

Niki Deutchman Foreperson In Terry Nichols' Trial Holds News Conference



Washington Transcript Service

January 7, 1997

00-00-0000

FOREPERSON IN NICHOLS TRIAL HOLDS NEWS CONFERENCE

JANUARY 7, 1998

SPEAKERS: NIKI DEUTCHMAN, JURY FOREWOMAN, NICHOLS TRIAL

[*] DEUTCHMAN: I think I would like to say a few things just about the trial in general. And I'll talk about that too.

QUESTION: Can you spell your name for us, first.

DEUTCHMAN: Niki is N-I-K-I and Deutchman is D-E-U-T-C-H-M-A- N.

Certainly, it's been a long trial. And there's been an awful lot of information that was presented. There was a lot of evidence to wade through and sort out. As the judge said in chambers today, he felt it was real important to separate the McVeigh trial -- the trial

of Timothy McVeigh from the trial of Terry Nichols because they are different people and because there are things that are different between the two of them.

I think that is really true. I think that -- we heard a lot of information about Timothy McVeigh. And we heard a lot of information that was evidence in the case. And it would have been fairly easy for us to make a decision about Timothy McVeigh's involvement. But with all the information that we were presented, it was not easy to make decisions about Terry Nichols.

They are different people and their involvement was different, in different ways. And it's very hard to say from the evidence that was presented exactly what Terry Nichols' involvement was. And that's why this has been such a difficult process.

Even though there was a great deal of evidence, it wasn't necessarily, it was circumstantial. And a whole lot of it could be looked at in a lot of different ways. And it did not prove, very much of it did not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Terry Nichols was involved. And for that reason, the decision was very difficult to make.

Obviously, because we as a jury came to the conclusion that he was involved in the conspiracy, that he was guilty of conspiracy, we felt like there was enough evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty of conspiracy.

How much involvement that was, was very much debated. And there were a lot of different views about that among the jurors. For how involved he was all the way from a very tiny amount to totally. And I think it's not fair to the jury or to our process for me to say how many people felt one way or another way.

I think it's sufficient know and I think it's obvious from what the verdict was that there was a lot of big range of opinion and because we weren't able to come to a conclusion in the sentencing phase, that there -- the differences of opinion were very strong and very definite. And after considering long and hard, going back over a lot of evidence, everyone being able to present their views in many different ways, we still were not able to come up with a definite, yes or no, and the judge will be making the decision.

I think that's reasonable. That was how the jury feels and to push it any farther, would indeed have been pressure, I think, and is not what the jury system is about.

QUESTION: Did the jury take some votes? Were there some votes taken?

DEUTCHMAN: Always, obviously.

QUESTION: How many votes were taken, and would you tell us what the splits were?

DEUTCHMAN: No. I'm not willing to talk about what the splits were. There were a lot of votes. Whenever they seemed to be

indicated. Since the trial, or since everything ended this morning, I've already seen some things. I hadn't been reading the paper, and I hadn't been watching TV, but I'd seen some things that suggested our verdict of conspiracy and the rest of the things that we found was found because it was Christmas and it let us out of there.

I think six and a half days, or how ever many days of deliberating, sort of speaks for itself. That's a lot of days, there was an awful lot of discussion. And I think that every single member of this jury took their job very seriously, and really tried to follow the judges orders to keep an open mind through the entire trial. And by the time it was done, I think in fact, that is where it was, that people had an open mind. And we just reviewed evidence.

QUESTION: Was there one specific thing you had a doubt about? One specific act like building the bomb, or...

DEUTCHMAN: Yes, there were a lot of specific acts that I had doubts about. I think that's part of the deliberation process, and I think...

QUESTION: What were some of those stumbling blocks?

QUESTION: Can you please look ahead Ms. Deutchman. Thanks.

DEUTCHMAN: I think -- I'm not willing to talk so much about what the stumbling blocks were. I think some things that -- you know, I think I really don't want to talk about the deliberations. I think it's not appropriate to talk about the deliberations.

QUESTION: Was there ever any consideration of the punishment during the -- your deliberations of guilt and innocence?

DEUTCHMAN: No, and as a matter of fact, we didn't know until we entered the sentencing phase that there were other options. Well, I guess -- until we were ready to begin the verdict -- to begin our deliberations for the verdict, we didn't know that there were going to be other options than they were in the McVeigh trial -- that we would have the option of first degree, second degree or involuntary manslaughter.

QUESTION: Was that confusing?

DEUTCHMAN: No, that was not confusing. And it was very helpful to have those options. And the sentencing and what the results of our deliberations were not part of what the original deliberations were for our verdict. I think it was very honest.

QUESTION: One woman who lost her daughter in the bombing said she was disappointed in her fellow man. What do you say to the victims' family members who lost people in Oklahoma City and in the Murrah building?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that it's an incredible tragedy and an incredible loss. And that the family members and the rescue people who came to talk to us during the jury, spoke very eloquently and agonizingly, and they had a lot to say. I think that the government

didn't do a good job of proving that Terry Nichols was greatly involved in all of this. And we took our responsibility very seriously for justice and proving beyond a reasonable doubt.

I think that just because someone has been arrested and in this case there will be punishment that will be met out, because someone has received punishment, it doesn't remove the empty places. It doesn't remove the holes when you've lost someone. And it may help for some closure, but it doesn't take away the loss, it doesn't take away the pain.

QUESTION: Niki, what about the issue of intent? You seemed to have a problem with that as a jury; that Terry Nichols intended to kill hundreds of people.

DEUTCHMAN: I think that's a fair question, and I think that what that gets down to is different jury members interpretation of how involved Terry Nichols was, and what he actually did as far as conspiracy was concerned and how much he knew about what the whole conspiracy was about.

QUESTION: And you specifically?

DEUTCHMAN: I feel very comfortable with the verdict that we reached.

QUESTION: Did at any point the discussion over sentencing make you rethink the verdict at all amongst the jurors -- the debate over the sentencing?

DEUTCHMAN: Of course. It definitely did, and we all reconfirmed our feelings about the verdict, and I think everyone certainly agrees with that verdict of guilty with conspiracy and with the rest of the way that we found to the verdict.

QUESTION: Can you explain why you personally had problems with what aspect of the government's case in proving that he intended to kill? Because in the first part of the guilt phase, all the jurors answered the question that they did believe that death was a foreseeable result? Speaking only for yourself, what problems did you have with the government's case involving intent?

DEUTCHMAN: I think there were a lot of things that were very circumstantial that could be easily explained away. There were a few things that could not be easily explained away.

QUESTION: Such as?

