

TURBULENCE OF EXTRATERRITORIAL POWER IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Arthur Jeverson Maya¹, Jason Fernando²

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia^{1,2}

Email: arthur.jmaya@uki.ac.id, jasonfernando0721@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The research reveals that power turbulence in Southeast Asia is caused by the involvement of major states in the region. Such involvement has implications for two levels of analysis, where there is a balance of power of intrusive states and a balance of power of regional states. The anomaly is that regional security is created with a high tendency for conflict and politics. The effort to deconstruct this anomaly uses the governmentality power approach and the genealogy method initiated by Michel Foucault. Philosophical debates arise when disciplining and normalizing the history of power and knowledge of intrusive systems. He confirmed that regional order is related to global power. In this regard, this research is limited to revealing the involvement of countries outside the Southeast Asian region carried out since the pre-colonial era by India and China. There is disciplining and normalizing through the censorship of panopticon governmentality and genealogy of power so that the relations of power and knowledge of intrusive systems carried out by countries outside the region gain population approval as contemporary patterns of power produced throughout history and have implications for power.

KEYWORDS Power, Southeast Asia, Governmentality, Genealogy.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

INTRODUCTION

Global power is paradoxical. It is maintained by the machinery of power production to achieve peace, while producing global chaos. It is believed to be a "multi-functional tool" to control world civilization, so that international political constellations are defined as arenas of power struggle. This research is an examination of the truth of the mainstream theoretical framework in international relations that "justifies" that intrusive system power relations with regional actors will have negative peace implications.

The mystification of the truth of mainstream theory is a historical philosophical fixation, so there is (almost) no attempt at theoretical cracks in these power relations (Ilott, 2023). This research idea seeks to explore and make cracks in the theoretical truth by pointing out some phenomena that do not fulfill the

How to cite: Arthur Jeverson Maya, Jason Fernando. (2025). Turbulence of Extraterritorial Power in Southeast Asia. Journal Eduvest. Vol 5 (2): 1487-1498
E-ISSN: 2775-3727

description contained in the indicators of intrusive power of powerful countries outside the region.

The aporia of mainstream theory will be challenged philosophically with a rigorous genealogical method in order to show that intrusiveness is only knowledge that is born and raised in the "shell" of mainstream theory for the purpose of normalizing the history of power in the region. The phenomenon focused on as the instrument of the plaintiff is the Southeast Asian region (Mabbett, 1977). Where, political constellations and power tendencies in Southeast Asia are full of conflictual relationships, coupled with egocentric and aggressive state logics, and supported by theoretical arguments of dogmatic realism, as well as sensitive territorial sovereignty regimes, making Southeast Asia a unique object to find the operation of global power. Theoretically, there is no open war in Southeast Asia, which is filled with conflictual dynamics due to the presence of intrusive systems.

Quoting Cantori and Spiegel, "the pattern of the participation of external powers in a subordinate system is the constant state of interaction between the balance of power among the external powers in the region and the balance between the peripheral and core nations (Cantori & Spiegel, 1970)." Where, the involvement of external powers in a region creates a balance of power between the intrusive powers in the region, and the balance of power between the peripheral and core nations (Munawar, 2023).

This reinforces the concept of Balance of Power which has implications for security. In addition to Cantori and Spiegel, the author's previous thesis also used intrusive system theory. The thesis is titled "Security Anomalies in Post-Cold War Southeast Asia." The research found that the involvement of the United States (US), China, and Australia in multilateral and bilateral arrangements, military intervention, and economic investment resulted in negative security and peace in Southeast Asia. The thesis confirmed Cantori and Spiegel's intrusive systems theory.

Referring to Cantori & Spiegel's argument, and the research findings of the previous thesis, this research is a big idea to revisit the intrusive system theory argument that the involvement of powerful states outside the region will contribute to regional security and negative peace. The review comes from an argument that global power relations with regional countries have no guarantee of security or peace, but will create regional political tensions, which have the potential for open war (Panakkal, 2024).

