



Coalition Against Genocide

Spotlight Series Report

Affiliations of Faith:

Joined at the hip

Part 2 of the CAG Spotlight Series on the Hindu American Foundation

This Spotlight Series report documents the Hindu American Foundation as an instance of the latest round of the Sangh's expansion in the U.S.

This report 'Affiliations of Faith – 2' is occasioned by a "response" from the HAF to the original report – what will henceforth be referred to as 'Affiliations of Faith – 1'. The HAF response is in part sheer unsubstantiated assertion that they are not part of the Global Sangh, and in part characterizations of some CAG members as Marxists or Islamists – basically red baiting and Islam baiting while ignoring the presence of Hindus, Christians, Sikhs, atheists and others in CAG. Overall, however, we are encouraged by HAF's response and we will keep the engagement going so as to illuminate the issue of how the HAF is indeed an extension of the Global Sangh.

The disappointing part of the HAF response is that they have failed to engage the substantive claims and the evidence we have presented. We showed, for instance, explicit institutional linkages into the Global Sangh within the HAF leadership and we showed the ideological affinity of the HAF to Sangh ideology on caste. It would have been interesting if the HAF had proven that Mihir Meghani was not a member of the VHP-A's Governing Council. It would have been interesting if the response had shown that the HAF was not born at the intersection of the Hindu Students Council (HSC) – itself a project of the VHP-A (see *Unmistakably Sangh*)¹, the CAN (Community Action Network) project that was Mihir Meghani's brainchild, and the VHP-A's Governing Council. Instead of a substantive response, all the HAF response does is to cover up the deep involvement of the HAF leadership in the Sangh by saying that in the "1970s and 80s" many young Indian Americans of Hindu dispensation were drawn to Sangh organizations because "there were simply no other options for socio-religious engagement.." Such a gloss is intended to convince the reader that all the Meghanis and the Bhutadas were doing were going for occasional HSC movie night or a Diwali dinner as ordinary members. The gloss is precisely meant to erase the fact that the Meghanis and the Bhutadas were the emerging leadership of the youth wing within the Sangh and were not ordinary members who never even understood that the HSC or the VHP had an ideology. In response to such a gloss, we furnish further evidence of

- A) The HAF's leadership being institutionally linked to the Sangh, serving as leaders in other Sangh outfits and self-identified with the Sangh.
- B) Second, we will look carefully at another instance where the HAF has been forced to take a public position – the case of their support for Sadhvi Rithambara – and show that HAF's support for this Hindutva demagogue is illustrative of their ideological position, and finally
- C) We look critically at the HAF's relationship with the idea of human rights, especially when it comes into question in the context of Hindutva violence in India, and demonstrate how their understanding of human rights sharply diverges from conventional and canonical human rights discourse as represented by organizations such as Human Rights Watch (HRW) and Amnesty International (AI).

However, before we step into the three part structure we also wish to make one categorical statement of intent. We wish to make clear that there is nothing *personal* in what we report. We have never met nor do we have a desire to meet any of those mentioned in our reports. We have no personal animosity nor do we wish them badly in their personal and professional lives. It is only the political ideology they support, have built HAF to aid, and the Global Sangh that we take exception to.

A. Dense Linkages: HAF Leadership In the Global Sangh

The HAF claim that the CAG report involved personal attacks allows for an excellent point of departure in the presentation of new evidence. Far from personal, all we do is trace the links of a large number of the HAF leadership to active participation/leadership in Sangh organizations. For instance here are a few more links that show that Rishi Bhutada did not just go to the HSC meetings at UPenn to eat samosas and learn the Gayatri Mantra. After starting with the HSC in University of Pennsylvania, Bhutada went on to hold multiple positions within the HSC including *Vice President, Vice-President of Public Relations and Outreach Director of the Hindu Students Council (HSC), Texas Chapter, and HSC Southwest Regional Coordinator*. Even after his student days Bhutada was the Director of the *Hindu Heritage Youth Camp* held by the VHP-A, and organized principally to mold young students into the Hindutva ethos. Activities include a daily *Shakha* – the signature activity of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) which combines exercise with ideological training. HSC members play a critical role in these camps as 'councilors' organizing activities such as study sessions.² If such clear positioning within HSC leadership is not sufficient, here is something from Rishi Bhutada that speaks to his self-identification with the Sangh.

