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Introduction

In May 2002, Timor-Leste formally became an independent, democratic state and the millennium’s newest nation. This was the culmination of lengthy processes of change, continuity and resistance in politics, society and culture throughout 450 years of Portuguese colonisation and, following this, the invasion and twenty-four year occupation by neighbouring Indonesia. The emergence of Timor-Leste as a newly independent nation provides a space for the East Timorese people to begin to seek a new political identity.

While formal democracy is quite new to Timor-Leste, there is an authority and leadership system embedded in East Timorese cultures that was established prior to Portuguese colonisation and that continues to guide communal life within most suku (villages). Through this system, people are governed by traditional authority figures, including the liurai (a hereditary ruler, ‘lord of the land’). The liurai’s authority emanates from a social and political system that is guided by uma lisan. Uma lisan refers both to physical structures, literally ‘sacred houses’, but also to social structures that guide relationships between members and between the natural, social and ancestral worlds. This study considers the current situation and influence of traditional rulership and social systems in contemporary East Timorese suku, identifying four broad categories that reflect the continuing importance of these systems in Timor-Leste. This article also reflects on the complex relationship between uma lisan and the figure of the liurai. The research findings are based on fieldwork conducted in fifteen suku listed here with their respective districts: Bairo Pite (Dili), Caicua (Vemasse), Bucoli, Triloka and Uatulia (Baucau), Parlamentu, Fuiloro and Tutuala (Lautem), Loihunu and Waimori and Uma Wa’in Kraik (Viqueque), and Ben Ufe, Lifau, Nipane and Bobometo (Oecusse). Further information on the methodology for this research is available in Anne Brown’s article in this volume.

Uma lisan and their attributes

Uma lisan, also known as uma lulik, are the primary symbols for social and cultural order in local communities across Timor-Leste. The community considers uma lisan a central part of their identity, and they have deep
significance in people’s everyday lives. They have particular importance during ritual celebrations such as for marriage, prior to harvesting corn, tarabandu (which as will be explained regulates activities and use of resources), and other rituals that provide opportunities for people to gather together. The ancestors and elders of each uma lisan continue to protect the uma lisan by passing down sacred knowledge through each generation.

Within the social structure of the uma lisan there are a number of different authority figures, one of whom is the lia-na’in, which literally translates as ‘owner of the words’. The lia-na’in are responsible for leading and caring for all the families and descendants of the uma lisan. Through rituals, they pray to the ancestors for help, asking that the ancestors always accompany the descendants of the uma lisan so they can carry out their work in a positive environment. As lia-na’in safeguard peace and stability in the family, they also take on an informal role resolving problems or conflicts that arise at the aldeia (hamlet) or suku (village) level.

In every suku there is a complex network of uma lisan that mediates and governs relationships between members of the same uma lisan, and also regulates relationships between different uma lisan. Everyone knows their uma lisan, and knows where they fit within the family structure that ties them together. Even though some members may move away from their traditional land and uma lisan, they often continue to maintain contact with each other and with the ancestors through this shared identity.

Some families in Dili no longer follow the ways of their uma lisan, signifying the loss of a generation from the uma lisan. However in almost all other districts across Timor-Leste, the uma lisan is central for managing family relationships and for forming new relationships through marriage for the creation of new families. The uma lisan also acts as a place to link people with their deceased ancestors. As a lia-na’in and xefe suku (elected village councillor) from within Lautem district explains, ‘uma lisan represent all of the deceased ancestors ... even though their bodies have died, their spirits continue to live around us, and they are always close to us through the uma lisan’. As a priest from Venilale put it, ‘it is through the uma lisan that people can communicate with other people. Every year when we do the ritual before the sau batar [corn harvest], they [the current members of the uma lisan] pray with gratitude to that which is most high’. Through these rituals, the people communicate with supernatural powers, using betel nut and betel pepper, sacred swords and other objects that symbolise and represent their ancestors’ residence in the spirit world, and asking that they continue to accompany people during their daily lives. According to them, this life does not end with this world. Through death, a new life is gained in another world.

