There was a time, not long ago, when mid-career Fellows from developing nations traveled to MIT solely to learn how to foster technological innovations for economic development. This model of learning was a one-way street: the Fellows were to transfer technical knowledge learned at MIT to their own nations, which needed new technologies to increase productivity and quickly industrialize. At that time, the SPURS Program (started in 1967) was designed to facilitate one-way learning: mid-career Fellows enrolled in courses at MIT offered by internationally known scholars; they attended weekly seminars featuring development experts from international institutions who shared their knowledge of the industrialization process; and the Fellows learned about U.S. culture and social norms by participating in events such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, and the Boston Marathon.

We live in a different world now. The United States is grappling with severe economic problems as well as stiff competition from abroad, and developing nations are facing unprecedented pressures for democratization and rapid urbanization that are challenging conventional views of economic and political modernization. The two trends may appear disconnected, but a look at the Arab Spring in the Middle East and the Occupy Wall Street movement in the United States reveals some commonalities. Both emerged from questioning conventional approaches to economic growth, and both have raised questions about the relationship between formal political processes and economic development. Both "movements"—if we can use that term—have questioned the efficacy of governance by political elites and have drawn attention to the neglected needs of individuals and communities marginalized in the formal political and economic processes. In a way, there is some similarity between these events and the social upheavals of the 1960s, when low-income urban communities in the United States organized against urban renewal and demanded civil rights for all. The current protests in both settings are demanding the empowerment of marginalized people and communities, changes that would require new rules for civic, political, and economic engagement. And while the two movements have flourished in very different settings, they are part of the same world—one that is now more integrated than ever before, economically, technologically, culturally, and even politically. As the protesters shout "The world is watching you!" governments everywhere recognize that their actions can no longer be justified simply by trotting out old notions of territorial sovereignty. The SPURS/Humphrey Program at MIT acknowledges that the world is very different now than it was in 1967 when the one-way learning model was formulated. As we rethink what should be our model today for educating mid-career professionals from developing countries, we have benefited from an institutional initiative formulated by the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program. This initiative—titled Associate Campus Partnership Program (ACPP)—was created relatively recently to extend the benefits of the Humphrey Program beyond the campuses of established universities that currently host Humphrey Fellows. ACPP's purpose is to encourage Humphrey Fellows to interact professionally as well as personally with students from different and smaller colleges than those at which the Fellows are based. This contact spreads the knowledge and professional connections the Fellows bring from across the world to community and regional colleges, which are eager to internationalize their curricula.

MIT applauds this initiative and wants to build on it to create a two-way flow of knowledge by developing new local-global linkages. MIT's partner in this new effort will be Roxbury Community College (RCC) in Boston, an institution with a long history of serving an area of Boston that is low-income and culturally diverse. Well-known for institutional innovation, RCC emerged out of a struggle between the community and the city in the late 1960s to stop the construction of an interstate highway that would have bifurcated the community. Currently, RCC serves a predominantly black student population (52%) from Roxbury, Mattapan, and North Dorchester. In addition, 14% of RCC students are Latinos, while Asians, White, and other groups—typically low-income—constitute 28% of the student body. This diverse student body is currently served by faculty members who share a deep commitment to Roxbury and its citizens. By partnering with the SPURS/Humphrey Program at MIT, RCC can extend the international reach of the SPURS/Humphrey Program beyond the campuses of established universities that currently host Humphrey Fellows. ACPP's purpose is to encourage Humphrey Fellows to interact professionally as well as personally with students from different and smaller colleges than those at which the Fellows are based. This contact spreads the knowledge and professional connections the Fellows bring from across the world to community and regional colleges, which are eager to internationalize their curricula.

MIT applauds this initiative and wants to build on it to create a two-way flow of knowledge by developing new local-global linkages. MIT's partner in this new effort will be Roxbury Community College (RCC) in Boston, an institution with a long history of serving an area of Boston that is low-income and culturally diverse. Well-known for institutional innovation, RCC emerged out of a struggle between the community and the city in the late 1960s to stop the construction of an interstate highway that would have bifurcated the community. Currently, RCC serves a predominantly black student population (52%) from Roxbury, Mattapan, and North Dorchester. In addition, 14% of RCC students are Latinos, while Asians, White, and other groups—typically low-income—constitute 28% of the student body. This diverse student body is currently served by faculty members who share a deep commitment to Roxbury and its citizens. By partnering with the SPURS/Humphrey Program at MIT, RCC can further cultivate among its students the confidence that they can contribute to the betterment of the world beyond their immediate neighborhood—and that they are not alone in their struggles. Getting to know the Humphrey Fellows promises to give RCC students new perspective on how common societal problems are tackled around the world, while providing Fellows an inside look at Roxbury and its historical struggles—a two-way learning street.

