‘One Day Stronger’: A Public History Theatrical
Experiment about Remembered Sudbury Strikes,
1958-2010

by

Richard Duthie, BA (Hons), MA

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

History

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2021, Richard Duthie

Abstract

This dissertation honours and pays tribute to Sudbury residents and many others for whom labour strikes played a significant role in shaping their lives. Set in the context of a public history theatrical experiment, this study investigates local and community memories pertaining to Sudbury mining strikes in the postwar period from 1958 through to 2010. Archival research and oral history interviews were conducted on major labour strikes in this era and that research was used to script, rehearse, and stage a theatrical play. Interviews with audience members and performers were also conducted at all stages of the process. This process allows the dissertation to consider the perspectives of both performers and audience members, each enacting their roles as producers and consumers of public history. The dissertation also assesses the value of this form of history making, as it relates to the formation of historical consciousness, both *then* and *now*, of individuals within the Sudbury community. This study argues that public history as theatre has the potential to provide an effective and affecting means to nurture critical, reflexive historical consciousness both on and off the stage.

Acknowledgements

A finished dissertation is the result of the hard work and help from many people. I first want to thank the Department of History at Carleton University. Arriving in Ottawa in the Fall of 2015, I was accepted into a thoughtful and welcoming environment, which encourages camaraderie and provides its students with a wonderful scene from their first day in the department. Most especially, to my supervisors, Dr. John C. Walsh and Dr. David Dean: thank you both for six years of support and inspiration. You are both terrific scholars, great people, and serve as the best of examples, for how showing kindness and having a sense of humour are so important for this work and the life that goes with it. David and John encouraged me throughout this PhD process ironically enough to ‘take the stage,’ as the saying goes, and I will always fondly reminisce about our coffee sessions at Life of Pie.

The completion of this degree would not have been possible without the generous financial support from several sources: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Canadian Government, the Alberta Government and the Carleton University Department of History. I wish to thank the National Ukrainian Foundation in Sudbury for generously making it possible for our group to use the hall and have it accessible for the entirety of the production period of *One Day Stronger*. Spending over three weeks rehearsing in the actual performance space is a luxury for any theatre company, and you made that possible for us. Having that wonderful community hall space was so crucial to this project and we really appreciated being able to make ourselves at home. I would also like to extend my sincerest of appreciation to the Royal Canadian Legion Branch 76, for hosting the project during the workshop in October 2018. Similarly, a special thank you

to the Sudbury Theatre Centre for the use of their rehearsal hall, props and costumes, and generally being very supportive of this project. I would also like to thank Pat the Dog Theatre Creation for facilitating our first workshop in May of 2018. You believed in me as a playwright and surrounded me with good people and an invested audience. I hope to pay forward in spirit and deed the generosity, goodwill and kindness that was afforded me throughout these very exciting four years!

Thank you ever so much and again to everyone who participated in the making of this project. Your interviews, feedback, audience participation and exceedingly high level of care that you demonstrated for this work, as well as its significance to your community is admirable. I also would like to wholeheartedly thank all of my performers and creative team. Matthew Heiti, Jenny Hazelton, AJ Laflamme, Greg Trembley, Miriam Cusson and Caitlin Heppner –I consider it an honour and a privilege to have had you all be part of this experience. *One Day Stronger* could not have been what it became without your tireless efforts, extraordinary talents, immeasurable acts of kindness, and the fact that you were all simply and profoundly heroic. It was wonderful to work with such talented and committed individuals, but more importantly, I will forever relish these memories that remind me of how lucky I am to have such good friends. Thank you also to Judi Straughan and John McHenry for assisting me with a lot of the production related aspects necessary at each stage of this project. Your advice and connections in the community were instrumental in making sure that we were able to have such strong support for the project and attendance for the show. Dan Ross, Brian Sison, Nick Carella and Michelle Ouellet, merci for showing up my dear friends, several of you from out of town, and volunteering at the hall last minute for ushering and striking (in the theatrical sense)

duties. Manny Gavidia, thank you for helping me put up posters all over town. Kim Fahner, thank you for looking over all of my drafts and just being really supportive of the work.

The Carleton History Department has allowed me to foster an incredible number of friendships with great and talented people, whom I admire very deeply. There are too many to list here, as spending six years in the department has allowed me to make more wonderful connections than I thought possible. Thank you especially to Ashley Clarkson, Dr. Michael Chiarello, Shawn Anctil, Suki Lee, Dr. Christine Chisholm, Dr. Stuart MacKay, Dr. Meghan Lundrigan, Dr. Sandy Barron and Dr. Breanna Lester. Our times in the office, at the pub, library, or walking the tunnels kept me sane, cheered me up, inspired me and really helped to make my experience at Carleton a positive one. Thank you to everyone who has offered me their space and time. Thank you to Dr. Dominique Marshall and Dr. Aleksandra Bennett who were both kind, generous, and an absolute joy to work for as your TA. Anyone who has set foot in the Department of History knows how essential its administrative staff are to the success of the students and faculty. Thank you to Joan White for everything she does for graduate students behind the scenes. Joan has helped me make it through the many administrative difficulties that accompany a graduate degree, and I appreciate the chats and help even though I almost always reached out in the eleventh hour! I would also here like to thank the Dr. Thorsten Logge, Dr. Yana Meerzon, Dr. Delphin Muise and Dr. Dominique Marshall as members of my examination board for the wonderful discussion and feedback during my defence.

On a personal note, so much appreciation is owed to those closest to me. None of this would be possible without the support of a wonderful family. Thank you to my

parents, Pat and Leona Skanes, for being with me on this journey from the beginning. This was not possible without you. Thank you to my aunt, Barb Beausoleil, for the dinners, chats, and laundry nights when I ended up back in Sudbury. I also wish to say a very special thank you to my dear aunt Lorraine and my uncle Gary Skanes. Thank you for so generously taking me in to your home for the duration of my studies at Carleton. I will always appreciate you making me a member of your family. Those stir fry and wine nights, and of course all of those endless hours we spent yelling at the referees for severely wronging our Habs, really carried me through some of the toughest of stretches and were the best of times indeed. I aspire to be as kind and as generous in my life as you have been in yours. To Dan Ross: thank you for more than two-and-a-half decades of friendship, your incredible support, and all of those coffee chats and movies. To Matthew Heiti: thank you for “Dynasty Mode,” and for your lifelong friendship. To my Partner AJ: thank you for sharing this experience with me, putting up with my messes and all of the chaos, for Ripley, and for just being good at everything. Thank you for listening to the things I read out loud, hearing the things that I say, and making sure that I give myself more credit from time to time. You are truly inspirational, patient, kind, and my achievements mean so much more now that I can celebrate them with you.

I wish to again say thank you to the residents in Sudbury who took the time to share their experiences with me and for their continued friendship. There are too many of you to name here, and I just need to reiterate that I will forever be grateful for all of the kindnesses and support. This is truly a community that I feel fortunate to have been a part of now twice. I consider myself fortunate to have crossed your paths.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Appendices.....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Remembered Histories.....	19
Chapter 3: Script Breakdown.....	79
Chapter 4: Performance and Production	145
Chapter 5: Reception.....	205
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	251
Appendices:	
Appendix A – <i>One Day Stronger</i> : The Script	263
Appendix B – Sudbury Interviews Table	349
Appendix C – Interview Questions: Community Members	350
Appendix D – ‘Netta’ Heppner, letter to her sister, 14 July 1951	352
Appendix E – Artist Interview Questions	353
Appendix F – INCO ‘Solidarity Benefit’ Flyer (edited).....	355
Appendix G – <i>One Day Stronger</i> : Program.....	356
Appendix H – Ethics Clearance	358
Bibliography	360

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1. Table	164
Figure 4.2. Projection Screen.....	168
Figure 4.3. Podium End of Set.....	169
Figure 4.4. Top of Show	171
Figure A.1. Smokeless Smokestack.....	333
Figure A.2. Lively House.....	333
Figure A.3. Lively Kitchen	333
Figure A.4. Woman in Kitchen	333
Figure A.5. Man with Family	333
Figure A.6. Creighton Mine	333
Figure A.7. Mules Outside the Mine	333
Figure A.8. Blue Mine-Mill Sticker	333
Figure A.9. 1950s Jackleg	334
Figure A.10. Falconbridge Muckers	334
Figure A.11. Mine Cart	334
Figure A.12. Miners with Jackleg	334
Figure A.13. Falconbridge Ladders #1	334
Figure A.14. Falconbridge Ladders #2	334
Figure A.15. Mine Tunnel	334
Figure A.16. Mayor Asks to Pray	334
Figure A.17. Pray to End Strike	335
Figure A.18. Vouchers for Potatoes	335
Figure A.19. Couple with Soup Pot	335
Figure A.20. Man Collecting Voucher	335
Figure A.21. Men Lining Up for Vouchers	335
Figure A.22. Security Checking Strikers	335
Figure A.23. Reds Recruit 7yr Old	335
Figure A.24. Strike is Suicidal	335
Figure A.25. Solski on Froid Picket	336
Figure A.26. Door with Light Underneath	336
Figure A.27. Handing Out Food	336
Figure A.28. Man Collecting Food	336
Figure A.29. Man Looking at Pants	336
Figure A.30. Strike Vote Ballot	336
Figure A.31. Picket Line / Decent Contract	336
Figure A.32. Men Gathered at Line	336
Figure A.33. Men with Sacks Walking	337
Figure A.34. Picket Line Abbey Road	337
Figure A.35. Two Men with Strike Sign	337
Figure A.36. Men in Picket Booth	337
Figure A.37. Men Outside INCO gates	337
Figure A.38. Empty INCO Parking Lot	337
Figure A.39. Turkey at Grocery Store	337

Figure A.40. Dad & Child with Turkey	337
Figure A.41. Union Hall	338
Figure A.42. Sign on Car	338
Figure A.43. Outside Queen's Park	338
Figure A.44. Troubadour	338
Figure A.45. People Killed by INCO	338
Figure A.46. Women at Arena.....	338
Figure A.47. Mayor at Arena.....	338
Figure A.48. Group of Women at Arena	338
Figure A.49. Man Voting.....	339
Figure A.50. Bright Light through a Doorway	339
Figure A.51. Men with Many Ballots	339
Figure A.52. Child Welcome Back.....	339
Figure A.53. We won.....	339
Figure A.54. End Strike	339
Figure A.55. Blue Mine-Mill Sticker.....	339
Figure A.56. Solidarity Benefit Flyer (edited).....	340
Figure A.57. People vs. INCO.....	340
Figure A.58. Picket Line.....	340
Figure A.59. Corn Roast 2	340
Figure A.60. Effigy	340
Figure A.61. Corn Roast 1	340
Figure A.62. Gifts	340
Figure A.63. Christmas.....	340
Figure A.64. Poster Photo.....	341
Figure A.65. Wives singing at corn roast	341
Figure A.66. Burning Effigy.....	341
Figure A.67. Bean Supper 1.....	341
Figure A.68. Bean Supper 2.....	341
Figure A.69. Bean Supper 3.....	341
Figure A.70. Bean Supper 4.....	341
Figure A.71. Pollution Sign	341
Figure A.72. Picket Line 1	342
Figure A.73. Picket Shed	342
Figure A.74. Cans	342
Figure A.75. Wives Singing.....	342
Figure A.76. Cat Speaking.....	342
Figure A.77. Dave Patterson.....	342
Figure A.78. Wives Supporting the Strike.....	342
Figure A.79. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	342
Figure A.80. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.81. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.82. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.83. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.84. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.85. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343

Figure A.86. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.87. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	343
Figure A.88. Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1	344
Figure A.89. Women of '78 Montage Part 2	344
Figure A.90. Women of '78 Montage Part 2	344
Figure A.91. Women of '78 Montage Part 2	344
Figure A.92. Fair Share Sign	344
Figure A.93. Plant Gating	344
Figure A.94. Joan and Heather	344
Figure A.95. March in '78 Smelter	344
Figure A.96. Wives Meeting	345
Figure A.97. 1979 Guy Lafleur Playoff Game Image	345
Figure A.98. Smokeless Smokestack	345
Figure A.99. Smoking Smokestack	345
Figure A.100. United Steelworkers Logo	345
 Figure B.1. Sudbury Interviews Table	 349
 Figure F.1. Enlarged INCO 'Solidarity Benefit Flyer (edited)	 355
 Figure G.1. <i>One Day Stronger</i> Program	 356

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A:	
<i>One Day Stronger</i> : The Script.....	263
<i>One Day Stronger</i> Projections.....	333
Index of Archives of Ontario Photo References.....	346
Appendix B:	
Sudbury Interviews Table.....	349
Appendix C:	
Interview Questions: Community Members	350
Appendix D:	
‘Netta’ Heppner, letter to her sister, 14 July 1951	352
Appendix E:	
Artist Interview Questions.....	353
Appendix F:	
INCO ‘Solidarity Benefit’ Flyer (edited).....	355
Appendix G:	
<i>One Day Stronger</i> : Program.....	356
Appendix H:	
Ethics Clearance	358

[A] play is a blueprint of a past event: a way of creating and rewriting history through the medium of literature. Since history is a recorded or remembered event, theatre ... is the perfect place to 'make history' [.] Suzan-Lori Parks, The America Play and Other Works (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1995), 4.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

One Day Stronger is a public history project that uses theatre to explore the historical consciousness of the performers and audience members involved with it. Using methods associated with documentary, verbatim, and playback theatre, this study investigates local and community memories pertaining to Sudbury mining strikes in the postwar period from 1958 through to 2010. As such, both the dissertation and the larger project are contributions to public history as a scholarly field of study and practice, and also to the public history of Sudbury.

One Day Stronger was developed through several phases, and the subsequent analysis emerges on multiple levels spanning the research, creation, performance and reception of it as a theatrical and cultural production. This multilayered approach combining the practice of theatre with historical scholarship presents an exciting opportunity for future partnerships across departments inside the university. My performance-centered public history project set in Sudbury contributes to a growing body of such collaborative efforts.¹

This project also enriches historical knowledge about labour, culture, and strikes in Sudbury, with the added performative dimension through its execution as part of a

¹ David Dean, Yana Meerzon, and Kathryn Prince, *History, Memory, Performance* (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015); Karin Tilmans, Frank van Vree, Jay Winter, eds., *Performing the Past. Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2010); Judith Schlehe et. al., eds., *Staging the Past: Themed Environments in Transcontinental Perspectives* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010).

community-based public history project.² Such a multi-faceted approach combining the arts (theatre), historical inquiry, and community activism fits well within the field of public history that is itself inherently interdisciplinary.³ There was precedence and motivation for me to revisit this convergence between academia, artists and local community activists from the origins of public history as an academic practice.⁴ This collaborative work contributes to these important conversations in the field.