As membership of the uma lisan carries an identity that is central to all the house members, this provides an important basis for building peace between related families. This is clearly evident when discussing the experience of political parties in local communities. While the influence of political parties
has created some deep divisions in national politics, this does not appear to have been the case in many local communities. As a senior resident of Tutuala, Lautem district, noted, ‘...in suku Tutuala even though the political parties have come and adopted the party system and some small conflicts have arisen, this hasn’t become an obstacle that has torn apart our family relations’. As he went on to explain, it is relatively easy for the people to resolve problems that arise among themselves because the lia-na’in from the uma lisan uses family relations to resolve any issues.

There are a number of significant cultural practices through which uma lisan contribute to the maintenance of communal cohesion and peaceful social relations. Firstly, the process for preserving or restoring the physical structure of an uma lisan also involves strengthening and repairing the social structure of the uma lisan. All family members, including in-laws, from close by and far away come together not simply to discuss and agree on how to rebuild the uma lisan, but also to resolve any problems between family members. This was seen in one suku visited by the research team when a particular uma lisan needed to be rebuilt. Before physically rebuilding the sacred house, the lia-na’in called all of the members of the uma lisan together—particularly those who were involved in various disputes amongst themselves—to sit together and resolve their problems.

Conflict is also dealt with in the uma lisan through the nahe biti bo’ot tradition, a localised system of conflict management that literally translates as ‘rolling out the big mat’. When a conflict arises, the issue is taken to the central uma lisan for resolution. There are many ways to conduct a nahe biti bo’ot ceremony but there are two broad paths through which the conflict can be resolved. The first is through a system of arbitration, whereby those involved in the conflict gather together with their families and the lia-na’in or the liurai resolves the dispute. The second path more closely resembles mediation, through which consensus is sought. Both paths are very strong and are trusted throughout the suku of Timor-Leste as the first point of call in resolving disputes. If the liurai is involved, the ceremony uses some of the liurai’s symbols to demonstrate the liurai’s governing power. Alternatively, nahe biti bo’ot may also be carried out using the general community uma lisan.

Complementing nahe biti bo’ot is the social institution of tarabandu — a traditional system for establishing social contracts, sanctioned through the power of the ancestors and established through a commitment between all the members of the uma lisan in a suku or a particular territory. Tarabandu operates through ritually banning some activities and requiring others for the good of the community. Each community member, for example, has the right to receive resources from within the suku, such as access to clean water and other goods, but also has a responsibility to be careful with these things if they have been consecrated through the tarabandu mechanism. In some communities visited, the people are working to re-establish tarabandu by referring to democracy, human rights and religious mandates as measuring
tools, in a very deliberate effort to maintain and revitalise their culture so that it can align with and complement the democratic principles espoused by the national government.

Through these traditional institutions of *nahe biti bo’ot* and *tarabandu*, each individual has certain rights and obligations as a member of their community or their cultural society. They have the full right to express themselves, as well as a responsibility to comply with the social contracts that have been established in a particular territory—including activities that are banned or required through *tarabandu*. Both *tarabandu* and *nahe biti bo’ot* are very old institutions, and the ongoing importance of these and other local institutions demonstrates that before modern democracy came to Timor-Leste there already existed an original and organic democracy that organised members of society with both responsibility and rights. Before the new nation of Timor-Leste was formed, all the population were already living with their own social mechanisms and processes of joint decision-making and consensus. Because of this, some communities remain uneasy about the implementation of formal democracy, and are concerned that it might undermine the resurgence of East Timorese culture. While the system of *uma lisan* continues to provide the foundation for social order and authority within East Timorese *suku*, the strengths of this system for peace and stability are not being recognised officially or protected, and possible methods that could strengthen East Timorese culture, particularly positive aspects that contribute to social cohesion, are being neglected.

