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A few years ago, while in the United States making my previous documentary, I was struck by the visceral attachment many U.S. citizens have to the death penalty. Although there seemed to be a rather superficial knowledge of this issue, in some areas—particularly in the South—support for the death penalty seemed like a belief, a real “faith.” This is the question I wanted to ask with Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2. What becomes of such a belief after being confronted with the reality of a death sentence?

Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 is a film that deals with the criminal justice system in an unusual way. It is not about the murderer or the murders themselves, nor is it about the victims or the investigators. It is about us, about our moral responsibility when the state gives the people the power to decide about someone’s life. Because any citizen in America could potentially serve on a jury, I thought this story would offer an opportunity to shift our vision of the death penalty from a vague and distant idea to something more tangible and complex. Jurors are an essential element of the criminal justice system, but no one knows how they feel after leaving the courthouse. More than twenty years later, Lindy is still struggling with the idea that she had a hand in a man’s death. A strong supporter of capital punishment when she entered the courtroom—an “eye for an eye person,” as she says—she became its collateral victim as she realized she had set an execution in motion and wondered whether her life would ever be normal again.

There was no doubt about Bobby Wilcher’s guilt in a brutal double homicide. The man never expressed remorse, and one could think he was among the worst of the worst for whom the death penalty is supposedly designed. Therefore, Lindy’s ordeal lies on a moral level: What legitimacy did she have to decide the fate of a man? She questions the morality of being allowed to send someone to his death, and as of today she still has not found an answer.

Meeting Lindy Lou Wells Isonhood was a gift. A gun-toting Southern Baptist Republican, she is part of an America that is often stereotyped, and she certainly shook up all the preconceived ideas I had. As conservative as she is, she had the courage to question her beliefs and to admit that sometimes the world is more complex than she wanted it to be. As she met with her fellow jurors, I admired her ability to listen, and I was startled to see that many had almost never talked about this experience. None of them felt any pride or satisfaction in fulfilling their civic duty and serving justice the way they did. Some even had set up coping mechanisms: one of them in particular talks about how he had to remove his emotions from the process in order to hand down a death sentence. Participating in the killing of a man requires you to lose part of your humanity.

While filming, I realized that although Lindy raised the question of their common responsibility, she also recreated a sense of community with these jurors. It may be a cliché to say that America—and probably most of the Western world—has never been as divided as it is today. I feel this sense of division is amplified by our ability to emphasize what is ugly within “the other,” so maybe it is time to find and promote what is best from the other side. It is more difficult; it forbids simplistic answers and it commands us to revise our judgments. Most of all, it requires us to listen to each other. People like Lindy Lou show us the way.
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Lindy Lou Wells Isonhood
Like most of her rural Mississippi neighbors, Lindy Lou Wells Isonhood believed in the death penalty. That belief was tested in 1994 when she sat on a jury that handed down a capital punishment sentence to a man convicted in a double homicide. Lindy understood the impact that her vote would have on the defendant. What she didn’t expect was the impact the vote would have on her.

Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 introduces us to Lindy twenty years after the trial. Still haunted by her decision, she sets out on an unconventional road trip to track down her fellow jurors. She wants to find out if the trial changed their lives in the way that it changed hers. And she’s looking for answers about how to heal.

For most of us, the death penalty is an abstract policy issue. But any U.S. citizen could be called to serve on a jury, just as Lindy was. And that’s why Lindy’s questions are excellent starting points for community conversations. Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 expands the death penalty debate in an extraordinary way, taking the focus off of crime, and demanding instead that we consider the long-term consequences for the jurors who, for a brief moment in time, wield the ultimate power to take a life.
Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 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 the death penalty, including *Herman’s House, 15 to Life* and *Give Up Tomorrow*.
- 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
- Cultural, art and historical organizations, institutions and museums
- Civic, fraternal 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.

Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 is an excellent tool for outreach and will be of special interest to people looking to explore the following topics:

- capital punishment
- death penalty
- ethics
- forgiveness
- guilt
- human rights
- jury duty
- justice system
- philosophy
- psychology
- religion

**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 *Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2* 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)
Capital Punishment in the United States

Capital punishment is legal in 31 U.S. states, in federal courts and in the military, though just two percent of counties are responsible for the majority of executions and death sentences. While sentencing laws differ by state, most states reserve the death penalty for violent crimes such as aggravated murder. The most common execution method is lethal injection, followed by electrocution, gas inhalation, hanging and firing squad. In most criminal trials, the jury decides the verdict and the judge determines the sentence, but in almost every state a death penalty conviction requires a unanimous jury decision (the exception is Alabama, where a jury only needs ten votes for a death penalty verdict, and a judge can overrule the jurors’ findings). In the United States, there are currently 2,792 convicted inmates awaiting execution (on “death row”). Only eight states carried out executions in 2017.