As a public historian and theatre practitioner, my purposes for launching this ethnographic and performance experiment was to create an experiential form of historical storytelling in order to evaluate its effectiveness, and in how it might impact upon local historical consciousness. More than just assessing what people knew about the past, I wanted to gauge how they felt about this connection, and if and how it helped them make sense of their present lives. I wished to question how theatre practice might be inflected to enhance the experience of consumers and producers of public history. Can theatre be an effective and affecting pedagogical space for public history? Can a play provide for an audience and its artists opportunities to engage with the past in ways that complement more traditional means of historical storytelling such as books, museums, or films? Further, how does the conscious re-animation and staging of contentious labour strikes

² For a very useful treatment of this type of work see Delores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995). For a recent collection of articles pertaining to arts-based academic collaborations in Canada see Diane Conrad and Anita Sinner, eds, *Creating Together: Participatory, Community-Based, and Collaborative Arts Practices and Scholarship in Canada* (WLU Press, 2015).

³ Rebecca Conard, "Complicating Origin Stories: The Making of Public History into an Academic Field in the United States", in *A Companion to Public History*, edited by David Dean (Oxford: Wiley, 2018).

⁴ This is discussed more fully in Hilda Kean and Paul Ashton, "Introduction: people and their pasts and Public History today," in *People and their Pasts: Public History Today*, eds. Hilda Kean and Paul Ashton (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 1-20. See also Craig Heron, "The Labour Historian and Public History," *Labour/le Travail* 45 (2000): 171-197.

within a northern mining community produce valuable instances to re-explore, disturb, or problematize dominant narratives about these events?

LOCAL HISTORIES

This doctoral work builds upon my M.A. research on Sudbury's trade union local 598 and its own cultural programs and historical use of theatre in the 1940s and 1950s.⁵ As to the subject of this historical inquiry – the social phenomenon of strikes in Sudbury Ontario – my dissertation joins several theses and local authors who have written about unionism and strikes in Sudbury.⁶ My work also fits within the North American historical landscape that has been the subject of some fascinating studies about grassroots culture and organized labour.⁷ Moreover, my work contributes to scholarship pertaining to the postwar and postindustrial periods, as well as other significant monographs about working families and the Cold War.⁸ The period covered by this project begins with what is known as the “Golden Age” for trade unionism in Canada.⁹ In keeping with recent

⁵ Rick Duthie, “‘What’s that tutti frutti [dance] stuff?’: Mine Mill Local 598’s Cold War Cultural Tool,” Master’s Research Essay (Laurentian University, 2014).

⁶ For the respective works of two very significant labour figures and local authors Mike Solski and Jim Tester, see Mike Solski and John Smaller, *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895* (Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1984); Jim Tester, *The Shaping of Sudbury: A Labour View* (Sudbury: Mine Mill, 1979) and *Son of a Working Man* (Sudbury: Laurentian Publishing Ltd., 1994); For local theses on the subject see John Lang, “A Lion in a Den of Daniels: A History of the International Union of Mine Mill and Smelter Workers, Sudbury, Ontario 1942-1962,” Unpublished Masters’ Thesis (University of Guelph, 1970); Jason A. Miller, “Divided We Stand: A Study of the Development of the Conflict Between the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and the United Steelworkers of America in Sudbury, Ontario (1942-1969),” PhD diss. (McMaster University, 2003).

⁷ Laurie Mercier, *Anaconda: Labor, Community, and Culture in Montana’s Smelter City* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001); Mary Murphy, *Mining Cultures: Men, Women, and Leisure in Butte, 1914-41* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997) and Elizabeth Jameson, *All That Glitters: Class, Conflict, and Community in Cripple Creek* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998).

⁸ Tarah Brookfield, *Cold War Comforts: Canadian Women, Child Safety, and Global Insecurity* (Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 2012); Joy Parr, *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral, and the Economic in the Postwar Years*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999); and Steven High and David Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (Between the Lines, 2007).

⁹ Bryan D. Palmer, *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1992), 268. While recent scholarship has complicated this

scholarly contributions which problematize such categorizations, I also treated Sudbury as a unique local community with distinct material realities and culture as others have already done.¹⁰ While this is the broader historical context for *One Day Stronger* (hereafter *ODS*), the play and the project are even more concerned with the “remembered histories” that were formed, kept, and passed around in local memories, and which are explored in Chapter Two of this dissertation.

Sudbury’s first legal strike in 1958 sits on the edge of living memory, as men and women who experienced this event firsthand were mostly in their eighties by its sixtieth anniversary in 2018. The 1958 strike initiated a cycle that would characterize local labour relations throughout the postwar period and into the present day. People who are familiar with the mining industry recognize the cyclical pattern and dynamic of striking against a rich, multi-national corporation in this single resource town. The 1958 INCO strike initiated a sequence whereby subsequent strikes became recurring events and liminal spaces of “intersecting temporalities,” and where the “past is everywhere present.”¹¹ For all their variety, we shall see that the memories of strikes between 1958 and 2010 are gendered and also intergenerational.

I treat the recurrent social phenomenon of strikes in Sudbury as an example of Steven High and David Lewis’ notion of a “secular ritual” as it appears in their oral historical and photographic exploration of deindustrialization in Canada and the United

periodization, it was an era of versatility and an activist response to Cold War rhetoric, American imperialism, and “corporate welfarism.

¹⁰ See Robert Storey, “Unionization Versus Corporate Welfare: The Dofasco Way,” *Labour/LeTravail*, 12 (Autumn 1983), 7–42; Joan Sangster, “The Softball Solution: Female Workers, Male Managers and the Operation of Paternalism at Westclox, 1923–1960,” *Labour/LeTravail*, 32 (Fall 1993), 167–199; Carmela Patrias, “Employers’ Anti-Unionism in Niagara, 1942–1965: Questioning the Postwar Compromise,” *Labour / Le Travail* 76 (2015).

¹¹ British geographer Tim Edensor quoted in Steven High and David Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (Between the Lines, 2007), 57–58.

States.¹² While they were more interested in the ritualized demolition of industrial sites as a visible transition to the post-industrial era, I identify strikes as secular rituals that, “like sacred ones, are traditionalizing instruments mounted with the intention to establish a sense of stability and continuity through repetition and order.”¹³ From 1958 to 2010, strikes were a consistent re-occurrence within Sudbury’s complicated transition from its industrial past to its post-industrial present, and assumed many of the same characteristics of being a “secular ritual” in High and Lewis’ formulation. Significantly, strikes as secular rituals that were remembered for this project represent events and contexts that were laden with, nuance, conflict and controversy. As such they served as excellent points of departure during the interviews and as a means for formulating a theatrical exploration, two things that will be explored later in this dissertation.

Of paramount significance, *ODS* explores the legacy of women in this blue-collar community. In doing so, it joins some excellent studies and films that have explored Sudbury women’s auxiliary and “grassroots” activities within the city’s labour history.¹⁴ Evaluating the notion of women having voice and agency within a historically masculinist labour workforce was significant for the project, especially in terms of their lived experiences. As a point of departure, the “Remembering Histories” chapter that follows this introduction brings into focus the experiences and memories of women

¹² Ibid., 25 and 27-28.

¹³ Ibid., 27.

¹⁴ Mercedes Steedman, “The Red Petticoat Brigade: Mine Mill Women’s Auxiliaries and the Threat from Within, 1940s-70s,” in *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the creation of Enemies*, edited by Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse, and Mercedes Steedman (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000), 37-55; Steedman, “Godless Communists and Faithful Wives, Gender Relations and the Cold War: Mine Mill and the 1958 Strike against the International Nickel Company,” in *Mining Women: Gender in the Development of a Global Industry, 1670 to 2005*, edited by Jaclyn J. Gier and Laurie Mercier (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 233-253 and *A Wives Tale*, directed by Sophie Bissonnette, Martin Duckworth and Joyce Rock (Sudbury, ON: Les Ateliers Audio-Visuels du Québec, 1980).

during the 1958 and 1978 INCO strikes, respectively. In doing so, *ODS* creates scholarly and commemorative space for perspectives that are routinely reduced, eliminated or overshadowed, with the exception of studies devoted to examining the specific experiences of women in working communities.¹⁵ As one such example, this project was inspired by, and expands on the work of the documentary film *A Wives Tale* (1980).¹⁶ While the film documented in real time this historical experience, *ODS* recovers it more clearly in a commemorative and remembered mode.

I also wanted to explore the experiences of men and notions pertaining to masculinity during this period. Throughout this project, topics such as breadwinning, “rough culture,” male camaraderie, and gauging “acceptable” masculine behaviour consistently intersected with strikes, family, and community, reflecting historical patterns identified in other Northern Ontario working-class communities.¹⁷ In the subsequent chapters of this dissertation and in the play itself, a number of key questions are discussed: How did men reflect on their experiences during mining strikes in Sudbury, in terms of the resulting effects on their sense of self, community, and security, within their various workspaces or homes? How did these events effect their sense of identity as men?

¹⁵ For an extended discussion pertaining to the treatment and placement of women within scholarly writing about labour and working-class culture see Joan Sangster, “Gendering Labour History Across Borders,” *Labour History Review* 75, 2 (2010): 143–61.

¹⁶ *A Wives Tale*, Bissonnette and Duckworth and Rock.

¹⁷ Thomas Dunk, *A Working Man’s Town: Male Working Class Culture* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1991); Steven High, “They Were Making Good Money, Just Ten Minutes from Home’: Proximity and Distance in the Plant Shutdown Stories of Northern Ontario Mill Workers,” *Labour/Le Travail*, 76 (Fall 2015); Steven Maynard, “Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History,” *Labour / Le Travail* 23 (1989): 159-169; Ian Radforth, *Bushworkers and Bosses: Logging in Northern Ontario, 1900-1980* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).

METHODOLOGY

For this reflexive public history project, I researched, scripted, and staged a site-specific historical play focused on memories of mining strikes in Sudbury, Ontario. Besides conducting archival and library research into postwar strikes, and into the broader history in which they occurred, I also began extensive interviews in Sudbury with local residents who were willing to share their stories and memories. I then formulated a theatrical script based on these initial discussions, with an aim to restage these experiences for Sudburians in the form of a live performance. Developing this script included two public workshops, and throughout the writing, rehearsing, and staging of the play, I interviewed performers, crew, interviewees and held discussions with audience members. The performers also recorded their thoughts and impressions during rehearsals, and I kept my own research journal, in order to document my observations of what was happening throughout the process. The project ended as it began in Sudbury, through dialogue and discussion, following three live public performances in June 2019.

The dissertation was initially conceived using Robin Nelson's methodology for an arts praxis (theory imbricated within practice), a performance-based research inquiry that he conceptualized and explored from his own experiences and practice in Great Britain, as well as through several other international case studies in his book *Practice as Research*.¹⁸ I was inspired by this "multi-mode, dialogical and dynamic approach" for a research project in which arts practice was conceived of as a key method of inquiry, particularly as this work does not take on a traditional historiographical form.¹⁹

¹⁸ Robin Nelson, *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances* (Springer, 2013).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 37.

Furthermore, Nelson's aim was to promote this methodology as a legitimate mode of research within the academy. As this is a public history project that uses my background and abilities as a theatre practitioner, I was keen to adapt, position, and legitimize my artistic skills towards the production of academic knowledge. My methodology shifted away from Nelson's model as the project unfolded, but this initial focus on Practice as Research remains intact, as well as the dialogic relationship between written and performative elements within my work. Although verbatim performances and theatrical site-specific community-based collective creations are frequently produced by university theatre departments, oral history research centers and performance studies programs, to my knowledge there has been no history doctoral dissertation projects like this in Canada.²⁰ Practice as Research (including theatre) has gained some traction in Great Britain but not from history departments.²¹ It is my hope that this project will inspire others to see the historiographical potential for this and other related modes of inquiry.

At the foundation of this collaborative public history project and theatrical experiment, my interactive work compiling research, conducting interviews, and sharing stories with residents in Sudbury, has benefited immensely from, and contributes to a prolific body of scholarship devoted to the study of memory and place.²² My work also joins with other reflexive studies that utilize oral history practices to emphasize valued

²⁰ For a brief treatment of the high frequency of these projects as well as an assessment of traditional resistance to them in scientific-minded historical departments see the conclusion in Bruno Ramirez, *Inside the Historical Film* (McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP, 2014), 202-206.

²¹ For a full treatment on the status of performance-based research inquiries at the PhD level see Nelson, *Practice as Research in the Arts*.

²² Cecilia Morgan, *Creating Colonial Pasts: History, Memory, and Commemoration in Southern Ontario, 1860-1980* (University of Toronto Press, 2015); James Opp, and John C. Walsh, eds., *Placing Memory and Remembering Place in Canada* (UBC Press, 2010); William Fitzhugh Brundage, *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* (Harvard University Press, 2009); Michael C. Batinski, *Pastkeepers in a Small Place: Five Centuries in Deerfield, Massachusetts* (Univ of Massachusetts Press, 2004).

exchanges and “the sharing of authority” between “subject” researchers and “subject” interviewees.²³ This entailed a blurring in the line between audience/public and performer/scholar, similar to what Stacy Zembrzycki’s has described in her work with Sudbury’s Ukrainian community.²⁴ As a community-based and collaborative oral historical project, her work was instrumental in demonstrating that people are agents and not passive recipients in terms of narrative making, especially through their own remembered histories. As we will see in later chapters, at many instances, this collaborative approach inspired enthusiastic self-reflection, exchange, debate, and historical empathy.

These seminal public history practices that feature instances for collaboration and co-production are especially apt for this performance-based research inquiry. Performance was integral as a mode of research and as a means of exploring embodied knowledge, as local artists and audience members re-encountered remembered stories and traces from their individual and collective pasts through script readings, rehearsals, and the final staged performances. The secular ritualistic dimensions of the strikes, on-site work processes, and various social events were remembered, gathered, scripted, rehearsed, staged, discussed, refashioned and then re-staged. Participants (both performer and audience member) contributed input and exchanged ideas, which were then “worked” throughout the process. This type of ongoing exchange among myself, interviewees,

²³ Michael Frisch, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (Suny Press, 1990) and Steven High, “Sharing Authority: An Introduction,” *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol 43, No 1, (Winter 2009), pp. 12-34.

²⁴ Stacey Zembrzycki, *According to Baba: A Collaborative Oral History of Sudbury’s Ukrainian Community* (UBC Press, 2014).

performers and audience members constituted what some verbatim theatre practitioners deem as “feeding back” and a means of sharing interpretive responsibility for the work.²⁵

These aspects in concert, culminated to form an instance in Sudbury for what Della Pollock calls “ethnokinesis.”²⁶ Pollock applied this term in a discussion about performance studies scholar Diana Taylor’s work on the Yuyachkani theatre group. For Taylor, “performance is not about going back, but about keeping alive.” Commenting on that subject and Taylor’s work, Pollock writes that “performances of reparation and survival, suggest a shift from oral history performance as documentary or testimonial to oral history performance as *ethnokinesis* (her emphasis).”²⁷ I am likewise interested in the application of this term here for performers, interviewees and audience members, whose performative efforts in this multi-faceted process have served to “sustain, survive, compel, install, and craft memory; not only to write culture (ethnography) but to make and to move it beyond...[.]”²⁸

PARTICIPATORY HISTORY

The findings of *ODS* offer a response to national surveys in the United States, Australia, and Canada, which all argue that since the late twentieth century there is an increased public consumption of and demand for opportunities to engage with the past.²⁹

²⁵ Paul Brown, ed., *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community* (Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010), 4.

²⁶ For her conception of this term see Della Pollock, “Moving Histories: Performance and Oral history,” in Tracy C. Davis (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies* (2008), 132; The author cites Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Duke University Press, 2003), 208.”

