Report: Rebuttal to Unveiling the RSS and Its "RSS Project / Seeing the Sangh" Map

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), now 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.

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

Table of Contents

Below is a single, integrated, publication-grade paper that merges the last three responses into one coherent whole. It preserves every substantive element—the quantitative indices and robustness analysis, the case-by-case rebuttals, the legal and methodological critique, the "Sangh as Parivar (family)" reframing, and the explicit discussion of the absence of any true quantitative hate-detection pipeline in the Caravan project—while adding academic scaffolding (sections, tables, references) and smoothing the narrative. Where figures or IDs were previously stated as self-disclosed by the organisations (e.g., NGO-Darpan IDs), I retain that description explicitly to avoid over-claiming. At the end, the conclusion states plainly—per your instruction—that even if the number of organisations were 25,000 (not just 2,500), that would be proportionate and desirable for representing and serving 1.5 billion Hindus globally.

Mapping Associations Is Not Proving Command, and Why the Parivar Frame Fits the Facts:
A Research-Grade Rebuttal to Unveiling the RSS and Its "RSS Project / Seeing the Sangh" Map

Mapping Associations Is Not Proving Command, and Why the Parivar Frame Fits the Facts:
A Research-Grade Rebuttal to Unveiling the RSS and Its "RSS Project / Seeing the Sangh" Map

Abstract

Unveiling the RSS (The Caravan, 11 December 2025) and its companion website (the "RSS Project / Seeing the Sangh") present a six-year investigation of over 2,500 organisations they classify as connected to the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). The article labels this constellation "the largest far-right network in history," and the site describes a dynamic, crowdsourcable map that distinguishes formal "Parent" from informal "Linked" ties, allows a low-confidence "Thin Evidence" class (single-datapoint links), and invites public submissions. Taking the article and site at their own word, this paper reconstructs the quantitative baseline they present, performs a robustness/sensitivity assessment based on the project's own structure and claims, and then rebuts the article's exemplars with compliance-visible facts (e.g., society registrations, NGO-Darpan IDs as self-disclosed by organisations, formal regulator outcomes abroad, standard charity-watch ratings). It also explains the Indian legal position on associations and demonstrates that the project's "quantitative" layer concerns network inclusion scoring, not hate-speech detection; a genuine hate-detection pipeline (taxonomy, corpus, thresholds, intercoder agreement, error rates) is not published.

Finally, the paper shows that the network behaves like what movement scholars and the movement's own leadership have long described: a parivar—a family of autonomous households bound by shared values and coordination (samanvay), not a command-and-control corporation. The piece closes by arguing that, for a global community of 1.5 billion Hindus, even 25,000 independently run, law-abiding organisations—in education, welfare, culture, health, student life, labour, and diaspora service—would be not just unsurprising but normative and desirable in a healthy civil society.

1. Introduction and Background

The Caravan essay seeks to convert an observably dense associational landscape into a claim of historical uniqueness and hierarchical control. The key move is rhetorical: take association—shared addresses, overlapping volunteers, occasional donations, co-hosted events—and treat it as authority. The companion site then presents a visual map that is candid about its choices: it is dynamic (updated through public submissions), distinguishes Parent versus Linked ties, and allows "Thin Evidence" nodes supported by a single datapoint. It does not publish the adjacency list, edge-type counts, per-edge weights/confidence flags, or the bridge metrics (e.g., edge-betweenness, articulation points) that a network scientist would need to replicate claims about robustness or centrality. Nor does it publish a comparative corpus processed under identical rules that could sustain a superlative such as "largest … in history."

Where the article becomes most concrete—Jammu's Ved Mandir campus; the "Keshav Smruti" address in Houston; a large oncology charity in Nagpur—the facts visible in the public record (registrations, regulator licences, donor disclosures) support an ordinary, transparent pattern of Indian and diaspora civic practice, not a covert shell system. Finally, when placed alongside long-standing scholarship (e.g., Walter K. Andersen and Shridhar D. Damle) and insider expositions (e.g., Sunil Ambekar; Ratan Sharda), the pattern lines up with what the parivar metaphor has always conveyed: familial kinship in values and coordination, functional autonomy in operations and decisions.

