

## The Silent Revolution: How Bány Garang Malwal Jok's Administration Transformed Twic East Leadership in Queensland, Australia (Part 2)

A Comparative Analysis of TECAQ and TECAA Leadership Through the Lens of Payam, Wut, and Dhien Representation (2009–2025)

**Abstract:** *This study was commissioned by Agwer Ajang-Warken Bior, former Secretary General of TECAQ under the government of Bány Garang Malwal Jok Piok, to document the transformative administration of Bány Garang Malwal Jok in Queensland from January 2023 to January 2025. As national leadership contests ramp up in Australia and election campaigns unfold in the USA and Juba, this chronicle serves not only as a tribute to Bány Garang Malwal Jok's exceptional leadership, but also as a blueprint for Twic East community (TECA) and youth associations (TEYA) across the USA, Canada, Kenya, Uganda, Juba, Mading-Bor and Panyagor.*

**By PaanLuel Wël, Brisbane, Australia**

### 1. Introduction

**Thursday, 10/07/2025 (PW)** -- Leadership in the Twic East Community Association in Queensland (TECAQ) and its federal counterpart, the Twic East Community Association in Australia (TECAA), is widely viewed not only as a service to the community but as a strategic platform for political influence, social prestige, and clan recognition. Within this structure, the chairperson position is the most prized seat of power, often seen as the ultimate expression of political dominance and community legitimacy. An examination of chairpersonship from 2009 to 2025, alongside the distribution of other top offices, reveals key patterns of dominance and exclusion along Payam, Wut, and Dhien lines, with TECAQ exhibiting greater rotational inclusivity than the more centralized TECAA leadership.

Part one of this study sets out to investigate the political evolution and transformation of TECAQ leadership under the administration of Bány Garang Malwal Jok, placing his transformative leadership in historical and cultural context, and assessing its implications for the broader Twic East community (TECA) and youth associations (TEYA) across the world. Part Two presents a comparative analysis of political influence patterns in TECAQ (Twic East Community Australia Queensland) and TECAA (Twic East Community Australia Australia-Federal) from 2008-2025, using a weighted approach where chairperson positions (the most prized and politically influential) carry primary weight, while deputy chairperson, secretary general, and treasurer positions provide supplementary influence indicators. This methodology reveals distinct patterns of dominance and underrepresentation across administrative divisions (Payam), sub-divisions (Wut), and local areas (Dhien).

To accurately measure political influence within these complex organizational structures, this analysis employs a carefully calibrated weighting system that reflects the hierarchical nature of political power:

- *Chairperson:* 4 points (primary political influence and ultimate decision-making authority);

- *Deputy Chairperson*: 2 points (secondary political influence and succession positioning);
- *Secretary General*: 1.5 points (administrative influence and organizational control), and
- *Treasurer*: 1 point (financial influence and resource management).

This weighting system acknowledges that while all positions contribute to political capital and organizational influence, the chairperson role represents the pinnacle of organizational power, community representation, and strategic decision-making authority. The deputy chairperson position serves as both a significant political role and a potential stepping stone to ultimate power, while administrative and financial positions provide essential organizational influence that can be leveraged for future political advancement.

