

C7 AA A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS TO TERMINATE THE CITY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF LIVING ARTS TRUST, INC. D/B/A O CINEMA: (1) TERMINATE FOR CONVENIENCE THE O CINEMA LEASE AT THE CITY OWNED FACILITY AT OLD CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 1130 WASHINGTON AVENUE, WITH 180 DAYS' PRIOR NOTICE, AND (2) IMMEDIATELY DISCONTINUE ANY GRANT FUNDING SUPPORTING THE O CINEMA PROJECT PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF OPERATIVE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH LIVING ARTS TRUST (O CINEMA).

Applicable Area:

MIAMI BEACH

COMMISSION MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Commission

FROM: City Attorney Ricardo J. Dopico

DATE: March 19, 2025

TITLE: A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS TO TERMINATE THE CITY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF LIVING ARTS TRUST, INC. D/B/A O CINEMA: (1) TERMINATE FOR CONVENIENCE THE O CINEMA LEASE AT THE CITY OWNED FACILITY AT OLD CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 1130 WASHINGTON AVENUE, WITH 180 DAYS' PRIOR NOTICE, AND (2) IMMEDIATELY DISCONTINUE ANY GRANT FUNDING SUPPORTING THE O CINEMA PROJECT PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF OPERATIVE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH LIVING ARTS TRUST (O CINEMA).

RECOMMENDATION

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

ANALYSIS

The attached Resolution was prepared at the request of the sponsor, Mayor Steven Meiner.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

N/A

Does this Ordinance require a Business Impact Estimate? (FOR ORDINANCES ONLY)

If applicable, the Business Impact Estimate (BIE) was published on:
See BIE at: <https://www.miamibeachfl.gov/city-hall/city-clerk/meeting-notices/>

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

CONCLUSION

Applicable Area

Citywide

Is this a "Residents Right to Know" item, pursuant to City Code Section 2-17?

No

Is this item related to a G.O. Bond Project?

No

Was this Agenda Item initially requested by a lobbyist which, as defined in Code Sec. 2-481, includes a principal engaged in lobbying? No

If so, specify the name of lobbyist(s) and principal(s):

Department

City Attorney

Sponsor(s)

Mayor Steven Meiner

Co-sponsor(s)

Condensed Title

Terminate City Lease and Grant Agreements with O Cinema. (Meiner) CA

Previous Action (For City Clerk Use Only)

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS TO TERMINATE THE CITY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF LIVING ARTS TRUST, INC. D/B/A O CINEMA: (1) TERMINATE FOR CONVENIENCE THE O CINEMA LEASE AT THE CITY OWNED FACILITY AT OLD CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 1130 WASHINGTON AVENUE, WITH 180 DAYS' PRIOR NOTICE, AND (2) IMMEDIATELY DISCONTINUE ANY GRANT FUNDING SUPPORTING THE O CINEMA PROJECT PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF OPERATIVE GRANT AGREEMENTS WITH LIVING ARTS TRUST (O CINEMA).

WHEREAS, the City executed a Lease Agreement with Living Arts Trust, Inc. D/B/A O Cinema ("O Cinema") on July 18, 2019 and Amendment No. 1 to that lease on June 18, 2024 ("the Lease Agreement") for the movie theater premises located on the first floor of Old City Hall, located at 1130 Washington Avenue in the City of Miami Beach ("the Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Lease Agreement allows O Cinema to operate a movie theater on the Premises subject to the City's right, inter alia, to terminate the Lease Agreement for the convenience of the City with 180 days' prior notice pursuant to Section 2.3 of the original Lease Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Commission desire to terminate the Lease Agreement and authorize the City Manager to exercise the City's right to terminate the Lease Agreement for Convenience with 180 day's prior notice to O Cinema; and

WHEREAS, the City executed two grant agreements ("the Grant Agreements") with O Cinema dated December 20, 2024 and January 24, 2025 in the amounts of \$25,831.00 and \$54,071.52, respectively; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of the Grant Agreements, half of the grant amounts have been paid by the City to O Cinema, but the second half of the grant amounts have not been paid and are not due to be paid until completion of the grant projects and submission, and the City's prior written approval, of the required Final Report; and

