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Leslie Howard has a very keen sense and expression of humor—and an even greater appreciation of it, while he has more personal charm than almost any great actor (or actress) I have ever known, and has that supreme art of concealing art and projecting his personal charm and spiritual magnetism over the footlights. But he is by no means a poseur, as so many of the other really great actors I have known so well and intimately have been, and is peculiarly unsophisticated in his views, expression and attitude towards life in general and the theatre and art of the cinema in particular.

There is something peculiarly wistful (one might say Barriesque) about his personality—a certain hesitancy about his judgment and decision, as if he hated to commit himself; and it is this quality, amongst many other graces, which makes one feel instinctively that he was born to play “Hamlet”—and let us add “Richard II”; while we have already had a taste of his perfection in “Romeo” and many more modern roles.

Leslie Howard in appearance is much younger than his years (he is at present a little over forty, but still has a slim and boyish figure), and one cannot realize that he is a paterfamilias until one sees him in the company of his growing son (a replica of Leslie) and his delightful and irresistible daughter. The sympathetic charm of his wife and their typical English home on the outskirts of Surrey in the village of Westcott, with its vista of broad acres and lovely gardens, add a finishing touch to his most treasured possessions, but we must not forget the score or more of polo ponies which await the young Squire in his stables. For country life evidently pleases him more than any other, and from his conversation, one soon gathers that he would much prefer to have been a modest writer than a great actor. And it is to the former calling that Howard père hopes his son, who already shows indications of his enthusiasm and success as a writer, will eventually turn to as his life-work after his forthcoming sojourn at Cambridge University.

It was a pleasure to hear Leslie Howard and his son’s description of a visit to Hugh Walpole’s English country retreat in Cumberland, and their whole-hearted tribute to that great writer and his charming company as an ideal host.

Strangely enough, too, the Leslie Howards’ daughter has no particular desire for a theatrical or moving-picture career, though there is no doubt that she inherently possesses all their natural gifts for the stage and cinema, while her debut in Hollywood with her father on the Radio in “Dear Brutus” will be recalled by all who had the pleasure of hearing them together.

Leslie Howard’s gratitude to America rings true in its evident sincerity, and his modest tribute to his own wonderful luck on the stage and screen immediately shatters once and for all any suggestion of egotism, or the feeling that he may merely have got his just deserts.

“Never,” he says, “has the actor had such chances of which he can avail himself to the full as nowadays,” though there always lurks the feeling that he does not really consider the actor (and himself as one of them) quite worthy of his princely rewards. Like Tree, who would have preferred his half-brother, Max Beerbohm’s career and envied his success as a writer, Howard gives one the indelible impression that he does not consider himself as quite in his ideal métier on the stage, though willing to make the best of it; and, while he has much in common with the late Herbert Tree in his philosophic

LeslieHoward.net
view-point and personality, Leslie Howard is much more of the "homme sérieux" in every way. In many ways Leslie Howard more closely resembles Charles Wyndham, and should rival that consummate comedian in "David Garrick".

Leslie Howard pays tribute to the great good done by the Little Theatre movement in America (and in England) to the stage as a whole, but considers that work has now been accomplished to the full in New York, which surpasses any European capital in the variety and breadth of its theatrical appeal and extraordinary range of its themes and treatment thereof. The local censorship he considers ample; any officialdom is apt no doubt to cramp the style and breadth of the popular theatre, confining many subjects inevitably to the limits of the private theatre and its membership as in England. (One need only instance the example of "Victoria Regina" in London to illustrate this.)

But Leslie Howard is by no means oblivious to the naiveté of American audiences as a whole, though, knowing, and having had some experience of his own apparent difficulty in sometimes making up his own mind, it is refreshing to hear him unburden himself amusingly (and perhaps not always quite convincingly—even to himself) of the love of Americans for conferences, in which everyone talks round in a circle and nothing is often or eventually settled.

