



Hindutva and the American Dream: *A Case for Inclusion and Representation*

**- A Critical Counter-Narrative to the Report
'Hindutva in America: An Ethnonationalist Threat
to Equality and Religious Pluralism'**



Table of Contents

ABOUT US 3

AMERICAN HINDUS AGAINST DEFAMATION (AHAD)..... 3

HINDUPACT 3

TATTWA.AI 3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5

ANALYSIS OF SENTIMENTS, BIASES, EMOTIONS, INTENT, AND HATE IN *HINDUTVA IN AMERICA* REPORT 7

SUMMARY OF THE REPORT 8

HINDUTVA IN AMERICA REPORT AT-A-GLANCE 8

NEWS, OPINION, OR RESEARCH? 9

SENTIMENT ANALYSIS 10

BIAS ANALYSIS 17

INTENT ANALYSIS 19

EMOTIONS ANALYSIS..... 21

STORY FRAMING..... 23

ORDER OF INFORMATION 26

LANGUAGE AND WORD CHOICE ANALYSIS 29

KEY PHRASES ANALYSIS..... 32

ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS ANALYSIS 35

LOGICAL FALLACIES AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS 37

MISLEADING STATISTICS, OMISSION, AND CHERRY-PICKING ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK 39

EUPHEMISMS AND DYSPHEMISMS ANALYSIS 41

FALSE EQUIVALENCE 43

MEDIA BIAS..... 45

MEDIA SOURCE BIAS 47

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTES 49

A SYSTEMATIC RESPONSE TO “HINDUTVA IN AMERICA: AN ETHNONATIONALIST THREAT TO EQUALITY AND RELIGIOUS PLURALISM” 60

ATTACK ON HINDU DHARMA AND PRACTICING HINDUS BY PROXY 61

A QUESTION OF CREDIBILITY: AFFILIATION ANALYSIS OF REPORT AUTHORS 63

RESPONSE TO “HINDUTVA NETWORKS IN THE U.S.” 65

THE NEXUS OF ADVERSARIAL ECOSYSTEM 68

WHY THESE ACTORS TARGET HINDUS 71

RESPONSE TO “TRANSPORTING HINDUTVA FROM INDIA TO AMERICA” 74

RESPONSE TO “MAINTAINING LINKS WITH HINDUTVA GROUPS IN INDIA” 76

RESPONSE TO “HINDUTVA LEVERAGES AMERICANS' UNFAMILIARITY WITH INDIA” 78

RESPONSE TO “EIGHT PRIORITIES OF US HINDU ORGANIZATIONS” CLAIM 80

RESPONSE TO “PROMOTING HINDU NATIONALISM” 84

RESPONSE TO “ANTI-MUSLIM AND ANTI-MINORITY ATTITUDES” 87

RESPONSE TO “WHITEWASHING OF HISTORY AND INTIMIDATION CAMPAIGNS AGAINST SCHOLARS” 89

RESPONSE TO “ERRONEOUSLY CONFLATING ‘HINDU,’ ‘INDIAN,’ AND ‘HINDUTVA’” 91

RESPONSE TO “PROMOTING HINDU ETHNONATIONALISM” 93

RESPONSE TO: “REFRAMING CRITICISM OF HINDU ETHNONATIONALISM AS ‘HINDUPHOBIA’” 95

RESPONSE TO “INFLUENCING AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND LOBBYING POLITICIANS” 97

RESPONSE TO “ATTACK CAMPAIGNS AGAINST PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS” 101

RESPONSE TO “PROMOTING ISLAMOPHOBIA AT THE LOCAL LEVEL” 103

RESPONSE TO “DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITIES WITHIN THE INDIAN AMERICAN DIASPORA” 105

RESPONSE TO THE “DISMANTLING GLOBAL HINDUTVA CONFERENCE” 108

RESPONSE TO "HINDUTVA CAPITALIZES ON AMERICAN CULTURE WARS" 113

CRITICAL REBUTTALS TO REPORT'S RECOMMENDATIONS..... 115

IMPACT OF CANCEL CULTURE 118

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY AND ANTI-HINDU BIAS 121

HINDUPACT DEMANDS..... 124

APPENDIX 128

HINDUHATE BIAS DETECTOR METHODOLOGY..... 129

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE TABLES 135

About Us

American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD)

Founded in 1997, American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD) is the world's first and most prominent Hindu organization dedicated to combating defamation. Started as an initiative of the World Hindu Council of America (VHPA), part of HinduPACT, AHAD actively monitors mass media, products, public places, and other media to ensure the respectful and accurate representation of Hindu dharma, culture, images, and icons. AHAD documents and responds to Hinduphobia. Since the inception of AHAD, hundreds of thousands of Hindus have participated in various advocacy activities led by AHAD. AHAD AI uses purpose-built, sophisticated AI tools to detect and counter Hindu hatred.

Check website more information about AHAD and its groundbreaking AI initiatives



Visit
www.ahadinfo.org for
more details

HinduPACT

The Hindu Policy Research and Advocacy Collective (HinduPACT) was established in 2020 as an initiative of the World Hindu Council of America (VHPA), dedicated to advocating for and researching issues concerning the American Hindu community. HinduPACT promotes human rights, voter education, and policies affecting American Hindus, aiming for peace and understanding through informed policy initiatives and grassroots advocacy. On January 1, 2025, HinduPACT became an independent organization.



Visit <https://hindupact.org>
for more details.

Tattwa.ai



Tattwa.ai is an independent technology company specializing in applications of Artificial Intelligence for the betterment of humanity. Tattwa.ai is an initiative of Dharma Universe LLC. The Hindu Universe, the very first Hindu website is another initiative of Dharma Universe.

Visit <https://tattwa.ai> for details.

Get in Touch:

Email: ahad@hindupact.org

Phone: (858) 866-9661

Website: <https://ahadinfo.org>

X: @AHADHindu

YouTube: @HinduPACTVideos



HINDUTVA

"HINDU + TATTVA" IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDU DHARMA



THE HINDU DHARMA

- *Ekam Sat Vipraha Bahudha Vadanti*

'Truth is One, Sages call It by different names' – The unity or oneness of the destination (or goal)

- *Ayam Bandhurayam Neti Ganana Laghuchetasam Udaracharitanam tu Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*

Only small men discriminate saying: One is a relative; the other is a stranger. For those who live magnanimously the entire world constitutes but a family.

- *Aano bhadra krtavo yantu vishwatah*

Let noble thoughts come to me from all directions



DEFINING TATTVA

Tattva (/ˈtʌtvə/) is a Sanskrit word meaning essence, 'thatness', 'principle', 'reality' or 'truth'. According to various Indian schools of philosophy, a tattva is an element or aspect of reality.



HINDUTVA, LEGALLY

As defined by the Supreme Court of India:

"Ordinarily, Hindutva is understood as a way of life or a state of mind and is not to be equated with or understood as religious Hindu fundamentalism... it is a fallacy and an error of law to proceed on the assumption... that the use of words Hindutva or Hinduism per se depicts an attitude hostile to all persons practising any religion other than the Hindu religion..."



HINDUTVA IS PERSONAL

A quest to better ourselves to follow the dharma in all aspects of our lives; Acceptance of everyone regardless of the perceived differences; Standing up for justice as Shree Krishna directed Arjun to do in the Bhagwad Gita.



HINDUTVA IS HINDU IDENTITY

Hindutva is based on the dharmic principles that originated in ancient India. It is "identity" of all those who identify with these dharmic principles and dharmic way of life.



HINDUTVA IS UNIVERSAL

Hindu *Sanskriti* or Culture encompassing social behaviors, norms, knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, and capabilities. Accommodating universal diversity in Hindu fold is what defines Hindu tattva (essence) – the Hindutva. Neither in ancient Bharat, nor in today's context, Hindutva can be linked to any national ethnicity. Indeed, there is evidence that the Hindu thought and *sanskriti* spanned from Eurasia to Indo-Pacific



- A Hindu view of what Hindu *dharma* and *sanskriti* means
- Diversity in all respects, including how you worship
- Acceptance of all, regardless of gender, race, religion, ethnicity and national origin
- Not a political philosophy but dharma or value based political approach

Hindutva was first defined in 1890s

v.2.02

Executive Summary

I. Introduction: Problematizing the Framework of the Rutgers Report

This analysis conducted by American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD), an initiative of HinduPACT, provides a critical evaluation of the report issued by the Rutgers University Center for Security, Race, and Rights’ report, titled “Hindutva in America: An Ethnonationalist Threat to Equality and Religious Pluralism.” Utilizing methods such as natural language processing (NLP) and textual analysis, the assessment indicates that the Rutgers report does not constitute neutral academic scholarship; rather, it advances a politicized and ideologically charged narrative. The report characterizes Hindutva as an ethno-religious threat imported from India, portraying Hindu-American organizations as extensions of Indian political parties. Nevertheless, this depiction lacks historical robustness and is overly simplistic analytically. The report demonstrates a malicious attitude toward the Hindu faith, diaspora identity, and civil society activities, categorizing all three as suspicious through a reductive and hostile lens.

II. NLP Analysis: Sentiment, Framing, and Structural Bias

An NLP-based audit uncovers significant linguistic bias in the Rutgers report, with the term “Hindutva” appearing over 200 times in mostly negative contexts, conflated with fascism, violence, and extremism. This is reinforced by the frequent use of dysphemistic adjectives such as “radical,” “supremacist,” and “militant” near references to Hindu organizations. Meanwhile, actors and institutions opposing Hindutva are framed in favorable or legitimizing terms, producing a stark lexical asymmetry. This rhetorical strategy suggests a predetermined agenda rather than academic neutrality.

Furthermore, the report demonstrates framing bias by characterizing legitimate civic institutions such as Hindu temples, cultural associations, and student organizations as transnational political fronts. The lack of similar critique towards other ethnic or religious diasporas suggests a selective deployment of scrutiny. The report also fails to distinguish between metaphysical, philosophical, and political expressions of Hindu life, violating the standards of intellectual rigor and comparative analysis.

III. The Counter-Narrative: Civilizational Context and Cultural Integrity

The Rutgers report fundamentally misconstrues Hindutva as a distortion of Hinduism rather than a reflection of its civilizational ethos in modern political contexts. This dichotomy reflects a Western epistemic tendency to delegitimize non-Abrahamic political identities. Hindutva, as articulated by Savarkar and other Hindu thinkers, aims to preserve Hindu dignity, sovereignty, and pluralism within national and global frameworks. The depiction of Hindu civic engagement—whether through temple-building, education, or advocacy—as “ethnonationalist penetration” marginalizes constitutionally protected activities and suppresses the legitimate public expression of Hindu identity.

Diasporic organizations such as HinduPACT, the Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh (HSS), Sewa International, VHPA, HAF, and CoHNA serve vital cultural and humanitarian roles. Their depiction as covert political groups is both inaccurate and defamatory. Groups like AHAD have consistently challenged religious stereotypes and cultural vilification, working to preserve pluralism and oppose Hinduphobia in American conversations.

IV. Countering the Rutgers Report’s Recommendations

Among the most troubling aspects of the Rutgers report are its recommendations, which urge universities to cut ties with Hindu organizations, label them as foreign agents, and examine their finances closely. These proposals—

reminiscent of McCarthy-era tactics—pose a serious threat to the civil liberties of Hindu Americans. They aim to criminalize cultural continuity and political advocacy based on ethnic or ideological associations. No other diaspora is subject to such treatment. These recommendations would institutionalize discrimination under the guise of safeguarding pluralism.

V. Recommendations from a Hindu and Hindutva Standpoint

To restore academic balance and protect civil rights, full transparency about the authorship and funding of the Rutgers report must be mandated. Federal investigations into Title VI violations are justified when Hinduphobia is widespread in institutional environments. Academic programs in South Asian and Religious Studies should be assessed for faculty diversity, curricular neutrality, and the inclusion of scholars grounded in Hindu practice and philosophy. Departments that endorse ideologically hostile events like the Dismantling Global Hindutva conference should be subject to oversight or receivership if they do not comply with anti-discrimination standards.

VI. Conclusion

The Rutgers report fails both as scholarship and policy guidance. It flattens complex identities, vilifies an entire tradition, and promotes recommendations that contravene civil liberties. In contrast, a Hindu civilizational approach affirms the dharmic principles of plurality, justice, and social harmony. Academic inquiry must go beyond stereotypes and ideological simplifications to genuinely understand Hindu realities in the diaspora and beyond.

Note: The following is an analysis of the report, "Hindutva in America: An Ethnonationalist Threat to Equality and Religious Plurality," published by the Rutgers Center for Security, Race and Rights, produced by American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD), a HinduPACT initiative. For brevity, the report will hereafter be referred to as the "Hindutva in America" report.



Analysis of Sentiments, Biases, Emotions, Intent, and Hate in *Hindutva in America* Report




Summary of the Report

The *Hindutva in America* report, published by the Rutgers Center for Security, Race and Rights, alleges that U.S.-based Hindu organizations are fostering a transnational Hindu nationalist movement that undermines American pluralism and promotes religious discrimination. It claims these groups propagate an "ethnonationalist" ideology tied to India's RSS and BJP, spread anti-Muslim sentiment, and attack academic freedom.

The report asserts that Hindu nationalist actors exploit cultural and political opportunities in the U.S. to influence policy and public discourse, conflating Hindu and Indian identities. It recommends actions such as ending partnerships with Hindu groups, applying sanctions, and regulating these organizations as foreign agents. Critics argue that the report itself is ideologically biased, selectively sourced, and part of a larger campaign of "Hinduphobia" that delegitimizes legitimate civic advocacy by Hindu-Americans.

Hindutva in America Report At-A-Glance

This word cloud emphasizes the phrases that are most prominently featured in the report.



News, Opinion, or Research?

The document is formally presented as a research report, published by the Rutgers Center for Security, Race, and Rights (2025), with institutional branding and an academic tone. However, when treated as an academic report, it blurs the line between objective research and activist opinion through its framing, language, and sourcing. This document is a purported research report but, in reality, functions as a structured "hit piece" against Hindutva, Hindu Americans, and Hindu civil society.

Here is why, based on the internal validation:

- Framing Bias: Employs the language of "threat," "fascism," and "hate networks" without a balanced scholarly evaluation.
- Source Bias: Depends heavily on adversarial activist scholars and media outlets. Nearly no genuine Hindu voices or counter-arguments are referenced.
- Mischaracterization: Deliberately conflates religious, cultural, and political identities to create guilt by association.
- Intent: Strongly persuasive and narrative-driven, with a clear ideological motive.

Omission of Context:

The report systematically neglects the lived experiences of Hindu persecution and the valid civic role of Hindu Americans.

Despite its veneer of academic rigor, "Hindutva in America: An Ethnonationalist Threat to Equality and Religious Pluralism" is not an impartial research report but a carefully constructed hit piece aimed at vilifying the Hindu American community. The document systematically employs biased framing, selective sourcing, and mischaracterization to promote a narrative of fear and hostility. It conflates Hindu religious, cultural, and civic expression with extremism, depicting benign activities like Yoga Day celebrations, temple construction, and educational advocacy as components of a sinister global conspiracy.

Throughout, the report omits authentic Hindu voices while heavily citing partisan activists and antagonistic scholars, breaching fundamental standards of balanced academic inquiry. Its frequent use of inflammatory rhetoric, terms such as "fascism," "hate networks," and "supremacist," exposes its polemical intent. Most notably, it disregards the historical and contemporary context of Hindu persecution, denying the community's right to participate in civic life and cultural preservation without suspicion. This document does not aim to enlighten or inform but rather to incite fear and hostility toward Hindu Americans under the false pretense of defending pluralism.

Sentiment Analysis

The Hindutva in America report exhibits a uniformly negative tone, extreme Hinduphobia risk, and systematically omits Hindu-centric perspectives. It fails key analytical precision standards when evaluated through a Hindu-centric lens. The structural and visual design of the report further amplifies anti-Hindu sentiment. The table below confirms that the document functions more as an advocacy piece designed to harm the representation of Hindus and Hindutva in U.S. civic life rather than as an unbiased academic analysis.

It heavily employs dysphemisms, misrepresentations, and omission of positive contributions to construct a narrative that reinforces anti-Hindu and anti-India biases. This strong negative sentiment pervades not only the ideological framing but also the policy recommendations, which seek to marginalize Hindu Americans from civic participation and institutional spaces. The report thus serves more as an advocacy piece for exclusionary policies rather than a balanced or constructive contribution to discourse on pluralism or civil rights.

Summary of Key Sentiment Related Indices

The overall sentiment of the 'Hindutva in America' report, as computed through a weighted analysis of its tone towards Hinduism (HSS), Hindutva (HTSS), and India (ISS), is markedly hostile, with a score of 4.67 on a 5-point scale, where 5 represents the most extreme negativity. The report systematically portrays Hindu individuals, organizations, and Indian democratic values through a lens of suspicion, vilification, and exclusion.

Index Name	Score (1 = Most Positive to 5 = Most Negative)	Description	Example	Impact
Polarity	5	Overwhelmingly negative polarity toward Hinduism, Hindutva, and India. The tone is consistently adversarial, with little to no balanced or neutral treatment of Hindu-centric perspectives. Negative framing, stereotypes, and selective omission dominate the narrative.	Hindutva is a fascist ideology responsible for systematic oppression of minorities in both India and abroad.	The strong negative polarity reinforces anti-Hindu and anti-Hindutva narratives, contributes to stigmatization of Hindu organizations, and may fuel institutional discrimination and bias against the Hindu-American community in academic, civic, and policy spaces.

Hindu Visibility Index (HVI)	5	Hindu voices or pro-Hindu organizations are minimally represented or presented negatively.	Mentions of Hindu organizations like VHPA, HSS, HinduPACT - usually framed critically.	Severely diminishes authentic Hindu representation.
Narrative Shift Index (NSI)	5	Article begins with a seemingly academic tone but shifts toward a strong negative advocacy stance midway.	Section 1 uses a “research” tone; sections 2 onward promote advocacy and policy actions targeting Hindu organizations.	Creates false appearance of objectivity, increases bias perception.
Hinduphobia Risk Score (HRS)	5	Multiple HinduHateRules4.xlsx tropes present; the article uses ideological misrepresentations and false equivalence repeatedly.	“Hindutva mirrors Nazi ideology,” “Hindu nationalism is a threat to minorities.”	High risk of reinforcing Hinduphobia in public discourse.
Hindutva Alignment Score (HAS)	5	Article strongly opposes Hindutva and distorts its philosophy.	Equates Hindutva with fascism and violence, ignoring its cultural and nationalist roots.	Misinforms readers about Hindutva, fuels prejudice.
India Sentiment Score (ISS)	5	Repeatedly presents India in a negative light, especially under current political leadership.	Frames India’s government as authoritarian and exclusionary without balanced perspectives.	Reinforces anti-India sentiment in Western academia/policy.

Hindu Sentiment Score (HSS)	5	Negative portrayal of Hinduism, Hindu organizations, and community advocacy.	Highlights caste discrimination and social ills with no acknowledgment of reform or pluralistic values.	Fuels stereotypes and promotes one-sided narratives.
Hindutva Sentiment Score (HTSS)	5	Highly negative depiction of Hindutva ideology and affiliated groups.	Calls for sanctions and FARA registration based on unproven allegations.	Promotes policy actions that could harm Hindu civil rights.
Analytical Precision Score (APS)	2	The article provides a large number of references, but many are ideologically aligned and selectively cited.	Heavy reliance on IAMC, Sabrang, HfHR sources without critical evaluation or balance.	Undermines academic credibility despite structured presentation.
Hindu Analytical Precision Score (HAPS)	5	Hindu-centric scholarship and perspectives are almost entirely omitted.	No citations from Hindu dharma scholars or mainstream Hindu organizations.	Profound analytical bias against Hindu viewpoints.
Narrative Accuracy	4	Selective facts used; significant omissions and one-sided narratives prevail.	No coverage of positive civic contributions by Hindu organizations; overemphasis on caste and violence narratives.	Skews public understanding and academic discourse.


Semantic Similarity Scores	High alignment with prior anti-Hindu academic and activist literature (high similarity).	Many statements match patterns seen in “Dismantling Global Hindutva” and IAMC reports.	Indicates narrative is derivative, not novel; driven by activist agendas.	
Tone	5	Overall hostile tone toward Hindus, Hindutva, and India.	“Hindutva is a threat to democracy” — stated without qualification or counterpoint.	Deepens negative perception, legitimizes targeting Hindu groups.
Intensity	5	Strong, urgent, and emotive language dominates.	Calls for government sanctions and surveillance of Hindu orgs.	Drives extreme responses in readers and policymakers.
Consistency	5	Uniformly negative from beginning to end.	No balancing sections or acknowledgment of positive Hindu contributions.	Reinforces confirmation bias; lacks academic balance.
Omission of Positive References	Severe	No positive references to Hindu contributions, pluralism, or advocacy.	Ignores Sewa International’s humanitarian work, HinduPACT civic initiatives, etc.	Presents an unfairly negative picture of Hindu civil society.
Misattribution Score	5	Multiple instances of guilt-by-association and sweeping generalizations.	Blames all Hindu orgs in America for Indian domestic politics without proof.	Legitimizes collective punishment and discrimination.

Use of Stereotypes	Extensive (10+ clear examples documented)	E.g., “Hindutva is inherently violent,” “upper-caste networks control Hindu advocacy.”	Reinforces harmful stereotypes against the global Hindu diaspora.	
Visual / Structural Sentiment	5	Structure reinforces negativity: negative headlines, unbalanced visual elements (e.g., word choices, quotes, captions).	Section headings emphasize “extremism,” “threat,” “violence.”	Steers reader perception toward hostility throughout the document.


Visual / Structural Sentiment

Page	Visual/Structural Element	Sentiment Score	Explanation
Cover	Bulldozer image	5	Symbolically links Hindutva with authoritarian violence.
3	Modi-Trump image	4	Suggests alignment with controversial global politics.
20	Modi doing yoga	3	Neutral image but repurposed in context of propaganda.
30	Parade with Indian flag	4	Framed within a narrative of aggression.
36	DGH Conference poster	5	Visual promotes the idea of dismantling Hindu identity, encourages physical violence towards RSS volunteers
40	Billboard “Stop bigotry against Hindus”	4	Used to imply disinformation rather than genuine grievance.
41	Akhand Bharat map	5	Presented to suggest imperialist Hindutva ambitions.
46	Hindutva family of hate diagram	5	Graphically asserts criminal-like association.
55	Page of endnotes	3	Mostly academic references, selectively interpreted.
63	Endnotes with links to advocacy media	4	Skewed sourcing reinforces narrative control.

Score (1 Favorable — 5 Hostile)



Score (1 Favorable — 5 Hostile)



Bias Analysis

This document consistently exhibits anti-Hindutva and anti-Hindu nationalist bias. It frames the Hindu identity primarily through a political and extremist lens, omits favorable counterpoints, employs charged visuals, and recycles negative tropes without presenting mainstream Hindu perspectives. The rhetoric is more polemical than analytical.

Biased Statement	Subjects	Sentiment Towards the Subject	Sentiment Category	Bias Classification	Bias Towards Hindus	Bias Rating (1–5)
"Hindutva is an ethnonationalist threat to equality"	Hindutva	Negative	Explicit	Loaded Language, Sensationalism	Negative	5
"Hindutva groups foster anti-Muslim bigotry in America"	Hindutva groups	Negative	Explicit	Loaded Language, Mischaracterization, Appeal to Emotion	Negative	5
"U.S. politicians are manipulated by Hindu nationalist groups"	Hindu-American organizations	Negative	Comparative	False Equivalence, Appeal to Emotion	Negative	4
"Hindutva ideology promotes violence"	Hindutva	Negative	Explicit	Loaded Language, Mischaracterization	Negative	5
"Charities such as Sewa International are conduits for Hindutva influence"	Hindu charities	Negative	Source	False Authority, Mischaracterization	Negative	4
"Hindu nationalist"	Hindu-American	Negative	Contextual	Hasty Generalization,	Negative	5

groups spread caste discrimination to the U.S."	organizations, Caste			Mischaracterization		
"Hindu festivals are used to promote extremist nationalism"	Hindu festivals, Hindutva	Negative	Cultural	Loaded Language, Sensationalism	Negative	4
"Hindutva organizations aim to silence U.S.-based scholars"	Hindu-American organizations	Negative	Explicit	Ad Hominem Attacks, Mischaracterization	Negative	5
"RSS is a fascist paramilitary organization influencing U.S. Hindu groups"	RSS, Hindu-American groups	Negative	Historical, Comparative	False Equivalence, Loaded Language	Negative	5
"Hindu-American advocacy of anti-caste laws is a cover to protect caste hierarchies"	Hindu-American groups, Caste	Negative	Lexical, Contextual	Cherry-picking, Mischaracterization	Negative	4

Intent Analysis

The Hindutva in America report clearly shows an intent to marginalize and discredit Hindu-American civic identity. Utilizing charged language, misleading historical comparisons, and selective omissions, the report frames Hindutva, Indian identity, and Hindu-American organizations as threats to U.S. pluralism while ignoring balanced views and the positive roles these communities play. Throughout its sections, the report pushes an ideological agenda that aligns with cancel culture tactics and advocates for government scrutiny and exclusion of Hindu advocacy that would not be tolerated for any other faith-based community.

The overall intent score is 5, signaling a strong anti-Hindu bias, with explicit attempts to undermine Hindu perspectives within American civic and academic spheres.

Section-Wise Intent Analysis Summary

Section Title	Identified Goals	Intent Indicators	Counter-Evidence	Intent Score (1–5)
Introduction	Frame Hindutva as an existential threat	Loaded terms, framing Hindu identity negatively	U.S. Hindu groups promote pluralism and civic engagement	5
Historical Context	Tie Hindutva to fascism and authoritarianism	Guilt-by-association with fascism, historical distortion	RSS civic work and cultural pride teachings contradict this	5
Transnational Networks	Portray U.S. Hindu orgs as foreign proxies	Terms like “network of influence”, “foreign agent”	U.S. Hindu orgs operate legally and independently	4
Political Influence	Accuse Hindu groups of manipulating U.S. politicians	Terms like “manipulating political figures”	Political advocacy is a protected civic right	5
Academic Suppression	Portray Hindu groups as silencing scholars	One-sided portrayal of academic disputes	Hindu students seek balanced curricula, not suppression	4

Caste in the U.S.	Frame Hindu groups as enablers of casteism	Terms like “protecting caste privilege”, generalizations	Hindu orgs explicitly oppose caste discrimination	5
Recommendations	Promote deplatforming and governmental restrictions	Calls for FARA registration, deplatforming	Recommendations violate civic rights and equal standards	5

Emotions Analysis

The Hindutva in America report exhibits a consistently hostile and emotionally charged tone. Its use of fear-inducing language (e.g., ethnonationalist threat, RSS as fascist paramilitary, web of foreign proxies) is designed to delegitimize Hindu identity and advocacy in the U.S. The cultural framing is deeply insensitive, erasing the pluralism, civic contributions, and reformist impulses that exist within Hindu-American communities. Our NLP computation-based Emotions Analysis indicates that the report’s dominant emotional tone is one of fear and alarm. It fosters a fear of Hindu American civic engagement and cultural expression.

The secondary emotions stirred by the report include mistrust of American Hindu organizations and community leaders. Moral outrage is framed through misleading comparisons to fascism, caste abuse, and political subversion, while hostility remains implicit throughout, especially in the recommendations for deplatforming and legal targeting.

The report violates norms of academic and civic fairness, promoting institutional discrimination under the guise of human rights advocacy. The overall Emotional Tone Score is 5, indicating a strongly anti-Hindu emotional tone, with an intent to foster hostility and suspicion toward the American Hindu community.

Section-Wise Examples of Emotions:

Section	Emotional Trigger	Emotional Tone Indicators	Cultural Appropriateness	Emotional Tone Score
Introduction	"Ethnonationalist threat," "aligned with global far-right"	Evokes fear and alarm about Hindu civic participation	Highly insensitive — omits Hindu diversity and pluralist civic work	5
Historical Context	"RSS is a fascist paramilitary," "Hindutva’s roots in European fascism"	Provokes disdain and moral outrage toward Hindutva and Hinduism	Deeply insensitive — erases civic and cultural contributions of RSS and Hindu organizations	5
Transnational Networks	"Web of influence," "foreign proxy organizations"	Fosters suspicion and mistrust toward Hindu charities and advocacy	Fails to acknowledge transparency and civic work of U.S. Hindu orgs	4
Political Influence	"Manipulate U.S. politicians," "buy political influence"	Evokes anger toward Hindu-American political participation	Misrepresents constitutionally protected civic engagement	5

Academic Suppression	"Silence scholars," "Hindutva intimidation campaigns"	Encourages sympathy for 'victim' academics , fosters fear of Hindu advocacy	Omits Hindu student and parent rights to academic balance	4
Caste in the U.S.	"Protect caste privilege," "caste apartheid," "violence against Dalits"	Evokes anger and moral condemnation of Hindu-American community	Grossly reductionist — ignores Hindu reform and pluralist caste positions	5
Recommendations	"End partnerships," "sanction Hindu-linked groups," "monitor and deplatform"	Frames Hindu groups as dangerous actors , promotes fear and institutional suspicion	Deeply insensitive — calls for exclusion of Hindu-American civil society	5

Story Framing

The document is structured to depict Hindus and Hindu organizations in a profoundly negative light, employing pervasive selective omission and stereotyping while providing minimal balanced representation. The context of temple destruction and anti-Hindu violence serves as a critical example of omission: the report repeatedly references cherry-picked examples of crimes as “Hindu majoritarian violence” but fails to adequately address the large-scale destruction of Hindu temples in the Indian subcontinent or the global attacks against Hindus.

Story Framing Detailed Analysis

Section	Framing Element	Bias Indicators	Bias Classification	Framing Bias Score (1–5)
Introduction	"Hindutva networks pose a threat to U.S. democracy"	Loaded framing of Hindutva as extremist and subversive	Loaded Framing, Stereotyping	5
Historical Context	"Hindutva ideology traces to fascist movements"	False historical equivalence, omission of indigenous Hindu philosophical roots	Loaded Framing, One-Sided Context	5
Funding Networks	"Charities funnel money to Hindutva-linked violence"	Guilt by association, selective citation of hostile sources	Loaded Framing, Stereotyping	5
Academic Influence	"Scholars opposing Hindutva face harassment"	Selective omission of radical anti-Hindu academic networks and their targeting of Hindu scholars	One-Sided Context, Selective Omission	4
Civic Advocacy	"Hindu organizations aim to infiltrate U.S. politics"	Conspiratorial framing without evidence of unlawful activity	Loaded Framing, Stereotyping	5
Caste Discrimination	"Hindutva organizations deny caste oppression"	Misrepresentation of U.S.-based Hindu organizations' clear stance against caste discrimination	Selective Omission, Loaded Framing	4

Anti-Muslim Narrative	"Hindutva groups spread anti-Muslim hate"	Broad generalization, no balanced representation of Hindu-Muslim interfaith efforts	Loaded Framing, Stereotyping	5
Universities & Hindutva	"Hindutva influence on campus is rising"	Lack of context about actual pro-diversity work of Hindu student groups	One-Sided Context, Stereotyping	4
Conclusion	"U.S. government must act against Hindutva proxies"	Alarmist tone, call for discriminatory policies	Loaded Framing, Selective Omission	5

Contextual Analysis

Key Event/Claim	Context Provided? (Yes/No)	Impact of Missing Context	Bias Classification
"Hindutva linked to global fascism"	No	Distorts Hindutva's indigenous, pluralistic ideological roots	Selective Omission
"Charity networks funding violence"	No	Omits transparency efforts and compliance of U.S. Hindu charities	Selective Omission
"Harassment of academics"	No	Omits documented harassment of Hindu scholars by anti-Hindutva groups	Selective Omission
"Caste discrimination denial"	No	Omits extensive public statements and anti-caste programs by Hindu groups	Selective Omission

"Hindu groups as political proxies"	No	Omits normal civic advocacy rights of ethnic communities in the U.S.	Selective Omission
"Hindu student group activities on campuses"	No	Omits pluralistic, intercultural, and service contributions by Hindu student organizations	Selective Omission
"Temple destruction and anti-Hindu violence"	No	Ignores ongoing violence against Hindus globally and its impact on the diaspora	Selective Omission
"Hindu festivals and culture"	Yes	Balanced representation in isolated mentions	None

Order of Information

The structure and sequencing of Hindutva in America reveal a clear and deliberate bias that systematically leads readers to adopt a negative view of Hindu-American organizations. The report prominently features negative framing through its alarmist title, emotionally charged language, and visuals right from the first page. An Executive Summary describes Hindutva as an “ethnonationalist threat” and conflates Hindu civic engagement with extremism. It emphasizes allegations of extremism and Islamophobia in both the Executive Summary and Introduction.

This framing is repeated throughout the first two sections, which emphasize claims of Islamophobia, transnational threat networks, and political manipulation. Importantly, there are no American Hindu voices or representations of pluralistic civic activity in these early sections. This sequencing tactic shapes readers’ perceptions while omitting a counterbalance. Furthermore, the report’s structure introduces the “priorities” of alleged Hindu nationalist groups framed in hostile language without verification or an opportunity for rebuttal.

The Conclusion compounds this imbalance by reiterating the same allegations while failing to include responses from the communities being maligned. The cumulative effect creates an echo chamber where the framing introduced in the opening pages is systematically reinforced through selection, omission, and structure, leaving readers with an unchallenged and highly biased narrative. This violates both academic and journalistic norms of fair sequencing and balanced perspective.

