In April 2013, I watched the police response in the days following the Boston Marathon bombing in awe. I had never associated the vehicles, weapons and tactics used by officers after that attack with domestic police work. I grew up in the War on Drugs era, when my father was a police officer in a city bordering Detroit. He held that job for 29 years, then became a member of SWAT when his city formed a team in 1989. But since my father had retired from the force in 2002, I wasn’t familiar with the effect the War on Terror had wielded on police work. Making this film was an attempt to understand what had changed.

Knowing that interviews with experts would do little to communicate the on-the-ground reality of American policing, we instead set out to give the viewer a direct experience. We attended police conventions throughout the country and started conversations with SWAT officers at equipment expos and a seemingly endless cascade of happy hours, offering the only thing we could: an authentic portrayal of whatever we filmed. On more than one occasion, we were on our way to the airport, camera in hand, only to receive a phone call from our contact in a police department instructing us not to come. Our access seemed to be directly tied to the amount of negative press the police were getting at any given time. It became increasingly difficult to get access after the events in Ferguson, Mo., and there were many times we thought we would have to stop production altogether. The urgency of the situation, however, motivated us to continue.

We noticed a trend in early 2014 of police departments being solicited by technology companies offering new tools to help alleviate dwindling operating budgets and loss of personnel. One technology provider we filmed offered the same IBM platform the National Security Agency uses to collect web communications to police departments for as little as 1,000 dollars per year. In 2014 and 2015, we watched as departments throughout the county adapted the technologies without any guidelines or policy directives governing their use. At times, companies would make a chief of police sign a nondisclosure agreement preventing them from telling their communities they even had the technologies. The mantra we would continue to hear was that the police couldn’t let terrorists know about the tools they were using to intercept their plots. The problem is, in three years of filming police, we never witnessed an opportunity to use the equipment on domestic terrorism. Instead, the military surplus equipment and surveillance technology were used on a day-to-day basis to serve search warrants, almost always for drugs.
In hindsight, it’s not hard to understand how we arrived at the current state of policing in America. Since 9/11, the federal government has given police departments more than 40 billion dollars in equipment with no stipulations on how it should be deployed nor any reporting requirements. Additionally, the federal government created a loophole that allowed police departments to keep the majority of the money and property seized during search warrants to supplement their operating revenue. If a police department makes a portion of its operating revenue from ticketing citizens or seizing their assets, then police officers become de facto tax collectors. We met many officers who said they hadn’t signed up for that.

Everyone wants to know what my father thinks of the film, and in all honesty, I think it pains him. It’s hard to watch the profession to which you dedicated your life evolve into something completely unrecognizable. During the 13 years my father was on SWAT, from 1989 to 2002, his team conducted 29 search warrants total. Compare that to today, when departments of a similar size that we filmed conduct more than 200 a year.

As we have begun to share the film, the overwhelming response from audiences has been shock and disbelief. I can say that we were just as shocked while filming the material. Going in, we had no idea what we were going to find. We kept thinking we were creating opportunities to film with departments that would show the full spectrum of the SWAT experience, but time and time again, we found ourselves inside homes searching for things that we never found. It’s my hope that both community members and officers working hard to challenge the culture of policing within their departments use this film to illustrate the dire need for change.

Craig Atkinson
Director, Do Not Resist
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A compelling exploration of the rapid militarization of local police in the United States since 9/11, *Do Not Resist* (90 min.) puts viewers in the center of the action, taking us inside a police training seminar that teaches the importance of “righteous violence”; on a ride-along with a SWAT team conducting a drug raid; to the middle of street protests in Ferguson, Missouri and a city council meeting in Concord, New Hampshire; even to the floor of a congressional hearing on the proliferation of military equipment in small-town police departments. What started as preparedness for a war on terrorists has morphed into a military-style war on drugs and protesters, and in many places, a perceived war on certain segments of the community.