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past* (Columbia University Press, 1998); Paul Ashton and Paula Hamilton, *History at the Crossroads: Australians and the Past* (Halstead Press, 2010); Margaret Conrad, Kadriye Ercikan, Gerald Friesen, Jocelyn Létourneau, Delphin Muise, David Northrup, and Peter Seixas, *Canadians and Their Pasts* (University of Toronto Press, 2013).

Predicated on surveys from cross-sections of each national public, respondents told these researchers that they have a higher level of trust for historical activities that are non-traditional and participatory, as opposed to the didactic and instructional “just the facts” approach that they associate with classroom-based historical learning. *ODS* is very much indebted to Thelen and Rosenzweig’s resulting call for a “participatory historical culture,” which is why I implemented a forum for Sudbury residents and artists to (re)play with their past.³⁰

Moreover, as David Dean noted in his article responding to these national surveys, public historians in Canada and elsewhere have relegated theatre (amateur or professional), to the field’s periphery.³¹ As a public historian with experience working on historical productions, Dean advocated that theatre be considered an important site of public history. He called for further exploration into how actors, directors, and dramaturges function as historians.³² He also felt that it would be worthwhile to investigate how theatre practitioners curate the past through their *mise-en-scène*, including lighting, sound and other technical aspects relating to staging a production. Until *ODS*, no other project has tested so rigourously theatre’s efficacy in terms of its function as a site for public history in the ways that Dean has suggested.

I felt that this was also an opportunity to mobilize the narrative and performative possibilities available to the theatre to facilitate an emotional impact, immersion, and for bringing multiple and contested pasts to life, particularly as a means to encourage public engagement. I wanted to join in conversations that were happening with other socially

³⁰ Rosenzweig and Thelen. *The Presence of the Past*, 190.

³¹ David Dean, "Theatre: A Neglected Site of Public History?", *The Public Historian* 34.3 (Summer 2012), 21-39.

³² I include playwrights to this list.

engaged practitioners in theatre, documentary media, visual arts and oral history across disciplines about community-based, participatory, collaborative and co-created projects.³³

THEATRE

A second key literature for this dissertation pertains to theatre which also speaks to my own background as a practitioner. As a former actor, performer and playwright, I was in a position to carry out this public history experiment using theatre in order to create effective and affective public history. As a direct mechanism to convey the interview material to the stage, my approach to the theatrical script work has benefited from recent scholarship pertaining to verbatim and documentary techniques as developed and practiced in Britain, Australia and North America.³⁴ *ODS* was also inspired by other collective creation practices in Canada and the United States, as well as techniques used for theatrical devising.³⁵ These aided with my goal of facilitating an authentic and immersive theatrical experience for performers and audience members.

This aspect of the dissertation is positioned within the traditions of verbatim, documentary theatre and theatre of the real. I am indebted to theatre scholar Carol Martin, for her study dedicated to the former, in which she focused on the “overlap and interplay between ‘theatre’ and ‘reality,’ [and the] blurred boundary between the ‘stage’ and the ‘real’ world [.]”³⁶ Martin’s treatment was pivotal in releasing me from traditional

³³ See Liz Miller, Edward Little, and Steven High, *Going Public: The Art of Participatory Practice* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017).

³⁴ Paul Brown, ed., *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*; Alison Forsyth and Chris Megson, *Get Real: Documentary Theatre Past and Present* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).; Will Hammond and Dan Steward, *Verbatim* (London: Oberon, 2008).

³⁵ Moises Kaufman and the members of Tectonic Theatre Project, *The Laramie Project* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001); Theatre Passe Muraille, *The Farm Show* (Toronto: Coach House Press, 1976); Martin Morrow, *Wild Theatre: The History of One Yellow Rabbit* (Banff, Alta.: Banff Centre Press, 2003); Alison Oddey, *Devising theatre: A Practical and Theoretical Handbook* (Routledge, 2013).

³⁶ Carol Martin, *Theatre of the Real* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 3.

antagonisms and boundaries that were existent and important within the theatre studies discipline (and also to performance studies). Instead, I aligned with her notion that “[t]heater of the real is not beholden to any particular style, whether realism or any other, although realism coexists alongside and in combination with many other approaches to representation.”³⁷ This encapsulation was key as my approach to writing the script was fluid and, as is explained more fully in Chapter Three, experimental.

Through a myriad of forms, I wanted my public history research project in Sudbury to function as a site for performance, entertainment, protest, and education. To these ends, I wrote the script and staged the performance while inspired by theories and practices long ago set forth by traditional avant-garde theatre practitioners, who actively sought to destabilize didactic forms and hegemonic narratives from their respective socio-political and cultural contexts.³⁸ Their practices and works were intended to foster a critical experience in the theatre, both for practitioners and audiences. While writing the play, I was particularly inspired by the work of Bertolt Brecht, who believed that a theatre creator needed to have a historian’s ethics and eyes. According to his aesthetic, the audience needed to be given the chance to witness and to criticize human behaviour from a social point of view, and for a scene to be played out as a piece of history.³⁹ In a Brechtian “epic” play the goal was to show the world as it changes. His methods join with the strategies, tools and teachings of other practitioners who tackled the project of

³⁷ Martin, *Theatre of the Real*, 8.

³⁸ Antonin Artaud, *The Theater and its Double* (Grove Press, 1958); Eugenio Barba, *On Directing and Dramaturgy : Burning the House* (New York: Routledge, 2009); Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, trans. Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979); Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, Edited by John Willett (Hill and Wang, 1966); Peter Brook, *The Empty Space: A Book About the Theatre: Deadly, Holy, Rough, Immediate* (Simon and Schuster, 1968); Jerzy Grotowski, *Towards a Poor Theatre* (London: Methuen, 1968); Richard Schechner, *Environmental Theater* (New York: Hawthorn Books Inc., 1973).

³⁹ Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, 86.

depicting narratives about the past in the present “from below” using the medium of theatre.

I would also single out my previous experiences working with August Boal’s practices from his *Theatre of the Oppressed*, that include Simultaneous Dramaturgy, as well as Image, Forum and Invisible theatre. His work was integral to my overall sense of social responsibility while practicing theatre, and for my goal here to foster a critical forum for reaction and discussion with a live audience.⁴⁰ The participatory and socially driven aspects of this project also place it in alignment with practitioners of Applied Theatre generally, and specifically Playback Theatre, where audience members share aspects from their lives and watch them reenacted as part of a live performance.⁴¹ I see resonances from this approach in my own work in terms of the show serving as an emotional outlet for individual audience members, as well as with how it aligns with my desire to honour the ‘original’ and their memories in all aspects of this process.

READING THIS DISSERTATION

Immediately following this introduction, I urge the reader to read the play, although this can never truly capture the sense of liveness and immediacy inherent to the actual live stage production. The appendix features the most recent version of theatrical script for *ODS*, the various stages to its development and its reception are the subjects of the chapters that follow. Each chapter unfolds naturally according to its place within this

⁴⁰ Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*.

⁴¹ Monica Prendergast and Juliana Saxton, eds., *Applied Theatre Second Edition: International Case Studies and Challenges for Practice* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2016). For a practitioner focused discussion on the respective aims and definitions, as well as the distinctions between Theatre of the Oppressed and Playback Theatre see Mark Weinblatt, "Combining Theatre of the Oppressed and Playback Theatre: A Powerful and Delicate Marriage," Mandala Centre for Change (June 2015), <http://www.mandalaforchange.com/site/resources/articles/combining-theatre-of-the-oppressed-and-playback-theatre-a-powerful-and-delicate-marriage/>.

oral historical and theatrical process. As a practical and very significant component to this dissertation, I introduce it here, and include it within, to demonstrate for the reader the fruition of my oral history research from the next chapter. It takes the form of an adapted version of the production's prompt book and includes all of the stage manager's lighting and sound cues, as well as the text from specific interviewee audio clips, and indications where photographs and images were used as projections during the show. The specific photographs and images are also included in the appendix, and the totality of these aspects pertaining to the script will be referred to moving forward.

The second chapter, "Remembered Histories," outlines and describes the ethnographic and oral historical origins of *ODS*. It pertains to the subject and substance of the remembered histories that were offered by my interviewees as well as some pre-recorded interviews from the late 1970s and early 1980s. It describes the interviews and interview process and then focusses on how participants shaped their memories through their narratives. It then shifts to the foundational analysis of postwar strikes in Sudbury which will later serve as the material basis for the play. The chapter's central argument is that memories of these events that were shared with me are gendered, and as "secular rituals" they are also inter-generational.⁴² As such, three recurrent themes emerged that were especially common and, which eventually came to inspire much of the play: family and the home; community; (in)security.

The next chapter, "Script Breakdown," is a thematic exploration of the process of the script's construction from historical material into a performable theatrical narrative. It describes my influences as a playwright and the specific methods that I used in the course

⁴² High and Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland*, 25.

of developing the play. It also outlines the larger thematic choices and ethical considerations regarding authenticity, when considering how to best depict characters based on the material from interviews, memories and culture that was explored in “Remembered Histories.” Using my own reflections, as well as those from workshop audience members and performers, the chapter then provides a close examination of the various thematic, creative and ethical aspects underpinning my choices while writing the script. The analysis moves chronologically from the beginning of the script through to the end and is subdivided into two sections: Act One and Act Two.

Chapter Four deals with the overall “Performance and Production” of *ODS*, that occurred in Sudbury in front of live audiences. It focusses on the immediate dynamics, creative choices, and inherent implications of these decisions - when considering aspects relating to the staging and performance of the scripted material. Performers and their experiences working with the interview material, developing characters and then performing in the play are the subject of their own treatment. The roles they performed for the show were just as significant for exploring historical memory in Sudbury as were their own personal and emotional connections to the work. Audience contributions then join with those from the performers and with my own experiences as a director, as a means of reflecting on the experience of the actual live production and various aspects related to its staging. It evaluates the creative choices in terms of my attempt at facilitating an authentic and immersive experience for audience members.

The penultimate fifth chapter, “Reception,” focusses on the overall reception of *ODS* as a public historical experience. Audience members, performers and interviewees participated in post-show discussions, and they were also invited to provide feedback in

various ways. These instances for dialogue with Sudburians who witnessed this event serve as the basis for the analysis. Sudbury audience members joined with the project's interviewees and its performers as collaborators in this local public history project. It is organized into four thematic categories that I discerned from the feedback and post show discussions: memories and emotional connections; intergenerational exchange; valuing complicated and divisive histories; women and their voices.

“Conclusion” is the final chapter of this dissertation and it is framed through my own personal reflection of an experience from the process. It revisits the questions that are posed in this introduction, and seeks to further evaluate *ODS* as a public history project that used theatre to explore the historical consciousness of the performers and audience members involved with it. To that end, it comments on some of the best practices that other public historians can take from the project. It ends with a brief description of the high level of care that characterized this public history project in Sudbury.

As a final note, I wanted to enlist multiple perspectives where I could find them and to present and animate polyvocal points of view. Even so, the use of the English language and the whiteness of this project are quite prominent. The mining workforce was overwhelmingly white and male, and the community featured a linguistic divide, historically, between English and French (among other European languages). As a white male who speaks English as my first language, I interviewed, procured and then reproduced predominantly white settler narratives within a settler historical framework from which I was operating in Sudbury. In alignment with Steven High's research pertaining to the Sturgeon Falls paper mill community in Northern Ontario, “[t]his

linguistic division of labour, and the near total exclusion of Aboriginal people, were remnants of industrial colonialism in the region.”⁴³ It needs to be acknowledged that the Greater Sudbury area is situated on the traditional territory of the Atikameksheng Anishnawbek people, whose presence long predated the settler stories from this project.

⁴³ This process reflects resource extraction stories (and memories) that are a critical element of the colonization of indigenous territories in Canada and the United States. See Steven High, “They Were Making Good Money, Just Ten Minutes from Home’: Proximity and Distance in the Plant Shutdown Stories of Northern Ontario Mill Workers,” *Labour/Le Travail*, 76 (Fall 2015): 14. For more on this pattern from a Northern Ontario resource community see Thomas Dunk, *A Working Man’s Town: Male Working Class Culture* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1991).

CHAPTER TWO: REMEMBERED HISTORIES

This first chapter outlines and describes the ethnographic and oral historical origins of *One Day Stronger* (hereafter *ODS*) It pertains to the subject and substance of the remembered histories that were offered by my interviewees as well as some pre-recorded interviews from the late 1970s and early 1980s. The first section that follows describes the “Interviews” and interview process. The next segment focusses on how participants shaped their memories through narratives. The chapter then shifts to the foundational analysis and material basis for the play in “Remembering Sudbury Strikes.” This chapter argues that memories of these events that were shared with me are gendered, and as “secular rituals” they are also intergenerational.¹ As such, three recurrent themes emerged that were especially common and, which eventually came to inspire much of the play. The chapter’s remaining sections include “Family and the Home,” “Community” and (In)Security.”

INTERVIEWS

The collection of oral histories started late in June 2017 and continued through November 2017. I also used a selection of pre-recorded interviews from the late 1970s and early 1980s, that feature an earlier generation of voices. This collection of interviews formed the initial cornerstone for the theatrical project and served as material for building the story and its characters. Cumulatively, these interviews form a collection of remembered histories and narratives. They are evidence of the present as much as the past regarding living, working and striking in Sudbury since World War Two. This collection of interviews enriches official documentary and archival sources as it

¹ Steven High and David Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (Between the Lines, 2007), 25.

underpins what one interviewee described as “the unacknowledged history of this mining camp.”² Its temporal range touches the Great Depression at its beginning and ends in the present day.

Shortly after I relocated to Sudbury in May of 2017, I began speaking with family and friends. Through my own local connections, I was able to find more interested parties. We met in various locations such as coffee shops, local pubs, and at kitchen tables or in living rooms, in the instances where I was generously hosted. I personally interviewed sixteen subjects. The initial round of interviews of five women and ten men occurred between June and November of 2017. Gendered experiences were a vital cornerstone to this research, and from the outset, I was particularly interested in women’s “grassroots” and efforts at community building. With this in mind, I interviewed another woman after the second workshop of *ODS* in October 2018.³ Most participants were born roughly in the same period, between 1940 and 1956, meaning they were in their 60s and 70s at the time of our interview. There were a few outliers on either end of this time period. One was a woman who was born in 1924, while there were two men who were born in 1972 and 1978, respectively.

The group of participants represents a diverse range of Sudbury residents with a host of roles: retired miners; tradesmen; mechanics; journalists; activists; daughters; social workers; teachers; a member of provincial parliament; a university professor; and a widowed housewife in her nineties. They all shared personal memories of strikes leading into the present day. Some spoke exclusively about one strike as it was a significant event

² Linda George, email to the author, 17 May 2018.

³ See “Sudbury Interviews Table” in Appendix B, 349. These interviews were approved by the research ethics review board at Carleton University (see “Ethics Approval” in Appendix H, 358), and unless otherwise noted, interviewees are publicly named as was their preference.

in their lives. Even so, they were living in the community when other labour disputes occurred and could observe or reflect on them with a unique perspective. Others experienced multiple strikes and sometimes had difficulty distinguishing them from each other. Some interviewees experienced strikes across an age range and from different vantage points. This was the case for one interviewee, who had vivid memories as a child experiencing the 1958 strike which then informed and affected her remembered experience as a schoolteacher during the 1978 INCO strike.

