



Summary Report

Vimy



What is your gender?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Male |  | 44% | 47 |
| Female |  | 56% | 61 |
| Total Responses | | | 108 |

In what year were you born?

The 109 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

Do you reside in Canada?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|--|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 98% | 103 |
| No |  | 2% | 2 |
| Total Responses | | | 105 |



if no, what is your nationality?

The 7 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.




if yes, how long have you lived in Canada?

The 97 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.



Do you currently have direct connections with the military?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 11% | 12 |
| No |  | 89% | 94 |
| Total Responses | | | 106 |

Would you say you attend the theatre

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|---|---|------------|-------|
| Frequently (more than three times a year) |  | 57% | 61 |
| Occasionally (one, two or three times a year) |  | 36% | 39 |
| Rarely (less than once a year) |  | 7% | 7 |
| Total Responses | | | 107 |

Did you know much about the battle of Vimy before seeing our performance?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 74% | 78 |
| No |  | 26% | 28 |
| Total Responses | | | 106 |

if no, what did our production tell you about the battle of Vimy and its place in Canadian history?

The 32 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

if yes, how did you learn about it (for example by reading a book, in school, watching a television documentary)?

The 77 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

if yes, did our production change your views about the battle of Vimy in some way? How?

The 77 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

What would you say was the main message of the play?

The 105 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

How important was it to you that the historical details (such as costumes and equipment) of our production were as accurate as possible?

The 106 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.






What would you say are the main advantages of seeing history on stage (compared to reading a popular history book, seeing a history film or visiting a history museum for example)?

The 104 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

Do you think stage effects (lighting, sound, set design) affect the way history is presented on stage? If so, can you give an example from our play?

The 98 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

How trustworthy do you think history plays are?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|---|---|------------|-------|
| Very trustworthy |  | 7% | 7 |
| Somewhat trustworthy |  | 34% | 35 |
| Not very trustworthy |  | 3% | 3 |
| Not at all trustworthy |  | 3% | 3 |
| It depends on the play, writer, director etc. |  | 53% | 55 |
| Total Responses | | | 103 |

Did you attend our production of Vimy to learn more about our country's history?

The 103 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.

If you reside in Canada, did our production of Vimy deepen your sense of identity as a Canadian? How?

The 101 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.



If you reside outside of Canada, did you feel our production of Vimy helped you understand Canada better? How?

The 7 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.



Do you feel that seeing Vimy has influenced the way you see Canada's current military role in Afghanistan? How?

The 99 response(s) to this question can be found in the appendix.



In the past year, have you read a historical fiction novel or a popular history book?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 81% | 85 |
| No |  | 19% | 20 |
| Total Responses | | | 105 |



In the past year, have you watched a historical film in the cinema or at home?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 79% | 81 |
| No |  | 21% | 22 |
| Total Responses | | | 103 |



In the past year, have you watched a history program on television?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 75% | 78 |
| No |  | 25% | 26 |
| Total Responses | | | 104 |



In the past year, have you explored family photographs or mementos with your family members or friends?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 72% | 76 |
| No |  | 28% | 29 |
| Total Responses | | | 105 |



In the past year, have you done some research into your family's history?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 53% | 55 |
| No |  | 47% | 48 |
| Total Responses | | | 103 |



In the past year, have you visited a history museum or a museum with history content?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 77% | 80 |
| No |  | 23% | 24 |
| Total Responses | | | 104 |

In the past year, have you visited a historic site such as a national park or heritage site?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 75% | 78 |
| No |  | 25% | 26 |
| Total Responses | | | 104 |



In the past year, have you played a history computer game?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 15% | 15 |
| No |  | 85% | 88 |
| Total Responses | | | 103 |

In the past year, have you read a popular history magazine, comic or graphic novel?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 27% | 28 |
| No |  | 73% | 76 |
| Total Responses | | | 104 |

In the past year, have you collected an object associated with the past?

| Response | Chart | Percentage | Count |
|-----------------|---|------------|-------|
| Yes |  | 49% | 51 |
| No |  | 51% | 54 |
| Total Responses | | | 105 |

Appendix

In what year were you born? |

| # | Response |
|-----|----------|
| 1. | 1966 |
| 2. | 1951 |
| 3. | 1939 |
| 4. | 1944 |
| 5. | 1957 |
| 6. | 1948 |
| 7. | 1959 |
| 8. | 1949 |
| 9. | 1939 |
| 10. | 1937 |
| 11. | 1937 |
| 12. | 1944 |
| 13. | 1942 |
| 14. | 1950 |
| 15. | 1951 |
| 16. | 1987 |
| 17. | 1966 |
| 18. | 1960 |
| 19. | 1945 |
| 20. | 1940 |
| 21. | 1953 |
| 22. | 1934 |
| 23. | 1953 |
| 24. | 1965 |
| 25. | 1950 |
| 26. | 1950 |
| 27. | 1930 |
| 28. | 1955 |
| 29. | 1961 |
| 30. | 1943 |
| 31. | 1952 |
| 32. | 1965 |

| | |
|-----|------|
| 33. | 1981 |
| 34. | 1957 |
| 35. | 1956 |
| 36. | 1953 |
| 37. | 1961 |
| 38. | 1951 |
| 39. | 1945 |
| 40. | 1947 |
| 41. | 1962 |
| 42. | 1983 |
| 43. | 1988 |
| 44. | 1992 |
| 45. | 1988 |
| 46. | 1991 |
| 47. | 1991 |
| 48. | 1991 |
| 49. | 1988 |
| 50. | 1982 |
| 51. | 1991 |
| 52. | 1989 |
| 53. | 1991 |
| 54. | 1990 |
| 55. | 1978 |
| 56. | 1990 |
| 57. | 1992 |
| 58. | 1927 |
| 59. | 1988 |
| 60. | 1950 |
| 61. | 1990 |
| 62. | 1949 |
| 63. | 1946 |
| 64. | 1983 |
| 65. | 1975 |
| 66. | 1970 |
| 67. | 1936 |

103. 1997

104. 1997

105. 1997

106. 1984

107. 1981

108. 1966

109. 1964

if no, what is your nationality? |

| # | Response |
|----|----------------|
| 1. | Canadian |
| 2. | Canadian / GB |
| 3. | n/a |
| 4. | Canadian |
| 5. | Sweederlandish |
| 6. | Yugoslavian |
| 7. | Canadian |

if yes, how long have you lived in Canada? |

| # | Response |
|-----|------------------------|
| 1. | 44 |
| 2. | 59 yrs. |
| 3. | 71 years |
| 4. | 66 years |
| 5. | 53 years |
| 6. | since 1957 |
| 7. | 47 years |
| 8. | 29 |
| 9. | all my life (71 years) |
| 10. | 51 years |
| 11. | 34 years |
| 12. | 35 years |
| 13. | all my life |
| 14. | 54yrs |
| 15. | 23 years |
| 16. | 44 years |

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------|
| 17. | whole life |
| 18. | all my life |
| 19. | 53 years |
| 20. | 58 years (my entire life) |
| 21. | Forever! |
| 22. | Since 1965 |
| 23. | Born here |
| 24. | 60 |
| 25. | 1975 |
| 26. | 53 years |
| 27. | 49 years |
| 28. | 42 years |
| 29. | 59 year |
| 30. | since birth |
| 31. | All my life |
| 32. | 51 years |
| 33. | 57 |
| 34. | 49 yrs |
| 35. | 51 years |
| 36. | 39 years |
| 37. | 63 years |
| 38. | 27 years |
| 39. | 22 years |
| 40. | 18 years |
| 41. | 20 years |
| 42. | 19 years |
| 43. | 19 years |
| 44. | 19 years |
| 45. | 10 years (2 years recently) |
| 46. | all my life (19 years) |
| 47. | 21 years |
| 48. | All my life |
| 49. | all my life (20 years) |
| 50. | 27 |
| 51. | 20 years |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 87. | 13 years |
| 88. | 13 years |
| 89. | Since I was born (13 years) |
| 90. | 13 years, 8 months, 18 days, 9 hours, 5 minutes, and 35 seconds |
| 91. | Since Birth |
| 92. | 13 years |
| 93. | 13 years |
| 94. | 26 years |
| 95. | 29 yrs |
| 96. | All my life -- 44 years |
| 97. | 35 years |

if no, what did our production tell you about the battle of Vimy and its place in Canadian history? |