DEUTCHMAN: There was a Wall Mart receipt that was -- as the prosecution said before we went into our deliberations, this is the key. Well, I think it definitely was a key. There -- and some of the activities in the week just before the bombing; such as going down to Oklahoma City and picking up the TV when the receipt showed that McVeigh was there.

And Terry must somehow have known, even if he didn't have direct contact, so why do you go to Oklahoma City to pick up a TV when it's

already in Kansas? And some other -- if they rode back in the car together from Oklahoma City and had some discussions and as a result of that, Terry suspected that Timothy McVeigh might be doing something and then he assisted him in the week following. Those are things that were difficult for everyone.

QUESTION: Do you realize that this is considered a mix verdict and that people find inconsistencies between the conspiracy conviction and the not guilty verdicts on the murder charges.

DEUTCHMAN: Absolutely, and I think some of the jurors have that difficulty as well.

QUESTION: What was the mood like in there, and where -- when did you get to the point that you realized that you were not going to be able to come to unanimous decision?

DEUTCHMAN: Every different juror might have a different answer to that question.

QUESTION: But as the forewoman, when did you realize that this was not a situation that you were all going to be able to agree?

DEUTCHMAN: I think there was a point yesterday afternoon when we asked for some information from the judge, the first time, that we were at a place that it was very difficult to move beyond. And so we were asking for more instructions from the judge to help us either get through that or not.

And he gave us some more instructions and we considered for a while longer, and then had another communication with the judge to help us a little bit further. And his response this morning made it final, and I think it really was at that point that we know that we really weren't -- I suspected that we had done as much as we were going to be able to, but not everyone probably felt that way.

QUESTION: Could you tell me a little about the dynamics of this jury; how you all got along? What kind of relationships there were? Are you friends?

DEUTCHMAN: I think before the deliberations started we were getting along wonderfully, and better than would almost ever be the case after been so close together for such a long time. I think that every juror considered this very seriously and very deeply and had deeply held opinions. Deeply held feelings.

QUESTION: Is this a jury that you would trust your life or death decision with?

DEUTCHMAN: I absolutely would. I think they made huge efforts to go through all of the evidence and consider every detail in as much depth as it was possible to do before coming to conclusions.

QUESTION: Finish your thought. You said before deliberations started, the jury got a long very well. (OFF-MIKE) happened afterwards?

DEUTCHMAN: I think there were sometimes that when people are taking their job so seriously, feel like it's such an important job, and they come to conclusions that they hold very strongly, that it's hard not to personalize that and be made at somebody that has a different view. I think that the way things are left is that we may not get together for reunions, but that we all still very much respect each

other and the place that we've come from and feel like we've done the best that it was possible for each one of us to do.

QUESTION: How did the jury feel about Michael Fortier and

QUESTION: What did you want the punishment to be?

DEUTCHMAN: I'm glad that the judge is going to make the determination.

QUESTION: What did the jury feel about Michael Fortier's as far as with if he got some kind of a special deal?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know that I'm going to talk about the special deal that deal that was arranged for Michael Fortier. I think that the jury considered what Michael Fortier had to say, that there probably were a lot of things about what he had to say that was good information for us to consider as part of the evidence, but someone who's used a lot of drugs over a fair amount of time, may not have very good memory and very good memory recall. So things that had to do with dates and times and people, were certainly looked at suspect.

QUESTION: Niki do you think that Terry mixed the bomb, and do you believe that he robbed Roger Moore? You personally?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know that I'm prepared to answer that. I don't think I want to answer that.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) testimony other Joe, two, three, four?

DEUTCHMAN: Thank you for asking about that. I think that the government perhaps really dropped the ball. I think that there were a large number of sittings right around before, the week before, and the days and month after the bombing. And sketches of people that were recognizable.

In this trial there even was a photograph of someone who may have been involved with mixing the bomb, with putting the bomb together. And that person -- it was a photograph from a newspaper, obviously that persons identity is known. I think there are other people out there and decisions were probably made very early on that Tim McVeigh and Terry Nichols were who they were looking for. And the same sort of resources were not used to try to find out who else might be involved.

QUESTION: What were your impressions of Michael Tigar?

QUESTION: And does that influence your opinion on how the government handled this case overall?

DEUTCHMAN: Definitely. I think the government was not able to prove to all of us satisfactorily that Terry Nichols was greatly involved in this process, only that he was somewhat involved in this process. And others obviously feel like he was a lot involved.

But the law says, and our instructions were that if two possible verdicts might be reached, both guilty and innocent, then innocent is what -- the lesser is what needs to be followed.

QUESTION: What did you feel was the weakest part of the government's case.

DEUTCHMAN: Terry Nichols wasn't directly present or implicated with anything.

QUESTION: So why was he convicted?

QUESTION: You understand that in a conspiracy you don't have to be there to be part of the planning or be responsible for a bombing.

DEUTCHMAN: And the -- as I mentioned before, the things that were the most difficult that actually beyond the shadow of a doubt have to do with the receipt and the trip to Oklahoma City and the things that happen in the week after the bombing. But none of the rest of it was strong enough for all of the jurors to say that Terry Nichols was really there, or really did any of those things.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) fertilizer?

DEUTCHMAN: Someone with -- that used one of the aliases that he used, purchased that. No one was able to really identify the person or really identify the truck, and there were times that Timothy McVeigh used an alias that -- last name that Terry Nichols also used and someone else may have used that name.

QUESTION: What was the lynch pin then that allowed you to issue a guilty verdict on a conspiracy count?

DEUTCHMAN: The things that I've mentioned already. The things in the week before the bombing.

QUESTION: Do you have any thoughts about whether the...

QUESTION: Some jurors were crying last night. Can you explain or perhaps tell us at all, was that really -- was that the clinch time, late last night, when that final note went to the judge?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that the jurors have been under and awful lot of stress and take their job really seriously, and we were working really hard on the whole thing. There were very strong differences of opinion that we were -- very -- for the most part -- not necessarily gently, but considerately of each other airing. And the

feelings were really strong, and there -- they were very strong more than one direction. And so it was a culmination of a long day of a lot of stress and there's tears involved.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) was between Mr. Nichols and Mr. McVeigh?

QUESTION: Do you think it was a mistake that you couldn't agree on the sentencing (OFF-MIKE).

DEUTCHMAN: No, I don't think it's a mistake that we couldn't agree on the sentencing process. I think what it says is that there were a certain number of people who felt very strongly that Terry Nichols was very involved, and there were a certain number of people who felt very strongly that Terry Nichols was only involved in a very minor way. And that makes a statement in itself. And it makes a statement that would not be possible to make filling out the form that we were given to fill out, which would effect say that we all thought he was very involved, or that we all thought he wasn't.

QUESTION: What do you think his intent was in being in the conspiracy? Do you think he intended to...