Michel Foucault, in his theory of power, shows that the disciplinary power machine operating in a knowledge regime will experience a discourse rift that has implications for power/knowledge relations. These power relations will lead to the turbulence of intrusive system power that has the potential for open warfare. Referring to Foucault, the production of intrusive power in Southeast Asia will be traced, to prove that intrusiveness is not a guarantee of security and peace, but a "tool of power" that has implications for the chaos of the Southeast Asian region (Foucault, 2002).

RESEARCH METHOD

The background above has revealed two major agendas in dismantling the operation of power in Southeast Asia. Where, the existence of an intrusive power system in Southeast Asia and the existence of a truth regime that maintains power and knowledge in the constellation of conflicts in Southeast Asia. Based on the background of the problem, the following research questions were formulated: How is the turbulence of global power and knowledge, especially the historical power of China and India in Southeast Asia?

This research aims to uncover the genealogical nature of global power and knowledge in Southeast Asia, especially in the prehistoric era. This research has two objectives that benefit academic studies and the general public. Where, contributing to the academic world, especially international relations related to contemporary philosophical approaches and genealogical methods that are rarely used in international relations writings (Linklater & Burchill, 2015).

Michel Foucault's Governmentality Approach

The basic framework that serves as the theoretical foundation for this research is the theory of Power Governmentality coined by Foucault. It aims to deconstruct the power of intrusive systems in the Southeast Asian region that are believed to have a significant impact on negative security and peace. The technology of power governmentality will reveal the compliance and disciplining of mainstream theories in international relations. According to Foucault, power is not something negative, but the effects of power should be seen as knowledge production. To quote Foucault (Foucault, 2002):

"We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production"

Power is not something that is static and immobile, but power moves and does not stay in the realm of history. It is produced from the past and continues to be oriented for the present, for the future. According to Foucault, power should question how it operates or how to operate it, not where it comes from. Foucault understands power as a form of power relation that is immanent in the space in which it operates.

Power must be understood as something that perpetuates power relations, that forms chains or systems of these relations, or that isolates them from others in a power relation. Foucault therefore defines it as a strategy in which power relations are the effect. Unlike other sociologists who think of power as a capacity or capital to achieve certain goals, Foucault sees power as something that is exercised from various places of constantly moving relations.

Governmentality is a study of governance that explains malleable power to show how social groups and individuals are governed by freedom and choice. Governmentality succeeds in revealing the paradox of "controlled autonomy" in neoliberal governance amidst societal expectations and institutional constraints. The second form of power is disciplinary power, which for Foucault is a mechanism of power that can regulate individual behavior and thought through subtle means. Apart from these two powers, Foucault also outlines sovereign power. Sovereign power is a form of power that moves together with the power of governmentality. However, sovereign power is always seen in a negative form, while governmentality is a power that is internalized and positive. Here Foucault's triangle of power emerges: sovereign power, discipline, and governmentality.

Biopower or governmentality, according to Foucault is the technology of power that governs the human subject as a population. It is the power that takes over life. In this context, governmentality surveillance, that is, surveillance that takes the human body and its movements as the focal point, looks like a political technology of population management and a technique of convincing the population in a complex context. The power of governmentality in Southeast Asia appears in the body of the state, where the state is the object of the operation of the power of governmentality (Swearer, 2013).

Biopower or Governmentality is understood in Foucauldian formulation as 'power over life' and the body of species is not an exclusive attribute of the state, but can be achieved anywhere by any organization through information gathering and data management processes and tools. Indeed, given the current transformations taking place in spaces of mobility as well as in nature, we are witnessing the modalities of biopower. This formulation reinforces the reality of Southeast Asia, where power cannot be seen in the state or an institution such as ASEAN, but must be seen as pervasive in all aspects of civilization.

If disciplinary power targets the internalization of the individual body, then governmentality disciplines the social body or population. Here we can determine that Foucault's governmentality power emphasizes the state, security, and the global political economy. Foucault analyzes how to produce a system of obedience in a population. In normalizing a form of power, Foucault offers a technology of power called the panopticon. Where, the panopticon is a machine of power to discipline individuals and populations. The panopticon works to produce power without anti-power (Lubis, 2014).