Rishi Bhutada's coming of age into the Sangh is captured in a brief note he wrote that his uncle Vijay Pallod posted on his behalf on the VHP-A's Governing Council listserv.³

Namashkar... Rishi Bhutada son of Ramesh Bhutada(Houston) has expressed his opinion. (authors note: it is of course just mere coincidence that Rishi Bhutada's uncle Vijay Pallod is a member of the governing Council of the VHP-A and the familiarity he suggests when mentioning Rishi Bhutada's father Ramesh Bhutada is because the latter is for instance currently the Vice President of the Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh (HSS)).

The young Bhutada's opinion in his note to the VHP-A is that of a strategist for the Sangh:

*I think that the VHP is being badly misrepresented by them. Quotes are given by purported members of the VHP who really aren't, there are serious and grave factual errors, and **we** are being generally put into a negative light. The only way **we** can counteract this is by focusing on public opinion. **We** may think **we** are doing good, but if the public hates **us**, all **our** work is for naught. Specifically, I think there are 4 areas **we** can focus to counteract the negative publicity **we** are getting. (emphasis ours)*

Note the prolific use of the pronouns “we, us and our” - clearly Rishi sees himself as part of the fraternity of the VHP-A and the larger Sangh within which he is located. Thus Rishi Bhutada is not just a campus and regional level leader of the HSC but also somebody who already in 1998, identifies closely with the VHP-A and the Sangh.

Similarly, locating Mihir Meghani as part of the VHP-A's Governing Council, should have been ample evidence of his institutional links and identification with the Sangh. But, the HAF it seems, has difficulty recognizing such substantive claims. Here therefore is another set of statements from Meghani from within the VHPA GC discussions:

here is a suggestions: should we support sanctions for China for religious persecution or not support it because Christian missionaries will come in... (sic) (all errors as in original)

At first the above statement may seem innocuous and unconnected to the current issue at hand. However, a moment of pause gives us a whole new perspective. Meghani has just expressed a specific comparative dislike of China on the one hand and Christian missionaries on the other. As a matter of fact a sensitive reading would suggest that he dislikes Christian missionaries more than he dislikes China. How could a member of the VHP-A Governing Council, who lives in the US and claims to be an ardent advocate of inter-faith harmony and Hindu spiritualism be expressing such dislike? The only possible answer is that he is mimicking and feels compelled by the one organization in India that dislikes, nay, hates Christian missionaries with a vengeance – the Sangh Parivar. We point to this specific example because this relation of deep dislike is something very specific to the Hindu supremacist movement and not shared by ordinary Hindus. Millions of Hindus – middle class, lower middle class and working class – send their children to Christian missionary schools. Millions of Hindus go to and seek treatment in hospitals and clinics run by Christian missionaries in India without any sense of animosity or ill will. It is only the Hindu supremacist movement that competes with the Christian missionaries and consistently airs views of hatred towards them. As a matter of fact one could call it one of the planks of contemporary Sangh ideology. And Meghani, sitting in the US, expresses the same. Where we may ask could he be getting it from if he is as the HAF claims all its leaders are – just a professional with an attachment to Hindu spiritualism? Consider this:

In December 1995, I attended the Vishwa Sangh Shibir 1995 in Baroda, Gujarat, Bharat (India), organized by Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). En route, RSS arranged a meeting with a delegation of 30 Khasi Hindus from Meghalaya that were touring the state of Maharashtra as part of RSS's Bharat Mera Ghar (India is My Home) project.

The above is Meghani again, reporting back to the VHP-A Governing Council. What is clear are two things: first that Meghani attended the Vishwa Sangh Shibir or the RSS' training camp for its global volunteers (Vishwa = Global; Sangh = RSS; Shibir = training camp). Second, beyond the training camp, the RSS had organized other meetings for the trainees/volunteers to meet with other Sangh ideologues working on RSS projects – in this case – Bharat Mera Ghar. It would be worth thinking of a good explanation for what Meghani was doing in Baroda and in Bharat Mera Ghar meetings. Certainly he didn't wander into the volunteers training camp all the way in Baroda thinking it's a samosa and chai party or even an afternoon discourse on the Gita. Would it be wrong to surmise that only if one has a reasonably solid sense of identification with a movement/organization would one fly 10,000 miles to attend an ideological training camp? And now, can we rest the case that Meghani is a deeply rooted Sangh follower?