With this scenario in mind, the Humphrey Program at MIT is moving forward to create an associate partnership with RCC. Our goals can be summarized as follows:

1. Expose the MIT Fellows to innovative grassroots community development practices in Roxbury so they may learn how some low-income neighborhoods in the United States have successfully mobilized resources and built physical infrastructure and social networks. These lessons will be very useful for the Fellows to take home, since the majority of the world's urban populations live in communities with very limited financial resources.

2. Extend the international reach of the SPURS/Humphrey Program beyond Cambridge, Mass., where the Fellows usually reside while at MIT. True, Cambridge is a cosmopolitan city, but Fellows can contribute even more by also sharing their international views in Roxbury—a community vastly different from Cambridge. In the process, the Fellows can help RCC students gain an understanding of urban development issues around the world and help them develop an interest in learning new languages and traveling abroad.

3. Create an intellectual and institutional pathway to attract RCC students to enroll in degree programs at MIT. The link with MIT may also open the institutional doorway for RCC students to enter other elite academic institutions and to compete successfully for jobs.

We are witnessing a new phase in the relationship between the United States and the world—a phase no longer marked by a one-way flow of knowledge, power, and finance. This new phase will be a two-way flow of mutual and reciprocal learning that ideally will lead to cooperative problem-solving. MIT's associate partnership with RCC is a step in that direction, and we are grateful for the support of the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program as we begin this new experiment in learning.
American Planning Seminars

Drawing from their diverse experiences, speakers discuss the institutional, social, financial, and political agendas of urban planning.

The American Planning Seminar Series was offered to the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows again last fall, organized for the third year in a row by Ralph Gakenheimer, professor of urban planning. Taking into account feedback from previous Fellows, this year the series used a more informal format to encourage Fellows to ask questions and to bring their own knowledge and experience to the topics on the agenda. Speakers began their sessions with brief introductions followed by discussions of successes and failures in their past or current projects. These discussions generated a great deal of interest and provided Fellows with a forum for talking about issues they were confronting in their work back home.

Introduction to American Planning

Speaker: Ezra Glenn, former director of planning for Somerville, MA, assistant to the chair of DUSP. Comments: Professors Ralph Gakenheimer, James Buckley, and Bish Sanyal. Ezra Glenn talked about making the transition from sociologist to urban planner and shared his experience working as a planner for the city of Somerville and his views on local planning issues in the United States.

Urban Revitalization and Redevelopment


Land Use Regulation and Property Rights


Intergovernmental Relationships in American Planning

Speakers: Frederick Salvucci, MIT Center for Transportation and Logistics, former Secretary of Transportation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Drawing from his own experience, Frederick Salvucci gave an overarching introduction to the struggles of megaproject planning. He said political party transitions, changes of leadership, resource scarcity, or any other minor incident could easily delay or dismantle a megaproject like Boston's Big Dig.

Pragmatism in American Planning

Speaker: George Proakis, director of planning for Somerville, MA, and Andrew Grace, urban designer for the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA). While Boston has been successful in maintaining its urban prosperity, just two miles north of Boston, Somerville has experienced economic decline.

Negotiation Workshops

Last fall, Lawrence E. Susskind, professor of urban and environmental planning at MIT, held two workshops on "Distributional Disputes" and on "Mutual Gains Approach to Negotiation," targeted toward the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows who, as midcareer professionals from different countries, share a sense of frustration because there are always people opposing their efforts or dissatisfied with their decisions.

The third talk took place on February 22, 2012 with the participation of the Cornell Humphrey Fellows. The discussion also included a short negotiation activity called "The Three Party Coalition Exercise:"

Leadership Workshops

An effective leader has the ability to get a group of diverse and talented people to work together toward a common goal. Although this sounds easy in principle, inspiring individuals to work collaboratively can be quite a challenge. Generally, leaders—many of whom have strong personalities—find ways to affect others in a positive way; they use their strengths to benefit others and have a lasting and determining influence on people's performance. In order to succeed as a talented leader, one needs everyone on the team to contribute and perform each individual duty and responsibility at a very high level of proficiency.

