

Savoy Management Did Not Know Judge Was Related to Contestant

Indignant Writer Says It Was Something Contemptible and Would Have Us Tell the World All About the Handing Out of That Second Prize

Before we delve into this thing which seemed to have created quite a furore, we want to say that the affair staged by the management of the Savoy Ballroom was staged in all honesty by that management and they have shown, without the least shadow of doubt, that they have never had any part in trying to mislead a public which, justly, has given them wonderful support.

And they are going to keep up that support, too, for the Savoy management spends liberally in entertainment and tries its utmost to give three and four times for the small price of admission charged. A letter from Mrs. Birdie Johnson of 157 West 136th street came to us last week, too late for comment, but this week—ah!

Mrs. Johnson claims that one Mr. Jackson, publisher of a paper or magazine called the Tattler, who acted as one of the judges, is a brother of the contestant receiving the second prize. Today we are reproducing the picture of the young women taking part in the contest, so that all hands can judge for themselves whether the people filing protest after protest are justified.

Personally we feel that they are, for the moment it is found that a judge in an affair of this kind is related to a contestant, the affair becomes all wet and it is time to get upon the housetops and cry unto high heaven. Mrs. Johnson not only files the claim that the Tattler man is related to the winner of the second prize, but also states that another gentleman connected with the same paper, or magazine, ALSO ACTED AS A JUDGE.

We pass no decision in the matter. If what is claimed is true, then the Savoy management has taken a stand that will endear them to the general public. It is their contention that the little lady with the curls, who was placed third, should be moved up to second place. As we stated before, we have no judgment to pass in the matter and simply ask the public to gaze upon the pictures and see if Mrs. Johnson's claim would stand up before an unbiased jury. Personally we think the lady's claim would stand up, but we must not pass judgment in the matter. We leave that for the public.

Then, too, our columns are wide open for any explanation any judge in the affair might feel like submitting BEFORE WE PRINT MRS. JOHNSON'S VITRIOLIC LETTER WHICH RINGS WITH TRUTH. Oh, this missive is hot, all right, all right. When the management of the Savoy found that something went wrong somewhere, if we are to believe the walls which have gone up since the affair, they voluntarily suggested that if the gentleman in question failed to come forth with an explanation of why he did not rise and suggest that it would be hard for him to appear as judge in something wherein a relative appeared, they would gladly do that which they feel the pub-

lic would have them do and one can ask no more.

Do you think, dear and gentle reader, that if an announcement was made from the platform stating that the brother or some close relative of one of the contestants would appear and be judged by those included said brother, relative and business partner of said relative, the gathering would have welcomed this state of affairs? Yep, you are right. We would have done the same. Now, if it is true, what is the next move? The Savoy stands ready, open and above board in the matter, what about thee, Tattler? Of course, we have no patience with the wag who suggested that the winner of the first award had no competition. Let the camera speed while we hold our breath.