**The significance of the liurai**

While the network of *uma lisan* and associated institutions of *nahe biti bo’ot* and *tarabandu* provide the foundation for social cohesion in East Timorese communities, another aspect of customary authority involves the *uma lisan* of the *liurai*. The authority of the *liurai* varies significantly from one *suku* to the next; indeed there is no single model for understanding the authority of the *liurai* in democratic Timor-Leste. Before discussing trends we observed in the various types and degrees of *liurai* authority that exist across Timor-Leste, we must first understand the structure and character of that authority.

**Liurai structure**

The hereditary rulership of the *liurai* and the rituals and customs surrounding their authority can be traced back many centuries prior to Portuguese rule. Historically, the authority of the *liurai* was established and maintained through the class system of Timor-Leste, which holds political, cultural, and economic significance in each territory or *suku*. At the highest level was the *liurai*, who historically controlled a large territory and population, and during colonial times was referred to as *Dom*, the Portuguese title for prince. Beneath the *Dom* was the council of elders, named *Bahen*. The *Bahen* came from different *aldeia*, and each had different functions. The Portuguese ruled through the *Dom* until the rebellion of 1911–12 (led by the *liurai* of Manufahi,
Dom Boaventura) after which the power of the Dom was severely curtailed. Following the defeat of Dom Boaventura, the Portuguese colonisers divided the liurai’s authority among the lower-order aristocracy that ruled beneath them, rewarding those who had been faithful and removing others from power. The Portuguese then ruled through this new class, who were also referred to as ‘liurai’, and who collected taxes and labour from the people on behalf of the Portuguese.

However, even prior to the rebellion of Dom Boaventura and the consequent consolidation of Portuguese colonial authority, the presence of the Portuguese had already had a significant impact on the authority structures of the liurai, by requiring that the liurai exercise various administrative functions and that he be capable of speaking a common language with the Portuguese. As a consequence, the original liurai sometimes had their role, power and leadership functions diminished. This was evident in Oecusse, for example, where new liurai emerged, known as the ‘white liurai’, who were better able to operate according to Portuguese requirements, taking some of the roles of the original liurai, known as the ‘black liurai’.

Despite this, the original liurai sometimes maintained their cultural responsibilities and power, and passed this on to future generations who were genuine blood-related descendants. In suku Tula Ika, Oecusse district, an original ‘black liurai’ chose a new ‘white liurai’ from another suku to take on his administrative and management work. As a senior person of Tula Ika explained:

> Our ancestors said, ‘I am choosing you as liurai. I am uneducated, I speak like a lia-na’in, I look after the uma lisan and have given power to Liurai Costa to undertake the administrative work’. Liurai Costa came and lit a candle here. They know their roots. Until today the liurai of Tula Ika, suku Lifau and the liurai of suku Costa continue to exist through the consideration of culture. These two types of liurai continue to be respected and obeyed by the people.8

It was through dynamics such as these that the structure of two liurai emerged in Timor-Leste. The ‘black liurai’ were all known as people who hold the cane and the flag and are original landowners, signifying that they are the ones who govern the suku. But beginning with this second phase of liurai rule, which adapted itself to Portuguese requirements, a new liurai could also be chosen (preferably from the blood-related descendants of the liurai) in order to continue the line of rule in that suku. The liurai clan would identify among themselves someone who was strong, had natural intelligence and knew how to govern, and they would become the new liurai to govern the suku when the old liurai died or stepped down. If someone did not govern well according to the members of the liurai’s clan, then the clan would decide to change to a new person of liurai descent who would continue the position into the future.

Despite this turbulent history, there are still liurai in some parts of Timor-Leste who belong to the structural level of the Dom. It is clear that the exact
dynamics of how the structure of the liurai changed during Portuguese times varies significantly from one place to the next, depending on the needs of the community and the extent of external pressure from the Portuguese colonisers.