To help Fellows hone their leadership skills, the SPURS/Humphrey Program organized a three-session Leadership Workshop, which was conducted by Stuart Krussell, associate director of the MIT Leadership Center. With vast experience in international development issues, Krussell worked closely with the Fellows and introduced them to the "Four Capabilities Leadership Framework," which uses case studies and group work to establish that four capabilities are central to effective leadership: visioning, sense-making, relating, and inventing new ways of organizing.

This capability framework was developed over a four-year period by MIT faculty at the Sloan School of Management, and tested in diverse, real-world settings. The discussion of these capabilities sparked a lively conversation among the Fellows, who used their own experiences and experiences of others to debate the effectiveness of "command and control" leadership versus a model of "cultivate and coordinate."

"Today, in a world where technology has created a truly global society, where the pace of change is constantly accelerating and where complex environmental and economic problems abound, how we think about leadership may be more critical than ever," Krussell said during the introductory session of the workshop.

During the first and second sessions, Krussell praised what he referred to as the "incomplete leader": he made the case with the Fellows that no leader is perfect, and that the best ones do not try to be. Instead, incomplete leaders concentrate on honing their strengths and on finding others who can make up for their limitations.
The leadership workshop will finish in the spring, when the Fellows will resume their discussion and have more opportunities to explore both individual and collective leadership cases in the context of planning decision-making processes in the public realm.

**Team Building Workshop**

Given the constant need to retool and reflect on their policy-making, planning, and leadership skills, the Fellows attended a one-day team-building workshop on how to use negotiation to build, participate in, and manage effective teams. Natalie Sanchez, a negotiation analyst consultant and research fellow of the Harvard Center for International Development, conducted the workshop. The seminar was intended to help the Fellows build a foundation of skills they can use to interact with and engage with one another over the course of the program. Using a negotiation framework, Fellows were exposed to a methodology that seeks to explain the ways in which communication between individuals and teams takes place and how it can be shaped to better meet the objectives of both the individual and the team.

This workshop was designed to expose Fellows to major tensions that are inherent to successful team building. Through simulated negotiation scenarios, a short negotiation skill lecture, and a conflict management tool for understanding and resolving disputes, the Fellows learned ways to create a balanced mix of analytical and interpersonal skills that can enhance their powers of communication, persuasion, and influence.

Leaders experienced in local public finance, sustainability, economic development, and regional planning agencies meet with the Fellows to share their insight.

To complement the wealth of classes the Fellows take at MIT, the SPURS/Humphrey Program arranges a number of professional visits to leading planning institutions in the Boston area, where officials of the agencies and organizations give lectures and presentations. Last fall, the Fellows took advantage of four local professional visits, where a variety of issues of interest to the Fellows were discussed at length.

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) was the first agency to welcome the Fellows at their headquarters. In a stimulating exchange, the Fellows heard James Rust, MBTA's director of financial planning, describe how Boston’s rail and transit system is managed, as well as the Authority’s legal and financial structure and fiscal challenges. In addition, Andrew Brennan, MBTA’s director of environmental affairs, outlined the agency’s sustainability initiatives. The Fellows were engaged in a lively discussion on the benefits and challenges of having a cleaner and more efficient vehicle fleet, as well as an increased focus on energy management and on making continuous improvements to systems and infrastructure.

The Fellows had the chance to meet with the top management of the Boston Redevelopment Authority’s (BRA) policy planning branch. Andrew Grace, BRA’s senior planner, hosted the Fellows at City Hall, presented a few of the ongoing initiatives, and shared his views on how the BRA is shaping both the aesthetics and economy of Boston’s neighborhoods and downtown. The Fellows were interested in the city’s transition from labor-intensive manufacturing to technology and service jobs. In a thought-provoking conversation, the Fellows analyzed the consequences of the economic dichotomy of Boston’s industrial development, with its urban economy specialized in the financial, business, professional services, educational, and medical sectors, while its suburban economy is more specialized in high technology and defense.