Leslie Howard is a very sparing eater, and, although he confesses to a natural fondness for wine and cigars, says that a little of either goes a long way with him. But he is passionately fond of polo (probably next to writing his only real hobby), while he is already making active plans for his own production of plays and artistic direction of others in pictures.

It is to that he will probably turn eventually when, if ever, his appeal as a favorite "star" should wane, while he is already arranging to alternate his own personal appearances with his direction of others on the screen.

And it is Leslie Howard's greatest ambition at present to divide his time equally between the Stage proper and the Talkie in the U.S.A., while he would naturally like to continue his activities here with those at home in England, spending six months in each country.

It is wonderful to think in these competitive days that Leslie Howard never appeared on any stage until his honorable return from the Great War in 1917, when he first appeared in London, but has had all his greatest success in these United States so far.

One last touch, which is indicative of the man, the dreamer—and the artist, with all his sensitivity and delicacy of feeling.

Leslie Howard told me—quite naturally and in a delightful and unexpected view of reminiscence—that the gold coin appended to the fragile chain which hangs around his neck (next to his skin), and from which he is never parted day or night, was sent to him by his wife just before his first great stage success in "The Cardboard Lover" (following a very thin and, indeed, rather hard time). "The charm of America's generosity and her appreciation of Leslie Howard.
HAMLET has been current in the repertory of the theatre for 333 years, and is now no less frequently played than when it first appeared. So many thousands of performances have been given, that a complete list, were it possible, would stagger the imagination. Even the incomplete records that we have are prodigious. Fathered in England, the play has since been seen in more countries and in more languages than any other in theatrical literature. A play never achieves its full stature until it has been taken from between the covers of a book and given animation on the stage.

A history of a play is the history of its performances. Very little is known of the earliest performances of "Hamlet", and such matters as the manner of dress were not described until two hundred years ago. But the famous Burbage, for whom Shakespeare wrote the play, was its first representative. The earliest record of real interest, however, concerns Robert Taylor, for it is his performance that Shakespeare is said to have directed himself. Betterton followed, starting a tradition, which, according to Shakespearean scholars, has exerted more influence on subsequent interpretations than any other. Barton Booth, who acted the Ghost with Betterton, said of his Hamlet, "When I acted the Ghost with Betterton, instead of my awing him, he terrified me; but divinity hung round that man." Betterton presented a dignified figure, conservatively dressed in black; this became a conventionality, which usually has been followed ever since. Such a costume was a fortunate innovation, for contemporary reports speak of one Hamlet as dressed in "cocked hat, shoulder-knots, and a full-bottomed wig".

Betterton and David Garrick, who is accorded the palm of eighteenth century criticism, are linked together by Hamlets of Robert Wilks, Spranger Barry, Thomas Sheridan, and John Henderson, who are variously commended without being described. Henderson's ability was noted, for he excelled equally as Hamlet, Falstaff, and Shylock.

Garrick, who first played the role in 1742, was the most famed Hamlet of the eighteenth century. Thomas Davies, contemporary authority, said of his performance, "He, of all the players I ever saw, gave the greatest variety to action and deportment." However, retrospective comments state that it was characterized most unmistakably by the stylized formality of all eighteenth century performances, the costume being that of George III's time, even down to the silk pocket handkerchief. This affectation of preciosity took the fancy of many successive performers until John Philip Kemble restored Hamlet to his original estate of dignity.

Of Kemble, Hazlitt said, "He played Hamlet with the strength of a man in armor," and "his performance has not been surpassed". He returned to conventional velvet dress and is said to have exerted more influence on the tradition of the part, inherited by all his successors in it, than has been exerted by any other subsequent performance.

There has been a lively surge of conflicting opinion about each one of his successors, most prominent among whom were Charles Kemble, Charles Mayne Young, Edmund Keane, William Charles Macready, Junius Brutus Booth, Charles John Kean, Barry Sullivan, Gustavus V. Brooke, Henry Irving, and Wilson Barrett.