During the Indonesian occupation of Timor-Leste the authority and structure of the liurai was impacted yet again, as Indonesia adopted an electoral system that replaced the Portuguese system of indirect rule through the liurai. Through the implementation of Pancasila, East Timorese communities experienced a ‘social shock’ as the system was transformed to allow ordinary people to be elected to the position of liurai, who then became known as kepala desa (village head). In some places, where the liurai continued to be trusted to look after their community and were sufficiently educated to deal with the Indonesian administration, communities voted for kepala desa who came from the liurai’s uma lisan. This was the experience of one former kepala desa of Parlamentu suku, who was a descendant of a liurai and served as kepala desa for five years.

However, the possibility of voting for people who were traditionally empowered to rule was also highly dependent on the situation under the Indonesian military. For example it was not possible in suku Caicua, where from 1980 onwards, the Indonesian military moved the population together with other nearby suku groups into the sub-district of Vemasse and chose the village head for the suku. This meant that for the duration of the Indonesian occupation, the kepala desa of Caicua was chosen through the authority of the Indonesian military and did not come from the liurai family. Unlike some suku that use the terms liurai and xefe suku interchangeably, the distinction between the traditional liurai and the elected local leader continues to be reflected in suku Caicua through the strict use of the term liurai to refer to the descendants of the liurai, and xefe suku to refer to those who have won power through suku elections and who therefore govern.

Since the referendum in 1999 and restoration of independence in 2002, East Timorese communities have been experiencing many more changes. Liberal democracy has developed very quickly, and the influences of globalisation and technology now pose a great challenge for the power of the liurai. In 2004, the first free suku-level elections were held for the konsellu suku (council of elected community leaders). Most of the 2004–05 candidates for xefe suku came from political parties, but some preferred to run as independent candidates. In this new state of affairs, where sovereignty is no longer in the hands of the liurai, there are nonetheless many elected xefe suku across Timor-Leste who are from the liurai’s uma lisan.9 The liurai are also East Timorese citizens in this democratic state, and democracy does not deny opportunities for liurai to obtain positions of power through a political party or as an independent candidate.

While the political structure of the liurai no longer exists as it did in pre-colonial and colonial times, the liurai’s uma lisan continues to carry important
rights and responsibilities in almost all suku, functioning according to the 
needs of each suku or territory. In many places the community or people 
continue to consider the liurai’s uma lisan as the highest in the uma lisan 
structure, leading the other uma lisan during popular traditional celebrations 
and rituals. This integral role in traditional custom, explored further below, 
accounts for its persistent influence in contemporary society in Timor-Leste.

The character of liurai authority

The authority of the liurai is deeply enmeshed with customary institutions, 
and traditionally the people both deeply respect and are in awe of them. 
The liurai’s power over subjects was dictatorial and when a person went 
against the liurai, they were physically sanctioned. This can be considered an 
authoritarian, even at times exploitative, model of rule. Even in suku where 
the liurai continue to command respect and significant authority within the 
community, people recall instances in the past when the liurai ‘governed 
using a formal whip’. For example, a liurai within the Oecusse district, who 
continues to be highly respected in the community, commented that:

[In the past it was good because if we spoke and they didn’t believe 
us we used... the right to beat people up; in the past I hit people, if 
people from my area didn’t follow my directions I just beat them up.]

Despite this, people still trusted him to lead and protect them during 
Indonesian times. Similarly, an elder of Uma Wa’in Kraik suku of Viqueque 
district, revealed characteristics of the customs that underpin a liurai’s 
authority in that suku:

...they existed in the past and continue to exist today. People are not 
allowed to speak or wave when they meet the liurai, this culture must 
be respected ... The elders in [this suku] who are thought of as the 
mother and father of the liurai protect the liurai from everything. They 
protect him within the suku as well as if there are interventions from 
beyond the suku. They do whatever the liurai says. If the liurai’s child 
considers want to get married, it is the elders who speak, the parents don’t 
speak. The people give buffalo as the brideprice. The parents cannot 
give buffalo as a brideprice otherwise the marriage won’t endure, they 
could all die, from the children up to the mother. Their role is to work 
in the vegetable garden and rice fields to give food to the liurai. If there 
is a message from the liurai then the elders are the ones who go. The 
elders look after and take care of the liurai. This custom began with the 
first Dom and continues today. There is an oath between the liurai and 
their subjects so they cannot separate. If the liurai visits his subjects 
and picks out a young piglet, the people will catch it and kill it so the 
liurai can eat. During traditional celebrations with dancing if the liurai 
wants to take a tais, sword or belak from one of his subjects then the 
person will give it to him. When playing cards for money, if the liurai 
wants to take everything then he will.
This explanation is revealing. While the liurai’s authority demands submission and tributes from his subjects, the community continues to trust him to lead them. In this suku, the power of the liurai is very strong, and his legitimacy derives from the place he has in lisan (or custom). This demonstrates a very specific type of legitimacy—one which is underpinned by a very different worldview to that of the state, and which is symbolised through various customs and objects. There is a deep relationship between the liurai’s identity and symbolic objects, such as the rotan (cane), kaebauk (crescent-shaped crown), mortel, kretek (cigarettes), books, aimean (red wood), babadook (traditional drum), tamboor (drum), and other materials symbolic of the liurai’s right to rule.

The continuing importance of these rituals and objects demonstrates that many communities continue to recognise the cultural importance of the liurai, for a variety of reasons. However, across the suku of Timor-Leste, communities now have a variable and complicated relationship with their liurai, which is reflective of the ongoing changes to the role and powers of the liurai that have taken place in the suku since Portuguese colonisation, as communities endeavour to adapt to the overarching requirements of the state.

**Analysis**

In this study, we have identified four categories that describe the current situation of the liurai in different suku. The first category considers those suku in which the liurai no longer have any real power, but the liurai’s uma lisan continues to be strong. The second category covers those ‘new suku’ that were formed during Indonesian occupation, often comprising of people from different areas, and (as a result) in which both the liurai’s governing power and the liurai’s uma lisan are not present. In the third category, there are suku that are not new, but where for various reasons the influence of the liurai and the liurai’s uma lisan appear to have died out. In the final category, there are suku in which the power of the liurai and their uma lisan remains strong. The following analysis explains these four categories in more depth.

*The liurai no longer has formal power, but their uma lisan remains strong*

In the great majority of suku that were visited in this research, the liurai no longer exercise any formal governing power, but their uma lisan remains strong. These suku included Uatulia and Caicua in Baucau, suku Parlamentu, Fuiloro and Tutuala in Lautem district, and suku Nipane, Lifau and Bobometo in Oecusse district. During the Indonesian occupation there were some liurai in the suku visited who continued to receive trust from the people and therefore won the suku elections. However, since independence, times have changed and the liurai in these suku no longer rule.

Nonetheless, in these suku the symbols that signify the power of the liurai’s uma lisan are clearly in evidence, and the cultural influence of the liurai continues to be strong. Even though they are not governing, the liurai continue to be trusted and respected by the elected suku council and
community members. It is through their cultural authority that some liurai continue to assume important roles through their uma lisan, maintaining the symbols, rituals and traditional knowledge that underpin their authority, and leading cultural celebrations in the suku. For example, in suku Uatulia, the liurai continues to lead the celebration of tarabandu which has important implications for governance. In Uatulia, the liurai’s uma lisan and the liurai’s symbols are full of significance for the community. All other uma lisan in this suku still consider the liurai’s uma lisan the most important and it continues to be the central location for the implementation of tarabandu. The liurai’s symbols that are used in celebrating tarabandu and for other purposes are the babadook or tambor (a small drum used in ritual dance), surik (a sword), and the liurai’s rotan (cane). These symbols are all full of meaning for safeguarding peace in the community. Whenever a tarabandu is re-established in the suku, these symbols are taken around the different aldeia to make a public announcement to the whole community, whereupon everyone is brought together on a particular day to celebrate and implement it.