In a third professional visit organized by Professor Ralph Gakenheimer, the Fellows visited the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), a regional planning agency serving the 101 towns of metropolitan Boston. Joel Barrera, MAPC’s deputy director, along with three members of his staff, detailed the many activities that MAPC oversees, including sound municipal management, sustainable land use, protection of natural resources, efficient and affordable transportation, a diverse housing stock, public safety, economic development, an informed public, and equity and opportunity among people of all backgrounds. The MAPC staff was very impressed with the Fellows’ analysis of regional planning governance in the United States as compared to that in their home countries. So many Fellows were engaged with MAPC’s mission to advance equity and development that Barrera invited them to join future sessions.

The Fellows also visited the Massachusetts State House and observed the Senate in session. Finally, they were hosted by World Bank officials during their Global Leadership Forum in Washington, DC. Ani Dasgupta, director of the Reform Secretariat, along with his colleagues Sumila Gulyani, Julia Bucknall, and Aleem Walji discussed with the Fellows about the functional scope of the World Bank and how it differs from a traditional commercial bank. Asked about how the World Bank deals with so many diverse economies, Dasgupta told the Fellows that development strategies vary significantly from case to case based on the direct requirements of each particular country.

One interesting discussion centered on the growing role of the World Bank in dealing with global issues, e.g. climate change, Millennium Development Goals, and other matters relating to global governance and the joint cause of global community. Although it is highly challenging for the World Bank to seek consensus on these issues across different countries with divergent interests, the Bank seems to have taken on a remarkable role in serving its agenda of development against all odds.

There are three more professional visits in store for the Fellows this April, when they will be hosted by the UN Development Programme, World Economic Forum, and the New York City Department of City Planning Authorities.
Harvard Loeb/SPURS Fellows Collaborations

The Loeb Fellows at Harvard’s Graduate School of Design (GSD) hosted the fall joint seminar with the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows. Invited speaker Michael Hooper, GSD assistant professor of urban planning, talked about housing development projects for slum dwellers in African countries. This topic triggered an engaging discussion about equity, project management, and poverty among the Loeb/SPURS Fellows.

On February 29, the SPURS/Humphrey Program hosted the Loeb Fellows for a talk on “Senseable Cities” by Carlo Ratti, associate professor of the practice of urban studies and planning at MIT, as well as director of the Senseable City Laboratory. Ratti’s research focuses on studying and predicting how digital technology is changing the way we describe, design, and occupy cities.

SPURS & DUSP Connections

Through their own initiative, the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows organized a discussion series that further deepened interdepartmental collaboration with undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral students. The SPURS Discussion Series is designed to focus on critical issues for international development practitioners, ranging from natural disaster recovery and urban upgrading projects for slum dwellers in African countries to regional planning challenges, democracy, and governance.

In 2011, MIT began cultivating a relationship with RCC, beginning with a meeting with RCC President Terrence Gomez and Vice President of Academic Affairs Brenda Williams. Two additional meetings with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

In the fall term, the partnership started off on September 28, 2011, with an eventful meeting with RCC faculty and students and a cohort of MIT faculty who specialize in community development. Participating MIT faculty included Amy Glasmeier, Xav Briggs, Phil Thompson, Karl Seidman, Ceasar L. McDowell, and Christopher M. Jones. The Fellows exchanged ideas with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

In the fall term, the partnership started off on September 28, 2011, with an eventful meeting with RCC faculty and students and a cohort of MIT faculty who specialize in community development. Participating MIT faculty included Amy Glasmeier, Xav Briggs, Phil Thompson, Karl Seidman, Ceasar L. McDowell, and Christopher M. Jones. The Fellows exchanged ideas with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

In the fall term, the partnership started off on September 28, 2011, with an eventful meeting with RCC faculty and students and a cohort of MIT faculty who specialize in community development. Participating MIT faculty included Amy Glasmeier, Xav Briggs, Phil Thompson, Karl Seidman, Ceasar L. McDowell, and Christopher M. Jones. The Fellows exchanged ideas with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

Inspired by the Hubert H. Humphrey Program’s vision to extend its alliances to a larger number of US citizens, particularly those residing in significant minority populations, the MIT SPURS/Humphrey Program established a partnership with Roxbury Community College (RCC), a college in the Roxbury Crossing neighborhood of Boston, MA.

