

NEWS FROM USEF NEPAL

VOLUME 25 NO. 2
July 2008

A Bulletin of activities and events from the Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States and Nepal

The Commission for Educational Exchange between the United States and Nepal

Post Box 380, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: 444-4780, 444-4779, 441-4598(Advising)
Fax: 977-1-4410881
email: fulbcomm@fulbrightnepal.org.np
www.fulbrightnepal.org.np

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR...

This spring brought great changes to Nepal's political landscape, as so many recent springs have done. This year we witnessed the nationwide elections to the Constituent Assembly; the relative upper hand gained by the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) vis a vis the other major parties in those elections; and the political visibility—and strength—of Madhesi parties for the first time ever. As spring wore on, the Constituent Assembly gathered for the first time, and Nepal was declared no more a Kingdom, but a Republic.

In June, American Fulbright student scholars began to depart, having finished their ten-month long grants, and Nepali Fulbright scholars began to return, with Master's degrees and two years of American living under their belts. On June 6, we celebrated the annual "Fulbright Day" commemorating the 1961 treaty between the United States and Nepal that established the Fulbright Commission. American Ambassador Nancy J. Powell hosted the event at the official residence (Kamal Kunj), and it brought together many old friends, alumni, and nearly a dozen Nepali grantees who were selected last year and who depart for the beginning of their Master's studies, Humphrey programs, and post-doctoral research studies in July and August this year.

For several years now, the annual Fulbright Day gathering has been an event where the Executive Director of the Fulbright Commission gives a short speech, followed by the presidents of the respective Fulbright, East-West and Humphrey program. This year I decided that a change might be interesting, and so myself and the alumni organization presidents refrained from our usual speeches so that we could hear from just two speakers: Ambassador Powell, and Mr. Sujeev Shakya, a Humphrey program alumnus. I asked Sujeev to be our principal alumni speaker, hoping that in future years we might hear from various alumni of all backgrounds, and he delivered a pithy and entertaining speech (see inside).

Meantime, the role and function of our alumni organizations has been a subject of reflection and sometimes criticism among alumni themselves (see an open letter to Fulbright alumni by Mr. BK Shrestha inside). Because of wider political difficulties in Kathmandu earlier in 2008, it was impossible to hold the elections to the Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal Executive Board until June 25: please see inside for results. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the outgoing Executive Board of FAAN, and in particular Dr. Sangita Rayamajhi, for having advanced the role and scope of FAAN's activities. Dr. Rayamajhi and her colleagues have been the most activist FAAN Board in recent memory: they organized a dozen Democracy Fora over a year period, which involved members of many different Kathmandu neighborhoods, and they also successfully hosted an historic conference for South Asian Fulbright Alumni in January 2008. Constructive criticism is always useful, but as we all know, it is easier to critique than to lead. To those with criticism, I would urge: get involved! And to Dr. Sangita Rayamajhi and her Executive Board: congratulations on a job well done!



Peter K. Moran

Peter K. Moran

Buddhist Thought and Modern Science

This article is adapted from a slightly longer one written by Professor William Waldron for a Tribhuvan University newsletter. I asked to reprint it here because it seems to speak to one of the central points of all Fulbright exchange: real inter-cultural discussion. Professor Waldron, from Middlebury College in Vermont, has been a visiting Fulbright Senior Scholar at both Tribhuvan and Kathmandu Universities in 2007-8. In some instances, Sanskrit diacritics have of necessity been modified.

Why should modern Nepali students study Buddhism? After all, isn't the need of the day economics, science and politics? How are 'old-fashioned' traditions like Buddhism relevant to these pressing needs?

These are realistic concerns and I am not suggesting that people should simply neglect science and politics and study Buddhism instead—quite the opposite. But I am suggesting that Buddhist thought is relevant to current issues in science and politics in ways that are not at all obvious at first glance. Buddhist thought can, in fact, shed light on our current conditions in ways that few other perspectives can.