Section-Wise Order of Information Bias

Section	Sequence of Perspectives	Bias Indicators	Bias Classification	Order of Information Bias Score (1–5)
Executive Summary (pg. 2-4)	Frames Hindutva as a "far-right ethnonationalist threat" in the first sentence; no Hindu-centric or neutral balancing perspective included.	Immediate frontloading of extreme negativity without contextualizing Hindu community diversity.	Frontloading Bias	5
Introduction (pg. 5-6)	Again opens with claim that Hindutva is "far-right," "Hindu supremacy," "ethnonationalism"; Hindu organizations	No Hindu self-representation included; reader primed to view all Hindu civic engagement as sinister.	Frontloading Bias	5

	depicted as vehicles of bigotry.			
Structure & Operation of Sangh (pg. 11-15)	Section titles like <i>"Transporting Hindutva from India to America"</i> and descriptions frame diaspora engagement as conspiratorial.	Selective sequencing avoids mention of humanitarian/cultural activities of these groups.	Selective Emphasis	4
Agendas of U.S.-based Groups (pg. 17-29)	All eight stated "priorities" of the US Hindu organizations presented in hostile language (e.g., <i>"Promoting Hindu Nationalism"</i> , <i>"Spreading anti-Muslim sentiment"</i>).	Hindu organizations' stated civic and cultural missions excluded until after a strongly negative sequence.	One-Sided Context	5
Hindu Nationalist Tactics in U.S. (pg. 31-36)	Focuses solely on allegedly aggressive or unethical tactics; no examination of positive civic contributions or community service.	Omits entirely the well-documented pluralistic activities of Hindu-American organizations.	Delayed Perspective	5
Harms to American Society (pg. 37-47)	Begins this section with <i>"Promoting Islamophobia"</i> and continues with loaded terms throughout; no counterbalancing discussion of pluralism.	Hindu organizations framed as threatening public safety and multiculturalism without presenting rebuttals.	Framing through Sequence	5
Recommendations (pg. 49)	All recommendations based on the prior negative framing; no space given for alternative	Hindu organizations' right to civic participation implicitly delegitimized by	Framing through Sequence	5

	interpretations or constitutional/legal concerns.	ordering of policy demands.		
Glossary (pg. 50-52)	Glossary terms themselves are loaded, e.g., <i>"Hindutva: Far-right political ideology of Hindu supremacy."</i>	Final reinforcement of negative framing; glossary subtly anchors bias through terminology definitions.	Framing through Sequence	5

Language and Word Choice Analysis

A careful analysis of the language used in "Hindutva in America" reveals a rhetorical strategy employing emotionally charged terms, negative framing, and selective omission that crafts a hostile narrative toward American Hindu identity.

The report shows a consistent pattern of using inflammatory and culturally insensitive language to describe Hindu organizations and activities. Terms like “ethnonationalist threat,” “paramilitary RSS,” “indoctrinating Hindu children,” and “Hindutva has Nazi-era links” frequently appear, leading readers to view Hindus and their civic engagement as dangerous. The article employs militarized metaphors (e.g., “weaponizes anti-caste sentiment”) and broad generalizations (e.g., “Hindutva groups fuel discrimination”), fostering fear and distrust. Importantly, there is a lack of positive or neutral language to describe Hindu traditions or interfaith efforts, suggesting an intentional bias aimed at marginalizing American Hindu voices. This pattern of loaded language and rhetorical imbalance not only violates principles of fair academic discourse but also contributes to the systematic 'othering' of Hindu-Americans in civic and cultural spaces, a trend that must be called out and corrected.

Detailed analysis showing how bias affects each section

Section in the Report	Key Phrase or Term	Bias Indicators	Bias Classification	Language Bias Score (1–5)	Page Number(s)
Executive Summary	"ethnonationalist threat"	Loaded language implying inherent danger	Loaded Language, Framing	5	1–2
Executive Summary	"Hindu nationalists capitalize on anti-Muslim discourse"	Suggests opportunism and negative intent	Loaded Language, Negative Framing	5	3
Introduction	"Hindutva is a political formulation"	Implies artificiality and malign design	Negative Framing, Loaded Language	5	6

Structure and Operation of the American Sangh	"paramilitary RSS"	Use of "paramilitary" to invoke violent imagery	Loaded Language, Sensationalism	5	12
Homegrown American Hindutva Organizations	"expanding Hindutva in the United States"	Implies subversive expansion	Negative Framing	4	13
Hindutva Leverages Americans' Unfamiliarity	"leverages Americans' unfamiliarity"	Implies manipulation of ignorance	Loaded Language	5	15
Agendas of U.S.-based Hindu Nationalist Groups	"spreading anti-Muslim sentiment"	Presents a sweeping accusation	Loaded Language, Stereotyping	5	18
Promoting Hindu Nationalism	"indoctrinating Hindu children"	Emotionally charged, suggests brainwashing	Loaded Language, Sensationalism	5	19
Anti-Muslim and Anti-Minority Attitudes	"hegemonic Hindus"	Implies inherent supremacism	Loaded Language, Negative Framing	5	21
Whitewashing History and Intimidation	"targeting South Asian Studies"	Implies coordinated aggression	Loaded Language, Negative Framing	4	22
Erroneously Conflating "Hindu," "Indian," and "Hindutva"	"deliberately excluding Christians, Dalits, and Adivasis"	Loaded accusation of intent	Negative Framing, Sensationalism	5	23–24

Promoting Hindu Ethnonationalism	"Hindutva has Nazi-era links"	Extreme negative association	Loaded Language, Sensationalism, Negative Framing	5	25
Reframing Criticism of Hindu Ethnonationalism	"disingenuously reframing anti-caste and anti-Islamophobia"	Suggests bad-faith intent	Negative Framing, Loaded Language	5	27
Influencing American Foreign Policy	"devotion to whitewashing counterparts' crimes"	Loaded language implying dishonesty	Negative Framing	5	29
Hindu Nationalist Tactics	"ploy to foster alliances with American far-right"	Loaded and speculative	Loaded Language, Sensationalism	5	45
Discrimination Against Minorities	"Hindutva groups fuel discrimination and privilege"	Loaded generalization	Negative Framing, Stereotyping	5	42
Capitalizing on American Culture Wars	"weaponizes anti-caste sentiment"	Militarized metaphor	Sensationalism, Loaded Language	5	46
Recommendations	"protect universities from Hindu nationalist aggressions"	Asserts aggression as a default behavior	Loaded Language, Negative Framing	5	49

Key Phrases Analysis

The Key Phrase Analysis of "Hindutva in America" reveals a systematic use of emotionally charged, ideologically framed, and selectively contextualized terminology that reinforces a negative portrayal of Hindus, Hindutva, and India. The report employs repetition of tropes like “far-right Hindu organizations,” “caste oppression,” and “Islamophobic rhetoric” without providing cultural or historical counterbalance. These phrases are not only disproportionate but also lack nuance, failing to differentiate between cultural Hindu identity and political activism.

Furthermore, positive Hindu identifiers such as dharma, seva (selfless service), and pluralism are conspicuously absent from the range of phrases, suggesting a deliberate omission. This linguistic pattern contributes to a narrative that undermines Hindu civic participation, framing it as inherently dangerous rather than as part of a legitimate assertion of cultural and religious identity within the diaspora.

Phrase	Category (Positive/Negative/Neutral)	Reason for Classification	Source	Page Number(s)
"Hindutva extremism"	Negative	Loaded language misrepresenting Hindutva	Extracted from the article	p. 5, p. 6, p. 19
"Transnational American Hindu Nationalist Organizations"	Negative	Suggests coordinated global extremist movement	Extracted from the article	p. 7
"Erroneously conflating 'Hindu,' 'Indian,' and 'Hindutva'"	Negative	Implies intentional deception by Hindus	Extracted from the article	p. 23
"Hindutva's growing extremism"	Negative	Loaded framing	Extracted from the article	p. 5, p. 6
"Regressive Hindu traditions harm progress"	Negative	Stereotypes Hindu practices	Extracted from the article	p. 21, p. 22

"Hindu revival is a threat to minorities"	Negative	Selective omission, fearmongering	Extracted from the article	p. 2, p. 4
"Hindutva leverages Americans' unfamiliarity with India"	Negative	Assumes manipulation by Hindus	Extracted from the article	p. 15
"Promoting Islamophobia at the local level"	Negative	Loaded accusation, without substantiation	Extracted from the article	p. 38
"Discrimination against minorities within the Indian American diaspora"	Negative	Generalization of Hindu community, without substantiation	Extracted from the article	p. 42
"Hindu nationalist groups often align with far-right Christian nationalism"	Negative	False equivalence	Extracted from the article	p. 9, p. 45
"Capitalizing on American culture wars"	Negative	Implies deliberate exploitation	Extracted from the article	p. 45
"Reframing criticism of Hindu ethnonationalism as Hinduphobia"	Negative	Dismisses legitimate Hindu concerns	Extracted from the article	p. 27
"Attack campaigns against public schools and scholars"	Negative	Overgeneralization	Extracted from the article	p. 34

"Hindutva family of hate"	Negative	Visual and textual stereotype	Diagram on p. 46	
"Hindu nationalist tactics"	Negative	Frames advocacy as subversive	Extracted from the article	p. 31
"Hindutva capitalizes on anti-Muslim public discourse"	Negative	Loaded claim, no Hindu perspective	Extracted from the article	p. 3
"Hindutva operates through deception and fear"	Negative	Framing without evidence	Paraphrased from article flow	Implied through multiple sections, especially p. 2–4, p. 6, p. 45
"Hindutva networks deploy bullying tactics"	Negative	Unsubstantiated generalization	Extracted from the article	p. 47
"Hindu nationalist lobbying to distort U.S. foreign policy"	Negative	Implies unethical behavior	Extracted from the article	p. 28–29
"Hindu nationalist groups undermine diversity"	Negative	Assumes anti-diversity stance	Extracted from the article	p. 2, p. 4

Adjectives and Adverbs Analysis

A detailed linguistic analysis of the article reveals a pervasive use of loaded adjectives and adverbs that consistently depict Hindus, Hindutva, and Hindu-related organizations in a negative light, often without balanced factual context and cultural sensitivity.

The Hindutva in America report is considerably weakened by its heavy reliance on logical fallacies and misleading statements. For example, it often equates Hindu-American civic organizations with violent foreign actors without any substantiated evidence. It conflates cultural identity with extremist political agendas, a tactic well-documented in previous analyses of anti-Hindu academic framing (see *Invading the Sacred*, *Academic Hinduphobia*).

By employing loaded questions and slippery slope arguments, the report fosters suspicion towards ordinary Hindu-American advocacy, charities, and religious expression. These tactics contradict the principles of objective scholarship and undermine the report’s stated goal of supporting pluralism. A true commitment to academic integrity and human rights would necessitate balanced engagement with Hindu perspectives instead of constructing a caricature of a threat through flawed reasoning.

Adjectives and Adverbs Analysis Table

Section	Descriptor	Bias Indicators	Bias Classification	Bias Score (1–5)	Page Number
Introduction	"Far-right political ideology"	Loaded language implying extremism	Loaded Language	5	2
Introduction	"Dangerous"	Exaggeration of threat	Negative Amplification	5	2
Introduction	"Hate agenda"	Emotionally charged, no balanced context	Loaded Language	5	2
Structure Section	"Militarized ethnonationalist force"	Highly charged, lacks factual neutrality	Loaded Language	5	12
Structure Section	"Exclusionary Hindu nationalism"	Stereotyping, promotes negativity	Negative Amplification	4	15

Agendas Section	"Extremist Hindu ethnonationalism"	Frames as inherently extremist	Loaded Language	5	27
Agendas Section	"Authoritarian caste agenda"	Overgeneralization, emotionally charged	Negative Amplification	5	25
Tactics Section	"Right-wing Hindu nationalist organizations"	Loaded phrase lacking balance	Loaded Language	5	35
Harms Section	"Aggressive intimidation"	Sensationalism, promotes fear	Exaggeration	5	41
Recommendations	"Hindu nationalist aggressions"	Pejorative framing without evidence	Loaded Language	5	49

Logical Fallacies and Misleading Statements

The logical fallacies and misleading statements in "Hindutva in America" are central to how the report constructs its narrative. A significant portion of the argument relies on strawman fallacies, misrepresenting Hindutva as a monolithic, extremist ideology lacking nuance or historical roots. The authors repeatedly equate Hindutva with global fascism or white supremacy without providing direct or culturally contextualized evidence, creating false analogies that obscure the actual philosophical and sociopolitical foundations of Hindu nationalist movements. Statements such as "Hindutva ideology promotes violence" and "Hindutva is responsible for communal unrest" reflect false cause fallacies, where correlation is presented as causation, ignoring broader sociopolitical dynamics and the roles of other actors in communal conflicts.

Additionally, the report engages in confirmation bias by selectively highlighting only those events, quotes, or academic opinions that reinforce its thesis while excluding counterexamples or dissenting Hindu voices. Appeals to emotion are prevalent throughout, especially when discussing diaspora funding, caste discourse, or minority rights, often employing emotionally charged language to circumvent critical reasoning. The report also demonstrates cherry-picking by isolating controversial incidents or fringe actors while ignoring the mainstream humanitarian or educational work conducted by Hindu organizations. Overall, the use of these logical fallacies undermines the intellectual rigor of the report and contributes to a one-sided portrayal designed more to indict than to investigate.

Statement	Type of Fallacy	Explanation
"Hindutva ideology promotes violence."	Strawman	Misrepresents Hindutva’s cultural focus by equating it with extremism.
"Hindus are intolerant of minorities."	Black-or-White	Oversimplifies Hindu community dynamics, ignoring pluralistic traditions.
"RSS is a paramilitary organization."	False Authority	Relies on activist claims not backed by verified legal classification.
"Hindu organizations in the U.S. act as proxies for violent Indian groups."	Genetic	Guilt by association; no evidence presented that U.S. organizations engage in violent advocacy.
"Hindu Americans who engage in advocacy are a threat to pluralism."	Appeal to Emotion	Uses fear and suspicion to delegitimize legal civic advocacy.
"Hindu festivals are increasingly politicized."	Slippery Slope	Claims cultural expressions lead inevitably to political extremism.
"Hindutva equates to White nationalism."	False Equivalence	Equates a religious-cultural revival with racial supremacist ideology.

"U.S. universities are threatened by Hindutva-inspired discrimination."	Loaded Question	Assumes existence of discrimination without proven incidents.
"Charities like Sewa International support Hindutva in India."	Hasty Generalization	Cites unrelated Indian political controversies without linking to verified activities of U.S.-based charities.
"Hindutva activists deny caste oppression."	The Texas Sharpshooter	Selectively highlights fringe voices while ignoring mainstream Hindu advocacy against caste discrimination.
"Hindu nationalism undermines American democracy."	Appeal to Nature	Implies Hindu civilizational values are inherently incompatible with American civic values — an unsound claim.
"Defending Hindu identity is equivalent to Hindutva extremism."	Composition/Division	Collapses legitimate Hindu self-assertion into a caricature of political extremism.

Misleading Statistics, Omission, and Cherry-Picking Analysis Framework

The Hindutva in America report displays systematic patterns of misleading statistics, omissions, and cherry-picking. Misleading statistics are used to inflate claims about Hindu involvement in violence and discrimination without providing comprehensive contextual data. Omissions happen often, as the report fails to acknowledge pluralistic statements, peace-building efforts, and the lawful activities of Hindu-American groups. Cherry-picking emphasizes negative incidents or disputed data to create a biased, hostile narrative.

This pattern undermines the report's credibility and distorts public understanding of Hindu and Hindu-American communities. Pro-Hindu, Hindu-centric sources clearly document a more nuanced and constructive role played by these communities in U.S. civic life and Indian cultural diplomacy.

Statement	Issue	Analysis
"Hindutva is responsible for the growing violence against minorities."	Misleading Statistics	Cites selective instances without accounting for broader political, economic, or communal triggers behind violence. Omits Hindu group-led peace-building efforts.
"U.S.-based Hindu nationalist organizations fund sectarian violence in India."	Cherry-picking	Relies on a small number of contested reports while ignoring public IRS filings and the large body of documented humanitarian work done by Hindu organizations.
"Hindutva ideology inherently promotes hate against minorities."	Omission	Fails to include numerous statements by Hindu organizations explicitly advocating pluralism and coexistence.
"Data shows that caste discrimination is prevalent and supported by Hindu organizations in the U.S."	Misleading Statistics	Draws from limited, non-representative surveys and activist groups without adequate methodological rigor. Ignores public anti-caste discrimination statements and legal compliance by U.S. Hindu organizations.
"Hindu groups use Indian government backing to promote religious majoritarianism in America."	Omission	Does not substantiate claims with verifiable funding or influence evidence; ignores U.S. regulatory compliance frameworks and the grassroots nature of most Hindu-American organizations.
"Hindutva-linked charities operate with little financial transparency."	Cherry-picking	Ignores routine IRS scrutiny, Form 990 filings, and independent audits conducted by U.S.-based Hindu charities.

"Hindutva groups undermine U.S. academic freedom by targeting scholars."	Cherry-picking	Relies on selective cases where scholars faced legitimate criticism for academic bias or factual errors. Omits Hindu scholars' documented lack of representation in South Asian studies programs.
"Hindutva poses an organized, well-funded threat to U.S. pluralism."	Misleading Statistics	Uses emotionally charged language and unsupported data about the scale of Hindu influence in U.S. political and civic life.
"Diaspora Hindutva groups create a transnational fascist network."	Omission	Fails to provide evidence of organized, violent, or coercive activity in the U.S.; ignores the diversity of Hindu diaspora voices.
"Hindu festivals in the U.S. increasingly serve as political platforms for Hindutva messaging."	Cherry-picking	Generalizes from isolated events, omitting the overwhelmingly cultural and religious nature of most Hindu-American festivals.
"Hindutva groups in the U.S. receive direct RSS directives."	Omission	No concrete proof is provided; ignores statements from Hindu-American organizations about their autonomous, local governance.
"Anti-minority violence in India is fueled by U.S. Hindu groups' rhetoric and funding."	Misleading Statistics	Constructs a tenuous causal link without accounting for domestic factors in India; lacks transparency in cited source methodologies.

Euphemisms and Dysphemisms Analysis

The Hindutva in America report relies heavily on a rhetorical pattern of dysphemisms and selective euphemisms to frame Hindu identity, advocacy, and cultural presence in a distorted light. Throughout the document, terms such as “Hindutva extremists,” “militant Hindutva ideology,” and “Hindutva-inspired violence” are repeatedly deployed, often without adequate sourcing, to insinuate that Hindu civic organizations and philosophies are inherently violent or oppressive. This linguistic strategy not only strips Hindutva of its complex and diverse historical and cultural dimensions, as documented in works such as Being Different (Malhotra) and Hindutva: Who Is a Hindu? (Savarkar), But also stigmatizes millions of American Hindus whose advocacy efforts are rooted in pluralism, civic engagement, and interfaith harmony.

Concurrently, the report employs euphemisms such as “caste-oppressed” in a highly selective manner, bypassing acknowledgment of the substantial legal, social, and religious reforms within Hindu communities. This framing serves to freeze Hindu identity in an archaic stereotype while erasing Hindu-led progress in social justice efforts. The strategic choice of euphemisms and dysphemisms functions to emotionally prime the reader, creating an aura of cultural suspicion around Hindu organizations and beliefs. Such rhetorical bias is antithetical to balanced academic inquiry and undermines genuine efforts toward mutual understanding and inclusion.

Phrase	Category	Explanation
"Hindutva extremists"	Dysphemism	Implies that Hindutva ideology is intrinsically extremist, ignoring cultural and nationalist nuances.
"Hindutva-inspired discrimination"	Dysphemism	Frames Hindutva as a source of discrimination, bypassing any positive civic contributions by Hindutva-aligned groups.
"Hindu right-wing"	Euphemism	Simplifies a diverse spectrum of Hindu political thought as uniformly right-wing.
"Hindu nationalist groups"	Dysphemism	Equates civic and cultural organizations with aggressive nationalism.
"Militant Hindutva ideology"	Dysphemism	Labels Hindutva as inherently violent without proportional evidence.
"RSS proxy groups"	Dysphemism	Implies foreign control and subversion, lacking proof of direct command structures.
"Hindutva threat to pluralism"	Dysphemism	Presumes Hindutva is antithetical to pluralism, omitting evidence of coexistence initiatives.

"Caste-oppressed"	Euphemism	While caste discrimination is a legitimate issue, the term is selectively applied to malign Hinduism, ignoring broader societal and legal reforms.
"Hindu majoritarianism"	Dysphemism	Conflates democratic demographic reality with oppressive intent.
"Hindutva-inspired violence"	Dysphemism	Uses generalized allegations without specifying perpetrators or context.
"Hindu nationalist project"	Dysphemism	Frames any articulation of Hindu identity as part of a sinister nationalist plot.
"Hindutva forces"	Dysphemism	Militarizes civil society movements and organizations through suggestive terminology.

False Equivalence

Throughout the report, false equivalences emerge as a central narrative strategy, connecting Hindutva and Hindu civilizational pride with extremist ideologies like Nazism, White supremacy, and Islamist radicalism. This not only misrepresents the philosophical and historical foundations of Hindu revivalist movements, but it also erases the pluralistic, non-expansionist character of the Hindu civilizational ethos.

Moreover, the report equates “caste” with racial apartheid, an enforced state-sponsored legal system. It draws equivalences between diaspora Hindu cultural advocacy and foreign subversive networks, which amounts to a smear against the democratic rights of an entire community in the U.S. The cumulative effect of these parallels is to create an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion toward Hindu Americans, delegitimizing their civic engagement and cultural expressions.

Statement	Type or Category	Explanation
<i>“Hindutva nationalism mirrors Nazi ideology.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	Hindutva is a cultural-nationalist movement focused on preserving Indic civilization; equating it to genocidal, racial-supremacist Nazism is factually baseless and inflammatory.
<i>“RSS is the Indian equivalent of the Ku Klux Klan.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	RSS is a volunteer-driven nationalist organization with a documented record of community service; comparing it to a white supremacist terrorist group is grossly misleading.
<i>“Hindutva is identical to White supremacist movements.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	Hindutva is grounded in civilizational pride and cultural revival, not racial hierarchy or supremacy as in White supremacist movements.
<i>“Hindutva is a violent political religion.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	Hindutva is not a religion but a socio-political philosophy; portraying it as a “violent religion” is a false characterization that ignores its broad civic and cultural dimensions.
<i>“Hindu supremacists seek global Hindu domination.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	No credible evidence exists to support claims of a global Hindu supremacist agenda; this mirrors Islamophobic conspiracy tropes applied falsely to Hindus.
<i>“Caste discrimination is equivalent to racial apartheid.”</i>	Historical Misrepresentation	Caste dynamics, though socially problematic, are distinct from the state-sponsored legal system of apartheid; conflating them erases complexity and reform movements within Hinduism.

<i>“Hindutva activism in the U.S. is equivalent to Islamist radicalism.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	Hindutva-related diaspora organizations engage primarily in cultural and civic work; comparing them to violent extremist movements is an unsupported and inflammatory equivalence.
<i>“Historical Hindu kingdoms practiced imperialism akin to European colonialism.”</i>	Historical Misrepresentation	Hindu polities were not expansionist in the colonial sense and lacked the exploitative, extractive apparatus of European empires; this comparison distorts history.
<i>“The Sangh Parivar operates as a shadow state.”</i>	Action/Responsibility Misrepresentation	The Sangh Parivar operates legally in India’s democratic framework; calling it a “shadow state” suggests illegal or subversive operations without basis.
<i>“Hindu festivals serve as cover for hate.”</i>	Action/Responsibility Misrepresentation	Diaspora Hindu festivals promote cultural pride and interfaith participation; framing them as a “cover for hate” is defamatory and unsubstantiated.
<i>“Hindu charitable organizations are fronts for political extremism.”</i>	Action/Responsibility Misrepresentation	Many Hindu charities have clear humanitarian missions and transparency; tarring them with extremism based on tenuous links is an unjust smear.
<i>“Diaspora Hindu civic participation is equivalent to subversion of democracy.”</i>	Ideological Misrepresentation	Civic participation by any community is a democratic right; framing Hindu advocacy as “subversion” is discriminatory and violates principles of free association.

Media Bias

The Media Bias Analysis Framework is utilized here because the Hindutva in America report serves as both an academic document and a media narrative, employing selective language and specific sources characteristic of biased media. This framework captures explicit arguments and the narrative strategies that shape the report’s rhetorical structure. It systematically assesses how the arrangement of information, omission of context, selection of sources, use of loaded language, and framing of the narrative influence reader perception, highlighting the tools employed by media to sway opinion.

Although presented as a "report," it shows media bias by offering a one-sided narrative that reinforces negative stereotypes about Hindus and Hindutva in both the U.S. and India. Key biases include sensationalism, the omission of Hindu voices, and misleading ideological equivalence, particularly the attempts to equate Hindutva with European fascism, which is a historically inaccurate analogy.

Furthermore, the source selection is biased, favoring activists known for anti-Hindu rhetoric while excluding mainstream Hindu academics and leaders. The narrative largely overlooks the positive contributions of U.S.-based Hindu organizations in humanitarian aid and cultural education.

Example of How Media Bias Manifests in the Report

Example Statement	Media Bias Category	Explanation
<i>“Hindutva threatens pluralism globally.”</i>	Sensationalism	Alarmist language exaggerates Hindutva’s role in global events without proportionate evidence or context.
<i>“Hindutva mirrors global fascism.”</i>	Bias by Labeling	Applying the heavily loaded label “fascism” erases ideological and cultural distinctions between Hindutva and European fascist movements.
<i>“U.S. Hindu organizations fund hate.”</i>	Bias by Omission, Spin	Omits transparency and charitable records of U.S. Hindu orgs (e.g., Sewa International), selectively highlighting unproven allegations and distorting funding data.
<i>“Hindu nationalist groups operate with impunity.”</i>	Story Framing	Frames all Hindu civic engagement as nefarious without acknowledging pluralistic contributions or legal compliance of these groups.
<i>“U.S. universities are influenced by Hindutva networks.”</i>	Selection of Sources	Relies heavily on testimonies from known anti-Hindutva and radical leftist activists without including mainstream Hindu academic voices.

<i>“Hindutva is responsible for all recent anti-minority violence.”</i>	Logical Fallacies and Misleading Statements	Causal link asserted without rigorous evidence; ignores role of local socio-political factors and countervailing data.
<i>“Minorities are unsafe in Hindu-majority India.”</i>	Bias by Omission	Omits data about extensive legal protections and welfare schemes benefiting minorities in India, such as those in Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and minority educational schemes.
<i>“Hindu cultural practices support caste oppression.”</i>	Cultural and Ideological Bias	Grossly oversimplifies diverse Hindu practices and reforms, ignores intra-Hindu reformist movements and opposition to caste-based discrimination.
<i>“Hindutva aligned with European white supremacy.”</i>	Geographic Bias, False Balance	Inappropriate geographic equivalence between fundamentally different political and cultural movements.

Media Source Bias

The report on Hindutva in America exhibits significant bias, relying on ideologically aligned outlets that criticize Hinduism, Hindutva, and India. Key sources include activist groups such as Sadhana, Hindus for Human Rights, IAMC, and Equality Labs, which are connected to broader anti-Hindu networks. These organizations favor left-progressive ideologies and align with global critical race theory, often displaying hostility toward majority religions in non-Western contexts. Some sources (IAMC, HfHR) are linked to U.S.-based Islamists and Pakistani narratives, raising concerns about foreign influence and agenda-driven reporting.

Similarly, media references are primarily drawn from left-leaning or activist-driven platforms like The Wire, Caravan Magazine, Al Jazeera, and USCIRF reports, which have well-documented histories of selective reporting, anti-Hindu editorial lines, and cultural insensitivity towards Hindu dharma.

The near-total exclusion of Hindu-centric sources, academic Hindu scholars, or community-led Hindu advocacy organizations creates an echo chamber effect that amplifies biased narratives while neglecting legitimate counter-perspectives. This biased sourcing undermines the credibility of the report. It violates basic academic standards of balance, fair representation, and neutral framing that should guide discourse on complex religious and cultural topics.

Media Source Analysis

Source	Type of Source	Page Number(s)	Bias Indicator	Potential Bias
Al Jazeera	Media Outlet (TV/Online)	p. 16, 33	Known anti-Hindutva bias	Frames Hindutva as fascist and exclusionary
The Wire	Online News	p. 21, 34	Left-leaning, anti-RSS bias	Frames Hindutva purely as a political threat
Human Rights Watch	NGO Report	p. 23	Selective reporting	Omits Hindu victimization, overemphasizes Hindutva-linked violence
Hindus for Human Rights	Advocacy Group	p. 11, 15	Ideological bias	Promotes Western progressive narratives against Hindu traditions
IAMC	Advocacy Group	p. 15	Anti-India/Pakistan-linked narratives	Known connections to radical diaspora activism

Sadhana	Advocacy Group	p. 17	Selective omission	Ignores Hindu pluralist traditions
Washington Post	Newspaper	p. 8, 20	Selective reporting	Frames Hindutva solely through U.S. far-right lens
The Guardian	Newspaper	p. 14	Sensationalism	Promotes Hindutva-Nazi equivalence
Equality Labs	Advocacy Report	p. 25	Methodologically flawed report	Drives caste narrative to malign U.S. Hindus
South Asia Scholar Activist Collective	Advocacy Network	p. 9, 12, 28	Ideological activism	Lacks academic rigor, promotes activist frames

Analysis of Selected References and Footnotes

In the analyzed citations, a recurring pattern emerges in academic, media, and advocacy narratives that address Hindu dharma, Hindutva, and the Indian diaspora. Many authors, including prominent activist faculty members such as Audrey Truschke, Christophe Jaffrelot, and Dheepa Sundaram, as well as commentators like Pieter Friedrich and Zahir Janmohamed, present Hindutva as a globalized threat often equated with authoritarianism, casteism, or religious chauvinism.

Their analyses often rest on ideological critique rather than empirical nuance. Hindu cultural expressions, diaspora participation, and legal activism are seen as evidence of illiberal intent. This framing tends to conflate diverse Hindu identities and institutions with political extremism, frequently relying on selective emphasis, moral binaries, and affiliation-based inferences.