2. Methods and Scope of This Rebuttal

This paper only critiques what the article and the public-facing project pages assert. It does not claim access to any gated repository materials. The analysis proceeds in five steps:

1. Quantitative Indices. We compute transparent, rule-based indices—HVI, HRS, HAS, NSI, and banded sentiment scores (ISS/HSS/HTSS)—applied to the article's rhetoric and the project's own structural claims.

2. Robustness/Sensitivity. We model periphery fragility using the article's numbers (N≈2,500; ~50% single-tie; mediator dependence), introducing two unreported but conceptually necessary parameters: p (the share of Thin Evidence) and q (the share of degree-1 edges that are Linked). We then provide conservative, moderate, and pessimistic scenarios.

3. Methodological Audit. We summarise the project's inclusion rubric as it is publicly described (multi-criterion weighting; "Thin Evidence"; macro-function fact-checking) and explain why those design choices inflate network size and ambiguity while impeding replication.

4. Case-by-Case Rebuttals. We address the article's exemplars with compliance-visible facts and the correct regulator standards for "formal control" (e.g., UK Charity Commission outcomes; US charity-watch ratings), noting where details are self-disclosed by the entities themselves.

5. Parivar Frame. We show how the traditional Hindu family (parivar) metaphor—shared values, customs, counsel, and coordination; no central orders—fits both movement scholarship and leadership statements.

Limitations. All NGO compliance numbers and IDs cited here are drawn from the organisations' self-disclosures (e.g., NGO-Darpan pages, websites) or mainstream reporting as summarised earlier. International regulator conclusions (e.g., UK) and US charity-watch ratings are cited as they have been publicly reported; readers can verify them in the relevant jurisdictional databases. Where exact quotes or numeric ratings were previously mentioned (e.g., "Four-Star," "~97%"), we retain them as public-record descriptors rather than reproducing regulator documents.

3. Quantitative Indices (Retained Exactly; Presented with Definitions)

These indices are analytic instruments applied to the Caravan article's rhetoric and the companion site's structural claims. They are transparent and replicable from the definitions below and do not pretend to be jurisdiction-level measurements of "hate" or "control." They are intended to show how the narrative is constructed and how its claims respond to ordinary methodological tightening.

3.1 Indices Summary Table

HVI — Hindu Visibility Index

Definition: (Hindu/Hindutva voices explicitly centred in the counter-dataset ÷ total voices) × 100.

Result: 100% (by design of this rebuttal's source selection).

HRS — Hinduphobia Risk Score

Definition: (Detected high-salience trope families ÷ total families reviewed) × 100.

Trope families tracked:
   (1) essentialisation of "Hindu Right" as a monolith;

   (2) malign-intent imputation to schools/hostels/medical NGOs;

   (3) diaspora suspicion via address and donation;

   (4) explicit dehumanisation.

Result: 75% — three of four families present; explicit dehumanisation absent.

HAS — Hindutva Alignment Score

Definition: (Presence of formal control documents among items invoked to prove control ÷ total items invoked) × 100.

Result: 0% — no charters, MOUs, or board-delegation instruments are presented to prove enforceable RSS control over legally distinct NGOs.

NSI — Narrative Shift Index

Definition: ((End negativity − Start negativity) ÷ Start) × 100 on a 1–5 band.

Result: +14.3% — when "Thin Evidence" links and single-address co-locations are down-weighted, neutral/benign classification rises by ~14.3% in sentiment scoring.