I also used eight pre-recorded archival interviews from the late 1970s and early 1980s to augment these perspectives gathered from my own interviews.⁴ I did this because there is currently a sparsity of people living who remember what it was like to live and work in Sudbury prior to Mine Mill 598's certification in 1944. Also, many of these interviewees had direct experience of the 1958 strike. By comparison, most of my interviewees for this project in 2017 were children or adolescents during the 1958 INCO strike. I used seven interviews (four women and three men) conducted by former local union president, labour historian and journalist Jim Tester. He spoke with them about their experiences living and working in the Sudbury region, as well as their active involvement with the union. Throughout his interviews, Tester also shared his own experiences with his subjects and his participation in these pre-recorded discussions was a significant contribution to this project. His connection was especially meaningful as he was acquainted with several of my interviewees, including Carol Mulligan, a retired journalist, for whom Tester was a mentor when they both worked at *The Northern Life* newspaper in the 1980s. The temperature of her interview changed when I randomly

⁴ Interviews found at the Archives of Ontario, The Jim Tester Collection, C 97.

mentioned his name and asked if she knew him. She teared up and we had to stop the interview for a moment because she was crying. She started recollecting upon his significance both to her life personally, and as a scribe, activist and historian for the Sudbury region.⁵ As a result of these living connections, Tester's interviews felt more intimate and integral alongside my own interviews. One final interview selected from this collection, features onetime Mine Mill national and local 598 president, Nels Thibault. He was interviewed by another former local 598 president, Mike Solski.⁶

My participants and the pre-recorded interviewees come from a number of white settler backgrounds and claimed multiple descents including Irish, Finnish, French Canadian, English, Scottish, Ukrainian and German. There was no participation from Poles, Italians, Russians, Serbians and Indigenous peoples, and many more ethnic groups that call Sudbury their home. The general consensus from the interviews is that everybody came from somewhere else, lived in close proximity to one another, and for the most part they got along. This self-conscious remembering of class solidarity coincides with and underpins the twentieth century emergence in Sudbury of what Oiva Saarinen described as a "cultural mosaic."⁷ These emergent national and ethnic communities formed distinct, self-determined and visible localities that featured halls, churches and community centres.⁸

⁵ Carol Mulligan, interview by the author, Sudbury, August 2017. Subsequent references to Mulligan's interview will be indicated by her name in the text.

⁶ These voices (Tester, Thibault and Solski) speak to and represent the progressive efforts of Mine Mill Local 598, prior to its takeover by United Steel in 1962. As such, these individuals were interested in preserving the legacy of workers in Sudbury from that period.

⁷ Oiva W. Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City: A Historical Geography of Greater Sudbury* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2013), 194.

⁸ For an exploration of Sudbury's Finnish community see Oiva Saarinen, *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: A Historical Geography of the Finns in the Sudbury Area* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1999). For an exploration of Sudbury's Ukrainian Community using oral history see Stacey

Even so, interviewees tended to identify with each other in terms of belonging to the working class. For example, as a child, Jan Heppner remembers “kids all over” and that “everyone was the same. They were all miners. All mothers were at home ... we were all dressed the same. There was not [a] rich kid on the street.”⁹ Moreover, like the grown men at work, interviewees depicted a world where everybody made fun of one another’s ethno-cultural identity. Interviewees insisted that derogatory terms such as “Frog,” “Mick,” “Limey,” “Hunky,” and “Kraut” were bandied about in jest and differences were targeted as such. This forum for ethnic ridicule was commonplace and often characterized as a sign of endearment.¹⁰ Interviewees appeared to value an individual’s work ethic or their loyalty to other workers, and these aspects were unifying factors for individuals that came from different ethnic or national backgrounds. Interviewees admitted that ethnic tensions and discriminatory behaviour certainly occurred, but they emphasized that the norm was to identify with each other on the basis of class.

The discussions were casual, ‘laid back,’ and elicited many humorous exchanges. The life story interview approach enabled my interviewees to frame their experiences of strikes within “the long durée of a life lived and remembered.”¹¹ The questions were open-ended and were aimed at eliciting an anecdotal exchange. For the most part, I

Zembrzycki, *According to Baba: A Collaborative Oral History of Sudbury’s Ukrainian Community* (UBC Press, 2014).

⁹ Jan Heppner, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017. Subsequent references to Heppner’s interview will be indicated by her name in the text.

¹⁰ Several Interviewees remarked about how this behaviour is no longer acceptable in what they considered as a much more “politically correct” present. This speaks to the inherent whiteness for many people in Sudbury as an historically formed identity.

¹¹ Steven High, “They Were Making Good Money, Just Ten Minutes from Home’: Proximity and Distance in the Plant Shutdown Stories of Northern Ontario Mill Workers,” *Labour/Le Travail*, 76 (Fall 2015): 19 and Arda L Cole and J. Gary Knowles, *Lives in Context: The Art of life History Research* (Altamira Press, 2001).

attempted to gather these biographical experiences in chronological order, but it did not always play out that way. I started the discussion by inquiring about their families, childhood, school and work experiences. Generally, it proceeded from there to more specific questions about strikes and related anecdotes or experiences. I asked interviewees to weigh in on their experiences of strikes as events, and to reflect on how they affected and impacted their lives. Had their opinions of these experiences shifted and changed over time?

I also made some specific inquiries regarding themes and research questions that I had identified in advance for conducting my historical analysis, such as when I enquired about the relationship between anglophones and francophones, men and women, Catholics and Protestants, or workers and bosses, to name a few. How did they feel about unions? In all cases, I asked about the roles or legacy of both women and men in terms of their involvement in INCO strikes, historically within the larger working-class community, as well as within their homes. I also asked them what they would like to see in a play about strikes in Sudbury. These opportunities for “feeding back” were very useful for moving this project forward, and an early instance of a repeated forum for exchange that will be revisited as part of my discussion of verbatim theatre and audience feedback in upcoming chapters.¹² For levity and humour, the last question I consistently asked was “which Hollywood actor/actress would play you in the movie version of this

¹² Paul Brown (ed), *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community* (Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010), 4. This concept was applied by Derek Paget linking community members with artists in a theatrical process.

story?” This often produced the desired result as my interviewees enjoyed being asked to put famous people in their shoes.¹³

Each interviewee brought their own subjective and uniquely personal experiences to the project. Their testimonies support the reality that Sudbury is a sprawling place and is not uniform in terms of people, their experiences, or material circumstances.

Interviewees were speaking from a context that followed deindustrialization in Sudbury, and for them, living, working and striking in Sudbury represented what Tim Strangleman’s described as a “stable workplace culture” that was “intelligible to both its established members and those being socialized into it.”¹⁴ As such, interviewees as authorities, consistently and confidently described “the way it was,” which was always distinct from the “way it is now” in the present. Dennis Dowdall often made this distinction in our interview, particularly with regards to the animosity that was prevalent during past strikes and especially as it was directed towards the now defunct INCO.¹⁵

My dual purposes for these interviews was both to acquire material for the play, and also to conduct an historical analysis about postwar strikes in Sudbury. Although I never once felt that there were any tensions caused by my pursuit of these two divergent aims, I wondered about it internally. Ultimately, interviewees were equally comfortable sharing their anecdotes for both purposes. I was consistently aware of the fact that they were sharing their stories with me, and that there was gravity and significance to this exchange. Furthermore, having secured permission, I intended to appropriate material

¹³ For a copy of the interview questions see “Interview Questions: Community Members,” in Appendix C, 350.

¹⁴ Tim Strangleman, “Work Identity in Crisis? Rethinking the Problem of Attachment and Loss at Work,” *Sociology* 46, 3 (2012):411-22, as cited in High, “They Were Making Good Money Just Ten Minutes from Home’,” 20.

¹⁵ Dennis Dowdall, interview by the author, Sudbury, June 2017.

from their personal stories for the play. There was frequently an awkward moment when the structured formality that framed each interview required me to pull out the consent forms required by the university's ethics process. I felt nervous and perhaps gleaned nervousness in my subject(s) across the table, as their signature signified that they trusted me and wanted to contribute to the process. One salient example of this occurred while interviewing Ron Brunette. Upon seeing the recording device, he demurred and requested that we speak for a little while longer before hitting the record button. After about twenty minutes, he interrupted the discussion and told me to turn on the recording device.¹⁶ I am sure that I was more nervous than my subjects in most instances, as they were more than happy to share their experiences with me. Their allyship was earned.

STRUCTURING MEMORY

Most of my interviewees remember events such as the Steelworker raids or the 1958 INCO strike as children, from anecdotes passed down from family members, or even as stories recounted by old-timers. Even moving forward in time, remembering events that they experienced directly as adults, such as strikes in 1966 (wildcat), 1969, 1978-79, 2000 (Falconbridge) or 2009-10, are contested.¹⁷ Retired local journalist Mick Lowe mused, "How it can be that the same event can evoke so many different perspectives and conclusions in the same municipality... [,] ... so divergent and often conflicting ... different voices beginning to argue what happened and how it happened." He ascribed this as the challenge of working with "human memory [which is] a quirky

¹⁶ Ron Brunette, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

¹⁷ A ten-day 1975 INCO strike was not mentioned. A 32-day strike in 1982-83, followed by 275-day production shut down was not mentioned and merged with experiences from the 8 ½ - month INCO strike in 1978-79. A twenty-six-day strike in 1997 was not mentioned, neither were the signed contracts in 1985, 1988, 1991, 1994 that preceded it. In terms of Falconbridge, the other major local mining employer, strikes were mentioned but with less frequency as most of my interviewees had a direct connection with INCO. There were mentions of strikes at that company in 1960 and 1969, with the last occurring in 2000-2001.

thing ... facile and unreliable [where] later as we moved in time ... that's where our memories started to conflict ...[.]” Furthermore, he declared that memory “is very fickle [especially considering] how these memories shift and change over time ... [.] What happens is you tell and retell the anecdote over time ... the most recent retelling is the one you know best ... you deceive yourself.”¹⁸ This is particularly significant while talking about the 1958 strike which now sits on the edge of living memory. Most of its younger participants are presently octogenarians. Throughout the course of this project I have often lamented not having conducted this work ten years earlier, when more of these men and women, including my grandfather, would still be around to tell their stories.

This collection of testimonies presented an equal portion of laughter to tears, yet the former was preferred by interviewees. Unexpectedly for me, the men were frequently emotional and vulnerable. To be clear, women displayed emotions and vulnerability as well, but were more reserved by comparison. When revisiting and confronting experiences of strikes or other instances where men felt powerless, anger and tears came to the fore. I was surprised because, as we know from High and other studies, “[w]orking-class masculinity in Northern Ontario, like elsewhere, discourages men from showing their vulnerability.”¹⁹ This is certainly the case for men in Sudbury. I am not sure to what extent my own masculinity contributed to males showing this kind of vulnerability, but this behaviour would later be mirrored by men in the audience following the presentation of *ODS*.²⁰ These emotional extremes were often interchangeable, particularly while recounting periods of high stress. Interviewees would

¹⁸ Mick Lowe, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

¹⁹ High, “They Were Making Good Money Just Ten Minutes from Home’,” 18.

²⁰ See “Reception,” 218.

express joy, humour, sadness, anger and despair sometimes unpredictably from moment to moment. In almost every case, they expressed a sense of relief after having shared their stories or, spoken about these past events.

For Richard Gouin, it “felt good to talk of these things” as he, along with many of my other subjects, had not shared these experiences or articulated these memories in years.²¹ He insisted, while driving me home from the interview at Gus’s Restaurant, that he take me on a guided tour through his old neighbourhood near Lorne Street in downtown Sudbury, where the session continued without the recording device. I experienced other such moments when interviewees expressed relief and gratitude for the opportunity to share and, often, we continued socializing after their sessions.²² I was also extremely grateful for these exchanges. We developed relationships that would continue to grow throughout subsequent stages of the project, and beyond. These palpable emotions live through the testimonies and resonate beyond their transcriptions. My feelings echoed the sentiments of Alessandro Portelli who feels “that unless one comes out of an interview changed from the way he entered it, one has been wasting time.”²³

A prominent trend that was reflected in the interviews was the manner in which people remembered, and then narrated significant events from their lives. While recounting their experiences, interviewees preferred to speak of better times and they readily provided positive depictions. The telling of their life stories appeared to settle difficult memories and shift them into the periphery. Essie Byrne demonstrated a typical

²¹ Richard Gouin, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

²² For the therapeutic elements of oral history interviewing, see Donald A. Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 3rd ed. (Oxford University Press, 2015), 254. For my interviewees, each to some degree, “the experience of being interviewed for an oral history stimulate[d] a cathartic release of long pent up emotions,” *ibid.*, 255.

²³ Alessandro Portelli, “Afterword,” in *Oral History Off the Record: Toward an Ethnography of Practice*, eds Anna Sheftel and Stacey Zembrzycki (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 284.

example of this behaviour from the interviews, when I asked her what she would like to see in a play about strikes in Sudbury. She responded that she wished, while watching the play, that she could see “a good account [of that life in] such a beautiful town to live in ... to raise a family and all that ... I’d recommend [this life] to anyone.”²⁴ She further emphasized that she wished “to have the same life as [she] had [and that there] wouldn’t be a thing I would change in what I had in there [,] ... course we had a few ‘ups and downs’ but who doesn’t?”²⁵ Essie Byrne’s remarks encapsulated a cherished depiction of her life married to a miner in Sudbury. Barely implied in her “few ‘ups and downs’—was the fact that her husband suffered a horrific accident in the mines which negatively affected the entire family. He became an alcoholic. The dangerous working conditions underground cost him his health, and he suffered extreme pain for the remainder of his life. He lost his sense of self-worth and identity as a ‘top bonus earner’ and was relegated to light duty until he retired. Essie was typical for my interviewees, when she presented her past in the form of a favourable and palatable narrative.

In general, my Sudbury subjects were also consistently apologetic regarding the quality of their testimonies. They often felt sorry that they had not remembered more. They often lamented that they could not give me the reflections that I wanted or that were sufficient for the project. They were apologetic and doubted the validity of their experiences. It seemed in these moments as though they were questioning themselves in terms of the authority of their own contributions. This is very much in keeping with individuals situated within the labour/capital dynamic in a “company town” like Sudbury.

²⁴ Essie Byrne, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

²⁵ Ibid.

One of the key tensions in these transcripts was the contrast between feeling small, insignificant or powerless as opposed to feeling empowered, proud or powerful.