<b>1.1. COMPILATION OF TECAQ LEADERSHIP FROM 2009 TO 2025</b>					
<b>A</b>	<b>First TECAQ Administration, Ajakthii Deng Biar, 2009 - 2014</b>				
#	Name	Position	Payam	Wut	Wut/Dhien
1	Ajakthii Deng Biar	Chairperson	Nyuak	Awulian	Payath
2	Abuoi Garang Kheer	Deputy Chairperson	Lith	Adhiok	Pakoy
3	Kwer Joh Duot	Secretary General	Kongor	Kongor	Anyang
4	Deng Chol Riak-Magany	Treasurer	Pakeer	Pakeer	Nook
<b>B</b>	<b>Second TECAQ Administration, Abuoi Garang Kheer, 2014 - 2017</b>				
#	Name	Position	Payam	Wut	Wut/Dhien
1	Abuoi Garang Kheer	Chairperson	Lith	Adhiok	Pakoy
2	Diing Nyuon Akoi	Deputy Chairperson	Kongor	Kongor	Padol
3	Deng Chol Riak-Magany	Secretary General	Pakeer	Pakeer	Nook
4	Dhieu Arok Ajang	Treasurer	Ajuong	Ajuong	Kwach
<b>C</b>	<b>Third TECAQ Administration, Anyieth Duom Angoh, 2017 - 2019</b>				
#	Name	Position	Payam	Wut	Wut/Dhien
1	Anyieth Duom Angoh	Chairperson	Ajuong	Ajuong	Nyopiny
2	Gen. Dau Wach Deng	Deputy Chairperson	Kongor	Kongor	Kebaar
3	Gakheer Dut-Mageer Ajak	Secretary General	Ajuong	Ajuong	Kwach
4	Atem Ajang-Magwer Nuer	Treasurer	Kongor	Kongor	Payath
<b>D</b>	<b>Fourth TECAQ Administration, Gen. Dau Wach Deng, 2019 - 2023</b>				
#	Name	Position	Payam	Wut	Wut/Dhien
1	Gen. Dau Wach Deng	Chairperson	Kongor	Kongor	Kebaar
2	Kwir-Masinde Chol Atem	Deputy Chairperson	Pakeer	Pakeer	Hol
3	Mathiang Garang Piok	Secretary General	Lith	Adhiok	Pakoy
4	Dut Deng Dut	Treasurer	Ajuong	Ajuong	Kwach
<b>E</b>	<b>Fifth TECAQ Administration, Garang Malwal Jok (Mony Abuk), 2023 - 2025</b>				
#	Name	Position	Payam	Wut	Wut/Dhien
1	Garang Malwal Jok (Mony-Abuk)	Chairperson	Lith	Adhiok	Pakoy
2	Yaak Barach-Magaar Dau	Deputy Chairperson	Nyuak	Ayual	Pawiir
3	Agwer Ajang-Warken Bior	Secretary General	Kongor	Kongor	Pan-Bior
4	Chol Awang Duot	Treasurer	Pakeer	Pakeer	Akonychok

<b>F</b>	<b>Sixth TECAQ Administration, Yaak Barach-Magaar Dau, 2025 - 2028</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Payam</b>	<b>Wut</b>	<b>Wut/Dhien</b>
1	Yaak Barach-Magaar Dau	Chairperson	Nyuak	Ayual	Pawiir
2	Agwin Makwach Agwin	Deputy Chairperson	Nyuak	Awulian	Pan-Agwin
3	Dhieu Maghot Piok	Secretary General	Lith	Adhiok	Pakoy
4	Manyuon Bol Ngwet	Treasurer	Kongor	Kongor	Payath

<b>1.2. COMPILATION OF TECAA LEADERSHIP FROM 2008 TO 2025</b>					
<b>A</b>	<b>First TECAA Administration, Yaak Deng-Malwal Akoy, 2008 - 2016</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Payam</b>	<b>Wut</b>	<b>Wut/Dhien</b>
1	Yaak Deng-Malwal Akoy	Chairperson	Nyuak	Ayual	Pawiir
2	Mangar Ayuel Malwal	Deputy Chairperson	Ajuong	Ajuong	Nyopiny
3	Ustaz Wach Duot Wach	Secretary General	Lith	Adhiok	Pan-Ayol
4	Mabior Kon Ghak	Treasurer	Pakeer	Pakeer	Hol
<b>A</b>	<b>Second TECAA Administration, Kwer Dau Apai, 2016 - 2018</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Payam</b>	<b>Wut</b>	<b>Wut/Dhien</b>
1	Kwer Dau Apai	Chairperson	Lith	Adhiok	Pathiem
2	Biar Manyuon Biar (Biar Biar)	Deputy Chairperson	Nyuak	Awulian	Patem
3	Biar Ajang Garang	Secretary General	Ajuong	Ajuong	Nyopiny
4	Mamer Atem Duom	Treasurer	Pakeer	Pakeer	Anok
<b>A</b>	<b>Third TECAA Administration, Deng Chol Riak-Magany, 2018 - 2021</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Payam</b>	<b>Wut</b>	<b>Wut/Dhien</b>
1	Deng Chol Riak-Magany	Chairperson	Pakeer	Pakeer	Nook
2	Garang Juach Thiew	Deputy Chairperson	Lith	Adhiok	Roordior
3	Ayiik Chol Anyang	Secretary General	Kongor	Kongor	Kebaar
4	Mamer Yaak Dutdit	Treasurer	Nyuak	Awulian	Patem
<b>A</b>	<b>Fourth TECAA Administration, Mamer Yaak Dutdit, 2021 – Present</b>				
<b>#</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Payam</b>	<b>Wut</b>	<b>Wut/Dhien</b>
1	Mamer Yaak Dutdit	Chairperson	Nyuak	Awulian	Patem
2	Mabior Mabil Atem-Agiei	Deputy Chairperson	Kongor	Kongor	Anyang
3	Makwach Mabior Deng	Secretary General	Ajuong	Ajuong	Ayoliel
4	Jonglei Kwereng Dau	Treasurer	Pakeer	Pakeer	Anok