| # | Response |
|-----|--|
| 1. | The 4 divisions of the Cdn. army which fought at Vimy really did represent a microcosm of the country at that time. |
| 2. | Not much |
| 3. | "Mechanics" of the battle, reasons for enlisting, the pain of being forced to shoot one of your own comrades, small national quarrels less important than ultimate national pride, waste of young lives, uniting of people from different ethnic backgrounds and geog. regions for a common cause, innocence and bravado of the young Canadians, and how this was soon destroyed, and replaced by a lifelong "internal burden" |
| 4. | The sheer size of the loss of Canadian lives |
| 5. | I didn't really learn anything specific from the production, but it did inspire me to do a little on-line research about Vimy and I learned it was the first time all 4 Canadian divisions had coordinated their efforts and that significant training/preparation went into this one battle. |
| 6. | nothing new |
| 7. | why the van doos are called the van doos |
| 8. | The regiments involved |
| 9. | Involvement of multiple branches of the army working together; involvement of Aboriginal soldiers |
| 10. | not much more |
| 11. | that it was a hard, high death battle in wich Canadian soldiers played a crucial role |
| 12. | It is a pivotal event, and was a great sacrifice on Canada's part |
| 13. | That there was an inner struggle as while as the outer struggle of war |
| 14. | Soldiers from all across Canada fought in the battle of Vimy. While they won the battle, it was very messy and there were many casualties. |
| 15. | it let me know the time and location that it involved, as well as which soldier weere also involved in the fight |
| 16. | very important work done by the Canadian soldiers under very difficult situations |
| 17. | It told me a lot about the personal stories associated with the battle, the social conditions the soldiers endured, and the diversity of the Canadian forces. It also depicted the sense that Canadians achieved what others couldn't and it shaped |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | the way they saw themselves. |
| 18. | That it was important to Canadian history |
| 19. | That it has helped shaped the country |
| 20. | the horrors they had to endure and how unprepared they were for the outcome |
| 21. | I learned about the subways and that Canadians alone fought for Vimy. |
| 22. | how it Canadians took Vimy. I knew Vimy was a win for Canada, but I didn't know the details. |
| 23. | How tough it was at that time. |
| 24. | Everything |
| 25. | That if you did not follow the rules you would die, and the French were not accepted as much. |
| 26. | everything |
| 27. | It informed me on how Canadians were involved in the battle of Vimy |
| 28. | Everything!! |
| 29. | Everything! :) |
| 30. | It told me how hard it was for everyone:soldiers, nurses, sweethearts. |
| 31. | What life was like for the soldiers and how they handled being in the war. |
| 32. | I knew the basics but this gave me a better sense of the mechanics of the battle and, of course, its impact upon the soldiers. |

if yes, how did you learn about it (for example by reading a book, in school, watching a television documentary)?
|

| # | Response |
|-----|--|
| 1. | reading, documentaries, websites, visited Vimy Ridge |
| 2. | I have read many histories about Vimy |
| 3. | Various readings |
| 4. | reading books |
| 5. | seen the memorial; read Goodspeed and many other accounts. |
| 6. | school, Pierre Berton's book |
| 7. | TV news, newspapers |
| 8. | book by Pierre Berton |
| 9. | Canadian War Museum;books |
| 10. | War Museum; news items; etc |
| 11. | I read Tim Cook's first volume on the Canadian Army in the First World War |
| 12. | university history - recently visited the war museum |
| 13. | combination of many sources |
| 14. | book, documentary, school |
| 15. | visiting Vimy Ridge |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 16. | History lessons, books, television, visit to Vimy Ridge |
| 17. | reading, TV, internet |
| 18. | TV documentary |
| 19. | I have learned about it through school, of course, by reading on my own and by visiting the Vimy memorial in France many years ago. |
| 20. | Season subscriber to GCTC |
| 21. | reading |
| 22. | My father went through WW1; I've read a lot. |
| 23. | Books, movies |
| 24. | documentaries |
| 25. | books, Beaver, and the War Museum |
| 26. | books, schools newspaper |
| 27. | books, TV documentary |
| 28. | Reading |
| 29. | Books (Pierre Burton etc) |
| 30. | visiting Vimy itself and readings |
| 31. | School, Books, Docs |
| 32. | School and books |
| 33. | School and books |
| 34. | Shool, books, TV documentaries, internet, etc. |
| 35. | in school |
| 36. | History class in school |
| 37. | school |
| 38. | from knowlegdeable peers |
| 39. | In School, In musuems, in books, on tv, in movies, in other war related theatre shows, in cadets, etc. |
| 40. | History Classes |
| 41. | social studies in high school |
| 42. | Reading my first year Canadian history textbook |
| 43. | School |
| 44. | Grade 10 history |
| 45. | books, tv |
| 46. | Read articles |
| 47. | In school |
| 48. | book, TV doc |
| 49. | school, reading a book, reading online |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 50. | osmosis and references in several books and plays |
| 51. | History class and a school trip to Vimy Ridge as part of the 90th Anniversary of Vimy Ridge Celebration. |
| 52. | school and reading |
| 53. | in school, on tv |
| 54. | great-uncle died |
| 55. | reading about Sir Arthur Currie in Bob Sharpe and Tim Cook's books, along with other historical books |
| 56. | books, visiting Vimy,Husband |
| 57. | watching television documentary |
| 58. | university, books |
| 59. | reading books |
| 60. | I'm a historian and work also at the Canadian War Museum |
| 61. | in school; fictional works on WWI |
| 62. | school, parents served in the war towards the end, TV doc, |
| 63. | School, Spare time |
| 64. | family, (dad a war buff and ex-airforce), books, tv etc |
| 65. | Documentary |
| 66. | History major in university |
| 67. | in school |
| 68. | Nothing |
| 69. | reading, school |
| 70. | books |
| 71. | by reading a book |
| 72. | blah |
| 73. | In school through a booklet. |
| 74. | i Read books |
| 75. | School |
| 76. | Textbooks, television documentary |
| 77. | In High school and University |

if yes, did our production change your views about the battle of Vimy in some way? How? |

| # | Response |
|----|--|
| 1. | no |
| 2. | No |
| 3. | Not much |
| 4. | not really |
| 5. | it helped to put a very human face on it |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 6. | no |
| 7. | no |
| 8. | no |
| 9. | no |
| 10. | Brought it to life. |
| 11. | The production deepened my understanding of how much Canada did in this battle |
| 12. | No |
| 13. | I think it added a level of humanity to my views. It's easy to understand facts and figures, but when you add faces is when things really begin to resonate with me |
| 14. | Enriched it. Reminded me of the diversity of the people who served. |
| 15. | did not think they knew battle plans so far in advance |
| 16. | enhanced my understanding of what the ordinary soldier experienced |
| 17. | better understanding of the ordinary person |
| 18. | added more human perspective to my perceptions |
| 19. | made it even more real |
| 20. | No particularly. However it made the battle seem more 'real' and more 'personal' than mere text had done in the past. Seeing the play was more interactive and gave me the same kind of 'linked in' feeling that I had when visiting the memorial itself. |
| 21. | Provided soldiers' insights to complement a visit to Vimy in 2007 |
| 22. | No |
| 23. | Brought it to life for me |
| 24. | no |
| 25. | no |
| 26. | no |
| 27. | no |
| 28. | Not my views, although I was unaware that troops dug tunnels |
| 29. | No |
| 30. | Did not change my perception |
| 31. | Deeper understanding of the make-up of Canadian forces |
| 32. | Not change, just expanded |
| 33. | The play seemed to make the battle seem much more tragic, rather than a great Canadian victory |
| 34. | not particularly |
| 35. | not really |
| 36. | not really |
| 37. | no |
| 38. | No |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 39. | The production showed more of the "Indian" perspective. |
| 40. | it made the event stick, I mean I was aware of vimy and the new details but know I feel as though I have a better grasp and will not forget |
| 41. | No. |
| 42. | no |
| 43. | It changed in that I saw the soliders perspective and it was very emotional for them. |
| 44. | the effects of wounds, incl. psych |
| 45. | I didn't remember the gas attack. |
| 46. | Yes, makes you think about the people involved as actual people and not just a bunch of bodies or anonymous people |
| 47. | did not change views but confirmed them |
| 48. | it reminded me of the human element and that although we may have been victorious, we still paid a very steep price |
| 49. | no, but it made me think about whether we are different, probably not! What it didn't do was explain why this was such an apparently pivotal event in Canadian history or nationhood |
| 50. | The production personified everything I had learnt about Vimy Ridge and it was moving to see a reenactment of a place that I've actually visited. |
| 51. | no |
| 52. | not really |
| 53. | no |
| 54. | Did not change my views, but definitely brought it more into focus |
| 55. | Reinforced the horrific nature of it |
| 56. | yes - how young the men were |
| 57. | No, although I deeply appreciated the playwright's ability to convey the mythology surrounding the battle. In fact, there were some elements that I knew to be historically innacurate (e.g. the tunnels were mostly dug by the British not the Canadians.) |
| 58. | no |
| 59. | no |
| 60. | It did not change my views |
| 61. | not really; it confirmed the senseless and personal cost to everyone touched by this battle |
| 62. | It made it more real |
| 63. | It gave a first person view, and how life was affected by the war. |
| 64. | no, but made it more personal to see the journey of the young men |
| 65. | no |
| 66. | Brought home the human side of the story |
| 67. | no |
| 68. | No |
| 69. | no |
| 70. | yes. it seemed much more scary with more deaths |

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 71. | No, because I knew that soldiers of many different heritages all made sacrifices for one common goal |
| 72. | meh |
| 73. | Yes. I know have more respect for the soldiers that died in the battle, rather than viewing it as simply a Canadian victory. |
| 74. | I realized how important the canadian forces were. |
| 75. | No |
| 76. | The production humanized the battle. |
| 77. | Not really... just more details and specifics |

