Cobbold Commission

The Cobbold Commission: What It Was, What It Found, and Why It Still Matters

The Cobbold Commission is one of the most frequently cited documents in discussions about the 1963 incorporation of North Borneo and Sarawak into the Federation of Malaysia. It is often presented in public debate as if it conclusively proved that the peoples of the two territories had clearly and democratically chosen Malaysia. A careful reading of the report itself shows that the historical reality was more complex. The Commission was politically framed from the beginning, it was not a referendum or plebiscite, it heard only a small fraction of the total population, and its own findings recorded not unconditional unity, but a divided and heavily qualified response.

What the Cobbold Commission actually was

The idea of “Malaysia” did not originate in North Borneo or Sarawak. The report itself states that on 27 May 1961 Tunku Abdul Rahman, Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, spoke in favour of a political association involving Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei. The British Government welcomed this proposal, and by November 1961 British and Malayan ministers had issued a joint statement saying they were convinced that the proposed Federation of Malaysia was “a desirable aim.” Only after that prior political agreement was the Commission established to ascertain views in North Borneo and Sarawak.

That point matters. The Commission’s own Terms of Reference did not begin from a neutral question such as, “What political future do the peoples of North Borneo and Sarawak freely choose?” Instead, they began from the expressed agreement of the

United Kingdom and the Federation of Malaya that inclusion in Malaysia was “a desirable aim,” and then instructed the Commission to ascertain the views of the peoples on that question and make recommendations. The body itself consisted of Lord Cobbold as chairman, two members nominated by the United Kingdom, and two members nominated by the Federation of Malaya. In other words, this was a consultative commission established within a political project already endorsed by the two governments most responsible for advancing that project.

A serious historical reading does not require anyone to deny that the Commission did real work or that some people sincerely supported Malaysia. But it does require honesty about the institutional design. The Cobbold Commission was not an open-ended act of decolonisation. It was a political inquiry set up after Britain and Malaya had already agreed on the destination they regarded as desirable.

How the inquiry was conducted

The Commission invited written memoranda and oral evidence. It received around 2,200 letters and memoranda, held 50 hearings at 35 centres, and heard more than 4,000 people appearing in about 690 groups. The report also states that all hearings were conducted in private and that evidence and memoranda were treated as confidential to the Commission. Those facts make clear that the exercise was a consultative inquiry, not a public vote.

This becomes even more significant when placed beside the size of the population. The report described Sarawak as having a population of about 700,000 and North Borneo as having a total population of 454,421, giving a combined population of roughly 1.154 million people. On those figures, the roughly 4,000 persons who appeared before the Commission amounted to only about 0.35% of the combined population. That means over 99.6% of the population did not personally appear before the Commission. Even allowing for representation through groups and memoranda, this was plainly not a universal act of popular decision-making.

The report itself also records practical limits that affected the quality of consultation. In North Borneo, the government paper explaining the Malaysia proposal was published only at the end of January 1962, and the Commission observed that there had been insufficient time before its arrival for every section of the population to make a careful study of the implications. In Sarawak, although the paper had been translated into major local languages, the report acknowledged the difficulty of communication, the remoteness of interior areas, and the fact that a high proportion of the population in those areas was illiterate, making explanation of a complex constitutional issue slow and difficult.

Those are not minor details. They go to the heart of whether the process was truly informed. If people had only a short time to study the proposal, and if many communities were hard to reach and needed the proposal explained through difficult communications conditions, then the claim that the Commission captured a fully informed and mature democratic choice becomes much harder to sustain.

The constitutional position of the territories at the time

The historical setting matters just as much as the procedure. At the time of the Commission, North Borneo was still a British Crown Colony administered by a Governor and Commander-in-Chief appointed by the Crown, with Executive and Legislative Councils presided over by him. The report further states, in explicit terms, that elections had not been held in North Borneo. Sarawak had somewhat more developed institutions, but these still operated under colonial constitutional arrangements headed by a Governor, and its legislative membership was partly elected through Electoral Colleges and Sub-Electoral Colleges rather than through a direct universal adult suffrage model.