According to the famous Fanny Kemble, her father, Charles, was "an image of a distracted intellect and a broken heart." These various comments on others were supplied by contemporaries; some were "scholars", "deficient in princely grace", "of exquisite sensibility"; others were "elderly", "robust", "unsympathetic".

"Wilson Barrett represented the prince as a young man of eighteen, whereas he is distinctly shown to be thirty, and the actor himself was middle-aged, and stocky in person. The endeavor was unfortunate," one critic euphemistically commented.
In the latter nineteenth century Henry Irving and Edwin Booth were considered the most outstanding. "They are the only two who have entirely justified themselves to exigent comprehensible judgment" is a comment typical of contemporary opinion. The simplicity, refinement, and elegance of Irving's performance are particularly stressed. He wore black tights, silk doublet, and cloak with a belt of jewels and a dagger.

The first American performance was given by Lewis Hallam at Philadelphia in July, 1759, and in New York in November, 1761, at a theatre in Beekman Street. There were many followers, but a glow of renown still lingers on impersonations of the prince by Thomas Abthorpe Cooper, James William Wallack, George Vanderhoff, Edwin Forrest, Edward Loomis Davenport, Edwin Booth, and Lawrence Barrett. Commentators say of recently remembered actors in the role, that Edwin Booth was born to act Hamlet. He had a princely mind, a gloomy temperament, and a contemplative disposition. He was of a slender, yet nervous physique, appropriate to the prince. The "Atlantic Monthly" said, "This actor so easily and constantly falls into beautiful attitudes and movements, that he seems to go about, as we heard a humorist say, 'making statues all over the stage.'"

Continental performances are almost as frequent as English and American, but it seems that the interpretations from the Teutonic races are always more convincing than those by the French and Italians. The French actors who have portrayed Hamlet include Fechter, Monnet-Sully, and Sara Bernhardt. Other women besides Bernhardt have not felt their careers complete until "Hamlet" had been essayed, beginning with Mrs. Siddons, and including Charlotte Cushman, Fanny Wallack, Anna Dickinson and fifteen other actresses of prominence.

Among contemporary performances the greatest is generally accredited to Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson, but in England Herbert Beerbohm-Tree, F. R. Benson, and H. B. Irving have also been crowned with laurels, and in America, Robert Mantell, Edward Sothern, John Barrymore, Walter Hampden, and Fritz Leiber. More recent performances of Hamlet have been given by Raymond Massey, Basil Sydney and John Gielgud.
who is playing the role of Gertrude, queen of Denmark, is Lady Forbes-Robertson, wife of the famous Shakespearean actor, Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson. Although she is an American by birth, she is more widely known in England for her magnificent performances in Shakespearean roles. The claim that America can make on her is that she was born in Rockland, Maine, and that Saratoga, New York, saw her first stage appearance in 1894. That was at the instigation of her sister, Maxine Elliott, who was the first to induce her to take up a theatrical career. In the same year she made her New York debut at the Star Theatre in "London Assurance." She built herself a considerable career in the Broadway theatre before she journeyed to London in 1899.

That year in London she played Ophelia to one of the greatest Hamlets of all time, Johnston Forbes-Robertson. Four months after she first played this role she became Mrs. Forbes-Robertson. From then until her husband's retirement twenty years later she played with him in London, and accompanied him on numerous tours, not only in England but in the United States and Canada. During that period she portrayed such famous heroines as Portia, Desdemona, Cleopatra, as well as many other non-Shakespearean roles. Her last performance in America was in 1914, when she came with her husband on his farewell tour. In 1917 the actress again played Ophelia, but this time to another great Hamlet, Henry Irving, at the Savoy Theatre in London.

In most recent years Gertrude Elliott has toured with her own repertory of plays throughout Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

WILFRID WALTER

who plays the part of Claudius, the king, never dreamed, when he got his first job, that a theatrical career was in store for him. It was as an Italian wine-grower's apprentice that he first worked. But he had had his heart set on painting as a career; so he returned to London, his home, where he won a scholarship at the Slade School of Art.

