

Witness: Dr Norman Joseph Temple
Statement number: 1
Exhibits: 0
Date signed: March 3, 2020

IN THE MATTER OF AN INQUIRY UNDER THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005
INTO UNDERCOVER POLICING

WITNESS STATEMENT OF DR NORMAN JOSEPH TEMPLE

I, Dr Norman Joseph Temple, of Vancouver, Canada, will say as follows:

Introduction

1. I was contacted by the Undercover Policing Inquiry in January 2019 in relation to my involvement with the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front in the early 1970s. I subsequently met with two members of the Inquiry legal team on 16 January 2020, who provided me with a bundle of documents relating to undercover policing and asked me a number of questions in relation to my knowledge and experience of undercover policing. This statement has been drafted with the assistance of the Inquiry.
2. In the late 1960s, I was in my early 20s and living in London, working as a technician in a hospital. I was politically active and I considered that being a revolutionary was part of normal life. There was at that time, a great deal of interest and support for demonstrations against the Vietnam War and this to me, felt like the centre of everything. I remember that huge demonstrations against the war took place in 1967 and 1968. I helped to organise a demonstration in Trafalgar Square in March 1969, which many people attended.
3. At that time, my political views were Maoist. There were a number of different branches of communism active at that time, and people tended to form into loose groups, dependent on their personal stance. The pro-China group (of which I considered myself a part) was led by Albert Manchanda and Edward Davoren. There were also those who were Trotskyist, but I had less to do with them.
4. I was supportive of any campaign groups which shared my aims and objectives and I attended demonstrations for a number of groups in the late 1960s and early 1970s. I

had a particular interest in Pro-Palestinian activities and was involved with the Pro-Palestinian Solidarity Campaign in the summer of 1969, which culminated in a trip to Jordan in summer of 1969. The Pro-Palestinian Solidarity Campaign came to an end in either late 1969 or early 1970. Around that time, things were heating up politically in Ireland and there was growing support for the liberation of Ireland and the expulsion of British troops back to the mainland.

5. I heard that Edward Davoren was holding meetings in a pub in Paddington in relation to the situation in Ireland. I had first become aware of Edward Davoren in connection with the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign. I was at that time, a floating revolutionary who lacked a cause.
6. I was interested to find out more about the group which Davoren was involved in and so went to my first meeting of the Irish National Liberation Solidarity Front (INLSF) in September 1970. This was a public meeting which took place in a room above a pub in Paddington. After the initial meeting, I became a regular member of the INLSF and attended meetings on a frequent basis. They usually took place in pubs and had around 15 – 23 attendees. The meetings would involve some talks from members about the cause generally and then some discussion on how to raise awareness and any demonstrations which may be planned.
7. The two key figures within the group were Edward Davoren and Joe O'Neill. Edward Davoren was highly charismatic. He was engaging, energetic and could command a room in moments. He was also ruthless and could be manipulative. He was used to being in command and would try and undermine anyone who he perceived as a threat to him. Davoren idolised Stalin within the pro-Chinese faction and I remember that he would often quote Stalin in meetings. Davoren did not work. His income depended on his wife's earning and from donations by members.
8. Joe O'Neill came from Northern Ireland. As far as I am aware, he had little political background before helping Davoren create the INLSF.
9. In addition to the usual attendance at INLSF meetings, there was an inner group of around 8 people, who were the key part of the organisation. After a couple of weeks of attending the general meetings, I was approached by Joe O'Neill, who invited me to become part of the inner core. There wasn't any formal vetting or checks into who I was. However, my history with revolutionary activities over the previous 3 years meant I could be trusted.

10. The INLSF produced a paper called the Irish Liberation Press and sold it around the Irish pubs in London. I quickly became involved in helping to produce the paper. It was very hard work selling the paper and I did this in addition to working full-time. Looking back now, it was exhausting. The paper was the main source of income for the INLSF, although my recollection is that it barely made any money at all and was often produced as a loss. I certainly do not think Davoren made any real money from the paper. My recollection is that this did not provide any income for him at all and I see the reference within the documents I have been provided (at tab 21, UCPI0000007822) that in June 1971, the INLSF was in dire straits financially, with debts of £1,461. I am not surprised by that and have no reason to doubt that it is accurate, as there was never any money around.
11. The meetings would usually involve speeches about the INLSF's aims and there was always a lot of talking (often from Davoren) about how we should overthrow the state and change things. References were often made within meetings to the need to use violence as a means by which to achieve revolutionary change, but I always took this to be just talk. There was never any serious suggestion of anything violent or criminal and I was never involved in any criminal activity or any acts of violence. The talk of using revolutionary violence was in reference to some future time when the time would be right for such activities, similar to the situation that then existed in Northern Ireland. The main purpose of the INLSF was selling the paper in order to raise funds and awareness of the cause and organising and attending public demonstrations. I would describe these as political protests which were disruptive, but peaceful in nature.
12. I was heavily involved in the INLSF from September 1970 until around August/September 1971 when I got married. A few weeks after I was married, I resigned from the INLSF in September 1971. By that time, I had had enough of the group and all of the work which was required from me in printing and selling the paper, so I thought that this was a good time to leave. I also found Davoren a difficult character to deal with. He was very dominant and I often felt under a great deal of pressure. He was dictatorial and followed the maxim "My way or the highway." My resignation was not taken well by Edward Davoren, who formally expelled me from the group at the next meeting. This was quite common for people who wanted to leave, you were never allowed just to leave; you had to be formally expelled. In addition, they denounced me in the Irish Liberation Press.
13. I was no longer involved in any political activities at all until 1976, when I became

engaged with pro-Palestinian activities. As I have said above, this had previously been an area I was interested in. For a time, I was the National Chairman of the British Anti-Zionist Organisation, from 1976 to 1981. In 1981, I moved abroad to work, eventually settling in Canada.