What would you say was the main message of the play? |

| # | Response |
|-----|---|
| 1. | War marks everyone differently but each is afflicted/affected in their own way. |
| 2. | It showed the profound long-lasting toll which war has on the soldiers people involved in it. |
| 3. | War is hell |
| 4. | War is really a bad idea for the participants |
| 5. | a soldier's life is not glamorous and although the soldiers were just ordinary men in so many ways, they were also heroes |
| 6. | That there war has a highly personal dimension that we sanitize. |
| 7. | war is futile, heroic and sad |
| 8. | hospital/Canadian Army trenches near the Vimy ridge |
| 9. | war is brutal |
| 10. | anti war.....sometimes we must do our duty, however misguidedly, or poorly deemed to BE duty |
| 11. | not sure |
| 12. | War's impact on those involved |
| 13. | the human dimension of war |
| 14. | Not clear. War is an adventure, war is terrible, surviving war can be worse than not. Certainly there was no sense that Canadians' national identity was forged in this key battle. |
| 15. | vimy was more than a battle, it was a collection of young boys and men, from different backgrounds, united for a moment that left them scarred forever |
| 16. | Our experiences shape who we are and stay with us forever. People who served did so for all kinds of reasons. |
| 17. | diverse group of men who really were there for an adventure rather than to represent country or based on principal |
| 18. | the utter horror and futility of war |
| 19. | the diversity of the characters. They also came together, at least in grief, in the end. |
| 20. | the loss that war inflicts |
| 21. | war is hell for everyone |
| 22. | Young men become involved in war for many reasons and when the reality hits them (as opposed to a romantic view they may have had before) war becomes dirty, difficult, frightening and, ultimately, deadly for far too many of them. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 23. | War impacts everyone, in different ways. Even a great victory for a country has very significant costs, and not just in terms of lives lost. |
| 24. | Horror of war that can be mitigated through personal connection/support |
| 25. | unpredictability of war |
| 26. | War is hell |
| 27. | The effect war has on individuals and the country |
| 28. | war changes/affects lives; |
| 29. | that even large scale battles are fought by individuals, and the impact is personal and horrific, regardless of the larger outcome. |
| 30. | Soldiers suffer more than we know |
| 31. | war is hell |
| 32. | Individuals - motivations, decisions, etc |
| 33. | That a shared experience of adversity can help people to connect across lines of preconceived difference. |
| 34. | war is hell, but ordinary people are still human to each other (with all the associations which "human" implies) |
| 35. | A young Canada came of age at Vimy |
| 36. | Canada's young men bore the brunt of suffering/death in the first war. |
| 37. | that war is hard and life-changing not just for those directly involved but also those left behind and that people take into war the prejudices they had before which in some cases are changed when one fights side by side with someone whose culture or race you previously despised |
| 38. | The impact of war on normal human beings |
| 39. | How war devastates our social and personal landscape; also how it draws forth tremendous courage and compassion |
| 40. | Strength is created through acceptance |
| 41. | everyone plays a part |
| 42. | Canada takes many different kinds of people to work. |
| 43. | The hopelessness of war, particularly the First World War |
| 44. | The sacrifice of human lives at Vimy |
| 45. | the stories of the soldiers are just as important as the battle |
| 46. | to show why Vimy was an important part to Canadians in WWI |
| 47. | The battle of Vimy was fought by real people, not by mythologized "heroes." |
| 48. | How the war affects individual lives |
| 49. | A person is only what their memory allows them to be. What they do in life (no matter how big or small) change our lives and the outcome of our lives. |
| 50. | War is complex. |
| 51. | I did not leave feeling like I had just been preached a message instead it felt more like I had been painted a small picture of what Vimy was for a few people. From this knowledge I can no go forth and call upon it because without knowing where we've been as society and the roads we've already walked we can not hope to ever find happiness and peace. |
| 52. | War affects people |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 53. | To fight for what you believe in, no matter where you come from. |
| 54. | how war hammers the young |
| 55. | even though we come from different place and have different values of life, we can all unite together to face common goal and this is the goal that has allowed so many opportunities for us now it is very important |
| 56. | The human cost of Vimy and of war |
| 57. | War is personal |
| 58. | Soldiers' lives are very difficult on the battle front, yet humour played a large role in keeping up the morale |
| 59. | futility, waste, naivete of the endeavour and the players |
| 60. | That Canadians experienced this event collectively but all individually. That war transforms those it touches. |
| 61. | that it has a human cost in physical, emotional and psychological suffering |
| 62. | Respect for Canadian soldiers and the role they played in WW2 |
| 63. | the foulness of war and how it can bring out the best and worst in people |
| 64. | I felt that I learned not to take life for granted - the play starts off with the four soldiers in the hospital, all supposedly alive, but it turns out that Sid had actually died in the end, and that was a critical point in the play that really affected me and stood out the most. Also, the death of Claire's lover who was part of the Highlanders was moving. And the stories from the war are important to share with the younger generations so that we do not forget the service these men have served for country to be freed. |
| 65. | horror of war |
| 66. | Love, friendship and everyone has a similar but very different story. |
| 67. | war is Hell |
| 68. | Each person had and have a story to tell and it's not all about the war but the sacrifices made by people for their country |
| 69. | Initially, what struck me was the camaraderie of the individuals; 2nd part of the play brings home that war is in fact hell |
| 70. | how we are different by region but connected by our interests nationally especially in sports, weather and by families |
| 71. | horror of war and effects of it |
| 72. | How terrible the conditions were for the very young men |
| 73. | Good question. That was a problem that I had with the production. Not really sure what he was trying to say except that it was horrible. |
| 74. | I believe that it was to demonstrate the everyday hardships of the "average" man and woman engaged in the First World War. |
| 75. | There wasn't a main message the script was incoherent. |
| 76. | Vimy wasn't all glory for Canadians - not for the individuals anyway |
| 77. | That Canada's effort in the First World War was a national experience |
| 78. | That war changes people, no matter what their motives for participating (ie, pro or against a war) |
| 79. | the senselessness of the War; the human tragedy of the soldiers and others who were part of the war effort |
| 80. | that the soldiers were ordinary people like us |
| 81. | That life of a Soldier, is a life to remember. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 82. | subjective: but the "humanity" of the inhumanity war |
| 83. | People from all over the country came together to fight this war |
| 84. | There is a human story to war |
| 85. | How differently and similarly at the same time the experience of being at war can be for each individual |
| 86. | I don't know. |
| 87. | How tough it was at that time. |
| 88. | how life was in WWI |
| 89. | i do not know |
| 90. | That we should always try to overcome our differences and unite to overcome obstacles. |
| 91. | Don't give up |
| 92. | The war was bad let's not start it again |
| 93. | the problems that people must go through during a war, and after (the sacrifices that people had to make) |
| 94. | The play demonstrated how war affects many people negatively in many different ways and that its damage is permanent |
| 95. | blah |
| 96. | It informed us of the difficulties and sacrifices made by our soldiers. It also tells us that the Battle was a significant and important moment in our history. |
| 97. | The sacrifices that people (soldiers, wives, nurses...etc) had to make in wars. |
| 98. | How people all over Canada helped win the war and to promote respect for our soldiers and legions. |
| 99. | The main message of the play was that the battle of Vimy Ridge showed that Canada, as a country, had matured enough. |
| 100. | Sorry, my brain just shut off, I'll complete the rest of the survey later. |
| 101. | The importance of the war and how it affected everybody. |
| 102. | I am not sure. The playwright says it is not a play about war. He missed the mark. I found the main characters to be poor caricatures of his idea of Canadian identities. |
| 103. | That the "official" history of events like Vimy cannot possibly convey the many, disparate individuals' narratives folded into that event |
| 104. | That war makes many victims, on and off the battlefield. And that our Canadians made a major sacrifice to attain the success they did in that battle. |
| 105. | Two messages, I think. One is obviously the horror of the thing. The other is the (possibly perverse) unifying effect of the battle on Canadians from different parts of the country. |

How important was it to you that the historical details (such as costumes and equipment) of our production were as accurate as possible? |