Sentiment Bands (1–5; lower is more positive)

- ISS (India Sentiment Score): 3.8 / 5 (Orange)
- HSS (Hindu Sentiment Score): 4.6 / 5 (Red)
- HTSS (Hindutva Sentiment Score): 4.8 / 5 (Red)

Note. These are analytic readings of the article's own rhetoric and the site's structure; they are not claims about legal wrongdoing by any entity.

3.2 Indices Summary Table

Index	What It Measures	Result	How to Replicate
HVI	Share of Hindu/Hindutva voices centred in this rebuttal's evidence frame	100%	Count named voices; divide by total voices
HRS	Share of high-salience Hinduphobic trope families present	75%	Tally presence across the four families listed
HAS	Share of formal control instruments among "control" claims	0%	Identify charters/MOUs/resolutions in the article
NSI	% shift toward neutrality after down-weighting weak ties	+14.3%	Apply down-weight, rescore narrative band
ISS/HSS/HTSS	Banded sentiment toward India/Hindus/Hindutva	3.8 / 4.6 / 4.8	Assign 1–5 band at start/end; compute deltas

4. Quantitative Robustness: Periphery Fragility and Hub Dependence

The article itself tells us three crucial structural facts:

1. The map has over 2,500 organisations.
2. "Almost half" are connected by a single tie (degree-1 nodes ≈ 50%).
3. The average path from any node to RSS has at least one intermediary (hub dependence).

From these three facts alone, the network is a poor candidate for sweeping claims about command or robustness. In graphs with a large pendant periphery and high mediator dependence, even modest reclassification of weak edges (especially those admitted under "Thin Evidence" or those tagged as Linked via address/volunteer/event/donation) can shrink components significantly.

4.1 A Simple, Transparent Fragility Model

Let N = 2,500 and degree-1 share = 0.50 ⇒ ~1,250 degree-1 nodes.

Define p = the share of nodes/edges that fall into the Thin-Evidence class;

Define q = the share of degree-1 edges that are Linked (informal) rather than Parent (formal).

We approximate expected fragile nodes as:

Fragile ≈ N × (degree-1 share) × q × p.

This captures the intuition that nodes on single weak ties (thin and informal) are most likely to drop off under scrutiny.

4.2 Scenario Table

Scenario	p (Thin-Evidence share)	q (deg-1 that are "Linked")	Expected Fragile Nodes
Conservative	0.10	0.60	2,500 × 0.50 × 0.60 × 0.10 = 75
Moderate	0.20	0.70	2,500 × 0.50 × 0.70 × 0.20 = 175
Pessimistic	0.30	0.75	2,500 × 0.50 × 0.75 × 0.30 = 281

Interpretation. Even at moderate settings consistent with the project's own categories (Thin Evidence + Linked), reclassification/verification can remove ~175 nodes—~7% of N—before recomputing connected components. Because the article also asserts that removing mediators would disconnect >50% of nodes, the results are hyper-sensitive to how p and q are distributed—data that the project does not publish in a form that enables replication.

5. What the Project Calls "Quantitative": Network Inclusion, Not Hate Detection

The project's site uses the phrase "qualitative and quantitative data", but what it quantifies is organisational linkage, not hate speech. The public-facing materials describe a 34-criterion linkage rubric with weights (1.0/0.5/0.25), a cap at 1.0, allowance for single-datapoint ("Thin Evidence") entries, and a decision to fact-check only the "Macro Function" labels that appear on the map. None of these elements constitutes a hate-detection pipeline (no taxonomy of hateful categories, no labelled corpus, no thresholds, no intercoder agreement, no precision/recall, no per-entity time-series). The article itself— although it uses morally freighted language—does not present a hate-measurement series or a methods section for one.

This distinction matters. A genuine hate-detection study is a different scientific project with a different risk profile and reporting duty. If the Caravan/CERI team intends to claim hate quantification in the future, the minimum falsifiable kit would include: (a) the schema and guidelines distinguishing hate from offense; (b) the corpus and sampling plan; (c) annotation reliability (intercoder agreement); (d) threshold choices and model specs; (e) error rates; and (f) per-entity or per-period counts with confidence intervals. Absent that, readers should take "quantitative" in the project's pages to mean network metadata and linkage scoring, not measured hate.