As he documents this chilling new trend, filmmaker Craig Atkinson (the son of a SWAT team member) brings in perspectives from criminal justice reformers, policymakers, law enforcement leaders, officers on the ground, and the citizens who are supposed to feel safer (but often don’t). In a non-partisan way, Atkinson looks at the changes in police tactics, training, and equipment, forcing viewers—and communities—to ask whether militarization supports or undermines the traditional domestic law enforcement mission to serve and protect.
Do Not Resist is well suited for use in a variety of settings and is especially recommended for use with:

- Your local PBS station
- Groups that have discussed previous PBS and POV films relating to law enforcement policies and tactics, including *Out in the Night*, *Every Mother’s Son*, or *15 to Life*.
- Groups focused on any of the issues listed in the “Key Issues” section
- High school students, youth groups and clubs
- Faith-based organizations and institutions
- Civic, fraternal, political advocacy and community groups
- Academic departments and student groups at colleges, universities and high schools
- Community organizations with a mission to promote education and learning, such as local libraries
- Cultural, art and historical organizations, institutions and museums

Do Not Resist is an excellent tool for outreach and will be of special interest to people looking to explore the following topics:

- activism
- Black Lives Matter
- constitutional law
- democracy
- law and order
- law enforcement
- militarization of police
- police tactics and training
- police-community relations
- street protest
- SWAT teams
- “war on drugs”

### Using This Guide

This guide is an invitation to dialogue. It is based on a belief in the power of human connection, designed for people who want to use Do Not Resist to engage family, friends, classmates, colleagues and communities. In contrast to initiatives that foster debates in which participants try to convince others that they are right, this document envisions conversations undertaken in a spirit of openness in which people try to understand one another and expand their thinking by sharing viewpoints and listening actively.

The discussion prompts are intentionally crafted to help a wide range of audiences think more deeply about the issues in the film. Rather than attempting to address them all, choose one or two that best meet your needs and interests. And be sure to leave time to consider taking action. Planning next steps can help people leave the room feeling energized and optimistic, even in instances when conversations have been difficult.

For more detailed event planning and facilitation tips, visit [www.pov.org/engage](http://www.pov.org/engage)
Quick Facts and Definitions

What is community policing?
Community policing is a policing strategy that seeks to develop relationships between officers and communities as a means to solve and prevent crime. Officers are assigned to certain neighborhoods on a consistent basis, enabling them to communicate clearly and earn the trust of local residents, organizations and leaders. Community policing was conceived as an alternative to traditional policing, which prioritizes responding to emergency calls and apprehending suspects after an incident.

What is civil asset forfeiture?
Civil asset forfeiture is a process by which law enforcement may seize an individual’s property that they allege is involved in a crime. Suspects do not need to be convicted of a crime or even arrested for police officers to seize cash, personal items or cars; once confiscated, the assets belong to the department, and it is very difficult to regain them legally.

Although authorized by federal and state laws, civil asset forfeiture has become controversial, with critics charging that the standard for suspects is too low and that police are motivated to seize valuable assets to profit their departments.

Who was Michael Brown? What was the cause of the protests in Ferguson, Missouri?
Michael Brown was an unarmed African-American teenager who was shot and killed in Ferguson, Missouri on August 9, 2014 by Darren Wilson, a white police officer. The shooting, which witnesses claimed was without provocation, sparked protests against the epidemic of police violence against Black people in the United States; a grand jury’s decision not to indict Wilson on November 24, 2014 prompted more demonstrations. The protests began in Ferguson and quickly spread via social media into a nationwide youth-led racial justice movement known as Black Lives Matter. The US Department of Justice issued two reports; one concluded that the shooting did not violate federal law, and the other asserted that there were discriminatory long-time law en-
forcer practices in the city disproportionately affecting the African-American community.

What is the 1033 Program?

Under the federal 1033 Program, state and local law enforcement agencies can obtain excess military supplies and equipment at no cost. Initiated by the 1990 National Defense Authorization Act, the 1033 program has authorized the transfer of more than $5 billion worth of military equipment to local agencies, including automatic rifles, Humvees, and armored vehicles. After photos of the Ferguson police using tanks and smoke bombs to quell protests shocked the nation in 2014, President Obama tightened standards on the 1033 program; however, Attorney General Jeff Sessions restored the program in 2017.