| # | Response |
|----|------------------------------|
| 1. | Very. It lends authenticity. |
| 2. | reasonably important |
| 3. | Very important |
| 4. | Not very |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 5. | important; this part was very well done |
| 6. | Very. |
| 7. | quite important; made it more engaging |
| 8. | not very much |
| 9. | very |
| 10. | I am not conversant enough with those details to identify errors, but I did find it jarring that they had highly polished boots in those muddy trenches. If there had been anything really glaring as say, a spitfire depicted on the backdrop, I would have picked that up. I thought the winding on of the puttees was a good touch - I have a photo of my father-in-law, in just such a uniform, taken "somewhere in France" as it says on the sign at his feet (Vimy survivor, from Ottawa Valley, originally Welsh child immigrant) |
| 11. | moderately important, I'm used to theatre productions not in period costumes |
| 12. | If I notice anything substantially wrong it would break the dramatic impact |
| 13. | this production is more about the characters, the story - the minimalist approach to historical details was appreciated |
| 14. | Not that important, They added a certain amount of atmosphere, but it is the story and the acting that counts most. |
| 15. | very important |
| 16. | Costumes and equipment add flavour, but I would not have been aware of any small discrepancies in accuracy. |
| 17. | helps set tone and show the uniqueness of the situation |
| 18. | very important |
| 19. | very important. The team work that went into making the production historically accurate was tremendous. |
| 20. | not that important but a nice touch |
| 21. | fairly, it reminded us of the contrast between then now |
| 22. | I think this is critical and your production seemed to attend to historical details as accurately as anyone might expect. |
| 23. | Not particularly important, although it would probably have seemed odd if the characters were in modern-day uniforms |
| 24. | Important! Non-WWI costuming would have detracted from the play and its message by being too incongruous |
| 25. | very |
| 26. | important; only one lapse (soldiers did not shout replies to superiors; that's USA) |
| 27. | Very important as it adds realism |
| 28. | somewhat important - the "feeling" must be right, but not to the last piece of equipment |
| 29. | fairly important |
| 30. | very |
| 31. | very important |
| 32. | Somewhat important |
| 33. | Conceptually, it's very important, since these details add to the credibility of the content. However, in this instance, I'm not all that familiar with clothing and gear from the period, so I had to take it on faith that the details were correct. |
| 34. | not that important |
| 35. | Very |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 36. | Very - I had my 13 yr old son with me who relies heavily on visual cues. |
| 37. | not very although it helps to see how little protection foot soldiers actually had and how much weight they had to carry inot battle |
| 38. | It helps to set the play into its historical (as much as possible) environment, to get a feel for the mentalities at the time, etc |
| 39. | It was important that the basic historical facts be correct. |
| 40. | Very important |
| 41. | very |
| 42. | Very because it allowed me to travel back to that time through those items |
| 43. | It is important, but if it is not possible, something very close will do. |
| 44. | very important |
| 45. | very |
| 46. | It looked beautiful and helped me get into the characters at a deeper level |
| 47. | It was relatively important - if something had seemed out of place, it would have lessened the impact of the story. But, since my knowledge of the period is not that extensive, I was not too particular or critical. |
| 48. | important. I appreciate historical accuracy |
| 49. | I feel any production could be put on with little costume. The story could have been told by veterans years later not in uniform. If it were amatuer theatre, it could have been each person wearing all black or neutral colors, but, it definitely helped create a finished and believable world seeing the characters in uniform of that time period. |
| 50. | Very. |
| 51. | I am only vaguely aware of what costumes and equipment from the period should look like so as long as it is believable (like no one whips our a cell phone) then I will buy into what I am seeing |
| 52. | Very |
| 53. | Very |
| 54. | It effects very powerfully emotionally, physically (feels like we're there with them) and that the procducers care enough to put on a good representation of a very important part of Canada's history. |
| 55. | fairl |
| 56. | ant because it brings the time period alive to those who are not familiar with the 1800s |
| 57. | It helps us imagine an event so outside our own experience. However, I found that the sparser productions "Jake's Gift" and "Spiral Dive" were more terrifying and had more emotional impact on me than "Vimy". |
| 58. | very important. created the whole effect |
| 59. | It was interesting to see the soldiers' uniforms and how they prepared themsleves for battle |
| 60. | quite important. Not sure that the Lt's headgear was that of a highland regiment. The hackle more Irish. It is easy to get details right for this war. All else seemed authentic |
| 61. | Very important |
| 62. | It helps set the scene and remind you what you are watching; it would be hard to watch a play on Vimy in today's uniforms and today's vernacular |
| 63. | It was important actually and I felt they were captured |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 64. | For a play like this...critical. Anachronisms can ruin a play ...like having a teklephone in MacBeth! |
| 65. | I thought it was pretty important because it makes the production and experience a lot more honest and truthful to the past. Although the message of a play can be successfully conveyed without the certain props and costumes, it is sometimes nice to see the effort and research put into this production - to make the experience more memorable and touching to the audience. We are able to visualize the actual imagery of what was in the pass. |
| 66. | very |
| 67. | very |
| 68. | not important |
| 69. | It helped me launch myself into that time frame and why things were done then |
| 70. | very important to the effectiveness of the play |
| 71. | very important, the production became more real and more accepted. |
| 72. | very important |
| 73. | very important / excellent success |
| 74. | Very. |
| 75. | It is understandable that the play is a play and therefore certain things need to be "represented" versus actually placed on stage (i.e. binoculars). I can appreciate that theatre, and other artforms, take artistic lisencc; however, as soon as you do try to represent something that can feasibly be historically accurate then do so: some elements did annoy me (not enough to detract from my overall appreciation of the play), such as: the men were not at all dirty, the gas mask bags hung too low, the nurses veil was a bit off. |
| 76. | minor issue-story is key |
| 77. | not very important |
| 78. | very important |
| 79. | Very |
| 80. | I think its important to be as accurate as possible as it helps the audience enter into the play |
| 81. | it lends to the reality of the period |
| 82. | Yes I agree, I was surprised how accurate it was. |
| 83. | very |
| 84. | very important |
| 85. | Important |
| 86. | Very important |
| 87. | Not important. |
| 88. | Very Important, because that creates the effect for the play. |
| 89. | not especially important |
| 90. | to show everyone what vimy was really like |
| 91. | Very, because otherwise it is neither realistic nor convincing. |
| 92. | Very |
| 93. | very important |

| | |
|------|--|
| 94. | It was very important because with accurate costumes and set, it lets me visualize the battle, and everything else, better. |
| 95. | It made the message much more impactful |
| 96. | meh |
| 97. | Well, if the details aren't right then I might be misinformed. |
| 98. | This allowed me to visualize what really happened much better. With better equipment and costumes, the play seems much more real. |
| 99. | It definitely improved the viewing of the play, but it wasn't something I took note of when I was watching. |
| 100. | It helped me feel in the play, and more realistic, and helped me make connections with the history books that I have read. |
| 101. | They helped the viewer think of it as real. |
| 102. | It is not very important, because even without the costumes (especially the cigarettes) I still get the message they are trying to convey. |
| 103. | I suppose so. There were some errors in the dialogue that troubled me more (like the characterization of the Boer War). |
| 104. | Somewhat important |
| 105. | Important to me |
| 106. | Very. Otherwise, inaccuracies either detract from the performance or, worse, give a false impression. |

What would you say are the main advantages of seeing history on stage (compared to reading a popular history book, seeing a history film or visiting a history museum for example)? |