I say this from the point of view of a modern Buddhist educator, who regularly teaches Indian and Tibetan Buddhism to mostly American students at a college in the United States and who has recently had the joy and privilege of teaching Buddhism to Nepali students for half a year at the Buddhist Studies Department at Tribhuvan University in Kirtipur.

The first and most important reason for modern people to study Buddhism—and one which certainly accords with traditional thinking—is that Buddhist philosophy provides a view of the causal and processual nature of both ourselves and the world in a more systematic and comprehensive fashion than any other philosophy does, including, I think, modern science. It can do this because the basic question the Buddha asked about life was couched in terms of causality: how does suffering (*dukkha*)

arise and how does it end? Because they followed this mode of questioning for many, many centuries, Buddhists have thought long and hard about causal relations. In the Buddhist view, no phenomenon exists all by itself, independent of its supporting causes and conditions. Rather, phenomena *come to be*, they arise, through certain patterns of interaction such as those enshrined in the formula of dependent arising (*pratītya-samutpāda*).

Buddhists have also long used a medical model—that is, a causal model—to describe this traditional way of thinking. The Buddha looked for the etiology, the causes, of the disease of the human condition, in order to bring about its cure, freedom from suffering, for which he prescribed an appropriate antidote, the Dharma.

Modern science takes a similar approach: it looks for causal regularities in order to discover *how things come to be*, rather than for definitions that attempt to describe *what they are in their essence*. As a consequence of this line of questioning, each of the various scientific fields demonstrates that we can only understand how the world works if we analyze it in terms of regular patterns of causal interaction.

Moreover, not only do the Buddhist and scientific understanding of cause and effect in the natural world basically agree with each other, they also agree that causality *only works* if there are no unchanging essences, no *svabhāva*. This is because an unchanging essence—were it truly unchanging—could play no causal role in a world of becoming.

For example, scientists do not strive to find the *essence* of a disease, they work to discern its causes and its cures. Definitions only provide pragmatic guidelines or “shorthand symbols or labels,” as philosopher of science Karl Popper explains, “in order to cut a long story short” (*Conjectures and Refutations*, 1974, p. 20). Definitions—and the ‘entities’ they purport to represent—are merely *prajñapti-sat*, provisional designations, as the Buddhists call them.

This point is crucial for analyzing our sense of self, the sense we have of being an independent, autonomous self—in short, an unchanging essence or *soḷ*. Both scientific approaches as well as traditional Buddhist philosophy observe that the very notion of an unchanging self cannot play any causal role in the living cognitive processes of human life. It has no causal function.

Therefore, most cognitive scientists, almost without exception, have concluded there is no scientific support at all for *that* notion of a self. As cognitive scientists Lakoff and Johnson, (1999, p. 268) declare: “The very way that we normally conceptualize our inner lives... [that] there is always a Subject that is the locus of reason and that metaphorically has an existence independent of the body... contradicts the fundamental findings of cognitive science.” This ‘contradiction’ between our scientific understanding and our everyday understanding is source of considerable consternation in cognitive science. As neuroscientist, Marvin Minsky (*Society of Mind*, 1986, 306f) laments: “We each believe that we

possess an Ego, Self or Final Center of Control... We're virtually forced to maintain that belief, even though we know it's false."

As we know, this is also the predicament that traditional Buddhists seek to understand and solve: why are we seemingly forced to maintain a belief in substantial self, even though it's false, even though it causes suffering to oneself and others?

One of the first steps in answering this question is, of course, to understand how this sense of self comes about in the first place, to understand, in short, its causes and conditions. Here, Buddhists have very much to say since they have been systematically investigating the causal patterns of mind and consciousness—and our nearly intractable sense of self—for many, many centuries. Indeed, this is the central preoccupation of Buddhist thought. I am not suggesting, however, that one can simply take traditional Buddhist ideas and apply them directly—without interpretation or modification—to the specific questions that cognitive scientists are currently asking. I am suggesting, though, that in their breadth and depth Buddhist ideas and practices are becoming relevant to questions about consciousness and the construction of self-awareness in ways that have only recently become obvious. It is almost certain that Buddhist ideas on consciousness will contribute significantly to our scientific understanding of mind: provided of course that we have students and scholars who are sufficiently conversant in both fields. This will be challenging but promising.