The United States Law Enforcement Structure

The intricate structure of the United States law enforcement system makes meaningful reform difficult. Any particular recommendation would need to be adopted by the 18,000 separate police departments in the U.S. While the federal government can provide fiscal incentives, it cannot dictate policy to local departments.

21st-Century Policing Tools

Many of the tools in place today in police departments across the United States have their roots in the Richard Nixon presidency and his “war on drugs.” Public figures such as President Richard Nixon, First Lady Nancy Reagan, President Bill Clinton and President George H.W. Bush have pushed for policies to fight drug use—mandatory minimum prison sentences for possession, increased defense spending for use against countries that produce and export drugs, immigration restrictions—based on the fear-mongering advanced by Nixon that drug use in America was “public enemy number one.” One of Nixon’s top advisers has since admitted that the antidrug legislation was passed primarily to disrupt Black communities and punish antiwar liberals. Policies such as stop-and-frisk, three-strikes laws and the 1994 crime bill laid the groundwork for the 1033 Program to exacerbate existing policing policy issues.

According to analysis by the National Center for Victims of Crime, crime rates have decreased significantly, particularly...
when compared to the 1970s and the 1980s. Economists and criminal justice experts widely agree that skyrocketing incarceration rates over the past several decades played only a minor role in overall crime reduction. However, Americans still believe that crime rates are higher and that the world is more dangerous than it is in reality, especially as people see media reporting more crime—and reporting extensively on deadlier attacks. In other words, despite falling crime rates, fear of crime and terrorism has increased. And elected officials are expected to respond.

In 2015, the president's task force on 21st-century policing issued recommendations organized around six main pillars, leading with building trust and legitimacy. The task force noted, "Law enforcement cannot build community trust if it is seen as an occupying force coming in from outside to impose control on the community." When police departments across the country face underfunding and understaffing, however, they increasingly rely on tools such as predictive policing and the 1033 Program, along with policies like civil asset forfeiture.

Technologies that have come of age in the past fifteen years are exacerbating issues of privacy and encryption. Increasingly, tensions surround law enforcement's use of search engine histories, GPS locations, drones, encrypted phones and other sources of data on human movement and behavior, and there are questions about the constitutionality of such use.

**Predictive Policing**

Predictive policing involves software that claims it can forecast when and where crimes may occur based on prior crime reports. Ideally, police departments would use the information to increase visibility and community outreach, reducing crime by deploying officers and resources to locations where crime is "more likely," based on the software. The software is used by 20 of the 50 largest police forces in the U.S., and, as of 2014, 70 percent of departments responding to a national survey noted they expected to implement it within several years.

There are widespread concerns among data scientists, legal experts and some police departments over the use of this technology. The methodology has not been seen to
work as designed; only a handful of tests have been done independent of the software companies, showing mostly negative results. The police chief of Oakland, California, for example, argued that the unintended consequences of the technology—especially the potential for focusing on minority neighborhoods—would erode community trust. Police departments also appear to be mixed as to whether the primary goal of predictive software is to prevent crime by increasing visibility of law enforcement or simply to catch more criminals.

There are also questions of whether predictive policing is constitutional, especially when police departments are using it without strong community oversight or transparency of the methodology and how it is applied. First, using past crime as a model for predicting future crimes ensures that racial bias within a police department will continue, may be unconstitutional. For example, as of 2013, Black Americans represent 13 percent of the U.S. population and approximately the same percentage of drug users, but they represent 44 percent of those incarcerated for drug crimes. Second, predictive policing presents another way in which juries and judges may unfairly believe these kinds of technologies—much like DNA or fingerprint evidence—without fully understanding their limitations.

Third, predictive policing that leads to a “stop” and/or an arrest may lack the “reasonable suspicion” standard required by courts. Specifically, many police departments have told their officers not to use someone’s presence at a location—one that was forecast by predictive policing software to have higher probability of crime at a given time—as a basis for stopping someone to question or search them, but that can be difficult for departments to enforce.