DEUTCHMAN: The definition of conspiracy and of intent has to do with -- and of conspiracy itself, could be even a very small way, as long as it was still known that this was part of a plan and basically what the plan was about. And even if he didn't know that there was a bombing involved, he know that something big and nasty was about to happen because he said so to the FBI. That Timothy McVeigh has said so.

QUESTION: Did the jury at all in the deliberating room discuss it? Did you personally want Terry Nichols to take the stand?

DEUTCHMAN: I think it would have been really nice to have been able to hear what Terry had to say. And he certainly was under no obligation to have to do that.

QUESTION: What did you make of Karen Anderson's gun list?

DEUTCHMAN: It's very interesting that one of the things on the gun list was a gun that Terry Nichols had purchased and registered in his name. When we looked at that list very closely, the paper was potentially old, and somewhat stained and had maybe been in the sunlight for a while, but the pencil markings on the paper looked very fresh and new.

QUESTION: Niki, do you think that the state of Oklahoma should go ahead and try him again?

QUESTION: Do you think that Mr. Nichols knew that this bomb could kill a lot of people?

DEUTCHMAN: Some of the jurors I think were not convinced that Terry Nichols knew that it was a bomb that was the big plan. I think anyone who knew that Terry Nichols knew about a bomb or who felt that Terry Nichols knew about a bomb, felt like obviously he'd have to know that it would cause a huge amount of damage and destruction and death.

QUESTION: I take it you did not?

DEUTCHMAN: I felt like he knew. I felt like knew that there was a bomb and that he was involved right up the end. The motivations for that could make a difference in how I felt about the rest of the verdicts and the rest of the things.

QUESTION: What do you think his motivation was?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know, and I don't think I want to talk about that.

QUESTION: Ma'am how would like this jury to remembered through history? How would you like this jury to be remembered?

DEUTCHMAN: As people who took their role very seriously, approached it very honestly, and worked at it very hard.

QUESTION: How would you describe your experience as a juror?

QUESTION: How hard has it been on you and on your family?

DEUTCHMAN: It's been extremely difficult. Just from the standpoint of scheduling things and setting the rest of my life on hold and what my family's had to go through with all of that, it's been difficult. But what was even worse was the deliberations because nothing was clear cut, and everything we had to really labor with and through, and not just once but over and over and over again. And there are a lot of feelings and emotions that are involved with that.

The sentencing phase -- there were times during the trial that were very difficult to sit through. The sentencing phase, obviously was excruciating. It was very agonizing for us and for the people who had to be there to testify.

QUESTION: Should Nichols he be tried again in Oklahoma City?

DEUTCHMAN: That's, I suspect, a legal decisions and I don't want to get into that.

QUESTION: Niki with such differing opinions among the jurors, why a verdict at all? If you couldn't come to...

DEUTCHMAN: Because there was at least enough agreement to be able to say that he knew that he was assisting in some kind of a plan that was going to involve probably death and destruction.

QUESTION: What went through your mind when you looked across the room and saw Terry Nichols crying? Number one. Part two would be, any reaction from you personally as to the my brother comments? Tigar walking behind during closings. First the tears from Nichols and then Michael Tigar.

DEUTCHMAN: Well, I think there was speculation among the jurors about how much of what we observed was real. I think that most of the jurors felt like Terry Nichols is someone who probably really cares very deeply for his family. And his separation from his family and the changes that have happened in his life with his family members and all of that is probably very real and not -- maybe not all of us felt that way, but I think a lot of people felt like that was very honest.

It makes a difference in the person that he is, if he can care so deeply in one area, what does that mean for other things? Well it could mean, it could mean almost anything. And it doesn't necessarily mean he could not be involved in something like this if it was a cause he believed very deeply.

QUESTION: And what about Michael Tigar's my brother comments and his reactions, his tears?

DEUTCHMAN: Michael Tigar is one heck of an attorney, and he and Ron Woods really did a job with this. Obviously the government was not able to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt more than just the basic conspiracy. And if Terry knew that there was death and destruction, then involuntary manslaughter is a -- has to be at least that, as a result of that.

All attorneys use acting as part of what they do. And some are better at it than others, and some make it seem very real and very heartfelt, and in fact it might be, and that's probably when it's most effective, is when there is some of it that's heartfelt. And it maybe that he really feels that way about Terry Nichols.

QUESTION: Without getting into the vote count specifically, could you talk about how many people...

DEUTCHMAN: Hold on a second.

QUESTION: Could you talk a little bit about -- there's been a lot of speculation about the fact that maybe the jury was hung up on the death penalty and whether or not you wanted to forward with that? Could you give us any indication of how big a role discussion of the death penalty played in these deliberations?

DEUTCHMAN: Well, we at least polled each other to find out how many people felt like that was the most appropriate outcome and how many did not. And there were some who felt both ways.

QUESTION: More on one side or the other?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't want to talk about numbers.

QUESTION: Were you surprised this morning when Judge Matsch took the sentencing decision out of your hands?

DEUTCHMAN: We thought that that might be a possibility and I think that there were a fairly large number of jurors who hoped that we might have just a little bit longer to be able to continue. At the same time as the Judge said in chambers, later in the day, there comes a point in time when deliberations are no longer deliberations but turn into pressure. And I think that that was a very real possibility. And pressure is not the same thing as considering something freely and openly and honestly.

QUESTION: But you never actually decided as a jury to turn it over to Matsch right? Even though that was actually one of your options.

DEUTCHMAN: At one point yesterday afternoon, we suspected that the communication we were giving to the judge might result in that affect. We didn't know if it would or not. And in fact it didn't and he gave us a response back.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) decide that part of the (OFF-MIKE) that says, we want you to be (OFF-MIKE)? Could you have all agreed to have done that?

DEUTCHMAN: To having the judge decided unanimously? I think there were some jurors who felt like that was -- I think some who felt strongly enough in the first two options that to them to allow the judge to make the decision was a cop out. On the other hand, if we were at a place where we could not agree, it's the only possible outcome. It's the only for it to be considered?

QUESTION: What do you think about Judge Matsch?

DEUTCHMAN: I think Judge Matsch knows the law very well. And even if he appears inattentive occasionally, while he's on the bench, there were many times that an objection would be raised at a time like that, and he immediately was very aware of what the legal issue was that was being objected to and what had been said, and whether it was appropriate or not and was able to make a ruling.

I think he did a very good job about screening what was allowed for evidence or not allowed for evidence, at least as far as things that wouldn't have made a difference in deliberations but could certainly have made a lot of difference in the tone in the courtroom. And I think he did a real good job.

QUESTION: You faulted the government for not looking harder for these other people who may have been involved. Do you think they should know reopen their investigation?