It is very common in contemporary Timor-Leste communities to find a separation of powers between the elected xefe suku, who is responsible for administrative matters, and the traditional liurai, who is responsible for culture and custom. As found in in suku Caicua and suku Nipane, this separation often involves a ritual bestowal of power from the liurai to the xefe suku. In suku Nipane, the elected xefe suku must ask permission of the liurai’s uma lisan before taking on his role. In this suku, when a person is elected who is not a direct descendant of the liurai, the new xefe suku must take a goat, pig and several chickens to be killed and eaten at the liurai’s uma lisan in a ritualised request for permission from the liurai’s uma lisan. The elected xefe suku stands at the sacred male pillar in the liurai’s uma lisan to pray for permission, asking for the spiritual power and strength to lead the people of the suku. Through gaining this permission, it is believed that the xefe suku will not face any difficulties for the duration of his leadership, because he is not only governing with formal power that he has obtained through the elections, he is also governing with cultural power that comes from the spirits of the liurai’s uma lisan. The people are frightened to take up the role of xefe suku if they do not first carry out this ritual, as there have been situations in the past where natural disasters have been attributed to the failure of the xefe suku to take into consideration the uma lisan of the liurai.

Even where a community has fully embraced the democratic system, many disputes continue to be resolved by traditional authorities through the institution of nahe biti bo’ot. Nahe biti bo’ot may also draw on the authority of the liurai and the liurai’s uma lisan to give added authority to the proceedings. The central role of the liurai or the liurai’s uma lisan in ongoing traditional practices such as nahe biti bo’ot clearly demonstrates the hybridity of authority and governance practices at the local level. This hybridity is being negotiated in very different ways, depending on the needs of the community. In suku Tutuala, the suku council and the suku community have formed a new
network called *Forum Mata Dalan* (FORMADA). This forum gives a voice to the many different authority figures in the *suku*, including representatives from youth, non-government organisations, students, the *lia-na’in*, and the *liurai*, referred to locally as *rai na’in* or ‘landowner’. All members of FORMADA take on a particular role in the forum. The *liurai’s* function is to carry out his responsibilities as the original landowner, making judgments about culture and customary traditions when there are family or community problems, and drawing on his deep knowledge of the land and traditional methods for resolving disputes.

In *suku* Lifau, there is a unique mode of cultural recognition of the *liurai* that involves the Catholic Church and can be observed during ceremonies such as those held at Easter or Saint Antonio Day. On these days, when all the Catholic members of the *suku* take candles, flowers and food and gather to make offerings at the Church, this is also understood to show respect to the *liurai*. This is because in Oecusse, the *liurai* were the first to convert to Catholicism. While the *liurai* in *suku* Lifau no longer has any official governance role, his cultural authority is still very strong, and he also is responsible for mediating and incorporating the cultures and beliefs espoused through the Catholic Church.

The reduced role of *liurai* in new *suku*

During Indonesian occupation, there were new *suku* established as people were resettled in accordance with the political interests of the Indonesian military. These new *suku* were immediately opened to the Indonesian-run electoral processes and as the *suku* boundaries did not reflect the old kingdoms of Timor-Leste, the *xefe suku* who led these *suku* were not descendants of the *liurai*; rather, they were ordinary people elected directly by the people.