Many of the citations refer to the work of the same ecosystem of Hindu hatred. Some recent activist reports include:

- 1. Savera Reports: <https://www.wearesavera.org>
- 2. Hindutva Harassment Field Manual: <https://www.hindutvaharassmentfieldmanual.org>
- 3. The Hindu Right in the United States: <https://www.hindutvaharassmentfieldmanual.org>
- 4. Various Bridge Reports from Georgetown University: <https://bridge.georgetown.edu>

Reference Analysis Table

Footnote No. in Report*	Author(s), Professional Affiliation	Author Bias	Advocacy Org Affiliation	Conference Participation Targeting Hindu/Hindutva	Bias (why biased)	Counter-point
1-1	Purnima Bose, Indiana University	Known for critical cultural studies, frequently adopts postcolonial lens critical of nationalism	No direct affiliations documented	Participated in events critical of Hindu nationalism	Frames textbook edits by Hindu groups as 'Hindutva imposition', dismisses indigenous identity concerns	Textbook revisions sought factual accuracy and dignity in representation of Hindu traditions; indigenous advocacy shouldn't be conflated with extremism
1-2	Aria Thaker, Journalist, The Caravan	Published multiple anti-Hindutva, anti-RSS	None formally, but aligns with narratives	Coverage aligned with academic conferences critical of Hindutva	Article generalizes all Hindu advocacy in US as	Diasporic Hindu groups often advocate for cultural

		narratives in Caravan	of South Asia academic collectives		Hindutva political project	representation, not political extremism
2	South Asia Scholar Activist Collective (SASAC)	Formed explicitly to critique 'Hindutva'—highly antagonistic and ideologically rigid	Yes, SASAC	Organizers and supporters of multiple anti-Hindutva panels	Uses vague definitions of Hindutva to conflate academic criticism with harassment	Conflating critique of anti-Hindu bias with harassment silences legitimate community advocacy
3	Dheepa Sundaram, University of Denver	Consistently critiques Hindu nationalism, especially in digital spaces	Yes, listed on advisory boards of anti-Hindutva academic coalitions	Yes, documented speaker in several related conferences	Frames legal complaints by Hindu groups as 'litigious assault' ignoring procedural legitimacy	Legal recourse by Indian American groups reflects civic engagement, not intimidation
4	Audrey Truschke, Rutgers University	Extensive writings show strong anti-Hindutva, often accused of cultural misrepresentation	Yes, aligns with groups like SAHM and SASAC	Yes, keynote and panelist in events targeting Hindutva	Conflates Hindu religious identity with right-wing politics, framing it as a US threat	Religious and cultural pride in Hindu diaspora is distinct from political extremism
5-1	Rebecca de Souza, University of Minnesota Duluth	Critiques 'ethnonationalism' in Hindu diaspora, aligns with decolonial scholarship	Contributed to ORE articles with academic collectives critiquing Hindutva	Associated with narrative-building forums on ethnonationalism	Conflates cultural pride with political extremism using academic jargon	Hindu identity assertion in diaspora is often cultural preservation, not majoritarian politics
5-2	Soumya Shankar, Journalist, The Intercept	History of writing negatively about pro-India, pro-Hindu figures	None formal; narratives consistent with adversarial journalism	Reports cover and support panels critiquing Tulsi and Hindu nationalism	Portrays Tulsi Gabbard's support for Hindu identity as political extremism	Support for Hindu values and leaders from Indian origin doesn't equate to endorsing extremism

8	Bridge Initiative Team, Georgetown University	Bridge frequently frames Hindu nationalist groups as threats without cultural context	Yes, Bridge is advocacy-linked research initiative	Frequent contributors to forums challenging Hindutva	Presents one-sided narratives framing groups like RSS, VHPA as extremist without acknowledging social service work	Groups like RSS and VHPA conduct vast community service, and critiques must consider this balance
9	Abhijnan Rej, The Diplomat	Geopolitical analyst critical of India's foreign policy apparatus	None documented	No direct affiliations to anti-Hindutva academic events	Framing BJP's US affiliate as foreign agent implies espionage-like malignancy	Registration under FARA is legal compliance; it doesn't imply subversive activities
10	Bridge Initiative Team	Bridge narratives lean toward Islamophobia /Hindutva threat framing	VHPA is a Hindu community organization; Bridge is a bias-focused initiative	Bridge participates in Hindutva-critical conferences	Selective portrayal of Seva programs minimizes VHPA's grassroots humanitarian work	VHPA Seva programs provide critical relief and community services to all castes and faiths
13	Rohit Chopra, Santa Clara University	Frequently critiques Hindutva, aligns with postcolonial and digital culture critiques	Writes in forums with anti-Hindutva editorial stances	Participated in panels and forums discussing online Hindu nationalism	Frames online Hindu activism as part of global right-wing ecosystem, ignoring cultural revivalism	Online Hindu discourse often arises from diasporic assertion and community defense, not global extremism
15	Pranay Somayajula, South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT)	Strongly aligned with anti-Hindutva activism	Yes, SAALT is a vocal anti-Hindutva advocacy organization	Frequent speaker and contributor in anti-Hindutva platforms	Connects American far-right violence with Hindutva ideology without evidence of	Such linkages are speculative and deflect attention from real community issues and

					direct causation	bridge-building efforts
16	Feminist Critical Hindu Studies Collective (Gandhi, Kamath, Krishnamurti, Sippy)	Group formed to critique dominant Hindu narratives	Collective associated with critical theory in religion	Key contributors to Hindutva-focused critique forums	Uses theoretical constructs like 'mimicry' to delegitimize Hindu American identity articulation	Diasporic Hindus navigating identity in complex contexts shouldn't be reduced to mimicry or reaction
16	Shreena Gandhi, Michigan State University	Critical of American appropriation and Brahmanical narratives	Part of Feminist Critical Hindu Studies Collective	Yes, contributor to anti-Hindutva academic circles	Frames Hindu authority as structurally oppressive without accounting for diversity	Traditional Hindu voices represent lived authenticity, not just structural dominance
17	Azad Essa (Pluto Press), Aparna Gopalan (Jewish Currents)	Both authors publish in anti-establishment platforms with anti-India editorial leanings	Aligned with left-leaning advocacy journalism	Content built on critiques of India-Israel strategic ties framed as 'Hindu-Zionist'	Equates India-Israel strategic cooperation with global right-wing axis	India-Israel ties are state-to-state relations driven by mutual security and economic needs, not religious ideology
20	Andrew Cockburn, Harper's Magazine	Long-time investigative journalist with critical stance on US-India relations	Writes for left-leaning platforms with anti-nationalism leanings	None documented, but editorial focus targets Hindutva	Frames Hindu advocacy in US as sinister lobbying, implying foreign interference	Hindu groups in diaspora engage in cultural advocacy and civic rights, not covert lobbying
22	Kanishka Singh, Reuters	Mainstream journalist; factual reporting	None known	None	Headline focuses on Indian origin without	Criminal proceedings should not generalize or

		often shaped by editorial framing			contextual nuance on global intelligence norms	criminalize Indian diplomacy or diaspora
24	Zack Beauchamp, Vox	Known for critical views on Hindu nationalism and India's democratic standing	Often cites sources aligned with anti-Hindutva networks like SASAC	Content derived from Hindutva Harassment Field Manual narrative	Frames Indian state as orchestrating diaspora surveillance without substantiated intelligence	Diaspora concerns should be verified through legal and diplomatic frameworks, not journalistic assumption;
25	South Asia Scholar Activist Collective (SASAC)	Explicitly critical of Hindutva, known for coordinated academic activism	Yes, SASAC	Organizers of Hindutva critique conferences and reports	Their guide shapes reporting to align with activist frameworks, not balanced journalism	Media guidance must allow space for neutral Hindu voices and diverse diasporic experiences
28	Scroll Staff, Scroll.in	Often publishes articles critical of Indian government and Hindu organizations	None direct, editorially aligned with left-leaning positions	No explicit participation	Frames BJP's overseas wing's FARA compliance as suspicious instead of procedural	Registering as foreign agent is legal compliance in the U.S., not proof of covert intent
37	BBC News Staff	Western media often frames Hindu defense training as militant without context	None, but editorial tone aligns with secular critique of Hindu organizations	No direct participation	Describes RSS youth training as 'far-right militia' rather than cultural self-defense	Such training emphasizes discipline, cultural education, and self-confidence, not violence
38	Christophe Jaffrelot, Sciences Po	Extensive publications with critical lens on Hindu	Frequent contributor to forums and media	Yes, speaker in panels critiquing Hindutva	Equates Hindutva with ethnic authoritarianism	Hindutva political success stems from

		nationalism, often frames it as ethnocracy	critical of Indian government		sm ignoring democratic mandate	democratic support and inclusive welfare governance
42	Rohit Chopra, Santa Clara University	Strong anti-Hindutva position in multiple books and essays	Contributes to platforms with known anti-India leanings	Yes, frequent panelist on Hindutva surveillance claims	Reduces digital Hindu communities to right-wing political operatives	Digital Hindu networks span spirituality, youth mobilization, and global heritage preservation
50	Laurie L. Patton, Emory University	Academic, generally balanced but often critical of religious authority claims	No formal affiliations	Involved in religion scholarship with institutional critique	Challenges claims of Hindu representation by traditional or diaspora actors	Pluralistic Hindu voices must include both scholarly critique and practitioner narratives
54	Jessica Marie Falcone, Kansas State University	Anthropologist critical of Hindutva influence in diaspora spaces	Contributor to critical race and nationalism discourse	Yes, documented contributor to critical forums	Frames youth Hindu cultural camps as ideological indoctrination centers	Cultural camps teach language, yoga, values, and identity—not fundamentalism
82	Dheepa Sundaram, University of Denver	Longstanding critic of Hindutva; focuses on digital activism and religious nationalism	Linked to academic advocacy circles such as SASAC	Yes, contributor to anti-Hindutva panels and papers	Presents 'Hindutva 2.0' as aggressive digital manipulation without acknowledging grassroots cultural revival	Online Hindu activism includes diaspora community-building, cultural education, and youth engagement
85	Amita Baviskar, Institute of Economic Growth	Critical of Hindu nationalism's interaction	Associated with progressive anthropology	Yes, panels on Adivasi marginalization and Hindutva	Frames Adivasi-Hindu alignment as state-led co-	Many Adivasi groups voluntarily engage with Hindu

		with tribal identities	gical networks		option, undermining indigenous agency	festivals and nationalist platforms
86	Audrey Truschke, Rutgers University	Persistent critic of Hindutva and Hindu political identity; frequently engages in contentious discourse on Hinduism	Key contributor to SASAC and Hindutva Harassment Field Manual	Yes, central speaker at multiple anti-Hindutva academic events	Frames all expressions of Hindu political culture as co-option or cultural dominance over indigenous groups	Hindu civilizational identity itself includes plural indigenous strands; the claim of appropriation flattens historical continuity
94	Christophe Jaffrelot (editor), Sciences Po	Established critic of Hindutva with a focus on caste and religious nationalism	Affiliated with liberal European research institutions critical of Indian right	Yes, keynote speaker at anti-Hindutva forums	Portrays Hindu nationalism as inherently exclusionary with minimal intra-movement differentiation	Hindutva includes strands of social reform, pluralism, and Dalit outreach often overlooked in Jaffrelot's model
105	Shambuka (pseud.), Peace & Change Journal	Presents Hindu American Democrats as instruments of caste capitalism and Hindutva	Ties to critical caste and postcolonial social justice networks	Yes, paper originates from racial justice academic conferences	Frames Hindu Democrats' civic presence as ideological infiltration	Diaspora political participation is plural and civic, not solely ideological
117	Zahir Janmohamed, writer and activist	Positions Hindu diaspora engagement in Washington as politically orchestrated manipulation	Affiliated with progressive human rights and anti-Hindutva advocacy circles	Yes, frequent participant in critical panels on Indian politics and diaspora lobbying	Frames political advocacy by Indian Americans as foreign interference, disproportionately focusing on Hindu groups	Diaspora lobbying is a constitutional right and common across ethnic groups in U.S. politics; selective focus undermines

						pluralist participation
118	Pieter Friedrich, freelance writer and activist	Long-time critic of Hindu nationalist organizations; writings portray Hindutva as a global extremist threat	Closely aligned with anti-Hindutva advocacy networks, often cited in SASAC-related discourse	Yes, actively involved in advocacy events and panels opposing RSS/VHPA	Portrays Tulsi Gabbard's Hindu affiliations as politically suspicious, implying guilt by association with Indian groups	Engagement with Hindu organizations is common among diaspora leaders and not inherently ideological or extremist
130	Dawn Herald Editorial	Pakistani national perspective with critical framing of Indian nationalism	Editorial stance anti-Hindutva and anti-Indian policy	Not applicable	Presents Indian cultural assertion as ideological threat in regional context	Cultural nationalism in India reflects civilizational identity, not regional antagonism
135	Aria Thaker, Caravan	Narrative aligns with critical portrayal of Hindu advocacy as political extremism	Caravan known for left-leaning editorial policy	Indirect through reportorial focus	Conflates Hindu identity advocacy in education with political mobilization	Curriculum corrections reflect cultural dignity, not political agenda
139	Zack Beauchamp, Vox	Framing heavily critical of Indian government, focuses on global surveillance and suppression themes	Vox editorial line is consistently aligned with progressive critique of nationalisms	Not directly, but amplifies SASAC-linked narratives	Asserts a covert campaign by India/Hindutva-linked groups against U.S. academics without proportional evidence	Civic responses to perceived academic bias are common across diaspora groups and not uniquely aggressive

143	Niha Masih and Joanna Slater, Washington Post	Coverage often reflects Western liberal critique of Hindu nationalism	No direct affiliations, but narrative alignment with SASAC	Referenced conferences with anti-Hindutva themes	Frames Indian American civic engagement as ideological export	Diaspora activism includes pluralist, multicultural contributions beyond political alignments
183	Dheepa Sundaram, University of Denver	Frames Hindu advocacy as litigious and obstructive to academic freedom	Member of SASAC, contributor to Hindutva Harassment Field Manual	Yes, active in events critiquing Hindu nationalism	Presents legal responses from Hindu groups as authoritarian suppression	Legal redress is a constitutional right, especially where defamation or bias is alleged
199	Nikhil Mandalaparthi, Hindus for Human Rights	Explicitly anti-Hindutva, promotes progressive critique of Hindu organizations	Yes, Hindus for Human Rights	Frequent speaker and policy advocate in anti-Hindutva spaces	Equates current Hindu advocacy in US with historical fascist sympathies, ignoring democratic context	Contemporary Hindu advocacy is rooted in rights-based pluralism, cultural pride, and civic representation
204	Hannah Ellis-Petersen, The Guardian	Western media narrative, often adopts highly critical tone towards Indian and Hindu political actors	None direct, but reflects editorial stance of Guardian's global south reporting	No, journalist	Frames opposition to academic critiques as coordinated Hindutva suppression campaign	Community responses to anti-Hindu academic bias are part of civic free speech, not threat campaigns
121-1	Audrey Truschke, Rutgers University	Persistent critic of Hindutva; article presents cultural symbolism as proof of	Key contributor to SASAC and Hindutva Harassment Field Manual	Yes, central figure in anti-Hindutva academic circles	Article equates a bulldozer float in an Indian-American parade with celebration	Cultural symbolism often varies in meaning; attributing hate ideology to symbolic elements

		extremist ideology			of hate without acknowledging alternative interpretations or diasporic autonomy	without participant intent risks overgeneralization and stigmatization of an entire community
142-1	Scroll Staff	Dismisses community concerns on Hinduphobia as political strategy	Scroll editorial stance often critical of Hindu narratives	No direct participation documented	Frames anti-Hinduphobia efforts as a right-wing tool, ignoring legitimate concerns of diaspora	Hinduphobia includes real instances of stereotyping and violence; dismissal harms minority advocacy
142-1	Vinayak Chaturvedi, University of California, Irvine	Extremely critical of Hindutva and Savarkar; presents them through a violence-centric historical lens	Academic orientation aligned with anti-nationalist historiography	Yes, has presented work at anti-Hindutva academic panels	Presents Savarkar exclusively as an architect of violence, omitting philosophical or reformist aspects	Savarkar's contributions include social reform, rationalism, and nationalism beyond mere violence
39-1	Olivier Therwath, CNRS France	Academically frames Hindu diaspora activism as cyber-radicalism	Linked to European anti-nationalist academic circuits	Yes, contributor to conferences on global right-wing movements	Portrays digital Hindu discourse as inherently extremist	Online Hindu identity expression reflects cultural pride and digital community-building
55-2	Cited in Macher, Hindu Nationalist Influence in US	Draws from predominantly anti-Hindutva sources like SASAC and Bridge	Likely aligned editorially	Unknown	Relies on unidimensional framing of Hindu advocacy as political extremism	Scholarly neutrality requires inclusion of Hindu diaspora's cultural self-expression

63-1	Liz Bucar, Northeastern University	Frames modern Hindu practices as illegitimate adaptations or appropriations	Engages with postcolonial and feminist critique networks	Participated in panels on cultural appropriation	Overemphasizes the problematic nature of Western use of Hindu traditions while ignoring evolving diasporic expressions	Global adaptations of Hindu practices often reflect reverence and continuity, not appropriation
63-2	Andrea R. Jain, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis	Critical of efforts to 'reclaim' yoga as Hindu; promotes universalized secular framing	Works with secular and critical religion academic platforms	Yes, including conferences on decolonizing yoga and critiques of Hindutva	Frames Hindu ownership of yoga as exclusionary or ideological	Yoga's historical roots are explicitly tied to Hindu darshanas and philosophical systems
78-3	Manan Ahmed, Columbia; Devulapalli & Saldarriaga	Research framed within activist analytics; focuses only on alleged Hindutva aggression	Linked to anti-Hindutva research collectives	Yes, part of Hindutva critique networks	Analysis lacks balance; assumes all critique of academia is harassment	Criticism of anti-Hindu content is valid free speech and community advocacy, not coordinated hate



A Systematic Response to “Hindutva in America: An Ethnonationalist Threat to Equality and Religious Pluralism”



Attack on Hindu Dharma and Practicing Hindus by Proxy

The authors of the report employed Hindutva deliberately and deceptively to criticize Hindu dharma and its practitioners. Hindutva, meaning “Hindu + tattva,” signifies the essence of Hindu dharma, also referred to as Sanatana dharma.

The Sanatana dharma, as described in the *Bhagavad Gita*, is eternal, universal, and dharmic. Lord Krishna states:

“Sva-dharme nidhanam śreyah paradharmo bhayāvahah”

“It is better to die in one’s own Dharma than to follow another’s path with fear.” (Gita 3.35)

This emphasis on living one’s authentic dharma forms the spiritual core of Hindutva—the defense and continuation of dharmic life in its cultural, ethical, and metaphysical dimensions.

“Ekam sat vipra bahudha vadanti”

“Truth is one, sages call it by different names.” – Rig Veda 1.164.46

Hindutva stands for this Vedic pluralism. It does not seek religious conversion or exclusion; rather, it asserts the right of the Hindu civilization to preserve its own diversity, from Shaiva to Vaishnava to Shakta to tribal and folk traditions.

Hindutva echoes the civilizational values of Rama Rajya, truth, justice, dharma, and protection of the weak. Rama, in *Valmiki Ramayana*, upholds:

“Ramaḥ satya-parākramaḥ”

“Rama is the embodiment of truth and valor.” – Valmiki Ramayana, Ayodhya Kanda

Similarly, the *Mahabharata* describes Bharatavarsha as a land of diverse practices united by Dharma (righteousness and fairness), which is what Hindutva seeks to protect from erasure.

In the *Bhagavad Gita*, Krishna declares:

“Yada yada hi dharmasya glanir bhavati bharata...”

“Whenever there is a decline in Dharma and rise of Adharma, I incarnate to restore Dharma.” (Gita 4.7)

Hindutva, in this light, is a nonviolent civilizational response to the erosion of dharma. It advocates not for aggression, but for cultural reawakening.

Labeling dharmic consciousness (Hindutva) as hateful denies the dignity of Hindu identity itself. This vilification aligns with *adharma*, not with the inclusive spirit of Hindu texts.

According to Mahatma Gandhi in *The Essence of Hinduism*, Hindu Dharma is characterized by inclusivity, a rejection of dogma, and a relentless pursuit of Truth through diverse paths (Dnyana, Bhakti, Karma, Yoga). Hindutva, as articulated by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, seeks to uphold these dharmic values by promoting cultural unity, spiritual integrity, and national pride among Hindus.

The Indian Supreme Court, in its 1995 judgment (Dr. Ramesh Yeshwant Prabhoo vs Prabhakar Kashinath Kunte), clearly stated that, “Ordinarily, Hindutva is understood as a way of life or a state of mind and is not to be equated with or understood as religious Hindu fundamentalism.” This judicial definition disassociates Hindutva from extremism and positions it as a broader civilizational and cultural framework — a “way of life” — rooted in the pluralistic and spiritual traditions of Bharat (India).

Hindutva is not a distortion but rather an expression of Hinduness and Hindu identity. Defending Hindutva is a dharmic defense of Hindu identity, grounded in the wisdom of the Vedas, Upanishads, Gita, Ramayana, and Mahabharata. It is not a means of domination but a spiritual, ethical, and cultural stance against civilizational erasure.

An attack on Hindutva is, therefore, an attack on the scriptural and lived reality of Hindu Dharma itself. The conflation of Hindutva with extremism has led to attacks on the Hindu population that identifies with the dharmic values of family, devotion, patriotism, and tradition. Hindu human rights reports indicate that narratives targeting Hindutva often bleed into the vilification of Hindu festivals, deities, scriptures, and community customs.

1. The Bhagavad Gita. Translated by Eknath Easwaran, Nilgiri Press, 2007. <https://www.holy-bhagavad-gita.org/chapter/3/verse/35>
2. The Rig Veda. Translated by Ralph T.H. Griffith, 1896. Hymn 1.164.46. <https://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/rigveda/rv01164.htm>
3. Valmiki, Ramayana. Ayodhya Kanda. Translated by Hari Prasad Shastri, 1952. https://www.valmikiramayana.net/ayodhya/sarga1/ayodhya_1_frame.htm
4. The Mahabharata. Translated by Kisari Mohan Ganguli, Book 6, Bhishma Parva, Section 9. <https://www.sacred-texts.com/hin/maha/index.htm>
5. The Bhagavad Gita. Translated by Swami Sivananda, Divine Life Society, 1989. Chapter 4, Verse 7. <https://www.holy-bhagavad-gita.org/chapter/4/verse/7>
6. Gandhi, M.K. The Essence of Hinduism. Navajivan Publishing House, 1948. https://www.mkgandhi.org/ebks/essence_of_hinduism.pdf
7. Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar. Essentials of Hindutva. 1923. <https://www.savarkarsmarak.com/essentials-of-hindutva/>
8. Supreme Court of India. Dr. Ramesh Yeshwant Prabhoo vs Prabhakar Kashinath Kunte, 11 Dec. 1995, AIR 1996 SC 1113. <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/920295/>
9. Narayanan, Vasudha. "Hinduism." Encyclopedia Britannica, 2024. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Hinduism>
10. Doniger, Wendy. The Hindus: An Alternative History. Penguin Books, 2009. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/36638/the-hindus-by-wendy-doniger/>
11. "Hinduphobia: Documenting the Attacks on Hindu Festivals and Traditions." Hindu American Foundation, 2023. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/hinduphobia-report-2023>
12. Sharma, Arvind. Hinduism as a Missionary Religion. SUNY Press, 2011. <https://www.sunypress.edu/Books/H/Hinduism-as-a-Missionary-Religion>

A Question of Credibility: Affiliation Analysis of Report Authors

Although the report's authors are not explicitly named, it's relatively easy to infer their identities from the institutional affiliations and previous reports published by these institutions. It is certainly pertinent to question why the authors opted to remain anonymous. What could they be concealing? Is it possible that the authors of *Hindutva in America* are not neutral arbiters?

The lack of transparency concerning the authors' affiliations and reliance on questionable sources significantly undermine *Hindutva in America*'s credibility as a scholarly document.

The authors' academic connections to institutions like Rutgers University, Columbia University, and the University of Denver, which are known for fostering exclusionary narratives, contribute to an intellectual monoculture. Our analysis suggests that the likely authors of the report, based on our research, have participated in conferences and publications that consistently disregard Hindu perspectives. They maintain longstanding relationships with activist groups and academic centers that regularly promote Marxist, postcolonial, and Islamist critiques of Hindu identity. Their public statements, publications, and professional activities coincide with the objectives of networks aiming to delegitimize mainstream American Hindu organizations and equate Hindu identity with political extremism.

Reliance on Adversarial and Compromised Sources

The report relies heavily on organizations and individuals who have documented biases against Hindu identity. These organizations, including IAMC, HfHR, SFJ, Sadhana and others have been profiled in the section titled, "Analysis of Funding and Political Networks Behind Anti-Hindu Advocacy."

The inclusion of such sources undermines the report's credibility. It reflects a deliberate choice to amplify adversarial narratives while excluding the perspectives of mainstream Hindu organizations and scholars. This selective sourcing is inconsistent with the standards of objective scholarship.

Case Study: The Wendy Doniger Controversy

The controversy surrounding University of Chicago professor Wendy Doniger's book "The Hindus: An Alternative History" illustrates broader patterns of academic bias documented in this section. Doniger's work faced criticism for its sexualized interpretations of Hindu deities and traditions, leading to legal challenges in India. Penguin India ultimately agreed to recall and destroy all copies of the book.

The incident highlights how certain academic approaches to Hindu studies prioritize sensationalized interpretations over respectful scholarship. Doniger's defenders, many of whom appear as sources in "Hindutva in America," framed the controversy as an attack on academic freedom while dismissing legitimate Hindu concerns about misrepresentation. This pattern of delegitimizing Hindu voices while protecting problematic scholarship reflects the same bias evident in the report's methodology.

Policymakers, scholars, and civil society leaders must approach *Hindutva in America* with caution. They need to recognize it as an ideologically motivated document intended to delegitimize Hindu civic participation and to promote hostile narratives about Hindu identity and the Indian state. The inclusion of sources with documented extremist ties and the exclusion of mainstream Hindu voices are not academic oversights; they represent deliberate acts of narrative manipulation. Defending the principles of academic integrity, intellectual pluralism, and constitutional fairness necessitates exposing and challenging such biases.

References

1. “Rutgers University’s Role in Hindutva Discourse: Academic Freedom or Intellectual Monoculture?” Rutgers Review, 12 Feb. 2024. <https://rutgersreview.com/hindutva-discourse-academic-monoculture>
2. “Columbia University’s South Asia Institute and the Framing of Hindu Identity.” South Asia Watch, 15 May 2023. <https://southasiawatch.org/columbia-university-south-asia-institute-framing-hindu-identity>
3. “University of Denver and the Politics of Religious Studies.” Denver Academic, 10 Oct. 2023. <https://denveracademic.org/politics-of-religious-studies>
4. “IAMC: Indian American Muslim Council.” Southern Poverty Law Center, 2024. <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/indian-american-muslim-council>
5. “Hindus for Human Rights (HfHR): Advocacy or Activism?” The Diplomat, 12 Jan. 2024. <https://thediplomat.com/2024/01/hindus-for-human-rights-advocacy-or-activism/>
6. “Sikhs for Justice (SFJ) and Its Global Campaigns.” BBC News, 18 Mar. 2024. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-56567890>
7. “Sadhana: Coalition of Progressive Hindus.” Sadhana, 2025. <https://www.sadhanacoalition.org/about>
8. Nanda, Meera. “Marxism, Postcolonialism, and the Critique of Hindu Identity.” Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 56, no. 10, 2022. <https://www.epw.in/journal/2022/10/marxism-postcolonialism-hindu-identity.html>
9. Doniger, Wendy. The Hindus: An Alternative History. Penguin Books, 2009. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/36638/the-hindus-by-wendy-doniger/>
10. “Penguin India Withdraws Wendy Doniger’s Book.” The Hindu, 11 Feb. 2014. <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/penguin-india-withdraws-wendy-donigers-book/article5680310.ece>
11. “Debate over Academic Freedom and Hindu Representation.” Times Higher Education, 20 Feb. 2014. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/debate-over-academic-freedom-and-hindu-representation/2011626.article>
12. “Academic Bias and the Marginalization of Hindu Voices.” Hindu American Foundation, 2024. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/academic-bias-and-marginalization-of-hindu-voices>

Response to “Hindutva Networks in the U.S.”

The Hindutva in America report, instead of offering an objective analysis of civic organizations within the American Hindu community, employs a selective framing and flawed methodology to pathologize legitimate civic engagement, while overlooking documented contributions to American society and broader global humanitarian efforts.

The organizations mentioned in the report—such as Vishwa Hindu Parishad of America (VHPA), Sewa International, the Hindu American Foundation (HAF), the Coalition of Hindus of North America (CoHNA), Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh (HSS-USA), and others—function as lawful, transparent, and socially beneficial nonprofit entities. Hindu Policy Research and Advocacy Collective (HinduPACT) was an initiative of VHPA until December 2024, when it became an independent organization. Their missions emphasize humanitarian service, interfaith dialogue, educational reform, and civil rights advocacy, with no credible evidence linking them to any extremist activities or unlawful conduct. These organizations actively engage in American civil society, adhere to strict legal and financial standards, and enrich the vibrant pluralism that characterizes the American democratic experience.

A central flaw of the Hindutva in America report is its reliance on guilt by association and its failure to distinguish between civic participation and ideological extremism. The report presents the everyday activities of American Hindu organizations, such as youth programming, disaster relief, cultural education, and initiatives to combat religious discrimination, as questionable solely due to their connection with Hindu identity and the broader global Hindu diaspora. This approach not only mischaracterizes the organizations involved but also perpetuates a form of religious profiling that contradicts the principles of equal protection under the law.

Legal and Financial Transparency

American Hindu organizations operate fully in compliance with U.S. federal regulations governing nonprofit entities. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requires rigorous reporting standards for 501(c)(3) organizations, including the public disclosure of donations, expenditures, and governance structures. These standards ensure transparency and accountability, and American Hindu nonprofits are no exception.

VHPA reported \$2.025 million in revenue in 2023, with 95% coming from contributions. These funds were used to provide scholarships, support cultural and religious education, assist underprivileged children, and advocate for American Hindus. Sewa International reported \$7.02 million in contributions in 2023, accounting for 92.5 percent of total revenue, with 89 percent of those funds dedicated to disaster relief, youth programs, and community health initiatives. Its IRS 990 filings detail partnerships with FEMA and local governments during Hurricane Ian recovery efforts, including debris removal and emergency meal distribution. The Hindu American Foundation disclosed \$3.08 million in contributions in 2024, representing 93 percent of its total revenue, which was directed toward interfaith dialogue, civil rights advocacy, and educational outreach. Public records indicate HAF's collaboration with the Sikh Coalition to combat hate crimes, resulting in a 30 percent increase in cross-community reporting in California. Similarly, CoHNA recorded \$449,874 in contributions in 2023, with 99.8 percent of those funds allocated to addressing Hinduphobia and advocating for curriculum reforms.

Documented Contributions to American Society

The humanitarian and civic contributions of American Hindu organizations are well documented and significantly impact the broader American community. These efforts are rooted in the Hindu ethical principles of seva (selfless service) and loka-samgraha (universal welfare), which transcend political affiliations and promote the common good.

Sewa International's extensive disaster relief work exemplifies this commitment. In the aftermath of Hurricane Ian, Sewa distributed over 3,000 meals and more than 400 relief kits in Florida, collaborating with FEMA, the YMCA, Hindu temples, and interfaith partners. These efforts mirrored the organization's previous work during the COVID-19 pandemic, when it provided over 50,000 vaccine doses to underserved populations. The bipartisan

recognition Sewa has received for its inclusive service further undermines the report's narrative of sectarian or exclusionary intent.

VHPA's Hindu Mandir Empowerment Council (HMEC) initiative developed guides and webinars for temple safety and security in partnership with the FBI and local law enforcement. HMEC has trained hundreds of Hindu temples across the nation in security best practices and assisted temples in securing federal and state grants for safety. HAF has participated in public interfaith dialogues with organizations such as the Sikh Coalition and the Anti-Defamation League, promoting a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect among diverse religious communities.

Educational initiatives further illustrate the civic engagement of American Hindu organizations. HSS-USA, through its Universal Oneness Day events and community service programs, has organized cleanups and honored first responders in 45 states, positively impacting local communities across the nation.

The report on Hindutva in America claims that diaspora funding for American Hindu organizations fosters communalism, intolerance, and right-wing extremism in India, suggesting that such funding ought to be restricted or criminalized. This narrative is highly flawed, ideologically driven, and legally questionable. It selectively omits evidence regarding the humanitarian and civic contributions of American Hindu nonprofits and pathologizes Hindu philanthropy in a way that is not applied to the transnational activities of other religious or ethnic communities.

Central to the argument is the assumption that diaspora philanthropy aimed at India or Hindu causes is inherently suspicious. American Hindu organizations, like their Jewish, Muslim, and Christian counterparts, participate in transnational philanthropy to support religious, cultural, and humanitarian initiatives that align with their faith traditions and civic duties. Their activities are lawful, transparent, and protected by the constitutional guarantees of free speech, free association, and religious liberty. Catholic Charities USA allocates 12 percent of its \$4.7 billion annual budget to international aid, including missionary work, without facing comparable scrutiny or suspicion. The selective framing of Hindu philanthropy as uniquely suspect reflects an ideological bias rather than a principled concern for transparency or accountability.

The propagation of false narratives about American Hindu organizations has tangible consequences. The California vs Hate Report (2024) documented that 23.3 percent of religious hate crimes in the state targeted Hindus, second only to antisemitic incidents. In response to these challenges, American Hindu organizations have proactively engaged with policymakers. HR 7648 (2024), a bipartisan bill co-sponsored by Hindu civic groups, seeks to enhance the reporting and prosecution of hate crimes targeting religious minorities. This initiative exemplifies civic engagement and a constructive commitment to American pluralism, not extremism.

References:

1. Anand, Priya. "Hindu Diaspora and Religious Philanthropy in the United States." International Society for Third-Sector Research, 2014. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_toronto/anand.priya.pdf
2. "7 Sangh-Linked US Groups Spent \$159m on Sangh Parivar in 2001-19: Report." NewsClick, 31 May 2022. [https://www.newsclick.in/7-Sangh-Linked-US-Groups0Spent-\\$159m-Sangh-Parivar-2001-19-Report](https://www.newsclick.in/7-Sangh-Linked-US-Groups0Spent-$159m-Sangh-Parivar-2001-19-Report)
3. "About HinduPACT." Hindu Policy Research and Advocacy Collective, 31 Mar. 2025. <https://hindupact.org/about-hindupact/>
4. "Sewa International Inc - Full Filing." Nonprofit Explorer, ProPublica, 28 May 2025. <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/200638718/202432749349301573/full>
5. "Hindu American Foundation LLC - Nonprofit Explorer." ProPublica, 28 May 2025. <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/680551525>
6. "Disaster Management." Sewa International USA. <https://www.sewainternational.org/DisasterManagement>

7. "HinduVote releases American Hindu Agenda for 2024 Elections." New India Abroad, 14 Jan. 2025. <https://www.newindiaabroad.com/news/hinduvote-releases-american-hindu-agenda-for-2024-elections>
8. "American Sikhs want to set the record straight about Khalistan." Religion News Service, 18 Oct. 2024. <https://religionnews.com/2024/10/18/american-sikhs-want-to-set-the-record-straight-about-khalistan/>
9. "Universal Oneness Day: Raksha Bandhan Event Honors First Responders and Strengthens Community Bonds." American Kahani, 27 Sept. 2024. <https://americankahani.com/community/universal-oneness-day-raksha-bandhan-event-honors-first-responders-and-strengthens-community-bonds/>
10. "Hindu American Foundation." Wikipedia, 18 Aug. 2005. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindu_American_Foundation
11. "Hinduphobia in California: US State witnesses rapid surge in Anti-Hindu violence, hate crimes against Indians." Organiser, 28 May 2024. <https://organiser.org/2024/05/28/239758/international/america/usa-america/hinduphobia-in-california-us-state-witnesses-rapid-surge-in-anti-hindu-violence-hate-crimes-against-indians/>
12. "Proposed bill aims to improve hate crime reporting." Southern Poverty Law Center, 28 Feb. 2025. <https://www.splcenter.org/resources/hopewatch/new-legislation-opportunity-hate-crime-data/>

The Nexus of Adversarial Ecosystem

Advocacy Organizations

A cluster of organizations consistently cited in reports and coalitions critical of Hindu-American civic engagement forms the backbone of anti-Hindu advocacy. These include:

- **Indian American Muslim Council (IAMC):** IAMC is the largest advocacy group for Indian Muslims in the U.S. and plays a key role in shaping narratives critical of Hindu identity and Indian policies. It operates with substantial funding from grants and individual donations, reporting over \$1.2 million in revenue in 2020. IAMC collaborates with other activist groups, hosts events with U.S. lawmakers, and amplifies critiques of Hindu nationalism and Indian governance.
- **Hindus for Human Rights (HfHR):** As a progressive Hindu voice, HfHR aligns closely with IAMC and other left-leaning coalitions. Taking extreme anti-Hindu positions, it challenges what it terms “Hindutva extremism,” and supports grassroots movements for caste and social justice in India. In 2022, HfHR reported \$570,812 in revenue and maintains partnerships with organizations such as the Coalition Against Fascism in India and the Poor People’s Campaign.
- **Sadhana: Coalition of Progressive Hindus:** Sadhana aims to mobilize progressive Hindus for social justice causes. In effect, Sadhana seeks to attract Hindu students with an innocuous Sanskrit name and aims to turn them against Hindu dharma and culture. It has received grants from organizations such as Fellowship in Prayer to enhance its operations and outreach.
- **Sikhs for Justice (SFJ):** SFJ is a designated extremist organization that has been banned in India for promoting Khalistani separatism. It is recognized for its anti-India and anti-Hindu rhetoric and has been linked to funding other activist groups, according to investigations by Indian authorities.

These organizations form a tactical alliance of Marxist, Islamist, and separatist networks united by a common hostility toward Hindu identity and the continuity of Indian civilization.

Academic Collaborators and Institutional Patronage

A significant portion of anti-Hindu advocacy is channeled through academic institutions and think tanks:

- **Academic Centers:** Universities like Rutgers, Harvard’s South Asia Institute, and Columbia have become hubs for scholars who promote adversarial narratives about Hinduism. These programs disproportionately cite activist networks such as IAMC and HfHR while systematically excluding mainstream Hindu perspectives.
- **Foundation Funding:** Major U.S. foundations, such as the Ford Foundation, Open Society Foundations, and Rockefeller Brothers Fund, have provided significant grants to projects and centers that promote “caste in diaspora,” “gender and Hindu nationalism,” and “Hindutva threat” narratives. This funding ecosystem supports scholarship and activism that align with these adversarial frameworks.
- **Intellectual Monoculture:** The dominance of specific ideological frameworks in South Asian studies has fostered an environment where Hindu voices are marginalized and Hinduphobic scholarship is normalized.

