

The Israelite.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY MORNING.
BLOCH & CO. PRINTERS, 82 Sixth Street.
ISAAC M. WISE, Editor & Proprietor.

TERMS. Three Dollars per annum, in advance. The
BIBLIOPHILE is published weekly in German, at the
same office, and by the same proprietor, at 50 Cents
per copy, in advance. For the two publications
taken by the same person, Four Dollars per annum, in
advance. Preachers are charged but half those prices.
Terms of Advertising. In either Paper, per square of
twelve lines of this type, set up daily: One insertion
5 cents; Two insertions 10 cents; Three insertions 15 cents;
Per 1 month 50 cents; 3 months 1 00; 6 months 1 50;
1 year 2 00.
Advertisements (without charge) and paper 1 year, 12
numbers, (not exceeding 25 lines, solid), 50 cents; 6
months, 25 cents; 3 months, 15 cents; 1 month, 10 cents.
The desired number of insertions should be plainly
written on the margin of advertisements, otherwise
they will be regularly published until ordered out, and
charged accordingly.
Book Printing. In English, German and Hebrew, executed
promptly, and every description of Job Printing, in
English or German, or both, thankfully received, and
executed with promptness, neatness and dispatch.
Communications, to insure prompt attention, should
be written on one side of the paper, and to a plain
fold, legible hand, with large space between the lines.

CINCINNATI

Friday Morning, DECEMBER 26, 1862.

Leopold Meyer, of Detroit, Mich., owes to this office \$9 25; he will please pay.

Isaac Shire, lately of Canandaigua, N. Y., has an important letter at this office. Send address immediately.

A sum of money has been left at this office for Mr. ABRAHAM SOHAWNER. He will please call and receive it.

Review of a Colonel's Order.

Who is Colonel J. V. du Bois? From which state and particular locality thereof does he hail? Is he a Frenchman or an American? and similar questions we were asked since the Cincinnati Gazette published that Colonel's general order, date December 8, and we could not answer them. It is difficult in our days, when the people of the loyal states support about 12,000 colonels, to know all of them, if the newspaper reporters do not give us some account of the exploits of the one or the other. We never read of the heroism, exploits or existence of a Colonel Du Bois, until his general order from Holly Springs, Miss., reached us. This document having rendered the Colonel specially interesting to us, we would like to know something about him, at least a little more than we do.

Most likely we would not have published the following general order, which was sent us almost instantly after its publication, from fear of being found guilty of publishing contraband news; had not the Cincinnati Gazette brought the famous document to public notice.—Here is a *verbatim* copy of the document as sent us from headquarters direct.

"HOLLY SPRINGS, Miss.,
December 8, 1862.

GENERAL ORDER.

"On account of the scarcity of Provisions all Cotton Speculators, Jews, and other Vagrants, having no honest means to support except trading upon the misery of the country, and in general all persons from the North, not connected with the army whatsoever and having no permission from the commanding General to remain in town, will leave in twenty-four (24) hours or he will be put to duty in the intrenchments."

"By order of Col. Jno. V. Du Bois, U. S. Army, Com'd'g.

"CHARLES H. TURLU,
1st Lieut., A. A. A. Gen'l."

A remarkable document, indeed, in the idiom, phraseology, grammar, spelling and sentiment, so much so that we hardly feel capable of officiating it. It is so entirely original in conception and style that it obscures Parson Brownlow's diction. Compilers of the documentary history of the present war must not forget to preserve this general order, it is too characteristic to be omitted.

We ask, who is the author of this famous order, the colonel or his lieutenant? In history it is important to know to whom mankind is indebted for certain productions and to us, especially, it might be important hereafter to know the author. The war over and these gentlemen shall return to private life to be humble civilians like ourselves, then it might be important to know our particular friends. Therefore we would like to ascertain the author of this famous general order. It would be considered a special favor, if the colonel would give us correct information on this topic.