This point is highly important when read against the international decolonisation principles already adopted by the United Nations in 1960. General Assembly Resolution 1514 declared that all peoples have the right to self-determination and that inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never be used as a pretext for delaying independence. Resolution 1541, especially Principle IX, stated that

integration with an independent state should result from the freely expressed wishes of the territory's peoples, expressed through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage, and only after the integrating territory had attained an advanced stage of self-government with free political institutions.

Measured against those standards, the Cobbold exercise looks much more like a politically managed consultation than a definitive act of self-determination. It was conducted before North Borneo had even held elections, before the peoples of the territories had spoken through universal adult suffrage, and under colonial constitutional structures that had not yet matured into full self-government. That does not make the report worthless. It does mean it should not be misrepresented as the equivalent of a referendum or plebiscite.

What the report actually found

The most important corrective to popular mythology lies in the Commission's own assessment of opinion. In Chapter 3, the report stated that the Commission could only arrive at an approximation and expressly said it could not guarantee that opinion would not change in the future. It then set out its famous three-part assessment. About one-third of the population in each territory strongly favoured early realisation of Malaysia without much concern about terms and conditions. Another third, many of them favourable in principle, asked for safeguards and conditions of varying importance. The remaining third was divided between those who insisted on independence before Malaysia and those who strongly preferred British rule to continue for some years. The report added that a hardcore, politically active opposition might amount to nearly 20% of Sarawak's population and somewhat less in North Borneo.

That finding is often oversimplified in later retellings. The shorthand claim that "two-thirds supported Malaysia" only tells part of the story, because the report itself distinguishes sharply between one-third who strongly favoured early Malaysia and another third whose support was conditional on safeguards. The remaining third did not support immediate federation at all; part of that group wanted independence first,

and part preferred continued British rule. Read honestly, the report does not describe overwhelming, unconditional or plebiscitary consent. It describes a divided political landscape in which support, caution, uncertainty and opposition all coexisted.

It is equally important not to distort the report in the opposite direction. The Cobbold Report does record genuine support for Malaysia in parts of the population. In North Borneo, for example, the report found almost complete unanimity of support among significant Muslim indigenous communities, many of whom were attracted by the prospect of joining a federation whose national religion was already Islam and by the belief that Malaysia would offer protection against Communism. But the same report also records deep anxieties in other quarters about religion, language, political status, and the fear that local interests might be submerged by a larger federal centre.

That balanced reading is the credible one. The report is neither proof of zero support nor proof of overwhelming democratic endorsement. It is evidence of a mixed and conditional political response.

Why safeguards were central, not incidental

One of the clearest lessons from the report is that safeguards were not a side issue. They were central to the politics of consent. In North Borneo, the report records repeated demands for state control over immigration from other parts of the federation, protection of land, forestry and agriculture under state control, protection of customary rights and practices, religious freedom, and assurance that North Borneo should not be treated merely as equivalent to one of the existing states in Malaya. It also records anxiety about adequate representation in the federal parliament and concern that the interests of the territory might otherwise carry too little weight.

In Sarawak, the report records analogous fears, including concern over communal balance, apprehension about “Malay domination,” unease over the proposed national language and religion, and anxiety about the symbolic and constitutional transfer of power from British control into a new federation. The report plainly shows that

constitutional design mattered because many communities did not regard entry into Malaysia as a blank cheque.

That is why the next stage after Cobbold was the Inter-Governmental Committee, whose task was to work out future constitutional arrangements and safeguards covering religious freedom, education, representation in the federal parliament, the position of the indigenous peoples, control of immigration, citizenship and the state constitutions. The safeguards later associated with Sabah and Sarawak were therefore not gifts casually added afterward. They arose because the Commission had documented real fears, real reservations and real demands for protection.