## 2. Political Analysis of TECAQ Leadership (2009–2025)

### 2.1. Payam-Level Political Dominance and Strategic Positioning

The weighted analysis of TECAQ reveals a complex political landscape where traditional geographic power bases intersect with strategic positioning and organizational capacity. Lith Payam emerges as the dominant political force with 25.49% of total influence, a dominance primarily driven by producing 2 chairpersons across the organization's history plus 3 additional positions. This concentration represents not merely numerical success but strategic political

control, as Lith Payam has managed to secure the organization's highest office in two separate administrations, demonstrating sustained political relevance and coalition-building capacity.

Kongor Payam presents a fascinating case study in political influence without ultimate power, achieving 25.49% of total influence despite securing only 1 chairperson position. This significant influence stems from exceptional breadth of representation across 7 other leadership positions, including 2 deputy chairpersons, 2 secretary generals, and 2 treasurers. This pattern suggests that Kongor operates as a political kingmaker or coalition partner rather than a primary power center, consistently placing its members in key supporting roles that provide substantial organizational influence and political capital.

Nyuak Payam's 23.53% of total influence derive primarily from 2 chairperson positions, with minimal representation in other roles. This concentration suggests a more focused political strategy where Nyuak leverages specific political moments or coalitions to achieve ultimate power but struggles to maintain broader organizational presence. The temporal distribution of Nyuak's chairperson positions, in the first and current sixth administrations, indicates either cyclical political influence or strategic political timing.

Ajuong Payam achieves 14.71% of total influence through a balanced approach, combining 1 chairperson position with 3 supporting roles across different administrations. This distribution suggests steady political engagement and institutional memory, with Ajuong maintaining consistent organizational presence while occasionally achieving ultimate political success.

Pakeer Payam's 10.78% of total influence represent the most concerning pattern of political marginalization, achieved entirely through non-chairperson positions. Despite contributing 4 members to various leadership roles across multiple administrations, Pakeer has been systematically excluded from the chairperson position, indicating potential structural barriers, coalition dynamics, or strategic marginalization within Queensland's political landscape.

## **2.2. Wut-Level Political Concentration and Dhien Dynamics**

The Wut-level analysis reveals how sub-regional political networks operate within the broader Payam framework. Wut Adhiok's dominance with 25.49% includes 2 chairpersons, establishing it as the most politically influential sub-division within TECAQ. This concentration within Lith Payam suggests that political influence operates through specific clan or family networks rather than broad geographic representation.

Wut Kongor's 25.49% demonstrate how consistent organizational engagement across multiple position types can generate substantial political influence. With 1 chairperson, 2 deputy chairpersons, 2 secretary generals, and 2 treasurers, Kongor Wut exemplifies a strategy of comprehensive institutional engagement, maintaining presence across all organizational levels and administrations.

Wut Ajuong achieves 14.71% and Wut Awulian achieves 11.76%, representing different strategic approaches. Ajuong Wut combines 1 chairperson with supporting positions, while Awulian Wut achieves influence through 1 chairperson and other supporting positions, including current representation in the sixth administration.

Wut Ayual's 11.76% come from 1 chairperson and 1 deputy chairperson positions, suggesting concentrated but limited political engagement. Wut Pakeer's 10.78% mirror the broader Pakeer

Payam marginalization pattern, indicating that political exclusion operates consistently across both Payam and Wut levels.