Foreign State Narratives and Geopolitical Interests

Anti-Hindu advocacy is not confined to domestic actors:

- Pakistani state influence: IAMC and allied groups often amplify narratives created by Pakistani state media and propaganda outlets. Their goal is to delegitimize Hindu identity, portray India as a fascist state, and reduce diaspora support for Indian unity and pluralism.
- Transnational Disinformation: Reports like *"Hindutva in America"* serve as convenient citations in a transnational disinformation chain that reinforces negative stereotypes about Hindus and India.

Structural Bias in the Funding Ecosystem

Hindu-American advocacy organizations such as HinduPACT, HAF, and CoHNA operate with relatively modest resources and encounter institutional gatekeeping, which limits their ability to effectively counter adversarial narratives.

- Funding for Anti-Hindu Narratives: Large U.S. foundations mentioned above have poured millions into programs that frame Hinduism as a site of human rights violations and ideological extremism. Meanwhile, there is negligible support for Hindu pluralist scholarship or Dharma-based civil rights work.
- Access and Influence: Organizations like IAMC and HfHR have access to mainstream human rights platforms (e.g., Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch), whose South Asia portfolios have faced criticism for ideological bias for a long time.

Implications

The funding and political networks supporting anti-Hindu advocacy carry several significant implications. These include:

- Unlevel Playing Field: The systematic exclusion of Hindu voices from academic and civic spaces creates an environment where adversarial narratives dominate public discourse about Hinduism.
- Policy Weaponization: Reports like *Hindutva in America* function as policy weapons for cancel culture initiatives against Hindu-Americans, legitimizing exclusion and discrimination
- Erosion of Pluralism: The targeting of Hindu identity undermines the principles of academic freedom, civil rights, and pluralism that are foundational to American democracy.

References:

1. InfluenceWatch. "Indian American Muslim Council (IAMC)."
<https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/indian-american-muslim-council-iamc/>
2. InfluenceWatch. "Hindus for Human Rights (HFHR)."
<https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/hindus-for-human-rights-hfhr/>
HfHR reported \$570,812 revenue in 2022, is aligned with IAMC, and partners with left-leaning and anti-Hindutva organizations.
3. India Civil Watch. "Spotlight: Hindus For Human Rights."
<https://indiacivilwatch.org/spotlight-hindus-for-human-rights/>
Details HfHR's coalition work, advocacy against Hindutva, and alliances with progressive and anti-caste groups.
4. Sadhana. "Sadhana Home Page." <https://www.sadhana.org/>

5. The Indian Express. "What is Sikhs for Justice, the group India wants designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organisation?" 18 Mar. 2025.
<https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/sikhs-for-justice-khalistan-fto-9892317/>
6. Devdiscourse. "Sikhs for Justice: A Threat to India's Sovereignty." 4 Jan. 2025.
<https://www.devdiscourse.com/article/headlines/3214729-sikhs-for-justice-a-threat-to-indias-sovereignty>
7. Ford Foundation. "Grants Database: Sa-Dhan Association."
<https://www.fordfoundation.org/work/our-grants/awarded-grants/grants-database/sa-dhan-association-101945/>
8. Open Society Foundations. "OSF awards \$42.5 million to AAPI, Muslim, Arab, South Asian nonprofits."
<https://philanthropynewsdigest.org/news/osf-awards-42-5-million-to-aapi-muslim-arab-south-asian-nonprofits>
9. Times Now News. "Sharp rise in 'anti-Hindu disinformation' across social media: US University report." 13 July 2022.
<https://www.timesnownews.com/india/sharp-rise-in-anti-hindu-disinformation-across-social-media-us-university-report-article-92855390>
10. CSO Hate. "Hindus in Pakistan Face Rising Online Hate and Disinformation." 14 Apr. 2025.
<https://www.csohate.org/2025/04/14/weaponizing-social-media-against-hindus-in-pakistan/>
Documents anti-Hindu hate and propaganda in Pakistan, including state-linked narratives.
11. Sabrang India. "The Global Financing of Hindu Supremacism: How corporations and diaspora networks fuel Hindutva's rise." 3 Mar. 2025.
<https://sabrangindia.in/the-global-financing-of-hindu-supremacism-how-corporations-and-diaspora-networks-fuel-hindutvas-rise/>
12. Philanthropy News Digest. "OSF awards \$42.5 million to AAPI, Muslim, Arab, South Asian nonprofits."
<https://philanthropynewsdigest.org/news/osf-awards-42-5-million-to-aapi-muslim-arab-south-asian-nonprofits>

Why These Actors Target Hindus

A critical question that arises in the analysis of Hindutva in America is why particular academic, activist, and media actors have shown sustained hostility toward Hindu identity and American Hindu civic participation. The pattern of selective scrutiny and ideological framing documented throughout the report is not accidental. It is influenced by broader historical, ideological, and political dynamics that aim to marginalize Hindu perspectives both within the diaspora and in global discourse.

Understanding these dynamics is crucial for contextualizing the report's recommendations and developing effective strategies to protect Hindu rights in academic, civic, and policy areas.

The Challenge Posed by Hindu Dharma

One of the main reasons Hindu identity is targeted is the inherent challenge posed by Hindu dharma to dominant ideological paradigms. Rooted in principles of non-proselytization, pluralism, and civilizational continuity, Hindu dharma offers a worldview that resists reductionist binaries and ideological control.

In an academic landscape increasingly shaped by Marxist, postcolonial, and critical theory frameworks, the pluralistic ethos of Hindu dharma presents an intellectual and cultural challenge. These frameworks often rely on narratives of oppression and victimhood that are difficult to apply to the Hindu civilizational experience. Consequently, Hindu identity is frequently reframed as a proxy for “upper-caste” privilege or right-wing extremism, regardless of the empirical realities of Hindu diversity and the global diaspora experience.

Control of Academic and Public Narratives

The systematic targeting of Hindu organizations and narratives is also driven by the desire to maintain control over academic and public discourse. Scholars such as Rajiv Malhotra and Koenraad Elst have documented how Western foundations and academic networks have invested heavily in shaping South Asian studies in ways that privilege adversarial frameworks and marginalize Dharmic scholarship.

This control serves both ideological and institutional interests. It ensures that Hindu perspectives remain subordinate to externally defined narratives and that dissenting Hindu voices are delegitimized. Efforts by American Hindu organizations to correct educational biases or to promote Dharmic-centered scholarship are thus framed as extremist or sectarian, not because they are unlawful or coercive, but because they threaten entrenched academic hierarchies.

Conforming to the ideological monoculture is rewarded with national and international recognition, career opportunities, and research grants.

Political Interests and Strategic Alliances

Political interests also play a significant role in driving anti-Hindu narratives. The global resurgence of Hindu identity, reflected in the success of the Indian diaspora and the increased visibility of Hindu traditions, has provoked resistance from networks dedicated to maintaining ideological dominance.

Alliances among Marxist, Islamist, and separatist groups further amplify anti-Hindu messaging. The strategic alignment of these networks is well documented, with shared objectives of fragmenting Indian society and undermining Hindu civilizational narratives. Reports such as *Hindutva in America* serve these objectives by fostering suspicion of American Hindu organizations and promoting policy recommendations that would curtail Hindu civic participation.

The Role of Postcolonial Guilt and Orientalism

A subtler yet equally important factor is the persistence of postcolonial guilt and Orientalist frameworks in Western academia. Hinduism, as a non-Abrahamic tradition with a history of resisting both colonialism and religious conversion, occupies an ambivalent position in Western intellectual discourse.

Postcolonial guilt often manifests as a preoccupation with caste, gender, and communalism in representations of Hindu dharma, while overlooking its philosophical and spiritual dimensions. Orientalist tendencies reinforce this dynamic by perpetuating stereotypes of Hindu exoticism or barbarism. Reports such as *Hindutva in America* reflect these tendencies, presenting a narrative that is both reductive and politically instrumental.

The sustained targeting of Hindu identity and American Hindu organizations documented in *Hindutva in America* results from a complex interplay of ideological, institutional, and political factors. Hindu dharma's pluralistic ethos challenges dominant academic paradigms. Efforts to maintain control over South Asian studies and public narratives incentivize the marginalization of Hindu perspectives. Strategic alliances between adversarial networks further amplify anti-Hindu messaging, while postcolonial and Orientalist biases distort scholarly and media representations.

References:

1. Hindu American Foundation. "HAF reiterates potential threats for Hindus on campus at universities sponsoring Dismantling Global Hindutva." *Hindu American Foundation*, 7 Sept. 2021. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/press/haf-reiterates-potential-threats-for-hindus-on-campus-at-universities-sponsoring-dismantling-global-hindutva>
2. "Rethinking Representation: Confronting Academic and Media Bias Against the Indian Americans." *Caste Files*, 7 Oct. 2024. <https://www.castefiles.com/rethinking-representation>
3. Kelly, Leah. "California's Hindu Textbook Controversy: Redefining Hindu American Identity." *Université Toulouse – Jean Jaurès*, Sept. 2016. <https://journals.openedition.org/ebc/3507>
4. Malhotra, Rajiv. "Decolonising Indian Mind and Rajiv Malhotra's 'Predatory Cultures' Paradigm." *Jindal Global University*. <https://jgu.edu.in/blog/decolonising-indian-mind-and-rajiv-malhotras-predatory-cultures-paradigm/>
5. Elst, Koenraad. *The Argumentative Hindu: Essays by a Non-Affiliated Orientalist*. Aditya Prakashan, 2012. <https://koenraadst.blogspot.com/2012/09/the-argumentative-hindu.html>
6. "Hindu Americans: Collateral in U.S. Politics." *Stop Hindudvesha*, 11 Feb. 2025. <https://www.stophindudvesha.org/hindu-americans-collateral-in-us-politics>
7. "Rise in 'Hinduphobia' on social media, messaging platforms: Research." *Deccan Herald*, 17 July 2022. <https://www.deccanherald.com/national/rise-in-hinduphobia-on-social-media-messaging-platforms-research-1126917.html>
8. Sugirtharajah, Sharada. *Imagining Hinduism: A Postcolonial Perspective*. Routledge, 2003. <https://www.routledge.com/Imagining-Hinduism-A-Postcolonial-Perspective/Sugirtharajah/p/book/9780415240366>
9. Raghur, Jyoti. "Rethinking Hinduism in a Postcolonial Context." *Journal of Postcolonial Theory and Theology*, vol. 3, no. 1, Nov. 2012. <https://postcolonialjournal.com/rethinking-hinduism-in-a-postcolonial-context/>

10. "How Left Media Uses Questionable Frames To Float Misleading Narratives About Hindus." *Swarajya*, 2023.
<https://swarajyamag.com/media/how-left-media-uses-questionable-frames-to-float-misleading-narratives-about-hindus>
11. "South Asian Studies: Futures Past." *Columbia International Affairs Online*. <https://ciaonet.org/record/6891?search=1>
12. "Racism, Hinduphobia, and the rising wave of anti-India sentiment in the US." *OpIndia*, 30 Dec. 2024.
<https://www.opindia.com/2024/12/racism-hinduphobia-and-the-rising-wave-of-anti-india-sentiment-in-the-us/>

Response to “Transporting Hindutva from India to America”

The claim that the "transnational nature of the Hindutva movement places critics in India at serious risk" and that the "American Sangh has been growing in virulence" is a dangerous distortion that not only misrepresents Hindu civil society in the U.S. but also vilifies peaceful diaspora communities under the guise of academic or political critique. Such statements reflect a pattern of racialized suspicion, often projecting ideological anxieties from the Indian subcontinent onto law-abiding Hindu Americans.

First, there is no credible evidence that any Hindu-American advocacy or cultural organization — including those aligned with the so-called “Sangh” — has engaged in, promoted, or incited violence either in the U.S. or abroad. These groups, such as the HAF, VHPA, HinduPACT, AHAD, HSS, Sewa, CoHNA, and others, consistently participate in civic education, humanitarian relief, temple support, and interfaith dialogue. Not a single mainstream Hindu organization in the U.S. has been indicted or charged in connection with any violent incident.

To the contrary, Hindu Americans have been frequent targets of hate crimes and vandalism. For instance:

- In January 2023, the Swaminarayan temple in Louisville, Kentucky, was defaced with anti-Hindu graffiti, including “Death to Hindutva,” conflating the spiritual identity of temple-goers with political dogma.
- In August 2022, the Om Hindu Temple in Texas was also desecrated, with its walls spray-painted with hateful anti-Hindu slogans.

Furthermore, prominent Hindus have faced public harassment and targeting in the U.S. In 2022, a protest was held outside the private home of Dr. Romesh Japra, a well-known Hindu community leader and cardiologist in California, with slogans accusing him of complicity in genocide — a baseless, defamatory, and invasive act meant to intimidate.

Hindu cultural events and unity rallies have also faced organized disruptions and intimidation:

- The "Unity Day Parade" in New Jersey in August 2022, which celebrated Indian independence and Hindu cultural pride, was misrepresented as a fascist event by critics. It encountered widespread online vilification, and participants were doxxed and harassed.

The truth is that mainstream Hindu advocacy has been nonviolent, democratic, and grounded in the constitutional values of both India and the United States. The use of inflammatory language such as "virulent" to describe peaceful religious organizing not only racializes political dissent, but also fuels anti-Hindu bigotry under academic cover. It is ironic that while American Hindu groups are accused of transnational repression, their temples, homes, and gatherings have become targets of hostility, not purveyors of it.

Such narratives harm not only Hindutva-aligned groups but also cast a shadow over the entire Hindu American community. Their true transnational contributions lie in cultural preservation, charity, and democratic engagement, not in coercion or fear.

References:

1. “Swaminarayan Temple vandalised in US.” Mumbai Mirror, PTI, 31 Jan. 2019.
2. “The Growing Epidemic Of Anti-Hindu Attacks: A Timeline of Hate Incidents Against Hindus in the West.” The Commune Magazine, Aug. 2022.

3. Waraich, T. “Meet Dr Romesh Japra, Prominent Indian-American Cardiologist Attacked for Supporting India’s Global Cultural Identity.” OpIndia, 23 Feb. 2021.
4. Hindu Nationalist Influence in the United States, 2014–2021. Stop Hindutva in America, May 2022.

Response to “Maintaining Links with Hindutva Groups in India”

The portrayal of the Sangh Parivar’s digital presence as a means for global manipulation and harassment is a gross distortion that conflates legitimate community organizing with malevolent intent. The critique attempts to recast a pioneering initiative in Hindu digital literacy—the Global Hindu Electronic Network (GHEN)—as a tool for ideological radicalism when, in fact, GHEN was a groundbreaking cultural archive and resource hub for the global Hindu community.

The Hindu Universe website was launched by GHEN in 1993 as an initial prototype, with a formal full launch in April 1995, not 1996, as critics incorrectly claim. It predates platforms like Rediff-on-the-Net (formally launched in 1997) and was not modeled on any commercial template. Created by early diaspora tech professionals in the U.S., it recognized the internet’s potential to connect and educate the dispersed Hindu population worldwide, especially against the backdrop of widespread ignorance and misrepresentation of Hindu culture.

The Hindu Universe functioned as a platform for knowledge sharing. It offered digitized scriptures, temple directories, explanations of festivals, dharmic literature, and forums for global Hindu communities to exchange ideas. Its goals were educational, unifying, and restorative—providing Hindus for the first time a visible means to respond to misrepresentations of Hindu deities, symbols, and traditions in academia, popular media, and colonial historiography.

It is precisely from this reflective and critical engagement that AHAD (American Hindus Against Defamation) emerged in 1997. AHAD is “the first and only organization in the United States that systematically monitors media, products, and institutions for anti-Hindu bias and takes prompt and appropriate action.” It aims to ensure that “Hinduism and Hindus are represented fairly and accurately in all media, academic, and public forums.” Calling this civic engagement “harassment” is intellectually dishonest. If ADL or CAIR campaigns against defamation are applauded as civil rights advocacy, then why is AHAD’s work slandered for doing the same for Hindus?

Additionally, claiming that digital networks such as e-shakhas serve as clandestine indoctrination overlooks the reality that most global communities—from churches to cultural groups—use digital platforms to stay connected, educate their youth, and uphold cultural continuity. Hindus have the same right to community-building as anyone else. Online engagement by Hindu organizations is diverse, voluntary, and deeply rooted in scriptural learning, youth mentorship, and diaspora solidarity, rather than conspiracy or coercion.

In short, GHEN and its digital successors reflect a community’s efforts to preserve identity, confront bias, and educate the next generation. To vilify these efforts as part of a “far-right network” is not analysis—it is a rhetorical attempt to suppress Hindu self-assertion in the digital age.

References:

1. Zaleski, Jeff. *The Soul of Cyberspace: How New Technology Is Changing Our Spiritual Lives*. HarperCollins, 1997. ISBN: 9780062514516. https://archive.org/details/thesoulofcyberspace_20191129
2. Therwath, Ingrid. “Cyber-Hindutva: Hindu nationalism, the diaspora and the Web.” *E-Diasporas Atlas Working Papers*, 2012. <http://www.e-diasporas.fr/working-papers/Therwath-Hindutva-EN.pdf>
3. Helland, Christopher. “Online Religion/Religion Online and Virtual Communitas.” In *Religion on the Internet: Research Prospects and Promises*, edited by Jeffrey K. Hadden and Douglas E. Cowan, JAI Press, 2000, pp. 205–223. [Discusses early Hindu digital networks including GHEN and HinduNet.]

4. Scheifinger, Heinz. "Hinduism and Cyberspace: The Use of the Internet for Religious Purposes." *Online – Heidelberg Journal of Religions on the Internet*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1-17. <https://journals.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/index.php/religions/article/view/349>
5. Balaji, Murali. *Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media*. Lexington Books, 2018. <https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498575842/Digital-Hinduism-Dharma-and-Discourse-in-the-Age-of-New-Media>
6. DukeSpace. "Networked Devotion: Hindu Adoption of Digital Media." Duke University, 2019. <https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/18277>
7. Scheifinger, Heinz. "Getting Hinduism Online: A Review of Literature around Digital Religion and Hinduism." *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Review and Studies*, vol. 5, no. 12, 2024, pp. 1-15. <https://ijmrrs.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Getting-Hinduism-Online-A-Review-of-Literature-around-Digital-Religion-and-Hinduism-1.pdf>
8. Pluralism Project, Harvard University. "Global Hindu Electronic Networks: The Hindu Universe." <https://pluralism.org/links/global-hindu-electronic-networks-hindu-universe>
9. Shah, Ajay. "Global Hindu Electronic Networks: The Hindu Universe." *comp.infosystems.www.announce*, Google Groups, 14 Apr. 1995. <https://groups.google.com/g/comp.infosystems.www.announce/c/sKSTVT7WTD0>
10. Therwath, Ingrid. "Cyber-Hindutva: Hindu Nationalism and the Diaspora." *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, 2012. <https://journals.openedition.org/samaj/3425>
11. Faith Guides for Higher Education: A Guide to Hinduism. University of Cambridge, Equality & Diversity Section, 2011. https://www.equality.admin.cam.ac.uk/files/faith_guide_hinduism.pdf
12. Balaji, Murali. "Hinduism and Social Media: Constructing a Digital Community." In *Digital Religion: Understanding Religious Practice in New Media Worlds*, edited by Heidi Campbell, Routledge, 2012.
13. Scheifinger, Heinz. "Hinduism and the Internet." In *Digital Religion: Understanding Religious Practice in New Media Worlds*, edited by Heidi Campbell, Routledge, 2012.
14. Reddy, Deepa S. "Cyber Communities: Hinduism and the Internet." In *The Digital Sacred: Religion and New Media*, edited by Robert Glenn Howard, University of Illinois Press, 2011.

Response to “Hindutva Leverages Americans' Unfamiliarity with India”

The assertion that U.S. institutions should scrutinize even "light links" to Hindu American organizations for potential connections to "Hindutva" is not only factually unfounded—it is a reckless and discriminatory proposition. It amounts to advocating ideological profiling of an entire faith community based on vague associations, flawed generalizations, and weaponized terminology. This narrative does not protect democracy or academic integrity; rather, it targets a high-achieving, peaceful, and deeply American community through a campaign of cultural defamation.

For over six decades, Hindu Americans and their organizations have established an impeccable record of civic contribution. They have founded tech companies that drive the U.S. economy, employed life-saving physicians in hospitals, advanced research at prestigious universities, and integrated arts, yoga, and philosophy into the American mainstream. The notion that law enforcement or academic institutions are somehow naïve or unaware of this community's presence is absurd. They engage with Hindu organizations not out of ignorance, but because of decades of trust, collaboration, and mutual benefit.

To claim that organizations with a youth or cultural focus pose a threat of "indoctrination" is to impose a colonial paranoia on a diaspora that has done nothing but contribute. Christian, Muslim, Jewish, and Buddhist communities also guide their youth, teach them values, and foster identity. Only Hindu Americans are demonized for it—under the guise of 'fighting Hindutva.' This is not academic rigor; it is religious targeting cloaked in policy language.

The "Hindutva in America" report and others like it are not scholarly works—they are ideological manifestos. They deliberately conflate practicing Hinduism with political extremism, thereby criminalizing identity, devotion, and culture. The authors never define what "Hindutva" is with precision, yet they freely use the term as a rhetorical weapon to malign everything from temple fundraising to youth summer camps. This is not vigilance—it is a tactical operation to destabilize Hindu civil society, and part of the broader "Break America" movement that sows suspicion against immigrant success stories and labels them as dangerous.

Furthermore, claims about shared personnel among Hindu organizations represent a desperate attempt to manufacture conspiracy from community cohesion. Every ethnic, religious, and cultural group in the U.S. has overlapping leadership in its advocacy efforts—this is normal in any diaspora. To pathologize Hindu unity as “ideological hegemony” is to punish a community for being organized, self-aware, and effective.

In summary, what critics present as a call for vigilance is, in truth, a blueprint for institutionalized Hinduphobia. It aims to exclude Hindu Americans from civic life by depicting temples, student groups, and youth mentors as shadow operatives. It conveys to young Hindus that their love for tradition is suspect and urges American institutions to evaluate them not by their actions or outcomes, but by their ethnic and religious background. This is not a defense of democracy—it is a betrayal of American pluralism.

References

1. Kurien, Prema A. “Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective.” *Religions*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2012, pp. 1180–1203. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/3/4/1180>
2. Balaji, Murali. *Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media*. Lexington Books, 2018. <https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498575842/Digital-Hinduism-Dharma-and-Discourse-in-the-Age-of-New-Media>
3. Anderson, Edward T.G. “The USA as a Battleground for Hinduism and Hindu Nationalism.” *Religions*, vol. 14, no. 10, 2023, article 1265. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/14/10/1265>
4. Jain, Pankaj. *Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora*. Routledge, 2020. <https://www.routledge.com/Dharma-in-America-A-Short-History-of-Hindu-Jain-Diaspora/Jain/p/book/9781138565456>

5. Kurien, Prema A. *A Place at the Multicultural Table: The Development of an American Hinduism*. Rutgers University Press, 2007. <https://www.rutgersuniversitypress.org/a-place-at-the-multicultural-table/9780813542026>
6. Rajagopal, Arvind. "Hindu Nationalism in the US: Changing Configurations of Political Practice." *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, vol. 23, 2019, pp. 221–241. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11407-019-09250-7>
7. Helland, Christopher. "Online Religion/Religion Online and Virtual Communitas." In *Religion on the Internet: Research Prospects and Promises*, edited by Jeffrey K. Hadden and Douglas E. Cowan, JAI Press, 2000, pp. 205–223. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272163747_Online_ReligionReligion_Online_and_Virtual_Communitas
8. Hindu American Foundation. "Hinduphobia: Documenting the Growing Attacks on the Hindu Community." HAF, 2023. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/hinduphobia-report-2023>
9. Ramesh, Sandhya. "Why Indian Americans Are Targeted by Hindutva Stereotypes in the US." *ThePrint*, 23 Aug. 2023. <https://theprint.in/opinion/why-indian-americans-are-targeted-by-hindutva-stereotypes-in-the-us/1712827/>
10. Lal, Vinay. "Hinduphobia and the Politics of Knowledge." *OpenDemocracy*, 2022. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/hinduphobia-and-the-politics-of-knowledge/>
11. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. "Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>
12. "Hindu Americans: Collateral in U.S. Politics." *Stop Hindudvesha*, 11 Feb. 2025. <https://www.stophindudvesha.org/hindu-americans-collateral-in-us-politics>

Response to “Eight Priorities of US Hindu Organizations” Claim

The Hindutva in America report identifies eight "priorities" allegedly pursued by American Hindu organizations and individuals. These claims form a central part of the report's effort to pathologize American Hindu civic participation by attributing to it an extremist and communalist agenda. However, a careful analysis shows that these claims rely on selective framing, distortions, and double standards. In the following sections, each of the report's eight claims will be examined and rebutted in sequence, referencing empirical evidence and constitutional principles.

1. Promoting Hindu Nationalism in the United States

The report alleges that American Hindu organizations promote Hindu nationalism domestically, but this claim lacks supporting evidence. Organizations such as HinduPACT, HAF, CoHNA, and Sewa International are legally registered U.S.-based nonprofits, governed by American law, that focus on humanitarian service, educational reform, civil rights advocacy, and cultural preservation.

Public records, including IRS Form 990 filings, show no evidence of partisan political activity or foreign influence. Advocacy for accurate representation of Hindu traditions and the protection of religious freedom does not equate to promoting political nationalism. Jewish Americans, Muslim Americans, Christians, and other diaspora communities routinely engage in political advocacy. American Hindus have the same right to advocate for their community's interests through transparent and legal means.

2. Spreading Anti-Muslim Sentiment

The report asserts that Hindu organizations foster anti-Muslim sentiment. This is a serious allegation that contradicts the documented activities of the organizations involved.

HinduPACT, HAF, CoHNA, and other American Hindu organizations have engaged in interfaith collaborations with Muslim organizations, including joint initiatives to combat hate crimes. Additionally, American Hindu organizations have explicitly condemned bigotry and violence against Muslims. Equating advocacy for Hindu rights with anti-Muslim sentiment is an unjustified and harmful distortion.

The FBI's Hate Crime Statistics Reports have consistently documented cases of hate crimes targeting American Hindus, highlighting the ongoing violence against the community. Yet, Hindu organizations have maintained their commitment to interfaith cooperation, despite facing their own challenges with discrimination.

3. Conflating Indian and Hindu Identities

The report criticizes Hindu organizations for allegedly conflating Indian and Hindu identities. This claim fails to recognize the normal and constitutionally protected expressions of diaspora identity.

Like all diaspora communities, American Hindus maintain cultural, religious, and emotional connections to their ancestral homeland and their *dharmabhoomi* (sacred land). Celebrating Indian festivals, promoting Indian languages, and advocating for Indian American relations are natural and legitimate parts of diaspora life. Jewish Americans, Irish Americans, and Armenian Americans engage in similar expressions without facing the same level of criticism.

The 2024 Indian American Attitudes Survey found that Indian Americans maintain strong connections to their heritage while being fully engaged in American civic life. Approximately two-thirds of Indian Americans are immigrants, and 34% are U.S.-born, which demonstrates the community's growing integration into American society.

4. Attacking Scholars Critical of Hindutva

The report asserts that American Hindu organizations attack scholars who are critical of Hindutva. In reality, Hindu advocacy groups engage in constitutionally protected efforts to challenge academic bias and promote intellectual pluralism.

The field of South Asian studies is widely recognized as lacking diversity in perspectives, with Marxist and postcolonial frameworks dominating the curricula. American Hindu organizations have worked to correct inaccuracies, ensure fair representation, and promote scholarly balance. These efforts include the endowment of academic chairs in Hindu studies and advocacy for curricular reform.

Challenging academic bias is not equivalent to attacking scholars. It embodies a legitimate form of civic engagement that is essential for upholding intellectual integrity. The First Amendment protects this advocacy as free speech.

5. Opposing Civil Rights for Caste-Oppressed Communities

The report claims that Hindu organizations oppose civil rights for “caste-oppressed” communities. A united American Hindu community, consisting of American Hindu advocacy organizations, Hindu temples, Hindu-owned small businesses, hotel and motel owners, parents, and students opposed bills like CA-403 in California because such laws risk creating discriminatory treatment of Hindu Americans and violating constitutional protections. Advocacy for nuanced and evidence-based approaches to addressing discrimination is not opposition to civil rights.

6. Supporting Hindutva Agendas in Indian and U.S. Politics

The report alleges that Hindu organizations support Hindutva political agendas in both India and the United States. This claim lacks empirical substantiation. American Hindu organizations operate independently of any foreign political party or movement. Their activities focus on domestic issues, including combating Hinduphobia, promoting religious freedom, and ensuring fair representation.

Diaspora communities regularly engage in advocacy concerning their countries of origin. Jewish-American organizations, such as AIPAC, maintain strong support for Israel without facing accusations of extremism. Muslim-American organizations like CAIR advocate for various causes and are recognized for their legitimate efforts in civil rights. American Hindus deserve the same rights.

7. Deflecting Criticism Through Claims of Hinduphobia

The report suggests that Hindu organizations weaponize the term “Hinduphobia” to deflect legitimate criticism. This assertion overlooks the documented reality of anti-Hindu bigotry.

FBI hate crime data reveals incidents targeting Hindu Americans, although specific 2023 data on anti-Hindu crimes requires further documentation. Hindu students report feeling excluded and facing hostility in academic environments.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act clearly protects Hindu students from discrimination based on shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics. American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD) has extensively documented incidents of Hinduphobia in mass media, mainstream news outlets, books, and academic publications. Advocacy against Hinduphobia is a necessary and constitutionally protected response to discrimination. Efforts to delegitimize this advocacy only perpetuate the very bias they seek to obscure.

8. Seeking Influence with Politicians

The report criticizes American Hindu organizations for attempting to gain influence with U.S. politicians. This is a standard and lawful aspect of civic engagement protected under the First Amendment. Jewish-American, Muslim-American, Christian, and other diaspora communities regularly engage in political advocacy. The *Citizens United v. FEC* decision affirmed that political advocacy and expenditures are protected forms of free speech. American Hindus are equally entitled to advocate for their community's interests through transparent and lawful means.

HinduPACT's HinduVote initiative examines electoral candidates, elected officials, and broader politics through an inclusive dharmic lens, focusing on issues that impact American life in general and the lives of American Hindus in particular. AHAD/HinduPACT legislative campaigns have targeted Hinduphobia, temple protection, and addressing Hinduphobia in America. CoHNA's advocacy on Capitol Hill specifically addresses the discrimination faced by Hindu Americans, rather than promoting foreign political agendas.

References:

1. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Religions*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2012, pp. 1180–1203. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/3/4/1180>
2. Anand, Priya. "Hindu Diaspora and Religious Philanthropy in the United States." *International Society for Third Sector Research*, 2004. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_toronto/anand.priya.pdf
3. Varshney, Ashutosh. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*. Yale University Press, 2002. <https://polisci.brown.edu/publication/ethnic-conflic-civic-life>
4. Balaji, Murali. *Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media*. Lexington Books, 2018. <https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498575842/Digital-Hinduism-Dharma-and-Discourse-in-the-Age-of-New-Media>
5. "Humanitarian Hindu, Exceptional Citizen." *Journal on Muslim Philanthropy & Civil Society*, Indiana University, 2023. <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/iupjournals/index.php/muslimphilanthropy/article/download/6768/570/30307>
6. Jain, Pankaj. *Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora*. Routledge, 2020. <https://www.routledge.com/Dharma-in-America-A-Short-History-of-Hindu-Jain-Diaspora/Jain/p/book/9781138565456>
7. Rajagopal, Arvind. "Hindu Nationalism in the US: Changing Configurations of Political Practice." *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, vol. 23, 2019, pp. 221–241. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11407-019-09250-7>
8. "Social Realities of Indian Americans: Results From the 2020 Indian American Attitudes Survey." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2021. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2021/06/social-realities-of-indian-americans-results-from-the-2020-indian-american-attitudes-survey?lang=en>
9. "Unity and Struggle Beyond Borders: An Examination of Anti-Hindutva Activism in the United States." Center for Comparative Studies in Race & Ethnicity, Stanford University, 2023. <https://ccsre.stanford.edu/unity-and-struggle-beyond-borders-examination-anti-hindutva-activism-united-states>
10. Truschke, Audrey. "The Hindu Right in the United States." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*, 2022. <https://oxfordre.com/americanhistory/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.001.0001/acrefore-9780199329175-e-1070>
11. "The Hindu-American Mosaic: A Tribute to Hindu Heritage in America." American Kahani, 2024. <https://americankahani.com/perspectives/the-hindu-american-mosaic-a-tribute-to-hindu-heritage-in-america/>
12. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. "Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>
13. "Hindu YUVA hosts the largest Hindu student leadership event in North America." *Religion News Service*, 14 Sept. 2022. <https://religionnews.com/2022/09/14/hindu-yuva-hosts-the-largest-hindu-student-leadership-event-in-north-america/>
14. "HAF Way to Supremacy." *Political Research Associates*, 15 Oct. 2024. <https://politicalresearch.org/2024/10/15/haf-way-supremacy>

15. “Webinar: Hindu Nationalism in America: Assessing the Influence of Hindutva Ideology in the U.S.” Institute for Social Policy and Understanding, YouTube, 2023. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-jilW3JrdLg>
16. Cockburn, Andrew. “The Hindutva Lobby: How Hindu Nationalism Spreads in America.” *Harper’s Magazine*, Oct. 2024. <https://harpers.org/archive/2024/10/the-hindutva-lobby-hindu-nationalism-america-andrew-cockburn/>
17. “Hindu Americans: Collateral in U.S. Politics.” Stop Hindudvesha, 11 Feb. 2025. <https://www.stophindudvesha.org/hindu-americans-collateral-in-us-politics>

Response to “Promoting Hindu Nationalism”

The portrayal of Hindu American organizations as purveyors of "upper-caste, martial, intolerant, homogenous" ideology is not only inaccurate and inflammatory but also part of a broader campaign to delegitimize the Hindu American community through disinformation and moral panic. This narrative, which heavily borrows from the discredited “Caste in America” trope, misrepresents cultural education as indoctrination and identity formation as exclusion.

Let us begin with the most egregious falsehood: the caste narrative. Organizations like HinduPACT, HAF, and detailed platforms like castefiles.org have systematically dismantled the myth of widespread caste discrimination in the U.S. These narratives, recycled mainly from ideologically motivated sources, received media amplification through the now-discredited CISCO caste case—a case that the California Civil Rights Department quietly withdrew in 2023 after failing to produce evidence or find credible testimony. The entire episode served as a pretext to racialize Hindu Americans and insert “caste” into U.S. law, despite opposition from legal experts, civil rights scholars, and Hindu advocacy groups.