The real issue behind the Cobbold Commission

The real issue is not whether the report existed, or whether some people supported Malaysia. Both are true. The real issue is whether the Cobbold Commission can honestly be used as proof that North Borneo and Sarawak freely, conclusively and democratically chose integration into Malaysia in a manner equivalent to a referendum or plebiscite. On the evidence of the report itself, that stronger claim does not hold. The Commission was created after Britain and Malaya had already said Malaysia was a desirable aim. It operated through private hearings and memoranda rather than universal suffrage. It reached communities under conditions that the report itself admits were difficult, rushed and uneven. It was conducted while the territories were still under colonial constitutional arrangements. And its findings recorded not unconditional unity, but a mixture of support, caution, reservation, independence-first sentiment and continuing opposition.

The most historically responsible conclusion is therefore this: the Cobbold Commission was an important consultative document, but it was not a referendum, not a plebiscite, and not an unimpeachable democratic settlement of the question of popular consent. It helped provide Britain and Malaya with a political basis to move forward, but it did not erase the deeper questions of self-determination, constitutional equality, and whether the peoples of North Borneo and Sarawak were ever allowed to decide their future through a fully informed and genuinely democratic process.

Historical Note / Disclaimer

This publication is provided for the purpose of historical education, public understanding, and informed discussion. It is grounded primarily in the 1962 Cobbold Commission Report and related historical and international reference materials. Every effort has been made to present the record accurately, to distinguish between documented facts and reasoned interpretation, and to avoid misrepresentation of the source material. References to archival records, official documents, or United Nations instruments are made for historical and legal context only, and do not imply endorsement by those institutions of any present-day political position. This publication does not constitute legal advice. For historical precision, the term “North Borneo” is used when referring to the pre-1963 territory, while “Sabah” is used where modern usage assists reader understanding. The objective of this article is to provide a credible and evidence-based account of the Cobbold Commission and its significance in assessing the questions of consultation, consent, constitutional safeguards, and self-determination.

Sources

Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, 1962 (Cobbold Commission Report).

Public transcription of the Report of the Commission of Enquiry, North Borneo and Sarawak, 1962.

United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV), Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, 14 December 1960.

United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1541 (XV), 15 December 1960, especially Principle IX on integration, self-government, and universal adult suffrage.

Appendix B of the Cobbold Commission Report for the 1960 population figures of North Borneo and Sarawak.

Introduction of the Cobbold Commission Report for the number of hearings, memoranda, and persons consulted.

Chapter 2 of the Cobbold Commission Report for the constitutional condition of North Borneo and Sarawak, the absence of elections in North Borneo, communication

difficulties, and concerns about safeguards.
Chapter 3 of the Cobbold Commission Report for the Commission's assessment of public opinion, including the one-third / one-third / one-third finding.

The Inter-Governmental Committee (IGC) of 1962

The Inter-Governmental Committee (IGC) was one of the central mechanisms in the 1962–1963 Malaysia process, but it is often misunderstood. It is sometimes described as though it proved that North Borneo and Sarawak had properly and democratically consented to enter Malaysia. That is not what the IGC actually was. In substance, the IGC was a constitutional and administrative drafting body created after Britain and Malaya had already agreed in principle to proceed with the Malaysia project. Its task was to work out the future constitutional arrangements and safeguards for North Borneo and Sarawak, not to obtain a direct democratic mandate from the peoples of those territories.

To understand the IGC properly, it must be placed in sequence. First, the Malaysia proposal was politically promoted through channels such as the Malaysia Solidarity Consultative Committee (MSCC). Then came the Cobbold Commission, which was presented as an inquiry into opinion in North Borneo and Sarawak. After that, Britain and Malaya met in London in July 1962 and agreed in principle that the proposed Federation of Malaysia should be established, subject to legislation. Only after that political decision was made was the IGC established. This means the IGC did not decide whether Malaysia should happen in the first place. It was created to determine the constitutional form in which it would happen.