One such new *suku* is Bairo Pite (within the capital city) in the district of Dili, established as a consequence of urbanisation and migration during Indonesian times. There is no *liurai* in this *suku*. However, the *suku* territory was formerly recognised as part of the traditional territory of the Mota Ain *liurai* from *uma lisan* Karaketu Mota Ain. As such, the people and the elected *suku* council members consider *uma lisan* Karaketu Mota Ain, which is located in Bairo Pite, as important for the community. The significance of the *liurai’s uma lisan* is most obvious in its role in implementing *tarabandu* in the *suku*. The contribution that the *liurai’s uma lisan* makes through this process is significant, and people consider it an important source of wealth, encouraging peaceful relations and managing the community’s natural resources. However implementing the *tarabandu* is not without problems here, as the residents of Bairo Pite come from many different parts of Timor-Leste, and their traditional affiliations and obligations are with the *uma lisan* of their families. This means that some do not consider themselves bound by the *tarabandu* mechanisms that the people have established.
A second case in this category of ‘new suku’ is Triloka, which was established as a consequence of the war. In accordance with Indonesian military requirements, the population were moved from their traditional lands and forcibly resettled, bringing several different aldeia from different suku together to form suku Triloka. There are no liurai recognised in this suku, but other aspects of culture remain strong—in particular their commitment to lisan, and the celebration of tarabandu in the suku. The situation in Triloka clearly demonstrates that while the significance of uma lisan and the influence of the liurai are closely related, they are nonetheless different and need to be analysed separately from each other. While the ‘monarchical’ rule of the liurai is no longer in existence in Timor-Leste, the cultural importance of uma lisan (which may or may not include the uma lisan of the liurai) continues to be strong.

The liurai and the liurai’s uma lisan are no longer relevant in some suku

This third category analyses those suku where, for a variety of reasons, the influence of the liurai and the liurai’s uma lisan has died out. This situation was found in suku Loihunu, where the liurai had governing power during Portuguese times but was replaced thirty-three years ago by the current xefe suku, who was formally re-elected in 2005. Although he was not traditionally empowered to rule, the xefe suku clearly had the trust of the community. A second case, in a suku in Viqueque, is a little different in that the elected xefe suku is a descendant of the liurai, but clearly prefers to use the democratic system and describes his own legitimacy as obtained through the electoral process rather than his family heritage. When asked if the liurai in this suku still exists, the xefe suku replied, ‘I refuse to say liurai, otherwise people will say I am arrogant—leave it up to the people to see and decide’. Nonetheless, there are still cultural considerations that he must take into account in exercising local leadership, as he explained:

[I]t is best if the liurai and non-liurai co-operate and do good work for the future. The liurai position passes from the old generation to the new generation. My interest is in continuing to consider the council of elders so that my leadership is strong. A leader who does not respect the elders will at some stage have to step down, and the elders will not choose someone who does not respect them.

This situation represents a very interesting hybridity of elected and cultural authority. While the position of elected xefe suku is described as having replaced the authority of the liurai, the council of elders (an authority that traditionally provided checks and balances to the liurai’s power) nonetheless continues to be respected. This continuing traditional influence, however, does not represent a settled state of affairs. Like all suku, the suku in question is in a state of transition and there are very real concerns that the cultural practices that are consecrated through the uma lisan will be lost. This is because there is now nobody who has the traditional power and knowledge to rebuild the uma lisan. As the xefe suku explained:
They were going to rebuild the *uma lisan*, re-establish the *tarabandu* system, but it cannot be done because all the *lia-na’in* have died and no-one is brave enough to become a *lia-na’in* and say the prayers. New people are scared to become a *lia-na’in* because if their prayer is wrong they can face suffering such as illness or death.\(^\text{16}\)

In addition to the fear that their cultural knowledge and traditions are being lost, there were also comments that the influence of democracy and modernisation pose a direct threat to people’s culture. As the *xefe suku* stated:

\[
\ldots\text{according to the people’s observations, democracy is running smoothly but the people who are receiving and implementing democracy do not know how to use it. Democracy gives freedom for people to speak but people don’t listen to each other. They also note that in the past everyone had to act according to their parents and the *liurai* and this also sometimes means that people do not progress forward. Finally there is movement down a democratic path of freedom but it is better that not everything is free; there must be respect for our culture.}^{\text{17}}
\]

During our research, people often commented that democracy was understood as giving unlimited freedom and the right to act according to one’s own desires, but without respecting the rights of others.\(^\text{18}\) Interpretations such as these have naturally led to the rights of others being breached, creating significant problems within communities. The concerns that are expressed in these communities represent the very real threat that is posed when traditions, and traditional institutions, are lost to the people.