WHEREAS, the Grant Agreements (1) provide at paragraph 15(c) that the City may, at its sole discretion, discontinue funding of the Grant if it is not satisfied with the progress of the grant project, and (2) provide at paragraph 15(d) that the City Manager may, at his sole discretion, suspend each agreement and all funding if any portion of the Grantee's project is found to be contrary to the City's values and/or interests in promoting a safe and inclusive environment for residents and visitors; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Commission desire to suspend and terminate the Grant Agreements and discontinue any further funding to O Cinema pursuant to paragraphs 15(c) and 15(d) of the Grant Agreements; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Commission desire to identify a new tenant/grantee to operate the movie theater located on the Premises that more accurately reflects the City's values and/or interests in promoting a safe and inclusive environment for residents and visitors.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT DULY RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA, that the Mayor and City Commission hereby authorize and direct the City Manager to take the following actions to terminate the City's relationship with and financial support of Living Arts Trust, Inc. D/B/A O Cinema: (1) terminate for

convenience the O Cinema lease at the City owned facility at Old City Hall, located at 1130 Washington Avenue, with 180 days' prior notice, and (2) immediately discontinue any grant funding supporting O Cinema pursuant to applicable provisions of operative Grant Agreements with Living Arts Trust (O Cinema).

PASSED and ADOPTED this 19th day of March, 2025.

Steven Meiner, Mayor

ATTEST:

Rafael E. Granado, City Clerk

(Sponsored by Mayor Steven Meiner)

APPROVED AS TO
FORM & LANGUAGE
& FOR EXECUTION



City Attorney *RR*

3/11/2025

Date

Article from Honestreporting.com

- [Rachel O'Donoghue](#)
- March 3, 2025
- 5:18 pm

Media Spins 'No Other Land' Oscar Win Into Yet Another Fake 'Israeli Settlers' Story

In an evening of glitz, red carpet pageantry, and self-congratulatory speeches at the Dolby Theatre in Los Angeles, one Oscar win was as predictable as the show's nearly four-hour runtime: Best Feature-Length Documentary. The award...

In an evening of glitz, red carpet pageantry, and self-congratulatory speeches at the Dolby Theatre in Los Angeles, one Oscar win was as predictable as the show's nearly four-hour runtime: Best Feature-Length Documentary.

The award went to the Israeli and Palestinian filmmakers behind *No Other Land*, a film chronicling Palestinian activist Basel Adra as he supposedly "risks arrest to document the destruction of his hometown" in Masafer Yatta, at the southern edge of the West Bank.

Hardly a shock. Not only was it the frontrunner, but it ticked all the right boxes for an Academy that never misses a chance to celebrate a politically fashionable pick. And with Israel dominating the headlines since the October 7 Hamas attacks and the ensuing war against the terrorist group, it didn't take a fortune teller to predict this win.

Cue the victory speeches: Adra took the stage alongside Israeli filmmaker Yuval Abraham, who used his moment to chastise the United States for blocking "a political solution, without ethnic supremacy, with national rights for both of our people." The line earned a rousing cheer—because what better way to celebrate cinematic achievement than by tossing out oversimplified, self-righteous slogans?

Also predictable? The media's muddled reporting on *No Other Land*'s subject matter. Many outlets seemed convinced that Masafer Yatta is some ancient Palestinian village network, systematically uprooted in recent decades to make way for Israeli settlers.

Which, of course, is exactly the narrative the filmmakers wanted to push.

The Truth About Masafer Yatta

The reality, as usual, is far less dramatic than the Oscar-winning version.

Historically, [Masafer Yatta was a grazing ground](#) for [Bedouins](#) and locals from the nearby town of Yatta—land they used but never permanently settled. Those who stayed for extended periods lived in caves, not in established villages.

In the early 1980s, the IDF designated the area as Training Zone 918, a military training ground. The arrangement was simple: locals could continue grazing their flocks, and the IDF would provide advance

notice when live-fire exercises were scheduled. This system worked with little controversy for nearly two decades.

Then, in 1997, things shifted. Palestinians petitioned the Israeli High Court to revoke the training zone designation. At the same time, illegal construction ramped up. Permanent structures began appearing, first in small clusters and then expanding into what is now generously described as the “12 villages” of Masafer Yatta.

Under the [Oslo Accords](#), Israel maintains full control over this area—known as Area C—until a final status agreement is reached. But that didn’t stop the creeping expansion, which military sources say wasn’t about housing a growing population but about creating political “facts on the ground.” Many structures, they report, stand empty, existing solely to inflate the appearance of a permanent Palestinian presence.

By 2000, the Israeli High Court halted evacuations but explicitly banned further construction—rules that were promptly ignored. The IDF offered compromises, allowing access on weekends, Jewish holidays, and for two months each year, all of which were rejected. It even approved permanent settlement in parts of the zone’s northwest section, but the legal battle dragged on.

After years of legal wrangling, the court ruled in favor of the IDF: the training zone designation stood, and illegal structures could be dismantled.