Governmentality is carried out by the technology of panoptic power to discipline Southeast Asian countries in understanding the involvement of powerful countries outside the region or intrusive systems, which will have implications for security. In reality in Southeast Asia, the intrusive system is still a theoretical truth to fulfill security needs. It is disciplined and normalized using panopticon technology that works based on disciplining institutions such as international regimes, international and regional organizations, international arrangements, and other forms of panopticon (Stuart-Fox, 2021). Governmentality power is slightly different from the way disciplinary power works. Whereas disciplinary power operates unnoticed by individuals, governmentality reveals its disciplinary face to

the population, so that we can know it is operating through the effects of power. The theory of governmentality will be operationalized as table 1 (see table 1).

Table 1. Theory Operationalization

Southeast Asian countries	Intrusive system	Power Governmentality	The power effect
Indonesia	India	Panopticon	Reproduction of intrusive systems
Malaysia	China	Technology	
Singapore		<i>Biopolitic</i>	
Philippines			
Brunei			
Darussalam			
Thailand			
Cambodia			
Vietnam			
Laos			
Myanmar			
Timor Leste			

Source: Researcher

Table 1 illustrates the operationalization of governmentality theory in exploring intrusive systems in Southeast Asia. It is mapped into several processes of power operations. First, determining the Southeast Asian countries that were intrusive; Second, determining the countries outside the region that were intrusive from the pre-European era to the post-Cold War era. Third, operationalizing governmentality power to find how the intrusive system operates and how it survives from pre-European to contemporary Southeast Asia; Fourth, analyzing the panopticon effect of governmentality power in Southeast Asia. These stages will be supported by the genealogical method.

Genealogical Methods in Analyzing Global Power in Southeast Asia

The research method to access the power of governmentality in Southeast Asia uses the genealogy method. Where, genealogy will trace the regimes of knowledge produced and reproduced in the power relations of the intrusive system and Southeast Asian countries. The genealogy in question does not trace events in a certain period, but rather shows the cracks in the knowledge regime at a certain time. According to Foucault, history is not past events, but history is the present. In other words, history is the present truth regime, so we can question how power can operate throughout history.

Genealogical methods reveal a discourse of 'metaphysics of presence' that has stable meaning. Genealogy is an analysis of the historical events that occur at the origins of power, or as Foucault calls it, genealogy will develop the specific events that accompany each beginning (Polimpung, 2014, p. 75). Simply put, genealogy is a type of historical thinking that reveals and records the significance of the relationship between power and knowledge. Genealogy relates to a form of history that history in terms of what is considered to be outside of history, including events

that are buried, covered up, or lost in the textuality and reproduction of history (Burchill & Linklater, 2015, p. 247). In other words, genealogy is the history of the present.

In a genealogical perspective, history does not show a gradual revelation of meaning and truth. Instead, it reflects an 'endless repetition of domination.' History occurs because dominant knowledge continues to have stable meanings and is enveloped by power, so the repetition of domination is solely present in the relations of power and knowledge. Foucault says that there is no single great history, but many varied historical threads in the relationship of knowledge and power. Genealogy shows the variety of historical flows that still survive and have been closed in influencing the behavior of subjects, objects, actions, and domains of knowledge (Burchill & Linklater, 2015, p. 248).

The positivist method seeks to explain intrusive systems by finding general laws to explain repetition over time in the hope of discovering meanings that are suppressed by the ideologies and structures behind history. Genealogy takes a different position to positivism by arguing that history can be identified with meaning based on objective laws. The genealogical method is an anti-essentialist approach, emphasizing that knowledge occurs in a particular place and time and is dominated by a perspective. In other words, the intrusive system in Southeast Asia is a pattern of international relations dominated by one perspective of IR. Science always has conditions as a consequence of maintaining its existence in the realm of competition, so there is no one "single truth," only competing perspectives and "regimes of truth".

According to Foucault, regimes of truth indicate when knowledge and power both persist. The term refers to discourses that are believed to be true, according to rules and criteria that determine true propositions from false ones, thus influencing the formation of practices (Burchill & Linklater, 2015, p. 248). In binary opposition, positivism seeks to show black - white, wrong - right, and so on. The regime of truth does not seek the truth, but shows the battle of truth in a domain, and conquers other truths. The winning discourse will influence the actor's practice of action. There is a battle between and within truth regimes, where there is a hierarchical structure so that power influences knowledge claims.