DEUTCHMAN: I think the government dropped the ball and if there are people who were very actively involved in this horrible crime, that it's an obligation to find them. And to bring them into the justice system. I think this was a horrible thing to have done, and I doubt very much that two people -- if Terry Nichols was even greatly involved, that two people would have been enough to be able to carry it off?

QUESTION: What about Beth Wilkinson's remark and closing statement. How do you conspire to build a weapon of mass destruction and not know it's going to kill people?

DEUTCHMAN: If -- you know that gets into individual jurors deliberations and how much involvement they felt like Terry Nichols had. And if there were some who felt like he didn't even know, necessarily that a bomb was involved, just that something was involved, then - - or if he were coerced for one reason or another and may have been involved at one point and time, and then chose to get out, and felt there was a threat, not necessarily to him, but to his family, which was in more places than Kansas, and didn't know a good way to get out of that and participated anyway, to protect his family.

And indeed those were some of the views that were held by some of the jurors, then his intent is a whole lot different.

QUESTION: You touched on this earlier, but could you address again, at this time perhaps the people who've lost loved ones in this bombing; who are clearly frustrated and were hopeful that the -- his jury might have made a decision on it's own as to the punishment.

DEUTCHMAN: I think that revenge and vengeance is very different from justice. And that just punishing someone because they've been arrested is not a solution to anything. And certainly even if punishment were for the death penalty, it still doesn't fill the holes that have been left when people are gone.

QUESTION: How do you know feel about the death penalty?

QUESTION: Niki several times today you've said that the government did not prove it's case beyond a shadow of a doubt...

DEUTCHMAN: Beyond a reasonable doubt.

QUESTION: OK. Well, you said beyond a shadow of a doubt (OFF- MIKE)

DEUTCHMAN: No. Beyond a reasonable doubt was the jury's...

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) some people thought that maybe acquittal was a possibility earlier on -- was that -- did that come up?

DEUTCHMAN: Certainly, when we first got into the deliberation room, I think that we still had been keeping an open mind, and there were a large number of jurors, before we reviewed evidence and talked with each other about our deliberations, there were a fair number of people who felt like he may in fact have been innocent, and the more we consider the evidence and what information that was there had been presented to us, the more that opinion was changed.

QUESTION: Niki, do you think Terry Nichols tried to back out of this spot?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that there were some who felt like that was a possibility. And that he may not really have been involved willingly sometime after November.

QUESTION: Do you think he should serve life in prison?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't want to talk about my personal views about that. I think the jury, and what now is left with the judge is where that needs to stay.

QUESTION: What about Marife Nichols testimony?

QUESTION: What about the family members of the victims in the penalty phase?

Did you ever feel that they were angry with the jury because of your original verdict?

DEUTCHMAN: A couple of times.

QUESTION: Marife's testimony, did that backfire on the defense, do you think?

DEUTCHMAN: I think there are some victims who probably feel a real need for vengeance. You know, that there were an awful lot of people who were involved in this horrible crime, and an awful lot of people who died and a lot of people who, have been permanently injured as a result of that. It's hard not to be bitter when something like that happens.

QUESTION: What do you think of Marife Nichols testimony? Did that backfire? Do you think she was good?

DEUTCHMAN: Um -- personally, I -- um -- things were clearer to me before she testified than after. And so I think it mostly was because it was hard for her to remember a lot of things, that it didn't necessarily help.

QUESTION: She screwed up on the time the first day. Then when they came back during redirect that was fixed up somewhat, she said noon.

DEUTCHMAN: It was fixed a little. But then when we reviewed the events of the day, I suspect the time that she even wrote down in her notes, a couple of weeks later still was not an accurate time depiction.

QUESTION: How did this whole process affect you personally? Will your life go back to normal, say by tomorrow?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know.

QUESTION: If you had to do it all over again, would you do it?

DEUTCHMAN: I guess I felt all along like, if there was a reason for me to be there, then, I was willing to be there, and to do the best I knew how to do. I'd sure rather not do any of this again. And if I can avoid being on a jury in the future, I probably will do that.

QUESTION: Niki, what do you say to the folks back in Oklahoma City who were perhaps hoping, expecting more?

DEUTCHMAN: Sentencing hasn't happened yet. And the judge explained, as we were beginning to go into our deliberations about sentencing, that federal law does not provide for parole. And he has -- I don't know what his guidelines are. He hasn't said what his guidelines are. But they even included life. They included enough years that would mean the same thing as life. I don't know what his sentencing is going to be. And I suspect that Terry Nichols is not likely to be out walking around in any kind of near-term -- or even long-term time period.

QUESTION: Did you volunteer to be foreperson, or how did the selection...

DEUTCHMAN: It's a vote.

QUESTION: Did you campaign?

(LAUGHTER)

DEUTCHMAN: No. I definitely did not campaign. It's how it happened.

QUESTION: I know you don't want to talk about votes specifically, but can you say which way the jury was leaning?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think that's a good idea.

QUESTION: You were talking about the FBI's conduct in the investigation.

DEUTCHMAN: Thank you for asking that question. I think, as was pointed out during the trial, there were over 30,000 interviews done by the FBI. And you know, that's an awful lot of interviews, and an awful lot of people. I suspect some

of those interviews were same people over and over again, because there were many people that did talk with the FBI multiple times.

The fact that there were no tape recordings of any of the interviews, especially of key people, really would have made, I think -- would have made a difference to us, as a jury. We regretted that every single day. Terry Nichols was interviewed for nine-and-a-half hours when he first turned himself in to the police after the bombing, and there were handwritten notes about what that interview was about. It didn't say anything about the questions. It didn't hear -- it didn't allow for any information about the tone of voice, either of Terry Nichols or of the investigators.

The number of pages of notes that were left from that interview, certainly take a lot less time than nine-and-a-half hours to read through and sort through. They did go over things more than once but you know, there are a lot of things that would have been very helpful if it had been on tape. And it seems it may not be -- but it seems arrogant to me on the part of the FBI to say, you know, we have good recall, and you can take what we have said. There was FBI report after report, after report, after report when they were talking with witnesses and the attorneys would say: Do you recall in your report to the FBI that you said such and such? And the witnesses said: No, I said something else. And it was similar, but it was not the same words and it had a different connotation. So you know, that is a real interesting aspect of things, and I hope that that changes.

QUESTION: And the fingerprint...

DEUTCHMAN: I think there were a lot of things about evidence that seemed to be sloppy. And in the fingerprints and even in the numbers that were written down on work sheets and reported a couple of days later that didn't agree. I mean there were a lot of things like that that seemed sloppy. The FBI lab that got flooded and the drill got soaked, and most of the contents were either rusty or ruined by

water. And the drill bits had rust on them. There were a lot of things that were sloppy about that.