The Jews need not feel offended that "we" are placed in connection with vagrants, &c., as they are also brought in position with "cotton speculators" and persons "trading upon the misery of the country;" and it is well known that high toned gentlemen "connected with the army whatever," also rank among the largest cotton speculators. If "trading upon the misery of the country" means anything intelligible to a humble civilian, the Jews have a gallant phalanx of company in the highest circles of society, who at present subsist on the misery of the country and coin money from the blood of the nation.

We are at a loss to know why the Jews

are specially mentioned in this general order. Too much honor altogether. The laws of the United States make no such distinctions, confer no authority on anybody to make it, and do not even tolerate an expression of this kind. Or are military commanders placed above the law, also of common propriety? They may violate the laws of grammar and rhetoric, but they are sworn to respect and protect the laws of the land, to violate them is a double crime to the soldier; because he is a citizen and sworn beside to enforce the law.—Well then, if the Jews at Holly Springs, Miss., are cotton speculators or such other vagrants they are included in the order without mentioning them separately, if they are not, by what right were they expelled and particularly mentioned? Which law of the U. S. confers such authority on any person? Which act of congress gives military commanders the right to defy the laws of the land, maltreat and insult loyal and peaceable citizens, because A. B. or C. harbors prejudice against a certain class of people? It is, in our estimation, a violation of the soldier's oath, a misconstruction of his duty, and a dangerous precedent. If force and power may with impunity defy the laws anywhere, how long will it take us to be submitted to a military despotism everywhere? Once subjected, how much precious blood will it cost us to get out of it? Readers may laugh that we attach so much importance to a colonel's order of a nature merely local; but it is not local. Did any superior officer revoke or correct it? No. On the contrary we are told that our co-religionists have been treated so in several other places, also in the office of the provost marshal of Nashville and elsewhere.—We are told that every provost marshal down South does in this respect as he pleases, and no superior officer interferes. We are told that it is prejudiced with some and avarice with others. If half of it, we are told in this respect, is true, the order of Colonel Du Bois and the words of Parson Brownlow are only the expression of the men in power for the time being; therefore it is dangerous and should immediately be attended to; to ascertain in time, whether we live under the constitution and laws of the United States, or under the arbitrary whims of large and small military chiefs. All orders of this kind should be collected, all men maltreated on account of their religious confession should make a lawful affidavit before the proper authority, and that collection be presented in due form to the President of the United States. If we do not help ourselves, nobody will. We have no member of congress now to watch these things, no particular friend in the cabinet, no hand at the public press, and many of our young men who served honorably as officers in the army, come home disgusted with the prejudices existing in higher quarters. The President of the U. S. has an oath registered in heaven "to enforce the laws; this matter must fully and fairly be brought to his notice. If we neglect this, we will be treated worse still.

As to Colonel Du Bois and his lieutenant we have to say—If Frenchmen they are, they should not have reproduced a prejudice killed by the French revolution. They should have remembered the numerous French Jews who fought upon the barricades of the republic, who distinguished themselves in the Crimean and Italian campaigns. They should have remembered that among the provisional government of the republic of 1848 there were two prominent Jews, Crimeux, the minister of justice, and Godchaux the minister of finance; and in the cabinet of the emperor the Jew Fould could never be spared. If Frenchmen they are, in remembrance of the numerous Jewish scholars and artists, writers and composers that contribute so much to the fame and luster of France, they should have buried their prejudices under the ruins of dark centuries.—If Americans they are, why did they not blush before the memory of Washington who testified to the patriotism and sacrifices of the Jews in the war of the revolution?—why did they not tremble before the threatening words of Thomas Jefferson who not only gave expression to the equal and inalienable rights of man, but also lionlike fought with his pen, the friends of a state church and the consequent distinction of citizens on account of their religious confessions? If Americans they are, how could they hurl that general order into the face of the descendants of the men who framed the constitution of the United States, the boldest document ever written by man? It is not the Jew, it is the American whom that order disgraces. In us it is not the Jew but it is the man and the American citizen who feels outraged by such proceedings. As a Jew we feel ourselves in our religious conviction, far, far beyond the slanderous jargon of anybody, far beyond the reach of general orders, stump speeches, or any other ephemeral piece of paper. As a Jew we pity the men of prejudice coun-

ted on ignorance, avarice, envy, or any other offspring of an ill will or a corrupt heart. As a man and a citizen, however, we feel outraged and demand justice from the hands of the chief magistrate of this country.

