

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1868

1 THE honest country delegates to the Democratic Convention yesterday have come out to their surprise and grief, that the city politicians who manage the party have no principles which they dare to avow. Many a sturdy Democrat, who has cherished manly faith in the integrity and candor of his party, went home last evening disgusted by the discovery that a handful of trick politicians were the dictators to whom he must bow. Now, they should be thankful for the privilege of walking quietly at home, until the Pittsburgh clique can manufacture some principles and cook up a ticket, and then give them leave to vote for it.

the Mosiac robe, which ANDREW JOHNSON claimed for a while, now appears to diversify his spotless ermine with both the light and the shadow. Mr. CHASE announces that marked and significant precision this principle that States, fully exercising all their privileges in the Federal Union, have the exclusive control of the question of suffrage. We quote his language as reported by the *Nicholson Enquirer* of June 6th:

"I have no objection to the several States being sovereign, he believes that the Constitution of the United States places the matter of suffrage into the hands of the States, and he thinks no other power has the right to interfere with it."

It would be difficult, even in view of recent developments of his duplicity and hardness as a politician, to believe that

It seems that, after all their promises to the contrary, the English will not wholly evacuate Abyssinia, but that a foothold will be retained in the country, some troops being stationed at Zoula, a town on the coast. This will surprise no one. It is not often that Great Britain refuses to avail herself of an opportunity to extend the influence of these concomitants of British civilization and dominion, the red coat and the bayonet.

Isador Rosenthal

SECRET, FROM 9 A. M. UNTIL 5 P. M.
June 1st, 1968. TO THE PRESIDENT, 1968-9

TYPE. Apply at the GALTHERS COUNTING

1. The first group of authors (e.g., Berman et al., 1986; Berman & O'Leary, 1988; Berman & O'Leary, 1991; Berman & O'Leary, 1992; Berman & O'Leary, 1993; Berman & O'Leary, 1994; Berman & O'Leary, 1995; Berman & O'Leary, 1996; Berman & O'Leary, 1997; Berman & O'Leary, 1998; Berman & O'Leary, 1999; Berman & O'Leary, 2000; Berman & O'Leary, 2001; Berman & O'Leary, 2002; Berman & O'Leary, 2003; Berman & O'Leary, 2004; Berman & O'Leary, 2005; Berman & O'Leary, 2006; Berman & O'Leary, 2007; Berman & O'Leary, 2008; Berman & O'Leary, 2009; Berman & O'Leary, 2010; Berman & O'Leary, 2011; Berman & O'Leary, 2012; Berman & O'Leary, 2013; Berman & O'Leary, 2014; Berman & O'Leary, 2015; Berman & O'Leary, 2016; Berman & O'Leary, 2017; Berman & O'Leary, 2018; Berman & O'Leary, 2019; Berman & O'Leary, 2020; Berman & O'Leary, 2021; Berman & O'Leary, 2022; Berman & O'Leary, 2023; Berman & O'Leary, 2024; Berman & O'Leary, 2025) have shown that the use of a single, standardized measure of self-esteem is insufficient to capture the complexity of self-esteem in the workplace. They argue that self-esteem is a multidimensional construct that can be measured at different levels of abstraction, ranging from global self-esteem to specific self-esteem related to a particular job or organization. They also argue that self-esteem is a dynamic construct that can change over time and in response to various workplace events and experiences.