1033 Program

The 1033 Program was launched in 1990 to transfer surplus military equipment to police departments and other law enforcement agencies at no cost. Managed by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), the 1033 Program seeks to provide excess U.S. Department of Defense property to federal,
state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies. The Law Enforcement Support Office in the DLA tracks the issued property, including providing required permission before a law enforcement agency can transfer, turn in or dispose of any of the property. From its inception to the end of 2014, the 1033 Program provided more than $5.1 billion worth of property to more than 8,000 agencies.

After President Obama cut back the 1033 Program drastically in 2015, in response to public reactions to seeing the military equipment being used in Ferguson, Missouri, and other public protests, Attorney General Jeff Sessions in August 2017 announced its revival, telling the National Fraternal Order of Police conference, “We will not put superficial concerns above public safety.” President Trump issued an executive order later that month that allowed local law enforcement agencies to acquire equipment and weapons under the 1033 Program without requiring approval from local governments. Each participating agency must meet three criteria: the agency's primary function is enforcement of laws; the agency’s officers are compensated; and the agency’s officers have the powers of arrest and apprehension.

According to an editorial by former New York Police Department commissioner and convicted felon Bernard Kerik, the 1033 Program helps to fill gaps left by scarce resources allocated by local jurisdictions, though local police departments and local jurisdictions requesting the surplus weapons and equipment should be held accountable to ensure police militarization is curbed. He further noted that armored vehicles were both needed and used as intended when local law enforcement agencies responded to terrorist attacks in San Bernardino, California, and the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida; when localities and communities provide oversight to ensure such equipment is deployed only when necessary, the program may be mutually beneficial and possibly help to restore trust in local police departments. Proper training to use the equipment and clear policies by the police departments over how and when the equipment can be used are also cited by crime and justice policy experts as essential to citizen approval.
Civil Asset Forfeiture

Civil asset forfeiture as a general policy in the United States has been in place since the 1700s, when English customs officials could enter homes or vessels and seize whatever was decided to be contraband; legal scholars have noted that rejection of this procedure was among the key grievances that led the American Revolution. The policy was significantly ramped up under the “war on drugs,” during the 1970s and 1980s, when law enforcement officers were newly empowered to seize money and property tied to the production of illegal drugs, a move aimed at disrupting organized crime and drug lords. In 1984, the Comprehensive Crime Control Act established a fund to return to local law enforcement agencies most of the funds they seized, and within the decade, proceeds nationally from forfeitures rose to more than $500 million from around $25 million. Ultimately, the practice of civil asset forfeiture was extended to any property suspected of being involved in criminal activity, not just the drug trade, and, as of 2017, revenue from forfeitures reached nearly $28 billion over the prior decade.

In 2015, President Obama pledged to restrict the use of civil asset forfeitures as part of broader criminal justice reforms. The reforms were criticized as being insufficient, and in 2017, under President Trump, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the restrictions would be rolled back and the forfeiture program would instead be broadened. However, lasting reform of the program may still be forthcoming; a lawyer for the American Civil Liberties Union cited several polls that indicate 80 percent of Americans oppose the practice. Many states over the past few decades have attempted to pass their own reforms. The program has been condemned by both liberal and conservative political groups, and U.S. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas indicated in a court decision that he questions the constitutionality of the practice and that civil asset forfeiture is “certainly worthy of consideration in greater detail.”
Sources


PBS. “The War on Drugs.” http://www.pbs.org/black-culture/connect/talk-back/war-on-drugs/