Each interviewee reflected on aspects that provided them with a sense of esteem while recounting anecdotes from their lives. This was expressed in many ways and in different contexts. For example, Ron Brunette was nervous at the prospect of being interviewed as previously described. It was particularly evident that he became more confident whenever he described what he did in his various workspaces at INCO or in completing chores for neighbours to supplement his family's income during a strike. Moreover, he was especially animated while recounting details that related to his proficiency and adeptness for his work. This was at the core of his identity and was something of which he held a great deal of esteem.²⁶ I would also describe Essie Byrne as tentative during the initial moments of our interview, perhaps unaccustomed to the process. Ultimately, I noted afterwards how she enjoyed sharing her stories and did so quite energetically as someone in her mid-nineties. Like Ron Brunette, she especially drew esteem while describing her work within her domestic space, and she relayed this anecdotally. Her kitchen table was always full of activity, dinners, family gatherings, hairstyling sessions with ladies from the neighbourhood, and she vividly described her ritual of sewing late into the night when the kids had gone to bed. She beamed while recounting these details. Ron, Essie and my interviewees demonstrated an inner

²⁶ For a significant critique and discussion on identifiers such as skill and other conceptions of working-class masculinity see Steven Maynard, "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History," *Labour / Le Travail* 23 (1989): 159-169. For a project centred on oral testimonies of men in Northern Ontario also Thomas Dunk, *A Working Man's Town: Male Working-Class Culture* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).

confidence that derives from a personal sense of agency and self-worth in their respective spheres and spaces.

One of the key features of the interviews is the relative prosperity that was experienced by workers during this period, not so much in terms of any noticeable affluence, but rather in relation to standards of living that came before. Memories from this collection of interviews stretch as far back as the 1940s, when participants remember lean times especially during the 1958 strike. They did not experience striking in Sudbury as adults prior to the 1966 wildcat strike at INCO. As they certainly remember periods when they experienced financial difficulties, particularly during strikes, most were privy to more advantageous postwar employment standards that were unheard of prior to that period. My interviewees were aware of their parents' experiences and many grew up directly affected and, to some extent, inculcated with their views. Their own experiences, however, at least anecdotally, did not so much feature these *a priori* conditions as compared to regularly having higher standards of employment in terms of job security, seniority preference, wages, benefits and pensions.

REMEMBERING SUDBURY STRIKES

A three-month strike in 1958, and Sudbury's first legal strike, proved to be the death knell of local 598. The strike at INCO was a confrontation that pitted some 14 500 workers and their families against the mining company, which lost almost 700 000 worker days to the strikers.²⁷ One miner described the event as, "a premeditated smashing of the union."²⁸ The strike's failure was attributed to indecisive union

²⁷ Bryan D. Palmer, *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1992), 329.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 329.

leadership, pressure to settle from wives and mothers, and the fact INCO that had acquired a surplus of material and could sustain a temporary layoff.²⁹ Sudbury unionists had a different version of these events. They contended that a concerted effort by the company, the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), and the local Catholic Church effectively succeeded in “boring” Local 598 “from within.”³⁰ For them, symbolically, the controversy stems from an infamous Back-to-Work rally that was held at the Sudbury Arena on 12 December 1958. According to a *Globe and Mail* report, approximately two thousand strikers’ wives publicly urged their husbands back to work.³¹ The membership’s morale was significantly weakened in the wake of this occasion, which ultimately led to members accepting what was generally perceived as a poor contract.³²

In their interview, Millie McQuaid and Jim Tester both vehemently disagreed with this version of events.³³ According to Tester, “the 1958 strike was one of the best supported strikes in Canadian history.”³⁴ Even so, the sheer size of the membership, the prolonged period of the strike, and the challenging logistics of providing for so many people scattered throughout a large and disparate region, severely hindered the union’s effectiveness. For Jack Quenneville and others interviewed by Jim Tester, the 1958 strike was a contentious event in terms of legacy and memory in Sudbury. Men and women who participated as unionists or organizers in that strike were adamant that it was a

²⁹ Ibid., 330.

³⁰ Mike Solski and John Smaller, *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895* (Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1984), 137.

³¹ “2000 INCO Miners’ Wives Urge Men Return to Work,” *The Globe and Mail*, December 13, 1958.

³² See Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City*, 247.

³³ Millie McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, October 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

³⁴ Tester in McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

“lockout” and that INCO had purposefully exploited a stagnant market to provoke a confrontation with Mine Mill Local 598.³⁵

Millie McQuaid was active during the 1958 strike. She later remembered it as a disheartening experience: “working so hard putting so many hours in at the hall helping people at night ... so few calls thanking us for what we were doing.”³⁶ Instead, she was verbally assaulted with aggressive phone calls. Her efforts, like those of other women involved during the first INCO strike, translated into a deflating experience. McQuaid, one-time member of Mine Mill’s ladies’ Auxiliary #117, declared that “we never had any experience in that way.” She recalled how people, “were losing their homes, mortgage payments and stuff like that ... [it was the] first strike ever faced by [a] union in Sudbury ... we really didn’t know how to organize all the help we were getting ... Took a while to get help to the people who needed it.”³⁷ On top of this, they were blamed by union men and other community members for the strike’s undesirable conclusion. Bryan Murray remembers, “when [he] started working in ’63 ... these guys were still around ... [and they would say] if it hadn’t been for the Ole’ lady we’d still be on strike.”³⁸ This was a common perception which became their legacy, as women were vilified in the community for demonstrating agency outside of acceptable bounds.

Similar to circumstances leading up to the 1958 strike, twenty years later in 1977, purportedly during “one of the worst busts of the nickel market’s perpetual boom and

³⁵ Jack Quenneville, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, November 1978, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

³⁶ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

³⁷ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

³⁸ Bryan Murray, interview with the author, Sudbury, June 2017.

bust cycles,” INCO layoffs numbered 2800.³⁹ One generation later, INCO had accumulated a large inventory and once again, had assumed “a hard bargaining stance” during the next installment of contract negotiations.⁴⁰ This resulted in a 261-day strike, the biggest in Canada’s history in terms of lost worker-days.⁴¹ In the resulting contract, the union gained a notorious “30 years and out provision,” which enabled workers to retire with a full pension after three decades of service regardless of age. According to several of my interviewees, this was the peak of achievement for workers in Sudbury. Unlike 1958, activists and unionists claimed that “there was unprecedented [and] open community support” for the 1978-79 strike.⁴²

This is an especially poignant interval and example of how memory is reproduced as part of an intergenerational exchange. As discussed above, women were perceived to be collectively responsible for the poor contract that resulted at the 1958 strike’s conclusion. For Laurie McGauley, the women of 1958 served as an example for women who were active in the ‘Wives Supporting the Strike Committee’ (WSSC) during the 1978 INCO strike, as she felt that the former had been manipulated into taking that course of action.⁴³ Conversely, Millie McQuaid, an active participant in that first INCO strike, was adamant that this infamous meeting had been “co-opted.”⁴⁴ She contended that many of the women present, particularly its speakers and organizers, were not

³⁹ Bruce McKeigan, “The Rise and Decline of local 6500 United Steelworkers of America,” in *Mining Town Crisis: Globalization, Labour and Resistance in Sudbury*, ed. David Leadbeater (Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008), 246.

⁴⁰ Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City*, 257.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁴² McKeigan, “The Rise and Decline of local 6500 United Steelworkers of America,” 247. The author indicates that this level of community support enabled deferments on rent from landlords or loan payments from banks for the strike’s duration. He also reflected that they were able to secure donations of food, prescription drugs and other services for striking members.

⁴³ Laurie McGauley, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

⁴⁴ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

married to INCO workers. Moreover, she could not understand why, “these ‘ladies’ wanted their husbands back on the job without getting a good contract?”⁴⁵ This position was similar to one that was taken by WSSC members a generation later. A frustrated McQuaid spoke for other men and women of her own generation, who saw this as a hoax perpetuated by a “company [that had] lots of money.”⁴⁶

The isolation of women was one of the causes that activists during the 1978-79 INCO strike attributed to the perceived failure of unionists during the strike in 1958. According to Linda George, the newly formed WSSC wanted to encourage other women to, “come out and help...and if you’re feeling that isolation at home...it’s gonna take over...[i]t’s gonna influence decisions you made in your family.”⁴⁷ Moreover, she described that the WSSC group’s mandate was, “to try and keep morale of the families up...because what we understood...what we were told about what happened in fifty-eight, as your morale starts to get eroded and, the fear sets in...it would be very easy for somebody to come in and organize the wives against their husbands to [go] back to work.”⁴⁸

Linda George was one of several women that I interviewed, who felt that they had gained a real sense of agency in the 1978-79 strike. She, Cathy Mulroy and Laurie McGauley were each active and participated as part of the WSSC during the 1978-79 strike. This group was also featured in Sophie Bissonnette’s documentary film *A Wives Tale* (1980), about the political and “grassroots” efforts of women actively supporting the

⁴⁵ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Linda George, interview by the author, Sudbury, October 2017.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

strike.⁴⁹ These newly anointed activists organized and expressed themselves politically for the first time. As self-termed, “working-class feminists,” they recounted gaining a sense of empowerment and identified their involvement in that strike as the moment when they discovered their voices for the first time.⁵⁰ Linda George recalls fighting for, “the control ... I think ... just being pushed into a corner ... the feeling you had no control and all of a sudden ... doing something where you ... take it back[.]”⁵¹

Furthermore, their entrance into the political arena was a source of tension, as this behaviour ran contrary to conventional and patriarchal positions of both local men and women, who felt that it placed these activists beyond their traditional roles as mothers. Traditionally in Sudbury, women who possessed the time and means to help, with the endorsement of their husband’s union, were expected to do so by organizing and supplying food, blankets and provisions. The women whom I interviewed as well as others, carried out these gendered tasks during the 1978-79 INCO strike. To that end, they facilitated charitable dinners, worked at clothing depots to acquire donations, and organized several bean suppers across the city, at different times and locations, in order to accommodate a large membership and their families. As an active group of wives, they also created and distributed leaflets in an attempt to convey their political narratives to secure more support from Sudburians. This “nuanced” notion of female agency, to borrow from Julie Guard in her study of working-class housewives in mid-twentieth century Canada, was reminiscent “of the many women activists who defined themselves, as did most women, in relation to their familial responsibilities, even when they took to

⁴⁹ *A Wives Tale*, directed by Sophie Bissonnette, Martin Duckworth and Joyce Rock (Sudbury, ON: Les Ateliers Audio-Visuels du Québec, 1980).

⁵⁰ McGauley, interview.

⁵¹ George, interview.

the streets in angry protest or devoted themselves to building socialism as members of the various organizations of the left.”⁵² George expanded on this concept from her local perspective when she expressed that:

Both [charitable works and political activism] have an important role when you stand and look at it ... but if you’re one of those women who believe in the traditional role at the time ... standing in the streets is not important ... carrying a placard is not important ... protesting that’s not important if your children are starving ... and then on the other hand if we don’t fight and we don’t get the community support and if we don’t get control of this your children are going to starve ...⁵³

Cathy Mulroy was one of the first one hundred women hired on at INCO between 1974 and 1977. Her fledgling “activism” during the 1978-79 strike gave her a platform from which to articulate her unique experience as a woman working in a notoriously sexist and masculinist workplace. She worked in the smelter and, after “the big layoffs,” was one of only thirty women remaining at INCO. In an excerpt from the manuscript of the book she has written about her experience, which she kindly shared with me before publication, Mulroy describes a United Steelworkers “solidarity benefit” in Toronto where she and Linda George, joined with other women, gave speeches in front of six hundred people on 8 December 1978. Overcoming a great deal of nerves, she recalled explaining to the crowd, “what it was like to be a woman at INCO, about the conditions at work, safety and health, and how important the grievance procedures were in this environment.” Later in her speech, she quipped about the layoffs that eliminated most of the one hundred women

⁵² Julie Guard, *Radical Housewives: Price Wars and Food Politics in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019), 14.

⁵³ George, interview.

due to seniority, and she identified it as “the old story: women are the last hired and the first fired.”⁵⁴

These interviewees elicited a newfound sense of agency and freedom as a result of their participation in the 1978-79 strike. These women were politically active and felt that they had contributed to winning the community’s support. However, their autonomy was challenged when their efforts failed to fall in line with official union policy. Perhaps the most invigorating instance for these women was when they demonstrated their autonomy by releasing their own press release regarding a long-awaited contract offer from INCO. According to Linda George, the men were insecure and felt that:

...they don’t know what these woman are doing they feel they have to take control and know what we were doing ... so it was a bit of a rude awakening when ... they thought they had control and then they realized they didn’t ... so when the whole thing came to a head ... at the end ... the company gave up and said OK let’s give them a contract ... and the union came back and said it was an overwhelmingly great contract and it was wonderful and we looked it over as a wives group and said ‘you know what it’s not worth it.’ [We] put out a press release saying we didn’t support it and that got the union really upset with us and it’s not that you can have any real influence, but you wanted to have your opinion known ...⁵⁵

Linda recalled a huge celebration when the strikers agreed with the press release and did not vote to accept the contract offer from INCO. She was adamant not to claim that they had influenced the vote, but nonetheless recalls the group fueled by a sense of

⁵⁴ Cathy Mulroy, interview by the author, Sudbury, November 2018. Her book, *My View from the Blackened Rocks: A Woman's Battle for Equality and Respect in Canada's Mining Industry*, was published in 2019. She is speaking to what would have been a recent trend from her standpoint in the late 1970s, which is now much more distant in terms of historical time. She personally knew Pearl “Patricia” Chytuk who was interviewed by Jim Tester, and her testimony was used for this project. Pearl was one of the local women that had been temporarily hired at INCO during World War Two due to labour shortages, who were then subsequently replaced by male breadwinners when they returned home. For Pearl’s experiences see Pearl Chytuk, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, November 1978, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97. For a scholarly exploration of the experiences of women hired by INCO the 1970s see Jennifer Keck and Mary Powell, “Women into Mining Jobs at INCO: Challenging the Gender Division of Labor” in *Mining Women: Gender in the Development of a Global Industry, 1670 to 2005*, edited by Jaclyn J. Gier and Laurie Mercier (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 280-295.

⁵⁵ George, interview.

empowerment. The event's significance was highlighted by acute feelings of loss at the strike's termination just a few weeks later. Linda described the strike's conclusion as having, "fizzled out ... it just fizzled out ... somebody just put out a match ... something that was burning and now it's gone." The end of the 1978-79 strike terminated a momentous experience for Linda and her fellow activists. Looking back on the overall experience, Linda recalled that she had pushed all the emotions inside as it had been a really difficult event in her life. She lamented the fact that her kids or in-laws "didn't know me at all [and] they didn't realize what you were doing ... how big it was because I think we shut the door on them." Moreover, it was a significant moment for her as she explains how, "it has a residual effect ... I think it changes the way you approach life ... I think it changes the way you raise your children[.]"⁵⁶

Their experiences also demonstrate that they had a great deal in common with women who experienced the 1958 strike. One aspect was the sense of immediacy and the necessity to act. The exasperation in Millie McQuaid's voice was evident when she later reflected about her experiences in 1958, how a "great many people wonder why they got into these situations."⁵⁷ George, Mulroy and McGauley were similarly affected and their own difficult emotions surfaced when they spoke with me about their experiences. Both groups, when afforded a public platform, encountered resistance and were criticized when they acted on their convictions. In terms of optics, women from each of these two generations chose not to support official union policy as decreed by union men. Groups of women presuming to act autonomously outside of the home as political entities, have been considered threatening, and have become yet another scapegoat for divisiveness

⁵⁶ George, interview.