Postmodernism addresses the issue of how a perspective produces representations that achieve dominant and monopolistic legitimacy by marginalizing other perspectives (Lubis, 2016, p. 74). This explains that the winning knowledge will gain legitimacy, thus burying other knowledge. Therefore, for Foucault, history is a process of normalization; the normal will undergo a process to be made "normal" - nothing is normal by itself.

Thus, Foucault's genealogy tries to trace the succession of knowledge that is considered normal in relation to power. Or in Polimpung's language, history is a discourse battle for the hegemonic throne of "truth"; the history of the burial of defeated discourses; the history of the low stigmatization of minor discourses (Polimpung, 2014, p. 76). He explained that science can be used as an instrument of discipline and training to conquer and make obedience.

Foucault's genealogical research has several interrelated variables; power - knowledge and origins. In the book *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault argues that

power is specialized through science. He calls it the rule of immanence. Power is thus decentralized and pluralized (Burchill & Linklater, 2015, p. 248). For individuals to be disciplined and normalized. This section aims to obtain information on heterogeneous power in Southeast Asia (Lubis, 2016, p. 80); Origins refers to the historical search for the origins of dominant knowledge, philosophy, social sciences, concepts, values, and morality. It is not about finding a secret or eternal essence (metaphysics) but an essence that proves that history has no essence. The search for origins is an important variable to discover exactly what knowledge follows a prolonged intrusive system event and has a stable meaning.

In addition, Foucault explains that 'language' as systems of thought and or systems of ideas related to one another, gives us knowledge or meaning or interpretation of the world. Language according to Foucault is an order of discourse that is our way of explaining reality. The language Foucault meant is not the language that structuralists understand; French, English, Indonesian, German, and other languages (Lubis, 2016, p. 83-86). Rather, there is discourse as a form of knowledge that is distinctive in the way we think and behave every day.

Such forms of knowledge/discourse include the discourse (language) of liberalism, the discourse of realism, the discourse of Marxism, the discourse of whiteness, and others. Thus, the power of discourse is a factor shaping our behavior. In Southeast Asia, there are various discourses/knowledge of intrusive systems as a stable system in creating security. Furthermore, the genealogy method in accessing the power of governmentality in Southeast Asia will be illustrated in table 2 (see table 2).

Table 2. Genealogy Stages

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Search for data, documents, literature on truth/knowledge regimes in Southeast Asia	Genealogies of power: tracing the historical fractures of power and knowledge relations associated with intrusive systems in Southeast Asia	Analyze data on the Panopticon of <i>governmentality</i> over the body of nation states in Southeast Asia	Deconstructing the effects of power and knowledge of intrusive systems in Southeast Asia

Source: Researcher

Table 2 represents the genealogical stages in determining the variables in this research using governmentality theory. The first stage is to reveal the knowledge or perspective of Southeast Asian international relations in the realm of history; the second stage is to reveal the power that operates in maintaining this knowledge so that it becomes the truth regime of the intrusive system in Southeast Asia; The third stage is to analyze the history of the present through panopticon technology, where the power of governmentality operates in the knowledge of the intrusive system so that it is still the perspective of Southeast Asian regional security; The fourth stage

is to deconstruct the effects of power and knowledge. The operationalization of the theory of governmentality and the application of the genealogy method will be discussed in the next chapter.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Case Study: Governmentality and the Genealogy of Indian and Chinese Power in Pre-Historic Southeast Asia

Southeast Asia is a term used during World War 2 (WW2) to describe the eastern Asian landmass consisting of the Indo-China peninsula and the islands of Indonesia and the Philippines. Southeast Asian societies were originally nomadic societies whose lives moved around according to their food needs. Various ancient cultures have made Southeast Asian societies with different livelihoods. In its development, various literatures record the description of Southeast Asia including Burma, Thailand, Indochina, Malaya, and the islands stretching east from Andaman and Nicobar to New Guinea. In addition, the regions of Assam and the Philippines have not been included in the geopolitics of pre-European Southeast Asia because they were the first areas of entry for India and China (Hall, 1988, p. 3-4).