The relevance of Buddhist thought is nowhere as obvious or urgent as in the troubled topic of ethnic or national identity. Although countless groups of people across the globe claim to have a distinctive, well-defined, and relatively autonomous ethnic identity, all the social sciences teach that personal and group identity are social constructions or social agreements that we collectively construct and adhere to. Many social

scientists also recognize that the devotion and loyalty directed toward these constructed identities leads to countless social and political conflicts since there are some ten thousand such groups in the world today, very few of which can have real political, or even geographical, autonomy.

Buddhists have also long thought that most human suffering is caused by our ultimately futile attempts to construct and protect a sense of self-identity (*âtman-grâha*). Since human identity is a construct (*samskerta-dharma*) that only comes into being through a complex combination of conditions—evolution, language, childhood development and socialization, acculturation, etc.—it can never be the unchanging source of independence and autonomy we ask of it. Selves do not and cannot stand alone and they never have. This is one of the most basic working assumptions in the social sciences and its parallels with Buddhist thinking are obvious. But while traditional Buddhists have limited their insights into the ill-fated consequences of identity construction at the individual level, they apply equally well at the social and cultural levels as well.

According to sociologists, we are continuously constructing our identities as a defense against anxieties caused by the impermanence and fragility of our existence, which are exacerbated in modern conditions. This is bound to fail, however, since the very attempt to grasp onto something as “open-ended, transitory, and liable to ongoing change” as self-identity leads, according to sociologist, Peter Berger, to a “permanent identity crisis” (*The Homeless Mind*, 1973, p. 78); in short, it exacerbates rather than alleviates our insecurities about who we are.

The Buddhist perspective on this is fully consonant with the basic insight of the social sciences: that an understanding of the constructed nature of identity liberates us from its cognitive obscurations and its emotional constrictions. If modern science, as suggested above, is one long lesson in dependent arising, then it is also part and parcel of the perennial Buddhist quest to understand and alleviate suffering wherever and however it occurs. As Nagarjuna famously put it (XXIV 40): “Who-ever sees dependent arising also sees suffering and its arising and its cessation as well as the path” [that leads away from suffering]

Congratulations to the NEW Executive Board of the Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal!!

Elections were held on June 25, at the Fulbright Commission in Gyaneshwor, with the following officers democratically elected:

President	Mr. Madan Mohan Das
Vice President	Dr. Shreedhar Gautam
General Secretary	Mr. Mahendra Bahadur Gurung
Secretary	Dr. Suresh Das Shrestha
Treasurer	Mr. Ram Bhakta Amatya
Member	Dr. Mukesh Kumar Chalise
Member	Dr. Bijay Kumar KC
Member	Dr. Tek Bahadur Gurung
Member	Dr. Ram Dayal Rakesh
Member	Dr. Buddhi Ratna Khadge
Member	Ms. Rachana Shrestha

Seeing How You Think

Mr. Anil Poudel is concluding his first year of Master's level study at Washington University in Missouri.

Do you also think that Americans are hyper sensitive about their feelings? And do you know what motivates you to think that way? I had an interesting experience figuring that out. During the orientation self-awareness workshop at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work, the process of putting all our concerns into words struck me. A group of 10 people, including European Americans, African Americans, and myself, a South Asian, introduced ourselves and engaged in a “rule-developing” exercise. I have been a member of many workshops and trainings while I was working in Nepal, and therefore, the process of rule-making was not new to me. However, the level of attention placed upon the possibility of being hurt by someone else’s comments stood out. Our list of rules already included phrases like “respecting each other” and “being sensitive to cultural differences.” The list kept growing with similar concerns, e.g., selecting appropriate words, not using derogatory terms, etc.