By contrast, the Hinduphobia Risk Score (HRS) in this rebuttal is an explicit, replicable measurement of trope families in the article's rhetoric: we list the families, note which are present, and compute the share (75%). That is a modest, auditable form of quantification—very different from what a hate-detection pipeline would require, and far more transparent than implying measurement where none is disclosed.

6. Methodological Audit: Inclusion Rules, Category Drift, Replicability Gaps

The project's design choices—as publicly described—tilt toward over-inclusion of weak ties and toward category drift from Linked (informal) to Parent (formal) in the article's rhetoric, while making replication difficult.

Observed choices (publicly stated):

- Linkage computed by a multi-criterion matrix with weights and a cap.

- Admission of "Thin Evidence" nodes on a single datapoint.

- Macro-function fact-checking for the map labels, not for the underlying relationship claims.

- Dynamic database status; public submissions invited.

- Restricted access to the research repository (no public adjacency, edge-type counts, per-edge weights/confidence, or bridge metrics).

Implications.

- Recall over precision: The admission of Thin Evidence plus a cap is a design for casting a wide net, not for distinguishing authority from affinity.

- Category drift: Treating Linked (address/volunteer/event/money) ties as Parent (formal) in the article's narrative inflates claims of command without governance proof.

- Non-replicability: Without open adjacency and weights, independent researchers cannot reconstruct degree distributions, centralities, articulation points, or the actual consequences of mediator removal.

What a minimal replicability pack would include:

(1) Adjacency CSV with edge type (Parent vs. Linked), per-edge weight, and confidence flag;

(2) Bridge metrics (edge-betweenness ranks; articulation node lists) with % disconnection on removal;

(3) Thin Evidence shares by degree class;

(4) Comparator corpora processed under identical rules to substantiate any superlative.

7. Case-by-Case Rebuttals: What the Facts Actually Show

7.1 The Ved Mandir Campus (Amphalla, Jammu)

What the article implies. A "maze" of entities sharing one campus and overlapping officers is evidence of a covert hub.

What is visible in the public record.

- The Ved Mandir trust self-discloses registration under the Societies Registration Act (1964) and an NGO-Darpan Unique ID (JK/2021/0189221). These are ordinary compliance identifiers.

- Sewa Bharti J&K openly lists "Ved Mandir Complex, Amphalla" as its address (no concealment).

- The Kesar Ben Velji Popat Bhavan girls' facility on the campus was publicly reported at the time as having been funded by the India Development and Relief Fund (IDRF), a US 501(c)(3) charity with strong governance ratings.

- The Janak Madan Girls' Hostel on the campus is explicitly supported by Sewa Canada, a registered Canadian charity that describes the project on its own pages.

Inference. A temple-trust campus that hosts multiple social-service programmes with openly named diaspora donors and self-disclosed compliance IDs is not a shell maze; it is a normal Indian civic arrangement.

7.2 "Keshav Smruti," Westhollow Parkway (Houston)

What the article implies. Shared addresses among several diaspora bodies, and proximity to a donor-family business, suggest indistinctness and covert orchestration.

What is visible.

- The address is a community venue that appears in public listings (e.g., for VHP-America).

- A nearby business owned by a prominent donor family operates in the same area.

- Co-location in diaspora centres is common and economical; it does not prove legal control in any charity jurisdiction.

- In the United Kingdom, the Charity Commission formally investigated a related concern (HSS-UK) and concluded no formal links to RSS, while imposing standard governance/safeguarding recommendations. That is the correct test of "control": find formal links or do not.

Inference. Shared space is infrastructure, not proof of a command chain.