His road into the theatre, while circuitous, followed a logical course. Pavlova noticed his work and commissioned him to design some settings for her. This was just before the war. After the intervening four years Mr. Walter found himself again, this time at the top of a twelve foot step-ladder, painting scenery for the Old Vic.

In no time he was one of the mob in "Julius Caesar," and playing bit parts in other Shakespearean plays. In the next five years he played in every play of Shakespeare's except "Cymbeline." During that time he rose to the first rank of Old Vic players, and his roles included Othello, Henry VIII, all three Falstaffs, the two Marc Antonys, Titus Andronicus, and Claudius.

Not satisfied with a lengthy list of great performances to his credit, he entered the field of playwriting. He wrote several plays, the most successful of which was a two character play entitled "Happy and Glorious." He was last seen in America in 1932, when he toured with this play.
PAMELA STANLEY

as Ophelia in Mr. Howard's "Hamlet", is making her first appearance in America. Though she is still in her early twenties, she has attained great prominence in London in a variety of roles and has impressed British theatrical circles by her brilliant portrayals of Shakespearean heroines. Titania in "A Midsummer Night's Dream", Phoebe in "As You Like it", Ariel and Miranda in "The Tempest" have all been recreated by Miss Stanley. Most of these performances were given in the Open Air Theatre in Regent's Park, where for the past three summers, despite the usual English weather, the actress has been playing to large and enthusiastic audiences.

Although Miss Stanley has played innumerable Shakespearean roles and many others in the West End, she has given one London performance in which Broadway will be chiefly interested. In 1935 the actress was the first to create the role of Victoria Regina in Laurence Housman's play of that name, which has since attained fame in America through Helen Hayes' portrayal of the role. Owing to the refusal of the Lord Chamberlain to license a public representation of her Highness on the English stage, the Gate Theatre presented Mr. Housman's play in semi-private performances, for which this theatre is famous.

Prior to this she had played in John Drinkwater's "Bird in Hand", Joanna in "Dear Brutus", and Wendy in "Peter Pan". Also she has been in such tried and true classics as Schnitzler's "Anatol" and Wycherly's "The Country Wife".

AUBREY MATHER

who plays Polonius, adopted the stage as his profession at the age of 19, and apart from four years of war service he never left it. He comes from a clerical family, for three of his uncles were bishops, his father was Canon of Wells Cathedral, and his brother is an archdeacon.

This is not Mr. Mather's first visit to the United States. He came here in 1919 to play under Morris Gest's management at the Manhattan Opera House in "The Luck of the Navy." He remained for an extensive tour of the United States and Canada. Mr. Mather is no stranger to Shakespearean roles, though for many years he has played in nothing but modern comedy in the London theatres. Earlier in his career he acted only in Shakespeare, and in "Hamlet" alone has enacted the roles of Bernardo, Guildenstern, First and Second Gravedigger, Player King, the Ghost, and King Claudius. He has never before played Polonius, his present role.

He is one of the first actors to be filmed in Shakespeare in Great Britain, playing the role of Colin, the old shepherd, in Elizabeth Bergner's motion picture of "As You Like It," which has just been completed.
JOHN BARCLAY

who is playing the Ghost of Hamlet's father, is equally well-known to musical and theatrical audiences. His versatility in the fields of acting and singing has made him a favorite with Gilbert and Sullivan fans. He has played in numerous revivals, the most notable of which were the Winthrop Ames productions during the 1926-27 season. Besides his comic opera pursuits the actor-singer has had vast experience in grand opera, having performed for six seasons with the Philadelphia Opera Company and one summer with the St. Louis Municipal Opera Company.

Born in Surrey, England, Mr. Barclay first turned to the theatre in 1918, when he performed under the direction of Sir Nigel Playfair in A. A. Milne's "Make Believe." From that time on followed an active theatrical career, interspersed with frequent concert engagements. New York last saw Mr. Barclay in 1934, in the adaptation of Strauss's "Die Fledermaus," entitled "Champagne Sec."