American courts have executed 1,468 people since 1976, but the number of executions has declined steadily since its peak in 1999. Nineteen states have banned the death penalty, including seven states within the last ten years. Worldwide, nearly three quarters of countries have ended the death penalty in law or in practice; within North America and Europe, it is legal in only the U.S., Belarus and Jamaica.

For decades, the death penalty has been a subject of debate in communities, state legislatures and courts across the country. Legislators have considered its cost, its effectiveness as a crime deterrent and the risk of wrongful convictions. Since 1973, 162 death row prisoners have been exonerated, and one recent study found that at least 4.1 percent of people on death row could be innocent. The constitutionality of the death penalty is also disputed, with opponents claiming that it violates the Eighth Amendment ban on “cruel and unusual punishments.” After the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed the death penalty in the 1972 case Furman v. Georgia, a number of states passed updated death penalty laws that addressed the “cruel and unusual” objections. The death penalty was illegal for four years, until the 1976 Supreme Court ruling Gregg v. Georgia, which overturned the national ban.
Sources
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Public Opinion on the Death Penalty

Public support for the death penalty reached its peak in the mid-1990s. In the wake of the Oklahoma City bombings (in which terrorists killed 168 people and injured more than 680), 80 percent of Americans approved of capital punishment. Support has declined steadily since then: a 2018 Quinnipiac poll found that voters preferred life without parole over the death penalty by 51 to 37 percent. A 2016 Pew Research Center poll found that concerns about the death penalty include fairness (capital convictions are often determined by arbitrary factors like jurisdiction and the defendant’s ability to afford a lawyer), drawn-out suffering for the families of victims during the appeals process and the risk of executing the innocent.

Sources

Religious and Moral Objections to the Death Penalty

While some opponents of the death penalty have raised practical or fiscal concerns, others have focused on the moral dimension. They emphasize the sanctity of human life and the injustice of a practice that is tainted by prejudice (people of color and the poor are disproportionately sentenced to death). In a 2007 editorial, the Dallas Morning News called for Texas to abolish capital punishment: “We do not believe that any legal system devised by inherently flawed human beings can determine with moral certainty the guilt of every defendant.” They argued the risk of executing even one innocent person — “an irrevocable sentence” — makes state-sanctioned killing morally unacceptable.

The faith-based movement against the death penalty has grown in recent years. The Catholic Church has long opposed capital punishment; in March 2015, Pope Francis called on governments worldwide to put a moratorium on the practice: “[the death penalty is] cruel, inhumane and degrading,” he said. “[It] does not bring justice to the victims,
but only foments revenge.” Other religious groups that officially oppose capital punishment include the United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Unitarian Universalist Association and Reform and Conservative Jews. Despite the official stances of these institutions, not all parishioners are abolitionists: two thirds of white mainline Protestants (including those in the above groups) approve of capital punishment.

Sources


The Bobby Wilcher Case

In 1982, 19-year-old Bobby Glen Wilcher met two middle-aged women—Katie Belle Moore and Velma Odell Noblin—at a bar in Scott County, Mississippi. When the bar closed, the women agreed to drive him home. During the drive, Wilcher diverted the car down a service road and stabbed both women to death, leaving their bodies in a ditch. Later that night, as he was driving Noblin’s car, he was stopped by the police for speeding and found with a bloody knife and the victims’ belongings. He was arrested the following day.

Wilcher was found guilty of first-degree murder in two separate trials in 1982. He did not express remorse at the trials. His death penalty conviction was appealed for 24 years until the Supreme Court upheld the sentence in 2006. On the day he was scheduled to be executed, Lindy Lou Wells Isonhood visited him at the Mississippi State Penitentiary to, in her words, “ask for his forgiveness.”
When Lindy Lou learned that Wilcher had been granted a stay of execution that evening, she thought, “God has given me more time to befriend this guy.” She visited Wilcher several more times and they spoke on the phone about three times a week. She was his only visitor besides his lawyer. She learned about his troubled youth, including his treatment at the hands of an abusive father, and that he was raped as a teenager at a juvenile detention center. Wilcher was executed by lethal injection on October 18, 2006.