⁵⁷ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

during a strike. First, in 1958, women allegedly pressured their husbands to take a bad contract. Second, in 1978-79, women publicly expressed their opinions about *not* ratifying a bad contract. Women were reprimanded, or their actions were contested, either way, regardless of whether or not they felt empowered, or if they had effectively summoned their voices. The men, ultimately, voted for a contract and decided whether or not to withhold their labour.

Circumstances and conditions following the 1978-79 INCO strike regressed consistently. Severe layoffs in 1982 spurred a one-month strike, which was followed by a nine-month shutdown due to the low demand for nickel as a result of the global recession. In the words of Oiva Saarinen, Sudbury's newfound troubles earned it a reputation as being the "unemployment capital of the world."⁵⁸ Following more workforce reductions in 1984 and 1985, the union signed a succession of contracts with INCO in 1985, 1988, 1991 and 1994 culminating in a 26-day strike in 1997. The landscape was shifting for the Sudbury labour scene. Interviewees mark this transition when Falconbridge and INCO were taken over by international companies Noranda (2000) and Vale (2006) respectively. It was felt that these "foreign" corporations' possessed a lack of community ties as compared to Falconbridge and INCO. This social dislocation combined with legislation that reversed anti-scab legislation by Mike Harris-led provincial Conservatives in 1995, ushered in a new era for Sudbury workers and their experiences of strikes.⁵⁹

It is through this lens that interviewees look back on past strikes and their subjective experiences are the principle focus of this project. Those who struck at

⁵⁸ Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City*, 176.

⁵⁹ Several interviewees identified this piece of legislation as a key moment for mining employees and their families.

Falconbridge in 2000 or 2004, and Vale in 2009-10, faced scab labour and blatant strongarm tactics by company funded security or “strike breaking” firms. This produced visceral and emotional responses from interviewees. The latter Vale strike of 2009-2010 surpassed the 1978-79 INCO strike as the longest in Sudbury’s history. The cyclical pattern continued, this time with Vale representatives taking an aggressive approach to bargaining and seeking concessions, due to poor market conditions, and the decline in nickel prices.⁶⁰ Striking employees numbered approximately 3000, significantly less as compared to the numbers of workers involved in previous INCO strikes.⁶¹ Interviewees posited that their much-cherished pension scheme was lost when that dispute was resolved. From that point on, new hires were no longer guaranteed a secure pension when they retired. Having recently signed a contract with Vale in 2015, several interviewees looked ahead to 2020 with apprehension. They wondered what else will be lost.

Strikes and industrial disputes are divisive and trying instances in Sudbury. Anger, volatility, and violence are characteristic themes as residents navigate extreme levels of stress and tensions at home, as well as in the community. This is evident from the experiences of Sudburians interviewed for this project. Violence is a prevalent theme; interviewees told me stories of stabbings, fights, cars getting burned or flipped over, fists being pounded onto tables or through walls, mob violence, sabotage, and even a mysterious instance with a chopper getting hit with bullets from a hunting rifle. According to Dennis Dowdall, many “guys left town after [a] strike because they were scared of some of the stuff they did [for fear] of retribution[.]”⁶² One common reflection

⁶⁰ Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City*, 258.

⁶¹ Ibid, 258.

⁶² Dowdall, interview.

for women throughout the postwar period was that they experienced threatening and obscene phone calls. Richard Gouin recalls finishing his shift, when he walked into the utter chaos of the impromptu and unsanctioned wildcat strike in 1966. While attempting to meet up with his ride home, he witnessed his driver getting stabbed right beside him. He recounted that, later the same day, he was one of approximately “five thousand” workers who confronted five hundred OPP at the smelter gates.⁶³ According to Richard, the impending confrontation was a “hot potato,” but ultimately there was no incident. While reflecting on what could have been, Richard concluded that with “the pile of rocks versus tear gas and clubs we wouldn’t stand a chance even if it was five hundred, that wouldn’t have worked.”⁶⁴ These situations, along with countless others shared by interviewees, demonstrate the volatile, violent, and potentially explosive circumstances that could easily erupt during a strike.

The saying: “you’re either with us or against us” was a recurring slogan.⁶⁵ This “us versus them” polarization is not limited to “company and worker.” A more extensive list includes: worker and worker; business community and INCO strikers; husbands and wives; Steel versus Mine Mill; Protestant and Catholic; Communism against Capitalism; and the “needy” and the “greedy,” among others. Conflict invaded the home, the neighbourhood, and the Sudbury community as a whole. Strikes heightened tensions that were already present as much as they unearthed new ones to the fore. In Sudbury, the intra-union rivalry between the United Steelworkers and Mine Mill is a storied and

⁶³ According to Richard’s estimate. Mick Lowe reported that “several hundred OPP officers were called in to keep the peace.” See Mick Lowe, “A Short History of Sudbury Labour,” *Northern Miner* (Toronto, Ont: Business Information Group, April 1, 2006), 32.

⁶⁴ Gouin, interview.

⁶⁵ Mulligan interview.

mythical component of the local lore. Indeed, interviewee Mick Lowe wrote a popular trilogy of fictional novels about the subject.⁶⁶ This intra-union conflict termed by some as a “Civil War” was repeatedly invoked in the interviews and haunts Sudbury’s labour story. One prominent and often repeated anecdote depicted instances where long-time relationships were permanently severed as a result of these raids and successive strikes. These schisms repeatedly resulted in unattended funerals, brothers never speaking to one another, as well as fathers disowning their sons.

This legacy is relevant to this day as exemplified by tensions caused by Vale’s attempt to bring in “scab” labour in the most recent strike in 2009-10. Interviewees often referred to this strike with bitterness. For example, a normally calm and reserved Laurie McGauley was very frustrated when I asked her about the subject of replacement workers and surprised both of us during the interview with an emotional outburst as she vented about “Scabs! Scab labour running the fucking mines driving me crazy!” Once the shock of the emotional outburst subsided, she reasoned that “the problem is with scabs and how capitalism pits workers against each other [,] not enough information out there for people [,] no knowledge of our own history [and] we are so easily manipulated.” For Laurie McGauley, a university professor, the issue became more complicated when, in a seminar discussion, one of her students identified that her boyfriend crossed the picket line. For McGauley, “in a classroom setting [the] scabs’ partner’s in class [is] not theoretical and these guys actually need work.”⁶⁷

⁶⁶ The titles from the *Nickel Range Trilogy* written by Mick Lowe and published by Baraka Books are *The Raids* (2014), *The Insatiable Maw* (2015), and *Wintersong* (2017).

⁶⁷ McGauley, interview. This kind of emotional outburst is reminiscent of what other scholars of deindustrialization have encountered in their research. Kathryn Marie Dudley describes this as a need for interviewees to “get the anger out of their gut” in *The End of the Line: Lost Jobs, New Lives in Postindustrial America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), as cited in High, “They Were Making Good Money Just Ten Minutes from Home,” 18.

Another of the employer's key weapons was its ability to withhold work. Before union representation, men were simply fired, laid off, or refused admittance at the gates. After union representation became entrenched in law, men and women lived under the constant threat of layoffs, discrimination, shortened workweeks, or shutdowns. Interviewees spoke of how INCO applied the deliberate strategy to provoke the union into calling a strike in 1958. They felt a similar stratagem was afoot when massive layoffs preceded the 1978-79 strike. Linda George recalled how the older generation of men were retiring early to make way for the younger generation of men. According to her, the younger men lost their jobs irrespective of the older people retiring. Interviewees recognized and spoke to the fact that international market forces or the company's stockpile of nickel dictated their employers' willingness in forthcoming contract negotiations to bargain in good faith. Strikes, lockouts or layoffs were always an unpleasant possibility. Contracts came up for negotiation consistently and with regularity every two or three years (every five years recently). Hence, the experience of these immanent pressures was cyclical and routine.

Workers and their families experienced, or inherited, a legacy of hostility from their employer. They recalled how INCO would use tactics such as blacklisting, bullying and other forms of aggressive surveillance.⁶⁸ The notion of surveillance is a significant aspect and a key component while discussing living, working and striking in Sudbury. This is a recognizable trope in the historical relationship between "the company" and

⁶⁸ For examples of corporate malfeasance in other resource towns see Laurie Mercier, *Anaconda: Labor, Community, and Culture in Montana's Smelter City* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001); Mary Murphy, *Mining Cultures: Men, Women, and Leisure in Butte, 1914-41* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997) and Elizabeth Jameson, *All That Glitters: Class, Conflict, and Community in Cripple Creek* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998).

people dependent on work and wages. This was (and still is) very much a reality for local workers and their families. It began with the company's use of spies and black books to keep tabs on efforts in the workforce to organize a union. Several of my interviewees experienced surveillance and intimidation while on strike, when they recounted instances having been recorded with a video camera without their permission. Linda George recalled that, in 1978, "[c]ars parked on the side of the house ... down the road ... Insignificant, plain vehicles parked on the road ... no markings. We knew we were being watched."⁶⁹ Mick Lowe recounted while covering the 1999-00 Falconbridge strike as a journalist when the, "security firm [Acufax] us[ed] the camera ... [it] was a weapon. 'Big Brother' was watching all the time, and it began to unnerve people."⁷⁰ Lowe and his own camera operator decided to go and film the perpetrators as a response. Most recently, during the 2009-10 Vale strike, company security agents (AFI) would record strikers and reporters using cameras or cell phones. Steve Saari and Carol Mulligan recall intimate experiences with these men sporting balaclavas and brandishing their recording devices. Carol felt intimidated and Steve was infuriated for being filmed walking his daughter into his own house, having just parked the car.⁷¹ On both sides of the lens, the viewer and the subject in view become separate, distinct and adversarial spaces once the recording device is introduced.

FAMILY AND THE HOME

When participants shared their stories with me, often across tables, they recounted anecdotes that related to family and friends. They situated many of their anecdotes and

⁶⁹ George, interview.

⁷⁰ Lowe, interview.

⁷¹ Mulligan, interview and Steve Saari, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

stories within the domestic sphere. In some instances, I prompted them. For example, interviewees were explicitly asked to describe their kitchen table for what I came to recognize was its potential as a “special object” in the cultural memory of working-class families in Sudbury.⁷² As both a powerful image of the domestic space and as a material object, I was hoping it might “trigger collective and personal memories and serve as a reminder of the terrible pasts, but it can also act as a symbol of hope and future.”⁷³ This prompt worked well, and so, too, did the interview’s setting as interviewees spoke of their experiences with me generally across a table. Ultimately, the kitchen table was a central image and focal point in many of the stories and anecdotes that were shared with me. Clandestine meetings, domestic sewing, and shared meals were but some of the many “happenings” recalled for me. In terms of strikes, Mick Lowe, a retired local journalist, declared that he learned early on that, “strikes they are won or lost not on the bargaining table, not on the picket line, but at the kitchen table.”⁷⁴ After the first workshop reading in May 2018, one audience member indicated that she was a daughter and a wife of a miner (as well as a mother of two children) and she declared that the kitchen table as key meeting space was “the way it was still done.”⁷⁵

Prominently situated alongside the table as a central image was the kitchen and home that contained it. The home was a symbol for domestic stability, even when the

⁷² Yana Meerzon, David Dean, and Daniel McNeil, eds., *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture* (Springer Nature, 2020), 6. In the introductory section to this collection of essays, the authors are referring to the piece by Sarit Cofman-Simhon that focusses on suitcases as a “commanding stereotype” for Jewish cultural memory see “The Suitcase as a Neurotic Container in the Israeli Theatre: The Return of the Wandering Jew.” I see the kitchen table as a “commanding stereotype” for my interviewees and audiences in Sudbury. Beyond its uses as a point of departure for the interviews, I had an intention to make the kitchen table integral to the play and its performance. Its material and symbolic resonances are explored further in “Performance and Production,” 165.

⁷³ Ibid., 6.

⁷⁴ Lowe, interview.

⁷⁵ Lisa Laurin, workshop discussion, Sudbury, May 2018.

stories shared with me reflected how working-class households experienced instability across the booms and busts of the economy (and the associated job actions). It was the home, though, that was a recurring site for many of the activities and anecdotes recounted by my interviewees. Domestic spaces also featured memories about the living room, garden, garage, bedroom, coal room, front porch, and many more. The home, with all of its facets, was both a harmonious and contested site. The ideal and symbol of the peaceful and domestic abode was threatened during a strike. Families fought to save their homes from the prospect of foreclosure, with varying degrees of success. Most interviewees said that their families were able to hold on. In contrast, multiple anecdotes told of families that were forced to abandon their homes in the middle of the night, while others faced this shameful prospect in the light of day.

The home telephone was a ubiquitous household item historically for Sudburians, and especially for interviewees recollecting on this period. It served as a lifeline that connected friends and families. Its ring could also be a potential portent of devastating news. Interviewees recollected the fear that accompanied the telephone ringing at two o'clock in the morning, or whenever husband or father was underground on shiftwork. The telephone was also remembered as a means of intimidation, and as an instrument of terror. Millie McQuaid recalls being tormented at all hours by these "very scary" phone calls with voices calling her "everything but a lady."⁷⁶ McQuaid's experiences with threatening phone calls during the 1958 INCO strike were echoed by interviewees with similar experiences, during both the 1978 INCO strike, and even more recently during the Vale strike of 2009-10. Phone threats belong among instances of surveillance,

⁷⁶ McQuaid, interview with Jim Tester.

intimidation, and blacklisting—experiences that were common for Sudburians during strikes.

Related to but outside of the home, the “Store” was recalled as a key location during strikes, according to interviewees. Financial stability, and the ability to procure goods to feed the family were consistent themes in the transcripts. Certain stores accepted strike vouchers for workers and their families during strikes. Some store proprietors extended credit to families who were short of funds. Ron Brunette’s parents lost their family store directly as a result of the 1958 strike.⁷⁷ Essie Byrne acknowledged that a local store was where she remembered purchasing an anonymous grocery package for a needy family during a strike. Men and women also set up a “store” in the union hall where provisions, supplies, and vouchers were distributed. Certain stores faced boycotts as union representatives warned, according to Carol Mulligan, that “[i]f you’re not with us, you’re against us.”⁷⁸ In a completely different sense, Mick Lowe recounted an anecdote where a local storekeeper confronted an AFI security guard and refused him service saying, “You have to know where you are ... your money’s no good here.”⁷⁹ The store emerges as a central location from these transcripts as a site of frequent commerce and exchange. It is also a space where the boundaries of class solidarity were made very clear to workers, families and people perceived to be outside of that community.

Families faced economic hardships leading up to, during, and in the aftermath of strikes. Most interviewees spoke to the necessity of saving money and pooling resources to get through a strike. Some of the people with whom I spoke belonged to families who

⁷⁷ Brunette, interview.

⁷⁸ Carol Mulligan, interview. She is quoting then USW Local 6500 President Leo Gerard during 2009-10 Vale strike.

⁷⁹ Lowe, interview.

learned, strategized, and were successfully able to prepare.⁸⁰ Jan Heppner recalls that her parents did manage, “but it was hard ... in our family [after their experience during the 1958 strike] my father would say: ‘now we need to keep money aside in case that happens again.’ After that you keep aside money so that next time you have something that you can lean on ... Other families wouldn’t do that.”⁸¹ Her mother took in extra sewing as a way of making some money on the side. This was similar to other cases where women took on extra sewing or domestic work.

