

For me to make statements, never heard of from your intercircle, should have/~~been~~^{never} permitted because the Historical trail I found to be among one of your reference publications.

I make reference to the book, EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE, by Sir E.A.Wallis Budge, Dover Publications. It takes no great effort to figure out that there has to be disbutes among your leaders, as to the authority as a reference on the Egyptian. I know if one was to join these disbutes, there would be over a dozen names or Author's who would be considered as a better reference to the Egyptian language. On such an argument or dispute lays a Historical and legal fact. E.A.Wallis Budge was Knighted as SIR which is the beginning of a Royal Bloodline, not because he wrote books on the Egyptian per-se, but because he knew something that entitled him to the Knighthood.

I know personally that I am a Royal Bloodline because of the United States Court Case, CARROLL -v- PATHKILLER, having the teachings and knowled to a Signatory Indian. Royal Bloodlines are not alone Birthrights but must include the knowledges. This too, is backed by Court History, UNITED STATES -v- CONSOLIDATED WOUNDED KNEE CASES,(1975) in which 65 Indians claimed the right to Royal Bloodlines or being a Signatory Indian. Judge Urbom challeng these Indians by giving detailed references and court history that separate Royalty from non-Royalty Indians or Signatory and Ambiguous Indians. He left open one of the greatest and simplest challenges that none of these Indians today can meet, which was no more than a desription of what makes up a Signatory Indian descent with full rights to the Treaties, by the statement:".... we cannot bring A CASUS OMISSUS in the law or in a treaty."

So SIR Budge was Knighted not because he knew how to write a simple book on the Egyptian Language, but because he knew something that was required of one as a Royal Bloodline and it appeared in his research of

For me to make statements, never heard of from your intercirole,
should have/Bâgârpermitted because the Historical trail I found to be
amounq one of your reference publications.

I make reference to the book, EGYPTIAN LANGUAGE, by Sir E.A.Wallis
B1-Niger Dover Publications. It takes no great effort to figure out that
there has to be disbutes among your leaders, as to the authority as a
reference on the Egyptian. I know if one was to join these disbutes, there
would be over a dozen names or Author's who would be considered as a better
reference to the Egyptian language. On such an argument or dispute lays
a Historical and legal fact. E.A.Wal} _is Budge was Knighted as SIR which
is the beginning of a Royal Bloodline, not because he wrote books on the
Egyptian per-se, but because he knew something that entitled him to the
Knighthood.

E knew personally that I am a Royal Bloodline because of the United
States Court Case, CARROLL -V- PATHKILLER, having the teachings and knowled
to a Signatory Indian. Royal Bloodlines are not alone Birthrights but must
include the knowledges. This too, is backed by Court History, UNITED STATES
-V- CONSOLIDATED WOUNDED KNEE CASES,(1975) in which 65 Indians Claimed the
right to Royal Bloodlines or being a Signatory Indian. Judge Urbom challeng
these Indians by giving detailed references and court history that separate
Royalty from non-Royalty Indians or Signatory and Ambiguous Indians.
I-Ie left open one of the greatest and simplest challenges that none of these
Indians today can meet, which was no more than a cîesription of what makes
up a Signatorjy Indian descent with full rights to the Treaties, by the
statement:"... . we cannot bring A CASUS OMISSUS in the law or in a treaty-"
- So SIR was Knighted not because he knew how to write a simple'
book on the' Egyptian Language, but because he knew something that was
required one as a Royal Bloodline and it appeared in his research of