Selected People Featured in *Do Not Resist*

**Dave Grossman** - Dave Grossman is a prominent trainer of U.S. military and local law enforcement.

**Tom Coburn** - U.S. senator from Oklahoma from 2005 to 2015.

**Claire McCaskill** - Senior U.S. senator from Missouri.

**Rand Paul** - U.S. senator from Kentucky.

**Brian Kamoie** - Assistant administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for Grant Programs.

**Alan Estevez** - Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.
Selected People Featured in *Do Not Resist*


**Richard Berk** – Professor of Criminology and Statistics at the University of Pennsylvania.

**Ross McNutt** – Founder, Persistent Surveillance Systems.
Immediately after the film, you may want to give people a few quiet moments to reflect on what they have seen or pose a general question (examples below) and give people some time to themselves to jot down or think about their answers before opening the discussion:

- If a friend asked you what this film was about, what would you say?
- Did anything in the film surprise you?
- If you could ask anyone in the film a single question, whom would you ask and what would you ask them?
- Describe a moment or scene in the film that you found particularly disturbing or moving. What was it about that scene that was especially compelling for you?

At the end of your discussion, to help people synthesize what they’ve experienced and move the focus from dialogue to action steps, you may want to choose one of these questions:

- What did you learn from this film that you wish everyone knew? What would change if everyone knew it?
- If you could require one person (or one group) to view this film, who would it be? What do you hope their main takeaway would be?
- Complete this sentence: I am inspired by this film (or discussion) to __________.
**Defining the Job and the Need**

What did you learn from this film about the militarization of local law enforcement agencies?

Compare/contrast what you see in the film with your own experience or your own community. What was familiar? What was different?

What’s the slogan or mission statement of your local police department? In your view, how does the acquisition of military gear and training support or undermine that mission?

Lieutenant Dave Grossman tells officers that their job is to “fight violence” with “superior violence.” Is that how you would define the job? Is that what you see police in the film doing?

FBI director during filming James Comey responds to concerns about “warrior cops” and the militarization of police: “Because monsters are real, we need a range of weapons and equipment to respond and protect our fellow citizens and protect ourselves.” Is militarization of police the only way to fight “monsters”? Is it the best way? In your view, what specific situations might justify police deployment of military-style tactics and equipment?

**Militarization and Public Protest**

Imagine being a non-violent protester in Ferguson. What do you think it felt like to look around and see police snipers, armored vehicles and officers in full military gear, all focused on you? Now imagine you are one of the officers. Who is the enemy you are fighting? How will you distinguish them from the citizens you are sworn to protect?

The 1033 Program was billed as necessary for homeland security, separate from law enforcement efforts. Why is equipment designated to defeat terrorists being used on protesting citizens?

Do you think that the tactics used in Ferguson would have been different if the protestors had not been people of color? Why weren’t the police using similar tactics during the protests in Charlottesville, Virginia? Should the police there have used similar tactics?
Police warn Ferguson protesters to disperse and one community member urges people to obey because they can’t guarantee anyone’s safety after the midnight curfew. If you were a protester, how would you interpret that warning? As you looked around, who would you perceive as the most likely threat to your safety?

Chicago police superintendent Garry McCarthy says, “What happened in Ferguson—the actual practice of how the demonstrations were handled—I think we’re all embarrassed by it, quite frankly, in law enforcement. I sat there aghast watching it. The simplest issue of the use of tear gas: in my book, if you fire tear gas, you’ve got a riot now.” What was your reaction to what you saw? What would you identify as cause and effect? Did police tactics provoke or limit violence (or both)? What could have been done to de-escalate the situation?

The War on Drugs

What’s the impact on a community or neighborhood of repeated raids like the ones shown in the film? What are the long-term consequences, for victims, for communities and for law enforcement, when people stop trusting that the police are serving the cause of justice?

Would these raids be viewed differently if carried out in a predominantly white neighborhood, perhaps looking for teens with marijuana or unauthorized prescription drugs? Are these tactics acceptable in white rural areas where the opioid epidemic has hit hardest?

The commanding officer of the team that came up empty on the supposed stash house raid says they do 200 of these a year, and talks about raiding the same house multiple times, even identifying where they dented doors on prior raids. If they are going to the same place again and again, shouldn’t that be a signal that their tactics aren’t working to end the problem? Why don’t the police see it that way?