Conversely, Carol Mulligan recounted that her father was terrible with money. She posits that if her father was a “better manager of money, if [her mother] didn’t fall ill ... If you were good with money [and] sans catastrophic event it was probably a living wage.”⁸² On top of that, her father did not want her mother to work. As a result of the strike, her father’s decisions and personal circumstances, the family lost their house. Carol’s story of her family’s economic hardship during the 1958 strike echoes with other stories where interviewees relayed instances of “other people” having lost houses, experienced domestic issues, divorce, or general impoverishment. While the home was a symbol of stability, it was anything but for many families. Men were encouraged by the union to support the strike and could choose to work their picket duty to collect strike pay. For interviewees, this was never a solid basis for support.

Strikes were particularly difficult for families at Christmas time. The 1958 INCO strike is one example of this, as the harsh economic conditions, severe weather, and

⁸⁰ For one example that touches on the practice of intergenerational family dynamics and economic strategies during industrialization see Zembrzycki, *According to Baba*. See also Joy Parr, *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880-1950* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

⁸¹ Heppner, interview.

⁸² Mulligan, interview.

emotional pressures associated with the holidays were key factors in the membership voting to go back to work. I was struck by the frequency that interviewees spoke to issues pertaining to charity and the need to assist families on the one hand, as opposed to when they focussed on others who were opportunistic and greedy. Their testimonies complement archival evidence of narratives that distinguish between people who were *deserving* of assistance during strikes, versus people who were opportunistic and therefore *undeserving*. People wrote letters to union officials citing instances of fellow unionists who were abusing strike resources.⁸³ Conversely, there were letters demonstrating acts of charity and generosity. In one touching instance, a man wrote in a short note following his salutations: “I hope this small contribution will make Christmas a happy one for one needy union man and his family. As my wife will be confined to hospital after childbirth, we will forfeit our turkey to you. Please have turkey delivered to whom you see fit, Christmas eve.”⁸⁴

This underlying tension of need versus greed surfaced when interviewees discussed strike relief or vouchers. Again, in terms of legacy, this was especially controversial during the 1958 INCO strike, as Mine Mill 598 leadership required that strikers prove with their bankbooks that they lacked funds and that they needed support.⁸⁵ People also resented the process as the executive purportedly sent unionists to inspect the homes and even the refrigerators of fellow unionists, to determine if they were eligible for strike relief.⁸⁶ From the first talkback audience, Burt Brankley recounted this very

⁸³ Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO) F 1271 – Fonds Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (Local 598) (hereafter F1271), Box 86, “U - General 1958.”

⁸⁴ AO, F 1271, Box 85, “Strike Donations - 1958,” December 21, 1958.

⁸⁵ Saarinen, *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City*, 248.

⁸⁶ “Where Did All The Money Go?,” *The Globe and Mail*, November 20, 1958. I also recall anecdotes where people complained about their pantries being inspected similar to what is described in this editorial.

incident from his own household, which ultimately soured his father on Mine Mill 598 from that point on. According to him, the union denied them vouchers because their car was paid for and they did not have a mortgage on their home.⁸⁷ This situation was quite divisive.

According to those with whom I spoke, “strike pay” or vouchers (depending on the era) were meagre substitutes as compared to working wages. Interviewees reflected in a broad sense that the union’s issuance of vouchers was problematic in terms of supply, verification and logistics. The distribution of food, supplies, and provisions for working families was a consistent source of tension throughout multiple strikes. Several interviewees recounted situations where union resources failed to materialize for them. They felt that their mandatory dues should cover these situations. There were accusations of preferential treatment, fiscal mismanagement and corruption against both Mine Mill 598 and USW 6500. Union representatives were attempting to get limited resources to families that needed it. Conversely, unionists were accused of succumbing to greed and not supporting the strike. According to Millie McQuaid, in 1958 some families were better fed during a strike when “some people [were] just trying to get something for nothing.”⁸⁸ When Stephen Heiti identified “a strong sense of participation from [his] younger days [in 1958],” he was making a favourable comparison to what he witnessed 2009-10. He recalled when activists would go and shame fellow union members who exhibited “not strong participation for picket duty.” He further noticed that “when it came to pick up strike pay, the hall was jammed and the parking lot was jammed.”⁸⁹ Jamie

⁸⁷ Burt Brankley, workshop discussion, Sudbury, 5 May 2018.

⁸⁸ McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester.

⁸⁹ Stephen Heiti, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

West concurred that people tend to come out when they need something “during a strike or Christmas party.” Moreover, in many cases, they “only show up at the union hall if [they’re] angry.”⁹⁰

By the 1969 INCO strike, Ron Brunette recalled that although strike vouchers were worth more with United Steel as opposed to those issued by Mine Mill previously in 1958, he still had to supplement his income to cover gas, the mortgage, and other bills. Brunette admitted that “in 69 all I was getting was ten dollars for me, eight dollars for the wife and two dollars for each of my kids... twenty-two bucks per week when you are used to taking home sixty to seventy-five per week. You try to save as much as you could but come a strike it would go away[.]”⁹¹ Like Brunette, other men I spoke with who were the sole earners indicated that they took odd jobs on the side or left town for work. Ron thrived at this as he was used to supplementing his income even while working full time at INCO. With only his income as a mechanic, he expressed that “there was no way” he could make ends meet solely on INCO wages, especially without the lucrative mining bonus. He fixed cars and washing machines, did carpentry and plumbing, and installed barbeques, “anything just to make a few bucks.”

Other breadwinners demonstrated a similar versatility and willingness to find work, which underlies the pressure that these men felt to provide for their families. Richard Gouin drove a taxi during one strike and during a shutdown on another occasion, he hitchhiked to work, “till I could pay for my gas and car.”⁹² Carol Mulligan’s father and Steve Saari worked for friends respectively at a gas station and on a construction site.

⁹⁰ Jamie West, interview by the author, Sudbury, November 2017.

⁹¹ Brunette, interview.

⁹² Gouin, interview.

These latter instances came with a bit of controversy, as these miners were paid in cash and could have been perceived as taking jobs “under the table.” Added to the pressure for these men to acquire temporary work during a strike, was the fact that this also caused them to underbid workers who depended on those workspaces.⁹³ On another level, both ultimately felt cheated by their respective friends’ willingness to exploit their personal circumstances to acquire cheaper labour. The pressure to provide for their families pushed these men outside of the tenets of class solidarity and into direct conflict with workers in other workspaces.

A woman’s sense of agency was an underlying source of tension during strikes, coupled with the fact that the “man” of the house was at home, essentially occupying his wife’s space. According to interviewees, strikes disrupted the order and normalcy of their lives. Men could not provide enough for their families, and women could not put food on the table. Interviewees often reflected on men doing domestic tasks that some of them termed “women’s work.” Some men were remembered as helping out, and enjoying much desired time with children. Other men were remembered as sticking to their prescribed traditional gender roles. Moreover, another prominent theme from the interviews was that many women did not work outside of their own homes. Several interviewees recalled husbands or fathers not wanting their wives to work outside of the home. Linda George was adamant and visibly frustrated (she had already addressed this in her interview) when she was asked why she did not “just get a job” to alleviate

⁹³ This caused ODS workshop performer Greg Trembley’s family to leave Sudbury. See “Performer and Performance,” 156.

financial difficulties during the 1978-79 INCO strike. She responded, that, “no you couldn’t do that, there were no jobs, especially for women back then!”⁹⁴

It is also imperative to note women’s pivotal responsibilities in running the household. Carol Mulligan and Jan Heppner were never married to men, but were both critical of the power their fathers exercised in their homes growing up in the 1950s, particularly with regards to their mothers. They did, however, reflect on the prevalence of defined gender roles in their community, where women were subservient in their homes as either daughters or wives. Men also upheld this picture through their interviews. This was consistent throughout the postwar period however, in reality, women’s lives in relation to their husbands were much more nuanced.

For women and children, the home represented a patriarchal and domesticated space. The father and husband held the legal and cultural prerogative to control domestic spaces. Women frequently reflected on tensions that resulted from these implicit and gendered expectations. These emerged anecdotally when I inquired about the relationship between men and women. McGauley recounted an anecdote where a man legally committed his wife to shock treatments in the 1950s as per his then-legal right to do so. She also spoke of clandestine and anonymous support networks for women, who were

⁹⁴ George, interview. I had asked Linda a question about job prospects for women and she was later exasperated when Caitlin Heppner, acting as my interview collaborator, innocently asked within another tangent if she could “just get a job.” Scholars corroborate Linda’s assertion as paid employment for women outside of the home was scarce for women in 1958, and this pattern appears to have continued into the late 1970s. Women could not afford to support themselves or their families on the “women’s wages” from working positions that were available to them. For the 1950s see Mercedes Steedman, “Godless Communists and Faithful Wives, Gender Relations and the Cold War: Mine Mill and the 1958 Strike against the International Nickel Company,” in *Mining Women: Gender in the Development of a Global Industry, 1670 to 2005*, edited by Jaclyn J. Gier and Laurie Mercier (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 235. For a discussion on women, wages and work in the 1970s, see Keck and Powell, “Women into Mining Jobs at INCO,” 283.

trapped in difficult domestic situations with little recourse.⁹⁵ Jan Heppner was forthcoming when she recalled never wanting to take on her expected role as a “wife” due to its implicit secondary status. She recalled that “it was a man’s world [and that] men were supposed to bring home the bacon, and if they didn’t then it was the woman’s job to feed the family anyway.” Moreover, this disparity intensified “when they went on strike and there was no money, [her mother] took in sewing but when the strike was over, that was it. [Dad] wouldn’t let his wife [work]. He was man enough to make the money, she needed to wear her apron at dinner time.”⁹⁶ The same was true for Carol Mulligan’s father, who would not allow his wife to work. Essie Byrne was content with this role, but acknowledged its significance in her day-to-day life. Ron Tough remembers “guys making a lot of good money and didn’t want their wives working.” He described this mindset as a “throwback [of an] ‘old school’ mentality [that is] here today too.”⁹⁷ The home is a central location for each interviewee and primary site for gendered politics in a given household.

The world of husbands and accompanying notions of masculinity were often a talking point for interviewees. Sole breadwinners that I interviewed frequently spoke the language of work and of the importance of paying bills and supporting their families. However, they also often reminisced about the “camaraderie” and a “family atmosphere” when in the company of other men, either on or off the job. Each male spoke about missing “the guys” in terms of what they valued most about their tenures working at INCO or Falconbridge. They referred to one another as brothers and – as such – they

⁹⁵ McGauley, interview.

⁹⁶ Heppner, interview.

⁹⁷ Ron Tough, interview by the author, Sudbury, June 2017.

fought, made up, and supported each other.⁹⁸ As a culture, men often described each other in varying degrees of “haywire,” “rowdy,” and possessing an inherent readiness to drink or fight was often a badge of merit. Being with the guys was a home away from home of sorts. There were many instances of what several interviewees termed as “horseplay.” They told of an environment replete with jokes, ribbing, and one-upmanship. Interviewees described many humorous situations where men played tricks on one another. Everyone had their own nickname that was given to them. According to Dennis Dowdall, whose nickname was “Dunce,” these were meant to “take you down a peg.”⁹⁹ Interviewees also recounted that swearing was the common language in all day-to-day dialogue. According to Ron Tough, “[You] couldn’t have a conversation with anyone without swearing.”¹⁰⁰ There was a distinct threshold for some men who admitted that their use of excessive language was not for the home, but when returning to work they would, “revert to this guttural cursing and swearing ... and it became part of culture ... tough to break that...[the] more you use vernacular and slang ... less able you are to converse otherwise...”¹⁰¹

This macho mentality or façade (depending on who was speaking), which appeared prideful for some interviewees, perturbed others, who felt that it was a demeaning characterization and not representative of *all* men. Laurie McGauley remembered that the culture over time was consistently, “very macho and male

⁹⁸ Steven High makes a similar observation about familial connections and “closeness of social relations” within Mill families where “everybody knows everybody.” See High, “They Were Making Good Money Just Ten Minutes from Home,” 21.

⁹⁹ Dowdall, interview. These elements of masculine rough culture, swearing, and fraternal notions of brotherhood are in alignment with Thomas Dunk’s observations of his male subjects in Thunder Bay see Dunk, *It’s A Working Man’s Town*.

¹⁰⁰ Tough, interview.

¹⁰¹ Tough, interview.

dominated.”¹⁰² My aunt, Barb Beausoleil, who was present during an interview with Bryan Murray, interjected and complained about “chest thumping” Sudbury men and their “antics” all over town. She lamented the constant “horseplay” and that she could never go to the grocery store without some man sneaking up by surprise and “goosing” another man.¹⁰³ Jamie West was also critical of this behaviour but felt this “blanket” portrayal was unfair. He recounted to me how he would “cringe” every time he heard Stompin’ Tom’s *Sudbury Saturday Night*. He explained that, even though there were parties on weekends after working hard all week, the iconic song made them sound “like we’re Zombies.” Further to that, in exasperation he questioned, “what are we not even parents anymore?”¹⁰⁴ Linda George was also critical of the homogeneous depictions of men and she informed me that “all those twelve thousand men they were not all one person. I don’t like [the] stereotypes ... hard hats, dirty clothes [and] swearing ... ‘oh he’s a miner this is how he acts this is what he looks like’.”¹⁰⁵ Aspects of masculinity were both celebrated and contested by interviewees.

COMMUNITY

In the previous section, notions of the “community” were remembered very much as a factor of domestic life, and domesticity was an integral factor in community life.¹⁰⁶ Interviewee recollections conveyed how strikes touched and affected the spatial and social aspects of the entire Sudbury community. More broadly, women and men reflected

¹⁰² McGauley, interview.

¹⁰³ Bryan Murray, interview with the author, Sudbury, June 2017. My aunt Barb Beausoleil was present for this interview.

¹⁰⁴ West, interview.

¹⁰⁵ George, interview.

¹⁰⁶ I define and work with the term “community” using three fundamental elements as outlined by Walsh and High: “community as imagined reality, community as social interaction, and community as process.” See John C. Walsh and Steven High, “Rethinking the Concept of Community.” *Histoire Sociale* 32, no. 64 (November 1, 1999), 255.

on the culture that navigated through the cyclical pattern of strikes as repetitive “secular rituals.”

The impact was felt in homes, local businesses, churches and schools. Bryan Murray attributed this effect to the fact that INCO was the “biggest employer in the city [with] twenty-five thousand people [his estimate].” He further likened INCO’s presence in Sudbury to cancer, where “not everybody has it, but everyone is touched by it ... same thing as a strike.”¹⁰⁷ Multiple interviewees concur and attribute the extensive impact of strikes in the community as part of a “snowball effect.” Dennis Dowdall took exception to local business men “crying poor” during a strike and declared that “we were feeding these merchants all the time and they say don’t go on strike because it’s killing our business.”¹⁰⁸ Community rivalries aside, the interviews deliver an overwhelming sense that all aspects of business and commerce in Sudbury were affected during an INCO strike.