Impact of the Death Penalty on Jurors

Researchers have studied the psychological effects that capital punishment has on the people who carry it out: jurors, justices and even executioners. Clinical social worker Janvier Slick has found that for some jurors, the burden of having to decide whether someone should be executed “results in a variety of symptoms related to post-traumatic stress, and the problems may remain with them for a long time.” The Capital Jury Project, which interviewed 1,200 people who served on death penalty juries, found that 62.5 percent of female jurors and 37.5 percent of male jurors sought counseling after their trials. Additionally, 81 percent of female jurors and 18 percent of male jurors regretted the decisions they made in their cases. Slick argues that jurors “are unconsidered casualties in death penalty cases. The impact the death penalty has on them in the immediate and long term should be included in [the debate over] ending it.”

Sources

Office of the Clark County Prosecuting Attorney. “Bobby Glen Wilcher.”
Sources


Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2

Lindy Lou and her daughter. Photo courtesy of Florent Vassault
Selected People Featured in Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2

Lindy Lou Wells Isonhood

THE OTHER JURORS

Linda – thought that Wilcher deserved the death penalty because he showed no humanity in court

Jane – an alternate who says she doesn’t believe in the death penalty anymore

Brett – focused on the judge’s instructions so he wouldn’t be influenced by emotions

Pete – barely remembers the trial; he didn’t struggle at all with his decision.
Selected People Featured in *Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2*

**Gayl** – didn’t have any doubts; was just glad when it was over

**Jon** – describes his vote as a “heavy load”

**Kenneth** – jury foreman

**Bill** – remembers people just eager to vote and get it over with, as if they were voting on a bond issue, but is satisfied that he voted the right way because he couldn’t have lived with himself if Wilcher ever got out of prison and killed again

**Allen** – never discussed the trial with his wife because it bothered him so much

**Eleanor** – chooses not to meet with Lindy
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?
- If you could ask anyone in the film a single question, whom would you ask and what would you ask them?
- Was there anything you saw in the film that surprised you?
- 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 __________.
Thinking About the Death Penalty

How did the film influence the way you think about the death penalty? Did it change your thinking in any way?

Jane, the alternate who now doesn’t believe in the death penalty, says, “I feel as certain as you can without being there that I would have said death, because when the criteria were read I didn’t see [an] out. You know, this is the law and you’re just doing what the law made you do.” Is it fair for the law to put people in the position of having to cast a life or death vote? Can you think of alternatives that would still meet the constitutional requirement of being judged by a jury of one’s peers?

Lindy recalls being shunned by family, friends and neighbors when she began to question the death penalty and her decision. She describes them as “eye for an eye people, tooth for a tooth people.” What does that mean to you? What does your faith tradition teach about the death penalty, forgiveness and justice? Are its principles based on the notion of “an eye for an eye”?

Lindy comments that technically, it’s the state sentencing a defendant to death, but it didn’t feel as if the state was doing it. It felt like the jurors, personally, were doing it. What is the difference between a verdict decided by the state and a verdict decided by one’s peers? Is one more just than the other?

Lindy’s daughter, Rebecca, recalls, “I didn’t know what the situation was, I was 13... I just knew she was at jury duty. I didn’t really even understand what that was... And she was a changed person when she came home. I just remember her being in her room a lot, crying a lot, being angry a lot.” In your view, in debates over the death penalty, what consideration should be given to the impact on jurors and their families?

Lindy says, “I went in there basically like any other juror probably with the thought that, ‘Yes, I won’t have a problem giving the death penalty.’ But while I sat there, something in me changed, and when it came time to really say that this...
man should live or die I did not want to do it!” What do you think contributed to Lindy’s change of heart?

Linda feels comfortable with her vote, in part because, in the courtroom, Wilcher “wouldn’t look at anybody and he acted like he just didn’t care about anything...You know on TV they always say you’re developing a relationship with a juror by looking at them. I don’t know whether that really happens or not.” What is the source of our ideas about proper demeanor for defendants? How do you think TV and movie depictions of courtrooms influence our expectations or actions when we’re involved in real trials? How do you think media have influenced our ideas about the death penalty and criminal trials in general?

After the trial, Bill recalls his boss asking, “‘Did you fry him?’... Almost comically! Almost like it was a joke... My boss, he was almost chuckling! He said, ‘Hey, did you fry him?’ He had a smile on his face... How can you take so lightly what we went through?” How would you answer Bill? Why might someone joke about putting a man to death?