Both in the case of Bhutada and Meghani, our effort was to show that what is in place is not just a history of leadership within Sangh organizations but a deep self identification with the Sangh and its ideology. There is much more evidence of the same available in the public domain and we will be only too happy to reproduce more of it for our readers. However, for now, a simple summary should do. The table below includes the names of the current Board of Directors. Simply put we can clearly identify

Sangh links for all but one of them. It is important to keep in mind that these individuals were not just “affiliated” with Sangh organizations but in fact occupied important leadership positions in them, and in several cases played a critical role in transforming and expanding these organizations before going on to become leaders in the HAF.

Board of Directors	Sangh background
Mihir Meghani	HSC, VHP-A
Rishi Bhutada	HSC, VHP-A's Hindu Heritage Youth Camp Director
Padma Kuppa	HMEC ⁴
Aseem Shukla	N/A ¹

B. Sadhvi Rithambara and the HAF

In 2010 a temple in New Jersey decided to invite Rithambara to deliver a speech on its premises, and faced as a result the spirited opposition of community groups and human rights activists. Rithambara has openly incited mobs of tens of thousands into violent action in India, most infamously in the destruction of the Babri Masjid in 1992. Her virulence would violate even the most lenient standards of hate speech, and yet the temple decided to proceed with her visit. HAF “applauded” the temple on its decision and defended the right of Hindus to hear the discourse of this “holy woman from India.”⁵ How “holy” Rithambara is to the HAF can only be assessed by examining her role in the Sangh Parivar. As a member of the *Margdarshak Mandal* (core group) of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) in India, Rithambara is the founder of the *Durga Vahini*, the women's armed wing of the Bajrang Dal. Both the Bajrang Dal and the VHP have been deeply implicated in numerous acts of extreme violence including the horrific genocide in Gujarat, 2002. In 2003 Rithambara was named by the CBI (India's equivalent to the FBI) as one of eight leaders of the Sangh Parivar (family of RSS organizations) responsible for “*spreading communal frenzy, rioting, criminal conspiracy and creating ill-will between communities at a place of worship*” as they incited mobs in 1992 to attack and destroy the 16th century Babri Masjid. Rithambara was accused of leading the mobs with slogans such as “*khoon kharaba hona hai to ek bar ho jane do*” (Transl. “*If bloodbath has to happen let it happen once*”).⁶

This is how Rishi Bhutada of the HAF described the New Jersey temple's decision to reverse its disinvitation to Rithambhara:

1 While there is little publicly available evidence of direct organizational links, Aseem Shukla's ties to Hindutva ideology are well established in his writings, especially in the years before he co-founded the HAF. See Section 3 below.

“The attempt by the IMC and the radical coalition groups to vilify the Sadhvi, who is here for purely spiritual and charitable work, is a political ploy to tar Hindu leaders and to debilitate the ability of Hindu Americans to support charitable work in India and to hear discourses on Hindu spirituality,” said Rishi Bhutada, member of HAF’s Executive Council. “It is the height of impropriety and absolutely unacceptable that these groups would defame Hindu leaders and presume to dictate to Hindu temples as to who should or should not be given the opportunity to speak there. The Hindu Samaj Temple, while initially seeming to succumb to these intimidation tactics, showed great courage in hosting the sadhvi.”⁷

What is particularly striking about the HAF's position on this issue is that the organization did not seek to offer a defense of her right to free speech, but defined her positively as a “holy woman,” “Hindu leader” engaging in “charitable work in India,” who offers “discourses on Hindu spirituality.” Moreover the HAF casts those criticizing Rithambhara as “groups” that “vilfy the Sadhvi” and as such “defame Hindu leaders.” The main question here is about HAF's stated commitment to “human rights.” How is human rights advanced by supporting a known public instigator of mass violence? Masking Rithambhara under the broad category of “Hindu holy woman,” the HAF actively aids the efforts of the Sangh fraternity to “normalize” the Sadhvi in the eyes of American Sangh supporters. Some of the current HAF leaders may remember similar efforts by HSC in 2007 alongside the VHP-A and the HSS, and even earlier by their elders in the VHP-A's governing council in 1998.

