The Connecticut Daily Campus two weeks ago elected a new editor. The election was routine. The events preceding the election, however, were not routine. Two weeks previous, polls opened throughout the University of Connecticut for the election of Student Senate officials. The Board of Directors of The Campus met earlier, of course, to discuss the issues and to decide whether to endorse any of the candidates for office. Because the Board could not make a unanimous choice, it was decided to present an objective appraisal of the four candidates for the Managing Editor position.

The editorial that appeared in The Campus on the day of the election, however, was not just an objective appraisal. It was, instead, an endorsement for two candidates for Senate President and Vice-President. This stunned the other members of the Board. In fact, they called an emergency meeting that afternoon.

The result of that meeting was a unanimous decision to remove the editor of his duties and place him on indefinite leave. The editor asked for, and was granted, 24 hours to consider the request. The suspension remained in effect for almost 48 hours until a new meeting was held to give the editor a chance to explain his position.

After the hearing, the Board voted to request the editor's resignation because they felt they could no longer work with him. The editor asked for, and was granted, 30 hours to consider the request.

At the next day's meeting, however, the editor said he did not wish to resign and asked further to be allowed to conduct the editorial meeting already scheduled for that week.

After discussion, the request was allowed and the editorial meeting held. The elections were routine, but the events preceding them were not as common.

The Opposite End

Newspaper elections were also recently held at Washington University in St. Louis. In that case, however, editors are not elected by the newspaper's Board of Directors, but by the University's Board of Publications.

Four students applied for the position of editor of the Student Life. One of those, of course, was elected. Immediately afterward, however, a protest was made to the dean of students that personal bias had entered the election. The dean conformed that the election was numerically incomplete, thus depriving the publication of proper representation.

The dean concurred with the objection and ordered another election. In the meantime, one of the Board members resigned and two new members were appointed. Following another lengthy meeting of the Board, and another discussion, a second candidate was elected.

An immediate protest was once again lodged with the President of the Student Senate, who questioned the general validity of the procedure. Because of the new appointments to the Board, the dean concurred.

The dean of students then appealed to the Board of Student Affairs to review the legality of the various meetings. After a hearing, the BSA ruled the first meeting of the Board of Publications to be the valid meeting.

The staff of the Student Life has protested the BSA ruling, charging that the editorship had already been made a power of the Student Senate.