In 2011, MIT began cultivating a relationship with RCC, beginning with a meeting with RCC faculty and students and a cohort of MIT faculty who specialize in community development. Participating MIT faculty included Amy Glasmeier, Xav Briggs, Phil Thompson, Karl Seidman, Ceasar L. McDowell, and Christopher M. Jones. The Fellows exchanged ideas with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

In the fall term, the partnership started off on September 28, 2011, with an eventful meeting with RCC faculty and students and a cohort of MIT faculty who specialize in community development. Participating MIT faculty included Amy Glasmeier, Xav Briggs, Phil Thompson, Karl Seidman, Ceasar L. McDowell, and Christopher M. Jones. The Fellows exchanged ideas with RCC faculty and students as well as MIT faculty and Fellows confirmed mutual interests in sharing knowledge, programs, and activities.

The SPURS Discussion Series is designed to focus on critical issues for international development practitioners, ranging from natural disaster recovery and urban upgrading projects for slum dwellers in African countries to regional planning challenges, democracy, and governance.

All SPURS/Humphrey Fellows will present their own work to the Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP) faculty and students.

Through the leadership of Jose Alicea, RCC associate dean of graduate students, the second joint seminar was held at the RCC campus with the talk “A Community Response Leading to the Stopping of I-95.” The Roxbury community played an essential role in successfully stopping a plan to construct I-95 right through downtown Boston. Karilyn Crockett, a doctoral candidate at Tufts University, presented the research questions and findings of her dissertation study into this historical process and event, followed by commentaries of DUSP Professors Mel King and Tunny Lee, who personally witnessed, participated in, and influenced the grassroots movement.

Two more events are planned for the spring term. The first event was held on February 16, 2012, and focused on income inequality with a discussion on the “Occupy Wall Street Movement.” Jan Wampler, MIT pro-
The Process of Reentry

How do Fellows cope with reverse culture shock?

For many Fellows, studying abroad is one of the most intellectually enriching experiences of their lives: it broadens perspectives, generates new ideas, fosters tolerance, and often leads to better understanding of new cultures and different beliefs, dispelling cultural stereotypes. While most of those who leave their home countries are aware of the kinds of challenges they are likely to face in their host country—even long before beginning the experience—few anticipate the reacclimatization struggle that often occurs when one returns home after spending a considerable time in the United States.

Many of the current SPURS/Humphrey Fellows will encounter “reverse culture shock” after completing their fellowship program at MIT, making this a good time to reflect on the challenges previous Fellows have faced in their work and at home after returning to their countries of origin.

Other Humphrey campuses are also addressing this issue. An article by Gary Weaver, a professor at the American University School of International Service, on the “Process of Reentry” was forwarded to us by University of California at Davis coordinator Dr. Gwynn Benner. In this article, Weaver reveals that reentry may be even more difficult than adjusting to the sociocultural institutions of an unfamiliar country. Weaver states that this is so in part because: 1) most foresee no problems in readapting to their native cultures, 2) at home, everyone expects the returnee to fit in quickly, and 3) the increased global-mindedness (of the Fellows) is sometimes accompanied by increased intolerance of parochialism in those at home.

Weaver writes that “sojourners often assume that the journey ends when one arrives home. In truth, the psychological sojourn does not end until one has successfully overcome reentry challenges.” This resonated with those of us who work with the SPURS/Humphrey Fellows, because every year we hear from former colleagues about how difficult this readjustment process is and how important orientation for reentry is for them. With this in mind, we contacted SPURS/Humphrey alumni dating back to the 2000 cohort, and collected some of their comments.

Retreats provide an excellent opportunity for participants to discuss issues while getting to know one another better in a more relaxed environment. Last September, the SPURS/Humphrey Program sponsored a retreat at the Maine Houses in Bryant Pond, Maine. Located in the Western Maine Mountains, it was the perfect place for the Fellows to interact and unwind after the bustling frenzy of adjusting to MIT and settling down in their new homes in Cambridge.

Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP) faculty, staff, and Fellows enjoyed the opportunity to discuss and share their first experiences in the United States. Having already spent a few days together, the Fellows talked about the group activities they had enjoyed and discussed what they looked forward to for the rest of their fellowship year.

Maine Retreat

Retreats provide an excellent opportunity for participants to discuss issues while getting to know one another better in a more relaxed environment. Last September, the SPURS/Humphrey Program sponsored a retreat at the Maine Houses in Bryant Pond, Maine. Located in the Western Maine Mountains, it was the perfect place for the Fellows to interact and unwind after the bustling frenzy of adjusting to MIT and settling down in their new homes in Cambridge.