Yet despite breathless media reports of “displacement,” the reality remains: evacuations have been minimal, the illegal buildings are still there, and the so-called “villages” remain.

Recommended Reading: [Masafer Yatta & Khan al-Ahmar: Behind the Headlines](#)

The Media’s Convenient Omissions

So naturally, by Monday morning, Israel woke up to a wave of skewed coverage about No Other Land’s win, all of it framing the Masafer Yatta dispute as somehow tied to Israeli settlers.

ABC News, for example, [suggested](#) the issue was part of Israel’s broader “settlement expansion,” stating:

Israel’s demolition efforts in the West Bank, on what Israel considers to be illegal structures, have largely been in an effort to clear the way for Israeli settlers to move into the region for reasons including religious beliefs and improved quality of life.”

Meanwhile, CNN [failed even to mention](#) that the so-called “collection of villages” in the Hebron hills consists of indisputably illegal structures while also tying the dispute to “the encroachment of Jewish settlers for decades.”

And the BBC? It didn’t even bother [including the fact](#) that Masafer Yatta is a military training ground, leaving readers with the entirely false impression that Israel cleared the area for settlers:

Israel has occupied the West Bank since 1967. Israeli settlements in the territory are considered illegal under international law, though Israel disputes this. They have expanded over the past 55 years, becoming a focal point of violence and conflicting claims over land.”

And that was the story across the board—from [NPR](#) to [The Hollywood Reporter](#). The facts were lost, and Masafer Yatta became yet another simplistic media tale in which Israel is, conveniently, the villain.

Liked this article? Follow HonestReporting on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#), [Instagram](#) and [TikTok](#) to see even more posts and videos debunking news bias and smears, as well as other content explaining what's really going on in Israel and the region.



[Rachel O'Donoghue](#)

Born in London, England, Rachel O'Donoghue moved to Israel in April 2021 after spending five years working at various national newspaper titles in the UK. She studied law at the University of Law, London, and gained a master's degree in multimedia journalism at the University of Kent.

THE **WRAP**

When Documentaries Become Propaganda: The Case for Rescinding the ‘No Other Land’ Oscar | Guest Column

Golan Ramraz

Fri, March 7, 2025 at 4:00 PM EST



If the Academy Awards have any interest in preserving their legitimacy—or even basic credibility—they must consider rescinding the Oscar handed to “No Other Land” for Best Documentary. To do otherwise would not only reward a flagrant distortion of the truth but would confirm what many have long suspected: that the Academy has abandoned even the pretense of valuing journalistic integrity in favor of political pandering.

To understand how disastrous this is, one need only glance at the rules of the Academy’s Documentary Branch, which explicitly mandate that a documentary should be “nonfiction” and provide an emphasis on “[fact rather than fiction.](#)” The film in question is dealing with a nonfiction subject matter, but using historical fiction methodology, which puts it at odds with the Academy definition. It is a masterclass in selective storytelling, omission and outright falsehoods – a piece of propaganda draped in the trappings of journalism.

Let’s start with the facts—or rather, the lack thereof. “No Other Land” presents a heart-wrenching narrative of Palestinian villagers in Masafer Yatta, purportedly expelled by Israeli authorities from lands they’ve inhabited for generations. It’s an emotionally charged story, to be sure, but also a lie. Historical records, from Ottoman-era documents to British Mandate maps and Israeli Supreme Court findings, tell a different tale: [the area was uninhabited state land](#) until [well after it was declared](#) a military training zone by Israel. [Aerial imagery from the 1980s shows no sign](#) of permanent settlement, and yet the filmmakers would have us believe in a historical continuity that simply does not exist.

As mentioned above, the Academy rules stipulate that a documentary must present a case with an eye towards “fact rather than fiction.” “No Other Land” fails spectacularly on this count as well. It carefully curates a story of victimhood, omitting any mention of [the illegal construction in Masafer Yatta](#), the residents’ permanent homes [in the nearby town of Yatta](#), or the offers made by Israeli authorities [to allow them](#) to stay if they agreed not to expand [those illegal settlements](#). The film includes no interviews with Israeli officials, no perspectives from historians or legal experts who might challenge its narrative.

This kind of selective storytelling isn’t just dishonest; it’s dangerous. By omitting key facts and context, the filmmakers have crossed the line from advocacy into outright deception and demonization. The Academy’s willingness to reward such a film raises a disturbing question: is the goal of the Best Documentary award to honor truth, or merely to signal political virtue?

