
Land Consolidation Committee - A Comment

by [Edzard](#) on January 18, 2006, 12:38 am

I object to Dhanapal as member of LCC, simply because we had a rule that we want to avoid multi-memberships in important groups - and Raman is already the ex-officio-member of the WC in the proposed LCC.

Furthermore I request to know (from Peter C.-S. and the other old members in the know) what safeguards have been put in place to avoid a recurrence of what has happened in the past- that a member of the Land-related group had to be dismissed for involvement in fraud and/or embezzlement.

Thank you

edzard

Posted in [Discussion](#)

by [Paul Vincent](#) on January 18, 2006, 10:37 am

I object to Jacques being a member of the LCC because he has absolutely no knowledge about land purchase, he does not speak Tamil and because **he is a political appointee**. He will not be in position to help to purchase lands, but he will be a definite tilt towards buying land in the city.

Truth

Paul Vincent

by [Juergen P](#) on January 18, 2006, 10:58 am

Committees in Auroville are taking themselves to bloody important and invariably after a short time stray from the original purpose.

The Govt. of India for example, for matters of dimensions which outweigh auroville by a factor of a million, sometimes appoints a 1 or 2 member committee to look into a certain matter and give a recommendation.

I believe we could do the same without so much fuss about all these things.

And yes, for the record, except for Paul B. i dont agree with the entire group.

Juergen, Palmyra

by [Angad](#) on January 18, 2006, 1:53 pm

I object to Francis being on the LCC because he has in the past acted to favour his

friends to gain financially on land deals,inspite of other members objections. His action even contradicted a letter of approval from the then Secretary of the AV Foundation!

by [Paul Vincent](#) on January 18, 2006, 7:18 pm

Angad is correct about Francis, this is proven with records available...

Truth

Paul Vincent

by [padro](#) on January 18, 2006, 8:01 pm

The question is whether that makes the man unqualified for the job. We all make mistakes and sometimes a mistake make a better man.

by [Paulette](#) on January 19, 2006, 9:33 am

To the WC and the Av Foundation

Feedback on the LCC:

Francis has already been the object of an investigation by the FAMC regarding the land purchase, after which he resigned. I am therefore bewildered seeing that his name comes up again, appointed by the FAMC itself, and with no objection from the old Aurovilians in the WC (the new ones, of course, know nothing and have no intention to inform themselves either). Moreover, with the AVC there is a plaint on very serious grounds against Francis; on top, Francis was linked to an early Aurovilian who was made to leave Auroville for years, for well known facts. For all such reasons I reject Francis's presence in any Auroville committee.

<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Many things have been said about the present and past people involved in land purchase, but apart from the enquiry on Francis no other enquiries have been made; the least we can demand is that none of the people so far involved in the land purchase are reappointed. Question: by what authority the WC has not studied the huge file on alleged mismanagement of funds regarding the land purchase, submitted to the WC by Paul Vincent months ago, when things had turned too hot? For this alone, independently from all other issues, the present WC has to be dissolved; none of them should sit in the LCC either. By the way, Paul had been elected in the WC, but was promptly made to resign. If the FAMC and WC are

unwilling to conduct an investigation, I hope the Av Foundation will do.

I also refuse the presence of the one whose family members have ostensibly bought land without relating it to Auroville (this was never a secret), and of anyone else behaving that way.

I sadly refuse the presence of Paul B. too, for he has built a mansion in the green belt. In the original vision, only modest, temporary dwellings were allowed in the green belt, and for the sole purpose of guardianship.

The appointment of such members is simply outrageous and proves once more that the FAMC and WC are incapable to represent what Auroville stands for.

Paulette

by on January 19, 2006, 9:16 pm

Denying people because of past mistakes will leave us with no one being able to be part of a committee in Auroville. Furthermore again I notice that third persons and parties are being written about in a rather slanderous way, which brings us nowhere near a solution.

by [Auronet admin](#) on January 20, 2006, 12:42 pm

Dear Paulette,

Please avoid publishing on Avnet:<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

-
- Any false, unsupported or deliberately partial information.
 - Slander and gossip.

Again we appeal to you and to all: please respect the Rules of the Game.

by [on January 20, 2006, 12:52 pm](#)

Warning alone won't do. Whenever there is a clear case of slander my advice is to keep your backs straight and remove the feedback immediately even when this feedback is supported by a large amount of people.

by [padro](#) on January 20, 2006, 1:56 pm

A plea for obeisance is futile if YOU YOURSELF do not know how to interpret the rules of the game. How can you expect others to do, what you yourself cannot?

by [Priya V.](#) on January 20, 2006, 7:11 pm

Dear AVNet

This comment would be more useful if you would specify which points in Paulette's letter are incorrect with evidence to support this.

Love

Priya

by [Paulette](#) on January 21, 2006, 2:16 pm

The comments from old Aurovilians writing before and after me speak by themselves. Are you going to accuse everybody of slander? Or I alone have such privilege (which includes Annemarie's insults)?

Why don't you check with the FAMC about the investigation conducted when Francis was, since years, the head of the land Service, and after which he resigned? And whose outcome has been mentioned by quite a few others, refusing his name for the same reasons?

Why don't you check about two illustrious Aurovilians who weren't allowed to return to Auroville for years -- one of them told me the truth, which I didn't want to believe until he himself told me that it was true, and which I am not going to unveil here out

of respect for such sincerity -- but which many old Aurovilians know even too well.

Why don't you check with the AvCouncil about a plaint of which I know all the details -- as the victim is known to me since years, and many others know what it is about, including pvc?

And so on: many old Aurovilians know what I am talking about, and it is simply shameful to be forced to remind such things in public.

Unrelated lands to Auroville and benami properties are another issue -- of which even people like Meenakshi and Guy have informed us during general meetings!!! Why aren't investigations carried on, instead of accusing me of slander for objecting to things (and persons) that old Aurovilians know, and weren't even kept secret?

ABOVE ALL, WHY IS PAUL VINCENT'S DOSSIER NOT THE OBJECT OF A COMPLETE INVESTIGATION -- INSTEAD OF BEING DELIBERATELY IGNORED?

The only name I have been objecting to alone is the one in the Green Belt, for deturping the Green Belt. But as this is a common practice and so many other names should be objected to for the same reason, I wonder whether it makes any sense to continue: Don Quixote and Integral Yoga (surrender to the Mother) are a strange issue.

Paulette

by [padro](#) on January 21, 2006, 2:44 pm

Everyday day a new topic for the drama queens or queers - and with what air. Itr is almost if we are addressing the Queen of England!

Source URL: <https://auroville.org.in/article/4844>