In 1998 the VHP-A leadership was very interested in bringing Sadhvi Rithambhara to speak at its events in the U.S. They wanted somebody like Rithambhara, “one big name VHP person” - to speak to U.S. based Hindutva supporters and “make the people aware of what VHP is doing.” This according to emails between Abhaya Asthana, the General Secretary of the VHP-A and Jitendra Goel, governing council member on the listserv who seems to have a direct contact with the “head office” in India. Note how he describes his efforts:

I have not heard from the head office about Ritambra Ji's trip. I am assuming that she is busy with the elections. It looks like that we will have to postpone our plans for the time being.

In 2007 Rithambhara was invited to speak at an event on June 9th in Houston, Texas. The co-sponsors of this event included the HSC, HSS and VHP-A. In the colorful flyer distributed for the event, organizers heaped glowing praise on the demagogue:

“Immerse yourself in a soul awakening discourse by Sadhvi Ritambhara also known as India's 21st Century Vivekananda.”

C. HAF and human rights, or how Hindus become more equal than humans.

In large part the general unfamiliarity of many Americans with the complexities and nuances of Indian politics has enabled the HAF to pull off this charade of “human rights” for as long as it has. Slick “public relations” style slogan branding by the organization revolves around the myth of universal Hindu victimhood, which is nothing more than a means of legitimizing Hindutva violence against minorities by casting it as “defensive.” Majoritarian fascism becomes recast as the righteous struggle of an aggrieved Hindu population defending itself against minority Muslim, Christian and other populations.

This anchoring in a majoritarian Hindutva political ideology prevents HAF from founding its efforts on the tenets of universal human rights, and the respect for **all** human life and dignity that the human rights principle rests upon. There perhaps is no more striking an illustration of the chasm that separates HAF's *real* commitments from the ideas and practices universally associated with human rights, than the organization's condemnation of findings by international and national human rights institutions on the critical question of Hindutva violence in India.

Consider for example how the HAF views the findings of Human Rights Watch (HRW) in 2012:

The HRW confirmed in its findings what a host of Indian and international observers have amply documented, that the state of Gujarat under the rule of Narendra Modi, has actively obstructed justice for victims of the 2002 genocide for over a decade. The HRW report concluded by noting: *“Ten years on, India owes it to the victims of the Gujarat riots to end the culture of impunity and prosecute those responsible for this open wound on the country’s reputation.”*⁸ Such an assessment of the human rights situation in Gujarat was challenged by the HAF, which found fault with the term “culture of impunity” and claimed against all the evidence to the contrary that there was *“copious evidence of comprehensive investigation and arrest by law enforcement, as well as prosecution and conviction by courts of those who have allegedly abetted or committed religiously-motivated crimes.”*⁹

Two critical points are worth noting in the context of two radically different assessments from two different organizations.

1. The HRW position is more or less shared by a wide range of national and international groups such as Peoples Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL),¹⁰ Citizens for Justice and Peace,¹¹ Peoples Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR),¹² Amnesty International, Asian Human Rights Commission,¹³ and International Initiative for Justice¹⁴. The HAF position in contrast is an isolated one with not a single mainstream international or national human rights organization sharing their assessment. This in itself should point to the 'outsider' status regarding the 'human rights' discourse that HAF has.

2. The isolation of the HAF is not surprising as all it does is mimic the RSS line on the Gujarat carnage. In other words the HAF position mimics the defense offered in public discourse by the perpetrators of the violence. The RSS and its outfits have attempted to consistently downplay the numbers of dead and homeless, consistently obfuscate the identity of those who died and consistently position the murderous mobs as 'spontaneous' and not as the evidence overwhelmingly shows, mobilized by the RSS and its various organizations, backed by the state machinery. Most human rights groups assess the number of dead as around 2,000 plus or minus a couple of hundred. The HAF assesses the number at below 1,000.¹⁵

All mainstream human rights groups reported that an overwhelming majority of those killed were Muslim. The RSS and HAF report the deaths as "Hindu and Muslim" attempting to present the massacre as a riot in which everybody was affected and not one in which the Muslim community was specifically targeted. In short, while national and international human rights organizations stand united in their assessment of the horrific events that unfolded in Gujarat in February 2002, HAF actually shares its position with the perpetrator of the violence. So much for being an organization with a "human rights" agenda. Even in 2002, years before the long-standing director of the HAF Aseem Shukla went on to co-found the organization, he poured scorn on the Human Rights Watch report, accusing it of spreading "anti-Sangh hatred."¹⁶ Echoing what has come to be the central tenet of the Hindutva history of the genocide – the claim that what happened at Godhra was premeditated "terrorism" while the mass murders that took place in the succeeding days were the result of a "spontaneous" outburst – Shukla offers justification for the massacres by resorting to a convoluted argument about "impotent rage" and "wounded psyche" allegedly experienced by "Hindus" marginalized by a world callous to their suffering.¹⁷