CLIFFORD EVANS

who plays Laertes, was born in Cardiff, Wales. He is well-known to New York audiences, having played the juvenile lead in "The Distaff Side," which he originally played in the London production.

Mr. Evans' experience in Shakespeare has been extensive. For the past few seasons he has been seen in leading roles at the Regent's Park Open Air Theatre, among them Sebastian in "Twelfth Night," and Lysander in "A Midsummer Night's Dream." Before that he played Ferdinand in "The Tempest" during the all-star season at the Old Vic, in which Charles Laughton took part.

Motion pictures have also taken much of Mr. Evans' time, for during the past year he has had leading parts in Phoenix Films and British International Pictures.

Prior to his appearance in "Hamlet," Clifford Evans played the lead opposite Diana Wynyard in "The Ante-Room."

JOSEPH HOLLAND

the "Horatio" in Hamlet, has an impressive list of recent Broadway productions to his credit. He made his New York debut in Katharine Cornell's production of "Romeo and Juliet," playing the role of Sampson. Following that he was seen in "Parnell" and then again with Miss Cornell, in "Saint Joan," playing the important part of Robert de Beaudricourt. The fall of 1935 found him with Philip Merivale in his productions of "Othello" and "Macbeth."

Although Mr. Holland is a native of Virginia and a graduate of the University of Richmond, he had his theatrical schooling at the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art in London. He played the title role in the school's performance of "King Lear" at the Haymarket Theatre, and on the strength of this interpretation got his first professional role, in "The Drums Begin" at the Embassy Theatre, London.

STANLEY LATHBURY

who plays the role of the First Gravedigger, has become Stratford-on-Avon's professional comedian par excellence. He has played all Shakespearean comedy parts in five different Stratford-on-Avon festivals. These same roles he has played in such remote and widely diversified parts of the world as Berlin, Cairo, Oslo, Australia, and New Zealand. Shakespeare has occupied only a comparatively small amount of time in a career which embraces over one hundred different characterizations. Notable among these was the role of "Scrubby" in "Outward Bound," which he created in London and played in seven different West End theatres, as well as important parts in English productions of "The Cherry Orchard," "He Who Gets Slapped," "The Seagull," "You Never Can Tell," "Petticoat Fever," and many other plays.

Mr. Lathbury was born in Cheshire, England, and began his active career in his father's East Indian business in Manchester. According to himself he was "quite a failure in the part," and gave it up after two years, to join a theatrical stock company. Since then he has had one of the busiest careers in the theatre. He has not been seen in America since 1914.
INTERVAL INTERVIEW

with Schuyler Watts

Q. Is there any one point of view behind this production?
A. We aim to re-create for a modern audience as much as possible of the impression Shakespeare's audiences must have received from the tragedy. On the one hand, speed—violence and velocity. On the other: Verse—sublime thought, noble expression.

Q. Why do you think it necessary to adapt the play?
A. Because esthetically the methods of the Elizabethan theatre and those of our own are intrinsically opposed. A black-out, a curtain or a fade-out, for example, is not the counterpart of a rhymed couplet; one is a complete stop, the other is a pointed pause. In the intellectual-emotional realm of high tragedy, this difference is of more than suspected importance. It is the difference between constant interruption and sustained ecstasy. Further, if the major premises of the play are made clear in current theatre terms (the Elizabethans did this) many implicit and too-long-neglected values in "Hamlet" spring suddenly back to life: thundering continuity, a sense of "Grand Hotel"—thus restoring to its original perspective the drama of the geographic scene-changes. The unravelling and clarifying of the dexterous plot and basic drive of the play; the correct orientation of Hamlet himself, amid colorful, super-charged melodrama.

Q. Why do you use a Danish locale?
A. Because Shakespeare did. To be sure, his was a modern-dress theatre; the Denmark his audiences saw was contemporay. But where the drama demanded — and sturdily demanded — an earlier era, with their will to make believe, they were eagerly transported back to Denmark prior to the Norman Conquest. England is absent, conspicuously so, from the action.