| # | Response |
|-----|--|
| 1. | more personal impact. |
| 2. | A history play can sum up/give a lot of information about key historical events in about 2 hours. |
| 3. | The context of individuals in the war |
| 4. | I wouldn't read a history book. I might see a film. I would avoid a history museum. |
| 5. | adds to the emotional aspect; makes it more personal and therefore real |
| 6. | The depiction of the human element in all its manifestations. |
| 7. | greater impact; live theatre is best at communicating emotions |
| 8. | forces undivided attention |
| 9. | making the action palpable |
| 10. | Live theatre appeals to a different part of human makeup. The sight of five young actors of comparable age to actual soldiers, and believable backgrounds, living the words, makes a strong impression; the sacrifice and pain of the nurse did not hit me quite so strongly - mostly, I felt anxiety about potential exhaustion....she had to be all things to all people all the time! This came through stronger on stage than when I read the play beforehand. |
| 11. | from the standpoint of learning about history, I don't think there are any significant advantages or disadvantages |
| 12. | Immediacy and visceral impact |
| 13. | It brings it to the level of reality more than just reading |
| 14. | It could bring the experience to life. Unfortunately this production failed to do that . |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 15. | it's visual - you feel it as opposed to watching or reading. You're there on stage with the actors experiencing |
| 16. | It makes it a human experience. The portrayal of emotions is much easier to convey. |
| 17. | sense of mood |
| 18. | the story becomes alive |
| 19. | Real people, even if they are acting, make a greater and more lasting impression. |
| 20. | again the bringing the individual human involvement to the forefront as opposed to looking at an event |
| 21. | we remain focussed on the story |
| 22. | The emotions become real when one sees actors on stage. Like anything else it is too easy to let one's mind drift when reading or even looking at museum exhibits. When watching a play one is absorbed both intellectually and emotionally with what is being presented. It makes the event and the entire era more alive for me. |
| 23. | Makes it "come alive", more likely to remember something about it since all your senses are engaged. |
| 24. | Human emotion and relations come to forefront; it's no longer just artifacts one is looking at to get a sense of what Vimy was like. |
| 25. | additional subtleties |
| 26. | It brings an aspect of history to life. |
| 27. | it's live! Will carry the emotions better, provide a fuller, more in-depth understanding |
| 28. | not sure there are any, except to spread the awareness to a non-reading audience |
| 29. | brings the story to life |
| 30. | it is more lively, you get a sense of something that is not present in books |
| 31. | Live interaction |
| 32. | Makes the experience more "real"; helps the viewer to realize that the people involved have the same personal issues, strengths, and challenges as the viewer. |
| 33. | audiences are older, arguably more intelligent, so more controversial aspects could be presented |
| 34. | Adds a human element |
| 35. | Gives you a very good feel for the emotional impact war has on the individual |
| 36. | In film, book, museum one is more removed from the emotional content of the issues although I have found that a good audiobook is almost like history on stage in terms of capturing one's whole mind and engaging one with the various characters |
| 37. | It is a strong complement to films and books; history becomes alive. |
| 38. | There is less of a filter when you see flesh-and-blood people embody the human emotions - the hopes and fears - of the young who, as yet untested, went forth into war. To hear these voices up close is to remind ourselves how real war is and how traumatic its effects on women and men of every generation. |
| 39. | One may feel more deeply connected |
| 40. | The experience is amplified and personified |
| 41. | It made a real connection with the trauma of war |
| 42. | It allows you to see the story come to life before you, as opposed to in your mind. |
| 43. | It makes it come alive, allowing for the audience to make a direct connection to characters |
| 44. | gives you a better understanding of the battle and the people who participated in it |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 45. | Makes it seem more human |
| 46. | The main advantage is that advantages from all those other media can come together in the theatre - the throughline/journey/relationships of characters (that you could also have in a novel or movie), the tangibility and accuracy of costume and props (that you could have in a museum), and finally, the liveness of actors and sharing the space where the story exists (only in theatre). |
| 47. | Well, different means of learning yield different results. Theatre can affect viewers in different ways than books and television. History can be told through any medium but sometimes theatre is an excellent, eye-opening, solid way of portraying history. |
| 48. | I have always understood things visually. Be it reading a descriptive book or whatever else, but, the moving imagery, seeing things happen in real time, has always seemed more alive to me because the actors make a personal connection to the audience. |
| 49. | The personal connection one feels in theatre that cannot be transmitted by other means. |
| 50. | when you watch people act it our live, there is a total immersion that can not be achieved through film or reading and a presentness that can not be found in a museum display |
| 51. | I don't take any popular representations of history at face value, so the advantages are more artistic - the experience of being part of the performance. |
| 52. | Visual representation |
| 53. | Feeling the soliders expressions of their part in the war, and hearing the war, and seeing parts of it, even if its really in our minds. It really draws you in. |
| 54. | a more vivid connection with the pain |
| 55. | It allows for a clearer picture of history rather than what young people of today may be used to which is text books and readings. |
| 56. | Intimacy with the story is stronger. |
| 57. | things feel spontaneous, as if they are actually happening in front of you |
| 58. | The visual impact of seeing soldiers on the war front certainly makes war and all its difficulties more real - it would be a great play for all school children to see so that they can also understand the role that Canada played in this war and all other wars as well. |
| 59. | stage give the story a sense of soul |
| 60. | I think history on stage is invaluable because it removes the physical barriers to the experience (in the case of film and print) and allows the imagination to explore beyond what is happening in front of you. The stage can bring you completely into the experience- for example- the staging of the tunnels in the play made the viewer feel claustrophobic, on edge, nostalgic, and frightened. |
| 61. | seeing it on stage brings out more emotion and sets the mood in a way other types of medium cannot always do |
| 62. | It somehow keeps it alive more than those other two ways. |
| 63. | A good [lay, well acted and produced, has an immediacy that other media cannot produce, which enables one to identify with the characters and situations. Only the descriptions of the war as related by the stretcher-bearer in the book about the deaf girl (I forget the name) were as telling. |
| 64. | It's one thing to read about the horrors of war, or see a 2-dimensional representation, but a physical live embodiment of something that is frightening and sometimes inconceivable is what makes the experience most chilling and important to explain to the younger generations who did not have to experience it. We are able to truly appreciate the service the men and women rendered for us and our country. |
| 65. | emotional and compelling |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 66. | it's much more personal, you feel like your apart of it. |
| 67. | more compelling |
| 68. | A more visual understanding of it |
| 69. | generally I find that the books let your imagination work more effectively; this play made me realize that some things cannot be left to the imagination |
| 70. | Seeing live action always more interesting, can identify quicker and can be a more lasting memory and experience. |
| 71. | another viewpoint |
| 72. | retain the details much better |
| 73. | Theatre has the ability to show us human experience through emotional and visceral contact unlike books or films. |
| 74. | The LIVE component. It brings the words on page to life. I feel that there is a greater sense of immediacy and that as an audience member I can relate to the people in front of me much better. Especially in a smaller theatre like the GCTC (I don't know if it would have been so in the NAC mainstage). |
| 75. | theatre can be a more visceral experience |
| 76. | it captures a different crowd - the theatre crowd, maybe it's more "real" too |
| 77. | opportunity for more direct connection with the characters |
| 78. | The events are personalized in ways that people can relate to; the war becomes not a date, but people (even if fictional) who were motivated, reacted and were changed by the events shown |
| 79. | I think that it's important to be able to really hear the voices of people. A stage play also strips the events down to their essence - you have to pay attention and your imagination fills in the real horror of the events |
| 80. | it brings more reality to the evens. |
| 81. | It reminded us about the Soldiers them selves, instead of just the battle. |
| 82. | 3D history-easier to grasp when disguised as entertainment |
| 83. | actors portray emotions in a way which cannot always be captured in a book or a documentary |
| 84. | Makes it more vivid, real |
| 85. | Making it more personal due to the physical closeness between the audience and the actors |
| 86. | There are none. |
| 87. | It helps you see what it was actually like. |
| 88. | it personifies it |
| 89. | It can express peoples emotions better |
| 90. | You can visualize it better because you're actually seeing it. |
| 91. | It seems more real |
| 92. | you get to hear the way they talked etc... |
| 93. | This shows you (a visual), Also, this lets you see all of the acts that really happened. In a museam, you only see a part of the scene. |
| 94. | You get a much better sense of how people felt |
| 95. | blah |

- | | |
|------|---|
| 96. | In a history book, it seems like just history. But in a play, it seems real and you can be part of the story and you can see what the people were feeling. Plays also make history more interesting. |
| 97. | This lets you visualize, and see the play yourself. You get to see the whole part of the battle. But in a museum, there is only parts of the battle. |
| 98. | It grabs and keeps your interest more. |
| 99. | The actors tend to act, talk, and look the way that the people from back then did, and it is different, so you feel that the happenings from back then were actually real. |
| 100. | When you are seeing history being played live, it is much more meaningful and I find it easier to understand. |
| 101. | History on stage, or performed has the advantage (or disadvantage) of appealing to emotions. |
| 102. | The ability to communicate more subtle aspects of the experience (such as doubt, fear, regret) |
| 103. | The immediacy of live theatre has a deeper impact than sometimes reading a book or seeing a museum display... the emotions conveyed in dialogue, the actions, the expressions and gestures of the actors all make it "come alive" more than other means. |
| 104. | It engages one in a different way, especially given the immediacy of the form. Depending on the script and treatment, theatre can lead one's imagination without taking over for it and this, I think, can lead to a greater sense of the history continuing to resonate. |

Do you think stage effects (lighting, sound, set design) affect the way history is presented on stage? If so, can you give an example from our play? |