Some of the witnesses -- there was one, especially, who felt -- she seemed to feel very badgered by the FBI, and refused to talk to them after once or twice and -- all the way up to the trial and then talked with the prosecutor -- or the defense some. And I don't know -- I don't think it was very much. So, you know, the -- I think government's attitude, and the FBI is definitely included in that, is part of where all of this comes from in the first place. There are a fair number of people out there who are pretty unhappy with the government, and feel unsafe and very suspicious, and in many cases, very angry with the government, and so many far-right groups show that there are a lot of people who have some feelings along those lines.

QUESTION: Do you think it was deliberate misconduct?

DEUTCHMAN: No I don't think so, I don't know. I think it's the way the government does business. I think maybe, it's time for the government to be more respectful, and to be more aware of each of us, as people, with the inalienable rights, equal rights, and not with the attitude of -- we know, and you don't. We have the power and you don't. The recent things in Congress, the findings with the IRS and some of the tactics that they have used. You know, I don't think the IRS is the only government enforcement agency that uses those kind of tactics, and I think that might be part of the message from this whole incident in the first place, and certainly from the trial, and from some of the findings, some of the things the FBI was involved with, and their attitudes of their involvement.

QUESTION: Did you carry that baggage into the jury box with you, or has this developed through the presentation of the government's case?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think anybody is -- who lives in this country hasn't had some experience with the government that they were unhappy with. And certainly, I have heard things like that before. I don't think that I necessarily had that kind of attitude before we went in. But I think that it was very interesting -- some of those issues were brought out more by Ron Woods in his questioning of agents and of witnesses than by others, and Ron Woods, I understand, is a former agent, a former FBI agent. And who would know better what the FBI's methods of doing business are, than one who has been part of their number.

QUESTION: What was convincing though, from the government's case? Obviously you still came up with nine guilty verdicts. So what pushed you, though, in that direction, in spite of your criticism?

DEUTCHMAN: Who said we came up with nine guilty verdicts? Oh, on the listing.

QUESTION: Eight counts of conspiracy.

DEUTCHMAN: OK. So what was your question?

QUESTION: What convinced you, then, in spite of the flawed case, that it was strong enough to come up with conspiracy?

DEUTCHMAN: Oh. Those were the things I talked about already. The things already immediately surrounding in the week preceding, and just following the bombing.

QUESTION: Do you think you had adequate proof that Terry Nichols told lies about his activities?

DEUTCHMAN: Well, if he said he didn't know that Timothy McVeigh was in the area, but he had a receipt, a Wal-Mart receipt that Timothy McVeigh had obtained before he took -- before there was a phone call on Sunday asking him to

come down to Oklahoma City to get him, that sounds pretty much like he must have known that Timothy McVeigh was in the area, even if he didn't get it directly from Timothy McVeigh.

QUESTION: Do you have trouble believing that Mr. Nichols -- taking it a step farther -- knew -- knew what Timothy McVeigh was up to?

DEUTCHMAN: There certainly were some jurors who felt that way.

QUESTION: Niki, I know, we know you're not condoning what happened in Oklahoma City a couple of years ago. But going back to what you said a couple of seconds ago, it almost seems like you said you can understand how someone would have hatred against the government to carry something out like that? Can you expand on that?

DEUTCHMAN: I understand how someone can be unhappy with the government. I think anything that carries things far is incredible. It's horrible. I can't see how anyone could morally justify killing a whole lot of people, even if it were directly the agents, or the people they felt were directly responsible, and especially a whole lot of other people and civilians and babies.

QUESTION: What about Kathleen Trainer(ph)? Obviously, the judge told you all as a panel that she lost it. You mentioned acting earlier. Do you think that was genuine, and how did the jury, or at least you feel about her, on the witness stand pounding her fist, and basically yelling and screaming.

DEUTCHMAN: May have been a combination of genuine and emphasis for the jury's benefit. I think that she is really agonized. I think that she said, there was -- she felt a whole lot of guilt. Her daughter pleaded with her to stay home that day, and she didn't. And she felt really guilty. And my interpretation of what happened is when you feel that guilty, there is a whole lot of anger, and you have to blame someone. And in that same 60-second period, she talked about how guilty she felt. And then she talked about -- I can't remember what her words were, but it was in effect, that she wanted us to find him guilty. You know, that it's his fault, because she feels guilty. Well, it's definitely someone's fault that there was a bomb that went off. And that's a horrible thing, and she suffered an incredible loss, and the pain that she feels every day is huge, and I hope that there can be some healing for her. And know that she was not guilty for this horrible crime.

QUESTION: What part of the victims's testimony was most compelling for the jurors?

DEUTCHMAN: I am sure it was different for everybody.

QUESTION: Did the prosecution go too far, though, in sentencing? Was there too much blood and gore and heartbreak?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think it made a significant amount of difference in -- in the considerations that we were making during our deliberations. I think that everyone felt like it was a horrible crime, and all of us have had at least some experience with grief, and knowing that many people are involved, you know, it's very compounded. It's a horrible thing.

QUESTION: Would it made a difference if the testimony had been going on during the verdict phase?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think so.

QUESTION: No?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think so. It wasn't part of whether Terry Nichols was involved or not. It was -- it was what happened as a result of the bombing. But whether Terry Nichols was responsible for the bombing or not was the issue. And if he was, then it does make some difference in the considerations when you're figuring out a sentence, but if he's not, it doesn't matter how much of that pain and agony you know about. The pain and agony remains. And if he's not the person responsible, you know, what do you do with that?

QUESTION: What did you think of the nine witnesses that the defense put on in behalf of Terry Nichols during the penalty phase?

DEUTCHMAN: Well, it was nice that Terry Nichols has friends and family members that care a lot about him. I don't know -- there -- it sounded like there might be some other things presented that might assist the jury a little bit more with our deliberations.

QUESTION: Such as?

DEUTCHMAN: And that might have assisted a little bit more during the trial, and certainly would have during this phase. That -- that would say a little bit more -- Michael Tigar intimated there might have been coercion in his opening statements for the sentencing phase, but there were no witnesses that said anything about that. There were a few pieces of evidence that were somewhat troubling that the defense did not have an obligation to say anything about but didn't say anything about, and it might have been helpful to have a little more information about.

QUESTION: What things were those?

DEUTCHMAN: Terry Nichols stayed in a hotel, a motel in Paul Valley (ph), the night before nitromethane fuel was purchased in Ennis, Texas. The prosecution talked quite a bit about -- not quite a bit -- very little. It was simply introduced in evidence that Terry Nichols spent the night there, and the prosecution showed on a map how far away that was from Ennis, Texas and how that related to any of

the known activities that Terry Nichols had been involved in before and after that time. And it -- that was troubling, and it might have been helpful to have a little bit of help with that.