If the HAF takes umbrage over the HRW's characterization of the Gujarat situation as posing the problem of a "culture of impunity," claiming instead that "*copious evidence*" exists "*of comprehensive investigation and arrest by law enforcement...*" let us briefly pay attention to one of the most written about cases in the Gujarat carnage and assess whether impunity or accountability is at play. Maya Kodnani, BJP MLA (Member of Legislative Assembly) and former minister in the Modi government was sentenced to 28 years in prison for her crimes during the carnage. Kodnani's role in the carnage is brutal and horrifying. In February 2002 Kodnani had distributed swords and incited mobs to kill Muslims, leading them on with a gun drawn as they proceeded to massacre men, women and children, often with unspeakable brutality including gangrape, mutilation, torture, ripping out the fetuses of pregnant women, pouring petrol into the mouth of a child and throwing a lit matchstick into his mouth, literally blasting the child's body to shreds, and burning alive most of their victims.¹⁸ At least 95 men, women and children were massacred in this single horrific event tied to the direct incitement and leadership of Kodnani and the VHP leader Jaideep Patel, another close ally of Narendra Modi. First reports of Kodnani's involvement began within days of the carnage as human rights activists began recording victim and eye witness testimonies.

And yet for months no FIR (First Information Report, a required preliminary step towards officially reporting a crime) could be filed against Maya Kodnani or Jaideep Patel. The Gujarat state machinery blocked the filing of the required FIRs and Kodnani only came under the legal scanner after 2008. In other words the Modi administration did all it could to block the prosecution for over five years. It is the sheer determination of the human rights community that ensured that FIRs were filed and the case brought against Kodnani in the Naroda Patiya massacre. As if the human rights community in India had not faced enough attempts at sabotage the Modi administration raised Kodnani to the level of a minister in 2007, five years after the carnage when it was common knowledge in Gujarat that she had been one of most prominent perpetrators of the violence. The task of prosecuting her became even more difficult and again it was the perseverance of human rights activists that ensured the case moved forward. Finally in 2009, under intense pressure from the human rights community, Kodnani resigned, subsequently faced trial and in 2011 was convicted – testament to the tenacity of the human rights

activist community in India. In other words the most successful prosecution of a perpetrator happened not *because* of the State but *despite* it; not because of the absence of impunity but because of the doggedness of activists in the face of impunity.

In sum, the HAF's position on "human rights" is the Hindutva position, its perspective not just reflective of that of the RSS, but faithfully representing and defending the position of the RSS, as if it were its own. Among the members of the Executive Council of the HAF is Ramesh Rao, a professor of Communications, with an established reputation as a vocal defender of the RSS. Rao's book titled *Gujarat after Godhra - Real Violence, Selective Outrage* (2003) condemned Human Rights Watch for pointing to state complicity as a critical enabling factor in the genocide of 2002. That Hindutva groups in coordination with the state governmental machinery under the leadership of Narendra Modi systematically orchestrated a genocide of Muslims in 2002 is not the product of the imagination of a "fringe" group, but the informed assessment of dozens of international and national human rights institutions. Yet for Rao, echoing the views of Modi and the Sangh, the violence was spontaneous and retaliatory, not meticulously planned and executed by Hindutva organizations. Other writings Ramesh Rao has to his name include *Secular 'Gods' Blame Hindu 'Demons' - The Sangh Parivar through the mirror of distortion* (2001), a defense of the RSS and the Sangh Parivar, *Multiculturalism, Population Explosion and Political Correctness*, in which Rao amplifies the falsehood that Muslims in India pose an existential demographic threat to Hindus due to allegedly higher growth rates, *Selective Outrage, Suspect Ethics*, in which he launches into a tirade against the renowned legal scholar Martha Nussbaum, who squarely blamed the Gujarat government and the Sangh Parivar for the genocide of 2002. In short, Rao is a vociferous defender and advocate of Hindutva, quick to defend the Sangh and its violent actions, attacking anybody who criticizes the Sangh, and faithfully representing what amount to little more than ideological cover for the RSS.