| # | Response |
|-----|---|
| 1. | Yes. Would have appreciated more bass in the audience so as to feel the rumble of artillery. |
| 2. | Yes, the sound effects in Vimy gave us a flavour of what the soldiers had to listen to all the time. The set also gave us a good idea of the confined spaces the soldiers had to fight in. |
| 3. | To some extent. The stark cots in the hospital ward make it easy to imagine a ... hospital ward. |
| 4. | absolutely; we both commented on the terrific sound effects in the play; for me it was the birdsong that grabbed my attention |
| 5. | The stage effects in Vimy were excellent. I thought the scene of the men waiting in the subways was very well done. |
| 6. | Yes. Provides a manageable sense of warfare (what soldiers experience is much louder, smellier, uglier and grittier) |
| 7. | yes they do, help the imagination - the stage effects were OK - "gas", battle noise |
| 8. | yes; sound of guns creates atmosphere of battle action |
| 9. | Good job there is no such category as "odour design"! More could have been made of the horse noises and rat infestations....I think these two references went over a lot of heads. Flashes, explosions, trench lighting, bird sounds, all helped to reinforce the depiction, and often add shock value, through contrasts. |
| 10. | I think a good stage director can "deliver" with a wide range of effects, as long as the effects aren't totally inappropriate or needlessly jarring, there isn't likely any negative effect |
| 11. | The scene where the four soldiers are waiting in the tunnels to attack was beautifully done in all aspects. |
| 12. | History -- or rather story -- enhanced with the minimalist approach |
| 13. | The use of the platforms (I don't recall the name of the set elements that served as duckboards in the trenches and beds as well as the ceiling of the 12 tunnels leading up to the front) . This was somewhat effective in setting the scene the sound effects did not give an impression of the chaos of the battlefield. The lighting on the rear scrims was in some ways out of character with the action. There is a section toward the end of the second act that had what appeared to be a |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | sunrise showing (whereas the action being described was taking place in the afternoon.) Moreover, the weather was poorly represented -- snow and sleet accompanied the attack according to the actors but the sound effects didn't give that sense. Moreover, they gave no impression of the deafening quality of a 1000 gun barrage. |
| 14. | the use of the herbal cigarettes really resounding with me. It smelled like war the subtle smell of burning |
| 15. | No. |
| 16. | lighting worked very well especially when light was put back over the audience |
| 17. | lighting was particularly effective, distinguishing the war scenes from the flashback home scenes |
| 18. | The lighting, set design and sound make the play seem very realistic, and one almost feels part of the scene. |
| 19. | yes, the constant background war noise during the production left no doubt you were in a war zone |
| 20. | can't think of an example right now |
| 21. | Rumblings of artillery fire, whistles blown on stage, the darkness of the trenches, the lighting of the candle (how symbolic!) all added a great deal to the sensory effects of the play. |
| 22. | Yes. One of the things I liked best about this play was the way it was designed and staged, for example, the scene where the soldiers are waiting in the tunnel, smoking cigarettes in almost complete darkness, really made you understand what it must have been like for them. |
| 23. | Certainly contribute. Vimy wouldn't have been Vimy without the sound/ashes of cannons. The snow fall seemed a bit skimpy and to be falling over just one of the actors. |
| 24. | yes, lighting in "subway" scene prior to attack |
| 25. | 1) yes; 2) no. |
| 26. | Very effective without being overpowering. |
| 27. | yes - lighting was particularly effective |
| 28. | Unfortunately, there are limits. For example, the staging could not possibly convey the omnipresence of mud and water. The play had the four soldiers spending the night before battle apparently dry - in one of the subways - whereas most had to stand in the rain all night, where the water was too deep to sit or lie down. |
| 29. | lighting was great in the tunnels |
| 30. | yes |
| 31. | Yes. The sound of bombs, etc, the uniforms make the story seem more real and believable. |
| 32. | Yes, but I can't think of a specific example. |
| 33. | they can, e.g. Macbeth @ Stratford last year set in modern Africa had good effects props costumes, but I found this production had less impact, perhaps due to small space; did actors use side aisles in house? for kids exposed to modern movies, theatrical productions can't compete for impact except by good acting and writing |
| 34. | Yes, the tunnel was quite convincing |
| 35. | I was very impressed with the sound - how it synced with the play, i.e. gunshots etc. Very effective |
| 36. | Yes - I thought the ramp that doubled as a ridge with the tunnel effect underneath as the soldiers waited for the moment to charge was very powerful |
| 37. | It makes it more real and therefore more striking, |
| 38. | I'm sure they do, but I'm not sure how. The stage effects do give us a sense of time and place. However, I feel it would still be powerful if there was a bare stage only with our attention focussed solely on the thoughts and words of the characters. |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 39. | Modern tech makes representation of certain events possible. |
| 40. | the candle in the tunnel with low lights made me feel I was there |
| 41. | Yes they enhance the story that is being told |
| 42. | Because it is hard to perform war on stage, these elements are crucial to show it. I particularly enjoyed the constant bombardment of shells in the background of the sound. |
| 43. | Yes, the scrim used in Vimy is a good example |
| 44. | yes. the scrim |
| 45. | Helps get the audience in the mood/time period |
| 46. | Yes, they can provide an environment that makes the scene more alive and more immersive - even though it is manufactured, it can bring the historical action to life in a way that adds detail and authenticity. |
| 47. | Yes. Every effect adds to the theatrical piece as a whole. The set and the sound were excellent and helped get the audience into the story. |
| 48. | Absolutely. Hearing the sounds of bombs and seeing the dull lighting made the world real. You know when the characters are cold because they are under blue lights. You know what time of day it was when the battle started and finished. Etc. |
| 49. | well I imagine it is very difficult to create the atmosphere of war in a theater, it is more important that the actors convince you that you are there than there be lots of stage effects. |
| 50. | I suppose it helps to indicate important parts and heighten dramatic moments, eg. the countdown to Vimy and the lights going dark at 0 hour |
| 51. | no |
| 52. | When there were sounds like the gunfire and explosions, it really made a cool effect when the actors reacted to it. It wouldn't be the same if they pretended they were hearing it. |
| 53. | the tunnel scene was scary |
| 54. | Very much so. It evokes just as much emotion as the actors on stage if done right. |
| 55. | Sound is critical: the explosions have to be extremely loud (without being so real as to cause hearing and psychological damage). Fog has to represent the gas. |
| 56. | Yes, the background really brought you back to that time. In particular the opening image of the Vimy backdrop with the soldier standing in front was very moving and brought you into the play from the first moment |
| 57. | well done. The pathetic fallacy of storms. The guns |
| 58. | See above for one example, but a particularly effective example was the snow at the top of the ridge, and the sound which seemed to surround the audience and pull you closer to the actors. |
| 59. | Yes. The sound of bombardment reminds us of where our story is taking place. |
| 60. | I really like the way the curtain was used - the setting was miniscule but worked really well! |
| 61. | Too general a question. If the play was about the negotiation and signing of confederation in Charlottetown, scenery and sound effects might be redundant. For this play, they were critical. With no barrage noises the impact of the assault section would be much reduced. |
| 62. | All these things contribute to the whole atmosphere of the play, so yes it is important to make these things just right. The set design was absolutely amazing for this production - I was smitten away by its dynamic and multiple uses for certain parts of the stage; the way that the beds were pushed aside for future uses. The lighting against the scrim helped visualize the reality of the war and was pretty eerie - but that was beneficial to the play's message. |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 63. | yes. sound is crucial. sounds of memories of canada |
| 64. | no |
| 65. | yes, battle background sounds |
| 66. | I do not know that much about these things, but I did find the background sound of the war noises were very effective. So much so, that it was very dramatic at the end when there was such complete silence. |
| 67. | When one can see individuals reacting to their physical environment it creates a more realistic story. Especially with the lighting and using the darkness with low light when the soldiers were on watch, gave the audience time to digest what they had to go through in a stress situation like war. |
| 68. | dim lighting, spare design |
| 69. | The battle sounds seemed very real. |
| 70. | Yes. The subway scene really gave the claustrophobic sense of that situation. |
| 71. | It helps I think to bring the atmosphere into play and to draw us into the experience of what the actors are trying to get across. |
| 72. | I enjoyed the lighting and set design. It was effective at generating a mood/tone |
| 73. | Yes, the lighting and all the space at the back of the stage gave a sense that this story we were seeing was just a tiny piece of something much bigger |
| 74. | the darkness on-stage in the build-up to the attack helped convey the reality of the moment along with the sense of apprehension of the characters |
| 75. | I believe that since we're used to a semi-realistic portrayal of war (more or less) in film, that is expected on the stage, and the fog machine I felt provided an added dimension to the experience because it made me think, as that big cloud approached me and I smelled the fog, what the effect of the gas attacks may have been like |
| 76. | yes. An example was the sounds of bombs in the background. Another example was the foreshadowing of the horror behind the drape. You knew beforehand that Laurie had not survived. |
| 77. | yes the lighting sets the mood. It was evident in each part...brighter light during the day in the infirmary and of course the dramatic light to give you the feeling of artillery. |
| 78. | yes, in fact I thought the stage set was too 'clean' and did not reflect actual conditions as well as it could have, but overall brought home a certain sense of the place, the hospital was more effective. The sound might have been more effective as well. It seemed a bit quiet to me...I recognize the need to not 'bust an eardrum' at the theatre but... |
| 79. | not particularly in this production |
| 80. | The details such as the water relief on the floor of the stage and the sounds that came along with it made us feel right there by the river with the actor without delay |
| 81. | No. |
| 82. | Yes, because it helps create the effect of the play. |
| 83. | no |
| 84. | Yes. It gives you the mood of the setting |
| 85. | Yes, because sounds like bombs exploding make it seem more real. |
| 86. | Yes, because if you're acting on a bright green stage, you won't know where they are |
| 87. | yes because when Laurie was behind the curtain and the spot light was on him it showed him through the curtain |
| 88. | Yes, the effects made the play much better. The smoke, and the smell it gave off was very good. It let you imagine what it would be like to be in the cave. All of the dusk, dirt, and the cigarettes. |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 89. | It can be used to manipulate how the viewer perceives the play and subsequently, how they perceive the history. |
| 90. | meh |
| 91. | The thunderous rumble of bombs exploding during the battle made everything that much more realistic. |
| 92. | The effects makes the play much better. The scene were the soliders are smoking is one example. The combination of dust, dirt and cigarettes give you the feeling that you are actually in the cave. |
| 93. | Yes. In vimy, the explosions and loud noises in the background really improved the play. |
| 94. | Yes, I think it really sets the mood. An example is when the lights are dim, you can tell it is night and it makes everything very mysterious. |
| 95. | Yes |
| 96. | These elements definitely impact how history unfolds on the stage. For example, I really enjoyed the curtain that, when Laurie was behind it, evoked memories and other thoughts. |
| 97. | Yes. Light and sound representing flashes of guns, the screen representing the veil curtain separating the living and the dead, the present and the imagined, were effective. |
| 98. | Very much so. The lighting during the scenes leading up to the battle (particularly when they were waiting to deploy) gave a strong sense of the discomfort, fear, and anticipation of the soldiers. |

Did you attend our production of Vimy to learn more about our country's history? |

| # | Response |
|-----|---|
| 1. | No. To learn of the writer's interpretation of the Vimy experience. |
| 2. | Yes, and I'm both a GCTC NAC subscriber. |
| 3. | No |
| 4. | No. |
| 5. | Yes. I am very interested in everything about Vimy |
| 6. | No. I went because I subscribe to the NAC theatre season. |
| 7. | no |
| 8. | No, I have subscription to GCTC |
| 9. | no |
| 10. | Not directly for this reason, but I DID in fact learn more. |
| 11. | no |
| 12. | No |
| 13. | yes, partly and to see a good theatre production |
| 14. | Not really, I had recently read Tim Cook's books and was curious how a playwright would deal with such a vast canvass. As it turns out he did a poor job/ |
| 15. | I subscribe to the GCTC |
| 16. | No. |
| 17. | Partially. Took my family to Vimy a few years ago to teach my children about our past |
| 18. | partly. Also because it sounded like a very interesting play |
| 19. | It is of great interest, but besides that, we do have a subscription to the National Arts Centre Theatre |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 20. | yes |
| 21. | no, it's part of my subscription |
| 22. | Yes, in part this was my reason for attending the production. |
| 23. | No. I have a subscription to GCTC and go to 6 plays a year, regardless of what they are. In fact, I did not even know the play was Vimy until I got to the theatre! |
| 24. | Not to learn more but to get the insight of 'actual participants' |
| 25. | no |
| 26. | no |
| 27. | Yes |
| 28. | yes |
| 29. | no |
| 30. | No |
| 31. | no |
| 32. | No |
| 33. | Yes, but not only for that reason. |
| 34. | no |
| 35. | No |
| 36. | No. |
| 37. | Yes |
| 38. | partially |
| 39. | Not particularly |
| 40. | no |
| 41. | No for class |
| 42. | No, I saw it for a class, but it did make me see the battle in a new way |
| 43. | No |
| 44. | no |
| 45. | No |
| 46. | No. |
| 47. | No |
| 48. | No, I already knew the tale of Vimy. I attended because it was a part of one of my university classes requirements, I have always found ww1 and ww2 interesting and im a frequent theatre goer. |
| 49. | In part. |
| 50. | no, for a theater class |
| 51. | No. |
| 52. | no |
| 53. | No, for class. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 54. | yes |
| 55. | no |
| 56. | Yes |
| 57. | No |
| 58. | Yes and no - complimentary ticket, but well worth seeing the play and understand more about Canada's role in the war |
| 59. | no |
| 60. | No |
| 61. | No. Mostly as a reminder of the sacrifice of others for my freedom. |
| 62. | I attended as part of my class but I wanted to attend anyway to learn what this production had to say about our country's history |
| 63. | To a limited degree |
| 64. | I attended the production as part of my theatre class. |
| 65. | no |
| 66. | no |
| 67. | no, have visited Vimy and War Museum |
| 68. | No. I had heard that it was a great production. |
| 69. | yes |
| 70. | no, to see how the play could be staged ge |
| 71. | partly |
| 72. | No. |
| 73. | No |
| 74. | no |
| 75. | no |
| 76. | no |
| 77. | No |
| 78. | not really. We'd read good reviews and this was our first time to the GCTC |
| 79. | I was invited to attend |
| 80. | No, pleasure time. |
| 81. | no |
| 82. | yes |
| 83. | Partly |
| 84. | A little |
| 85. | No. |
| 86. | Yes. |
| 87. | no |