QUESTION: What do you think the relationship was between McVeigh and Nichols?

DEUTCHMAN: Obviously, they spent a lot of time together. They met in the army. It sounds and appears as though they definitely had a friendship over a fairly long period of time. Whether that friendship remained or not, and how intimate it was or not, is not clear from what we heard with evidence.

QUESTION: Do you think one is the leader, and one was the follower? Much was made of that?

DEUTCHMAN: Much was made of that. And there -- from the evidence, it was hard to tell which might be which. And there were

many people, for a long time, who felt like even if Terry Nichols might have been a leader in -- when they first met, because he was the platoon leader when they first got into the army and older, and Tim McVeigh was just entering the army, and he was unsure, and lacking in confidence, that that sort of -- someone who is just out of high school often doesn't have much very confidence, and it may not take a long time in your own life experience to build some of your own, and begin to find out who you are as a person. So just because there was that kind of a role when they first met, doesn't mean it stayed that way.

QUESTION: What do you Mr. Nichols role was in participating in the conspiracy?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know.

QUESTION: Niki, what did you make of Roger Moore in the robbery, the alleged robbery?

DEUTCHMAN: We talked about that a lot, as a jury. And there were a fair number of things that -- that we recognized as a jury that were inconsistencies that weren't necessarily brought out in a trial, but were present in the evidence that was there.

QUESTION: For instance?

QUESTION: Judge Matsch...

QUESTION: For example, how do you explain away the stolen weapons that were found in his house.

QUESTION: Wait, wait. She's trying to answer the question.

DEUTCHMAN: If there was, and it was suggested, but there wasn't any evidence that was presented to help with that suggestion. It was suggested that it may have been an arrangement which would help finance this whole operation. It is entirely possible, from what was presented, that that could be. It isn't definite. I mean, obviously, guns were taken, and I think he really was tied up with duck tape and with wire ties, and the events that happened, that were described, probably really happened. What was behind all that, I really don't know.

QUESTION: You're not convinced Nichols pulled it off?

DEUTCHMAN: I have doubts Terry transported them, yes, absolutely. Some of the evidence suggested that Tim McVeigh left the day before Terry did, to go to Arizona.

QUESTION: And you didn't see enough evidence to determine a motive in your own mind for the conspiracy on the part of Mr. Nichols, is that correct?

QUESTION: You don't buy the anger over Waco or the literature found in his storage area?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know why he might have been involved. Certainly, he had such literature and he talked with a couple of people about those kind of issues.

QUESTION: How significant were all the Ryder truck sightings, which were a major part of the defense's case?

DEUTCHMAN: Well, what it said is that there were at least -- there was at least more than one Ryder truck in the area, probably several over several days, and just because one was spotted there on Tuesday morning, didn't necessarily mean that that was Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols mixing up a bomb.

And as a matter of fact, one of the jurors is an explosive expert, and speculated that a lot of the mixing of the bomb was probably done a long time before hand, because of the amount of time it would take. And that there were some things that needed to be done at the last minute, and may have been done there, and may have been done somewhere else. What that said to us is that the government's speculation that they mixed it up that morning at the lake may have happened, and may not have happened.

QUESTION: Did you believe that Terry Nichols was at the military auction the morning that the government says the bomb was being built?

DEUTCHMAN: I suspect he was there, at least part of the morning. I have no idea how much of the morning he was there.

QUESTION: Niki, Terry Nichols didn't testify, but if he did was there anything that might have answered ambiguities. Is there anything you would have liked to have heard from him directly?

DEUTCHMAN: Of course. I would have liked for him to talk about a lot of different parts of things, but he didn't have an obligation to do that.

QUESTION: You said you were glad when we asked about the FBI. Is there anything else that we should be asking about, that we haven't? In other words, jury story words?

DEUTCHMAN: I think I made a list of some things that I felt were issues, and I think we've talked about those.

QUESTION: Will there be a book coming out by any of these jurors?

DEUTCHMAN: Not by me.

QUESTION: Have any of the media sources been hitting you up for interviews? Larry King call you or Ted Koppel or anybody?

DEUTCHMAN: Larry King hasn't called me.

QUESTION: Are you going to be making any appearances on any networks or anything?

DEUTCHMAN: I am not interested in a whole media show. And if this now is enough, then I would leave it at that. If it seems like it's important for me once more, or twice more or something. I thought this would last for five minutes and it's been longer. Maybe there's been a chance to say what needs to be said now. And I have to think about that. I don't know.

QUESTION: When you all left the deliberation room for the last time, what was it like in there? I know you don't want to say about votes and all that, but give us a sense of a tone inside there.

DEUTCHMAN: I think there were a lot of very strong feelings. And a feeling of frustration that we weren't at a place where we were

unanimous. And frustration at trying to find out how we could get to that kind of place, and not knowing how we could do that. So there were strong feelings and there was a whole lot of frustration. And a real attempt being made to keep things civil and considerate of each other, but some people feeling really so strongly, that they couldn't understand how someone else would have a different view. And so it was tense.

QUESTION: Some have reported less than civil exchanges?

DEUTCHMAN: It hadn't gotten to that place.

QUESTION: Was heard that there yelling among the jurors yesterday?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think -- I wouldn't call it yelling. I think there were people who had really strong feelings and voices raised a little but I don't think -- I wouldn't call it yelling and wouldn't call it any kind of thing where someone was intimidating or trying force someone to change their mind.

QUESTION: Niki, you gave a lot of credence to Ron Woods, FBI service, but would it change your opinion, knowing that he hasn't been in the FBI for more than 25 years?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that they made a very good presentation. They did a very good job of the defense for Terry Nichols.

QUESTION: Why don't you interpret the go-for-it letter that was left behind?

DEUTCHMAN: That was very troubling to everyone. And I don't think there was one interpretation of that by the jurors.

QUESTION: We missed the question.

DEUTCHMAN: The go-for-it letter. I think that was some -- those who felt like there might have been coercion, I think that that was one of the things that helped to show that there might have been. Why would he write a letter when he'd gone to the Philippines a lot of times before, and hadn't taken care of setting all his affairs in order and writing a will and all of that. Why would he do that at this time and then talk to his son, and his son think that his dad was never coming home again. That's one thing that may have pointed toward coercion.

QUESTION: Was he as good a father as the defense wanted you to believe.

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know. I wasn't there.

QUESTION: Do you think there was sentiment among the jury that he was coerced?

DEUTCHMAN: Probably, not by many.

QUESTION: Have you talked to other jurors about talking to the media? Are you speaking for all of them, or did that come up?