During the process, I felt that there was a fear of being hurt by others, as well as a fear of hurting others unintentionally. One of the rules that I suggested was not to attack anyone personally and not to take issues discussed in the workshop personally either. To some extent my suggestions were biased by the perception that most of the Americans present in the workshop were defensive about their emotions and feelings. I was worried that this overt cautiousness would impair a healthy discussion.

I perceived the U.S. participants as hyper-sensitive in terms of their feelings. One of the reasons I felt that the concerns expressed were trivial is because I am

from a “high-context culture.” Edward T. Hall (1976) characterizes high-context culture as an interaction between people with similar experiences and expectations, where inferences are drawn leaving details unsaid for the culture to explain. For example, when a Nepali guest is asked if s/he would like to eat or drink, s/he might reply ambiguously “okay” or could even answer “no, I am fine.” However, through the Nepali cultural lenses, a host is expected to ask repeatedly and even insist. The host is supposed to see the context: Is it lunch time? Did s/he have time to eat before leaving her home? Is s/he just feeling too shy to say yes?

On the one hand, this example shows that Nepali people may not express their concerns directly, and on the other it shows that context is very important to human interaction. The participants were expressing their concerns very directly and in great detail, and the context factor—our own limitations in terms of dealing with people of different ethnic and cultural background—seemed undermined, at least from a Nepali perspective.

The purpose of the self-awareness workshop was to discuss issues of racial, sexual and cultural diversity so that participants could gain a better understanding of what they currently believed and could listen to others to become more culturally competent. When I realized that I was coming from a high context culture and was motivated to think in a certain ways, I saw things differently. At first this understanding made me realize how sensitive the issue of diversity was in the U.S. Secondly, the level of awareness among the participants on



Mr. Anil Poudel (left) getting pumpkins for a Halloween party with friends Khuvaydo Shoinbekov (middle, from Tajikistan) and Jianqiang Liang (right side, from China). (photo courtesy of Anil Poudel)

the issue of diversity was very encouraging. Many Nepali still suffer discrimination based on a caste system. The caste system is very rigid; people are born into a high caste or a low caste family and they cannot change their status. The people of the lowest caste suffer physical and psychological hardships from social discrimination. They are treated as untouchables and are involved in low paying and less-desired jobs. Though caste discrimination is illegal, the implementation of effective policy is far from complete. Mere laws against caste discrimination are especially ineffective, as it is ingrained in the Hindu religion that is practiced by almost 80% of Nepali. High caste persons in Nepal receive privileges similar to European Americans (the people of white racial makeup) in the U.S. Undoubtedly the privileges in Nepal are more conspicuous. However, the level of awareness on these issues is minimal in Nepal as compared to the level of awareness on racial issues in the U.S.

The encounter at the workshop has made me think in many different ways. On reflection, I think my ideas about the U.S. participants were biased by the feeling that Nepali people were emotionally stronger than them. However, as I became aware of my own cultural perceptions, I admired the level of awareness about racial and ethnic issues among the participants. The learning experience at the school and the experience of living in the U.S. have encouraged me to challenge my own biases pertaining to my initial reactions to the workshop. The experience has broadened my knowledge base and has helped me to become more culturally competent.

Alumni News and Recent Talk Programs

Mr. Peetambar Kuswaha returned from his Master's degree study at Purdue University in January 2008, and began working as Program Officer for Heifer International's regional Chitwan office in February 2008. Heifer International has been in Nepal for over a decade, and works to provide micro-loans, and especially "loans" of goats and buffalo, to village farmers. For more information, see www.hpinepal.org.np

On March 20, the Nepal Association of Humphrey Alumni (NAHF) held a talk program on "Current Trend and Future Challenges in Constituent Assembly," by constitutional law expert, Mr. Bhimarjun Acharya at the USEF auditorium.

John Narayan Parajuli, a Partnerships in Undergraduate Learning Scholarship (PLUS) alumnus, is currently with the UN Mission in Nepal in Pokhara working as a Civil Affairs Officer. He has recently been offered a Erasmus Mundus Journalism scholarship to study in a Master's course (2 years) that will take him to: Denmark (University of Aarhus), Holland (University of Amsterdam) and UK (University of Swansea, Swansea, Wales).

