn't say it was 3 500 she didn't
12:12
say it was five thousand she said it was
12:14
under a certain number so the whole
12:17
argument that was used to support the
12:19
CMS mandate was in fact based on a lie
12:23
recited by a Justice of the Supreme
12:26
Court and a lie that was used to
12:28
influence the outcome of the case
12:31
now
12:32
for starters that's a problem and the
12:35
fact that nobody has pointed that out
12:36
and actually taken action against her is

12:39
unconscionable because lying in the
12:42
Supreme Court as a Justice prejudicing
12:45
the outcome of a case is actually not
12:47
just an ethical problem it turns out
12:49
it's also a legal problem and it turns
12:52
out that most of us are not familiar
12:54
with 28 U.S code subsection 455 which
12:59
gives us the legal basis upon which the
13:01
disqualification of a Justice judge or
13:04
magistrate judge should happen
13:06
and what you'll see under a any justice
13:11
judge or magistrate judge of the United
13:13
States shall disqualify himself in any
13:15
proceeding in which his impartiality
13:18
might be reasonably questioned
13:21
why is that problematic well it's
13:23
problematic because it turns out that
13:25
when things like the state of New York
13:27
who on behalf of the public servants of
13:31
the state of New York appealed for an
13:33
emergency consideration by the Supreme
13:36
Court guess who that emergency appeal
13:39
goes to from New York
13:41
it goes to Justice Sotomayor
13:45
not surprisingly the ethical and legal
13:48
requirement
13:50
requirement because it says shall
13:53
disqualify
13:55
you see that
13:56
this is not you may
13:58
you shall disqualify yourself
14:02
and it goes on to say he shall also
14:04
disqualify himself in the following
14:06
circumstances whereas a personal bias or
14:09
Prejudice concerning a party or personal
14:11

knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts
14:14
concerning the proceeding
14:16
guess what ladies and gentlemen there is
14:18
no question that when the CDC of all
14:22
organizations when the CDC has to come
14:25
in and say we fact checked you justice
14:28
Sotomayor and you lied
14:31
that's not a small little glitch that's
14:34
a massive glitch and it's a massive
14:36
glitch because the disputation of
14:38
evidentiary facts is not a subjective
14:41
matter here this is an objective
14:43
situation where Justice Sotomayor having
14:46
prejudiced the Supreme Court and having
14:48
prejudiced countless Federal benches
14:50
because of her error because of all of
14:54
those things she was required by the
14:58
statute 28 U.S code section 455 she was
15:01
required by the statute to disqualify
15:03
herself and she did not
15:05
that is a violation of the law and is
15:09
the basis upon which there should be
15:11
right now starting now an impeachment
15:14
proceeding against her she is not fit
15:17
for the bench and the reason I'm saying
15:20
that is very clearly because as we
15:24
continue to look down the stream what we
15:27
find is that in every single one of the
15:32
pieces of evidence that we have used in
15:35
every intervention that has happened
15:37
including all of the interventions that
15:40
were done to subordinate the rights and
15:44
responsibilities afforded to Americans
15:46
by virtue of the Constitution of the
15:48
Bill of Rights every one of those were
15:50
suborned for a very particular reason

15:52
and that is because people believed
15:56
rather than followed the science let's
15:59
talk about what that means
16:02
interestingly enough we see
16:04
that in the most recent publication from
16:07
the January 30th 2023 we see that of all
16:12
organizations the Cochrane organization
16:15
of all people happen to be
16:18
capable of going through a review of all
16:22
of the face mask trial evidence and I
16:24
want you to see what the science
16:27
actually said and by the way
16:30
lest you think that somehow or another
16:32
this science was not available at the
16:35
time that the interventions were
16:36
suggested you're wrong because it was
16:39
available at the time these
16:41
interventions were suggested I've done
16:43
shows about it you've heard about those
16:46
shows and you've seen those references
16:49
but it's important for you to see the
16:51
actual statement made by the Cochrane
16:55
Institution
16:58
wearing masks in a community probably
17:00
makes little or no difference to the
17:02
outcome of laboratory confirmed
17:04
influenza sarcov2 which by the way you
17:08
know they put together which we were
17:09
supposed to not put together compared to
17:12
not wearing masks
17:14
harms were rarely measured and poorly
17:16
reported that's kind of interesting but
17:18
what you find out is that this goes on
17:20
to say that if you're wearing cloth
17:23
masks
17:24