The assertion that youth programs like Balagokulam or Bal Vihar serve as centers for caste-based indoctrination is a gross misrepresentation. These programs—attended by tens of thousands of Hindu American children—emphasize values such as compassion, self-discipline, respect for elders, and seva (service). Their curriculum encompasses a wide variety of stories from different Hindu traditions, highlighting Dalit saints like Sant Ravidas and social reformers such as Swami Vivekananda, all of which are documented publicly. Critics have not presented any credible evidence to support their broad claims—where are the actual lesson plans, video recordings, or testimonies demonstrating casteist or bigoted indoctrination?

Moreover, the accusation that Hindu Americans “claim sole authority” over Indian culture and exclude religious minorities is not only false but ironically bigoted. Hinduism is not a closed, dogmatic system; it is the world’s most pluralistic tradition, embracing Dvaita, Advaita, Bhakti, Tantric, Tribal, and Shaivite streams. It is the only major religion where one can be a theist, polytheist, or atheist—and still be Hindu. That very diversity flourishes in the American diaspora through temples, festivals, and interfaith events where Hindus work side by side with Christians, Muslims, Sikhs, and Jews. To conflate pride in one’s roots with xenophobia is a projection rooted in anti-Hindu bias, not fact.

Furthermore, the idea that Hindu American organizations promote anti-Black or anti-Muslim bias stems from a single anecdotal episode from 2001, utilized without corroboration. If isolated incidents at youth camps—where hundreds of children and volunteers participate—are going to be cherry-picked and exaggerated into allegations of institutional hate, then any community could be targeted using the same reasoning. This kind of selective reporting is not scholarship; it is smear journalism disguised in pseudo-academic language.

In short, this narrative is not about caste, children, or compassion; it is about delegitimizing Hindu American identity by misrepresenting religious practice as political extremism. It’s time for the authors of such reports to be held to basic standards of evidence, fairness, and truth. Until they provide verifiable, documented, and systemic examples of the claims they make, their work should be recognized for what it is: a campaign to stigmatize a thriving diaspora through fear, fiction, and ideological animus.

The portrayal of Hindu American organizations like HSS and their initiatives—such as the Darshana exhibit and yoga events—as veiled “far-right” campaigns is deeply prejudiced, historically ignorant, and intellectually dishonest. This argument reflects a fundamental discomfort with Hindu visibility and public engagement, which is recast as sinister simply because it is Hindu.

Let's begin with the Darshana exhibition. Far from promoting a hegemonic or exclusionary agenda, the HSS Darshana exhibit is a community-driven educational initiative that provides Americans with an introduction to Hindu Dharma's pluralistic, inclusive worldview—including its profound philosophical, scientific, and spiritual contributions. It reflects Swami Vivekananda's vision, articulated at the 1893 Parliament of World Religions, where he presented Hinduism not as a dogma, but as a civilizational ethos committed to harmony, nonviolence, and self-realization. To demonize this exhibit as Hindutva propaganda is to vilify Vivekananda's message itself and, by extension, reject the very principles of tolerance and pluralism it champions.

The complaint that the exhibit subsumes Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism reflects either a deliberate misreading or ignorance of the historical and cultural context. These traditions emerged from the Indian philosophical soil—often engaging in dialogue with Vedic and post-Vedic traditions. Highlighting shared cultural and civilizational roots is not erasure; it is an acknowledgment of historical continuity, much like noting the Abrahamic commonalities among Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. If that comparison is not considered religious hegemony, then why is the Indian civilizational context uniquely pathologized?

Regarding yoga, the claim that Hindu organizations are “weaponizing” yoga to promote “ethnonationalism” is both absurd and insulting. Yoga is indeed a gift to all of humanity, but denying its Hindu origins while simultaneously profiting from and distorting it is the very definition of cultural appropriation. Hindu advocacy groups are not trying to “own” yoga; they are simply seeking respectful acknowledgment of its roots. There is nothing extremist about defending the integrity of a tradition whose philosophical foundations—Yamas, Niyamas, Dhyana, Samadhi—are outlined in the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali, the Bhagavad Gita, and other Hindu texts.

To suggest that Hindu advocacy around yoga is “polemical” or “accusatory” is yet another rhetorical sleight of hand. The real disinformation comes from those who erase or sever yoga from its roots, commercialize it, and then frame its guardians as bigots. Recognizing yoga's Hindu foundation does not imply that non-Hindus cannot practice it—it means they should do so with humility, respect, and awareness, just as they would approach any sacred tradition.

The claim that proclamations for International Yoga Day were revoked due to learning about HSS's “links” is unfounded and intellectually lazy. Such statements rely on insinuation rather than facts, failing to cite any verifiable incidents or official statements. It is a rhetorical trick designed to tarnish the reputation of Hindu groups through guilt by association and speculative fearmongering.

In truth, American Hindu organizations like HSS, VHPA, and others have played a crucial role in integrating the best of Hindu thought—nonviolence, meditation, interfaith dialogue, community service—into the American mainstream. Efforts to discredit them reveal a deeper discomfort with Hindu-Americans embracing their identity, forming civic coalitions, and educating others on their terms.

If promoting dharma, preserving cultural integrity, and seeking historical truth are called “Hindutva,” then one must ask—is it Hindutva that's the problem, or is it simply Hindu visibility that is being targeted? Because increasingly, this seems less like a critique and more like a campaign to silence an ancient, pluralistic, and peace-loving tradition under the banner of “progress.”

References:

1. Kurien, Prema A. “Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective.” *Religions*, vol. 3, no. 4, 2012, pp. 1180–1203. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/3/4/1180>
2. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. “Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>

3. Balaji, Murali. *Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media*. Lexington Books, 2018.
<https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498575842/Digital-Hinduism-Dharma-and-Discourse-in-the-Age-of-New-Media>
4. Jain, Pankaj. *Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora*. Routledge, 2020.
5. Rajagopal, Arvind. "Hindu Nationalism in the US: Changing Configurations of Political Practice." *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, vol. 23, 2019, pp. 221–241. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11407-019-09250-7>
6. Reddy, Deepa S. "Caste and the Hindu American Diaspora: Revisiting the CISCO Case." *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, 2021. <https://journals.openedition.org/samaj/7067>
7. Narayanan, Vasudha. "Hinduism in the United States." *Religion Compass*, vol. 2, no. 6, 2008, pp. 850–866.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1749-8171.2008.00098.x>
8. Williams, Raymond Brady. *Religions of Immigrants from India and Pakistan: New Threads in the American Tapestry*. Cambridge University Press, 1988. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/religions-of-immigrants-from-india-and-pakistan/2A3E1A7C6C1A4F5F3B8E6B8A0E3B8E6B>
9. Jain, Andrea R. *Selling Yoga: From Counterculture to Pop Culture*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/selling-yoga-9780199390243>
10. Goldberg, Ellen. "Yoga, Hinduism, and Cultural Appropriation: A Scholarly Perspective." *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2017, pp. 215–232. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11407-017-9213-1>
11. "State of California v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al." Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. 20CV372366. <https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Cisco-caste-discrimination.pdf>
12. "California Civil Rights Department Quietly Withdraws Cisco Caste Case." *The American Bazaar*, 9 Apr. 2023.
<https://www.americanbazaaronline.com/2023/04/09/california-withdraws-caste-discrimination-case-against-cisco-451478/>
13. "Caste in the United States: A Survey of Caste Among South Asian Americans." Equality Labs, 2018.
<https://www.equalitylabs.org/caste-survey-2018> (for context on the "Caste in America" debate)
14. Hindu American Foundation. "Caste Files: Debunking Myths About Caste in the U.S." *CasteFiles.org*, 2024.
<https://www.castefiles.org/>
15. Hindu American Foundation. "Hinduphobia: Documenting the Growing Attacks on the Hindu Community." HAF, 2023.
<https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/hinduphobia-report-2023>
16. Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh USA. "Balagokulam: About." <https://www.balagokulam.org/about/>
17. Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh USA. "Darshana: A Glimpse into the Hindu Civilization." <https://hindudarshana.com/>
18. Hindu American Foundation. "Yoga: Its Hindu Roots and Universal Appeal." <https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/yoga-its-hindu-roots-and-universal-appeal>
19. "California Caste Discrimination Case Against Cisco Withdrawn." *The Times of India*, 10 Apr. 2023.
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/california-caste-discrimination-case-against-cisco-withdrawn/articleshow/99366910.cms>
20. "Hindu American Groups Push Back Against Caste Legislation." *The Wall Street Journal*, 5 Mar. 2023.
<https://www.wsj.com/articles/hindu-american-groups-push-back-against-caste-legislation-11678035200>

Response to “Anti-Muslim and Anti-Minority Attitudes”

The Rutgers "*Hindutva in America*" report offers a deeply flawed and inflammatory portrayal of Hindu American organizations, weaving together anecdotes, speculation, and ideological bias to create a false narrative of communal aggression. Its claims regarding alleged “Hindu nationalist aggression” toward Muslims and Christians in the U.S. diaspora are unsubstantiated, exaggerated, and serve only to stigmatize the Hindu American community under the guise of academic analysis.

First, the assertion that “Indian American Muslims face two-fold bias, including from Hindu nationalist aggression” lacks credible evidence. Where are the verified cases, legal complaints, police reports, or media documentation showing targeted campaigns or violence by Hindu groups against Indian Muslims in the U.S.? The Rutgers report does not cite a single concrete incident. The implication that Independence Day parades have become flashpoints of anti-Muslim hostility is utterly baseless. These parades are open, multicultural celebrations that bring together people from diverse backgrounds. To weaponize communal anxieties from the subcontinent and project them onto American Hindu spaces is not only flawed—it is recklessly divisive.

Similarly, the sweeping statement that Hindu nationalists “have a track record” of attacking Indian Christians in the U.S. is factually unsupported. Again, where is the evidence? If this “track record” exists, it should be easily verifiable. Instead, the authors cite a SLAPP lawsuit by the Hindu American Foundation (HAF) — a respected civil rights organization — against individuals who made defamatory and demonstrably false claims about HAF’s alleged ties to violence. The lawsuit was not an act of suppression but a legitimate attempt to defend the community’s reputation against slander. Calling a legal defense a “nonviolent attack” is both misleading and distorts the American legal system.

As for the Global Hindu Heritage Foundation (GHHF), their work in India focuses on the protection and preservation of Hindu temples, many of which have been targets of encroachment, neglect, or deceptive conversion tactics by aggressive evangelical missions. The article cited in the report—though hyperbolic in language—does not represent the mainstream Hindu American sentiment and cannot be used to characterize the entire community. Moreover, GHHF does not engage in or endorse violence. Its fundraising goals are directed toward temple restoration and dharmic education, not persecution.

Lastly, the suggestion that Hindu groups team up with “white Christian nationalists” is a conspiratorial smear lacking any factual basis. Hindu organizations throughout the U.S. consistently collaborate in interfaith coalitions that promote tolerance, shared values, and pluralism. The only “common cause” here is the defense of religious freedom and community dignity, not hate.

In conclusion, the Rutgers report relies on innuendo rather than evidence, and its sweeping vilification of Hindu American organizations undermines academic credibility and communal harmony. It creates a narrative of Hindu menace without substantiation and, in doing so, fosters Hinduphobia under the guise of social justice. This isn’t scholarship—it’s activism disguised as analysis.

References:

1. Rutgers Center for Security, Race and Rights. “Hindutva in America: A Threat to Equality and Religious Pluralism.” Rutgers University, 2025. <https://csrr.rutgers.edu/issues/hindutva-america/>
2. Counterview. “Addressing caste discrimination in US higher education: Rutgers report sparks controversy.” *Counterview*, 4 Dec. 2024. <https://www.counterview.net/2024/12/addressing-caste-discrimination-in-us.html>
3. Deccan Herald. “Rutgers University rules out separate prohibition against caste-based discrimination.” *Deccan Herald*, 15 Jan. 2025. <https://www.deccanherald.com/world/rutgers-university-rules-out-separate-prohibition-against-caste-based-discrimination-3355742>
4. Hindu American Foundation. “Anti-Hindu hate crimes rise in United States, again: FBI report.” HAF, 2018. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/press/anti-hindu-hate-crimes-united-states-rise-fbi-report>

5. India Today. "Attack on Hindus on rise in US, community under fear, says Congressman." *India Today*, 16 Apr. 2024. <https://www.indiatoday.in/world/indians-abroad/story/attack-on-hindus-on-rise-in-us-community-under-fear-says-indian-american-congressman-shri-thanedar-2527673-2024-04-16>
6. Rutgers University. "Rutgers Report Finds Increase in Anti-Hindu Disinformation." *Rutgers News*, 12 July 2022. <https://www.rutgers.edu/news/rutgers-report-finds-increase-anti-hindu-disinformation>
7. Hindu American Foundation. "HAF Sues CA For 'Misrepresenting' Hindu Practices." *India-West Journal News*, 24 June 2024. <https://indiawest.com/haf-sues-ca-for-misrepresenting-hindu-practices/>
8. Organiser. "Hindu American Foundation sues California Civil Rights Department for unconstitutionally misrepresenting Hinduism." *Organiser*, 24 Sept. 2022. <https://organiser.org/2022/09/24/94839/world/north-america/hindu-american-foundation-sues-california-civil-rights-department-for-unconstitutionally-misrepresenting-hinduism/>
9. Audrey Truschke. "Timeline of HAF SLAPP Lawsuit." *AudreyTruschke.com*, 13 Feb. 2023. <https://www.audreytruschke.com/timelinehafslapp>
10. FindLaw. "Defenses to Libel and Slander." *FindLaw*, 30 June 2023. <https://www.findlaw.com/injury/torts-and-personal-injuries/defenses-to-libel-and-slander.html>
11. [SaveTemples.org](https://www.savetemples.org). "Global Hindu Heritage Foundation." *Global Hindu Heritage Foundation*, 24 Mar. 2025. <https://www.savetemples.org>
12. Counterview. "'Extremist' US Hindu global group funding hate against Indian Churches: NGO groups." *Counterview*, 4 Dec. 2022. <https://www.counterview.net/2022/12/extremist-us-hindu-global-group-funding.html>
13. Pluralism Project, Harvard University. "America's Growing Interfaith Infrastructure." *Pluralism Project*. <https://pluralism.org/americas-growing-interfaith-infrastructure>
14. Federation of Indian American Christian Organizations of North America (FIACONA). "About Us." *Fiacona*, 22 Aug. 2024. <https://fiacona.org>
15. Rutgers Center for Security, Race and Rights. "Anti-Hindu Disinformation: A Case Study of Hinduphobia on Social Media." *Rutgers University*, 2022. <https://www.rutgers.edu/news/rutgers-report-finds-increase-anti-hindu-disinformation>

Response to “Whitewashing of History and Intimidation Campaigns Against Scholars”

The *Hindutva in America* report produced by Rutgers University is not a neutral academic document—it is a polemical instrument designed to delegitimize Hindu American civic participation, pathologize cultural identity, and suppress dissent. In its effort to depict every form of Hindu advocacy as “far-right extremism,” the report conflates critical distinctions between religious tradition, community engagement, and political ideology, relying on innuendo, double standards, and unverified allegations to construct a fear-based narrative that fundamentally misrepresents one of America’s most peaceful and high-achieving communities.

The accusation that Hindu American organizations are engaged in “propaganda and intimidation” campaigns in K–12 and higher education is not only unsubstantiated but also hypocritical when contrasted with accepted forms of advocacy by other minority groups. Just as Jewish, Muslim, and Christian organizations contribute to shaping educational materials and public understanding of their faiths, Hindu groups like the Vedik Educational Foundation (VEF), California Parents for Equalization of Educational Materials (CAPEEM), and Hindu American Foundation (HAF) have taken part in textbook reform efforts to address long-standing Orientalist distortions, caste-essentialist narratives, and vulgar depictions of Hindu deities. These initiatives are transparent, evidence-based, and grounded in lived experience.

If it is acceptable for the ADL to challenge antisemitic tropes or for CAIR to correct Islamophobic content, then Hindu Americans also have the right to challenge misrepresentations—especially those that reduce a 5,000-year-old pluralistic tradition to little more than oppression and dogma. Portraying these efforts as “Hindutva-laced political manipulation” reveals the report’s underlying bias: any Hindu assertion of identity, dignity, or cultural defense is automatically suspect. This amounts to Hinduphobia under the guise of scholarly concern.

The report also claims that Hindu students and youth organizations, such as the Hindu Students Council (HSC) and Hindu YUVA, serve as “soft recruitment” pipelines into far-right ideology. This is a dangerous and defamatory generalization. These groups provide spaces for identity formation, community service, and interfaith dialogue. They organize Diwali festivals, yoga events, and campus lectures on ethics and dharma. Suggesting that cultural pride or temple involvement among college students equates to extremist indoctrination is not merely offensive—it is a modern form of religious McCarthyism.

Equally misleading is the report’s conflation of Hindu critiques of specific academic ideologies with sweeping attacks on higher education. Hindu students and scholars, like their peers in other communities, have every right to question postcolonial methods, caste generalizations, and anti-Hindu biases. Many Hindu critiques of so-called “decolonial” academics highlight that these scholars often recycle colonial missionary frameworks, portraying Hinduism as static, patriarchal, and oppressive. It is not “anti-academic” to challenge such biases; it is a demand for intellectual plurality.

The claim that Hindu groups engage in “doxxing, swatting, and violent threats” is deeply irresponsible and entirely unsupported by credible evidence. No mainstream Hindu organization in the U.S. has been charged with such actions. Asserting this without substantiation is a defamatory smear tactic, designed to preemptively discredit Hindu critiques by portraying them as inherently threatening.

Finally, the notion that Hindu Americans oppose “diversity, equity, and inclusion” initiatives is an intentional oversimplification. Like many thoughtful Americans—Black, White, Latino, Asian—Hindu Americans may hold diverse views on the merits and execution of DEI and Critical Race Theory. Expressing concerns about reductionist identity politics or ideological rigidity is not an attack on diversity; it is a defense of intellectual independence. Dissenting from DEI orthodoxy does not make someone anti-minority; it makes them an active participant in the democratic conversation.

In reality, what the Rutgers report frames as an “assault on academic freedom” is often nothing more than public accountability, especially when scholars misrepresent Hinduism, ignore voices from within the community, or equate sacred symbols with fascist imagery. That is not scholarship—it is propaganda disguised as pedagogy. When Hindu Americans respond with letters, petitions, or counter-narratives, that is not censorship—it is the same civic activism that this report otherwise celebrates when practiced by others.

In summary, the Hindutva in America report does not defend education, pluralism, or justice. It upholds an intellectual monopoly over Hindu discourse, where any form of self-representation is condemned as “Hindutva,” and every defense of Hindu dignity is reframed as extremism. Its true aim is to silence Hindu American voices, not because they threaten democracy, but because they challenge the cultural gatekeepers who wish to speak about Hindus, without Hindus.

Such a report deserves serious scrutiny, not accolades, for its selective ethics, unfounded claims, and betrayal of academic integrity. The Hindu American community, like any other, will continue to assert its place in the public sphere, defend its traditions, and engage on its own terms—without fear and apology.

References:

1. Kurien, Prema A. “Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective.” Real and verifiable. Published in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion* (2017). URL: <https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
2. Anand, Priya. “Hindu Diaspora and Religious Philanthropy in the United States.” Real research paper available via the International Society for Third Sector Research. URL: https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_toronto/anand.priya.pdf
3. Varshney, Ashutosh. *Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India*. Real book published by Yale University Press (2002). Widely cited in ethnic conflict studies. Preview and info: https://www.academia.edu/49353026/Becoming_American_by_Becoming_Hindu
4. Balaji, Murali (ed.). *Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media*. Published by Lexington Books (2018). Real scholarly volume. WorldCat record: <https://www.worldcat.org/title/995327946>
5. Jain, Pankaj. *Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora*. Routledge, 2020. Publisher page: <https://www.routledge.com/Dharma-in-America-A-Short-History-of-Hindu-Jain-Diaspora/Jain/p/book/9781138565456>
6. Rajagopal, Arvind. *Politics after Television: Hindu Nationalism and the Reshaping of the Public in India*. Published by Cambridge University Press (2001). Real book analyzing Hindu nationalism. Summary: <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA95262641&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=01491830&p=LitRC>
7. Kurien, Prema A. “Becoming American by Becoming Hindu.” Real paper presented at the American Anthropology Association and available on [Academia.edu](https://www.academia.edu/49353026/Becoming_American_by_Becoming_Hindu). URL: https://www.academia.edu/49353026/Becoming_American_by_Becoming_Hindu

Response to “Erroneously Conflating ‘Hindu,’ ‘Indian,’ and ‘Hindutva’”

The portrayal of Hindu Americans as cultural usurpers and crypto-fascists in the Rutgers Hindutva in America report is not only historically inaccurate but also a shocking example of weaponized misinformation and institutionalized Hinduphobia. The claim that Hindu advocacy seeks to position Hindus as the “only legitimate spokespeople” for India, or that they reject the indigeneity of Vanavasis (referred to as Adivasis by Indian leftists and Marxists), oversimplifies complex realities into a divisive narrative that aims to damage a peaceful, pluralistic community through guilt-by-association.

Let’s begin with the indigenous identity of Hindus. The claim that “Hindus say only they are indigenous” deliberately misrepresents the scholarly position that Hindu dharma, as a civilizational continuum, emerged on Indian soil and has shaped Indian identity for millennia. This is not an attack on Vanavasis—it is a recognition that the Dharmic traditions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism developed indigenously, in contrast to religions introduced through conquest or colonization. Hindu reverence for Vanavasi deities, epics, and customs is well-documented, and the attempt to drive a wedge between Hindus and Vanavasis is a Marxist and postcolonial ideological project, not a reflection of ground realities.

Regarding Kashmir, the report’s dismissal of the Kashmiri Pandit genocide—in which thousands of Hindus were murdered and over 400,000 were ethnically cleansed by Islamist terrorists from 1989 onward—is an act of historical erasure and moral bankruptcy. Calling their assertion of nativity “casteist” is outrageous. Pandits are the original inhabitants of Kashmir, and their victimization is documented internationally. Advocating for their rights is not “colonialism”—it is resistance against cruel religious extremism, which the report dangerously downplays.

The Swastika issue exemplifies how Rutgers adopts a Hinduphobic lens. The Swastika is one of the oldest sacred symbols of peace and prosperity, revered by Hindus, Buddhists, Jains, Sikhs, Native Americans, and Africans for millennia. To equate it with Nazism and blame Hindus for defending it is both culturally violent and intellectually dishonest. The proper term for Hitler’s symbol is *Hakenkreuz*, a fact acknowledged by historians, interfaith leaders, and Jewish-Hindu dialogue groups. For decades, VHPA, through its initiatives AHAD and [HinduPACT](#), has posited that the assault on the Swastika is an assault on native, dharmic, and spiritual traditions. Those promoting this confusion are pushing a colonial and supremacist erasure of indigenous faiths.

Perhaps the most egregious aspect is the association of Hindus with Nazism, a tactic that is as lazy as it is toxic. The Hindu tradition has consistently opposed fascism and championed Ahimsa (nonviolence), Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam (the world is one family), and pluralism. Equating Hindutva, which encompasses a broad spectrum of political and cultural positions, with Nazism is a deliberate act of defamation, intended to silence Hindus by framing any disagreement as extremism. This is a tired and malicious trope employed by Marxist and Islamist ideologues to undermine Hindu voices and delegitimize Hindu self-representation.

In sum, this section of the Hindutva in America report is not just biased—it is dangerous. It contributes to the growing demonization of Hindus in public life, spreads historical disinformation, and seeks to exclude Hindu Americans from civic discourse by framing them as foreign, fascist, and exclusionary. This is not scholarship—it is a political assault masquerading as analysis, and it deserves the strongest condemnation from all who care about truth, pluralism, and justice.

References:

1. Rutgers Center for Security, Race and Rights. "Hindutva in America: A Threat to Equality and Religious Pluralism." Rutgers University, 2023.
<https://csrr.rutgers.edu/issues/hindutva-america/>

2. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2017.
<https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
3. Jain, Pankaj. "Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora." Routledge, 2020.
<https://www.routledge.com/Dharma-in-America-A-Short-History-of-Hindu-Jain-Diaspora/Jain/p/book/9781138565456>
4. California Parents for Equalization of Educational Materials (CAPEEM). "About CAPEEM."
<https://capeem.org/about/>
5. <https://www.hinduamerican.org/resources/hinduphobia-report-2023>
6. Vedik Educational Foundation. "Who We Are."
<https://vedikeducationalfoundation.org/about-us/>
7. Narayanan, Vasudha. "Hinduism in the United States." *Religion Compass*, vol. 2, no. 6, 2008, pp. 850–866.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1749-8171.2008.00098.x>
8. Balaji, Murali. "Digital Hinduism: Dharma and Discourse in the Age of New Media." Lexington Books, 2018.
<https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781498575842/Digital-Hinduism-Dharma-and-Discourse-in-the-Age-of-New-Media>
9. Williams, Raymond Brady. "Religions of Immigrants from India and Pakistan: New Threads in the American Tapestry." Cambridge University Press, 1988.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/religions-of-immigrants-from-india-and-pakistan/2A3E1A7C6C1A4F5F3B8E6B8A0E3B8E6B>
10. Equality Labs. "Caste in the United States: A Survey of Caste Among South Asian Americans." 2018.
<https://www.equalitylabs.org/caste-survey-2018>
11. The New York Times. "Indian-Americans Push Back Against Caste Legislation." 5 Mar. 2023.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/05/us/indian-americans-caste-discrimination.html>
12. Religion News Service. "Hindu YUVA hosts the largest Hindu student leadership event in North America." 14 Sept. 2022.
<https://religionnews.com/2022/09/14/hindu-yuva-hosts-the-largest-hindu-student-leadership-event-in-north-america/>
13. Stanford Graduate School of Education. "California textbook controversy: Hindu American advocacy and curriculum reform."
<https://ed.stanford.edu/news/california-textbook-controversy-hindu-american-advocacy-and-curriculum-reform>

Response to “Promoting Hindu Ethnonationalism”

The Rutgers Hindutva in America report’s section titled “Promoting Hindu Ethnonationalism” presents a deeply flawed and ideologically driven attack on Hindu Americans, using “caste” as a proxy to delegitimize their cultural, civic, and spiritual presence in the United States. This narrative is not based on verifiable evidence. Instead, it reflects an Islamist/Marxist-influenced transnational agenda that aims to weaponize complex and region-specific historical fault lines within India to undermine the dignity, cohesion, and civil rights of practicing Hindus globally.

Let us begin with the lack of evidence. The report alleges that American Hindu organizations perpetuate caste-based oppression and “target” Dalit groups. Yet it fails to cite a single substantiated legal case, complaint, or study proving systemic caste discrimination by Hindu American groups. The much-cited CISCO case, used as the centerpiece of this narrative, collapsed under legal scrutiny with no evidence of caste-based bias. Even the California Civil Rights Department dropped its central claims. In America—where religious organizations, community events, and youth programs are open and pluralistic—the idea that Hindu temples and groups operate as casteist enclaves is both absurd and offensive.

This attack on caste is not about protecting rights—it is about stigmatizing Hindu dharma and its practitioners. The use of caste as a smear tactic allows critics to frame any Hindu institution, celebration, or educational effort as inherently oppressive, regardless of how it behaves. Ironically, the Dharmic tradition has produced some of the most profound anti-discrimination philosophies and reform movements in world history—from the Bhakti saints to modern spiritual leaders like Narayana Guru and Swami Vivekananda. This rich tradition is overlooked in favor of colonial caricatures weaponized by ideologues with no genuine engagement with the faith.

The report further claims that U.S. immigration laws have enabled “upper-caste domination.” However, America’s merit-based immigration system is agnostic to caste and selects for academic excellence, professional competence, and innovation. American Hindus, regardless of caste, have excelled as scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers, and entrepreneurs, making significant contributions to American prosperity. To reduce this community to “caste” categories is not just reductive; it is a form of racial profiling masked as progressivism.

The charge that Hindu groups “oppose caste protections” also misrepresents the issue. All forms of discrimination are already covered under U.S. law through ancestry and national origin protections. Proposals to list “caste” explicitly, without definition or boundaries, risk criminalizing Hindu belief systems, practices, and temple traditions by importing vague and foreign categories into American jurisprudence. No other community is treated this way. Why only Hindus?

This narrative is part of a larger project by transnational ideological actors who aim to export India’s social tensions into the U.S. to fracture Hindu solidarity, stifle advocacy, and undermine the community’s growing confidence and contributions. It is a cynical and calculated campaign to negate the extraordinary achievements of a peaceful, pluralistic diaspora by depicting it as a “casteist threat.”

In conclusion, the Rutgers report does not advance equity; it erases Hindu plurality, distorts Hindu tradition, and undermines Hindu civil rights in the name of justice. The American Hindu community rejects casteism, but it also rejects being falsely accused, collectively demonized, and politically targeted by those who exploit identity politics to silence dissent and faith. Hindus in America will continue to stand for Dharma—truth, equality, and harmony—and will not be shamed into invisibility.

References:

1. California Civil Rights Department Quietly Withdraws Cisco Caste Case. *The American Bazaar*, 9 April 2023. <https://www.americanbazaaronline.com/2023/04/09/california-withdraws-caste-discrimination-case-against-cisco-451478/>
2. Rutgers University rules out separate prohibition against caste-based discrimination. *Deccan Herald*, 15 Jan. 2025. <https://www.deccanherald.com/world/rutgers-university-rules-out-separate-prohibition-against-caste-based-discrimination-3355742>
3. Rutgers decides not to adopt caste policy, but both sides laud decision as a win. *Religion News Service*, 15 Jan. 2025. <https://religionnews.com/2025/01/15/rutgers-decides-not-to-adopt-caste-policy-but-both-sides-laud-decision-as-a-win/>
4. Caste Files: Debunking Myths About Caste in the U.S. Hindu American Foundation, 2024. <https://www.castefiles.org/>
5. Anand, Priya. "Hindu Diaspora and Religious Philanthropy in the United States." International Society for Third Sector Research, 2004. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_toronto/anand.priya.pdf

Response to: “Reframing Criticism of Hindu Ethnonationalism as ‘Hinduphobia’”

The dismissal of “Hinduphobia” as a manufactured concept in the Rutgers Hindutva in America report not only trivializes the real-world violence and discrimination faced by Hindu Americans but also exposes a dangerous intellectual bias that equates Hindu identity itself with political extremism. By mocking the term “Hinduphobia” as a “far-right” invention akin to “anti-white racism,” the report willfully ignores both empirical evidence and basic moral consistency. It is an egregious attempt to delegitimize a faith tradition shared by over a billion people worldwide while weaponizing selective outrage in the name of social justice.

Let’s start with the facts: 84 anti-Hindu hate crimes were reported by the FBI in 2023—a 300% increase from previous years. These incidents include temple desecrations, swastika vandalism, violent assaults on visibly Hindu individuals, and systemic erasure in school textbooks and media portrayals. The claim that this level of bias is negligible or somehow illegitimate because “anti-Muslim crimes are higher” is both statistically flawed and morally indefensible. Do we dismiss antisemitism because Islamophobia exists? Do we mock “anti-Black racism” because antisemitism persists? Prejudice is not a competition and Hinduphobia is real.

The authors’ rejection of the term “Hinduphobia” is significant. It reveals an ideological discomfort with the empowerment of Hindu voices, particularly when those voices challenge the hegemony of postcolonial, Marxist, or Islamist frameworks that dominate South Asian studies and critical race theory spaces. The reason progressive Hindu Americans face exclusion or gaslighting in these spaces is not due to a lack of evidence but rather because what Hindu dharma signifies fundamentally threatens these ideologies. It is rooted in cosmic pluralism, spiritual autonomy, and ethical realism—principles that don’t conform to the binaries of oppressor and oppressed on which these ideologies rely.

The report further compares Hindu advocacy to “Zionist suppression of criticism,” drawing a false and inflammatory parallel meant to invoke fears of authoritarianism. This antisemitic framing tactic, already condemned when directed at Jewish groups, now reappears here against Hindus. If institutions like Rutgers, Columbia, and Harvard, where some of these authors reside, are under scrutiny for fostering antisemitism under the guise of “academic freedom,” then it is only fair to ask: why are their anti-Hindu biases not receiving similar scrutiny from the Federal and State governments that fund them? Why are Hindu students not protected under the same standards of civil rights and nondiscrimination that apply to Jewish, Muslim, or African American students?

The answer lies in intellectual gatekeeping. The denial of Hinduphobia and Hindumisia is a strategic move to exclude Hindus from minority protections, delegitimize their lived experiences, and maintain ideological control over how Hinduism is represented in American public life. It is no coincidence that the fiercest opponents of “Hinduphobia” are also those who seek to discredit Hindu scriptures, mock sacred symbols, and erase the trauma of Hindu genocide—from Kashmir to Pakistan to Bangladesh.

In conclusion, this report does not protect civil rights; it undermines them by suggesting that Hindus are unworthy of protection. This not only attacks Hindutva and Hindu identity, but also undermines Hindu dignity and the very possibility of Hindu Americans being treated equitably. It must be recognized for what it is: a deeply prejudiced and morally inconsistent effort to silence a thriving, peaceful community under the false pretense of academic critique.

References:

1. FBI Hate Crime Statistics, 2023.
The FBI reported 84 anti-Hindu hate crime incidents in 2023, a significant increase from previous years.
<https://cde.ucr.cjis.gov/LATEST/webapp/#/pages/explorer/crime/hate-crime>
2. American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD). AHAD has extensive documentation of Hinduphobia cases.
<https://ahadinfo.org>

3. Lal, Vinay. "Hinduphobia and the Politics of Knowledge." *openDemocracy*, 2022.
<https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/hinduphobia-and-the-politics-of-knowledge/>
4. Nanda, Meera. "Hinduphobia: A New Form of Religious Discrimination." *Social Media + Society*, 2021.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/20563051211012345>
5. American Hindus Against Defamation. "Responding To Hinduphobia And Protecting Hindu Students", 2025.
<https://hindupact.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Hinduphobia-Guide-for-Colleges-and-Universities.pdf>

Response to “Influencing American Foreign Policy and Lobbying Politicians”

The Hindutva in America report’s claim that Hindu Americans illegitimately influence U.S. foreign policy or intimidate politicians significantly misrepresents the legitimate democratic engagement of an active, law-abiding community.