Department of Urban Studies and Planning (DUSP) faculty, staff, and Fellows enjoyed the opportunity to discuss and share their first experiences in the United States. Having already spent a few days together, the Fellows talked about the group activities they had enjoyed and discussed what they looked forward to for the rest of their fellowship year.
leadership in times of crisis and transition
by Jagdish C. Pokharel, former Vice Chairman of National Planning Commission, Government of Nepal, PhD, MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning

The usefulness of the thinking tool of Donald Schon, the legendary philosopher-planner in the department, was perhaps the most frequently referred to when giving shape to planning processes in the recurring political transitions in which I had to perform. For thinking, doing, and delivering in a politically unstable context, “Beyond the Stable State” became a mantra. I am sure many of us who come from developing and democratizing nations where political stability is too precious an assumption to make find his guidance invaluable. How to think, act, and deliver in a perpetually unstable context is what most of you would like to take home when you go to your respective destinations.

On the second day after my return I witnessed two major crises and turning points in the political history of my country. These changes and crises gave me an opportunity to test the knowledge and skills that I had acquired at MIT. The first period began with the post-democratic changes of 1990s and ended with the intensifying conflict (that marked) the beginning of new millennium. We experienced an almost mesmerizing effect of freedom and people’s power. At this time, I recall all those lectures by world-renowned academicians and practitioners who spoke very simply but left an unforgettable impression on me. I would like to convey my highest regard and respect to these thinkers for sharing moments with us.

I share your feelings at having had an opportunity to be in this wonderful program under the aegis of very capable academic leaders. Twenty-one years ago, I was involved in the program in different capacities and I still cherish those moments. I interacted with wonderful midcareer professionals from different countries, and we have remained in close contact. The program is uniquely placed to bring together participants like you to share experiences and to be enriched by the invaluable truth-seekers at MIT and in other institutions around this “Benares of the West”—the Greater Boston area.

Every moment you have spent here has contributed to your ability to see and understand things differently. I too have felt that every moment at this institution has helped build my capacity to face and lead my country differently. As years pass by and you forget the details, there will remain certain “mantras” and “sutras” that these gurus have given to you that will guide you as you engage yourself in your “Karma,” or work; that, at least, has been my experience in professional life. When you are facing the difficult choices in your “Karma Bhumī” (workplace), often under stress and confusion, the words of wisdom that you have heard and acquired from these gurus will provide you the light and guidance to stand, act, and win—like the words of Krishna to Arjuna in the epic war of the Mahabharata. All this knowledge and wisdom together will make you feel a kind of completeness in knowing and doing things. This feeling has enabled me to engage myself in my Karma Bhumī, Nepal, over the years in both crises and normal situations. I have moved confidently with hope and courage while charting a middle path between the overly competing extreme tendencies in the country.

I share your feelings at having had an opportunity to be in this wonderful program under the aegis of very capable academic leaders. Twenty-one years ago, I was involved in the program in different capacities and I still cherish those moments. I interacted with wonderful midcareer professionals from different countries, and we have remained in close contact. The program is uniquely placed to bring together participants like you to share experiences and to be enriched by the invaluable truth-seekers at MIT and in other institutions around this “Benares of the West”—the Greater Boston area.

Every moment you have spent here has contributed to your ability to see and understand things differently. I too have felt that every moment at this institution has helped build my capacity to face and lead my country differently. As years pass by and you forget the details, there will remain certain “mantras” and “sutras” that these gurus have given to you that will guide you as you engage yourself in your “Karma,” or work; that, at least, has been my experience in professional life. When you are facing the difficult choices in your “Karma Bhumī” (workplace), often under stress and confusion, the words of wisdom that you have heard and acquired from these gurus will provide you the light and guidance to stand, act, and win—like the words of Krishna to Arjuna in the epic war of the Mahabharata. All this knowledge and wisdom together will make you feel a kind of completeness in knowing and doing things. This feeling has enabled me to engage myself in my Karma Bhumī, Nepal, over the years in both crises and normal situations. I have moved confidently with hope and courage while charting a middle path between the overly competing extreme tendencies in the country.

I recall all those lectures by world-renowned academicians and practitioners who spoke very simply but left an unforgettable impression on me. I would like to convey my highest regard and respect to these thinkers for sharing moments with us.