Dr. Minendra Rijal (Fulbright MA scholar 1987-1989) and Dr. Arzu Deuba (former

member of the Fulbright Commission Board) were elected to Nepal's Constituent Assembly in April 2008. The Constituent Assembly has been charged with the task of writing a fresh constitution for Nepal over the next two years, and with governing the country in this transition phase.

Dr. Sienna Craig, Dartmouth University (Fulbright Student Scholar 1995) recently had her book based on her experiences in Mustang, *Horses Like Lightning: A Story of Passage Through the Himalayas* (Boston, MA: Wisdom Publications) launched by the Rubin Museum in New York City. This is a work—"by turns cultural exploration and memoir – of a young woman's first hand experience of change and continuity in one of the world's most remote regions, through the lens of the horse and 'horse culture.'"

On May 15th, East-West Center Alumni Association celebrated the annual EWC Day by distributing education kits to the children of Bal Bhojan (Food for education program) at Yatkha Bahal. The President of Bal Bhojan, Dr. Shuddh S. Rauniyar welcomed the alumni and expressed his appreciation for their contribution. He then guided alumni to see the

dining house where the children are provided free lunch after attending classes. The children sang a group song in our honor and President Dr. Shankar Sharma gave an inspiring pep talk to the children (thanks to Mr. Kiran Raj Joshi, Secretary of the EWC Alumni Association of Nepal for this synopsis). See photos...

Mr. Michael J. Piech, Fulbright Student of film studies, spoke on his research topic, "Nepali Commercial Film and Political Determination: A Comparative Study Among Young Adults Residing in Urban and Rural Areas of the Central Development Region," at a Fulbright Forum on June 11.

On June 17, Ms. Charis F. Boke, Fulbright Student of Anthropology, presented a Fulbright Forum on her research over the past ten months: "Aniconic Worship: Representational Systems and Human Interaction."

One of the last Fulbright Fora of the season, appropriately with the onset of monsoon, Mr. Tyler G. McMahon, Fulbright Student of Economics, spoke on "Rainwater Harvesting in Kathmandu: Benefits, Costs, Obstacles, and Opportunities – An Economic Perspective" on June 23.



East-West Center Alumni Association of Nepal sharing lunch on the Annual East-West Center Day. (photo by Kiran Raj Joshi)



EWC Alumni President Dr. Shankar Sharma speaking with students of Bal Bhojan. (photo Kiran Raj Joshi)



American Student Scholar Justin Eure with Khumbu children (photo J. Eure)

An Address to Fellow Alumni on Fulbright Day, 2008

Mr. Sujeev Shakya allowed me to reprint here his brief remarks at the Ambassador's Residence on June 6, in case some alumni in Nepal missed the event, and for the benefit of alumni much further afield. Sujeev was a Humphrey Fellow in 2002, and is a member of the Nepal Association of Humphrey Fellows.

It is a great honor and privilege to be here this evening. Thank you for being given this opportunity to share some of my thoughts on the role of US program alumni in the context of the historical transitioning of the Nepali state. I am aware of the time constraints therefore I would like to talk about just five issues.

Firstly, Nepal has been a country of individual brilliance but collectively we malfunction brilliantly. When we look around this gathering here this evening, one would wonder how on earth that a country that has such luminaries who have shone in their own fields reel under constant state of confusion and lack of sense of direction? With no dearth of change-agents, why change is not taking place for the better?

With Nepal entering a new era, an 'open moment' is again presented to us where we can all contribute not only individually but perhaps collectively in defining a state that will not only bring about growth, but growth that is equitable and sustainable. We have here an opportunity to define how a federal structure would be put into place, or how different constituencies will share national resources, or how the communities that have been left out for years will be included in the national mainstream, while at the same time ensuring that the nation is not fragmented on the basis of ethnicity or identity.