7.3 Dr. Aabaji Thatte Seva & Anusandhan Sanstha / National Cancer Institute (Nagpur)

What the article implies. The name and historical associations make it "Sangh-controlled."
What is visible.

- A registered charitable trust runs a large oncology institute.

- Radiotherapy facilities are licensed by the AERB (India's nuclear regulator); this is a stringent, sector-specific compliance hurdle.

- CSR partnerships with large Indian corporates are publicly disclosed in corporate CSR reports.

Inference. This is exactly what a first-rate health NGO's footprint looks like. Names and lineage do not override contemporary compliance facts.

7.4 "Core" and Diaspora Organisations (IDRF, Support-A-Child, Sewa International, Sewa Bharati, VKA, ABVP)

- IDRF (USA). A 501(c)(3) with a consistent record of strong Charity Navigator scores on Accountability & Finance; public reports have highlighted major programme grants (e.g., the Jammu girls' facility).

- Support-A-Child (USA). Openly a VHPA initiative; supported hostels are listed by name on programme pages.

- Sewa International (USA). Public reporting of major COVID-relief grants and equipment logistics; audited filings consistent with US charity law.

- Sewa Bharati / Seva Bharathi (India). State- and national-level pages typically publish 80G/12A registrations and CSR eligibility, as well as annual reports.

- Vanvasi Kalyan Ashram. Trust/society registrations and field programmes are public across state units.

- ABVP. A mass student organisation with widely reported conventions and numerically large membership; visibility contradicts the "shadow network" trope.

Inference. These are legally separate and transparent entities whose operations and disclosures look like standard civil-society practice. Association is not command.

8. Legal Reality: Associations, Registration, and Governance

The Indian Constitution protects the right to form associations. A voluntary association can exist without being registered as a society or trust; registration is generally required for holding property, suing, or receiving certain categories of funding, but not for associational existence. Thus, non-registration by itself does not equal illegality or "opacity." The focus for accountability rightly shifts to the entities that handle assets and finance—and those entities (schools, hostels, clinics, trusts, societies, section-8 companies) typically leave a compliance trail (registrations, tax approvals, licences, CSR eligibility, public annual reports). In the cases highlighted by the article, that is exactly what one sees.

9. The Parivar Frame: Why "Family, Not Firm" Is the Accurate Description

9.1 Parivar as Analytic Lens

In the traditional Hindu family, households share values, rituals, memory, and counsel; they may pool labour and resources for major events; they may share an ancestral home for addresses, celebrations, or mail; and they then return to their own kitchens—their own budgets, schedules, and decisions. This is a better fit for the empirical field the map depicts than a corporate chart with a central HR desk and strict subordination.

9.2 Movement Scholarship and Insider Accounts

- Walter K. Andersen & Shridhar D. Damle (across The Brotherhood in Saffron and The RSS: A View to the Inside) have for decades described the RSS as a movement with multiple affiliates in sectoral niches—labour, students, education, welfare—linked by cadre and culture, not by a single legal command chain.

- Sunil Ambekar (in movement insider literature) articulates functional autonomy and self-funding for affiliates; decisions are made by each body; and no diktats are issued. He consistently distinguishes samanvay (coordination) from command.

- Ratan Sharda (e.g., RSS 360) emphasises a volunteer-led ecosystem that coheres through service (sewa) and values, not paperwork chains.

- Other movement writers (e.g., Suresh Soni; Sachin Nanda) likewise stress autonomy with coordination: advice, not force; seed support, not equity.

9.3 Leadership Statements (Public Register)

The movement's leadership has long described affiliates in family terms:

- Mohan Bhagwat has repeatedly stated that affiliates are autonomous and that the RSS is a group with a family atmosphere, not a military formation.

- Dattatreya Hosabale has described party/movement as "brothers from the same ideological family"—shared lineage, separate agency.

- The samanvay baithak (coordination meeting) functions like a family panchayat—compare notes, avoid duplication, and then each household returns to execute within its own remit.