After the drug raid, the mother says it felt like they were looking for terrorist: “They tore down my house. My son
went to jail... for a gram and a half that they shook out the bottom of a book bag.” And though the son got out of jail the same night, he now has court fees, a record, no way to pay for the tools he needs for his landscaping business (so, potentially, no income because they seized his cash) and he missed school. Is this level of disruption to people’s lives acceptable as collateral damage in the war on drugs?

The father asks who is going to pay for the windows that the team blew out. Because police said the tactic was necessary as a distraction to keep their team safe, and because they found some drugs (even though it was only a tiny amount of marijuana, which, albeit illegal, wasn’t what they were seeking), the police do not have to pay. If the city or police department (i.e., the taxpayers) had to absorb repair costs, do you think police practice would change?

After the raid has underwhelming results, the lead officer explains, “It happens. Drug warrants are, you know, 50/50.” In your view, is that an acceptable percentage given the impact on people’s lives and community trust?

Do you see any connections between the raids and warrants served by SWAT teams and the protests in Ferguson?

Training

In his training session, Dave Grossman says, “You are to your city, your county, your state what the frontiersman was to the frontier.” Why do you think he chose to reference “the frontiersman”? Why might Grossman rely on imagery that evokes traditional notions of manhood?

Grossman exhorts his audience, “What do you fight [violence] with? Superior violence. Righteous violence, yeah? Violence is your tool.” In the context of domestic law enforcement, what is “righteous” violence? Can you think of an example, either from the film or from your own experience?

What was your reaction to Grossman’s suggestion that those who successfully use violence will be rewarded with great sex? Where else have you heard similar promises of sex in exchange for committing violence?
Do you think it’s a good idea to continue to use Dave Grossman’s books as required reading at the FBI Academy and police academies throughout the country? Why or why not?

At the end of a night confronting protesters in Ferguson, one officer asks another, “Did you have fun?” Then they “shield bump.” If you were a supervisor and overheard this, would it concern you? Why or why not? What would you do/say?

Do you think that racism or implicit bias plays a role in law enforcement decisions to deploy military tactics? What’s your evidence? What type of training might decrease the chance that bias factors into the decision?

A wrongly convicted man testifies before a Congressional task force: “You have to deal with your hiring practices, who you putting in them uniforms, because a badge is a powerful thing.” If you were in charge of hiring for your police department, what characteristics or qualities would you look for? Would you seek out the type of people who find Grossman’s message about violence and manhood appealing? Why or why not?

An analyst inspects video feeds of a wide-scale aerial surveillance system being utilized by local police departments.

Photo courtesy of VANISH Films

Surveillance

The film discusses several newer technologies. Would you be comfortable with the following being deployed in your community? Why or why not?:

- body cameras for police
- license plate scanning
- facial recognition software
- aerial surveillance from aircraft, satellites and drones
- surveillance cameras posted on traffic signs, utility poles or buildings
- forecasting from “big data” sets that can create profiles identifying likely criminals
- law enforcement routinely scanning social media

Los Angeles Police Department sergeant Paula Davidson says people mistakenly believe that police aren’t permitted
to run a license plate even if they haven’t seen you do anything wrong. She says, “Well, yes, we can. You just hope that everybody who runs them are running them for the right reason.” What would the wrong reasons be (i.e., what’s the danger of allowing police to run plates for any reason whenever they want)?

Policy

At a Concord, New Hampshire city council meeting a man holds a sign that says, “More Mayberry, Less Fallujah.” What does that mean?

Is community oversight of local police departments a good idea?

A former U.S. Marine at the Concord meeting notes, “It’s unlawful or unconstitutional to use American troops on American soil.” He also advises city leaders, “There’s always free cheese in the mousetrap.” If military equipment is the “cheese,” what’s the “trap”? Why would posse comitatus (the legal principle that U.S. troops should not be used against U.S. citizens on American soil) apply here and why would it be of concern? Why do you think the city council approves the acquisition of military equipment despite his warning?