Secondly, the challenge will be to build a pluralistic society. One of my biggest

takeaways from my Humphrey year was an experience of pluralism. I observed and learnt that pluralism is one of the hallmarks of US society. A republican state should bring about variety in thoughts as well as in thought processes. The challenge will be to take these in the right spirit. Consensus is utopian, therefore, it would be important to build a society where more than a single perspective is respected. This means that we will have to become good listeners, which we are not (and surely I am not hinting at those who are not listening to me right now!). Amongst the many leadership traits, it is always said that listening is one that leaders cannot ignore and perhaps the Nepali leaders in all fields have ignored this for too long. The prosperity of the state-in-the-making would largely depend on how much we will be able to embrace pluralism and appreciate multiple perspectives.

Thirdly, the debates are not only going to hot up—be it on ethnic representation or on sharing resources—but there are good chances that these debates may lead to protracted confrontation. Therefore, keeping vigil on the processes will be one of the biggest challenges in the coming years and of course not limited to the period in which constitution is drafted. We will not have much time for experimentation. We will not have much time for trial and error. Globally, the coming few years are going to be trying in the context of the rising food and energy prices. Having suspended its development and fiscal agenda for

the past couple of years, Nepal will have to do more to be able to ensure that social inequity does not grow.

Fourthly, we have to change the scale of thinking. Nepal is not a small country between two large nations, but a country that is 40th largest in terms of population, and a country linked to two other countries that have two-fifths of the global population and are growing at a rapid pace. It is about thinking big. Be it thinking of Nepal earning more through the sale of hydro-energy than Saudi Arabia earns now through sale of oil, or making Nepal one of the top ten destinations in the world that brings ten million people every year, or being among the world's top five producers of medicinal herbs. Our past was fractured by myopia; our future has to be built around a vision. A vision that will transform each of our lives for the better.

Finally, it is time for collective efforts and partnerships. Partnerships between various players that would like to see Nepal transform for the better. Partnerships between groups and organizations that will pursue small issues that can bring big changes. Partnerships that will create opportunities and benefit our population at large. The starting point could be for all the US Alumni organizations here in Nepal to pick up a cause, work on it collectively, and produce far reaching transformation. I would like to end with a quote from Buddha, "Everything Changes, Nothing Remains Without Change."

The Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal: The need for rejuvenation

Bihari Krishna Shrestha, a FAAN member

The 600 plus strong list of the Fulbright Alumni, the composite category of Nepali scholars who studied in the US under the Fulbright educational exchange, the Hubert Humphrey Fellowship, and East West Center programs, reads like a “who is who” in the Nepali world of academia, politics, administration and business. The three programs, which have a history of four decades or so in Nepal, have together offered some of the most coveted opportunities for the best and brightest of the country to study in the most advanced seat of learning in the world, the United States of America. Obviously, the Nepali Fulbright alumni represent a major pool of talent and capabilities in a wide diversity of disciplines that have direct bearing on our national development.

Inspired by the possibility that Nepali society could benefit immensely from an organization of such alumni, the Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal (FAAN), the organization of the returnees from the Fulbright exchange program only, was established in 1991 and functions under a constitution framed in 1996. Fittingly, the organization has been tasked with 11 different objectives that include exchange of information and expertise on educational, scientific, technological, social, economic, cultural, political and other environmental and development matters, promoting research, academic growth and professional standards amongst its members and offering consultative services on matters of development. Without question, these are areas in which the alumni could

best contribute, based on their professional studies, as well as on the challenges that all of them obviously faced in trying to translate their expertise into meaningful development performance towards the modernization of this chronically poor and traditional society.

However, these laudable goals notwithstanding, the “Fulbrighters” have not been even half as bright in meeting them. While there has been rather fierce competition as in the last attempted Fulbright Alumni Association of Nepal Board election, it is hard to see what could have motivated alumni to run for the Board. By and large, the FAAN has for many years been working more as a club of well-placed US returnees who have the resources to afford a self-paying get together that seems to mostly occur when a US ambassador is newly arriving or leaving. Apparently, lately, even that has become restrictive, although free, with invitations selectively issued to members and guests. While there are over three hundred Fulbright alumni presently around in the country, only some 130 of them are FAAN members who rarely come together in full strength. The largest of their gathering is the annual Fulbright Day reception normally hosted by the US Ambassador at her or his residence.