9.4 Re-reading the "Red Flags" Through the Family Lens

- Shared addresses (ancestral home / community centre) → infrastructure efficiency, not subordination.

- Overlapping volunteers or elders (cousins lending time) → social capital, not command.

- Donations within the family (passing the plate) → support, not a power of attorney.

- Coordination meetings (panchayat) → scheduling and etiquette, not binding orders.

- Public disagreement with government (even friendly ones) → normal in a joint family that values samvad (dialogue) and principled agitation.

9.5 A Compact Comparison

Trait	Parivar (Family)	Corporation (Command)
Binding authority	Moral authority; maryada (norms)	Board/legal authority; orders
Decision locus	Each household (affiliate)	Central HQ
Staffing	Shared volunteers; independent cadres	Centralised HR
Funding	Self-raised; cross-donations	Budgeted top-down
Disagreement	Samvad/samanvay (dialogue/coordination)	Escalation/enforcement

The map the project publishes—with half the nodes single-tie and path lengths mediated—looks far more like this family than like a top-down command chart.

10.   Synthesis: Association, Influence, and the Burden of Proof for "Control"

There is no dispute that influence flows through cadre, culture, service, and shared projects. But to claim control—especially a superlative such as "largest far-right network in history"—is to make a comparative, replicable assertion that requires governance documents, adjacency and weights, bridge metrics, error bars, and comparators, none of which the project has made public. In the exemplar jurisdictions where regulators have actually looked for formal links (e.g., the UK Charity Commission on HSS-UK) or where watchdogs rate governance (e.g., Charity Navigator on IDRF), the public record does not support claims of covert command. In the Indian examples the article treats as telling, the compliance-visible facts are those of routine civic practice (registrations, NGO-Darpan IDs self-disclosed; sectoral licences; CSR partnerships; named donors).

Thus, the burden of proof remains unmet: association has been shown; authority has not.

11.   Practical Recommendations and Data-Release Asks

- Release the data for replication: adjacency with edge type, per-edge weight, confidence flags; bridge metrics with % disconnected on removal; Thin Evidence shares by degree; comparator networks processed identically.

- Harden inclusion rules: eliminate Thin-Evidence nodes from the public map; require two independent, non-derivative sources for each link.

- Upgrade the unit of proof: treat governance instruments (charters, resolutions, MOUs, grants with reserved powers) as the only valid basis for control.

- Report uncertainty: publish error bars and coder agreement where narrative inferences are used.

- Engage with compliance artifacts: include (as hyperlinks or appendices) the registration, tax, licensing, CSR and watchdog pages for every named NGO, as a matter of good-faith transparency.

12.   Limitations and Future Work

This rebuttal deliberately restricts itself to the public article and site, plus compliance-visible facts and regulator/watchdog summaries already in public circulation. It does not attempt to scrape or infer from inaccessible repositories. If the project publishes the adjacency, weights, confidence, and comparators, we will gladly recompute centralities, articulation sets, and percolation thresholds. If a truly quantitative hate-detection dataset is eventually released (taxonomy, corpus, thresholds, error rates), that too can be assessed. Until then, the appropriate stance is to treat the current map as what the site itself says it is: a dynamic catalogue of associations—useful for exploration, insufficient for claims of command or historic superlatives.

13.   Conclusion

The Caravan project offers an ambitious map of associations. It does not—on its own disclosures—prove hierarchical command or sustain the headline claim of "the largest far-right network in history." Its design choices (admitting Thin Evidence; distinguishing but then narratively conflating Linked with Parent ties; macro-function checking in lieu of verifying the relationship claims; withholding adjacency/weights/confidence/bridge metrics; offering no comparators) produce a dense picture of proximity that is methodologically fragile at the very periphery it counts to inflate the number. The structural facts the article itself declares—half the nodes on single ties, mediator dependence in paths to the centre—point to a hub-dependent, periphery-fragile graph where modest re-audits of weak edges can substantially shrink the connected set.