TECAQ's Dhien-level analysis reveals more balanced representation despite higher-level concentration. Pakoy leads with 25.49%, followed by Kebaar, Pawiir and Payath each with 11.76%. Those with the least political influence are Nyopiny (7.84%), Kwach (6.86%), Nook (4.90%), Padol (3.92%), Hol (3.92%), Pan-Agwin (3.92%), with Anyang (2.94%), Pan-Bior (2.94%) and Akonychok (1.96%) at the bottom of the political ladder.

This relatively even distribution suggests that while Payam and Wut levels show concentration, grassroots political representation maintains some democratic character. The diversity of Dhien representation across 11 different local areas indicates that TECAQ's leadership selection, while concentrated at higher administrative levels, draws from broad geographic constituencies. This pattern suggests that political influence, while concentrated in certain Payams and Wuts, must still maintain legitimacy through diverse local community representation.

### **3. Political Analysis of TECAA Leadership (2008–2025)**

#### **3.1 Payam-Level Political Balance and Federal Dynamics**

TECAA demonstrates markedly different political influence patterns compared to TECAQ, reflecting distinct organizational culture and possibly different constituency requirements at the federal level. Nyuak Payam leads with 32.35%, driven by 2 chairperson positions and 2 additional roles across four administrations. This federal-level dominance contrasts with Nyuak's more limited TECAQ influence, suggesting different political strategies or coalition requirements at federal versus state levels.

Lith achieves 22.06%, showing more balanced influence compared to their TECAQ positions. Lith's reduced federal influence (22.06% versus 25.49% in TECAQ) suggests that state-level political dominance doesn't automatically translate to federal success.

Pakeer Payam's 20.59% represent a remarkable contrast to its TECAQ marginalization. Combining 1 chairperson position with 3 supporting roles, Pakeer demonstrates that federal-level political opportunities can compensate for state-level exclusion. This pattern suggests that TECAA's political dynamics may be more inclusive or that federal representation requires different coalition arrangements.

Ajuong Payam achieve 14.71%, showing more balanced influence compared to their TECAQ positions. Ajuong's consistent performance across both organizations indicates steady political engagement and cross-level political competence.

Kongor Payam's 10.29% represent the most significant federal-level political underrepresentation. Despite achieving 25.49% influence in TECAQ, Kongor's minimal federal presence suggests systematic barriers to federal-level political advancement, possibly due to different coalition dynamics, strategic marginalization, or federal-level political requirements.

#### **3.2. Wut-Level Federal Representation and Dhien Influence**

TECAA's Wut-level analysis reveals more balanced political influence distribution. Adhiok Wut leads with 22.06%, including 1 chairperson positions, establishing clear federal-level political dominance. This concentration within Lith Payam suggests that federal political influence operates through specific sub-regional networks, similar to TECAQ but with different geographic bases.

Awulian and Pakeer Wuts each achieve 20.59%, Ajuong 14.71% and Ayual 11.76%, demonstrating more balanced influence compared to TECAQ's concentration patterns. This distribution suggests that federal-level political competition may be more open or that federal representation requires broader geographic legitimacy.

Kongor Wut's 10.29% confirm its federal-level marginalization, representing a stark contrast to its 25.49% TECAQ influence. This disparity indicates that Wut-level political strategies successful at state level may not translate to federal success, possibly due to different political dynamics or systematic exclusion.

TECAA shows broader Dhiem representation with 12 different areas contributing to leadership across four administrations, compared to TECAQ's 11 areas across six administrations. This broader representation density suggests more rotational or merit-based selection at the federal level, where leadership legitimacy may require diverse local community endorsement.

Patem, Pawiir, Nook and Pathiem lead with 20.59%, 11.76%, 11.76%, and 11.76% respectively, while 10 other Dhiens contribute between 10-2%. This distribution indicates that federal-level political influence, while still concentrated in certain areas, maintains broader geographic legitimacy compared to state-level patterns.

#### **4. Comparative Political Analysis: State vs Federal Dynamics**

The weighted analysis reveals fundamental differences in political structures between state and federal levels. First, TECAQ shows higher concentration, with the top two Payams (Lith and Kongor) controlling 55% of political influence through different strategies, Lith through chairperson dominance and Kongor through broad organizational engagement. TECAA's top two Payams (Nyuk and Lith) hold about 52% but with different compositions, suggesting that federal-level political success requires different strategic approaches.

