

Kawaguchi followed the way from Gyanima and »proceeded westwards along the Langchen Khanbab and came upon a river flowing down from the north to the

Camp 57 and back to Taklakot, one arrives at 62 days in all, instead of 58. But as the dates of the two above-mentioned gentlemen are in semiofficial reports, they must be trusted.

It is indeed difficult to reconcile this traveller's traverse with existing reliable maps. Toxem (Tuksum) he places at $84^{\circ} 48'$ E. long., although it is in reality (Ryder) at $83^{\circ} 30'$, and already on Nain Sing's map of 1866 at $83^{\circ} 25'$ E. long. The distance between Tuksum and Taklakot, as the crow flies, is on his map 224 miles, in reality only 144 miles. Along the road it is 290 miles in the first case and only 200 in the second. For the journey from Tuksum to Taklakot 15 days' marches were required. During the first 5 days, out of these 15, he covered 178 miles, »but afterwards not quite such great distances». There really remained only 22 miles for the last 10 days! So he covered 178 miles in 5 days, and 22 miles in the next 10 days. Take another example, it does not matter where, the result will always be the same. For the distance, say between Maryum-la and Tuksum, Nain Sing found 71 miles, and Ryder, the most exact surveyor who ever was in Tibet, 72 miles. Mr. Landor has found it to be 141 miles or exactly the double! So Nain Sing's conscientious survey cannot be said to have been improved by this traveller, who says of Nain Sing's map: »La carte qui a été publiée aux Indes d'après ses renseignements est de plus rudimentaire, et telle qu'un enfant européen de dix ans pourrait faire bien mieux.» (*L'Asie Française*, December 1910, p. 511). And still, in the very few cases where his map is correct, as for instance in the lower part of Samo-tsangpo, it has been taken from Nain Sing. Even the three northern tributaries are entered as Nain Sing saw them. The upper part of the same river has not been improved, for it has been dragged out to the double of its real length.

I will remain objective in this extraordinary case of »exploration», by giving only quotations. Thus we find the following statement about the channel between the lakes, much more striking than even Kawaguchi's »discoveries»: »It was my good fortune to make quite sure from many points that, as can be seen from the illustration reproduced in these pages, the ridge between the Rakas and Mansarowar Lakes is continuous, and no communication between the two lakes exists. With the exception of a small depression about half-way across, the ridge has an average height of 1,000 feet all along, a fact which ought in itself to dispose of the theory that the two lakes are one. I also further ascertained from the natives that there is no communication whatever between them, though the depression in the ridge makes it probable that at a very remote period some connection existed. The lowest point in this depression is over 300 feet above the level of the lake.» *Op. cit.* I, p. 257. To which Holdich gives the following comments: »he has fallen into the inexcusable error of making a positive assertion about the physical conformation of the lake surroundings without having actually traversed the ground to which he refers. He states that there is no connection between the Manasarowar and Rakas-tal, but he failed to push his exploration right across the intervening ridge so as to ascertain positively whether there was, or was not, such a connection.» *Geogr. Journal*, Vol. XII, Dec. 1898, p. 588. — In an article: »Connection between Mānasarowar and Rākas-tāl» (*Nature*, November 24, 1898, p. 76) Sir Richard Strachey says of his brother Henry: »He did not visit the actual point at which this stream leaves Mānasarowar, but in 1849 I did so, and there is no more doubt about the fact than that the Thames runs past Richmond.» But our traveller replies: »Such other trifles as the connecting of lakes by imaginary rivers to maintain the reputation of a scientific impostor (Henry Strachey!), or the building of accurate maps from badly taken photographs are frauds too commonly perpetrated on the innocent public by certain so-called scientific societies (The Royal Geographical Society!), to be here referred to.» *Across Coveted Lands*, London 1902, Vol. I, p. 332.

In a Correspondence to the R. G. S. a certain Mr. G. Kendall-Channer writes about our explorer that he »was very anxious that I should write to you to state that in August, 1895, when up travelling in Tibet . . . I practically crossed the ridge dividing the Mansarowar and Rakastal lakes. I . . . kept along the crest as much as possible. I saw no 'ditch' connecting the two sheets of water. The connection I believe to be a tunnel. The pundits with whom I have talked over the matter deny any cutting between the lakes.» (*Geographical Journal*, Vol. XV, p. 75). The supposed discovery of the tunnel is a very good joke. I wonder whether any other lake on the earth has had so much to support and to suffer as the sacred Manasarovar?

From Tugu-gompa he continues to the E.N.E., crossing a river, on which »Tokchim» is situated, and reaching another where the »Tarjum's encampment» is found. In reality Tokchen is the Tarjum's