Evidence of Southeast Asian civilization is not widely described in pre-European times, but evidence of discoveries in Java such as *Pithecanthropus Erectus* by Eugene Dubois and *Homo Modjokertensis* by von Koenigswald, both of which are believed to be related to Peking man; *Sinanthropus Pekinensis*, in addition to Indian artifacts such as Anyath in Burma (Hall, 1988, p. 6). The evidence confirms that the ancient civilizations of Southeast Asia were variously Indian and Chinese. It is very difficult to detect the organization of pre-European ancient societies in Southeast Asia, but through these archaeological findings we can conclude that there were societies that had primitive organization.

Another connection is related to the discovery of belief artifacts, where there are characteristics of the beliefs of Southeast Asian communities with communities around the Ganges river. Where there are similarities in the findings of statues, millstones, troughs for storing skulls, and stored grave stones. Archaeologist Von Heine Geldern argues that the culture has similarities in various parts of Southeast Asia such as Nias off the west coast of Sumatra, which still has these symbols and is still a contemporary belief (Hall, 1988, p. 9). The above evidence confirms that Indian and Chinese involvement in Southeast Asia dates back to ancient societies and into later centuries.

In its development, Southeast Asian societies moved towards agriculture with the term given by the Chinese genealogy of power as "farming," such as planting sweet potatoes in Papua and growing rice in the Indonesian region. These farming systems were also made functional, with women in many traditional Southeast Asian societies placing the tubers in the prepared fields, weeding out the weeds, waiting for them to grow, and then harvesting the produce; while men did the more strenuous tasks of preparing the fields or fencing them off to avoid damage from pigs (Hall, 1988, p. 10). This indicates that the functional system or division of labor has been practiced by Southeast Asian societies since the primitive era. The division of labor to men and women was done with the aim of distributing work

effectively. The process of spreading Indian and Chinese culture in Southeast Asia is getting more and more organized.

In the 1st century AD, George Coedes, a French archaeologist, wrote of the spread of culture by a highly organized genealogy of Indian rule. He called it Indianization. The term describes an organized expansion of Indian culture based on the royal system in India. The system of spreading Indian culture in Southeast Asia is the spread of Indian beliefs, namely Hinduism. So Hinduism is believed to be the first religion in Southeast Asia.

Other data shows that in the 1st century onwards the influence of the use of Sanskrit in Southeast Asia was enormous, for example the mythology in the Puranas and Dharmasastra was transmitted using Sanskrit. This prehistoric phenomenon resulted in caste conflicts, where all people sought to elevate their caste through rituals in Indian mythology (Hall, 1988, p. 23). This process is referred to as "sanskritization" or in sociological terms as "passing." The interesting part of this 1st century phenomenon is that the rituals to elevate social caste in Hinduism in Southeast Asia were performed by the lower classes to gain recognition of caste elevation.

Sanskritism in the spread of Hinduism in Southeast Asia has implications for harmony, where there is a blend of Hinduism and local beliefs, although in its development, the blend is dominated by Hinduism, for example in Old Kmer and Bali. Sanskritism at that time became a harmonizing tool related to Indian expansion in Southeast Asia in order to be accepted. Indian expansion grew rapidly through merchant castes that joined forces to expand trade in Southeast Asia (Munawar, 2023, p. 13-18).

Coedes also gave clues to pieces and drawings of Indian prototypes. The architecture that Coedes points to is the Ananda Temple in Burma, which tradition has it that king Kyanzittha had built similar to the Ananta Cave Temple in Udayagiri, Orissa - one of the places in eastern India. That such artifactual evidence has corroborated the argument of Indian involvement in Southeast Asia by some mechanism. Furthermore, organized expansion through the spread of Hindu belief culture was spread to Southeast Asia through the mechanism of sanskritism, so that Hall and Coedes concluded the harmonization of Indian castes and Southeast Asian tribes.

Hall adds that by the late 2nd century there is evidence of Indianized states such as Funan and Jin yi. These states were located in 3 (three) places; the Mekong river lowlands & delta; Hue in Annam (now incorporated into Vietnam), and the Malay peninsula. Funan is modern Chinese speech. Funan had a strategic geography for Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia, the capital of Funan was Vyadhapura or called the city of hunters - located at Ba Phnom hill and Banam village in Prei Veng province - now Cambodia.