it actually Not only was not a good idea
17:27
cloth Max were actually associated with
17:29
a higher incidence of influenza like
17:33
illness
17:34
you heard what I just said
17:36
that's a small problem
17:38
but if you go to Every federal case on
17:40
face masks they said that the science
17:43
said it worked here's the problem it
17:46
never worked it never was shown to work
17:49
and the only thing that suggested
17:51
efficacy were in vitro studies and
17:55
computer simulated model aerosol studies
17:58
which suggested that masks would somehow
18:01
deliver a blockade of particles or micro
18:04
droplets or anything else but the
18:06
problem with those studies is none of
18:08
them not one confirmed the in public use
18:13
transmission of any pathogen whatsoever
18:18
so the bad news is
18:20
that there was not science supporting
18:23
the Mandate in the first place as a
18:25
matter of fact we can go to February of
18:27
2009 and if we go to February 2009 what
18:31
we see is the person who is actually
18:33
hired by the public health entities in
18:37
the United States to come up with the
18:39
idea of whether face masks work or
18:41
whether it didn't work it turns out that
18:43
if we go through the CR McIntyre article
18:47
what we find is all the way down here at
18:50
the bottom we find out that not only did
18:54
the masking situation not work
18:56
but right here it says and this is a
18:59
very interesting
19:00
non-scientific

19:02
non-data supported piece of conclusion
19:06
Although our study suggest that
19:08
Community use of face mass is unlikely
19:11
to be effective control policy for
19:13
seasonal respiratory diseases adherent
19:15
mask users had a significant reduction
19:17
in the risk for clinical infection
19:19
another recent study that examined the
19:22
use of surgical masks and hand washing
19:24
for prevention of influenza transmission
19:26
also found no significant difference
19:29
between intervention arms in other words
19:32
the data that was available in 2009
19:35
which I'm going to share with you in the
19:37
chat right now the data that was
19:39
available in 2009 was are you ready for
19:42
this
19:43
evidence that already showed that the
19:46
interventions did not work now why is
19:49
that a problem it's a problem because
19:51
federal judges beginning in
19:53
Massachusetts and going across the
19:55
entirety of the world have decided that
19:58
they were able to authorize police
20:01
powers and remember I told you police
20:03
powers are a very precise instrument and
20:06
according to every Supreme Court
20:08
decision that has ever been issued
20:10
around police Powers up until this court
20:13
in every one of them a minimum standard
20:16
of evidence is required and the least
20:19
intervention required to achieve the
20:22
outcome is what is required in police
20:25
Powers you are not authorized to
20:27
experiment on a population
20:31

under police power's actions and you are
20:33
not authorized under police powers to do
20:35
anything that remotely resembles the
20:38
ability to influence the outcome of a
20:40
person's life based on your hunch that
20:42
is not the domain of police powers and
20:46
the reason why this is so problematic
20:48
and the reason why we have to deal with
20:49
this issue is because inside of the
20:52
argument that is being made around face
20:54
masks and injections whether you are on
20:57
the pro side or the anti-side of these
21:00
issues what's missing from the entire
21:03
conversation is that no public health
21:07
benefit was offered for any of these
21:11
particular conditions based on any
21:14
established science there was nothing
21:16
not one piece of evidence that suggested
21:20
that any of these things worked
21:22
yet we are now living in a situation
21:25
where we're not only not afforded the
21:28
ability to have this independent
21:29
conversation but worse than that I want
21:32
you to see what mainstream media did
21:35
with the data
21:36
okay that I just showed you which says
21:40
that there is no evidence of these
21:44
things working
21:45
not surprisingly
21:47
guess what mainstream media said
21:50
yes they reduce the risk despite a
21:54
review saying they don't
21:58
now the tragedy of this is this is
22:01
actually the way the narrative was
22:03
published and reported when the Cochrane
22:06
review came out showing that there was

22:09
no difference and when they say little
22:11
or no difference the answer is they are
22:14
actually not making a close call in fact
22:16
what they're doing is they're lumping
22:19
together SARS cov2 influenza and are you
22:23
ready for this other respiratory
22:25
pathogens because the SARS COV data
22:27
alone
22:29
did not show any effect
22:32
so the great news is we have to
22:34
manufacture a catch-all and then hope we
22:37
find something and even when we hoped we
22:40
found something we actually didn't find
22:42
it
22:43
but that doesn't stop
22:45
the media from saying they still work
22:48
and they still reduce the risk of
22:50
spreading covid despite the fact
22:54
that this headline itself is itself
22:57
false
22:59
you don't spread covid ladies and
23:02
gentlemen
23:03
if there was a pathogen or biologically
23:07
or chemically engineered product that
23:09
was something we labeled as SARS cov2
23:12
then that would be the thing that we
23:15
would be worried about transmitting or
23:17
spreading covid for those of you paying
23:19
attention is not a pathogen covid is a
23:24
series of ill-defined influenza-like
23:27
symptoms and it is not a thing that
23:30
spreads
23:31
because symptoms held by individuals do
23:36
not spread
23:38
and herein lies the tiny problem with
23:41