The documentary branch of the Academy has faced scandals before—infamously awarding “Bowling for Columbine” despite clear evidence of manipulative editing and deceptive statistics. But this is different. This is not about a filmmaker stretching the truth to make a point; this is about outright fabrications being rewarded with the industry’s highest honor. If the Academy refuses to act, it sends a clear message: that as long as the politics are correct, the facts don’t matter.

For further evidence of the rot, look no further than the [recent scandal of the BBC pulling](#) “Gaza: How to Survive a War Zone” due to revelations that the film was rife with inaccuracies and unverified claims. Or the disgraceful Emmy handed to Bisan Owda for “reporting” that was little more than a mouthpiece for Hamas propaganda. That the Academy could watch “No Other Land”—a film that shares the same DNA of deception—and respond with applause rather than outrage is a scandal in itself.

Some might argue that rescinding an Oscar would set a dangerous precedent. Nonsense. If anything, it would set exactly the right precedent: that documentary filmmakers are not free to manufacture facts without consequence. The Academy has done it before, quietly revoking the Oscar for 1969’s “Young Americans” when it was discovered the film had been released in a previous year. This situation is far worse; it’s not a matter of timing but of truth. To do nothing now would not only call the Academy’s integrity into question but risk turning the Best Documentary award into a punchline.

The problem runs deeper than one film. By awarding an Oscar to “No Other Land,” the Academy has aligned itself with a growing trend of documentaries that present one-sided narratives as gospel truth, leveraging emotional manipulation and selective editing to push political agendas. The consequences of this are dire. Documentaries, once a vital tool for uncovering uncomfortable truths, are fast becoming instruments of propaganda, eroding public trust not just in the filmmakers but in the entire journalistic enterprise.

It is not too late for the Academy to do the right thing. A full investigation into the film’s claims and its eligibility under the Documentary Branch’s bylaws is the bare minimum required. If, as the evidence suggests, the film was indeed a grotesque distortion of reality, the Oscar should be revoked publicly and unapologetically.

This article is not meant to be a direct and detailed refutation of the documentary, though should the Academy launch such an investigation into the

film's veracity, we are available to provide evidence and documentation to back up these claims.

Failing to act would not only embolden more filmmakers to abandon journalistic standards in favor of propaganda but would make the Academy complicit, cementing its reputation as a partisan echo chamber. At a time when public trust in media is at an all-time low, that's a risk they cannot afford to take.

There was a time when the Oscar for Best Documentary was more than a political statement; it was a recognition of the courage to tell uncomfortable truths. If the Academy wants to reclaim that legacy, it must start by sending a clear message: propaganda has no place at the Oscars, and those who indulge in it should not be rewarded but exposed.

Editor's note: An earlier version of this op-ed erroneously cited the Academy guidelines for a documentary due to errors in translation by the authors. The story has been updated to reflect the correct guidelines.

The full Academy definition is in a document titled [Special Rules for the Documentary Feature Film Award](#) is: "An eligible documentary film is defined as a theatrically released nonfiction motion picture dealing creatively with cultural, artistic, historical, social, scientific, economic or other subjects. It may be photographed in actual occurrence, or may employ partial reenactment, stock footage, stills, animation, stop-motion or other techniques, as long as the emphasis is on fact and not on fiction."

Editor's note: TheWrap reached out to the filmmakers of "No Other Land" regarding the allegations in this piece. They had no comment. The Academy did not respond to TheWrap's request for comment.

Golan Ramraz has been writing and producing for over twenty years. As a writer, Ramraz has written everything from animation to live-action, novels to features, originals to adaptations, collaborating with legends, Oscar winners, Pulitzer Prize recipients, acclaimed novelists and more. Ramraz began his career at Creative Artists Agency before moving on to working with director Doug Liman and as Director of Development for Marvel Studios. As a professor and consultant, Ramraz has worked and lectured all over the world, including Spain, France, The Netherlands, Australia, Chile, Israel, Mexico, Bulgaria, Italy and at colleges and universities all over the United States, including USC, Columbia and UCLA. He currently mentors under-represented writers and creators.

Guy Goldstein is the founder and CEO of Revenue Path, and a partner at Positive Pipeline, as well as a producer and writer based out of Israel. With a wealth of experience ranging from bootstrapped startups to Fortune 500 companies, Guy has earned a reputation as the go-to expert when no one else can fix the problem. Guy also serves as an advisor and a consultant to many companies going through the development process. In addition, he is at the forefront of the practical application of technological innovations and is currently driving AI transformations in a number of industries, including the worlds of film and television, as well as for government agencies and NGOs around the world.

The post [When Documentaries Become Propaganda: The Case for Rescinding the 'No Other Land' Oscar | Guest Column](#) appeared first on [TheWrap](#).