DEUTCHMAN: I decided a few days ago that it might be easier to try to do this for me to do this at once instead of having everybody pestering. I told the other jurors I thought I might do that and invited anyone who wanted to join me. I think there were several jurors who felt like they really didn't want to talk to any

media at all for any reason, and others who all of us -- many of us have different opinions, and I think that others who might want to talk to the media would want to speak for themselves and not have it be part of a group thing.

QUESTION: Niki, what is your opinion now about capital punishment, now as you have lived through this trial? Capital punishment as a concept?

DEUTCHMAN: I guess, basically it hasn't changed a whole lot. I think that as a general idea, it's a very bad idea. But I think when there's public potential -- public great harm, by someone who has been involved with something like this, you know, someone who has potential for creating a large amount of death and destruction. If they have been involved in something like that, are convicted of something like that, if they remain alive and in prison, they are a hero figure, and that there also is contact with people who are in prison, and that it certainly could be a possibility to still be involved with further things, and that that's a threat that probably is not reasonable.

QUESTION: Your emotional reaction during jury selection, you were the first person spoken to, and you cried when you talked about capital punishment. I'm sure you recall that. Now having gone through it emotionally how do you feel about it?

DEUTCHMAN: I basically feel the same as I felt then. I've been struggling with it for a while, before I got to the interview process. As they asked me then, this is theory and later on it may be reality, and for me actually being there and being questioned about it made it reality and no longer theory.

QUESTION: Did you think that Michael Tigar was ever talking really to you during the penalty phase, when he talked about Israel and about the mercy extended to various people -- did you ever get that sense, and with the midwife and your occupation, did you ever feel like that?

DEUTCHMAN: There were a couple of times when one of the attorneys -when something was talked about a book about lamaze (ph) or something else, one of the attorneys would look and smile about me. I suspect that that was directed at me. But the comments made to the court in general, I think were not necessarily directed towards me.

QUESTION: Do you think Terry Nichols in prison could pose such a threat in the future?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know.

QUESTION: Based on what you heard, do you agree with the McVeigh verdict and death sentence?

DEUTCHMAN: Yes.

QUESTION: Were you relieved when you realized you would be a part of sentencing Nichols to death?

DEUTCHMAN: My personal feeling was that, given who we were as a jury, and how we felt as a jury, that was the most likely way for that for the judge to decide was the most likely way it was going to end up, and I think I feel most comfortable with that.

QUESTION: Some of the McVeigh jurors have said in effect, that they feel that you dropped the ball, and that they, given what they saw during the McVeigh trial would have convicted Terry Nichols on the same counts as McVeigh.

How would you respond to them?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that they're different people, and they're different trials. I think the government -- the indictments were worded Terry McVeigh and Terry Nichols, and then each of the things. So they include both names in everything. And we heard enough evidence in this to be able, easily to make a decision about Timothy McVeigh. But the evidence was not so easy to do something with -- in terms of Terry Nichols, for us.

QUESTION: Niki, it was also noted that in the last couple days when you entered the courtroom you smiled broadly at the defense, not at the prosecution.

DEUTCHMAN: Oh, I did too.

QUESTION: OK.

DEUTCHMAN: At both.

QUESTION: Well, that part wasn't noted. So there was speculation on what that meant. Did it mean anything?

DEUTCHMAN: It didn't mean anything. I admire both sets of attorneys as people, and as people who were doing their jobs. I guess there is one other thing that might be an issue. That is: There were attempts occasionally at using distortion and innuendo, both in the ways the questions were asked, and certainly in the closing -- opening and closing arguments that were used on both sides, but were used -- it was -- it was less obvious, I guess I should say, with the prosecution than it was with the defense, and I think it backfired. And I think it's good that it backfired with this jury, because innuendo and distortion is not -- um -- honest.

QUESTION: Give us an example, please.

DEUTCHMAN: I'm not good at remembering specific examples. There were some statements that Pat Ryan made in his closing arguments that rephrased some of the words of some of the witnesses. And the rephrasing was just a word

or two, but it changed the connotation. And it's examples like that, things like that.

QUESTION: The prosecution did it more egregiously you felt than the defense?

DEUTCHMAN: It was less obvious with the prosecution than it was with the defense. I think that it is probably part of what happens any time, especially when there's closing arguments, but Michael Tigar had a smile on his face and sort of looked at everyone with this twinkle in his eye as he was making some of those innuendoes, which were fairly mild. And fairly easy to recognize, especially because he gave a lot of cues when he was doing that.

QUESTION: Any of those come to mind?

DEUTCHMAN: No. No. But I felt like it was easier to tell and it was more with a sense of drama than an urgency to change or alter how you felt about something.

QUESTION: So it was less offensive to you?

DEUTCHMAN: Pardon me?

QUESTION: So it was less offensive then?

DEUTCHMAN: It was less offensive and it was easier to spot. And I think that that's useful. When people are considering things, jurors are human beings like anybody else, and some people are going to see that, and some people aren't. And it's useful to know when that's going on and consider it accordingly.

QUESTION: It sounds like you didn't trust what you were hearing from the prosecution?

DEUTCHMAN: Um, it was conclusions about things and phrases about things and including -- for example, when Ms. Wilkinson was doing her closing arguments, she went through a whole lot of the things of the evidence, and it was the prosecution's interpretation of that evidence. And it's reasonable that they would talk about the evidence according to their view of things, but it was very obviously not the view of all the jurors. And we had looked at the same evidence and considered it very strongly, and come up with our own conclusions about it. So them saying this is how it is, wasn't necessarily in agreement with how the jury -- you know, this was closing arguments for the sentencing phase, so we'd already come up with our verdict and knew very well what that meant to us.

QUESTION: How did you feel about the Elvis sightings?

QUESTION: So you suggested that Terry Nichols was building a life and not a bomb -- was...

DEUTCHMAN: Well I think he was building a life. He may also had been building a bomb. I don't know.

QUESTION: Does the jury realize that they still have to go through a sentencing phase after the guilt phase. It looks like some looked surprised. Did you know that?

DEUTCHMAN: We asked for a vote on that. Once we got into our deliberations in the sentencing phase. How many people knew that this meant we were going to have to do this. There were a few jurors who knew that, and most of us didn't. And I think it wouldn't -- and we talked about that also, it wouldn't have made a difference in what our deliberations were and what our conclusion was the first time, but there were several of us who were surprised and who thought we probably were done. And then it was like oh, no, look what we're in for now.

QUESTION: Were your verdicts in the guilt phase, in any way a compromise?

DEUTCHMAN: When you're given instructions that say, in effect, this -- you have to come up with a verdict, and that when two possible choices, exist, one of guilty and one of innocence, then because it's innocent until proven guilty, that says there is a reasonable doubt and the finding of innocence has been found. There has to be compromise.