the injection conversation
23:44
when you have a thing that is supposed
23:47
to limit the severity of symptoms
23:50
and what you don't do is confirm that in
23:53
any of your clinical trials individuals
23:55
actually had a pathogen
23:58
what you find out is that interestingly
24:01
enough at the injection Inception what
24:05
we did was we changed the PCR Behavior
24:08
to make sure that we created the
24:10
illusion that if you were injected we
24:13
would reduce the cycle thresholds making
24:15
it less likely for you to actually
24:17
allegedly test positive
24:20
for the presence of the pathogen
24:22
but there's a tiny problem with that
24:26
the tiny problem with that is that in
24:28
every one of the studies that we've
24:29
looked at in fact injected people had
24:32
equal
24:33
loads of the pathogen
24:36
equal
24:40
I want to be really clear on the point
24:42
the point is
24:44
that the information I just shared with
24:46
you was all available
24:49
there was no scientific basis for
24:51
anybody to claim following the science
24:54
because there was no scientific basis to
24:57
support any of the interventions
25:00
tragically
25:02
because we now have nearly the
25:04
recitation which is a dogmatic
25:07
recitation
25:08
at the beginning of almost every
25:10
scientific article that recites the

25:13
catechism that says there is a pathogen
25:16
that pathogen causes a disease and that
25:18
disease requires an intervention we have
25:21
seen the Judiciary entirely Bamboozled
25:24
to the point where they're not even
25:26
considering the fact that they are
25:29
violating their own laws
25:34
and it is because of that that I think
25:36
it's critical that we start the
25:38
conversation that says justice Sotomayor
25:41
should be impeached for a violation of
25:44
28 U.S code
25:47
section 455 and let's come back to that
25:49
for a minute
25:51
the reason is this
25:53
when you have prejudiced
25:55
not only
25:57
the Supreme Court
25:59
but because of that Supreme Court
26:01
determination you have prejudiced the
26:03
entirety of the federal judiciary
26:07
and you know that you have done it with
26:09
a lie
26:11
a lie so egregious that the CDC despite
26:14
its self-interest in promoting the very
26:17
intervention that was being supported by
26:19
the Supreme Court had to come on and say
26:21
hey guess what she got it not wrong by a
26:24
little bit she got it wrong by probably
26:26
somewhere in the neighborhood of two or
26:28
more orders of magnitude
26:32
she has met the statutory requirement
26:35
for
26:36
40 for the the disqualification 28 U.S
26:40
code section 455
26:42

B1 disqualification
26:46
she has used disputed evidentiary facts
26:51
to create personal bias and Prejudice
26:54
concerning the matter in the proceeding
26:56
and that means everything that she and
27:01
every reference that every federal judge
27:03
has made to determinations made after
27:06
sotomayor's lie are based on a fallacy
27:10
that is a disqualification
27:12
for a Justice of the Supreme Court of
27:16
the United States
27:17
not kind of it's actually in black and
27:21
white
27:23
so I want you to have a look at this I
27:25
want you to realize that this is one of
27:27
those things where I'm not kind of
27:29
making an allegation that might require
27:32
a little bit of fact checking or
27:33
anything else
27:35
I'm making a clear and compelling
27:38
statement that the statutes of the
27:40
United States demand
27:42
that Justice Sotomayor gets impeached
27:46
and removed from the bench
27:49
and that as a result of that
27:52
every ruling that has made reference to
27:55
the CMS mandate
27:57
every reference that is made made
28:00
reference to the Supreme Court regarding
28:02
the CMS mandate must be vacated because
28:06
it is based on a prejudiced
28:09
fallacy filled
28:12
manipulation
28:13
of the police Powers afforded in
28:17
limitation
28:19
by laws in the United States

28:21
now there are a few of you who are
28:23
sitting there going yes but I'm not in
28:25
the United States listen the same work
28:27
I'm doing here you can do in your
28:30
jurisdiction because it turns out that
28:32
the same laws the same practices and the
28:34
same things that have been done here are
28:36
being done around the world you can do
28:38
exactly this kind of work and come to
28:41
exactly the same conclusion but in the
28:43
United States
28:45
this butterfly of the week is
28:47
encouraging us all to say it is time
28:50
that we put Sotomayor
28:53
and for that matter the rest of the
28:56
ascending justices
28:59
it's time that we put them on notice
29:01
that they no longer are fit for service
29:04
and they must be removed
29:06
and with that
29:08
that's the butterfly of this week
29:10
I look forward to seeing you again
29:11
hopefully next week and I'm looking
29:14
forward to seeing many of you share this
29:17
information
29:18
feel free to copy it paste it let's make
29:21
sure that every single one of the people
29:24
who are out there trying to raise money
29:26
on the back of either Pro this or anti
29:28
that make sure that you get this
29:30
information out there because all of
29:32
those arguments are based on a fallacy
29:34
and the fallacy is because people who
29:37
are actually promoting either the pro or
29:40
the anti-narrative have not read the
29:42

conditions under which police Powers

29:44

should and can be used and as such

29:47

they have no basis upon which they're

29:50

making the arguments have a beautiful

29:52

day and I will catch you all soon take

29:55

care bye-bye

English (auto-generated)