Q. Briefly just what is Hamlet all about?
A. That's not as stupid a question as it sounds. I would like to be able to answer it. "Hamlet" is infinite, myriad; it is about everything in heaven and earth — and shall I couple hell? Essentially, though, it is two things: a rousing melodrama, a show — and at the same time it is the study of a man's soul. Everybody knows that. But what has been sadly lost sight of (and in the theatre of all places!) is the dramatic clash by means of which Shakespeare consolidated the two aims. Charge it to vain-glorying actors, charge it to surface-scratching directors, but recognize, for Shakespeare's and for Hamlet's sake, that the main point of the play is the protracted battle of Hamlet and the King, the revenger and his prey. Irresolution is admittedly the focal theme, the major motif — but it remains a theme; other characters mention it. And note that it begins and ends within the span of the great antagonism, and that this antagonism, this fateful hating of Hamlet and the King, lives right up to the brilliant, but never-noticed last encounter.

Q. Have you changed the lines?
A. Naturally not. Every word, every phrase is Shakespeare's — and what I think he would consider more important, every rhythm. Alterations in sequence have been made in terms of modern theatre; like all great works of art, "Hamlet" seemed to fall into three parts. Act I: Hamlet pledges himself to revenge. Act II: his campaign of lunacy. Act III: the changed Hamlet, the fatalist. The Elizabethan production, of course, crashed on with no interruption from start to finish; the Second Quarto, on which our script is based, strikingly attests this. The all-encompassing problems was how to approximate in terms of our conventions — realism, intervals, second-act climax, sustained Act II, etc — the general impact, the fluid continuity, of Renaissance performance.

Q. You spoke of the correct orientation of Hamlet to the play: what did you mean by that?
A. Theatre annals disclose, in the main, two standard Hamlets. There are others: the sentimental, vase-with-the-acorn interpretation; the Conscience, thematic Hamlet; the psycho-pathological introvert study. But two performances especially emerge again and again down the years — the Hamlet of Reason, the sensitive intellectual; and opposed to him, the
roaring avenger. The former has been charged with accenting only the mental vigor of the part; the latter, with missing much of the subtlety. Yet his has been the performance most applauded, the reason no doubt being that it is the one more closely associated with revenge. In other words, one was appreciated, the other was liked. Which certainly indicates an audience demand for violence in "Hamlet", spirit. But if the significance of the King and his vital opposition to Hamlet had been maintained, would not this demand have been automatically assuaged? As it happened, it was not; that quality inherent to the melodrama of the play had to be supplied by Hamlet himself — and thus a popular Hamlet sprung into being. But did Shakespeare intend this? Did he not, on the contrary, by capitalizing on the isolation of his hero, mean the lofty meditations to contrast to the more external King-revenge-plot?

Q. Is the King then important?
A. Emphatically.

Q. In the course of your work for Mr. Howard, have you made any textual discoveries?
A. Only two. Shakespeare makes it clear by the use of the word "idle" that the Queen approaches the great Closet-scene under the impression that Hamlet is really mad. By the form of address she uses, we know also that she is pitying, affectionate. On the appearance of the Ghost (invisible to her) and with it Hamlet's attendant behavior, she says "Alas, he's mad". Shakespeare indicates a pause after her remark, making it reasonable, I believe, to assume he wished the Queen's deduction to sink in. But why, if she had been thinking him insane anyway? Why — unless she had not been thinking him insane? Interestingly, examination of her speeches from this point of view reveals an abrupt change from amazement denial to pathetic pleading. I happens that Hamlet's speech between this change is the longest in the scene: Shakespeare usually had some action during a long speech in conversation. This is what might be happening: Hamlet figuratively accuses his stepfather of murdering King Hamlet — "Blasting his wholesome brother. Have you eyes?" The Queen, who has just seen her husband's reaction to the enacted Gonzago murder, suddenly begins to realize her son is not mad — and he is telling her she has lusted with, and is now married to, a murderer. Two lines later Hamlet shouts his recognition of her final awareness — "Ha! have you eyes?" After a few minutes of his torturing her with dagger-words, the Ghost appears. Note that his appearance now is motivated by plot: he has expressly told Hamlet to "leave her to heaven". If Hamlet did not know she realized he was sane, there would be nothing particularly unnatural or even cruel about his abuse; the Queen would merely take it for the ravings of an out-and-out madman. But if this interpretation holds water, he now knows that she knows, he has seen that knowledge, commented on it — and his forgetfulness about the Ghost, I submit, is the Ghost's reason for appearing: note that he comes as a husband ("in his habit as he lived") not in arms, demanding revenge. When the Queen turns and sees Hamlet pronouncing a frightened benediction upon himself and then talking to space, she gasps "Alas, he's mad." Shakespeare, even at this fever-pitch moment, gives us an instant to catch some of what this means to her: all the terrible things she has been listening to, and believing, are not true! Even as she now erroneously thinks her husband no murderer, so must she erroneously return to her earlier conclusion, that her son is mad. "Alas, he's mad." Irony. Playwriting. As I can find no scholarship on the point, I must offer it thus folly.