It is this same Ramesh Rao who "*wrote seven of the annual human rights reports for HAF between 2004 and 2012.*"¹⁹ In essence the HAF's principal author of seven of its eight annual "human rights" reports is an ardent Hindutva ideologue who dismisses the very notion of rights when it comes to the victims of Hindutva atrocities.

Endnotes

- 1 *Unmistakably Sangh: The National Hindu Students Council and its Hindutva Agenda*. 2008 <http://hsctruthout.stopfundinghate.org/>
- 2 *Vishwa Sharma Ki Jai*, VHP-A website: <http://camps.vhp-america.org/vishwa-dharma-ki-jai/> ; also see *VHP offers pizza, coke to attract 2nd gen Indians*, Lalit Jha, HindustanTimes.com), PTI August 03, 2005 <http://www.hindustantimes.com/indians-abroad/indiansabroadnews/vhp-offers-pizza-coke-to-attract-2nd-gen-indians/article1-34825.aspx>
- 3 VHP-A Governing Council Listserv Archive: <https://web.archive.org/web/20091110042014/http://hindunet.org/archive/listmail-vhpgc-l>
- 4 Hindu Mandir Executive Council, a VHP-A organization devoted to bringing Hindu temples under the control of the Sangh.
- 5 HAF welcomes Hindu temple reversal on hosting Hindu monk. September 7th, 2010. <http://www.hafsite.org/media/pr/haf-welcomes-hindu-temple-reversal> (accessed 12/2/2013).
- 6 Court to watch video footage of demolition, Times of India. TNN Jul 19, 2003, 01.07am IST. http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2003-07-19/india/27190226_1_ayodhya-demolition-case-cbi-counsel-rai-bareli (accessed 12/2/2013)
- 7 See Note 5
- 8 *India: A Decade on, Gujarat Justice Incomplete*. Human Rights Watch. February 24th, 2012. <http://www.hrw.org/news/2012/02/24/india-decade-gujarat-justice-incomplete>
- 9 <http://www.hafsite.org/media/pr/uscirf-hearing-testimony>
- 10 *An Interim Report to the National Human Rights commission*. March 21st, 2002. Peoples Union for Civil Liberties. <http://www.pucl.org/Topics/Religion-communalism/2002/gujarat-nhrc-submission.htm>
- 11 *Survivors - Citizens for Justice and Peace*. 2010. Recognizing the Urgent Need for Monitoring and Intervention in the Ongoing Justice Process that Involves 97 Women Eye-Witnesses and Survivors in Nine Critical Trials <http://www.cjponline.org/CJPSURVIVORSJUNE%202010.pdf>
- 12 *'Maaro! Kaapo! Baalo!' - State, Society, and Communalism in Gujarat*. Peoples Union for Democratic Rights. New Delhi. May 2002. http://www.pudr.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/maro_kapo_balo.pdf
- 13 *A crime against humanity in Gujarat and state government's complicity*. 7th April, 2003. Asian Legal Resource Center, Asian Human Rights Commission. <http://www.humanrights.asia/news/alrc-news/ALRC-PL-04-2003>
- 14 *Threatened Existence: A Feminist Analysis of the Genocide in Gujarat*: Report by the International Initiative for Justice (IIJ), December 2003, <http://www.onlinevolunteers.org/gujarat/reports/iiig/2003/>
- 15 See http://www.hafsite.org/media/pr/uscirf-hearing-testimony#Question_2
- 16 *The HRW Report on Gujarat: Another Assassination*, Aseem R. Shukla, May 13, 2002. Sulekha.com. http://creative.sulekha.com/the-hrw-report-on-gujarat-another-assassination_100472_blog
- 17 *A Gujarati's Road to Rage*. Aseem R. Shukla, 2002. Sulekha.com. http://creative.sulekha.com/a-gujarati-s-road-to-rage_100349_blog
- 18 *Compounding Injustice: The Government's Failure to Redress Massacres in Gujarat*. Human Rights Watch. July 2003. <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/06/30/compounding-injustice>
- 19 <http://www.hafsite.org/media/pr/haf-team>