Policy Choices

Bill says, “I didn’t consider it 12 people deciding his fate. I considered it one person. Because any one person could stop it, right?” That’s because the state requires a unanimous jury vote to impose the death penalty. How did that policy increase the burden placed on individual jurors in this case? Given what you see in the film, would you recommend revising the policy in any way? In your view, how should policies and procedures be balanced to preserve the rights of defendants and also respect the needs of jurors?

Lindy reflects the feelings of several jurors who felt trapped into voting for death because, she says, “At that time we couldn’t give him life because there was a possibility that he would be paroled... And I didn’t want him out!” Now that life without the possibility of parole is always available as an option, do you think jurors have a fairer choice, knowing that the offender will never get out of prison regardless of what they decide?
Lindy’s husband asks whether “they invited any of the jurors come to the execution.” No jurors received such an invitation. Do you think they should have? Should jurors be required to attend the execution? Why or why not?

Bill describes being depressed after the trial, and Allen, who was also deeply affected, suggests that “our government needs to provide some sort of counseling for those people.” Do you agree? Should taxpayers fund counseling services for jury members in death penalty cases?

One juror turns down Lindy’s request to meet because she isn’t interested in talking. How do you think you would respond to such a request? If you have served on a jury, would you want to meet up afterward to check in and compare your experience with those with whom you served? Do you think that the court system should facilitate such meetings?

Some of the jurors were troubled by peers who didn’t seem to grasp the gravity of their task. Bill says, “I was struck by the eagerness amongst some of the jurors just to get this: ‘Hey, let’s vote and get out of here.’ Like they were voting on whether to approve a bond issue or something.”

What would you do if you were on a jury and you didn’t believe that other jurors were taking their responsibility seriously? What would your recourse be in that situation?

Brett says he “was real intent on understanding the judge’s instructions: What is it that we’re supposed to do and what’s the criteria? Because I wanted to know that there was a clear path that took all the subjective out of it and made it all objective.” Is it possible for determinations about life or death to be “objective”? Should that be a goal? Is it what the Constitution requires? Is that what judges should instruct jurors to do?

Gayl is comfortable that “what needed to be done was done,” but says, “They should have carried out the sentence much quicker than they did.” How does it affect inmates, jurors, families and society’s sense of justice when prisoners remain on death row for years? Would you speed up this process if you knew it could lead to the wrongful execution of innocent people in some cases?

During the jury selection process for a capital trial, prosecu-
tors can eliminate jurors who are opposed to the death penalty on principle. This means that everyone serving on the death penalty has affirmed that they would theoretically sentence someone to death if the crime met the legal requirements. This procedure, known as selecting a “death-qualified jury”, is controversial—some argue that a jury consisting only death-qualified jurors would be biased against a defendant. What do you think of the death qualification? Do you think it ensures that defendants in capital cases receive a fair and impartial trial?

**Personal Journeys**

Lindy says that the trial “had some residual effects on me throughout the years.” How would you describe the “residual effects” experienced by Lindy and the other jurors?

Lindy says, “When I didn’t do what my heart told me to do [and vote for a life sentence instead of a death sentence], that’s when that guilt and remorse came over me.” Would you find it acceptable for a juror to begin a trial by saying, “I’m going to base my vote on what my heart says”? What are the benefits and drawbacks of basing decisions on emotions?

The film opens with Lindy talking with her granddaughter Maddie. Why do you suppose it was important to Lindy to share her jury experience with her granddaughter?

Lindy visits and befriends Bobby Wilcher, the man she sentenced to death. He responds to her request for forgiveness by saying, “Yes! You’re forgiven! You didn’t put me here. I’ve put myself here.” Why do you think that wasn’t enough for Lindy to forgive herself or put the issue behind her?

Lindy’s husband, Ira, can’t understand why his wife invests time and energy befriending Bobby Wilcher, a man convicted of two brutal murders. Can you imagine yourself visiting a convicted murderer the way that Lindy visits Bobby? What would stop you? What do you imagine the benefits would be for you and for the inmate?

Lindy is upset that Pete barely remembers the trial where he voted to sentence a person to death. Rather than experience the gravity of the event, he seems to find it almost trivial, not
worth his time. She concludes, “A lot of people in the United States are like that. They are self-centered, and self-serving, and... shallow, shallow, shallow.” What was your reaction to Pete?

Allen says, “According to law, we were right, but still, you have to live with it... It’s easy to say you support the death penalty, but hard to live with if you actually have to do it.” Kenneth recalls coming home and crying, seesawing between questioning his vote and knowing that he did the right thing: “It was just an emotion beyond anything I had ever felt before.” Jon says that people think they know what it would be like to sentence a man to death, but “unless you’ve been there, you won’t know. It’s not an easy thing to deal with. It’s... a heavy load. It works on you. So, you have to deal with it... It’s not an easy thing to do. At all.” Can you think of anything that might make it easier for these jurors to make peace with their decisions?