We send this paper to the President, Mr. Stanton, General Halleck, Rosser, Grant and Curtis, and hope they will bestow proper attention on the subject. At the same time, however, we request our friends to collect all orders and affidavits on this point to be brought before the President, and to be placed on record, for future reference, for the information of that historian who will render an impartial verdict.

To prove, however, to our readers that the Jew is not the only outraged person, we copy the following from the New York Times:

Military Marauding—The Evil.

A private letter to us from a high-minded officer in one of the South-western armies has this statement: "If I should tell you the state of demoralization of many of our old regiments in the Valley of the Mississippi, you would not believe it. They have no respect for man or woman, and are guilty of offenses that, if committed at home, would send them to the penitentiary for life." Similar representations are made in so many other quarters that it is no longer possible to doubt that portions of our army have become greatly demoralized.

It is not a pleasant fact, but it is a criminal to shut our eyes to it. Every loyal organ of opinion in the land should raise its voice against it, and demand its correction.

The wrong is a blistering shame to the cause. Who can not remember the mingled amazement, indignation and disgust excited by Beauregard's proclamation to the Virginians before Bull Run? "He dared to say of our army: 'All rules of civilized warfare are abandoned, and they proclaim by their acts, if not on their banners, that their war-cry is Beauty and Boldy.' It was a piece of audacious falsehood that we could account for only by his desperation." We repelled it as the most infamous of libels.—It was so. With respect to the conduct of several regiments now in the service, it is so no longer. "So far as has depended upon them, Beauregard is purged of his calumny.—The blot he in vain tried to affix upon our sacred cause they have established. The purest cause that ever summoned to battle has, in the conduct of thousands of so-called defenders, been foully dishonored.

The wrong is a prodigious hindrance to the revival of Union feeling. The war has been prosecuted with the expectation that when their leaders were broken down and crushed out by force, the Southern people, benefited by experience, would again turn to the old flag. All hope of this must disappear if, by the practical conduct of our armies we show that it is not a love of the Union, a genuine nationality of feeling, that constrains us to strike these blows, but the thirst for plunder and the lust of domination. Nothing can be conceived better calculated, than such misconduct of our soldiers, to nerve the Southern people to additional desperation against submission, and to leave stings after submission which will rankle for generations.

The wrong is a great detriment to discipline. It superinduces a general laxity and license utterly incompatible with those habits of subordination, without which there can be no good soldiery. This is peculiarly fatal to the American soldier. He is by birth and education incapable of that passive, machine-like compliance, which comes so natural to the European, who has been habituated to strong rule from the cradle.—His obedience, if it is what it ought to be, springs quite as much from a moral force within, as from military constraint without. Everything, therefore, which breaks down the moral force impairs his military worth. No Marauder—least of all an American one—can make a good soldier.

Lastly, this wrong entails a terrible evil upon Northern society. This general license must engraft habits upon the young men of the army which will cling to thousands of them after their military life is ended, and put them directly on the road to the penitentiary. It is the most dangerous thing in the world to disregard, for even the shortest time, on any cause, the distinction between *meum* and *laum*. Its whole tendency is to dull and obscure all sense of such distinction, and to make a man a despot without reference to cause. From plundering a rebel to plundering anybody else, would be but a step; and it would cost hardly one more scruple to rob in peace than to rob in war. Is the army thus to be made a school for felons, or a hot-bed for the growth of disorder, violence and spoliation? Heaven forbid.

A woman offering to sign a deed, the judge asked her whether her husband compelled her to sign? "He compelled me," said the lady; "no, not twenty like him."

Dr. Bernhard Beer's Letter to Bongo.