14. I have read the bundle of documents which have been provided to me by the Inquiry, which consist of a number of intelligence reports. These appear to be accurate in terms of their content. I am surprised at the level of detail included in terms of what someone would be able to recall. I certainly never saw anyone taking notes within the meetings so I wonder how they were able to remember all the details of what was discussed. This suggests that either people used a recording device or they had an extremely good memory.
15. Within the documents I have seen, there are some omissions. Particularly in relation to an individual called Jackson, who I understood to have been an undercover police officer who infiltrated the INLSF. I have not been provided with any reports relating to Jackson.
16. Jackson was already a member of INLSF when I first joined the group in September 1970. He was part of the outer group and attended meetings in the pub in Paddington. We chatted a few times and he was quite a talkative character. There is a photograph of us together at a demonstration in or around 1971. I remember that in late 1970 or early 1971, Davoren and O'Neill singled him out and accused him of being an undercover police officer. Jackson quit the group that night and I did not see him again.
17. Shortly after Jackson left the INLSF, a man called Alex Sloan joined. Alex was Scottish and was a quiet person. I did speak to him, but only in limited terms. He was never part of the inner circle, but attended the general meetings in the pub along with others. I don't think he was particularly close to anyone else within the INLSF. He did not form any significant relationships within the group. Nor did he engage in any sexual relationships, as far as I'm aware. He usually just sat and observed. I wasn't aware that Alex Sloan had any involvement in any criminal activity, or that he encouraged anyone else to take part in any criminal activity. I don't believe that Alex Sloan was involved in any civil legal proceedings or that he became privy to any confidential information or legal advice.
18. Throughout early 1971, there were growing tensions within the INLSF between Edward Davoren and Joe O'Neill. Joe O'Neill was concerned that Edward Davoren was

focussing on non-Irish issues and diluting the group's aims and objectives. In my view, Davoren was keen to hold onto his power within the group at all costs. Having now read the documents provided to me by the Inquiry, I can see reference to this split in a report dated 25 June 1971 (at tab 20, MPS 0739470). This occurred at a meeting of all the members.

19. I recall that at that meeting, Davoren stated that Joe O'Neill, in a private conversation with Davoren, had accused Alex Sloan of being an undercover spy. Given that the police were regarded as the enemy within the organisation, this was a serious allegation to have been made. Davoren accused O'Neil of making up this terrible allegation against "Comrade Alex". Immediately after the meeting, Davoren admitted that he agreed with O'Neill's suspicions about Alex Sloan. It is obvious that Davoren was trying to score points against O'Neill and to discredit him. At the time that he was accused of being in the police, Alex denied this and shouted to ask "what evidence he [O'Neill] had?" It was clear to me that Alex felt he had to leave. However, instead of simply leaving, Alex actively tried to disrupt the group. I met Alex with another member of the group outside Alex's flat, on the evening that he left. Alex told us that two other members (one supporting Davoren and one supporting O'Neill) had both been spying on him. I believe this was Alex's attempt to throw a spanner in the works by suggesting that two members from opposite sides of the group were collaborating to spy on him. It was an attempt to further divide the organisation into two groups, as no one felt they could trust anyone else. Alex and I parted that night on cordial terms and I did not see him again.
20. During the meeting where the organisation split, Joe O'Neill and 5 others walked out in protest against Davoren. They did not form a new organisation, but instead all went their separate ways.
21. At the time, I didn't personally have any suspicions about Jackson or Alex Sloan. Looking back now, I can understand why the police would be interested in the INLSF. Ireland was definitely a hot political topic and it does not surprise me to learn that we might have come to the interest of the police. Whilst there was no formal vetting of any members, I do remember that there was a lot of paranoia about phones being tapped and we would usually move any phones out of the room before discussing anything sensitive. I think that it would have been seen by members of the groups as being a badge of honour, in that the police thought that what we had to say was important and that we were worth spying on.

22. I now turn to some of the questions which have been asked within the Rule 9 Request.
23. The report at tab 11 (MPS-039483) dated 10 March 1971 relates to a protest which was arranged in relation to the death of Stephen McCarthy. Over the previous months, I had done some reading into basic areas of law and I turned this into a leaflet to assist members of the group, if they were arrested at a protest. I was probably asked to do this by Davoren. I did not have any expectation that violence was planned. However, the protest was likely to attract police attention and it was possible that arrests might take place. I can't now recall what advice was contained within the leaflet, but I would expect that I would have advised members of what to do in that circumstance. I can't now recall if anyone was arrested.
24. The report at tab 13 (MPS-0739490) dated 21 April 1971 refers to a trip I made to Ireland. This was trip which I undertook with other INLSF members. It was all done on a shoe-string. Davoren gave us each 10 shillings towards travel expenses, which the INLSF had received from selling the paper, but otherwise we funded ourselves. I recall that we initially travelled to Liverpool to try and cross to Ireland from there. We were turned away by police at the port so we then drove to Swansea and managed to get a ferry there over to Ireland. During the trip we visited Belfast, Derry, Cork and Dublin. I particularly recall within this trip that we were at one point surrounded by a group of commandos in Belfast and also challenged by Irish republicans.
25. I am very pleased to provide this statement to the Inquiry. I feel my experiences and recollections may be of interest to people, now or in the future.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

NORMAN TEMPLE

.....
[Name]



.....
[Signature]

March 3, 2020
.....
Date