

The discussion from the previous Sanhedrin was brought forward to the current session to gain the wisdom of additional Sages from other traditions.

Rav Bloom disagreed with the previous ruling, saying “This makes no substantive change, and attempts to perfect the imperfectable.”

The YBM’CU (HaRav Yalow) claimed that this follows precedent, saying “This merely codifies what the original meeting intended.”

Rav Pomerantz disagreed: “It was not at all clear that there was a TV / film choice.”

Rabbanit Olson followed the YBM’CU, saying “I think it’s necessary to clarify this, and it should have been done earlier, but it’s clear that administrators have in practice been splitting them into movie and TV, so we should follow the administrators.

Rav Dashoff the Younger disagreed, saying “This still doesn’t cover other forms of presentation than TV and movies – theatre, advertising... You’re killing everything else.”

Rav Olson brought a further point: “The time split still governs, but gives the administrator some guidance on what to do when it’s in the 20% movement zone.”

Mar Feldbaum started a machlochet by saying “If we only want to clarify what to do in the grey zone then this may create a conflict. Move to substitute for the entire motion a resolution of the Business Meeting on what to do in the event of a conflict on timing.”

The YBM’CU said unto him “A resolution will not be included in the ballot and may also be missed by administrators.”

Geveret Zipser disagreed, saying “The language as stated in the amendment is obfuscatory and believe that the amended language will create much more confusion.”

Rav Pomerantz argued for the Elders to guide the people, saying “Given the choice of confusing the voters and confusing the administrator, the administrator is much more likely to be able to deal with these final points.”

Rabbanit Olson disputed Mar Feldbaum’s argument: “I think voters are already confused, and clear language in the Constitution seems better.”

Rav Easterbrook brought the point that “There is a conflict between the vague desire that one should cover TV and one should cover film, and the running time issue.”

Rav Standlee spoke for the congregation, saying “We can’t expect voters to go through all the minutes for minor details. The legislative intents of what we intended was clear, so we need to clarify.”

Rabbanit Dashoff also invoked the congregation, claiming “If what we’re doing is

trying to rule based on minutes, the minutes will confuse voters.”

Rabbanit Deneroff considered future generations: “The resolution and the amendment are the same, but everyone would see the amendment.”

Mar Feldbaum again tried to win his point: “This language isn’t clear and provides guidance to neither administrators nor voters.”

However, his argument was not supported by the Rabbaim nor was his wording.

The halacha is according to the YBM’CU and the Sages who proposed the change.

Moved to amend portions of section 3.3 of the WSFS Constitution by adding words to clarify the intention of WSFS regarding the Dramatic Presentation Categories, as follows:

3.3.6: Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form.
Any theatrical feature or other production in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year, with a complete running time of more than 90 minutes.

3.3.7: Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
Any television program or other production in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year, with a complete running time of 90 minutes or less.