Geographically, the land of Funan had numerous canals or cuts that allowed Chinese merchants to cross into the Malay Peninsula. Funan was located between the Chinese and Indian oceans. Hall writes that most Indonesians who passed through were heading to China to trade in spices. The language of trade was Austrian-Asian Khmer, which changed during the Funan regime to ancient Khmer (Hall, 1988, p. 26). Chinese and Indian influence from Funan to the Malay

Peninsula was so strong that Southeast Asian civilization resembled Chinese and Indian civilization. Funan was a state founded on the consequences of Indianization. The characteristics of the state were also based on Hindu and local beliefs. In addition, in the 7th century, the state of Champa and the maritime kingdoms in Sumatra and its surroundings emerged.

This uniqueness illustrates that the concept of the state was not born at the time of Westphalia 1648, but the concept of organizing society existed before that. For example, in the shell of Southeast Asia, Funan and Champa were the most ancient states established at that time in mainland Southeast Asia. This was followed by the rise of maritime kingdoms in the far west of Indonesia after the fall of Funan with its powerful fleet and trading branches.

The existence of these maritime kingdoms is proven through fragments, pictures, and other relics that show that in the 7th century there were maritime kingdoms on the island of Sumatra. This is corroborated by Coedes' writings in 1918 on the history of Srivijaya (Sriwijaya), Coedes' writings paved the way for archaeologists that Srivijaya was once victorious as the strongest maritime state in the Malay Peninsula and its centers of power. At the end of the 7th century, ancient kingdoms in Southeast Asia emerged through expansionist forces, where the power of these kingdoms was divided into 2 (two) parts, namely agrarian or land kingdoms, and maritime kingdoms.

The involvement of India and China in Southeast Asia has created new powers. These powers took the form of expansionist maritime kingdoms. The model of power and organization of society was more influenced by the culture of animism and Hinduism, and Buddhism through the discipline of Sanskritism. The kingdoms that developed in the Malay peninsula and Southeast Asia originated in the countries that are modernly called Myanmar, Cambodia, Vietnam and Indonesia. The first dominant power emerged from the western tip of Indonesia called Srivijaya with Palembang as its capital.

Indian and Chinese power has been both continuous and paradoxical in Southeast Asian history. The production machine of power is maintained by the subjects to bring peace and renewal, while producing global chaos. Power becomes a "multi-functional tool" by the subjects in controlling civilization in Southeast Asia. The subjects play in the regional arena to expand and maintain the knowledge they have produced. This knowledge is a form of discipline to each kingdom in the Southeast Asian region, which leads to the reproduction of an intrusive system.

Referring to governmentality, the power produced by India and China has operated to regulate freedom and behavior at every social level in every Southeast Asian Kingdom. Governmentality becomes a mechanism of power that will subtly change thinking inevitably. Governmentality is seen when returning to Foucault's statement, that "history is the present" is a discourse that has the meaning of a close relationship with knowledge that is closely related to the regime of sovereign truth from India and China to Southeast Asia.

Truth as knowledge normalized by subjects of power such as Hinduism and Buddhism. This is evidenced by the Khmer Empire in Southeast Asia, each regime of which experienced different dynamics during its 600-year reign and made great contributions to ATD society. Hindu and Buddhist values have taken root as the

lifestyle of the Khmer people. The kingdom faced great resistance from other kingdoms such as the Champa kingdom at the end of its heyday. In the 12th-14th centuries, China was more involved in Khmer power arrangements, through trade, cultural, and political arrangements (Cottrell, 2017).

Indian genealogy also influenced the Khmer Empire, especially in relation to phallus worship. The phallus is a symbol of Indian power. Theoretical argumentation confirms that the power relations of the Khmer monarchy and Shivaism through the symbolic power of the phallus and yoni were disciplined and normalized in ATD from the 8th to 14th centuries, so that the Khmer population actively worshipped the phallus's "sacred personal" representation of the Khmer king.