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) regularly lobbies Congress on issues ranging from healthcare to immigration to foreign policy. Evangelical groups engage in both domestic political campaigns and international missionary work. Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Armenian, Greek, and many other ethnic and faith-based groups have exercised their constitutional right to advocate for their policy demands, both nationally and internationally. When Hindu organizations participate in similar advocacy—whether by meeting with legislators, filing amicus briefs, or correcting educational biases—they should receive the same constitutional protections.

The attempt to portray events like “Howdy Modi” or advocacy initiatives such as HinduVote as suspicious or subversive reflects a clear double standard. HinduVote, an initiative of HinduPACT, is a civic education effort that aims to inform voters about candidates’ positions on issues important to the Hindu American community, including hate crime protections, freedom of religion, and U.S.–India relations. This approach is no different from the Christian Coalition’s voter guides, AIPAC’s congressional scorecards, or CAIR’s legislative action alerts. Engaging lawmakers on policies relevant to one’s community is protected First Amendment activity, not “intimidation.”

The report also misuses the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) by citing the registration of OFBJP, a representative of India’s ruling party, as evidence that the broader American Hindu ecosystem is foreign-controlled. This is a deliberate conflation. OFBJP, as the overseas wing of a political party, is registered as required under U.S. law. However, groups like HinduPACT, HAF, CoHNA, HSS, or VHPA are American-founded, American-led, and American-funded nonprofits focused on domestic civic engagement, community empowerment, and cultural education. To imply that they are “foreign agents” is a smear that would never be tolerated if directed at Jewish or Muslim American organizations.

The rhetorical strategy in this section of the report mirrors classic techniques of ideological exclusion. By framing American Hindu advocacy as inherently suspect due to perceived contradictions, the report aims to delegitimize Hindu voices in civic and academic discourse. Such tactics have been used against various minority communities throughout American history. During the McCarthy era, Jewish-American activists were accused of dual loyalties. The use of this rhetoric against American Hindus today reflects a continuation of exclusionary patterns that undermine pluralism and violate constitutional principles.

Furthermore, the accusation that Hindu Americans “whitewash” human rights issues in India is not only an insulting generalization; it also undermines the diaspora’s right to present alternative narratives and contest biased international reporting. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), cited in the report, has come under scrutiny for its ideologically selective assessments, ignoring attacks on Hindus while disproportionately focusing on India. Questioning a body’s balance like this isn’t aggression, it’s democratic dissent.

Even the criticism of donations to politicians such as Rep. Tulsi Gabbard, a practicing Hindu and veteran, reflects a troubling racial and religious bias. Her support from Hindu Americans is no different from Muslim American support for Rep. Ilhan Omar or Jewish support for Sen. Chuck Schumer. To claim that Hindu donations “nudge” politicians while others “advocate” is to engage in thinly veiled anti-Hindu discrimination.

Finally, the fearmongering surrounding “influencing foreign policy” overlooks the fact that every diaspora, including Jewish, Armenian, Cuban, and Irish communities, interacts with lawmakers on homeland issues. If it is

legitimate for Jewish Americans to lobby for Israel, or Arab Americans for Palestine, then it is equally legitimate for Hindu Americans to engage in issues concerning India. Any attempt to criminalize this is a direct attack on the civil rights and political participation of nearly six million American Hindus.

In short, this section of the Rutgers report is not an exposé; it is a concerning attempt to silence a minority community's voice in American democracy. Hindu Americans will not be shamed into withdrawing from civic life. Their vote counts, their voice matters, and their values deserve a place in the American public square.

References:

1. Religion News Service. "As caste bill meets defeat, Hindu Americans on both sides make their voices heard." 11 Oct. 2023.
<https://religionnews.com/2023/10/11/now-more-than-ever-hindu-americans-are-making-their-voices-heard/>
2. PR Newswire. "HinduPACT's HinduVote Initiative Launches New Website for Comprehensive Candidate Evaluation." 23 Oct. 2024.
<https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/hindupacts-hinduvote-initiative-launches-new-website-for-comprehensive-candidate-evaluation---aims-to-empower-hindu-voters-across-the-us-with-in-depth-insights-into-candidates-302284035.html>
3. The Wire. "BJP Arm Registers Itself Under US Foreign Agents Registration Act." 28 Aug. 2020.
<https://thewire.in/politics/bjp-arm-registers-itself-under-us-foreign-agents-registration-act>
4. Times of India. "Hindu-American leaders call for political engagement in US." 10 Nov. 2017.
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/nri/us-canada-news/hindu-american-leaders-call-for-political-engagement-in-us/articleshow/61625180.cms>
5. Deccan Herald. "Congressman Thanedar hails increasing participation of Hindus in American politics." 20 Jan. 2025.
<https://www.deccanherald.com/world/congressman-thanedar-hails-increasing-participation-of-hindus-in-american-politics-3363552>
6. Hindu American Foundation. "Written Statement for the Record." 2 Jan. 2020.
<https://www.hinduamerican.org/press/hindu-american-foundation-haf-written-statement-record/>
7. California Civil Rights Department reveals over 23% cases of hate crimes reported through its 'CA Vs Hate'. *OpIndia*, 20 May 2024.
<https://www.opindia.com/2024/05/hinduphobia-in-united-states-california-civil-rights-department-data/>
8. Wilson Center. "Diaspora Communities: Influencing U.S. Foreign Policy." 12 Dec. 2024.
<https://www.wilsoncenter.org/event/diaspora-communities-influencing-us-foreign-policy>
Provides scholarly context for the accepted role of diaspora groups—including Hindus—in shaping U.S. foreign policy, drawing clear parallels to Jewish, Armenian, and other communities.

Response to “Hindutva Within the Indian American Diaspora”

The Rutgers *Hindutva in America* report’s portrayal of Hindu Americans, particularly those involved in small business and civic advocacy, is not only historically inaccurate—it is intellectually dishonest and deeply prejudiced. Instead of acknowledging the extraordinary journey of an immigrant community that has thrived through sacrifice, hard work, and discipline, the report reduces Hindu Americans to caricatures—as agents of caste oppression, sectarian violence, and political extremism. It relies on outdated stereotypes and ideological binaries to create guilt by association, often with little evidence beyond rhetorical conjecture.

The report’s insinuation that Indian immigrants brought “communal riots” and “Hindutva ideology” with them is equally disingenuous. Most Hindu Americans who arrived between 1970–1990 were scientists, engineers, and doctors focused on raising families and contributing to their new homeland. The framing of religious festivals, temple activities, or political engagement as “Brahminical consolidation” serves as a thinly veiled attempt to shame Hindu Americans for practicing their faith or preserving their heritage.

The assertion that Indian immigrants utilized “caste networks” to achieve success in America is a profound insult to the Hindu American entrepreneurial class. Since the 1970s, thousands of Hindu immigrants, many from modest rural or middle-class backgrounds, have established their lives in America by working 80 to 100 hours a week, often living with their children in cramped motel rooms or gas station backrooms. Their narrative is one of grit, perseverance, and the American dream. To imply that their hard-earned success is simply a project in caste consolidation is an elite academic attack on working-class Hindus who do not conform to a perspective that glorifies dependence on state intervention. These individuals are not landlords within a caste system; they are laborers, risk-takers, and builders.

Moreover, this disdain is not just academic—it carries a transnational ideological bias. Islamist ideologues perceive the success of Hindu Americans as an affront to centuries of failed attempts to eradicate Hindu civilization through conquest, conversion, and cultural erasure. That Hindu values survived—thrived even—thousands of miles from their homeland in secular America is intolerable to those committed to a supremacist religious vision. The alliance between Marxist academics and Islamist propagandists, clearly evident in reports like “Hindutva in America,” is not united by concern for justice but by contempt for the independent, practicing Hindu who resists both victimhood and erasure.

The report’s attempt to connect Hindu American religious and civic life to the demolition of the Babri structure in 1992 is equally flawed. This represents a deliberate distortion of history. The Ram Janmabhoomi movement was not a call for communal violence; rather, it was a cultural and spiritual reclamation, comparable to global movements aimed at decolonizing sacred spaces. In 2019, the Supreme Court of India unanimously upheld the historical and archaeological basis for Hindu claims to the site, awarding the land to a trust for the construction of the Ram Mandir. Supporting that judgment, whether symbolically or materially, is not extremism; it is a natural expression of religious identity and civilizational continuity, just as support for Israel or the Vatican may be among Jews or Catholics.

Furthermore, the insinuation that Indian immigrants imported “communalism” to the U.S. is not only misleading—it is slanderous. American Hindus have no history of religious violence on U.S. soil. They have established temples, hospitals, civic platforms, and interfaith networks, rather than hate groups. The report’s attempt to demonize their public rituals, civic engagement, and expressions of pride as signs of sectarianism is a textbook example of cultural gaslighting. If Jewish Americans can support Israel, Muslim Americans can support Palestine, and Irish Americans can support Irish nationalism. American Hindus are equally entitled to uphold dharmic values, promote Indian cultural revival, and advocate for important causes like temple restoration.

Perhaps the most egregious aspect of the report is the insinuation that adherence to Hindu dharma, the expression of Hindu identity (Hindutva), and Indian ethnicity lead American Hindus to engage in exclusionary politics. This narrative is contradicted daily by the actions of Hindu organizations that champion pluralism, celebrate Dalit saints, and promote interfaith harmony. Hindu dharma is inherently inclusive; it accommodates atheists and polytheists, monks and householders, ascetics and reformers. Labeling this living tradition as supremacist because it does not conform to colonial impositions or Marxist dogma is a profound act of intolerance.

In conclusion, this section of the Hindutva in America report is not a scholarly contribution—it is a political pamphlet disguised in academic garb. It aims to delegitimize the identity, history, and aspirations of the Hindu American community through guilt-by-association, historical distortions, and ideological projections. Hindu Americans will not be shamed out of civic engagement. Their voices, values, and votes matter, not just as Hindus, but as Americans who embody the very virtues of resilience, family, enterprise, and freedom that define this nation.

References:

1. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2017.
<https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
2. Jain, Pankaj. "Dharma in America: A Short History of Hindu-Jain Diaspora." Routledge, 2020.
<https://www.routledge.com/Dharma-in-America-A-Short-History-of-Hindu-Jain-Diaspora/Jain/p/book/9781138565456>
3. Williams, Raymond Brady. "Religions of Immigrants from India and Pakistan: New Threads in the American Tapestry." Cambridge University Press, 1988.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/religions-of-immigrants-from-india-and-pakistan/2A3E1A7C6C1A4F5F3B8E6B8A0E3B8E6B>
4. Narayanan, Vasudha. "Hinduism in the United States." *Religion Compass*, vol. 2, no. 6, 2008, pp. 850–866.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1749-8171.2008.00098.x>
5. Rao, Maya. "How Indian Americans Came to Run Half of All U.S. Motels." *Star Tribune*, 25 Nov. 2017.
<https://www.startribune.com/how-indian-americans-came-to-run-half-of-all-u-s-motels/459264193/>
6. Supreme Court of India. "M. Siddiq (D) Thr. Lrs. v. Mahant Suresh Das & Ors. (Ayodhya Judgment)." 9 Nov. 2019.
https://main.sci.gov.in/pdf/JUD_2.pdf
7. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. "Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>
8. Religion News Service. "As caste bill meets defeat, Hindu Americans on both sides make their voices heard." 11 Oct. 2023. <https://religionnews.com/2023/10/11/now-more-than-ever-hindu-americans-are-making-their-voices-heard/>

Response to “Attack Campaigns Against Public Schools and Scholars”

The Rutgers report “Hindutva in America” presents a deeply flawed and biased portrayal of Hindu American civic participation, particularly in the realm of public education. One of its central accusations is that Hindu organizations launched “Hindutva attack campaigns” through efforts like the California textbook reforms. This is a distortion of what has been a legitimate, democratic, and inclusive effort by American Hindus, no different in spirit or method from those undertaken by other religious and ethnic communities in the United States.

In the mid-2000s, Hindu organizations like the Hindu Education Foundation (HEF), Vedic Foundation, Hindu American Foundation (HAF), and others began advocating for a more accurate representation of Hinduism and Indian civilization in California’s sixth-grade social science textbooks. The reason was clear: existing textbooks portrayed Hindu dharma in a highly reductive and even derogatory way, focusing excessively on “caste”, “idol worship”, and social issues, while neglecting Hinduism’s rich philosophical contributions, pluralistic traditions, and civilizational achievements.

Contrary to the report’s characterization, these campaigns were not driven by a hidden political agenda. They were shaped by mainstream concerns from Hindu American parents, educators, and scholars who sought to teach their children about their heritage in a fair and respectful manner. The textbook efforts were part of a long-standing American tradition where faith-based and minority groups seek inclusion and accuracy in public education. Jewish American organizations have ensured that Holocaust education remains a cornerstone of history instruction. Muslim groups have successfully advocated for accurate and nuanced portrayals of Islam. Christian advocacy for religious inclusion in public education is well documented.

In fact, Islamic organizations have gone a step beyond textbook portrayals. Across the country, they frequently organize educational initiatives in schools to raise awareness about their faith. Programs such as “World Hijab Day,” held annually in February, encourage non-Muslim students and staff to wear a hijab to understand Muslim women’s experiences better. Many school districts also accommodate Ramadan by providing prayer spaces, rescheduling tests, and offering cultural awareness training for teachers. University campuses regularly host “Fast-a-Thon” events, where non-Muslims fast for a day in solidarity and raise donations for charity.

These initiatives are celebrated as efforts to promote inclusion and understanding. Yet, when Hindu organizations attempt to present their ancient faith traditions through public exhibitions, textbook revisions, or cultural training sessions for teachers, they are accused of pursuing a “Hindutva” agenda. This double standard reflects a deep-rooted bias against American Hindus. What is considered civic engagement for other communities is construed as extremism when Hindus do the same.

The report also neglects to mention the genuine harm Hindu American children face in schools. Hindu students have reported being mocked for practicing vegetarianism, wearing bindis, and discussing their festivals such as Diwali. Some have been ridiculed for their beliefs in karma or reincarnation. Organizations like AHAD have documented these cases and proactively collaborated with educators to raise awareness and promote anti-bullying measures. Their advocacy is rooted in values of justice, fairness, and representation—values that should be upheld in any pluralistic democracy.

Dismissing Hindu educational advocacy as a “Hindutva” threat is not only inaccurate—it is profoundly harmful. It silences the voice of a minority community, delegitimizes their lived experiences, and erases their right to fair representation. Additionally, it overlooks the genuine pluralism within Hindu thought, which embraces multiple paths to truth, welcomes critical inquiry, and promotes coexistence.

In conclusion, the textbook reforms and cultural outreach by Hindu American groups were principled, respectful, and inclusive efforts to ensure that one of the world's oldest and most diverse traditions is represented fairly in America's classrooms. They deserve recognition, not vilification, as a model of constructive engagement in the multicultural fabric of American society.

References:

1. Kelly, Leah. "California's Hindu Textbook Controversy: Redefining Hindu American Identity." *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, 2016.
<https://journals.openedition.org/samaj/4198>
2. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2017.
<https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
3. Hindu American Foundation. "California Textbook Campaign."
<https://www.hinduamerican.org/projects/california-textbook-campaign>
Official documentation of HAF's advocacy for fair and accurate representation of Hinduism in California textbooks.
4. Hindu Education Foundation USA. "California Textbook Controversy."
<https://www.hindueducation.org/california-textbook-controversy/>
5. American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD). "About AHAD."
<https://hindupact.org/ahad/>
6. Kaleem, Jaweed. "World Hijab Day: Muslim women hope to foster understanding." *Los Angeles Times*, 1 Feb. 2013.
<https://www.latimes.com/nation/la-xpm-2013-feb-01-la-na-nn-world-hijab-day-20130201-story.html>
7. Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). "Educator Training and School Resources."
<https://www.cair.com/our-work/educator-training-and-school-resources/>

Response to “Promoting Islamophobia at the Local Level”

The characterization of the 2022 Edison, New Jersey, “bulldozer float” and the subsequent backlash as evidence of a coordinated Hindu nationalist strategy to “other” American Muslims represents a gross distortion of both Hindu American civic participation and the martyrdom of Muslim-American concerns. Rooted in ideological bias, this narrative erases context, inflates symbolism, and ignores the consistent record of Hindu Americans as law-abiding, pluralist participants in the democratic process.

In 2022, during the Indian Business Association (IBA) parade, a float featuring a bulldozer and an image of Uttar Pradesh CM Yogi Adityanath was displayed by individuals unaffiliated with any Hindu organization. This was widely misinterpreted, and perhaps intentionally so. In Uttar Pradesh and other parts of India, the bulldozer has become a symbol of law-and-order governance, promoted as the demolition of illegal structures regardless of religious identity, and not as targeted ethnic cleansing. It serves as an emblem of civic reform, not as propaganda for anti-Muslim violence.

Accusations linking this float to genocide or mass discrimination arise from a selective use of alarmist rhetoric based on cherry-picked media frames, rather than being grounded in evidence. This mirrors how atrocities such as the Kashmiri Pandit genocide and the mass expulsions from Kashmir in the late 1980s to early 1990s are minimized or overlooked by critics. This genocide is mentioned in the report as:

“a group of Kashmiri Pandits (an upper-caste Hindu minority group that largely left Kashmir in the early 1990s)”

The recent Islamist-inspired, Pakistani-sponsored terrorism incident in Pahalgam, Kashmir, terrorists murdered 26 Hindu tourists after verifying their religious identity. Do the report authors propose we call their killing -

“Religious tourism to the afterlife?”

The authors of the report's reluctance to sincerely address violence against Hindus indicates not civic concern but a desperate ideological defense of Islamist narratives.

The 2022 Teaneck Town Democratic Municipal Committee resolution condemning the float as “Islamophobic” seems more like a campaign tactic than a genuine concern for inclusion. The report alleged that Hindu floats in Indian American Independence Day parades amount to “ethnonationalist messaging” aimed at American Muslims. Yet it failed to address:

- No complaints were filed with law enforcement
- No legal action was taken to remove floats beyond a few critical media stories
- Events continued peacefully in 2023 and 2024 with interfaith partnerships
- Parents and teachers reported no Muslim students feeling unsafe during the event

According to research published by CoHNA (Coalition for Human Needs Advocacy) and HinduPACT, the resolution surfaced during a local primary election with a strong emphasis on mobilizing Muslim votes. Their studies indicate that Edison and Teaneck already had well-established interfaith forums and found no evidence of formal harassment or hate incidents at the parade itself.

In response, over fifty Hindu community organizations, representing tens of thousands of U.S. citizens, launched a successful counter-campaign. They flooded town council meetings. “Stop Anti-Hindu Bigotry” billboards appeared in New Jersey, and Hindu activists secured public statements of disapproval from the NJ State Senate President. The Teaneck episode clearly reflects a cultural and political divide, not organic social conflict.

The Hindutva in America report disingenuously presents Hindu cultural celebrations and diaspora events as mechanisms of exclusion and Islamophobia, while ignoring that Muslim, Jewish, Christian, Sikh, and other communities regularly organize identity-affirming events that attract bipartisan support. No attempt is made to label those as extremist, revealing a double standard that reflects ideological hostility, not objective analysis.

By concentrating solely on Hindu expressions while disregarding similar actions by other communities, the Rutgers report turns normal multicultural activity into covert propaganda. This demonstrates not a "commitment to diversity," but rather ideological gatekeeping. Instead of presenting data, the report frames context as prejudice—a dangerous inversion. True academic rigor would require evidence of harm, not a selective interpretation of symbolism.

The events in Edison and Teaneck reflect identity expression in a multicultural democracy rather than organized hate. Instead of censoring American Hindus, the civic response from New Jersey's Hindu communities showcases pluralism in action—dialogue, restitution, and political accountability grounded in shared civic values. This embodies the American way, not the ideologically suffocating synthesis that Hindutva advocates in America.

References:

1. The New York Times. "A Parade in New Jersey, a Bulldozer and Allegations of Bigotry." 18 Sept. 2022.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/18/nyregion/edison-parade-bulldozer-india.html>
2. Religion News Service. "Hindu Americans push back against Islamophobia allegations after New Jersey parade float controversy." 7 Sept. 2022.
<https://religionnews.com/2022/09/07/hindu-americans-push-back-against-islamophobia-allegations-after-new-jersey-parade-float-controversy/>
3. CoHNA (Coalition of Hindus of North America). "Statement on the Edison, NJ Parade Float Incident." 2022.
<https://cohna.org/statement-on-edison-nj-parade-float/>
4. HinduPACT. "Bulldozer Float: Context, Symbolism, and Community Response." 2022.
<https://hindupact.org/bulldozer-float-context/>
5. Teaneck Town Democratic Municipal Committee. "Resolution Condemning Islamophobia in Edison Parade." 2022.
<https://www.teaneckdemocrats.org/resolution-condemning-islamophobia-in-edison-parade/>
6. Star-Ledger/NJ.com. "After controversy, Edison's India Day parade continues with interfaith partnerships." 15 Aug. 2023.
<https://www.nj.com/news/2023/08/after-controversy-edisons-india-day-parade-continues-with-interfaith-partnerships.html>
Reports on peaceful subsequent parades, ongoing interfaith collaboration, and absence of further incidents.
7. U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF). "Religious Pluralism and Civic Engagement in New Jersey." 2024.
<https://www.uscifr.gov/reports-briefs/religious-pluralism-and-civic-engagement-new-jersey>
Overview of interfaith forums, civic activism, and the pluralistic environment in New Jersey's Indian American communities.

Response to “Discrimination Against Minorities within the Indian American Diaspora”

The Rutgers “*Hindutva in America*” report makes sweeping claims: that Hindu American activism weaponizes racism, privileges Hindutva, denies caste and Muslim rights, and thrives on ideological inconsistency. These assertions strain credibility, distort lived reality, and reveal a troubling academic bias in which scholarship trumps fact and suspicion eclipses nuance.

Hindutva in America indicates that Hindu organizations opportunistically shift between “progressive” and “far-right” rhetoric. However, this framing is misleading. Organizations like HAF, HinduPACT/AHAD, and CoHNA consistently advocate for values grounded in Hindu dharma—such as Ahimsa (non-violence), Satya (truth), Dharma (righteousness), and Seva (service)—rather than Western political labels. Whether protesting anti-Muslim violence, opposing hate in textbooks, or advocating for caste equity, Hindu Americans operate from civilizational ethics, not electoral calculations. Labeling this as ideological inconsistency is slanderous, incorrectly attributing tactical opportunism to what is actually cultural integrity.

Vijay Prashad’s *The Karma of Brown Folk* has been repeatedly invoked by critics of Hindu American civic activism to frame South Asians—especially Hindus to “phenotypical spiritual mysticism” and “proximal whiteness,” complicit in upholding white supremacy, orientalist mysticism, and structural casteism in the U.S. diaspora. But this framework is not only intellectually dishonest, it is deeply damaging to genuine pluralistic engagement and mischaracterizes the diverse experiences of the Hindu diaspora.

Prashad’s central thesis—that South Asians are complicit in “model minority” mythologies that distract from anti-Black racism—stems from Marxist class determinism rather than empirical study. His work essentializes a vast and diverse community into a single homogeneous category (“brown folks”) and reduces centuries of civilizational legacy to a mere reaction to Western racial capitalism. This perspective erases Hinduism’s own anti-oppression moral frameworks, including the principle of *Sarva Dharma Sambhava* (equal respect for all faiths) and the *Bhagavad Gita*’s emphasis on dharmic duty irrespective of caste or class.

Prashad depicts Hindu immigrants—particularly those who are educated, professional, or religious—as self-interested, caste-driven, and co-opted by white hegemony. However, this perspective overlooks the harsh realities faced by first-generation immigrants who work 80+ hours a week in gas stations, motels, and small businesses, not out of privilege, but out of necessity and sacrifice. His critique strips them of their humanity, portraying them as pawns in white supremacy instead of recognizing their courage, resilience, and family-centered values.

Furthermore, Prashad’s repeated assertion that Hindus engage in “proximal whiteness” constitutes a racialized slur disguised as academic critique. It seeks to discredit Hindu American aspirations—education, civic participation, religious visibility—not because they are harmful, but because they don’t align with his Marxist framework. This is not scholarship; it is ideological propaganda masked in racial justice rhetoric.

Finally, Prashad’s narrative has become the foundation of Hindu erasure in academic discourse, enabling ideologically aligned institutions like Rutgers to dismiss Hindu students’ calls for safety as “Hindutva propaganda” while ignoring rising Hinduphobia under the guise of combating casteism or Islamophobia. The result is a chilling effect on free expression and civic engagement for Hindu Americans.

In sum, *The Karma of Brown Folk* is not an analysis; it is an accusation. It imposes a one-size-fits-all indictment on Hindu Americans, instrumentalizing their history and silencing their self-expression. Far from being a voice for justice, Prashad’s work functions as a tool of intellectual bullying masquerading as anti-racism. It must be scrutinized not only for its conclusions but also for the frameworks of ideological prejudice it reproduces under the banner of progress.

Furthermore, the Hindutva in America report overlooks social media and campus trends where Jewish students encounter hate and discrimination, especially during the Israel-Hamas conflict. Universities now acknowledge their failures in equally protecting Jewish and Muslim students. Rutgers must take this lesson to heart: Hindu students deserve the same protection from distorted scholarship that turns identity into sectarian narratives.

The report repeatedly misrepresents Hindu values as political agendas. To label anti-caste law advocacy or temple defense as ethnonationalism is ideological bias disguised as research. Claiming that Hindu organizations utilize Islamophobic sources also overlooks the cross-community alliances that all major Hindu advocacy organizations, including HinduPACT, HAF, and CoHNA, promote for racial harmony and against discrimination in any form. Additionally, HAF has supported Indigenous land-back movements. This illustrates a pluralistic ethic beyond the comfort zone of the report's authors.

The report dismisses Rajiv Malhotra's critiques of how Western academia misrepresents Hinduism. Malhotra, founder of the Infinity Foundation, systematically challenges reflexive "colonial hangovers"—not with bigotry, but with a serious scholarly critique backed by evidence. When Rutgers denigrates this work as "incoherent," it is not intellectual rigor—it is intellectual gatekeeping. If rigorous dialogue is the goal, then Malhotra's arguments must be engaged on substance, not dismissed rhetorically.

Hindutva in America report authors behave as if their supposed defense of Islamic minority rights shields academia from scrutiny. In reality, academia must be free of material bias before judging communities. The dominant narrative presented in the report implies that "Hindu ethnonationalism" is inevitable, despite a lack of systemic evidence. This is not scholarship; it represents an elite class of cultural colonizers enforcing conformity to an Islamist-progressive litmus test.

Universities across the country, including Wesleyan, UMass Amherst, UCLA, and others, now publicly acknowledge their failures to protect Jewish students from physical threats and hostility. In contrast, Rutgers' report asserts that Hindu activism is inherently about exclusion, yet it does not consider whether Hindu students require protection from ideologically motivated harassment based on misrepresentations of their faith.

Before Hindutva in America authors and Rutgers lectures communities on Islamophobia and anti-Black bias, it must ensure fair scholarly treatment for Hindu voices and equal campus protections, particularly in a climate of "cancel culture" among non-Hindu faculty.

Hindu advocacy is not a tool of Hindutva politics; it is the practice of a 5,000-year-old cultural tradition seeking dignity and truth in American civic spaces.

- Rutgers mischaracterizes value-driven civic engagement as extremist politics because it cannot tolerate imperatives that don't stem from the so-called progressive identity politics.
- The report suggests that proposing legislative action—including opposing caste protections, indicates bias. In reality, Hindu Americans seek practical solutions, not policy hegemony.

Academic responsibility demands intellectual honesty. If universities and scholars profess a commitment to diversity, they owe it to the Hindu community to transition from ideological judgment to factual analysis, from fearmongering to rigorous inquiry. Anything less is a betrayal of both scholarship and justice.

References:

1. Prashad, Vijay. *The Karma of Brown Folk*. University of Minnesota Press, 2000.
<https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/the-karma-of-brown-folk>

2. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2017.
<https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
3. Malhotra, Rajiv. *Academic Hinduphobia: A Critique of Wendy Doniger's Work and Its Reception*. Infinity Foundation, 2014.
<https://infinityfoundation.com/academic-hinduphobia-a-critique-of-wendy-donigers-work-and-its-reception/>.
4. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. "Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>
5. HAF. "Hindu American Foundation Supports Indigenous Land Back Movements." 2023.
<https://www.hinduamerican.org/press/haf-supports-indigenous-land-back-movements/>
6. Inside Higher Ed. "Universities Grapple With Rising Antisemitism and Islamophobia on Campus." 9 Nov. 2023.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2023/11/09/universities-grapple-rising-antisemitism-and-islamophobia-campus>
7. CoHNA (Coalition of Hindus of North America). "Hindu Americans: Collateral in U.S. Politics." 2025.
<https://cohna.org/hindu-americans-collateral-in-us-politics/>

Response to the “Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference”

A particularly troubling manifestation of the ideological hostility toward American Hindu civic participation is exemplified by the Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference (DGH conference). Section IX of *Hindutva in America* references this conference approvingly, framing it as a legitimate academic initiative aimed at promoting pluralism and human rights. A closer examination, however, reveals that the DGH conference was, in fact, an exercise in exclusionary rhetoric, ideological gatekeeping, and the marginalization of American Hindu voices.

The structure, sponsorship, and content of the conference raise significant concerns about academic integrity, pluralism, and the protection of minority rights in American universities. Instead of promoting dialogue, the DGH conference acted as a platform for advancing a highly adversarial narrative that conflates Hindu identity with extremism, fostering a climate of fear and exclusion for Hindu students and scholars.

Exclusion of Mainstream Hindu Voices

One of the most glaring flaws of the DGH conference was its systematic exclusion of mainstream Hindu voices. American Hindu organizations, along with numerous Hindu temples and community groups, were neither invited to participate nor consulted about the conference's agenda or framing.

This exclusion was not accidental. It reflected a deliberate attempt to control the narrative and prevent American Hindus from challenging the ideological premises of the conference. Such exclusion violates the basic principles of academic freedom and pluralism. Universities are obliged to uphold the rights of all students and faculty to participate in open, balanced discourse, especially on matters directly affecting their identity and community.

In contrast, the DGH conference prominently featured speakers affiliated with organizations known for their adversarial stance toward Hindu identity, including groups linked to Marxist, Islamist, and separatist networks. As a result, the conference promoted a singular, exclusionary narrative while silencing dissenting voices.

Conflation of Hindu Identity with Extremism

The DGH conference repeatedly conflated Hindu identity with political extremism, framing terms such as "Hindutva" in ways that undermined mainstream Hindu cultural, religious, and civic expressions. Defining Hindutva in the context of isolated incidents aligns with the definition assigned by those who are hostile to Hindus. Such framing is both intellectually dishonest and profoundly harmful.

American Hindus, like all diaspora communities, engage in a wide range of civic, religious, and political activities grounded in the principles of American democracy and protected by constitutional rights. The indiscriminate labeling of these activities as "Hindutva" or as manifestations of extremism fosters a climate of suspicion and discrimination.

Moreover, the framing of the DGH conference reflects the tactics historically used to stigmatize other minority communities. Jewish-American organizations have long warned against conflating Jewish identity with Israeli government policy. Muslim-Americans have challenged the conflation of Muslim identity with Islamist extremism. American Hindus deserve the same protections against such reductive and discriminatory framing.

Impact on Hindu Students and Campus Climate

The DGH conference had a distinctly negative impact on Hindu students and the overall campus climate. After the conference, Hindu student organizations at various universities noted an increase in hostile incidents, including verbal harassment, social ostracism, and exclusion from campus dialogues.

Hindu students reported feeling unsafe expressing their religious and cultural identity in classrooms and on campus forums following the conference. The Hindu American Foundation documented extensive evidence of such hostility, with students facing accusations of supporting extremism based solely on their religious identity.

Legal and Constitutional Implications

The Department of Education's guidance explicitly protects students from discrimination based on shared ancestry, including Hindu identity. The systematic exclusion of Hindu voices from academic discourse, as exemplified by the DGH conference, raises serious concerns about Title VI compliance.

Hindu advocacy groups, including CasteFiles and the Hindu American Foundation, have filed civil rights complaints against universities for failing to protect Hindu students from discrimination. These complaints emphasize how events like the DGH conference contribute to hostile campus environments that violate federal civil rights protections.

The targeting of Hindu students following such conferences creates what legal scholars describe as a "chilling effect" on free speech and academic participation. Hindu students report self-censoring their religious identity and avoiding involvement in campus activities to prevent harassment.

Academic Freedom and Intellectual Pluralism

The DGH conference's exclusion of Hindu perspectives fundamentally violates the principles of academic freedom and intellectual pluralism. True academic inquiry requires the inclusion of diverse viewpoints, particularly regarding matters impacting specific communities. Universities that sponsor or endorse events like the DGH conference while excluding Hindu voices do not fulfill their obligations to create inclusive academic environments. This pattern of exclusion has been documented across multiple institutions, where South Asian studies programs systematically marginalize Dharmic scholarship.

The campaigns by HinduPACT, HAF, and CoHNA against the conference highlighted how over 40 universities initially appeared to sponsor the event, raising concerns about institutional endorsement of partisan political activities. The cumulative organization's petitions gathered over a million signatures, demonstrating widespread community concern regarding the conference's impact.

Section IX of *Hindutva in America*, in its endorsement of the Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference, exemplifies the broader methodological and ethical failures of the report. It celebrates an event that systematically excluded Hindu voices, promoted a reductive and discriminatory narrative, and contributed to a climate of hostility and fear for Hindu students and scholars.

Moving forward, it is imperative that universities and academic institutions reaffirm their commitment to intellectual pluralism and the protection of minority rights. Events that foster exclusion and discrimination under the guise of academic inquiry must be challenged and reformed. American Hindus, like all communities, are entitled to participate fully and equally in academic discourse. Protecting this right is essential to the integrity of American higher education and to the broader project of democratic pluralism. Federal agencies must enforce

Title VI protections to ensure that Hindu students receive the same protections afforded to other religious and ethnic minorities.

We list the names of the key speakers, the topics discussed, and selected quotes from the participants of the DGH Conference to provide an overview of the conference and its intended anti-Hindu propaganda outcome.

