

# Kent State Figure Linked to

## KENT, From A1

lowed by firing from the skirmish line of guardsmen.

Bayh speculated that the unexplained first shot prompted the guard response. "In my judgment, it is entirely possible that one Terrence Norman was the catalyst," Bayh said.

The senator produced two transcribed statements, purportedly made by two other national guardsmen, which also linked Norman to the shooting incident.

In one of them, a sergeant said he saw guardsmen stop Norman behind the skirmish line. The sergeant said, "I heard the young man say, 'A student grabbed my camera and started to beat me up—I shot.'" The sergeant's name was also withheld by Bayh.

The guardsmen said in their statements that a plain-

clothesman arrested Norman, removed a silver-colored revolver from his pocket and led him away.

Norman, who joined the Washington police force four months after the Kent State shootings, told *The Washington Post* that he will make no statements until he talks with his attorney next week.

He has persistently maintained his innocence, however, to fellow police officers and officials of the special operations division, the riot-trained special detail to which he is assigned.

Those officials said that Norman told them he was a student at Kent State in 1970 and worked part time as a campus security officer. In an interview with Ohio law enforcement authorities, Norman said he was working for "the campus police and higher ups" during the

May 4 campus demonstration and intended to use photos he was taking for prosecution purposes.

The police officials in Washington said Norman told them he never fired his revolver during the demonstration, but that he struggled with some students and during the melee the weapon fell to the ground.

Police here said Norman told them he made a full statement to the FBI and to local investigators, telling them that if they needed further information, he could be reached in Washington. He said he never heard anything further from the authorities or the local grand jury, and thought the matter closed.

To police officials here, Norman has maintained that he was never salaried as an FBI informer, but had become friendly with local

agents and had been asked to monitor several National Socialist Party (American Nazi) rallies and was reimbursed for expenses.

Police said Norman told them he was not working for the FBI the day of the shooting.

As a result of questions raised by Bayh during the Senate confirmation hearing for FBI Director Clarence Kelley, the FBI reported July 9 that Norman had received \$125 for informing on National Socialist activities. Kelley said, however, that Norman was never under direct contract with the FBI.

One significant contradiction in the investigation of Norman's activities concerned the ammunition removed from his five-shot .38 cal. revolver—and the weapon.

In several signed statements, it was learned, Norman said his weapon was loaded with four hollow point bullets and one steel-jacketed, armor-piercing bullet. However, a campus policeman who observed the revolver being opened the day of the shooting testified that the weapon contained five regular, ball-type bullets.

Additionally, authorities said that a trace of the revolver showed that it was missing from the stock of the Smith & Wesson Co. in Springfield, Mass. The firm's officials said there was no record of its having been sold.

## Reopening of Shooting Probe

Norman told *The Akron Beacon-Journal* in a telephone interview last month that he obtained the revolver in a trade with an acquaintance.

Bayh has complained that the FBI failed to determine whether the revolver had been fired before it was confiscated.

Justice Department officials declined Friday to say whether the company commander's letter to Bayh had influenced Richardson's decision to reopen the Kent State case. "We have received a lot of things in recent months," a Justice spokesman said.

J. Stanley Pottinger, chief

of the department's civil rights division, said he would not speculate on "any new evidence we may or may not have."

Pottinger claimed the decision to reopen the case was influenced, in part, by a number of events that have occurred since former Attorney General John N. Mitchell decided in August, 1971,

against launching a federal grand jury probe.

These include, Pottinger said, civil suits brought by some parents of the victims, congressional inquiries, student petitions, lobbying by the academic community, increased pressures for reform of National Guard procedures and continual inquiries by the press.