Second, Lith's TECAQ dominance (25.49%) contrasts sharply with its modest TECAA influence (22.06%), indicating that state-level political strategies may not translate directly to federal success. Conversely, Nyuk's federal leadership (32.35%) exceeds its Queensland influence (23.53%), suggesting that different political networks and coalition strategies may be required for federal-level success.

Third, Kongor Payam presents the most intriguing case study in the relationship between organizational capacity and political achievement. Despite achieving 25.49% of TECAQ influence (second-highest) through exceptional breadth of representation, it manages only 10.29% of TECAA influence (lowest among all Payams). This pattern suggests several possible explanations.

First, Kongor may operate as a political kingmaker or coalition partner rather than a primary power center, consistently placing members in key supporting roles that provide substantial influence without ultimate authority. Second, there may be systematic barriers to federal-level

political advancement, possibly due to different coalition dynamics at federal level or strategic marginalization by other political groups. Third, Kongor's political strategy may be more suited to state-level dynamics, where broad organizational engagement translates to political influence, while federal-level success requires different approaches.

Fourth, Pakeer Payam's contrasting fortunes between state and federal levels highlight how political marginalization can operate differently across organizational contexts. Its TECAQ marginalization (10.78% influence entirely from non-chairperson positions) suggests systematic exclusion from Queensland's political power structures. However, its strong TECAA performance (20.59% influence including 1 chairperson) indicates that federal-level political opportunities can compensate for state-level exclusion.

This pattern suggests that TECAA's political dynamics may be more inclusive, possibly due to different constituency requirements, federal-level political culture, or strategic recognition that federal representation requires broader geographic legitimacy. Alternatively, it may indicate that different political coalitions operate at federal level, providing opportunities for groups marginalized at state level.

Fifth, the deputy chairperson analysis reveals important succession patterns and political pathway strategies. In TECAQ, 3 out of 6 deputy chairpersons eventually advanced to chairperson positions in subsequent administrations, suggesting established political pathways and succession planning. This pattern indicates that deputy chairperson positions serve as both significant political roles and strategic positioning for future advancement.

TECAA shows less clear succession patterns, with only 1 deputy chairperson advancing to chairperson, indicating either more competitive selection processes or different political dynamics where deputy chairperson roles don't automatically translate to succession opportunities. This difference suggests that federal-level political advancement may be more merit-based, coalition-dependent, or influenced by factors beyond organizational positioning.

Sixth, Secretary General and Treasurer positions show different distribution patterns that illuminate various pathways to political influence. TECAQ's administrative positions are more evenly distributed across Payams, suggesting that administrative competence is broadly recognized while political influence remains concentrated. TECAA shows similar administrative balance, indicating that technical and administrative capabilities are valued across geographic divisions.

However, the weighting analysis reveals that sustained political influence requires combining administrative competence with political positioning. Groups that achieve long-term political success, like Lith Payam in TECAQ and Nyuak Payam in TECAA, demonstrate ability to leverage administrative roles into political advancement while maintaining broad organizational engagement.

## **5. Conclusion and Future Implications**

This comprehensive weighted analysis reveals that political influence in Twic East diaspora organizations operates through sophisticated, multi-layered dynamics where chairperson positions provide primary political capital, but sustained influence requires broader organizational engagement and strategic positioning. The contrast between TECAQ's concentrated but competitive political patterns and TECAA's more balanced but stable political

arrangements highlights how organizational context, constituency requirements, and political culture shape Twic diaspora political dynamics.

The analysis identifies several critical patterns with broader implications for Twic diaspora political organization. First, the relationship between organizational capacity and political achievement is complex, with groups like Kongor demonstrating that broad organizational engagement doesn't automatically translate to ultimate political success. Second, the contrasting fortunes of different Payams between state and federal levels highlight how political strategies must adapt to different organizational contexts and constituency requirements. Third, the role of deputy chairperson positions as political stepping stones varies significantly between organizations, suggesting different approaches to succession planning and political development.

Understanding these weighted influence patterns is crucial for comprehending actual power dynamics within Twic diaspora organizations and identifying pathways for more inclusive political participation. The analysis suggests that sustainable political influence requires balancing ultimate power achievement with broad organizational engagement, while different organizational levels may require different political strategies and coalition approaches.