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I have compiled and categorized all the sentences related to racial terminology from the "THE CENSUS". I organized them into several key groups: Malays, Chinese, Indians, and other sentences that pertain to broader racial classifications.

Malays

1. “Take, for example, the 1911 Federated Malay States Census, which lists under ‘Malay Population by Race’ the following: ‘Malay,’ ‘Javanese,’ ‘Sakai,’ ‘Banjarese,’ ‘Boyanese,’ ‘Mendeling’ (sic), ‘Krinchi’ (sic), ‘Jambi,’ ‘Achinese,’ ‘Bugis,’ and ‘Other.’”
2. “The census-makers...constructing their ‘Malays,’ keep their eyes modestly lowered to their own colonial borders.”
3. “(Needless to say, across the waters, Dutch census-makers were constructing a different imagining of ‘Malays,’ as a minor ethnicity alongside, not above, ‘Achinese,’ ‘Javanese,’ and the like.)”

Chinese

1. “The VOC records, however, angrily identify him as a Chinees – indeed that is the single most important piece of information about him that they convey.”
2. “There is no reason whatever to think that the accused murderer...thought of himself as ‘a’ Chinees.”

Indian

1. “‘Parsees’ lasted until the census of 1901, where they still appeared – packed in with ‘Bengalis,’ ‘Burmese,’ and ‘Tamils’ – under the broad category ‘Tamils and Other Natives of India.’”
2. “In the 1980 census ‘Sikh’ still appeared nervously as a pseudoethnic subcategory – alongside ‘Malayali’ and ‘Telegu,’ ‘Pakistani’ and ‘Bangladeshi,’ ‘Sri Lankan Tamil,’ and ‘Other Sri Lankan,’ – under the general heading ‘Indian.’”

Then I proceeded to categorize “the sentences that pertain to broader racial classifications”.

The specific categories are as follows:

On changes in racial classifications during the colonial period “The first is that, as the colonial period wore on, the census categories became more visibly and exclusively racial.”

“His second conclusion is that, on the whole, the large racial categories were retained and even concentrated after independence, but now redesignated and reranked as ‘Malaysian,’ ‘Chinese,’ ‘Indian,’ and ‘Other.’”

On the historical roots of racial categorization

“This mode of imagining by the colonial state had origins much older than the censuses of the 1870s.”

Racial categorization and quantification of colonial governments

“But after 1850 colonial authorities were using increasingly sophisticated administrative means to enumerate populations...according to a maze of grids which had no immediate financial or military purpose.”

On the impact of racial categorization on government institutions

“Guided by its imagined map it organized the new educational, juridical, public-health, police, and immigration bureaucracies it was building on the principle of ethno-racial hierarchies which were, however, always understood in terms of parallel series.”

The racial terminology that I have highlighted from Anderson's text captures how the language of the census reinforced the constructed racial divisions that continued to shape social identities in the post-independence era. By defining populations in racial terms and systematically tracking them, colonial governments imposed a lens through which individuals perceived themselves and others.

This work highlights Anderson's concept of 'imagined communities', where language serves as an invisible tool to structure colonial society into distinct racial communities in a hierarchy. By assigning labels to ethnic groups, the census instilled a sense of difference among populations who might otherwise have perceived their identities as fluid. This standardized language not only reflected the social landscape but also profoundly reshaped it. After independence, these colonial racial divisions persist in the national lexicon, shaping politics, social interactions, and self-identity. In Malaysia, terms such as 'Malay', 'Chinese' and 'Indian' continue to influence governmental frameworks and social hierarchies, reflecting the original colonial classifications. How official language constructs and perpetuates social divisions is demonstrated by the persistence of these categories.