The official British statement of 1 August 1962 put the matter plainly: an Inter-Governmental Committee would be established, with the British, Malayan, North Borneo, and Sarawak governments represented, and its task would be to work out the future constitutional arrangements and the necessary safeguards for the two Borneo territories. That is a crucial point. The IGC was a governmental negotiating mechanism, not a referendum, plebiscite, or constituent assembly of the people.

The IGC was chaired by Lord Lansdowne, Britain's Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, with Tun Abdul Razak, Deputy Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya, as deputy chairman. A preparatory meeting was held in Jesselton on 30 August 1962, after which the committee created five sub-committees: Constitutional, Fiscal, Legal and Judicial, Public Service, and Departmental Organisation. Its work then continued through meetings in Jesselton, Kuching, and Kuala Lumpur, with its last plenary meeting held on 20 December 1962. Its report was later published on 27 February 1963. All this shows that the IGC was a detailed constitutional workshop, not a mass act of public self-determination.

This distinction is fundamental. Official narratives sometimes point to the fact that North Borneo and Sarawak had members on the IGC and imply that this demonstrates proper representation of the people. It is true that local figures sat on the committee. The report records North Borneo members including D. A. Stephens and Datu Mustapha, and Sarawak members including Temenggong Jugah, Abang Haji Mustapha, Abang Haji Openg, and Ling Beng Siew. But the existence of local membership does not automatically amount to popular consent in law or in democratic principle.

The deeper issue is mandate. These participants were not elected through a full territory-wide democratic process authorising them to decide sovereignty on behalf of the peoples of North Borneo and Sarawak. Nor were they representing fully self-governing democratic national governments constituted by the people in the modern sense. Their presence in the IGC may show elite participation in negotiations, but it does not by itself prove that the people had directly authorised them to determine the international political status of the territory. That is the key historical and legal distinction the public must understand. The documentary record establishes the IGC's composition and function; the conclusion that this fell short of a full democratic mandate is a legal-historical interpretation drawn from that record.

Another point of major importance is the kind of federation the IGC was actually helping to build. The report states that the future constitutional arrangements would

be based on the existing Constitution of the Federation of Malaya, amended to meet the requirements of the new states and to change the name of the federation. That means the IGC was not designing a wholly new federation from equal original foundations. It was adapting the constitutional framework of Malaya to admit North Borneo, Sarawak, and Singapore.

This reading is reinforced by the United Nations Juridical Yearbook, 1963, which stated that the amendments maintained the governmental and legal structure of the Federation of Malaya and that the three additional states were admitted to that federation, which continued under the new name of Malaysia. In other words, the UN legal view treated Malaysia, in institutional terms, as the continuation and enlargement of Malaya rather than as the creation of a wholly new equal state. That does not resolve every political or moral issue surrounding the process, but it is strong evidence of how the legal structure was understood internationally at the time.

This point matters greatly for public understanding. If the legal and constitutional structure remained that of Malaya, merely enlarged and renamed, then the IGC should not be romanticised as a constituent assembly of equal founding nations. Its historical significance was narrower and more technical: it was the mechanism through which the entry of North Borneo and Sarawak into a Malaya-based federation was organised, safeguarded, and formalised.

The IGC’s practical importance lay in the safeguards it formulated. Its report dealt with religion, immigration, education, citizenship, representation in the federal legislature, state constitutions, legislative powers, land, finance, the judiciary, the public service, the national language, the special position of indigenous peoples, constitutional safeguards, emergency powers, and transitional arrangements. These were not minor administrative matters. They went to the heart of how North Borneo and Sarawak would exist within the proposed federation and what protections they were supposed to retain.

Among the most significant areas were immigration, financial arrangements, state

constitutional protections, the public service, and the position of the indigenous peoples of the Borneo territories. The report and its annexes reflected the view that, in the early period after Malaysia's establishment, as few changes as possible should be made to arrangements affecting the daily lives of the people in the Borneo States, and that federal powers should in some areas be delegated to the state governments during the transitional period. These provisions show that the IGC itself recognised that North Borneo and Sarawak had distinct institutional conditions and could not simply be absorbed without special treatment.