The last FAAN annual general meeting (AGM) could not be formally held due to lack of quorum, with only some 30 members being in attendance. The Executive Committee apparently has had problems holding a meeting even to appoint an election committee

properly. While the executive committee should have presented its report to the AGM in a more organized manner, that is, a written report endorsed by the executive committee and circulated in advance, what actually transpired in the last attempted AGM was a lackadaisical affair at best. An extempore brief speech by the president was followed by a handwritten brief report read out by the secretary and a similar presentation of accounts by the treasurer. There was no debate worth the name, and the meeting soon broke up for the rather lavish snacks and hot and cold drinks that awaited them downstairs in the courtyard.

In brief, given the high ideals that had inspired FAAN's creation in the first place, there is an urgent need for injecting a new vigor in the functioning of the organization whose members are, after all, counted among the elites in this chronically underdeveloped country. Although the country went through many trials and tribulations between 1991 and 2008, there has hardly been an occasion when the FAAN professionals were required to come together to share their rich insights about them. While such initiatives would have contributed to fostering a sense of special professional bond among the FAAN members, deservedly, it would also have gone on to establish the organization as an important dialogue partner in national debates on contemporary political and developmental issues. It is along this line that the rejuvenation of the organization is urgently needed.

This task obviously falls on the incumbent leadership, despite the fact that it has already completed its tenure some seven months ago and has only a caretaker status at best. For this, a catalytic input from the Fulbright Commission, which has been generously hosting and supporting the organization all these years and in many ways, would go a long way in helping FAAN acquire a new sense of purpose much needed particularly at the present juncture of the country's history.

Backpage: Fulbright Day 2008



Ms. Usha Nepal, Ms. Rupa Joshi, Dr. Jagadish C. Pokharel, and Mrs. Pokharel.



Mr. Damodar Gautam, Mr. Yog P. Upadhyay, and Mr. Yogendra Purush



Fulbright Senior Specialist Dr. George McLemore and Mr. Yamal C. Rajbhandary



Dr. Mark Turin, Ms. Sara Shneiderman, and Dr. Pratyoush Onta



Mr. Suman Sijapati, Dr. Shakti Rana, and Dr. Bijaya K.C.



Mr. Sudyumna Dahal, Ms. Beth Robertson, and Ambassador Powell



Dr. Sangita Rayamajhi, Ms. Jharna Joshi, Mr. Amod Bhattarai, Mr. Sudhir Mahat, and Mr. Pratap Nakarmi



New Fulbright grantees Ms. Anita Shrestha, Ms. Sagun Basnet, Ms. Tripti S. Bhattarai, Ms. Dovan Rai, and Fulbright Commission Board member Ms. Christina Monson



American Fulbright Student Scholars Mr. Ajay Pillarisetti, Ms. Beth Robertson, Mr. Scott Sorrell, Ms. Charis Boke, Mr. Tyler McMahon



Current American and Nepali Fulbrighters
 1st row – Mr. Keshav Sahi/Ms. Dovan Rai/Ms. Sagun Basnet/AMB Powell
 2nd row – Ms. Anita Sherstha/Ms. Sangeeta Mishra/Ms. Tripti Shrestha Bhattarai
 3rd row – Dr. Peter Moran/Mr. Kishor Rajbhandari/Mr. Tyler McMahon/Mr. Justin Eure/Mr. Ajay Pillarisetti/Mr. Bal Krishna Sharma/Ms. Charis Boke
 4th row – Mr. Sam Mowe/Ms. Beth Robertson/Ms. Mary A. Prude/Mr. Sudyumna Dahal



New Fulbright grantees, leaving for the US in July and August 2008: Ms. Tripti S. Bhattarai, Ms. Sagun Basnet, Ms. Sangeeta Mishra, Ms. Anita Shrestha, Ms. Dovan Rai