

THE TIMES AND ITS ANGLO-SAXON  
RAJAH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS.

SIR,—The *Times*, although feigning to court inquiry into the Borneo massacre, seems ill at ease at the prospect of it, and rather sore with Lord John for the readiness with which he granted the necessary evidence. The *Times* asks that Sir James Brooke should be tried on the evidence contained in his own published diaries. Certainly this is not a modest demand, for it is simply asking, for a man on his trial, that his own assertions, and his own construction of them, should be accepted as a sufficient answer to the indictment, yet from the surprising indiscretions and revelations of the diary its facts may be accepted, although not the construction put on them, and may be taken for want of better evidence.

Here, then, are the facts. Sir James Brooke describes the Dyaks of Borneo generally, and he is corroborated by more impartial witnesses, as a simple, hospitable, and confiding race, wholly without the knowledge of fire-arms, and never pirates, because, if for no better reason, destitute of the means of committing piracy. He had visited the two devoted tribes in their own rivers, with a very slender escort, and in very pointed language he describes them as being like the rest of the race, simple, confiding, hospitable, and so ignorant of fire-arms that the very bravest of them scampered off at the bare report of a musket.

No sooner, however, do the Sakarran and Sarebas become the neighbours of the Anglo-Saxon Rajah, and are found by him not to be so submissive as could be wished, than they are made exceptions to the general rule of Dyaks not being pirates. He denounces them, in no measured terms, as dangerous and ferocious pirates, worthy of extermination. The British Navy, bewildered and seduced by the dangerous bounty on manslaughter of 20*l.* a head, is hounded on against the miserable men, and in seven years time, although many hundreds have been put to the sword, not one prisoner has ever been brought to trial before the legal tribunal close at hand, in order to solve the question of the tribes being or not being piratical. This one simple fact is alone enough to damn the whole allegation.

The *Times*, which is never "second" to any one in the matter of ill words, adopts Rajah Brooke's conclusions, quite heedless about the facts from which they are drawn, and pronounces the Sakarran and Sarebas tribes as being "as bloodthirsty and irreclaimable a gang of savages as ever disgraced the human shape," and upon whom, therefore, "signal punishment was most deservedly inflicted." Now this is the whole case of Sir James Brooke and the *Times* newspaper — foul words and no facts! The Dyak race is to be found spread over a territory four times the size of Britain, and everywhere they are rude, simple, and, as far as fire-arms are concerned, "unarmed." No one has ever charged piracy on any Dyak whatsoever. Even the pet witness of the *Times*, the redoubtable Aaron Smith himself, who has seen and achieved such wonders, I will venture to say, never saw or encountered, throughout his various piratical associations, a Dyak pirate.

The discovery that a Dyak might not only be a pirate, but even a formidable one, although fleeing at the sound of a musket shot, was the discovery of Sir James Brooke, and even he, out of the 100 tribes of Dyaks, confined the charges to the two tribes who were his own conterminous neighbours.

The *Times* says that it has carefully read the four volumes published about Rajah Brooke by Keppel and Mundy, and that "from first to last" it finds Sir James Brooke "acting in the most humane and patient spirit towards the tribes of savages he has endeavoured for years to reclaim." Now I utterly discredit the story of the careful reading of the four volumes, because I have so good an opinion of the sagacity of the *Times* as to think that it would never have pronounced this piece of singular impertinence about "a humane and patient spirit," if it had really done what it pretends. Read, for example, Mundy's first volume, in which are given in much detail "five" distinct cases of palpable homicide, respecting which the *Times* and other friends of Sir James Brooke have taken special care never to have given one word of explanation, although often called for.

I am, sir, &c.,

London, Feb. 8, 1850. AN EAST INDIAN.