Rather than identifying a need and then looking for equipment, the sheriff of Juneau County, Wisconsin (pop. 26,000) peruses a catalog of the military equipment that the government is making available and then says, “Oh, we could use that.” Why might that practice signal a problem in the system?

Consider the following points that senators bring up during the hearing on the 1033 Program:

Why would the government make bayonets available to local police departments?

Why are police departments using the equipment for riot suppression when the program’s policy specifically prohibits that use?

Why is there no policy to track how the military equipment is used?

Why is 36 percent of equipment provided new (“condition A”), not used?

Why would a small community with one sworn officer (a sheriff) need an MRAP at all. And why would it receive two MRAPs, especially when the program says each community can only receive one?

What questions would you ask if you were a senator? Given the concerns, would you vote to shut down the program? Why or why not?

Militarization and American Values

Do you think the militarization of police makes American democracy stronger? Why or why not?

Who benefits from the militarization of police? Who is most likely to be harmed by the shift from community policing to military tactics?

When you hear the phrase “law and order,” what images come to mind? Do they include what we see in the film: SWAT teams serving warrants, conducting drug raids and confronting protesters in Ferguson?

Dave Grossman calls people who object to militarizing the police “idiots” and threatens that “the individuals who tried to disarm our cops will be hunted down,” attacked, and shamed. Do you consider this rhetoric patriotic? Why or why not? What’s the distinction between de-militarizing and de-arming?

One Concord, New Hampshire citizen cites a statistic from the federal government’s National Safety Council: “Your chances of dying from a terrorist attack are one in 20 million.” That citizen then urges the city leaders to “put the brakes on the fear and act rationally. Terrorism works because it makes people irrational and it makes them destroy themselves. That’s what’s happening.” In your view, is the militarization of local police forces a signal that terrorists have won?

While visiting young people in prison, President Obama says, “I think we have a tendency sometimes to take for granted or think it’s normal that so many young people end up in our criminal justice system. It’s not normal. What is normal is young people making mistakes.” What’s the danger to society of accepting widespread incarceration as normal? What’s the connection between the criminalization of youthful mistakes and the militarization of law enforcement?

What’s your interpretation of the film’s title?

Additional media literacy questions are available at: www.pbs.org/pov/educators/media-literacy.php
Taking Action

• Find out what military equipment your local police department has acquired through the 1033 Program and ask the department for its policy on deployment of that equipment. Work with police officials, local elected representatives and community/citizen boards to ensure that the policy reflects your community’s values.

• Arrange for a town hall or informational meeting with your federal legislators to check the current rules and status of oversight efforts on Program 1033 and the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO). Let your representatives know what you would like to see happen with the military’s program to distribute unused equipment to local police departments.

• Convene a study circle to look at the history of policing in the U.S. Examine its purpose, who it protected, why there is a separation between law enforcement agencies and military troops and how it compares to the use of police in other nations, both democratic and autocratic.
Further Resources

**AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION: WAR COMES HOME: THE EXCESSIVE MILITARIZATION OF AMERICAN POLICE**
www.aclu.org/report/war-comes-home-excessive-militarization-american-police

This 2014 report covers the militarization of U.S. police forces.

**BLACK LIVES MATTER**
www.blacklivesmatter.com

The organization at the center of many recent protests against police violence provides activism toolkits, information on events and more. Also see www.facebook.com/BlackLivesMatter.

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

Government organization offers information about the Law Enforcement Support Office (LESO) and the 1033 Program.

**DRUG POLICY ALLIANCE**
http://www.drugpolicy.org

A leading U.S. drug policy organization advocates for drug policy “grounded in science, compassion, health and human rights.”

**JUSTICE POLICY JOURNAL: “THE MILITARIZATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT: BYPASSING THE POSSE COMITATUS ACT”**

An easy to read article by Scott Tighe and William Brown chronicles the history of posse comitatus and the use of military forces against civilian populations in the United States.