The IGC became even more important when the Malaysia Agreement 1963 (MA63) was signed. Article VIII of MA63 expressly required the governments of the Federation of Malaya, North Borneo, and Sarawak to take legislative, executive, or other action to implement the assurances, undertakings, and recommendations contained in Chapter 3 and Annexes A and B of the IGC Report, insofar as they were not already implemented by the Constitution of Malaysia. This means the IGC was not just background discussion. Its core safeguards were built directly into the legal architecture of MA63 itself. Anyone seeking to understand what protections were promised to Sabah and Sarawak must therefore read the IGC together with MA63.

This is why the IGC cuts in two directions. Defenders of the Malaysia process can point to it as evidence that safeguards were negotiated in detail and that local figures from North Borneo and Sarawak took part in the negotiations. That is true. The IGC does show detailed negotiation on matters of real constitutional importance. But critics can point to equally important facts: the key political decision in principle had already been taken before the IGC began; the committee was governmental and elite in character rather than a direct expression of popular sovereignty; and the federation it helped build was expressly based on the existing constitutional structure of Malaya. Those facts do not make the IGC irrelevant. They define its true historical meaning and its limits.

A useful comparison is Singapore. Singapore held a referendum on merger on 1 September 1962. Even though that referendum has been criticised for the way its

options were framed, it still involved a formal vote by the population. The same cannot be said of North Borneo and Sarawak in the IGC process. This contrast highlights the weakness of any argument that the IGC itself amounted to a direct democratic act of self-determination for the Borneo territories.

Brunei also sheds light on the wider setting. British parliamentary statements in 1962 noted that Brunei's inclusion in Malaysia would be welcomed and that Brunei had sent observers to the Inter-Governmental Committee process. This shows that the IGC belonged to a broader regional and colonial framework shaped by inter-governmental bargaining and strategic calculation, not solely by direct democratic choice in each affected territory.

For Sabahans today, the most responsible conclusion is this: the IGC was a major constitutional document, but it was not a referendum of the people and not conclusive proof that the people of North Borneo had given a direct, democratic, sovereign mandate for the transfer of their political future. It was a committee of governments and selected representatives working out safeguards and legal arrangements within a process already set in motion by Britain and Malaya. Its importance lies in the promises it recorded and the constitutional model it helped shape. Its limitation lies in the fact that it was not itself a free, direct, and popular act of self-determination by the people of North Borneo.

In plain terms, the truth about the IGC is this: it was the constitutional-engineering stage of the Malaysia project. It mattered because it defined the safeguards and legal arrangements later tied into MA63. But it should not be misrepresented as though it settled the question of consent once and for all. The record shows negotiation. It does not, by itself, amount to a full democratic mandate from the people of Sabah or Sarawak to decide sovereignty on their behalf.

Historical Note / Disclaimer

This article is prepared for public education and historical reference. It draws on primary materials including the Report of the Inter-Governmental Committee, British

parliamentary statements, the Malaysia Agreement 1963, and United Nations legal records. Where this article discusses whether the IGC amounted to genuine democratic consent or self-determination, it is making a historical and legal interpretation based on the structure, membership, and function of the IGC process. Official Malaysian narratives may present the IGC as part of a lawful and consultative path to Malaysia; this article argues that the process did not amount to a full democratic mandate from the peoples of North Borneo and Sarawak.

Source

Report of the Inter-Governmental Committee, 1962.

UK Parliament Hansard, House of Commons, 1 August 1962, “Malaysia (Federation).”

United Nations Juridical Yearbook, 1963, chapter VI.

Agreement relating to Malaysia, signed 9 July 1963, United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 750.

National Library Board Singapore, “Referendum on merger with Malaysia.”

Source: https://www.rsnbgie.com/history/cobbold-commission