Lindy recalls “looking at the window, down on the street... There are people out there. They’re going out to lunch. They’re walking in the park. They’re walking around the street. They’ve got a normal life! And we’re up here getting ready to kill somebody!” Is there anything about the way that trials or courtrooms are designed that could help jurors mark the momentous nature of the task that’s being asked of them?

Kenneth’s daughter says she would never be able to vote for a death sentence, because life and death is God’s decision to make, not hers. Do you think you could vote for a death sentence? Why or why not? What if there was a very small chance that the defendant was innocent? How certain would you have to be of the defendant’s guilt to sentence them to death?

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

• Set up a Nextdoor, Google or Facebook group for people who have served on juries to talk about their experiences (without revealing confidential information, of course).

• Convene a study circle at your place of worship or civic group to research and discuss the ethical issues raised by the death penalty.

• Hold a town hall with local political representatives to share recommendations related to death penalty legislation in your state.

• Host a panel or debate on the efficacy of the death penalty. Ask speakers to address the impact on jurors, attorneys, corrections staff and judges, as well as on defendants and families of defendants. Consider crime rates and financial costs as well.
FILM-RELATED WEB SITES

LINDY LOU, JUROR NUMBER 2
www.facebook.com/lindyloujuror2/  
@lindyloujuror2

Original Online Content on POV
The Lindy Lou, Juror Number 2 website—www.pbs.org/pov/lindylou—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.

Death Penalty: General Information

DEATH PENALTY INFORMATION CENTER
www.deathpenaltyinfo.org
This is a comprehensive site that offers statistics, research, issue背景者, legislation tracking, a state-by-state database and resources (including in Spanish).

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/04/24/5-facts-about-the-death-penalty/
The Pew Research Center presents polling results on support for and opposition to the death penalty.

PROCON.ORG: “SHOULD THE DEATH PENALTY BE ALLOWED?”
https://deathpenalty.procon.org/
This page and its links offer overviews of pro and con arguments on various aspects of the death penalty.

Opposition to the Death Penalty

8TH AMENDMENT PROJECT
http://8thamendment.org
This is the website of a group that works to end the use of the death penalty in the United States and change the national discourse on the issue.

EQUAL JUSTICE USA
https://ejusa.org/learn/
This group provides information on transformative justice alternatives that address trauma, health, racism and victim’s services.

DEATH PENALTY ACTION
http://deathpenaltyaction.org/
This advocacy organization provides resources, as well as educational and direct-action activities, including the Annual Fast and Vigil to Abolish the Death Penalty.
Many states have organizations dealing with alternatives to the death penalty. These vary in services but often provide state-specific statistics, legislative updates, policy statements, services and advocacy. Do an Internet search for the name of your state and the phrase “alternatives to the death penalty” to find local resources.
POV Produced by American Documentary, Inc., POV is public television’s premier showcase for nonfiction films. 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 37 Emmy® Awards, 21 George Foster Peabody Awards, 12 Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Awards, three Academy Awards®, and the first-ever George Polk Documentary Film Award. 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 (NALIP) Award for Corporate Commitment to Diversity. Learn more at www.pbs.org/pov.

POV Spark (www.pbs.org/pov)
Since 1994, POV Digital has driven new storytelling initiatives and interactive production for POV. The department has continually experimented with web-based documentaries, producing PBS’ first program website and the first Snapchat-native documentary. It has won major awards for its work, including a Webby Award and over 19 nominations. Now with a singular focus on incubating and distributing interactive productions, POV Spark continues to explore the future of independent non-fiction media through its co-productions, acquisitions and POV Labs, where media makers and technologists collaborate to reinvent storytelling forms.

POV Engage (www.pbs.org/pov/engage)
The POV Engage team works with educators, community organizations and PBS stations to present more than 800 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 arts organization 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. AmDoc is a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization.

Major funding for POV is provided by PBS, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Endowment for the Arts and the Wyncote Foundation. Additional funding comes from The John S. and James Knight Foundation, Nancy Blachman and David des Jardins, Bertha Foundation, Reva & David Logan Foundation, Open Society Foundations, Chicago Media Project, Sage Foundation, Lefkofsky Family Foundation, The Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences, 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 WNED.ORG.

You can follow us on Twitter @POVengage for the latest news from POV Engage.
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