

Arguments End in Gainesville 8 Trial

By JOHN KIFNER

Special to The New York Times

GAINESVILLE, Fla., Aug. 30 —Final arguments were heard today in the trial of the Gainesville Eight. The Government charged that the alleged plotters conspired to "cause havoc" at the Republican National Convention, and the defense contended that the case was "nonexistent, pitifully weak at best."

Late this afternoon, the jury voted not to hear Federal District Judge Winston E. Arnow's instructions until tomorrow morning.

The jury is to begin its deliberations on the fate of seven antiwar veterans and a supporter charged with plotting an assault with automatic weapons, crossbows and slingshots on the Republican convention.

In his closing argument, the prosecutor, Jack Carrouth, contended that it was "laid out in cold evidence from that witness stand" that the alleged conspirators planned to provoke a riot at Miami Beach "so these defendants could be made

heros and leaders before the public."

The defense's closing arguments concentrated heavily on attacking the credibility of the five paid informers and an undercover police office on whom the Government's case rests.

Mr. Carrouth, in his rebuttal, said: "They think it's great sport to attack people who give up part of their life to help the Government catch criminals."

In his closing argument, which took up the entire morning session, Mr. Carrouth once again outlined what the Government says the alleged plot entailed.

The alleged conspirators, members of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, planned to fire slingshots at the police in Miami Beach to enrage them into attacking otherwise peaceful demonstrators, Mr. Carrouth said. Simultaneously, he said, other plotters were to attack police stations, stores and power plants in the City of Miami to lure the police away so the first group could escape.

Radicalizing Others

In describing the alleged plot, Mr. Carrouth charged that its point was to "radicalize" the other demonstrators by setting the police upon them, which would "catapult" the veterans into "the leadership of the New Left."

Proof of the alleged conspirators' violent intent, he said, was the testimony of the star informer, William W. Lemmer, who said they turned down a plan from the national office known as the "Marshall Plan," which called for equipping a force of 300 veterans with helmets, baseball chest protectors and eight-foot poles with a noose on the end to serve as protectors of nonviolent demonstrators.

"If they had gone along with the Marshall Plan, they wouldn't be in the trouble they are today," Mr. Carrouth said.

During the trial, Mr. Carrouth occasionally mixed up the testimony of various Government witnesses and today he added several details that had never been heard from the witness stand. For example, he told the jurors that there had been testimony that a defendant, Alton Foss, planned to go to Cuba where "being a revolutionary, Castro would give him a farm."

Incidents Described

Delivering the major defense closing argument, Brady Coleman attacked the Government's use of informers as a "scenario of deceit."

Mr. Coleman went over the testimony of each of the informers and, in describing a series of incidents in which the defense contends that Mr. Lemmer lured others into crimes, asked: Is that the kind of person you want to believe?"

Going over the overt acts charged in the indictment against each defendant, he asserted that the Government's case was "a lot of extraneous, isolated, off-the-wall testimony" and that the prosecution had dragged in unrelated allegations to "inflame the jury."