**TEACHING TOLERANCE: “TEACHING ABOUT RACE, RACISM AND POLICE VIOLENCE.”**
https://www.tolerance.org/moment/racism-and-police-violence

This web package comprises a compilation of classroom-ready reading materials and professional development resources on race, racism and police violence.

**THE WASHINGTON POST: “THE 12 KEY HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE DOJ’S SCATHING FERGUSON REPORT”**
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-nation/wp/2015/03/04/the-12-key-highlights-from-the-dojs-scathing-ferguson-report/?utm_term=.962da7c1ce01

Mark Berman and Wesley Lowery look at the report on actions in Ferguson, Missouri issued by the U.S. Department of Justice.

---

Original Online Content on POV

*To further enhance the broadcast, POV has produced an interactive website to enable viewers to explore the film in greater depth. The Do Not Resist website—www.pbs.org/pov/DoNotResist—offers a streaming video trailer for the film; an interview with filmmaker; a list of related websites, articles and books; a downloadable discussion guide; and special features. Join in the discussion: #DoNotResistFilmPBS*
HOW TO BUY THE FILM

To order Do Not Resist for home or educational use, go to http://www.donotresistfilm.com

Produced by American Documentary, Inc., POV is public television’s premier showcase for nonfiction films. The series airs Mondays at 10 p.m. on PBS from June to September, with primetime specials during the year. Since 1988, POV has been the home for the world’s boldest contemporary filmmakers, celebrating intriguing personal stories that spark conversation and inspire action. Always an innovator, POV discovers fresh new voices and creates interactive experiences that shine a light on social issues and elevate the art of storytelling. With our documentary broadcasts, original online programming and dynamic community engagement campaigns, we are committed to supporting films that capture the imagination and present diverse perspectives.

POV films have won 36 Emmy® Awards, 19 George Foster Peabody Awards, 12 Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Awards, three Academy Awards®, the first-ever George Polk Documentary Film Award and the Prix Italia. The POV series has been honored with a Special News & Documentary Emmy Award for Excellence in Television Documentary Filmmaking, three IDA Awards for Best Curated Series and the National Association of Latino Independent Producers Award for Corporate Commitment to Diversity. More information is available at www.pbs.org/pov.

POV Digital www.pbs.org/pov

Since 1994, POV Digital has driven new storytelling initiatives and interactive production for POV. The department created PBS’s first program website and its first web-based documentary (POV’s Borders) and has won major awards, including a Webby Award (and six nominations) and an Online News Association Award. POV Digital continues to explore the future of independent nonfiction media through its digital productions and the POV Hackathon lab, where media makers and technologists collaborate to reinvent storytelling forms. @povdocs on Twitter.

POV Community Engagement and Education

POV’s Community Engagement and Education team works with educators, community organizations and PBS stations to present more than 650 free screenings every year. In addition, we distribute free discussion guides and standards-aligned lesson plans for each of our films. With our community partners, we inspire dialogue around the most important social issues of our time.

American Documentary, Inc. www.amdoc.org

American Documentary, Inc. (AmDoc) is a multimedia company dedicated to creating, identifying and presenting contemporary stories that express opinions and perspectives rarely featured in mainstream media outlets. AmDoc is a catalyst for public culture, developing collaborative strategic engagement activities around socially relevant content on television, online and in community settings. These activities are designed to trigger action, from dialogue and feedback to educational opportunities and community participation.

Major funding for POV is provided by PBS, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and National Endowment for the Arts. Additional funding comes from Nancy Blachman and David desJardins, Bertha Foundation, The Fledgling Fund, Marguerite Casey Foundation, Ettinger Foundation, New York State Council on the Arts, New York City Department of Cultural Affairs in partnership with the City Council, Ann Tenenbaum and Thomas H. Lee, and public television viewers. POV is presented by a consortium of public television stations, including KQED San Francisco, WGBH Boston and THIRTEEN in association with WNET.ORG.

You can follow us on Twitter @POVengage for the latest news from POV Community Engagement & Education.

Front cover: Police in Richland County, South Carolina conduct a drug search warrant for marijuana.
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