Continued from No. 27.
Dr. Beer next addresses Bongo thus: "You continue: He (God) has but one people, that entirely belongs to him; viz: the Israelitish, the others revolted against him."
"You only put more stress on the accusation, raised against the Mosais doctrine by theological and philosophical authors; that they teach particularism, (exclusiveness), by adding thus according to the Mosais Law, but other nations revolted against God. But where is the passage in the Pentateuch that says, the other nations revolted against God therefore only one people belong to him alone."

"Exodus 19, 6 it says 'Ye shall be to me a peculiar (people) from among all nations,' but it is added in the same verse, 'For mine is the whole earth,' i. e., all nations are my work; for all men are created in my image, therefore my providence is for all.' Therefore the explanation follows in verse six, 'And ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.' i. e., I have chosen you as my own members I make it your duty to cooperate on earth as the true priests to promulgate the true knowledge of God, and to maintain in yourselves this 'call' by holiness. Previously, however, it is stated in verse 5, that the condition for which the selection of Israel depends, is: 'If ye will diligently hearken to my voice and observe my covenant, i. e., if you will adhere to the doctrines of justice and the precepts of holiness which I shall teach you.'

"There is no particularism anywhere that says, because the rest of mankind revolted against God, he rejected them and chose Israel to belong exclusively to Him." Only the historical fact must be taken into consideration, that the nations then partly had sunk so deeply, and partly (as Egyptians and Indians) were so divided into castes and so much estranged among themselves, that they as a unit were incapable of receiving and retaining the true and the good. The Hebrew people, however, had inherited of the fathers the basis of truth, the nucleus of the good, though encrusted by an Egyptian shell, still it was preserved; therefore it was chosen to be the bearer of those sublime doctrines and verities which are the condition of human happiness.

"In this and in nothing else reposes the motive to the election of Israel, as it is expressed in the Bible, Deuteronomy 9:4-6 clear, indeed, for everybody who properly understands to read the Bible. Also the ancient Jewish doxology understands the election of Israel in this manner, as expressed in the morning prayers: 'Thou hast brought us nigh to Thy great name by truth, to worship Thee and to comprehend in love thy Unity.'

"It is sufficiently proved, that Israel's election was not to involve the rejection of other nations; by the repeated injunctions of the Law to grant equal rights (Deut. 10:16; 27:19) and show equal love (Exodus 23, 9; Leviticus 19:33, 34) to the Heathen stranger as to the Israelite; even if he has not embraced the Mosais Law (Deut. 10:17.) In the same spirit the possession of Esau and the children of Lot, notwithstanding their Heathenism, is declared to Israel inviolable (Deut. 2:5, 9.)

"Judaism, therefore, never considered the non-Israelitish nations as rebellious or rejected; the idea of an 'exclusively' or 'principally saving church,' never found favor in that religion; the just ones of all nations, if they only observe the first rudiments of morals, (Genesis 9:4-6) are much more, considered as having claim to the kingdom of heaven like the Israelites.—(Talm. Sanhed. 105, a.)

"You then continue:—'The world and man stand in juxtaposition to this so-conceived God who reveals his will externally in the Decalogue, as something foreign; not godly, as something which is not perpetually created by him, but at some fixed period was created by him, and then rebelled against him. This anti-godly being necessarily must stand under the power of another powerful and anti-godly spirit, under the dominion of the prince, of this (lower) world, Satan, who disputes God the dominion over man. Man, according to the spirit breathed of God, is a double being, he is God's, if he obeys the laws of the spirit; or Satan's, if he follows after the desires of the flesh. He is of a sinful nature, and must make sacrifices for his sins.'

"I now ask, how far this idea of Hegel, so easily presented by you, that the God of the Jews is thought to exist entirely outside of the universe which therefore must be viewed as something foreign to God that revolted against him—is actually founded upon the ancient records of Judaism?

"According to the theories of Hegel, God or the absolute existence becomes a reality by the human mind only. God is no separate being aside of the world, but is always developing himself. The more perfection humanity gains, the more self-conscious the Deity becomes, as he has his seat in the hu-