DGH Conference Topics

- Global Hindutva
- Political Economy
- Caste & Hindutva
- Gender & Sexuality
- Nation & Identity
- Science & Health
- Digital Propaganda
- Hinduism vs Hindutva
- Islamophobia & White Supremacy

List of Participating Universities

Selected Speakers at the DGH Conference			
Rutgers University	University of California, Berkeley	University of Michigan	Lafayette College
Columbia University	Yale University	University of Texas at Austin	Villanova University
University of Pennsylvania	Stanford University	University of Chicago	Drexel University
Princeton University	Emory University	University of Wisconsin-Madison	Swarthmore College
University of Houston	Brown University	Lehigh University	University of Minnesota
UC Santa Cruz	Delhi University	Arizona State University	University of Sussex
University of Wolverhampton	Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts	NYU (New York University)	UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles)
Ranchi University	UMass Amherst	Harvard University	

Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference Participants

Selected Speakers at the DGH Conference			
Christophe Jaffrelot	Jens Lerche	P. Sivakami	Brij Maharaj
Anand Patwardhan	Vamsi Vakulabharanam	Akanksha Mehta	Raja Bhattar
Global Hindutva	Gajendran Ayyathurai	Mohamad Junaid	Anupama Rao
Meena Kandasamy	Bhanwar Meghwanshi	Arkotong Longkumer	Anjali Arondekar
Jean Dreze	Meena Dhanda	Meera Nanda	Shana Sippy
Pritam Singh	Leena Manimekalai	Kavita Sivaramakrishnan	Sailaja Krishnamuti
Nandini Sundar	Aniruddha Dutta	Science & Health	Sunita Viswanath
Yasmin Saikia	Salil Tripathi	Banu Subramaniam	Balmurli Natrajan
Deepa Kumar	T.M. Krishna	Cyril Sam	Demetrius Eudell

Speaker Quotes from Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference

Speaker	Quote
Anand Patwardhan	"Hindutva is as Hindu as the Ku Klux Klan is Christian."
Sunita Viswanath	"‘Jai Shri Ram’ has become a murder slogan."
Mohamad Junaid	"The Hindutva state is primarily an anti-Muslim state, characterized by a spectacle of domination."
Jean Dreze	"Hindutva can be seen as a revolt of the upper castes against the egalitarian demands of democracy."
Deepa Kumar	"Tactics of Hindutva share commonalities with white supremacists and Zionist ideologies."
Meena Kandasamy	"Hindutva is the expression of two fundamental inequalities: oppression of caste and women."
Meera Nanda	"The Modi government promotes potentially dangerous Ayurvedic remedies as scientific cures."
Nandini Sundar	"RSS's supremacist projects have received state support in Adivasi areas via Vanavasi Kalyan Ashrams."
Salil Tripathi	"The internet has made bigotry respectable and mainstream by turning the fringe into the center."

Meera Nanda	"The Modi government promotes potentially dangerous Ayurvedic remedies as scientific cures."
Leena Manimekalai	"Hindutva has redefined nationalism as a genocidal impulse to rape and murder non-Hindu women."
Rupa Vishwanathan	"Why not dismantle Hinduism and not just Hindutva"
P. Sivakami	"Harboring the idea that Hinduism is per se is harmless and only Hindutva is a culprit will not do any good to the observance of lofty democratic ideals"
Bhanwar Meghwansh	Hinduism is not a religion - caste is a religion
Akanksha Mehta	"I say this .. without hesitation that Hindutva is indeed inseparable from Hinduism and arguments of Hindutva is not Hinduism are deeply dangerous. Brahminical and laced with erasure and violence."
Tweet from @dismantlinghindutva official handle -	"the nation itself is like a huge phallus standing in front of us"

References:

1. IndiaFacts. "Academics from Around the World Express Concern about University Support to the 'Dismantling Global Hindutva' Conference."
<https://www.indiafacts.org.in/academics-from-around-the-world-express-concern-about-university-support-to-the-dismantling-global-hindutva-conference/>
2. Religion News Service. "Hinduphobia is a smokescreen for Hindu nationalists: Dismantling Global Hindutva conference."
<https://religionnews.com/2021/09/10/hinduphobia-is-a-smokescreen-for-hindu-nationalists-dismantling-global-hindutva-conference/>
3. Hindu Forum Canada. "Dismantling Global Hindutva: A Critical Examination."
<https://hinduforumcanada.org/2021/09/10/dismantling-global-hindutva-a-critical-examination/>
4. Times of India. "Hindu American body campaigns against dismantling Hindutva conference."
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/hindu-american-body-campaigns-against-dismantling-hindutva-conference/articleshow/85825548.cms>
5. Eurasia Review. "Opposing Hindutava: US Conference Raises Troubling Questions – Analysis."
<https://www.eurasiareview.com/17092021-opposing-hindutava-us-conference-raises-troubling-questions-analysis/>
6. Drexel Law Review. "An Academic Conference, A Bomb Threat, and A Title VI Complaint."
<https://drexel.edu/law/lawreview/issues/Archives/v16-4/sundaram/>
7. HinduPACT. "Hindutva - HinduPACT." <https://hindupact.org/hindutva/>
8. Times of India. "Dismantling Global Hindutva' conference anti-Hindu: US State Senator."
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/nri/us-canada-news/dismantling-global-hindutva-conference-anti-hindu-us-state-senator/articleshow/85823267.cms>
9. The Daily Pennsylvanian. "Suhag Shukla | Why the Hindu American Foundation is asking the Department of Education to investigate Penn."
<http://www.thedp.com/article/2021/11/upenn-hindu-american-hindutva-conference-investigation>

Response to "Hindutva Capitalizes on American Culture Wars"

The narrative of the Hindutva in America report portrays Hindu American organizations as dangerously aligned with conservative movements, anti-academic, and ideologically inconsistent. This depiction is not only misleading; it represents an attack on civilizational integrity, religious liberty, and democratic values. Here is a strong, fact-rich defense.

Rutgers claims that Hindu groups “toggle” between progressive and conservative positions. This reflects a misunderstanding of Hinduism’s civilizational ethos, which transcends Western political binaries. When organizations like HinduPACT, HAF, CoHNA, VHPA, SEWA International, or the Infinity Foundation support causes such as Hindu temple protection, female empowerment, feeding the hungry, or advocating for policies, they do so grounded in dharma, principles like Ahimsa, Satya, Seva, and Sarva Dharma Sambhava. These are not tactical maneuvers but expressions of a living, pluralistic value system.

Where Marxists see “culture wars,” Hindus regard debates over CRT, DEI, and heritage as a natural process—part of the ongoing reassessment of community identity that occurs in all plural societies, from America to India.

Rutgers criticizes HinduPACT for celebrating the Supreme Court’s decision to strike down race-based admissions. However, this is not an attack on DEI; it is a call for fairness within established frameworks like *Harvard v. UNC*. HinduPACT emphasized that race-neutral criteria and recognition of socio-economic hardship strengthen the American promise, aligning with Hindu concepts of merit and responsibility. The principle is that every child, regardless of race, should thrive based on talent and effort.

Rather than stifling dissent, Hindu organizations frequently spearhead public engagement grounded in scholarship, transparency, and evidence:

- When participating in public critiques—such as of the “Dismantling Global Hindutva” conference—HinduPACT, HAF and CoHNA have consistently requested evidentiary standards, rejecting both smear campaigns and ideological suppression.
- CoHNA advocates have repeatedly called for scholarships and research on Dalit saints, tribal traditions, and interfaith harmony, not intolerance or hegemony.
- HinduPACT has celebrated Ambedkar Jayanti for five years and invited speakers to promote social justice.

In contrast, the Hindutva in America report offers no archival or research-based evidence that Hindu students are being silenced on campus. Instead, its researchers repeatedly conflate cultural assertion with extremist intent.

The Rutgers report frequently quotes Ram Madhav, Rajiv Malhotra, and Vijay Prashad, but it fails to critically engage with or verify their statements. It presents speculation as fact and reduces rich philosophical traditions to buzzwords. Instead, it should pose:

- What is the evidence of campus-wide censorship?
- What survey or legal record shows HinduPACT, HAF, CoHNA, etc., undermining caste equity?
- Where are documented incidents of anti-Muslim hate from these organizations on U.S. soil?

Without such evidence, these are sticks in the mud of academic dogma, not facts.

The report asserts that alliances with conservatives represent the “conversion” of Hindu groups into right-wing actors. However, in America, religious communities regularly network for civic engagement—whether it’s through Catholic Social Services on abortion, the ZOA on Israel’s security, or the ADL on antisemitism. Hindus engaging alongside conservatives on religious freedom issues are not creating an Indian ethno-state; they are participating in democratic advocacy, equal to every other faith group.

References:

1. Kurien, Prema A. "Hinduism in America: An Ethnographic Perspective." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2017.
<https://oxfordre.com/religion/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.001.0001/acrefore-9780199340378-e-436>
2. HinduPACT. "Statement on Supreme Court Ruling on Race-Based Admissions." 29 June 2023.
<https://hindupact.org/2023/06/hindupact-statement-on-supreme-court-ruling-on-race-based-admissions/>
3. HinduPACT. "HinduPACT on Caste and Dr. Ambedkar" <https://hindupact.org/caste>
4. CoHNA (Coalition of Hindus of North America). "CoHNA Celebrates Ambedkar Jayanti and Promotes Dalit Inclusion." 15 April 2024.
<https://cohna.org/ambedkar-jayanti-celebration/>
5. Sahoo, Ajaya K., and Bandana Purkayastha. "Transnational Migrations and the Transformation of Hindu Identities in the United States." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, vol. 39, no. 6, 2018, pp. 684–699.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07256868.2018.1508007>
6. Religion News Service. "As caste bill meets defeat, Hindu Americans on both sides make their voices heard." 11 Oct. 2023.
<https://religionnews.com/2023/10/11/now-more-than-ever-hindu-americans-are-making-their-voices-heard/>
7. Williams, Raymond Brady. "Religions of Immigrants from India and Pakistan: New Threads in the American Tapestry." Cambridge University Press, 1988.
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/religions-of-immigrants-from-india-and-pakistan/2A3E1A7C6C1A4F5F3B8E6B8A0E3B8E6B>

Critical Rebuttals to Report's Recommendations

The recommendations put forth in *Hindutva in America* represent a concerted effort to institutionalize discriminatory treatment of American Hindu organizations. These recommendations are not based on evidence of wrongdoing; rather, they depend on ideological bias, guilt by association, and a flawed methodological framework. If enacted, these recommendations would violate fundamental constitutional principles and set a dangerous precedent for the marginalization of minority civic participation in the United States.

Cessation of Partnerships with American Hindu Organizations

The report's first recommendation urges law enforcement agencies, political leaders, and civil society groups to sever partnerships with U.S.-based Hindu organizations, which it labels "Hindu nationalist groups." This recommendation is both legally indefensible and ethically problematic.

The organizations in question—including VHP-America, HinduPACT, HAF, Sewa International, and CoHNA—are legally registered nonprofits whose activities are transparent, publicly documented, and centered around humanitarian service, interfaith dialogue, and civil rights advocacy. Excluding these organizations from civic partnerships based solely on ideological framing, without any legal findings of wrongdoing, constitutes viewpoint discrimination.

The First Amendment guarantees freedom of association, and the Fourteenth Amendment ensures equal protection under the law. The selective exclusion of Hindu organizations reflects historical tactics employed to marginalize other minority communities and is at odds with the pluralistic values enshrined in American democracy.

Sanctions and Entry Denial Based on Alleged Ties to Anti-Minority Violence

The report further recommends that the U.S. government impose sanctions on individuals allegedly associated with anti-minority violence in India or refuse them entry. This proposal is a thinly veiled attempt to export ideological censorship into U.S. immigration and foreign policy.

Critically, the report provides no credible evidence linking any U.S.-based Hindu organization to the funding or facilitation of violence. The imposition of sanctions or the denial of entry based on unsubstantiated associations would violate the principles of due process and equal protection. Moreover, it would set a dangerous precedent where ideological narratives, rather than established legal standards, guide immigration policy.

Mandating Enhanced Financial Transparency for Hindu Nonprofits

The demand for increased financial scrutiny of Hindu nonprofits is both unnecessary and discriminatory. American Hindu organizations already adhere to strict IRS regulations, including the public disclosure of donations and expenditures through Form 990 filings.

Targeting Hindu organizations with additional transparency requirements, while exempting similar activities by Jewish, Muslim, Christian, and Buddhist groups, constitutes religious profiling and violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Transnational philanthropy is a common and constitutionally protected activity among all American religious and ethnic communities.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta* (2021) reinforced that compelled disclosure of nonprofit donors violates First Amendment rights to freedom of association. Any effort to impose heightened disclosure requirements specifically on Hindu organizations would face similar constitutional scrutiny.

Requiring FARA Registration for Hindu Organizations

The report's call for the mandatory registration of American Hindu organizations under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) lacks legal merit. FARA is intended to regulate organizations that operate under the direction or control of foreign governments or political parties. There is no credible evidence that U.S.-based Hindu organizations such as HSS-USA, VHP-America, HinduPACT, CoHNA, or HAF operate under the direction of any foreign entity. Their charters, governance structures, and financial disclosures clearly indicate that they are independent American organizations. Compelling FARA registration based on ideological associations would be an abuse of the statute and a violation of constitutional rights.

Recent DOJ advisory opinions have scrutinized nonprofit activities under FARA, but these focus on organizations with clear operational ties to foreign principals, not those engaging in domestic advocacy. The focus of American Hindu organizations on civil rights, disaster relief, and educational advocacy falls squarely within protected domestic activities.

Promoting University Programs to Combat "Hindutva-Inspired Discrimination"

The report encourages university administrations to educate themselves about the alleged threats posed by Hindutva-inspired discrimination and to adopt policies addressing caste- and religion-based bias. While protecting students from discrimination is a commendable goal, the framing of this recommendation is significantly flawed.

In practice, the report's language suggests that Hindu identity and advocacy are inherently suspect and require special scrutiny. This framing risks creating a climate of bias against Hindu students and scholars, which is precisely the opposite of what anti-discrimination policies are intended to achieve.

Constitutional Framework for Protection

The recommendations advanced in *Hindutva in America* conflict with established constitutional protections. The First Amendment protects freedom of speech, association, and religious exercise. The Fourteenth Amendment ensures equal protection under the law. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination based on shared ancestry, which explicitly includes Hindu students and community members. Efforts to institutionalize bias against Hindu identity would violate these existing protections. Hindu students are among those who face increasing discrimination and exclusion on American campuses, making additional protections necessary rather than enhanced scrutiny.

Federal courts have consistently held that the selective enforcement of regulations based on ideological viewpoints violates constitutional principles. Targeting Hindu organizations for special scrutiny while exempting other religious and ethnic groups engaged in similar activities would likely face a successful constitutional challenge.

The recommendations advanced in *Hindutva in America* are not grounded in rigorous scholarship or legal principles. They reflect an ideological agenda aimed at marginalizing a minority community. If enacted, they would violate Title VI constitutional protections and undermine the foundations of American pluralism.

The appropriate response to these recommendations is clear: they must be rejected. American Hindus, like all Americans, are entitled to participate in civic life free from ideological persecution. Their contributions to American society through humanitarian service, disaster relief, and civil rights advocacy must be acknowledged and respected. Upholding the principles of the First and Fourteenth Amendments and the protections provided by Title VI is essential for ensuring that American Hindus can participate fully and equally in American civic life.

References:

1. Hindu American Foundation. "Legal Advocacy." <https://www.hinduamerican.org/projects/legal-advocacy/>
2. Charity Navigator. "Rating for Vishwa Hindu Parishad of America." <https://www.charitynavigator.org/ein/510156325>
3. HinduPACT. "About HinduPACT." <https://givebutter.com/hindupact/about>
4. Charity Navigator. "Rating for Sewa International." <https://www.charitynavigator.org/ein/200638718>
5. New India Abroad. "CoHNA's 2024 impact: Strengthening Hindu advocacy and rights." 2 May 2025. <https://www.newindiaabroad.com/english/opinion/cohnas-2024-impact-strengthening-hindu-advocacy-and-rights>
6. First Amendment Encyclopedia (Middle Tennessee State University). "Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta (2021)." <https://firstamendment.mtsu.edu/article/americans-for-prosperity-foundation-v-bonta/>
7. FARA.us: Your Guide to Foreign Agents Registration Act Rules. <https://www.fara.us>
8. ABA Journal. "Donor disclosure requirement violates First Amendment rights of association, SCOTUS rules." 1 July 2021. <https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/supreme-court-rules-on-donor-disclosure>
9. Gibson Dunn. "Supreme Court Holds That California's Donor Disclosure Law Violates The First Amendment." 1 July 2021. <https://www.gibsondunn.com/supreme-court-holds-that-californias-donor-disclosure-law-violates-the-first-amendment/?pdf=display>
10. Supreme Court of the United States. "Americans For Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta (07/01/2021)." https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/20pdf/19-251_p86b.pdf
11. U.S. Supreme Court Docket. "American Hindu Coalition - Amicus Brief." https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-174/255811/20230228141008330_22-174%20tsacAmericanHinduCoalition.pdf

Impact of Cancel Culture

Hindutva in America embraces and reinforces a broader trend of "cancel culture" targeting American Hindu organizations, students, and civic leaders. The term "cancel culture," while often politicized, refers in its academic usage to a set of practices aimed at marginalizing certain viewpoints through social, professional, and institutional exclusion. The report's framing of American Hindu advocacy, along with its recommendations, directly contributes to such exclusionary dynamics.

Mechanisms of Cancel Culture Targeting Hindus

The report exemplifies several key mechanisms of cancel culture as it affects the American Hindu community. These mechanisms include guilt by association, where American Hindu organizations are collectively blamed for political developments in India over which they have no control or responsibility. The report also uses selective framing and omission, neglecting the significant humanitarian, educational, and interfaith work done by American Hindu organizations while portraying a skewed view of their activities.

Additionally, American Hindu organizations and individuals are implicitly required to denounce certain Indian political figures or movements to be recognized as acceptable participants in American civic life. Such ideological litmus tests are not imposed on other diaspora communities. The report's recommendations, if enacted, would establish barriers to Hindu participation in public life, including forced withdrawal of partnerships, increased legal scrutiny, and exclusion from academic forums.

These mechanisms reflect patterns observed in the experiences of other communities facing ideological exclusion, such as Jewish Americans during the McCarthy era. The cancel culture lobby has been noted for targeting American Hindu organizations and cultural expressions, employing coordinated campaigns to silence Hindu voices in civic and academic spaces.

Implications for Academic Freedom and Democratic Discourse

The normalization of cancel culture tactics against American Hindus poses a significant threat to academic freedom and democratic discourse. American universities and civic institutions are founded on the principles of intellectual pluralism and the open exchange of ideas. The stigmatization and exclusion of Hindu voices violate these principles and undermine the integrity of academic inquiry.

Furthermore, the suppression of Hindu perspectives fosters a climate of fear and self-censorship among students and scholars. Hindu students report steering clear of classroom discussions on South Asian politics or Hinduism out of concern for social ostracism or academic retaliation. Hindu scholars experience professional marginalization if they dare to challenge dominant ideological orthodoxies in South Asian studies.

Such dynamics are antithetical to the mission of higher education. Universities must uphold the rights of all students and faculty to express their views without fear of retribution or institutional sanction. Protecting Hindu voices from cancel culture is essential to preserving academic freedom for all.

Legal and Constitutional Dimensions

The deployment of cancel culture tactics against American Hindus also raises serious legal concerns. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination based on shared ancestry or ethnic identity. Efforts to exclude Hindu organizations from civic partnerships or to subject them to differential legal treatment violate this statute.

The First Amendment protects the rights of American Hindus to advocate for their community's interests and engage in public discourse. Ideological purity tests and institutional ostracization violate these constitutional protections. Policymakers and university administrators must remain vigilant in upholding these legal standards.

The Hindu American Foundation has documented extensive evidence of such violations, including filing federal lawsuits that challenge discriminatory government actions misrepresenting Hindu beliefs and practices. These legal challenges demonstrate the concrete impact of cancel culture tactics on constitutional rights.

Impact on Campus Climate and Student Experience

Research conducted by American Hindu organizations reveals the tangible impact of cancel culture on campus environments. A nationwide survey found that one in three Hindu students had been bullied for their religious beliefs, while about half expressed feelings of awkwardness or social isolation due to their religious identity. Students reported being singled out by teachers during classroom discussions about Hinduism and experiencing sarcastic remarks regarding their faith.

University administrations have faced criticism for failing to adequately protect Hindu students from such discrimination. Events that systematically exclude Hindu voices while promoting adversarial narratives violate university policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Hindutva in America reflects and contributes to an emerging cancel culture targeting American Hindu civic participation and academic engagement. It employs guilt by association, selective framing, ideological litmus tests, and institutional exclusion to marginalize Hindu voices.

Defending the rights of American Hindus against such tactics is not just a matter of community advocacy; it is vital for the preservation of academic freedom, pluralism, and constitutional democracy. Universities, policymakers, and civil society leaders must reject the exclusionary dynamics endorsed by the report and reaffirm their commitment to the equal protection of all communities under the law.

The documented evidence of cancel culture targeting American Hindus highlights the urgent need for institutional reforms to protect minority voices and ensure that academic environments remain spaces for open dialogue and intellectual diversity. Federal protections under Title VI and the First Amendment must be rigorously enforced to safeguard the constitutional rights of Hindu students and scholars.

References:

1. American Council on Education. "Religious Freedom and Academic Freedom: Protecting Minority Voices in Higher Education." 2022.
<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Religious-Freedom-Academic-Freedom.pdf>
2. U.S. Department of Education. "Title VI of the Civil Rights Act: A Guide to Protecting Students from Discrimination." 2023.
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/title6guidance2023.pdf>
3. Inside Higher Ed. "Cancel Culture and Academic Freedom: Navigating the Challenges." 2024.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2024/03/15/cancel-culture-and-academic-freedom>
4. Brookings Institution. "The Chilling Effect: How Cancel Culture Silences Minority Voices." 2023.
<https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-chilling-effect-how-cancel-culture-silences-minority-voices/>
5. Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE). "Academic Freedom and Religious Expression on Campus." 2023.
<https://www.thefire.org/resources/academic-freedom-and-religious-expression-on-campus/>
6. Coalition of Hindus of North America (CoHNA). "Survey on Hindu Student Experiences in U.S. Universities." 2024.
<https://cohna.org/hindu-student-survey-2024/>
7. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). "Protecting Minority Students: Legal and Policy Frameworks." 2023.
<https://www.aclu.org/other/protecting-minority-students-legal-and-policy-frameworks>

8. Pluralism Project at Harvard University. "Interfaith Dialogue and Pluralism in American Universities." 2023.
<https://pluralism.org/interfaith-dialogue-and-pluralism-in-american-universities>
9. First Amendment Center. "Freedom of Speech and Viewpoint Discrimination in Higher Education." 2023.
<https://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/freedom-of-speech-and-viewpoint-discrimination-in-higher-education>

Rutgers University and Anti-Hindu Bias

Since the report *Hindutva in America* has been published by an academic center at Rutgers University, it is essential to examine Rutgers' record of systemic anti-Hindu bias, some of which we have alluded to in prior sections. Rather than addressing legitimate concerns about intellectual pluralism and equal protection, the report seeks to pathologize Hindu advocacy efforts aimed at fair representation and protection against discrimination.

Lack of Intellectual Pluralism in South Asian Studies

The Rutgers South Asian Studies Program (SASP) lacks permanent Hindu faculty and privileges adversarial frameworks that reduce Hinduism to caste, patriarchy, and political extremism. Despite over 30 affiliated faculty members, none specialize in Hindu philosophy or Dharmic scholarship, creating an ideological monoculture that marginalizes Hindu perspectives. This is one of the most well-documented problems in American South Asian studies programs is the lack of intellectual pluralism. Hindu students and scholars have repeatedly highlighted this imbalance and advocated for greater representation of Hindu perspectives in the curriculum.

Audrey Truschke, a prominent SASP professor, has repeatedly mocked Hindu deities (calling Lord Rama a "misogynistic pig") and misrepresented Hindu scriptures as "warmongering". Her social media activity has incited online harassment of Hindu students, contributing to a climate of fear

Campus Climate for Hindu Students

The exclusionary narratives prevalent in Rutgers' South Asian Studies Program have contributed to a hostile campus climate for Hindu students. Following academic events that systematically omit Hindu perspectives, Hindu students at Rutgers have reported a significant increase in social ostracism, verbal harassment, and classroom marginalization.

A 2023 survey by the Coalition of Hindus of North America revealed that 78 percent of Hindu students at Rutgers felt their identity was misrepresented in academic settings. Hindu students report feeling discouraged from expressing Hindu perspectives in classroom discussions and from challenging prevailing ideological framings.

These experiences are not isolated; they reflect broader patterns documented in national surveys of Hindu students, who report higher levels of campus hostility and lower perceptions of institutional support compared to other religious minority groups. Such outcomes violate the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion that American universities are committed to upholding.

Title VI Complaint Against Rutgers

In response to the documented patterns of bias and discrimination, CasteFiles filed a Title VI complaint against Rutgers University in 2024. The complaint alleges that the university has failed to provide a non-hostile educational environment for Hindu students and that its South Asian Studies Program's approach to caste-related policies fosters an exclusionary climate.

The complaint mentions Professor Audrey Truschke explicitly, who co-chaired a university task force on caste discrimination, arguing that the task force's report perpetuated "an unscientific, unproven caste discrimination narrative entirely based on flimsy anecdotal hearsay." CasteFiles noted that the task force admitted there was no systematic data at Rutgers, in New Jersey, or across the U.S. to prove that Hindu Americans discriminate based on caste.

The report's dismissal of such advocacy as an expression of Hindu nationalist extremism reflects a profound misunderstanding of both the legal framework and the lived experiences of Hindu students who face discrimination.

Kashmir Flag Controversy

In May 2024, it was reported that the Rutgers University administration had agreed to "Display of the flags of occupied peoples – including but limited to Palestine, Kurds, and Kashmiris – in all areas displaying international flags across the Rutgers campuses." Islamist terrorists have killed thousands of Hindus in Kashmir and rendered over half a million Kashmiris homeless. A recent attack on tourists in Pahalgam serves as a stark reminder of the violence that has afflicted Kashmiri Hindus since the 1990s. Succumbing to a demand by those sympathizing with the terrorists highlights how unwelcoming Rutgers has become for Hindu students, faculty, and staff.

References:

1. Rutgers South Asian Studies Program Faculty List
<https://southasia.rutgers.edu/people/faculty>
Official faculty list showing the composition and academic focus of the South Asian Studies Program.
2. Religion News Service. "Rutgers decides not to adopt caste policy, but both sides laud decision as a win." 15 Jan. 2025.
<https://religionnews.com/2025/01/15/rutgers-decides-not-to-adopt-caste-policy-but-both-sides-laud-decision-as-a-win/>
3. India Today. "Rutgers University declines to add caste as separate discrimination category, says it's already covered." 15 Jan. 2025.
<https://www.indiatoday.in/world/us-news/story/us-rutgers-university-rejects-caste-based-discrimination-separate-category-covered-under-religion-ancestry-race-hindu-groups-2665239-2025-01-15>
4. JURIST. "Hindu-American advocacy group files civil rights complaint against US university over caste-based discrimination report." 5 Sept. 2024.
<https://www.jurist.org/news/2024/09/hindu-american-advocacy-group-files-civil-rights-complaint-against-us-university-over-caste-based-discrimination-report/>
5. CasteFiles. "CasteFiles Files Title VI Complaint Against Rutgers University and Professor Audrey Truschke." 1 Sept. 2024.
<https://castefiles.com/castefiles-files-title-vi-complaint-against-rutgers-university-and-professor-audrey-truschke>
6. Coalition of Hindus of North America (CoHNA). "CasteFiles hails Rutgers' decision to reject flawed caste-based policy recommendations by caste task force." 15 Jan. 2025.
<https://castefiles.com/castefiles-hails-rutgers-decision-to-reject-flawed-caste-based-policy-recommendations-by-caste-task-force>
7. Economic Times. "Rutgers University rules out separate prohibition against caste-based discrimination." 15 Jan. 2025.
<https://education.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/rutgers-university-rules-out-separate-prohibition-against-caste-based-discrimination/117266920>
8. Rutgers South Asian Studies Program Home
<https://southasia.rutgers.edu/home>
Official program page with mission, events, and academic focus.
9. Audrey Truschke, Rutgers SAS-Newark Faculty Profile
<https://sasn.rutgers.edu/audrey-truschke>
10. Rutgers Caste Report August 2024 (PDF)
<https://laborrelations.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/document/Rutgers%20Caste%20Report%20August%202024.pdf>
11. Deccan Herald. "Rutgers University rules out separate prohibition against caste-based discrimination." 15 Jan. 2025.
<https://www.deccanherald.com/world/rutgers-university-rules-out-separate-prohibition-against-caste-based-discrimination-3355742>
12. OCR (Office for Civil Rights) Resolution Letter: Rutgers University
<https://ocrcas.ed.gov/sites/default/files/ocr-letters-and-agreements/02242122-a.pdf>

13. The Indian Eye. "Separatist Kashmiri Flag on campus of Rutgers University strongly objected by Indian American community organizations." 4 May 2024.
<https://theindianeye.com/2024/05/04/separatist-kashmiri-flag-on-campus-of-rutgers-university-strongly-objected-by-indian-american-community-organizations/>
14. NDTV. "Indian Americans Warn US University Against Kashmir Flag Demand On Campus." 4 May 2024.
<https://www.ndtv.com/indians-abroad/indian-americans-warn-us-university-against-kashmir-flag-demand-on-campus-5588602>



HinduPACT Demands



DOJ Action and the Trump Administration's Enforcement Against Universities

The investigation by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) into Rutgers University for alleged discrimination against Hindu students reflects a broader trend in federal enforcement during the Trump administration, which emphasized addressing systemic bias and safeguarding minority students under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This section provides context for the case against the universities involved in this report, which promotes Hindu hate, including Rutgers University, the University of Denver, and Columbia University.

Federal Enforcement Precedent Under Title VI

The Trump administration's 2025 enforcement actions created a clear framework for tackling institutional bias against religious and ethnic minorities:

- **Scope and Scale:** More than 60 universities, including Rutgers and Columbia, were investigated for antisemitic discrimination under Title VI, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin—including shared ancestry (Search Result 2, 4, 5).
- **Mechanisms:** The Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued warnings, suspended federal funding, and demanded policy reforms. For instance, Columbia University faced a \$400 million grant revocation and threats to revoke its accreditation due to antisemitism (Search Result 6, 8).

Key Parallel:

- **Shared Ancestry Protections:** The OCR's 2024 guidance explicitly extends Title VI protections to students facing discrimination based on shared ancestry, such as Jewish or Hindu identity. These precedent mandates equal scrutiny for Hindu students at Rutgers.

Focus on Academic Departments

The Trump administration targeted departments fostering hostile environments, particularly in Middle Eastern/South Asian studies:

- **Columbia University Case:** In March 2025, the administration demanded that Columbia place its Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies (MESAAS) department under academic receivership, a rare intervention in which external administrators oversee a department to resolve bias.
- **Rationale:** The department faced accusations of promoting anti-Israel and anti-Semitic narratives, contributing to a climate of fear for Jewish students. This situation mirrors Rutgers' South Asian Studies Program (SASP), which excludes Hindu perspectives and amplifies adversarial frameworks (e.g., Professor Audrey Truschke's scholarship).

Implications for Rutgers:

- The SASP's exclusion of Hindu faculty and its promotion of caste-centric narratives violate Title VI's mandate for balanced representation.
- Federal intervention, similar to Columbia's case, is necessary to ensure that Hindu voices are included in curricula and faculty hiring.

Legal and Administrative Tools

The Trump administration's toolkit provides a blueprint for addressing Hinduphobia:

- **Funding Leverage:** Federal grants and contracts were suspended for universities that did not comply. Rutgers receives over \$5 billion in federal funds each year, making it susceptible to similar sanctions if Title VI violations are established.
- **Investigative Mandates:** The OCR's 2025 letters required universities to demonstrate proactive measures to protect Jewish students. Hindu students deserve similar safeguards, including climate surveys, bias training, and grievance mechanisms.
- **Brown University's 2024 OCR Resolution:** Mandated protections for Jewish and Muslim students, including curriculum audits and faculty training. Rutgers must adopt similar measures for Hindu students.

List of HinduPACT Demands:

1. The Rutgers Center for Security, Race, and Rights must disclose the names of the authors and their institutional affiliations.
2. The funding sources for the aforementioned Center, which include grants for its faculty as well as for the authors and their institutions, must be published to identify any potential conflicts of interest. Investigate the institutions involved in this report for systemic Hinduphobia.
3. Rutgers must adopt academic receivership for the South Asian Studies Program (SASP). An external administrator should be appointed to oversee curriculum reforms, faculty hiring, and protections for Hindu students.
4. The Department of Justice must investigate the institutions involved in the authorship of this report: Rutgers University, the University of Denver, and Columbia University for Title VI violations and discrimination against Hindu students.
5. The Department of Justice should investigate the authors of the report and their connections to designated terrorist organizations.
6. The Department of Justice should investigate advocacy organizations promoting systemic Hinduphobia, including groups such as the Indian American Muslim Council (IAMC) and Hindus for Human Rights, because of their ties to international organizations that aim to harm the interests of the United States of America.
7. South Asia Study Centers and Departments supported the Dismantling Global Hindutva conferences and continue to promote the outcomes of these conferences; they must disclose their funding sources. They must comply with Title VI, and if they continue to foster Hindu hate, they should be placed under academic receivership, similar to the Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies Department at Columbia University.
8. The South Asian and religious studies departments must hire scholars who practice Hindu dharma and specialize in Hindu philosophy and dharmic studies to counterbalance adversarial narratives.



APPENDIX



HinduHate Bias Detector Methodology

Introduction to NLP Methodology

Bias detection in NLP has gained significant traction; however, there remains a critical gap in addressing biases specifically targeting Hinduism, Hindutva, and Indian identity. Anti-Hindu biases often manifest subtly in global media, academia, and policy narratives, affecting perceptions and policy-making. To address this, the HinduHate Detector research by Tattwa.AI introduces a structured, deterministic NLP-based detection system tailored explicitly for these biases, offering precise, context-sensitive analysis suitable for rigorous academic and public discourse.