| | |
|------|--|
| 88. | no |
| 89. | No |
| 90. | No |
| 91. | yes |
| 92. | No |
| 93. | blah |
| 94. | I guess so...yeah. But the sad thing is I probably wouldn't have gone if I hadn't gone with school. And then I would have missed out!! |
| 95. | Yes. |
| 96. | No, I attended it on a school trip. |
| 97. | It was for a school trip. |
| 98. | Not really, I knew a little about Vimy Ridge before, but my class went to see it. |
| 99. | no |
| 100. | No |
| 101. | Not really. I did not anticipate a history lesson. |
| 102. | Yes. |
| 103. | Yes, but just as much to see how the battle (or surrounding events) would be treated by the play. |

If you reside in Canada, did our production of Vimy deepen your sense of identity as a Canadian? How? |

| # | Response |
|-----|---|
| 1. | No. |
| 2. | I now better understand how the battles at Vimy helped solidify Canada as a nation. |
| 3. | No |
| 4. | No. I already know that the battle at Vimy is widely seen as the making of the nation of Canada. |
| 5. | Yes. I recently read Three Day Road and the play reminded me of the broad cross section of Canadian society represented in the military |
| 6. | No. But I liked the way it depicted people from places so separate from each other that they may almost have been different countries. Interesting that the common theme was hockey. |
| 7. | A deeper understanding of an iconic story about Canada |
| 8. | Not really, actually quite the contrary, it make me think how little I have in common with the Canadians portrayed on stage. I am neither of a British descent, nor a French descent, not native. I do not have longings for the Nova Scotia sea shore or Winnipeg winter. And so on. |
| 9. | somewhat; I already felt deeply about Vimy |
| 10. | i arrived in this country with a respect and love for the strength and decency of Canadians. This production has given me more evidence of the source of those qualities |
| 11. | no |
| 12. | It reminded me of the sacrifice |
| 13. | Not really - I am a Canadian whether I saw this play or not |

14. Not really, it skimmed over the surface of the historical events but then focused on the individuals (not surprising as it was a play!) The characters didn't speak about the how they felt to be part of a Canadian Corps for the first time and what that meant to them or their loved ones at home. That is one aspect of the production which could have really illuminated my understanding of the degree to which this event was viewed in contemporary society in Canada (beyond bashing the 'Bosch!') Unfortunately I was disappointed in any incoherent expectation of this sort as the production did not address this at all.
15. It just makes me proud to be part of such a brave nation
16. Yes. It reminded me of how different we all are, but at the same time, how we are all Canadians.
17. Yes primarily because we went to Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel
18. the portrayal of the boys from different backgrounds, but all Canadian, was excellent
19. It emphasized the fact that Canada took on a whole new character as far as the rest of the World was concerned. British troops, French troops, etc. failed to do what Canadian troops did at Vimy.
20. by identifying people and where they said they came from, i.e., Winnipeg, Renfrew
21. it's great to see Canadian stories
22. I appreciated the idea that the soldiers were from different parts of the country, different walks of life, different linguistic or racial groups and yet all fought for the same purpose I particularly enjoyed the role of the nurse because too often we forget how involved women became in WW1, not only at home but also overseas.
23. I'm not sure it deepened it (I already feel very Canadian!) but it certainly resonated. Having each of the characters come from a different part of the country and different ethnic group (ie. anglo, francophone, native Canadian) and seeing the way they interacted with each other and the prejudices that existed at the time (and probably still exist, for many) was very interesting and made the play itself feel very Canadian, especially when there were references to things like Canoeing, mosquitoes, east vs. west Montreal, etc... somewhat stereotypical but it made it feel like this play "belonged" to me.
24. Yes. By showing people with racial/geographic antagonisms can come together in common cause.
25. yes, personalized the event beyond historical significance
26. no
27. Yes, it highlighted various tensions within the country at that time.
28. no
29. no
30. Somewhat, first time fighting together
31. no
32. No
33. I don't think so.
34. no
35. No
36. To some extent. The play reinforced how large Canada is i.e., soldiers of different outfits coming from all parts of Canada.
37. Yes, It makes us more aware of Canada's past. We are a young country but still have an history well worth nurturing and celebrating. I see it as developing a sense of identity, a pride in our past, in our country.

| | |
|-----|---|
| 38. | Yes, it reminded me that Canada and the best of its values are worth fighting for. But the choice to fight is always a hard, difficult one to make. |
| 39. | Not at all. |
| 40. | no |
| 41. | What's a Canadian? Yes it did. It allowed me to see one of the key parts of Canada's history and feel the success and sadness of that moment |
| 42. | The play dealt with a lot of issues that tend to be covered up in Canadian history, such as the tension between the French, and the First Nations, and as such I feel I know a little more about Canadian identity as a whole. |
| 43. | No |
| 44. | yes. made me proud |
| 45. | It did because it showed how multicultural our country is now and then |
| 46. | Yes, because I learned more about the battle and about the people who fought. |
| 47. | Not really, but I can see how it would/might |
| 48. | No, as I said, I had previously known how the battle of Vimy Ridge was Canada's first victory creating our identity as a country of our own. So, I had previously deepened my sense of identity as a Canadian before. The show just reinforced, I suppose. |
| 49. | Not particularly. I am not drawn to war as a Canadian identifier. |
| 50. | Yes, I'm a Nova Scotian girl with roommates from Winnipeg, Calgary and Ontario so it was amazing to see all of us represented so well on stage! I have stood many times at Five Islands looking out into the bay, and I have heard constantly about the temperatures and insects that plague Winnipeg along with the wonderful canoe trips my Ontarian roommates tell me about |
| 51. | No. |
| 52. | yes, the different provinces being represented. The Winnipeg guy was very accurate and funny |
| 53. | Yes, it reminded me how important our soldiers really are and why they fight for us. |
| 54. | I'm pretty solidly identified! |
| 55. | no |
| 56. | It showed a diversity that I haven't seen written about anywhere else. |
| 57. | Yes, it made me feel proud to be a Canadian, proud of what our country gave up to help others |
| 58. | yes - it made me realize that the soldiers in WW1 had very primitive conditions to work in and sacrificed too many lives for Canada |
| 59. | no. I object to the claim that we became a country at Vimy. But proud - and disturbed - at the sacrifice. |
| 60. | Definitely. It is seldom that Canadian productions feel truly Canadian. Identity can only be an inherent feeling and often plays, films etc feel trite and forced. The production made me understand the idea that a national identity was born on that battlefield. Other attempts to create this feeling have failed (specifically thinking of Paul Gross' Passchendaele here!) |
| 61. | Yes. I think it helped to remind me that although we should be proud of what our soldiers accomplished at Vimy and other battles, we also have to remember what it cost, particularly to the soldier (i.e. JP's ordeal) |
| 62. | Absolutely! It only adds to the love I feel for what the soldiers did for us and currently do for us. |
| 63. | It reinforced the concept of the sacrifices made by Canadians, which don't get enough recognition, especially to our south! |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 64. | It did, because it made me proud of our men and women and what they did to save our country even though it grieved me that they had to go through this. |
| 65. | yes. personalized the battle |
| 66. | no |
| 67. | no, but visiting Vimy did |
| 68. | No. I already had a knowledge of Canada's part in WW I. It did deepen my sense of the war itself. |
| 69. | yes, it gave me a sense of unity and I started to think of 2010 olympics how as a national we were pulled together thru an idea of who we were and to stand up for who we are. |
| 70. | Yes. Very proud of our contribution to the war and keeping our country free from tyranny |
| 71. | yes - by the dedication of the soldiers |
| 72. | Yes. I didn't realize that Canada was alone in taking Vimy. |
| 73. | Not really, although as I said before, I did appreciate how the playwright was able to connect many aspects of Canada's mythology surrounding the FWW. |
| 74. | no |
| 75. | Yes, I know a bit more about Canadian history. I didn't even consider the politics (French/English/Aboriginal relations) that Canadian Forces took to Europe with them. The play makes me less likely to think of Vimy as a glorious moment in history. There was such an awful underbelly to it. |
| 76. | no; the sense of Canadian identity presented in the play seemed contrived |
| 77. | No, but it did make me think that this play rather than Passchendaele should be one of our national narratives for the Great War |
| 78. | not really. I already have a strong identity as a Canadian. My grandfather fought in WWI although he never spoke of his experiences and as far as I know, he didn't fight at Vimy. |
| 79. | no as a Canadian I've been always proud of our involvement in any war time situations. |
| 80. | Yes, reminded me to be proud and to never forget. |
| 81. | yes, the use of men from far flung regions and the reminder of the first nations' contribution |
| 82. | yes. it made me think of what my grandfather lived through during WWI |
| 83. | Yes because of the important role Vimy plays in our history |
| 84. | Every time I learn about it, especially with a different medium, it helps relating to it better |
| 85. | Yes, because it lets me know how hard my ancestors had it. |
| 86. | no |
| 87. | yes, it made me proud to be canadian |
| 88. | No |
| 89. | Yes, because it showed how brave canadians are |
| 90. | yes, because Canadians are awesome |
| 91. | It did not |
| 92. | meh |
| 93. | Um... I don't know... It definately made me proud of our country. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 94. | Yes. |
| 95. | It definitely gave me more respect for our soldiers, but didn't give me a deeper sense ofv identity. |
| 96. | Not really, it just made me more thankful, to the troops who gave their lives to make our country a better place. |
| 97. | Yes because I learned a lot about our history |
| 98. | No. The way the play dealt with the issue of identity was poorly done. A checklist of stereotypes. |
| 99. | In one sense, yes. It made me feel that we all grapple with personal, regional, and other affiliations and supposedly shared histories in addition to relating or fitting into the broad story of Canada and what being Canadian is supposed to mean. |
| 100. | Yes. I have a better understanding of what happened in a defining battle in our history. This helps me understand Canada and our contributions to WWI and Europe better. |
| 101. | Yes. It helped to bring home this notion that the First World War, and particularly Vimy, brought together disparate parts of the country together for the first time. |

