

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 disbuttes among your leaders, as to the authority as a reference on the Egyptian. I know if one was to join these disbuttes, 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 knowledge 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 challenged these Indians by giving detailed references and court history that separated 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 description 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 interciorle, should have/Bágárpermitted 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

Bllfgef 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 Ízhe 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 knowledge

to a Signatory Indian. Royal Bloodlines are not alone Birthrights but must

include the knowledges. This too, is backed by Court History, UNITED STATES

CONSOLIDATED WOUNDED KNEE CASES,(1975) in which 65 Indians claimed the

right to Royal Bloodlines or being a Signatory Indian. Judge Urbom challenged

these Indians by giving detailed references and court history that separated

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 El Signatory]ndian descent with full rights to the Treaties, by the

sl_atement:". . . . we cannot bring A CASUS OMISSUS in the law or in a Ízreaty. "

SQ 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 es a Royal Bloodline and it appeared in his research of