Comrades in Brighton & Hove DPUK,

On Tuesday 4 October I received a message from Nehaal informing me that she had been asked as the only admin of one of the B&H WA Groups to remove me from it. The pretext she was given was that there had been '*a lot of complaints from different peopl over quite a long period.'* No detail was given as to who had made the complaints or what the substance of those complaints were.

Nehaal stated that *'Personally I am not really in favour of removing someone as a response to anything but I think we were generally too disparate and incoherent a campaign to engage with anything more meaningful at this point.'* B4 going on to say that the *'group chats are not really where the campaign is.*' All of which was completely irrelevant.

I had also been removed by Andrew Farrar from the Don'tPayBrighton General and the Announcement lists – although he had not even bothered to provide any explanation.

The allegation of complaints was a pretext not the reason for my peremptory removal. If anyone had been the recipient of abusive messages on the different WA groups it was me, such as being compared to herbicide!. However I ignored them unlike the snowflakes who took exception to any political debate.

On 20 September I received a final warning from an Admin. It was completely unfair but in order not to play into the hands of the unelected Admins I decided not to engage personally with anyone confining my few contributions to political observations about the campaign.

My removal relates to the following, observations swhich I have repeatedly made:

i. Who is running DPUK nationally? Why are they anonymous, what is the decision making process concerning the campaign's strategy nationally? Are they simply a bunch of friends who got together as has been suggested? Why is there no forum to involve others in strategy and policy making?

ii. Why do the Admins of the group chats appear to be a group of friends and acquaintances with no accountability to anyone?

iii. DPUK emphasizes on its website in bold that:

'We only do this* [not paying] *if we get a critical mass of people pledging to cancel their bills.'

The number 3 days ago was 195,510, today it is 198,551. In other words it is rising by about 1K a day. It is clear that at this rate it will take over 2 years before DPUK will call on people to stop paying their bills. This is clearly absurd.

Pledges have dramatically slowed from 10K a day to 1K a day following the government's announcement of the £2.5K cap It is clear that Truss's package has cut the ground from under DPUK's feet. Yet there is no discussion of alternative strategies and those who try to raise such a discussion, as I have done, are being cancelled on any pretext.

iv. As someone who was expelled from the Labour Party as part of the 'anti-Semitism' witchhunt, the democracy of DPUK bears more than a passing resemblance to that of

Starmer's Labour. Except that this time it is so-called anarchists who are doing the expelling and cancelling.

v. Even if the 1 million target had been reached people would have been able to pay via other methods. The target of 1 million has been made into a shibboleth.

vi. The last national meeting I attended had a maximum of 112 people in it. All speakers were preselected and those wanting to speak from the floor were not taken as the meeting had to finish in1 hour. How is that democratic?

vii. I realize that for the anarchists who form the leadership of the campaign, locally and nationally, democracy is a luxury but a campaign which isn't controlled democratically by those taking part in it is will not succeed.

viii. The campaign faces immense hurdles anyway. Whereas everyone could take part in the campaign against the Poll Tax there are 4 million households on pre-payment meters who can't take part. DPUK does not seem to want to discuss these issues and instead Andrew Farrar and his cronies have found it more convenient to remove someone who does raise them.

ix. When Andrew approached me over the summer I was more than willing to work with him but even then, when I raised the lack of transparency of DPUK nationally, he objected.

x. Entirely absent from DPUK's publicity are any political demands such as taking the energy companies into public ownership. Why? There is massive support for such a demand but to anarchists nationalization is no better than privatization as they are all capitalist institutions. According to We Own It 66% of the public support nationalization yet DPUK says nothing about this. When I mentioned public ownership in my introduction to the last public meeting it was greeted with spontaneous applause.

In short DPUK is a campaign which makes no political demands, which relegates everything to one tactic, has no democratic structures and operates on the basis of who you know. The campaign is destined to fail. I can only assume that the unelected leadership believe that the inability of people to pay for their energy will itself be enough to sustain a campaign. This is a very risky and cynical strategy and it makes DPUK redundant.

Tony Greenstein