If you reside outside of Canada, did you feel our production of Vimy helped you understand Canada better?
How? |

| # | Response |
|----|--|
| 1. | N/A |
| 2. | N/A |
| 3. | I do not reside outside of canada but, history of a country is definitely what helps people understand a country better. |
| 4. | N/A |
| 5. | partially. Different cultures invlved in the war and the complexity it might bring. |
| 6. | No. |
| 7. | blah |

Do you feel that seeing Vimy has influenced the way you see Canada's current military role in Afghanistan?
How? |

| # | Response |
|-----|--|
| 1. | No. |
| 2. | Not necessarily, although my nephew in the PPCLI was in Afghanistan for 7 months over the past year. |
| 3. | No |
| 4. | Change "Fritz" and "Bosche" to Taliban and war is still dumb. |
| 5. | I don't think so; I did not think about that after seeing the play |
| 6. | No. I'm close enough to it already. |
| 7. | no |
| 8. | Not really, I was, and I am against it from the very beginning. I know that this is the price we pay for having access to the American markets, but still. I am grateful to Chretien that he managed to stay away from Iraq. |
| 9. | no; the circumstances are too different |
| 10. | No. I can identify few parallels between these two conflicts |
| 11. | no |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 12. | No, but my military connections make that unlikely |
| 13. | War is hell, I cannot really say it has or has not influenced me in either way |
| 14. | Not really. The contexts are very different. Vimy was seen as unifying event in Canadian history (at least in English Canada) whereas the Afghanistan mission is seen as remote and very political and somewhat divisive, However, as it is being fought by the Regular Army -- something that has never happened in Canadian history and Vimy was fought by members of a million-strong volunteer force in a total war situation the comparison of the two situations is very difficult to make since the contexts and criteria of the two are so different. |
| 15. | not necessarily - my friends are currently deployed and that makes it pretty real |
| 16. | Partially...worry that too many "boys" are there for excitement and do not realize the horrors of war. |
| 17. | this play portrays war as futile, that must have an influence on how I feel about Afghanistan although our involvement there seems to have much greater purpose |
| 18. | I am unsure about Canada's role in Afghanistan. There was absolutely no doubt about Canada's role in World War 1. It was something that just had to be done. |
| 19. | possibly, I got a sense of what a soldier must endure |
| 20. | they shouldn't be there any longer |
| 21. | I have issues with our military being in Afghanistan. One wonders if, like Vimy, it will result in the waste of many many young live or whether, like Vimy, historians in the future will somehow view it as a turning point in Canada's continuing story. |
| 22. | No. I see WW1 and Afghanistan as very different kinds of conflicts and I just don't see the point of having Canadian military over there -- it seems pointless and unnecessary. That view did not change because of this play. |
| 23. | No particular impact. |
| 24. | no |
| 25. | no |
| 26. | No, I am aware of the individual impact. |
| 27. | no |
| 28. | no |
| 29. | No- two completely, different wars |
| 30. | no |
| 31. | No. I watched this as a play about a specific moment in time and did not link it with the current conflict in Afghanistan. |
| 32. | no |
| 33. | No |
| 34. | No |
| 35. | Yes, it illustrates well the impact of war on our soldiers, a really traumatic experience for most. |
| 36. | That is a complex question. I see both parallels and stark differences. |
| 37. | No. |
| 38. | no |
| 39. | Yes |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 40. | No, the Afghan mission is strictly peacekeeping, and I see it in a completely different way than the battle if Vimy |
| 41. | No |
| 42. | no |
| 43. | no |
| 44. | No. |
| 45. | No |
| 46. | No, the play did not make me see the influence that Canada is involved with Afghanistan because I already had known about Vimy before I saw the play. |
| 47. | It deepened my grief that war continues. |
| 48. | no, I have always felt that there are very few similarities between the world wars and modern war fare. Now men enter because they want to fight and are aware of the realities of war. I know that there are bad people in the world and it is not right to say well they aren't hurting us right now so why should we bother but they are hurting their own people and that is not fair. I am conflicted in that we need military force to over come the oppression of the Afghani people and yet I can not support people (our troops) who choose to participate in violence. ate in violence! it is one tough spot we've gotten our selves into as humaity, a lot of poor choices and e |
| 49. | No. |
| 50. | no |
| 51. | They're reasons for fighting are the same as the boys from the world wars, and Clair in the play was right: they aren't the first to think this and thay everyone is there for the same reasons, whether or not one is more Canadian than the other. |
| 52. | I'm not sure yet. |
| 53. | no |
| 54. | No |
| 55. | Yes, it furthered my dislike for having Canadian military in the war because the humanity of the soldiers is emphasized |
| 56. | Soldiers sacrifice much for freedom of others |
| 57. | No. I'm not sure that both were not futile. However, proud of our military. We send them so we need to own the responsibility for them and the decision |
| 58. | No |
| 59. | Not really, but it did add to my understanding of what the soldiers are going through. |
| 60. | Yes, it makes me more proud of the work the soldiers are doing now |
| 61. | No. Afghanistan is more like Korea... or the Boer war |
| 62. | It has just as it has affected the way I view war in general - the personal stories explained in the play developed a personal connection with the audience and it makes you feel like you were part of the event too. And once you learn the stories of certain soldiers, you begin to wonder about the lives of the soldiers now stationed in Afghanistan. And it is important to keep all those people serving in our memories because they are doing so much for us. |
| 63. | no. |
| 64. | no |
| 65. | no, times have changed |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 66. | Haven't thought about that, but definitely will now! |
| 67. | Maybe it will allow us to be more sympathetic to the soldiers way of life, their training, and how they must rely trust each other when unexpected things occur. |
| 68. | Yes, there is a need to protect freedoms |
| 69. | Not really - completely different warfare |
| 70. | No. |
| 71. | Not particularely |
| 72. | definitely not! |
| 73. | Not really |
| 74. | no |
| 75. | No |
| 76. | I don't think that I made a connection between Vimy and Afghanistan. It seems to me that these are quite different military roles. |
| 77. | I don't know |
| 78. | Yes, Soldiers then and now affect from the after math |
| 79. | no, a different kind of war in a very different time: the media has changed this aspect of was immeasurably |
| 80. | no |
| 81. | No |
| 82. | No |
| 83. | No. |
| 84. | Yes, because now I know how tough it is. |
| 85. | no |
| 86. | yes. I think we should pull out |
| 87. | No, because I still think that we should never have sent armed forces into Afghanistan, and it's a war we can't win. |
| 88. | Yes |
| 89. | yes, it is important |
| 90. | Vimy did not influence my view on Canada's current military role in Afghanistan. |
| 91. | meh |
| 92. | Ummm... no... I hadn't thought of that connection. |
| 93. | Yes, it does. I now think more about what is really happening in Afganistan, About the people who are fighting, and what they are going through. |
| 94. | I now have more support for the war and the role that Canada is playing in it. |
| 95. | Yes, because I understand how hard the war is on them. |
| 96. | No |
| 97. | No. I still feel the same about that. |

98. Somewhat. Sometimes I question the relevance of the current military contribution in Afghanistan. This play, by raising questions about what we contributed in Europe and whether the personal sacrifice was merited, naturally makes me ask the same questions of the current situation.

99. Not particularly, aside from the aspect of the horrors of war, whatever the era.