This paper deals with three different cases, each of which was considered separately by the Committee on Jewish Law and Standards of the Rabbinical Assembly:

(1) Case of a Child Born Without a Foreskin
This portion of the paper was considered at a meeting of the Committee on January 13, 1982 and was adopted by a unanimous vote. Those members present and voting were Rabbis Kassel Abelson, Ben Zion Bokser, Salamon Faber, David M. Feldman, Edward M. Gershfield, Wolfe Kelman, David H. Lincoln, David Novak, Mayer E. Rabinowitz, Joel Roth, Morris M. Shapiro, Israel N. Silverman, Harry Z. Sky, and Henry A. Sosland.

(2) The Case of a Convert Who Was Circumcised When Still a Gentile
This portion of the paper was considered at a meeting of the Committee on December 15, 1982. The Committee agreed to divide the voting on this portion of the paper into two parts:

(a) Requirement of Hattafat Dam Brit
This part was adopted by a vote of 14-1. Voting in favor were Rabbis Kassel Abelson, Ben Zion Bokser, David Novak, Mayer E. Rabinowitz, Barry S. Rosen, Joel Roth, Israel N. Silverman, Harry Z. Sky, Henry A. Sosland, and Alan J. Yuter. Voting in opposition was Rabbi Jacob B. Agus.

(b) Recitation of the Liturgical Formula
This part was adopted by a vote of 12-2-1. Voting in favor were Rabbis Kassel Abelson, Ben Zion Bokser, David M. Feldman, Edward M. Gershfield, Robert Gordis, David H. Lincoln, David Novak, Mayer E. Rabinowitz, Barry S. Rosen, Israel N. Silverman, Harry Z. Sky, and Henry A. Sosland. Voting in opposition were Rabbis Jacob B. Agus and Alan J. Yuter. Rabbi Joel Roth abstained.

(3) The Case of a Jew Who Was Not Circumcised on the Eighth Day, or Was Circumcised by a Gentile, or Was Circumcised as a Purely Medical Procedure
This portion was adopted as the Majority Opinion of the Committee by a vote of 10-5. Voting in favor of this portion of the paper were Rabbis Kassel Abelson, Jacob B. Agus, Ben Zion Bokser, Salamon Faber, Edward M. Gershfield, Wolfe Kelman, David Novak, Alexander M. Shapiro, Harry Z. Sky and

Henry A. Sosland. Voting in opposition were Rabbis David M. Feldman, David H. Lincoln, Mayer E. Rabinowitz, Joel Roth, and Morris M. Shapiro. This portion of the paper was considered and voted upon at a meeting of the Committee on March 10, 1982.

"Hattafat Dam Brit", a paper by Rabbi Joel Roth, dealing with the same subject as the third portion of Rabbi Novak’s paper, was adopted as the Minority Opinion of the Committee on March 10, 1982 by a vote of 5-10.
The Question of Hattafat Dam Brit

A more detailed discussion of the question of the Hattafat Dam Brit is necessary for a full understanding of the issue. The dam has been a subject of debate and controversy, with various interpretations and explanations offered by scholars and experts in the field.

This page contains a discussion of the Hattafat Dam Brit question, including an analysis of the historical context, legal implications, and potential solutions. The discussion is intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the issue and its significance.

The page is part of a larger document that explores various aspects of Jewish law and tradition, with a focus on contemporary issues and their historical roots. The document is structured to facilitate easy navigation and access to relevant information.

The page concludes with a reminder to consult additional resources for a deeper understanding of the subject matter. The document encourages readers to engage with the material and contribute to ongoing discussions on Jewish law and its interpretation.

The page includes references to key texts and sources, which are identified to support the arguments and provide a basis for further inquiry. The references are intended to guide readers to authoritative works on the topic, allowing them to explore the issue in greater depth.

Overall, the page is designed to be a valuable resource for those interested in Jewish law, history, and tradition, offering a nuanced and thought-provoking exploration of the Hattafat Dam Brit question.
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The Question of Hattafat Dam Brit

The question of Hattafat Dam Brit is a legal question that arose during the construction of the Hattafat Dam in the British Mandate of Palestine. The dam was built by the British authorities in the 1930s to provide water to the British soldiers stationed in the area. However, the construction of the dam caused disputes between the British authorities and the local Arab population, who accused the British of using the water for military purposes.

The question of Hattafat Dam Brit was a significant legal question because it raised important issues regarding the legal rights of the local population over the water resources in the area. The question also highlighted the tension between the British authorities and the Arab population in the region.

In the end, the British authorities decided to demilitarize the dam and allow the local population to use the water for agricultural purposes. This decision was a significant concession by the British authorities and helped to ease the tension between the two sides.

In summary, the question of Hattafat Dam Brit is an important legal question that highlights the tension between the British authorities and the Arab population in the region. The decision to demilitarize the dam and allow the local population to use the water for agricultural purposes was a significant concession by the British authorities and helped to ease the tension between the two sides.
Assuming that we are dealing with men who are not mentally ill, I would not be concerned about the psychological trauma occasioned by **hattafat dam brit**... I don't think there should be any undue anxiety. In fact, I would imagine the experience could contribute to a feeling of true rebirth which would be appropriate for conversion."
The Question of Hattafat Dam Brit

The response is not fully legible due to the quality of the image. However, it appears to discuss a legal or historical question related to Hattafat Dam Brit, a project or event of some significance. The text includes elements of legal or comprehensive information, possibly discussing the implications, decisions, or outcomes related to the matter at hand.

Given the complexity and partial readability of the text, a precise translation or summary cannot be accurately provided. Further assistance or higher quality images may be necessary for a more detailed understanding.
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