QUESTION: But did you find any inconsistency yourself in -- we asked this before I think, in the conspiracy verdict where you had to answer the two questions: Was death a foreseeable result, and then define the guilty verdicts on involuntary manslaughter, which does not imply intent. Do you see...

DEUTCHMAN: I can see why it would be hard to wrap around that. But there were a fair number of jurors who were not convinced of the extent of his involvement, or his reasons for involvement. And that that's a lot of where that came from. I think that was part of the frustration in the sentencing phase. Because the -- what we were asked to consider used words that sounded very similar to the words of the conviction conspiracy. And there were those among the jurors who felt like they really were -- could be interpreted as saying different things, and that was some of the frustration that was felt during this last phase of the deliberations.

QUESTION: Could you give us a sense again of how many times you went around the table, or took a vote. Was it...

DEUTCHMAN: It was many.

QUESTION: Less than five? Many?

DEUTCHMAN: It was many especially in the guilty phase. It was many.

QUESTION: Were you ever close to murder charges in the first phase? Was it ever close to being first-degree murder?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't know if that's reasonable for me to answer or not. I think the final conclusion is enough for that.

QUESTION: In Mr. Tigar's words, what about the prosecutors, Wilkinson and Mackey? What did you think of them as lawyers?

DEUTCHMAN: I felt that Mr. Mackey and Ms. Wilkinson, especially took their job very seriously and very honestly, and for the most part, except foreclosing arguments, presented things very honestly and appropriately. Without trying to twist things one way or another but simply presenting them for what they were.

QUESTION: Were they good lawyers?

DEUTCHMAN: I think they are very good lawyers.

QUESTION: Did you say think they really were until it came time for the closing arguments.

DEUTCHMAN: I think they were still good lawyers then, but I think that probably some innuendo can't be avoided, and there was a lot.

QUESTION: Good lawyers, but was the defense better, Michael Tigar better than them?

DEUTCHMAN: The government wasn't able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, a whole lot of the evidence. And that isn't entirely the attorneys. That's partly what they're given as evidence to be able to work with.

QUESTION: You'd rather have Michael Tigar as an attorney than Seth Wilkinson?

DEUTCHMAN: I would be comfortable with either of those.

QUESTION: Do you think it helped or hurt not to have been sequestered? What did you think of that decision?

DEUTCHMAN: I'm really glad we weren't. My life was upside down enough as it was. I think that during deliberations, I occasionally had the feeling that it might have been easier. To just kind of stay there and be with it. That coming home and switching gears and doing

home things, it was good that I could do that because of our schedule, and because of my family, but it was hard.

QUESTION: What did you say to the judge in the note that you sent him?

DEUTCHMAN: If he wishes to talk about that, he can. He actually talked about the contents of the note this morning. So.

QUESTION: Niki, what was your opinion about Pat Ryan?

DEUTCHMAN: I think he's someone who is really involved, who cares a whole lot about this. Obviously, he's the attorney for the state of Oklahoma. I think he probably feels very deeply that Terry Nichols is totally guilty, and is doing the best that he can to take care of that. You know, if someone is guilty you do what you can to prosecute them. And I think he's doing did the best, that is possible, that he knows how to be able to bring that about. I feel like he used a fair amount, not only in the closing arguments, but sometimes during the questioning of distortion and innuendo. I personally didn't appreciate that.

QUESTION: What did you personally do to avoid news accounts during the course of the trial?

DEUTCHMAN: If the news was on and they said, and now the Terry Nichols trial, we turned it off until it was over. I haven't read the paper, more than once or twice, skipping over the parts about the trial, since the whole thing started. Occasionally people will say hey, there was an article that said, da-da, da-da, and I said I can't talk about this. I think that all of us made a real effort to stay away from it as much as we could.

QUESTION: Are you going to go back and read the articles?

DEUTCHMAN: Absolutely.

QUESTION: How did the jurors leave each other at the end there, leaving the courthouse. Was it cordial, did they hug, what did they do?

DEUTCHMAN: Some of the jurors hugged. Some of them didn't. I think there was still a lot of thoughtfulness, you know, people were really thinking about what had happened. And there were some who were trying to reconcile things with -- I think those who especially who felt like we needed to spend a little bit more time, felt like it ended before they had a chance to do that, and were, you know, dealing with that a little bit.

QUESTION: Any plans to get together in the future? Any telephone numbers exchanged?

DEUTCHMAN: Some.

QUESTION: Some people are interpreting your verdict jointly, as saying, it's OK to build the bomb, just don't plant it, and you could get away with it.

What would your response to that be?

DEUTCHMAN: I think that there were jurors who felt like he was not involved with the bomb at all.

QUESTION: What happens if you get a jury summons again in the mail?

DEUTCHMAN: Well, I will probably answer it. But there is a form you fill out at the beginning, at the very beginning of the process that says: Have you ever served on a jury? I expect I would say yes I have, and I don't plan to serve another one. I think that's probably people who are leaving. I think we have done enough.

QUESTION: Thank you very much Niki.

QUESTION: When the victims family were testifying, you closed your eyes. Why?

QUESTION: You turned away sometimes from them, it seemed.

DEUTCHMAN: A truthful answer to that, is that I do energetic healing work, and it seemed to me there were a very lot of very wounded people testifying, and who were in the courtroom. And if it were possible for there to be healing involved in some of this process and some healing energy could be made available for that to happen, if anyone should choose to. And I was able to do that, that I wanted to do that. And so, truthfully that is what was happening. I was both listening and sort of something between meditating and praying.

QUESTION: What is the energetic healing?

DEUTCHMAN: That's another whole -- I'm getting the message here. I think that's probably...

QUESTION: How will you be healed now? What will you do? You are not going to Disneyland.

DEUTCHMAN: I'm not going to Disneyland.

QUESTION: Maybe one last thing Niki, if I could, you said some people felt he wasn't involved at all. Does that mean...

DEUTCHMAN: In building the bomb.

QUESTION: ... in building the bomb. Does that mean some people, nevertheless felt forced into the conspiracy verdict?

DEUTCHMAN: No, there were people who felt like he was involved; that he knew that there was a plan that involved something big and bad and destructive; but not necessarily what it was, and some who even felt like they didn't know necessarily, that he might not have known necessarily when it was going to be.

QUESTION: Did you ever come close to deadlocking on the guilt part?

DEUTCHMAN: I don't think I need to say anything one way or another about that. I think we came to a conclusion, and I feel comfortable with what that conclusion was. I think most of the jurors felt at least comfortable with it, and some of them felt very comfortable with it.

Thank you.

QUESTION: Thank you very much. Thank you.

END