



THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540-4570

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE

202-707-5640 (VOICE)

202-707-1771 (FAX)

photoduplication@loc.gov (EMAIL)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the Miscellaneous Manuscripts Collection of the Library of Congress Manuscript Division contains an item from the papers of *Abdul Baha* entitled **REPORT ON THE WRITING SHOWN ON THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE ALLEGED WILL OF ABDUL BAHA BY DR. C. AINSWORTH MITCHELL** and that the attached photocopies - the title page, the presentation page, 1 unnumbered page [page 1], and pages 2 through 4 - are a true representation from that work.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY FURTHER, that the work is marked with the handwritten notation "Presented to the Library of Congress by Ruth White, September 2, 1930."

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the seal of the Library of Congress is affixed hereto on February 22, 2007.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Virginia D. Sorkin", written over a horizontal line.

By: Virginia D. Sorkin
Acting Chief
Library of Congress
Photoduplication Service



Presented to the
Library of Congress
by
Ruth White
September 2, 1930

^{Gift}
Thos. H. Lawrence White
Sept 8, 1930

*Presented to the
Library of Congress
by
Fritz White
September*

REPORT

ON THE WRITING SHOWN ON THE PHOTOGRAPHS
OF THE ALLEGED WILL OF ABDUL BAHA

BY

DR C. AINSWORTH MITCHELL
EDITOR OF "THE ANALYST"
85, ECCLESTON SQUARE,
LONDON S.W.1
ENGLAND

JUNE 3rd 1930

June 3rd 1930



R E P O R T
ON THE WRITING SHOWN ON THE PHOTOGRAPHS
OF THE ALLEGED WILL OF ABDUL BAHA.

I have made a minute examination of the writing in the photographs and photographic enlargements of the alleged will of Abdul Baha, and have compared it with the authenticated writing of Abdul Baha in a series of photographs and photographic enlargements received from Mrs. H. Lawrence White.

In the absence of an opportunity to examine the original document, any conclusions to be drawn from an examination of the photographic enlargements must necessarily be of a provisional character contingent upon the accuracy of the photographic records. Moreover, some of the facts which are taken into consideration in the scientific examination of an original document cannot be perfectly studied in a photographic reproduction, such as, for example, the ink, penstrokes, and so on.

Assuming that the authenticated specimens of writing are of approximately the same period as that at which the disputed will is alleged to have been written and signed, the points which can be accurately compared in the photographic enlargements are the mode of formation of the writing, the changes in pressure, the form of individual letters, and the relationship in the size of parts of the letter to the whole.



A fact requiring explanation is the presence of apparent erasures on some of the pages of the will, namely in lines 12 and 13 of page 2, and line 13 of page 4. Without a microscopical examination of the original document it is not possible to state whether a chemical agent has been used, but assuming there have been erasures at these points I think it probable that they were done mechanically, not chemically. The apparent erasure on page 5, line 11, may possibly be the result of an imprint from other written matter while the ink was wet.

The photographic reproductions of authenticated specimens of the writing of Abdul Baha were the following:-

1. Writing from the Book of the Unitarian Church, Montclair, New Jersey.
2. Writing from the Guest Bible for 1912, City Temple, London.
3. Authenticated signatures on two letters to Mrs. Stannard on a photograph, and a possible authentic signature in the possession of Mrs. Devine.
There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the signature from Mrs. Devine, since it agrees closely with the other signatures.

The Signatures on the Envelope:- A comparison of the four signatures on the envelope of the alleged will with the four authenticated signatures reveals many striking differences in the mode of formation of the characters, as for example:

ll
In the authentic signatures the width of these characters, compared with their height, is much greater than in the signatures on the envelope. The strokes are also much firmer



in the envelope signatures than in the authenticated signatures.

we In the authenticated signature the entire character is roughly $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the width of the open space between the uprights; in the disputed signatures the corresponding figure is twice as great. In the authentic signatures the cusp is rounded; in the disputed signatures it is pointed. In the authenticated signatures the relationship between the depth of the gap and its breadth is as 1 : 1.4 to 1.6, whereas in the disputed signatures it is as 1 : 2.3 to 2.6. Thus the ratio is totally different. In my opinion these differences are not consistent with the signatures upon the envelope being in the writing of the writer of the authenticated signature.

The Body of the Will:- A comparison of the formation of the writing on the envelope with that on pages 9 and 10 of the will shows so many points of resemblance that there is no reason to doubt that they were written by the same person.

I have also studied minutely the photographic enlargements of the writing on the other pages of the will, and have formed the following conclusions:-

Page 2, with the exception of the last two lines, agrees with Page 3.