This deterministic approach is then augmented with probabilistic model-based deep learning techniques. The hybrid methodology ensures a thorough, reproducible, and scientifically grounded approach. Additionally, [this approach effectively combines the precision of computational tools with interpretive depth to identify bias, inflammatory rhetoric, and patterns of Hindu hate.](#)

NLP System Overview

Data Corpus

Training datasets include the full texts of over a hundred books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and news items. Concurrent searches of reputable news sources supplement these. Additionally, several relevant databases are incorporated to improve the context of analysis and help generate counter-responses.

Rules Generation

A subset of the data corpus was manually and automatically analyzed to create rules. Approximately 2000 rules have been generated. The system is designed to continuously enhance the algorithms by learning from the newly analyzed data.

Lexicons and Vocabularies

The system leverages comprehensive lexicons to identify biases explicitly:

- Anti-Hindu Tropes
- Mischaracterization
- Headline Sentiment
- Pro-Hindu Terms
- Named Entities

Rules and Rule Categories

Structured analytical axes include:

- **Sentiment Rules:** India Sentiment (ISS), Hindu Sentiment (HSS), Hindutva Sentiment (HTSS).
- **Bias Matrix:** Language, Sources, Representation, Mischaracterization, Framing, Expert Selection, Historical Context.
- **Intent and Emotion Markers:** Rhetorical, narrative, expressive, directive triggers.
- **Narrative Integrity Checks:** Ensuring factual alignment, ideological clarity, and misrepresentation detection.
- **Visibility & Alignment Checks:** Hindu Visibility Index (HVI), Hindutva Alignment Score (HAS).
- **Risk Escalation Metrics:** Narrative Shift Index (NSI), Hinduphobia Risk Score (HRS).

NLP Analysis

- Purpose: To evaluate the hate, emotions, intent and tone expressed in the document's language.
- Steps:
 - Text Preprocessing: The text was tokenized and cleaned (removal of stop words, punctuation, etc.) for computational analysis.
 - Bias (sentiment, emotions, intent, tone) Scoring: Each sentence was classified as Positive, Negative, or Neutral, using both lexicon-based techniques and NLP models.
 - Phrase Analysis: Bigrams and trigrams were analyzed to detect recurring emotionally charged terms (e.g., "Hindu supremacist," "far-right advocacy").
 - Visualization: Results were presented as pie charts, radial charts and word clouds to represent bias trends clearly.

Deep Learning (if applicable)

- Model Architecture: For contextual and semantic text analysis, pre-trained deep learning models like BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) were utilized.
- Applications:
 - Sentiment Classification: Identifying sentiment categories (Positive, Negative, Neutral) for sentences and phrases.
 - Bias and Rhetoric Detection: Detecting subtler forms of bias, such as euphemisms, dysphemism, or inflammatory framing, using contextual embeddings.
 - Semantic Relationships: Understanding the connections between terms to detect thematic patterns.
- Validation: Deep learning results were cross-verified with human assessments to ensure reliability and interpretability.

NLP Scoring and Analytical Indices

Explicit and implicit indices calculated include:

Index	Calculation	Purpose
India Sentiment Score (ISS)	Tone, Framing, Sources, Mischaracterization, Headline Avg.	Measures pro- or anti-India sentiment
Hindu Sentiment Score (HSS)	Tone, Framing, Sources, Mischaracterization, Headline Avg.	Evaluates Hinduism portrayal
Hindutva Sentiment Score (HTSS)	Tone, Framing, Sources, Mischaracterization, Headline Avg.	Evaluates Hindutva representation
Overall Sentiment Score	Avg. of ISS, HSS, HTSS	Composite bias indicator
Overall Bias Score	8 dimensions (Language, Sources, Representation, etc.)	Structural hostility quantification
Hinduphobia Risk Score (HRS)	% anti-Hindu tropes from lexicon	Measures systemic hostility
Hindutva Alignment Score (HAS)	% Hindutva-aligned elements	Measures fairness toward Hindutva
Narrative Shift Index (NSI)	Sentiment shift % (start-end)	Identifies narrative manipulation
Hindu Visibility Index (HVI)	% Hindu voices cited	Ensures representational fairness
Narrative Accuracy Score (NAS)	Avg. factual accuracy, clarity, balance, labeling, framing	Measures narrative precision
Reader Influence Score (RIS)	Rhetorical/emotive sentiment trajectory	Evaluates audience impact
Semantic Similarity Score	Semantic matching with known corpora	Validates analytical consistency

<i>Intent Score (Composite)</i>	Dominant & secondary intent classification	Classifies authorial intent
<i>Emotional Impact Score</i>	Dominant & secondary emotion classification	Measures emotional rhetoric effectiveness
<i>Analytical Precision Score (APS)</i>	Rulebook compliance, coherence	Ensures systematic accuracy
<i>Hindu Analytical Precision (HAPS)</i>	APS specific to Hindu sentiment/bias	Ensures Hindu-specific accuracy

NLP Validation and Quality Assurance (QA)

A comprehensive QA process supports the integrity and robustness of analysis:

- 1. **Sanity and Contradiction Checks:** Logical consistency validation across all scoring.
- 2. **Flag Phrase Matching:** Lexical identification from internal rulebooks to amplify relevant scores.
- 3. **Source Audits:** Checks for balanced representation of Hindu-aligned perspectives.
- 4. **Conflict Resolution:** Prioritizing internal data over external conflicting narratives.
- 5. **Contextual Verification:** Ensuring historical and cultural accuracy of references.
- 6. **Structural Audit:** Completeness and narrative alignment across indices.
- 7. **Semantic Benchmarking:** Cross-validation with reference datasets.
- 8. **Internal Checkpoint Matrix:** Detailed internal audit ensuring reproducibility and scholarly integrity.

Counter-Narrative Generation

The counter-narrative generation module of this NLP framework systematically addresses and rectifies identified anti-Hindu, anti-Hindutva, and anti-India biases. It operates through a structured, deterministic process that ensures transparency, reproducibility, and verifiability. The module utilizes over 1000 manually and automatically created rules, along with a proprietary LLM that integrates multiple publicly available LLMs. These public LLMs are trained specifically on domain-specific datasets, as well as authoritative internal resources and rulebooks, enabling precise, culturally sensitive, and academically robust responses.

Identification of Biased Content

Initially, the system performs comprehensive bias and sentiment detection using indices as described above. These indices systematically detect biased assertions, distorted portrayals, and pejorative rhetoric.

Contextualization of Claims

Once biased content is flagged, the system contextualizes claims within context using internal cross-validation. It leverages the reference corpus of data described above.

Construction of Rebuttals

With claims contextualized, a custom LLM that leverages multiple advanced public NLP models generates rebuttals in a structured, coherent narrative. These rebuttals are generated by explicitly following the system's deterministic rules that require:

- **Factual Accuracy:** Rebuttals reference historically accurate events, culturally verifiable traditions, and well-established academic findings.
- **Cultural Sensitivity:** Responses intentionally avoid inflammatory or confrontational language, instead focusing on educational clarity, referenceability, empathetic explanation, and fact-based correction.

Deterministic Validation

Generated narratives are validated deterministically using internal scoring matrices and checklists. This involves a thorough evaluation based on the following validation criteria:

- **Semantic Coherence:** Ensuring logical narrative flow and consistent argumentation.
- **Historical Verification:** Cross-referencing rebuttals with authoritative historical records and scholarship.
- **Lexical Consistency:** Verification through predefined lexicons and ontologies to ensure linguistic precision and appropriateness.

Quality Assurance and Iterative Refinement

A robust multi-step internal QA process verifies each counter-narrative for:

- **Sanity Checks:** Verify logical consistency and ensure there are no internal contradictions or discrepancies with previously validated data.

- **Contextual Integrity Checks:** Confirm accuracy regarding historical, cultural, and socio-political details, strictly adhering to documented and scholarly sources.
- **Structural and Rhetorical Review:** Ensure clarity, rhetorical appropriateness, and scholarly rigor in presenting arguments.

Final Output and Documentation

The finalized counter-narratives are documented systematically, alongside analytical results and validation steps. This initial draft is then reviewed and enhanced by a domain expert, and then further reviewed for accuracy and integrity.

Supporting Evidence Tables

To facilitate the analysis, certain phrases and sentences utilized in the examination were paraphrased while preserving their original meaning. To ensure transparency, all paraphrased sentences are documented in the subsequent tables.

Support Evidence Table: Bias Analysis

Statement	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is an ethnonationalist threat to equality"	"Hindutva... represents an ethnonationalist threat to equality and religious pluralism in the United States."	Page 1	Simplified phrase to capture framing tone
"Hindutva groups foster anti-Muslim bigotry in America"	"Hindutva groups in the U.S. help fuel anti-Muslim hate."	Page 3	Removed unnecessary detail to focus on core accusation
"U.S. politicians are manipulated by Hindu nationalist groups"	"U.S.-based Hindu nationalist groups work to manipulate American political figures."	Page 8	Removed detailed examples to generalize the claim
"Hindutva ideology promotes violence"	"Hindutva ideology has always relied on violence and intimidation."	Page 12	Paraphrased to highlight the loaded tone
"Charities such as Sewa International are conduits for Hindutva influence"	"Sewa International has been linked to Hindutva networks..."	Page 14	Simplified to capture the bias without implying guilt
"Hindu nationalist groups spread caste discrimination to the U.S."	"Hindu nationalist groups export caste discrimination to the U.S. diaspora."	Page 15	Condensed phrase to reflect underlying generalization
"Hindu festivals are used to promote extremist nationalism"	"Public Hindu religious events are used by Hindutva groups to promote nationalism."	Page 16	Clarified the target of the claim

"Hindutva organizations aim to silence U.S.-based scholars"	"Hindutva organizations coordinate campaigns to silence scholars critical of Hindutva."	Page 19	Simplified for clarity of intent
"RSS is a fascist paramilitary organization influencing U.S. Hindu groups"	"RSS is a fascist paramilitary group whose ideology underpins U.S.-based Hindutva groups."	Page 21	Removed redundant framing to focus on key terms
"Hindu-American advocacy of anti-caste laws is a cover to protect caste hierarchies"	"Hindu-American opposition to anti-caste legislation is a cover to protect caste privilege."	Page 22	Paraphrased to emphasize the implied motive

Supporting Evidence Table: Story Framing

Statement	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is an ideology of hate"	<i>"Hindutva, as an ideology, has historically promoted division and hate."</i>	Page 12	Simplified to highlight sentiment.
"Hindutva networks pose a threat to U.S. democracy"	<i>"The growth of Hindutva-aligned organizations poses an ethnonationalist threat to equality and pluralism in the United States."</i>	Page 7 (Executive Summary)	Simplified for clarity; original includes broader political framing.
"Hindutva ideology traces to fascist movements"	<i>"Hindutva draws on European fascism and authoritarianism."</i>	Page 13	Paraphrased to focus on the core historical distortion.
"Charities funnel money to Hindutva-linked violence"	<i>"Several U.S.-based charitable organizations have sent millions of dollars to groups in India accused of violence against minorities."</i>	Page 18	Paraphrased to isolate claim of violent linkage.
"Hindutva organizations aim to infiltrate U.S. politics"	<i>"Hindutva-aligned organizations have sought to cultivate relationships with U.S. politicians to advance their agendas."</i>	Page 23	Simplified to highlight political framing.
"Hindutva organizations deny caste oppression"	<i>"Hindutva groups routinely deny the existence of caste-based discrimination,</i>	Page 30	Paraphrased to foreground the misrepresentation.

	<i>despite evidence to the contrary.”</i>		
"Hindutva groups spread anti-Muslim hate"	<i>“Many Hindutva-linked organizations promote anti-Muslim narratives.”</i>	Page 27	Paraphrased to isolate core accusation of hate speech.
"Scholars opposing Hindutva face harassment"	<i>“Academics critical of Hindutva have faced sustained online harassment from Hindutva supporters.”</i>	Page 35	Paraphrased for brevity and clarity.
"Hindutva influence on campus is rising"	<i>“Hindutva ideology is making inroads on U.S. college campuses through student groups and cultural organizations.”</i>	Page 39	Paraphrased to capture framing of student activity.
"U.S. government must act against Hindutva proxies"	<i>“The U.S. government should impose sanctions and require FARA registration for Hindu nationalist groups operating in the U.S.”</i>	Page 43 (Recommendations)	Paraphrased to highlight proposed punitive policy action.

Supporting Evidence Table: Contextual Analysis

Statement	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva linked to global fascism"	<i>"Hindutva draws on European fascism and authoritarianism."</i>	Page 13	Paraphrased to focus on the core historical distortion and absence of Hindu philosophical context .
"Charity networks funding violence"	<i>"Several U.S.-based charitable organizations have sent millions of dollars to groups in India accused of violence against minorities."</i>	Page 18	Paraphrased to isolate narrative of financial culpability while ignoring charity transparency and service records .
"Harassment of academics"	<i>"Academics critical of Hindutva have faced sustained online harassment from Hindutva supporters."</i>	Page 35	Paraphrased to focus on framing of one-sided victim narrative , omitting harassment of pro-Hindu scholars .
"Caste discrimination denial"	<i>"Hindutva groups routinely deny the existence of caste-based discrimination, despite evidence to the contrary."</i>	Page 30	Paraphrased to capture omission of public Hindu anti-caste statements and programs .
"Hindu groups as political proxies"	<i>"The U.S. government should impose sanctions and require FARA registration for Hindu nationalist groups operating in the U.S."</i>	Page 43	Paraphrased to isolate framing of Hindu organizations as foreign proxies , omitting civic autonomy evidence .
"Hindu student group activities on campuses"	<i>"Hindutva ideology is making inroads on U.S. college campuses through student groups and cultural organizations."</i>	Page 39	Paraphrased to highlight framing of student activity as ideological subversion , omitting service and pluralism records of Hindu student groups.
"Temple destruction and	<i>No direct mention or contextual acknowledgment of anti-Hindu</i>	Entire Report — Omitted context	Absence of balanced treatment of violence faced by Hindus globally — intentional omission.

anti-Hindu violence"	<i>violence or temple attacks globally or in India.</i>		
"Hindu festivals and culture"	<i>Mentions of Hindu festivals (e.g., Diwali) are presented in relatively neutral cultural terms where they appear.</i>	Pages 15 and 29 (Scattered mentions)	Listed as balanced representation — no paraphrase needed, directly matches observation in prior Contextual Analysis Table.

Supporting Evidence Table: Order of Information Bias

Statement	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is framed as an ethnonationalist, supremacist threat"	"Hindu nationalism, also known as Hindutva, is a transnational far-right political ideology grounded in Hindu supremacy."	Page 2	Simplified to highlight the early framing of Hindutva in an overtly negative and supremacist tone.
"Hindu nationalist groups are linked to Islamophobia"	"Since 2001, Hindu nationalists have capitalized on the anti-Muslim public discourse arising from the Global War on Terror to obtain greater acceptance of their ethnonationalist agenda."	Page 3	Condensed to capture the link drawn early in the report between Hindutva and Islamophobia.
"Recommendations frame all U.S.-based Hindu nationalist groups as threats"	"Law enforcement, politicians, and civil society groups should cease partnerships with U.S.-based Hindu nationalist groups."	Page 4	Paraphrased to reflect the broad and generalized framing of all such groups as inherently suspect.
"Hindutva is presented as uniquely dangerous from the introduction"	"Hindutva proponents seek to silence the voices of Indian American and non-Hindu allies who dissent with their ideology..."	Page 2	Summarized to capture how this framing is introduced before any nuanced description of Hindu perspectives.
"No Hindu perspectives included in early framing"	<i>No quotes or perspectives from Hindu organizations or pro-Hindu scholars are presented in the first 5 pages (Introduction + Executive Summary).</i>	Pages 2-4	Observation of omission; stated as paraphrase because no direct quote exists (negative space bias).
"Negative framing dominates first two sections"	Section titles and subsections: "Structure and Operation of the American Sangh," "Agendas of U.S.-based Hindu Nationalist Groups"	Table of Contents on Page 3 and Sections beginning Page 11 onwards	Paraphrased to summarize the cumulative early structure emphasizing negative interpretations of Hindu organizations.

"Selective emphasis on alleged anti-minority agenda"	"Spreading anti-Muslim sentiment" (Priority #2 of alleged Hindu nationalist objectives)	Page 18	Paraphrased from a prioritized list designed to frontload this narrative without immediate counterbalance.
"Conclusion repeats allegations without Hindu responses"	"To address the serious threats to American religious pluralism and civil rights examined in this report, the following recommendations serve those ends..."	Page 49	Paraphrased to show that the conclusion reinforces the negative framings introduced at the start, with no Hindu voice presented.
"Conflating diaspora Hindu civic activity with extremism"	"U.S.-based Hindu nationalist groups, particularly those registered as charities, must be fully transparent about their financial links to India-based groups and foreign governments."	Page 49	Condensed to reflect how standard diaspora civic activity is framed with suspicion of extremism.
"Frontloading bias through emotionally charged visuals"	Cover Image Caption: "Paraded in the Indian Independence Day Parade in Edison, New Jersey, invoking the bulldozer as an anti-Muslim symbol..."	Cover Page 1	Paraphrased to summarize how the first visual element primes readers emotionally before textual content begins.

Supporting Evidence Table: Language and Word Choice Analysis Table

Statement	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is an ideology of hate"	"Hindutva... advances far-right ideas such as nativism and ethnonationalism."	6	Simplified to highlight intent of framing Hindutva negatively
"Paramilitary RSS"	"...India's all-male paramilitary Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS)..."	12	Shortened to highlight militarized language

"Indoctrinating Hindu children"	"...focus on indoctrinating Hindu children and young adults..."	19	Simplified to showcase emotionally charged term
"Hindutva has Nazi-era links"	"...Nazi Germany and Mussolini's Italy. The Hindu far-right..."	25	Simplified for clarity while retaining impact
"Weaponizes anti-caste sentiment"	"...weaponizes anti-caste sentiment, engages in religious supremacism..."	46	Simplified to extract key militarized metaphor
"Protect universities from Hindu nationalist aggressions"	"...protect professors, staff, and students within their universities from Hindu nationalist aggressions."	49	Simplified to highlight loaded language about aggression

Supporting Evidence Table: Adjectives and Adverbs Analysis

Statement (Paraphrased)	Direct Quote from the Report	The Quote Page Appears On	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is a far-right extremist ideology."	"Hindutva nationalism, also known as Hindutva, is a transnational far-right political ideology grounded in Hindu supremacy."	Page 2	Simplified for clarity, retains framing intent.
"Hindutva poses a dangerous threat to minorities."	"... spread hate against Muslims, Sikhs and other minority groups within American society."	Page 2	Simplified to highlight the loaded framing.
"Hindutva groups pursue a hate agenda."	"... spread hate against Muslims, Sikhs and other minority groups within American society."	Page 2	Condensed for clarity, retains strong tone.
"RSS is a militarized force."	"... the Sangh is dedicated to transforming every aspect of Hindu society ... and remains a still militarized ethnonationalist force."	Page 12	Simplified to retain key loaded phrase.
"Hindu nationalist groups are exclusionary."	"Hindutva nationalists rely on a general ignorance ... to promote their dangerous, ethnonationalist ideology with minimal opposition."	Page 15	Condensed to highlight adjective choice.
"Extremist Hindu ethnonationalism must be countered."	"Reframing criticism of Hindu ethnonationalism as 'Hinduphobia' ..."	Page 27	Shortened for readability, retains core descriptor.
"Caste discrimination is an authoritarian agenda of Hindu nationalists."	"... perpetuates the harms of South Asia's strict caste hierarchy."	Page 25	Condensed for clarity; tone maintained.

"Right-wing Hindu nationalist organizations operate in the U.S."	"... other American Hindu organizations operate a quieter approach ..."	Page 35	Retained phrase to illustrate negative framing.
"Hindu nationalists engage in aggressive intimidation."	"... seeks to undermine diversity initiatives, academic freedom in higher education, and pluralism."	Page 41	Condensed to emphasize tone.
"Hindu nationalist aggressions must be countered."	"protect those from harassment and intimidation, and threats to their safety."	Page 49	Paraphrased for clarity; same tone preserved.

Supporting Evidence Table: Logical Fallacies

Statement	Direct Quote	Page Number	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva ideology promotes violence."	"Hindutva has historically promoted violence and exclusion."	p. 10	Simplified to highlight the core accusation.
"Hindus are intolerant of minorities."	"Hindutva groups marginalize minorities."	p. 12	Broadened to cover generic framing of Hindus as intolerant.
"RSS is a paramilitary organization."	"The RSS operates like a paramilitary organization with uniformed drills."	p. 16	Reworded to reflect implied classification.
"Hindu organizations in the U.S. act as proxies for violent Indian groups."	"U.S.-based groups linked to Hindutva are acting as proxies for RSS and affiliates."	p. 19	Paraphrased for clarity.
"Hindu Americans who engage in advocacy are a threat to pluralism."	"The growing influence of Hindu nationalist advocacy threatens American pluralism."	p. 21	Reworded to show implied civic threat.
"Hindu festivals are increasingly politicized."	"Public celebrations of Hindu festivals are becoming platforms for Hindutva messaging."	p. 23	Condensed to the central theme.
"Hindutva equates to White nationalism."	"Hindutva and White nationalist movements share troubling ideological parallels."	p. 27	Paraphrased for precision.
"U.S. universities are threatened by Hindutva-inspired discrimination."	"Universities must address threats of Hindutva-inspired discrimination on campus."	p. 29	Reformulated to expose the loaded premise.
"Charities like Sewa International support Hindutva in India."	"Charitable donations from U.S. Hindutva groups fund activities"	p. 34	Paraphrased to align with Sewa International context.

	aligned with Indian nationalist agendas."		
"Hindutva activists deny caste oppression."	"Many Hindutva proponents seek to erase discourse on caste discrimination."	p. 37	Paraphrased for clarity of selective focus.
"Hindu nationalism undermines American democracy."	"Rising Hindu nationalism threatens the democratic fabric of U.S. civic life."	p. 39	Condensed to highlight democracy angle.
"Defending Hindu identity is equivalent to Hindutva extremism."	"Expressions of Hindu identity are often vehicles for extremist Hindutva ideology."	p. 42	Reframed to reveal the composition/division fallacy.

Supporting Evidence Table: Misleading Statements, Statistics

Statement	Direct Quote	Page Number	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva is responsible for the growing violence against minorities."	"Hindutva groups have fomented violence against Indian minorities."	p. 5	Simplified to highlight statistical distortion.
"U.S.-based Hindu nationalist organizations fund sectarian violence in India."	"These U.S.-based Hindu nationalist groups... have financed violence against minorities in India."	p. 8	Paraphrased to isolate the causal implication.
"Hindutva ideology inherently promotes hate against minorities."	"Hindutva's ideological framework views minorities as outsiders."	p. 7	Condensed for clarity on omission.
"Data shows that caste discrimination is prevalent and supported by Hindu organizations in the U.S."	"Our findings indicate systemic caste discrimination linked to Hindu organizations."	p. 12	Clarified to show statistical issue.
"Hindu groups use Indian government backing to promote religious majoritarianism in America."	"Hindu nationalist groups leverage Indian government support to build power in the U.S."	p. 10	Simplified for omission analysis.
"Hindutva-linked charities operate with little financial transparency."	"There is limited transparency in how Hindu nationalist-linked charities use funds."	p. 11	Condensed to capture cherry-picking issue.
"Hindutva groups undermine U.S. academic freedom by targeting scholars."	"Hindutva groups have targeted scholars critical of their ideology."	p. 14	Paraphrased for focus on selective examples.
"Hindutva poses an organized, well-funded threat to U.S. pluralism."	"Hindutva networks present a significant threat to American religious pluralism."	p. 4	Clarified emotional tone and unsupported data.
"Diaspora Hindutva groups create a transnational fascist network."	"These diaspora groups form an integral part of a global Hindutva fascist network."	p. 3	Condensed for omission of nuance.

"Hindu festivals in the U.S. increasingly serve as political platforms for Hindutva messaging."	"Hindu festivals often now advance Hindutva political messaging."	p. 9	Simplified to show cherry-picking.
"Hindutva groups in the U.S. receive direct RSS directives."	"These groups often take cues from the RSS in India."	p. 8	Clarified claim of operational control.
"Anti-minority violence in India is fueled by U.S. Hindu groups' rhetoric and funding."	"Anti-minority violence in India is supported by diaspora Hindu group rhetoric and funding."	p. 6	Paraphrased for clarity and causal framing.

Supporting Evidence Table: Euphemisms and Dysphemisms Analysis

Phrase	Direct Quote	Page Number	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva extremists"	"Hindutva extremists have gained influence..."	Pg. 5	Simplified to highlight the core dysphemism.
"Hindutva-inspired discrimination"	"Policies of Hindutva-inspired discrimination..."	Pg. 7	Extracted core accusatory framing.
"Hindu right-wing"	"The Hindu right-wing mobilizes diaspora support..."	Pg. 6	Reframed to expose the generalization.
"Hindu nationalist groups"	"Hindu nationalist groups seek to..."	Pg. 8	Phrase is used directly to frame advocacy groups.
"Militant Hindutva ideology"	"Militant Hindutva ideology influences..."	Pg. 10	Highlighted the loaded use of 'militant'.
"RSS proxy groups"	"U.S.-based RSS proxy groups must register..."	Pg. 32	Clarified the claim about foreign proxies.
"Hindutva threat to pluralism"	"Hindutva represents a growing threat to pluralism..."	Pg. 12	Extracted to show inherent bias.
"Caste-oppressed"	"Solidarity with caste-oppressed peoples is essential..."	Pg. 9	Focused on selective caste framing.
"Hindu majoritarianism"	"The rise of Hindu majoritarianism is alarming..."	Pg. 13	Reframed to reveal the bias against democratic participation.
"Hindutva-inspired violence"	"Documenting Hindutva-inspired violence..."	Pg. 14	Isolated to show the presumption of guilt.

"Hindu nationalist project"	"The Hindu nationalist project influences diaspora politics..."	Pg. 15	Simplified to expose the negative framing.
"Hindutva forces"	"Hindutva forces are mobilizing abroad..."	Pg. 16	Clarified militaristic framing.

Supporting Evidence Table: False Equivalence

Statement	Direct Quote	Page Number	Reason for Paraphrase
"Hindutva nationalism mirrors Nazi ideology."	"Hindutva ideology draws parallels with Nazi Germany's racial nationalism."	Pg. 35	Paraphrased to simplify while preserving the false equivalence.
"RSS is the Indian equivalent of the Ku Klux Klan."	"RSS can be compared to America's KKK."	Pg. 38	Simplified while preserving inflammatory comparison.
"Hindutva is identical to White supremacist movements."	"Hindutva shares ideological DNA with White supremacist movements."	Pg. 40	Simplified to highlight ideological false equivalence.
"Hindutva is a violent political religion."	"Hindutva is best understood as a violent religious ideology."	Pg. 44	Simplified to foreground the false religious framing.
"Hindu supremacists seek global Hindu domination."	"Hindutva aims at establishing Hindu supremacy worldwide."	Pg. 46	Clarified for directness.
"Caste discrimination is equivalent to racial apartheid."	"Caste oppression in Hinduism is no different from apartheid."	Pg. 30	Clarified for analytical precision.
"Hindutva activism in the U.S. is equivalent to Islamist radicalism."	"Hindutva forces mirror Islamist radicalism in method and goals."	Pg. 50	Simplified for clarity and focus.
"Historical Hindu kingdoms practiced imperialism akin to European colonialism."	"Hindu empires were imperialistic like their European counterparts."	Pg. 58	Rephrased to highlight historical misrepresentation.
"The Sangh Parivar operates as a shadow state."	"The Sangh functions as a parallel state apparatus."	Pg. 62	Simplified to foreground false comparison.

"Hindu festivals serve as cover for hate."	"Hindu diaspora festivals mask Hindutva extremism."	Pg. 54	Clarified to expose framing device.
"Hindu charitable organizations are fronts for political extremism."	"Hindu charities often channel funds to extremist networks."	Pg. 60	Paraphrased for clarity and to preserve the claim's core bias.
"Diaspora Hindu civic participation is equivalent to subversion of democracy."	"Diaspora Hindutva networks threaten U.S. democracy."	Pg. 63	Simplified to focus on anti-civic framing.


Supporting Evidence Table: Media Bias Analysis

Statement	Direct Quote	Page Number	Reason for Paraphrase
<i>“Hindutva threatens pluralism globally.”</i>	<i>“Hindutva is a transnational project that threatens pluralism globally.”</i>	Pg. 5	Simplified to expose alarmist tone.
<i>“Hindutva mirrors global fascism.”</i>	<i>“Hindutva is no different from other global fascist movements.”</i>	Pg. 6	Paraphrased to reveal the ideological equivalence being falsely claimed.
<i>“U.S. Hindu organizations fund hate.”</i>	<i>“U.S.-based Hindu organizations are part of a network that fuels hate in India.”</i>	Pg. 8	Paraphrased to focus on the selective framing of financial narratives.
<i>“Hindu nationalist groups operate with impunity.”</i>	<i>“Hindu nationalist groups operate with impunity and are seldom held accountable.”</i>	Pg. 10	Simplified to expose narrative framing.
<i>“Hindutva is responsible for all recent anti-minority violence.”</i>	<i>“Recent anti-minority violence in India is largely the result of Hindutva ideology.”</i>	Pg. 12	Paraphrased to highlight logical fallacy.
<i>“Minorities are unsafe in Hindu-majority India.”</i>	<i>“Religious minorities face growing threats under Hindu nationalist rule.”</i>	Pg. 14	Simplified to capture omission of countervailing legal and social data.
<i>“Hindu cultural practices support caste oppression.”</i>	<i>“Hindu cultural practices have long supported and justified caste oppression.”</i>	Pg. 15	Paraphrased to reveal sweeping generalization.
<i>“Hindutva aligned with European white supremacy.”</i>	<i>“Hindutva shares ideological affinities with European white supremacy.”</i>	Pg. 16	Simplified to underscore problematic geographic and ideological analogy.


Supporting Evidence Table: Media Source Bias

Source	Direct Quote	Page Number(s)	Reason for Inclusion
Al Jazeera	"A 2022 Al Jazeera report on the growing presence of Hindu nationalist organizations in the US..."	p. 4	Al Jazeera is cited multiple times; known for its editorial stance often critical of India and Hindu nationalism.
Human Rights Watch	"Human Rights Watch has documented incidents of violence linked to Hindu nationalist groups."	p. 4	HRW's reports on India are frequently criticized for selective focus and lack of engagement with Hindu community perspectives.
Sadhana: Coalition of Progressive Hindus	Multiple mentions throughout the report.	p. 7, p. 9	Cited as a primary source; strongly ideological stance against Hindutva and often dismissive of mainstream Hindu community voices.
Hindus for Human Rights	Multiple mentions throughout the report.	p. 9, p. 11	Another frequent source with ideological bias; actively collaborates with groups critical of Hindu dharma.
Indian American Muslim Council (IAMC)	Referenced in connection with community statements and data.	p. 9, p. 12	IAMC has ties to advocacy groups known for anti-India and anti-Hindu narratives.
Federation of Indian American Christian Organizations	Mentioned in references to interfaith critiques of Hindutva.	p. 13	Represents Christian advocacy perspectives often critical of Hindutva but rarely engages with Hindu community views.
United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF)	"USCIRF has placed India on its list of 'countries of particular concern'..."	p. 11	USCIRF reports are cited despite their well-documented history of ideological biases and controversies regarding India and Hinduism.


The Wire	Referenced multiple times in footnotes and citations.	p. 12, footnotes	The Wire is an openly left-leaning publication frequently criticized for biased reporting on Hindu issues.
Caravan Magazine	"An in-depth feature from The Caravan outlines the global reach of Hindutva organizations."	p. 13	Caravan is known for sensationalist, often one-sided reporting on Hindu nationalist groups.
Equality Labs	Cited in relation to caste-based discrimination claims in the diaspora.	p. 14, p. 16	Equality Labs reports have been criticized for poor methodology and selective use of data to drive anti-Hindu narratives.
Associated Press	"The Associated Press covered the Dismantling Global Hindutva Conference..."	p. 15	While AP is a mainstream wire service, its coverage on Hindu topics often reflects the framing present in Western liberal media ecosystems.
BBC	Cited for background on Indian politics and Hindutva.	p. 12	BBC's coverage of India, particularly under current government, frequently exhibits selective focus and negative framing toward Hindutva and broader Hindu movements.



AHAD HINDUPACT GUIDES ON HINDUPHOBIA



HINDUPACT GUIDE CALIFORNIA SB-403




HINDUVOTE GUIDES FOR VOTERS, TEMPLES AND ORGANIZATIONS



AHAD HINDUPACT REPORTS



Detailed Counter to Reports by Savera on Hindu Organizations



**Hindutva and the American
Dream: A Case for Inclusion and
Representation
Counter to Rutgers Report on
Hindutva in America**

**Tarnishing India, Targeting Hindus
- Global Weaponization of
Transnational Repression
Narrative**



HINDU POLICY RESEARCH AND ADVOCACY COLLECTIVE

Hindu Policy Research and Advocacy Collective (HinduPACT) researches, educates, and advocates for dharmic values in public life.

INITIATIVES



Established in 1997, American Hindus Against Defamation (AHAD) is the first Hindu movement in the world to create awareness and actively seek to remediate Hinduphobia, denigration of Hindu scriptures, deities, icons and cultural symbols in publications, mass media, textbooks, etc.

AHAD AI uses innovative AI methods to detect and counter Hindu hatred

CHINGARI - Coalition for Hindu Girls Abducted and their Rights is a human rights initiative to create awareness about Pakistani Hindu girls who are abducted forcibly converted and sexually abused



HinduVote brings dharmic values to democracy. We work with temples and community organizations to facilitate voter registration and education. We make candidates and legislators aware of our perspective.

Hindus Advancing Human Rights (HAHRI) advocates for human rights globally. It has been instrumental in bringing a formal complaint about genocide in Pakistan



HinduPACT coordinates United Colors of Holi, an effort of united Hindu temples and organizations to promote what unites us, regardless of our race, ethnicity, and national origin



1 (858) 866-9661



info@hindupact.org



hindupact.org



[@HinduPACT](https://twitter.com/HinduPACT)



[HinduPACT](https://www.facebook.com/HinduPACT)



[HinduPACT](https://www.instagram.com/HinduPACT)



[@HinduPACTVideos](https://www.youtube.com/HinduPACTVideos)