The other point requires even fuller exposition, and as it crosses swords with so brilliant a "Hamlet" authority as John Dover Wilson, I cannot undertake its defense here. Suffice it to say — and watch the playing for your verdict — we believe the 'madness' section (and section it is) of Hamlet's apology to Laertes before the fencing, is intended for the King, who is right there. The play, I hope we have proved, is incomplete without the King-Hamlet feud; and this is the final show-down of the two: Shakespeare, having rocketed his play without a stop to this great moment, would not (and I propose, did not) throw it away. And from Hamlet's final baiting of his mortal enemy we get no lack of character; to the contrary — we salute the man that he means business, that he has at last stood up to the King, and said:

"Hamlet is of the faction that is wronged."

Q. Do you think this production has caused Shakespeare to turn over in his grave?
A. We'd like to think we've done him a good turn.
Leslie Howard faced a New York audience for the first time across the footlights of Henry Miller’s Theatre on the evening of November 1, 1920, in “Just Suppose.” Before that he had appeared in London in “The Freaks,” “The Title,” “Our Mr. Hepplewhite,” “Mr. Pim Passes By,” “The Young Person in Pink,” and “East Is West.”

Born in London and educated at Dulwich College, he had enlisted in the army at the outbreak of the World War. After the war he turned to acting, making his first appearance in the English provinces in “Peg O’ My Heart” and “Charley’s Aunt.” In New York, after “Just Suppose,” came “The Wren” and “Danger,” in 1921, “The Truth About Blayds” in 1922 and in quick succession thereafter “A Serpent’s Tooth,” “The Romantic Age,” “The Lady Christiflinda,” “Anything Might Happen,” and in 1923, “Aren’t We All,” in which he played the diffident and unfortunate Hon. Willie Tatham, a comedy performance which brought him sharply to the fore in the American Theatre.
day. His last appearance in New York previous to "Hamlet" was in "The Petrified Forest," in which he played Alan Squier, the disillusioned aesthete who considered himself a misfit in the modern world.

Not content with this impressive list of triumphs, Mr. Howard has also adventured in the fields of authorship and production. He wrote and appeared in "Murray Hill," which still travels up and down the length and breadth of the country under various titles and as the vehicle of innumerable stock companies. Having appeared under Gilbert Miller's banner in many plays, Mr. Howard became associated with Mr. Miller as co-producer as well as star in "Berkeley Square," "The Animal Kingdom," and "The Petrified Forest." With "Hamlet," the actor for the first time ventures into production completely on his own.

Howard enthusiasts who are not satisfied by the multitude of stage appearances listed above have been able to witness any number of stellar screen performances, outstanding among which are "Outward Bound," "Smilin' Through," "Secrets," "The Animal Kingdom," "Berkeley Square," "Of Human Bondage," "The Scarlet Pimpernel," and "Romeo and Juliet."