The first period began with the post-democratic changes of 1990s and ended with the intensifying conflict (that marked) the beginning of new millennium. We experienced an almost mesmerizing effect of freedom and people’s power. At this time, I served on commissions and as an advisor in order to learn more about Nepal, having just returned from abroad. During this period, I was engaged in the country’s policy making from outside government, and did not occupy an official position although several were offered to me.
This was a period where growth and equity moved together at a very memorable speed and with relative harmony. I was involved as an independent professional in the beginning. Later, I became involved as a national-level planner—a member of the planning commission. The state was no longer the only actor. It was transforming to play the role of facilitator, referee, guardian, and regulator. Nepal adopted major economic reforms and the international donor communities were largely pleased with the progress.

Regular, fair, and participatory elections made decentralized governance possible and helped link people with state affairs through their representatives. This was a period when people felt a rare kind of political stability. Later, it became clear that there were still undercurrents working against the seemingly stable state, and within a few years the country plunged into a major armed conflict. As the conflict gained prominence in the mid-1990s, I joined the National Planning Commission as a member responsible for transport, local development, governance, and environment.

In hindsight, I feel that we planners had to be partly blamed for not seeing this trend toward conflict. Consequently, we were not innovative or bold enough in our approach to take timely action to arrest the possibility of these dramatic changes. We had based our plans on the assumption of “equal playing field” as well as the “same level of development” for everyone. The reality was different. In countries like mine, there were areas and communities that were more or less isolated and would never make it to the lower levels of government and community to address these variations. Our effort to devolve power, however, was not without resistance. First was the resistance of the bureaucracy, which engaged in “selective neglect.” And second were powerful politicians at the center who thought decentralization of power and resources to the local bodies would weaken their control. Thus, even our assumption that regular elections would redistribute resources and power was not entirely valid.

We were gradually sliding into conflict, and for the first time in the history of Nepal we faced a violent conflict waged by armed Maoist rebels. At the same time, the far right and royalists also used this opportunity to attack the liberal democracies that began in the 1990s. The country saw the brutal face of violence and terror for the first time in the nearly 250 years of its existence.

National planners did not have many prescriptions for this period of conflict. The assumption of stability was invalid and the state was becoming more concerned with meeting violence with violence. Political parties were displaced from their constituencies. There was no investment in transport and investors left the country. The majority of youth either joined the rebels or left the country for employment. Civil society and non-government organizations concentrated their activities in the cities, district headquarters, and other safe places. The state apparatus was systematically destroyed and displaced—physically and mentally. Office buildings were destroyed and people who tried to maintain relations with state agencies were punished. In most rural areas, the state disintegrated. In these difficult years, national planners had to change their plans and implementation strategies. We tried to integrate security and development by focusing on the construction of large infrastructure projects, such as roads and hydropower projects, using the army. We also planned small community works such as schools, health posts, and drinking water facilities in rural areas in order to reestablish the link between the state and people.

As the conflict intensified, our strategy began to fail. The entrenched structural disparity was unlikely to be lessened by incremental, technocratic approaches. Gradually, security took first priority over development works. Our strategy to “win the hearts and minds of people” in conflict did not work, and after the king again took power at the turn of the century, I resigned.

In 2006, we entered a new political context. The Far Left rebels and Democrats had joined hands and defeated the Far Right, symbolized by the king. An amendment to the constitution was jointly promulgated to guide policy until a new constitution was drafted by the constituent assembly. With this the country officially entered a new peaceful phase, the third, of post-conflict political transition through negotiations and dialogue.

I was chosen to lead the National Planning Commission during this critical transition. I suspect I was acceptable to my own political party and the broader country. In 1990, Maoist rebels had joined the political bloc by resigning when they gained prominence in the mid-1990s, I joined the National Planning Commission as a member responsible for transport, local development, governance, and environment.

My Humphrey Program fellowship gave me an opportunity to find a better position when I returned home. When I returned to work, everything was the same. At home, everybody was happy with my return. About the preparation to return home, I think it was easy but I know that in some cases there were problems in their adaptation. One suggestion could be to work with some people who are knowledgeable with this kind of situation and offer it at the end of the year. “My Humphrey Program fellowship gave me an opportunity to find a better position when I returned home. When I returned to work, everything was the same. At home, everybody was happy with my return. About the preparation to return home, I think it was easy but I know that in some cases there were problems in their adaptation. One suggestion could be to work with some people who are knowledgeable with this kind of situation and offer it at the end of the year.”

—Fan Tu, Associate Professor, Zhejiang University of Technology, Zhejiang, China, Humphrey Fellow 2010.
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