**The *liurai’s* governing power and culture remains strong**

In this final category, there are two *suku* that were identified during fieldwork where the *liurai’s* governing power and the influence of the *liurai’s* *uma lisan* remains strong: Uma Wa’in Kraik, and Bucoli. In both of these *suku*, traditional modes of rule continue to be implemented very systematically, and have endured throughout all the phases of East Timorese history.

In *suku* Uma Wa’in Kraik, the current *xefe suku* is the fifth generation of *liurai*, and the people of the *suku* and *liurai* territory refer to him as ‘Dom’ as a title of respect. This *liurai* won the 2005 *suku* elections, and his position gained further strength during the 2009 elections as he was the only candidate. A similar situation also exists in *suku* Bucoli where, since Timor-Leste gained independence, the *liurai* (in this case a woman) has continued to win the *suku* elections. Like in Uma Wa’in Kraik, the *xefe suku* of Bucoli effectively has a dual authority, where she has both a formal mandate to govern through the *suku* elections and is also informally trusted as a *liurai* to lead the community. When asked about the existence of *liurai* in *suku* Bucoli, a senior resident stated:

\[
\ldots\text{the *liurai* governed in the past, now it’s the *xefe suku*. If the *liurai* is abolished we are also abolishing a particular culture. The *liurai* has power and influence that people respect as sacred. People respect the}
\]

\[
\text{(continued)}
\]

\[
\text{(continues on next page)}
\]
liurai in the same way they respect a culture, so to abolish it depends on the people. Now people are embarrassed to do the traditional dance, but they are not embarrassed to do the modern dance. This is a sign that it is possible the culture will be lost.19

There are several reasons why the people may prefer the liurai as leader of these suku at the present time. The liurai maintains and strengthens cultural leadership and is able to use his or her cultural power and authoritarian leadership style in order to guarantee stability and reduce violence in the suku. Those who are not descendants of the liurai may be afraid to nominate themselves as a candidate for xefe suku because the position is considered lulik (sacred). For these and possibly other reasons, the people of these suku use the democratic process to strengthen the pre-existing traditional governance system in the suku. However, as suggested by the senior resident of Bucoli quoted above, this may well change in the future.

Conclusion

The varying results across different suku clearly demonstrate the diversity of approaches that communities are taking in negotiating the continuing importance of lisan, uma lisan, and the liurai, while also adapting to the requirements of liberal democracy. While in some suku it appears that democracy has posed a challenge to the existence of the liurai, other suku have used the democratic process to continue to re-elect those who are traditionally empowered to rule. In some new suku formed during Indonesian times, they have recognised the strength that the liurai’s uma lisan can offer to a community, and have effectively ‘borrowed’ the leadership of the traditional liurai—despite the fact that they are not traditionally related—in order to reinstitute various cultural practices such as tarabandu. The various ways in which communities are adapting to democracy is very dependent on local history and politics and the particular requirements of lisan in that community. These requirements will continue to change according to communal needs and external pressures.

There is however, a very real fear that adopting democracy means that important cultural practices will be lost. Nonetheless, despite communities’ sense of unease over what democracy means for culture, there are also many people who are actively working to maintain and revitalise their culture. In almost all suku, there is a commitment to rebuilding the uma lisan. And in almost all suku, there is a push to re-establish systems of tarabandu, which may also incorporate new methods to ensure that their culture is in line with the modern system. The continuing role of the liurai and the uma lisan is a message to East Timorese society and the international community that the formation of Timor-Leste as a nation did not begin from zero. Across the suku of Timor-Leste, there was already a cultural package that worked to safeguard the community, regulating people’s relations with each other, with the environment, and with the ancestors. While there are some customs that persist in these communities that are not beneficial to people fully realising their rights as equal citizens, our research clearly demonstrates that the implementation
of democracy should give proper consideration to the *uma lisan*, other cultural symbols and practices, and the traditional authority that continues to exist in East Timorese society.
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