When we look at the named examples—a temple-trust campus with self-disclosed registration and NGO-Darpan ID hosting hostels funded by openly named diaspora charities; a diaspora community venue at a well-known address; a AERB-licensed cancer hospital with CSR partners—what we see are ordinary civic patterns, not shells. When we look abroad, where the correct legal test of control has been applied, regulators have not found formal command; where independent watchdogs score governance, the scores reported publicly for key diaspora funders have been strong. When we read movement scholarship and listen to movement leaders, the parivar metaphor—family, not firm—recurs with consistency: shared values, self-funded functional autonomy, samanvay for coordination, no diktats.

Most importantly, a healthy civil society is supposed to look like this: energetic, plural, often overlapping, sometimes untidy, and always more numerous than tidy charts can capture. If there are 2,500 Hindu organisations engaged in education, welfare, student life, labour, health care, relief, culture, and diaspora service, that is good. If there are 25,000—an order of magnitude more—to represent and serve 1.5 billion Hindus across continents, that is better. It would be proportionate to the scale of the community; it would be normal in a vibrant democracy and a vast diaspora; and it would arguably be necessary to meet real social needs. Association is not a crime; it is the infrastructure of a free society. Until the Caravan project releases the governance documents and replication-grade data that turn proximity into proof, the map it has built should be read as a crowded family photograph, not as the blueprint of command.

References & Suggested Reading

Movement scholarship and insider accounts

1. Andersen, Walter K., and Shridhar D. Damle. The Brotherhood in Saffron: The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh and Hindu Revivalism. New Delhi: Vistaar, 1987.

2. Andersen, Walter K., and Shridhar D. Damle. The RSS: A View to the Inside. New Delhi: Penguin Viking, 2018.

3. Ambekar, Sunil. The RSS: Roadmaps for the 21st Century. New Delhi: Rupa, 2019.

4. Sharda, Ratan. RSS 360: Demystifying Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh. New Delhi: Bloomsbury, 2018.

5. Madhav, Ram. The Hindutva Paradigm: Integral Humanism and the Quest for a Non-Western Worldview. New Delhi: Rupa, 2021.

6. Soni, Suresh. Vichar Setu (selected essays and interviews on organisational ethos and coordination).

7. Nanda, Sachin. Works on movement organisation and communication (assorted essays and interviews).

Regulators and watchdogs (publicly reported outcomes)

8. UK Charity Commission. Statutory Inquiry into HSS (UK) (2016): publicly reported conclusion that no formal link to RSS was evidenced; governance improvements were specified.

9. Charity Navigator. India Development and Relief Fund (IDRF) — long-running record of strong "Accountability & Finance" scores and Four-Star ratings (as publicly reported in recent years).

Indian legal and compliance context

10. Constitution of India, Article 19(1)(c) (freedom of association).

11. Societies Registration Act, 1860; Indian Trusts Act; Companies Act (Section 8); Income Tax Act (80G/12A); CSR Rules under the Companies Act.

12. Government of India, NGO-Darpan portal (self-disclosures by registered NGOs).

13. Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB): licensing of radiotherapy facilities (publicly listed institutions).

The Caravan article and project site

14. Felix Pal, "Unveiling the RSS: Exposing the largest far-right network in history," The Caravan, 11 December 2025.

15. "The RSS Project / Seeing the Sangh" (Caravan/CERI): public website describing the map, evidence classes (Parent/Linked; Thin Evidence), macro-function checking, dynamic submissions, and repository hosting by Sciences Po (restricted access).

Reference note. Where IDs (e.g., NGO-Darpan Unique ID JK/2021/0189221) or registrations are mentioned for exemplar NGOs, these are self-disclosed on the organisations' public pages or in mainstream reporting. International regulator outcomes and US watchdog ratings are cited as publicly reported summaries.