Phallus worship is a legacy of Indian expansion in ATD. Through archaeological evidence, the worship of the masculine phallus by the Khmer people is related to the pre-historic Indian involvement in ATD, where Shivaism had become the "scheme of thought" within the royal body. In fact, it shows that the monarchy is a representation of Shivaism, so the behavior of the monarchy (should) be recognized as Shiva's behavior. To borrow Foucault's thought, that censorship of power over the population or biopower works to produce knowledge to discipline the body of the Khmer empire and other regimes in Southeast Asia.

CONCLUSION

This research presents a new perspective that the model of life in Southeast Asia is the result of knowledge production that has been subtly shaped by civilizations outside the region throughout history. The influence of knowledge from these outside civilizations is evident in the sovereign governance of Southeast Asian countries, where systems of locality have been penetrated by global power, creating historical cracks that are still ongoing today. Such power has encouraged the spread of knowledge as something that is considered normal and difficult for most Southeast Asian societies to realize. For centuries, governmentality from outside the region dominated Southeast Asia, particularly since pre-history with India and China playing significant roles. In this context, the genealogy of power is used as a nation-state level of analysis to understand the period of expansion of external state power over Southeast Asia. This genealogy is not merely a method of the history of thought, but a tool to trace how power operates in history, which is seen as an arena of struggle for dominance. Thus, global power comes as turbulence, where there is a dynamic between acceptance and resistance. Acceptance is more dominant because civilization built by external forces has successfully produced knowledge relations as a means of control. Meanwhile, resistance to this domination only occurs in a limited way, because external power has been deeply embedded and continues to construct the social structure and thinking of Southeast Asian society.

REFERENCES

- Foucault, Michel. (2002). *Arkeologi pengetahuan*. Basabasi.
- Ilott, Luke. (2023). Genealogy Beyond Critique: Foucault's Discipline and Punish as Coalitional Worldmaking. *Political Theory*, 51(2), 331–354.
- Linklater, A., & Burchill, S. (2015). *Teori-Teori Hubungan Internasional*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Lubis, Akhyar Yusuf. (2014). Postmodernisme: teori dan metode. *Jakarta: Rajawali Pers*, 80.
- Mabbett, Ian W. (1977). The 'Indianization' of Southeast Asia: Reflections on the historical sources. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 8(2), 143–161.
- Munawar, Apep. (2023). Identifikasi Budaya di Region Asia Tenggara. *Jurnal Samudra Geografi*, 6(1), 13–18.
- Panakkal, Abbas. (2024). Integration of South Asia within Southeast Asian traditions. In *Southeast Asian Islam* (pp. 86–117). Routledge India.
- Stuart-Fox, Martin. (2021). *A short history of China and Southeast Asia: tribute, trade and influence*. Allen & Unwin.
- Swearer, Donald K. (2013). Buddhism in Southeast Asia. In *The Religious Traditions of Asia* (pp. 119–141). Routledge
- Acharya, A. 15 Februari 2021. Journey to the East: The Hindu-Buddhist Making of Southeast Asia. Diakses pada 27 Juli 2024. <https://thediplomat.com/2021/02/journey-to-the-east-the-hindu-buddhist-making-of-southeast-asia/>.
- Andaya, B. W. Februari 15, 2021. Introduction to Southeast Asia. Diakses pada 25 Juli 2024. <https://asiasociety.org/education/introduction-southeast-asia>
- Cottrell, C. 2017. The Dawn of Ancient Khmer-Chinese Relations. Diakses pada 26 Juli 2024. <https://www.peacepost.asia/2017/07/30/the-dawn-of-ancient-khmer-chinese-relations/>.
- Maya, J.M., Anomali Keamanan di Asia Tenggara Pasca Perang Dingin, Thesis, UGM Yogyakarta, 2016, hal. 1-87, http://lib.ugm.ac.id/ind/?page_id=248, diakses pada 24 Juni 2024.
- Miksic, J., 'The Buddhist-Hindu Divide in Premodern Southeast Asia,' Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre, vol. 1, September 2010. <https://thediplomat.com/2021/02/journey-to-the-east-the-hindu-buddhist-making-of-southeast-asia/> , diakses pada 27 Juni 2024.