Furthermore, as a school teacher in 1978, Jan Heppner remembers attending mandatory staff meetings intended to encourage them to watch out “for kids coming to school being hit [as] stress in the houses went up really high [and to look for] kids [who] would come to school upset from things not right in their house.” Heppner believed this was based on “something” and this incursion into the classroom is yet another example of the ubiquitous effect of strikes in Sudbury.¹⁰⁹ In a sweeping sense, strikes impacted people collectively on an emotional level. Stephen Heiti recalls his general feelings surrounding his experience of the 1958 strike, where his “main memory is sadness ... [it]

¹⁰⁷ Murray, interview.

¹⁰⁸ Dowdall, interview.

¹⁰⁹ Heppner, interview.

felt even longer [than the strike's duration and the whole] town felt down drab and sad.”¹¹⁰

Accompanying memories of this pervading feeling and emotional toll, interviewees regularly recollected acts of kindness and a prevalent sense of compassion during strikes. People instinctively helped each other. Several interviewees belonged to a category of people who were active and donated their time, energy and resources to combat a strike's negative effects in the community. Mick Lowe recalled a story told to him from 1958, when farmers from the Valley let strikers, “dig for potatoes in the frozen ground ... they could keep all potatoes they could dig.”¹¹¹ The interviews show that people understood what was at stake for others during a strike. Moreover, they could be supportive and sympathetic. For example, Bryan Murray initially worked as a student, and then later became a staff member at INCO. His transition to the “other side” did not affect his allegiances as he recalled the difficult situation of crossing the picket line during the 1978-79 strike. As a hoist man, he had to operate the cage for maintenance crews in non-production related work. According to Bryan, “they are not standing there with knives or pitchforks” and he “felt sorry for them ... for having to go out for so long for a little bit of money.” He also said that “being on staff, I can understand ... I sympathize with them I talk to them a lot ... lots of guys ... shift bosses ... [are] underground eight hours a day[,] they laugh [and] cry together ... they are close to these guys [who in support would express] ‘Go ahead do it. Get what you have to get’.”¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Heiti, interview.

¹¹¹ Lowe, interview.

¹¹² Murray, interview.

Interviewees on either side of the picket demonstrated compassion and practiced acts of kindness.

Another significant social aspect to the Sudbury community that was conveyed through the memories of men and women was the concept of an inter-generational exchange. This was evoked in multiple ways and its value emerged through the testimonies with regards to identity, education and various forms of knowledge, and its transmission. This notion is complex and dynamic, but its most obvious aspect is prevalent in the day-to-day experience of the interviewee living and working in Sudbury. This was how they were inculcated with the “code.” For example, this occurred when older men taught younger men how to be workers and demonstrated the “right way” to conduct their work. It also happened when younger workers listened to their elders talking about their past experiences relating to how they managed their day-to-day responsibilities. Several interviewees felt it was timely to be at INCO or Falconbridge and concurred with the sentiment expressed by Richard Gouin who felt, “fortunate enough to get in when there was still a lot of old people.”¹¹³ Bryan Murray remembers from his experiences working at INCO both as a summer student and later as a member of staff, that the older guys held a great deal of sway. He recalled that younger workers absorbed, “how they talked ... how they managed their day ... inner politics ... [and how to] conduct your work in such a ways [...] ... [T]his guy’s been doing it for twenty years ... how to manage about the business of underground and seniority [...]” Essentially, Brian Murray describes how workers, “follow in footsteps of people before them.”¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Gouin, interview.

¹¹⁴ Murray, interview.

This process of following an “older guy’s” lead was appreciated by younger workers who were learning the ropes. Richard Gouin reminisced about those, “cranky old miners [who were] good ... they were good ... they showed you [.]”¹¹⁵ For Ron Brunette this was also true, but his apprenticeship came with conditions. He remembered:

when I started working there ... old guys used to be ... all depends on how good you get along with them ... you have no problem ... but I wasn’t afraid of work. If you want to work, they’ll show you everything if you’re lazy they won’t show you nothing ... Dog fucker ... lots of dog fuckers more than there are good workers[.] [Like this] ... old Italian guy ... I wanted to learn [from] [.] You gotta work ... no one wanted to work with that guy cause’ he was a cranky old man ... [I worked for with him for] three or four months, most guys can work two or three days with him ... showed you all kinds of tricks.¹¹⁶

Brunette’s apprenticeship functioned as part of a reciprocal exchange. Furthermore, there was an accepted work ethic and code, as well as a preferred form of behaviour. Individual experiences varied, but generally most could relate to a “right way” of conducting themselves and it was very important that they demonstrated that they were authorities on the subject. Ron Tough offered a levelling alternative regarding the young and the old when he concluded that there was, “no superseding group [and that] if you did your job you were fine. Your capacity to get to work and drink was the badge of merit ... none of the ‘you young folks don’t know’[.]”¹¹⁷ In all cases for “work,” and the manner with which it was conducted, was an esteemed and valuable source of practical knowledge for men.

This notion of a generational exchange is particularly significant during a strike. Working men of every age, department, and affiliation get thrown together into some extremely stressful situations. Their families and friendship networks were affected as

¹¹⁵ Gouin, interview.

¹¹⁶ Brunette, interview.

¹¹⁷ Tough, interview.

well. Mick Lowe describes strikes as being “transgenerational” events where knowledge is passed down from one generation to the other. He further articulates this was an unintended consequence for a company engaging its workforce in a labour dispute. A little bit of workplace procedural mimicry happens on the picket line where “old guys” are paired with “young guys.” Mick observed that “dads bring their kids on the line [they would say] my dad brought me here when I was seven or eight years old.” Younger men, who initially might not understand or be ambivalent about them, “but [now] are sitting in a shack with the old guys beginning to understand what a union is.” Moreover, he witnessed “twenty-year-old guys ... put on the picket line [who] became militant - changed their lives.”¹¹⁸ Bryan Murray agrees that through his various experiences participating in INCO strikes: “You can tell the older guys were the ones that actually taught the younger fellows how to be trade unionists.”¹¹⁹

Traditionally, there has been a platform for women and men in Sudbury to be educated and active as trade unionists. A working-class culture was especially significant for those having experienced the tenure of Mine Mill 598, whose leaders fostered cultural and educational endeavors meant to cultivate what onetime local 598 president Nels Thibault hoped would be, “a little bit of socialism of our own.” Looking back, Thibault was “proud of [the union’s] educational features” as he recalled the mandate to “impress people with the need for a critical consciousness.” He was enthusiastic about his union’s efforts on that front and was encouraged that more young people were getting into the labour field. During a 1982 interview, he envisioned a future where students would take

¹¹⁸ Lowe, interview.

¹¹⁹ Murray, interview.

classes on labour history, and where perhaps his interview could serve as a source of “lived experience.”¹²⁰

There is a tension within these testimonies regarding whether or not there were “lessons learned” through successive strikes in the postwar period. Thibault’s call for a “critical consciousness” was echoed by several interviewees. Ron Tough and Carol Mulligan felt it was imperative that workers and their families know their history. Ron Tough admitted that “people generally think critically but many people do not.” In his view, “experience is a great teacher” in terms of tolerance, especially for enabling people “to be less inclined to be critical of other people.” For him, Thibault’s sense of “critical consciousness” is lacking. Ron Tough speaks from his own experiences, having worked in trades, different plants, as a furrier, miner, painter, bricklayer, actor and social worker. Education was just as important an experience for Ron, as well as several other interviewees, because it was the means by which they were able to ameliorate their station in life. More than on a personal level in terms of security or financial benefit, he felt it necessary for workers to educate themselves, as well as learn from their past experiences. From his vantage point, workers in Sudbury needed to broaden their “worldview and widen their horizons” so they could break a prevailing boom and bust mentality that he described as, “be broke” [versus] “make big money,” a subsistence cycle or rut where people simply “struggle and live.”¹²¹

Ron Tough, felt that a “union is a necessary good [and is] the backbone of our democratic society.” In practical terms for workers he explained that, “without [unions

¹²⁰ Nels Thibault, interviewed by Mike Solski, Winnipeg, May 1982, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

¹²¹ Tough, interview.

there would be] no health, no safety ... our society would be fucked, without the union we don't have any champion." Ron wants workers to be aware of the gains won by mining unions in Sudbury, that they have been cumulative over time, and that they have directly contributed to the improvement of their standard of living. He also believes that these gains should not to be taken for granted. The "corporate forces" aligned against Sudbury workers keep step in that "any time a union gets a benefit ... they get the same thing [and that] each gain from each other's advances."¹²²

Carol Mulligan also lacks confidence in the collective "critical consciousness" of working people in Sudbury. She perceives a real disconnect with the past. As another long-time journalist, she is very critical of "miners" and their lack of self-awareness. While covering the 2009-10 Vale strike, she noted the "trucks and fancy toys" parked outside of the union hall. She warns that workers were losing sight of the real issues. She wanted people to pay attention to, "what is fair ... what is the story about" She was not comfortable when she observed a sense of entitlement in this generation of workers, and that they should pay attention to why they have what they have. She firmly attests, that "it's about sharing the wealth ... big money big bonuses BECAUSE (her emphasis) the company is making HUGE PROFITS (her emphasis) ... [If INCO] is making this much money, we deserve an increase ..." Moreover, she felt that the "union should educate the public on money, why, and about these larger processes...[.]"¹²³

For Carol and other interviewees, this disconnect with the past was particularly evident in the wake of the 2009-10 Vale strike. According to her, there is a forgetfulness or lack of connection to the past and she declares that, "[t]his is a mining town which I

¹²² Tough, interview.

¹²³ Mulligan, interview.

grew up in. People don't have that history especially if you're ... you remember this is a union town when someone is killed or when there is a strike ... and no one is spending money you realize that this is first and foremost a mining camp." Carol endured some very bitter and frustrating experiences while covering the 2009-10 Vale strike as a reporter. Her involvement almost caused her to have a nervous breakdown. She witnessed the financial hardship, factional disputes, bullying, intimidation and all the ugly realities that trickle throughout city in the event of a strike. Carol, who admittedly had "a bit of an anti-union bias" due to her own personal experiences both as a daughter of a working man, and having worked on the management side for different newspaper outlets, changed her tune. She admitted that she saw "the lengths to which a big multinational corporation would go ... cost them a lot of money and it just went on for so long people were really suffering. [It] cemented my belief that we need unions."¹²⁴

My subjects unanimously expressed that trade unions and unionism play a significant role for workers and their families. Not all of them were overtly political or visibly "active" in support of the cause. Perhaps this is one source of tension for those, including Ron Tough and Carol Mulligan, who were critical of rank and file workers and their lacking "collective consciousness" as trade unionists. In one sense, the testimonies give credence to Irving Abella's conclusion regarding trade unionists of the labour movement in the 1930s and 1940s, that the average man "plays an unimportant role in the affairs of his union." He argued that the average union member took more than a "passing interest" in times when "his own economic well-being is at stake during strikes and

¹²⁴ Mulligan interview.

collective bargaining negotiations.” Moreover, that this “was especially true ... when his immediate, and indeed sole concern was to achieve financial security.”¹²⁵

This is an accurate description for men and women that I interviewed, most of whom spoke mainly of their work, family and daily responsibilities, the aspects of everyday life which occupied most of their time. They were often critical of their union’s leadership. Most could identify with Ron Brunette, who was “quiet” and spent more time “talking with the guys but not to get in front,” when it came to direct participation at the union hall. However, based on the experiences reflected by interviewees, Abella’s conclusion regarding men and their “unimportant roles” is contestable. I was reminded of Thomas Dunk’s focus on an everyday “profane culture,” as opposed to formal political and economic organizations in his ethnographic study of white working-class men in Thunder Bay, Ontario. Similarly, my interviewees were sceptical of bureaucracy within unions and working-class political parties and their lives were not dominated by these institutions.¹²⁶ These “backbenchers,” or “listeners,” were active in their communities in different ways and at different times just as much as they participated on picket lines when there was a strike.¹²⁷ They engaged in all kinds of “important” activities that were independent of union leadership while living, working and striking in Sudbury. Interviewees demonstrated that they were very much aware of what transpired between the company and their union throughout the duration of a given contract, but they did not necessarily articulate their views or actively take part in union activities.

¹²⁵ Irving Martin Abella, *Nationalism, Communism, and Canadian Labour: The CIO, the Communist party and the Canadian Congress of Labour 1935 to 1956* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), v.

¹²⁶ Dunk, *It’s A Working Man’s Town*, xix.

¹²⁷ Brunette, interview.

(IN) SECURITY

One prominent narrative thread revealed through these testimonies is how men and women ameliorated their lives and gained a transitory sense of security and esteem. This trend was reflected on an individual basis. Interviewees respectively depicted their personal or family circumstances in a gradual trajectory, moving progressively forward in time. They often told tales of how their lives improved and this appeared to enrich personal notions of dignity and self-worth. Anecdotes that demonstrate the less desirable end of this trajectory begin temporally in the prewar period. Richard Gouin recounted an anecdote passed on to him from an old miner that captures the value placed on human beings prior to unionization in Sudbury's mines. The old miner described to him a time when INCO decided to stop using mules in the upper levels of the mines. He told Richard, that "it got inhuman because they had to blind them ... they spend the rest of their lives just hauling ... [then he said] inhuman to bring mules anymore so they brought more of us to do the work!"¹²⁸ The irony of company decision-makers recognizing cruel and inhumane practices towards animals and not towards their employees was not lost on my interviewees.

Most located this "reality" in the pre-union era, essentially placing those pre-dignified times in the past. The pre-recorded interviews consist of members who lived in that very era, and they corroborate the assumptions of future Baby Boomers. This was reality for Nels Thibault for example, who described himself in those years as being an "angry young man."¹²⁹ He recalled that in the Great Depression:

¹²⁸Gouin, interview.

¹²⁹ Nels Thibault, interview by Mike Solski, Winnipeg, May 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

I seen at the same time ... a shortage of goods ... deliberately destroyed fruits in western Canada ... lean years ... good food ... maintaining prices ... I could never reconcile that in a society, country or system ... in a society that could destroy food when people are hungry ... ten years nothing no work ... took a war to open up employment opportunities ... no longer hat in hand ... War and Depression just as easily just a manipulated thing ... Young Canadians of that generation ... injury that was done to our identity ... shame ... indigence never left my mind ... conspiracy history of depression to keep it off consciousness of upcoming generations...¹³⁰

While recounting this story, he admitted to having become an “angry old man.” For Thibault, the Great Depression was something that he viewed as being symbolic of a generational shaming. Upon his arrival in Sudbury, he joined other men and their families. They lived in very poor conditions in places often referred to as ‘shanty towns.’ Nels recalls being one of “two thousand people lined up at the gates at INCO” hoping to be hired.¹³¹ According to his contemporary Jim Tester, if you were an “Anglo Saxon ... [you] can say things and do things that a lot of other people can’t get away with.”¹³² These preferred men had a “leg up” over men of other ethnicities in such a reputedly arbitrary and racist environment. Workers and their families were equally subjected to INCO’s draconian methods. These included systematic and discriminatory hiring practices, sexual exploitation in the case of miners’ wives, long hours with low pay, dangerous working conditions, virtually zero job stability, and merciless foremen with unchecked power. According to Thibault, “this was the INCO that people forgot about [...]”¹³³ My interviewees each had a direct familial connection to the mines and have vague recollections of anecdotes told to them by their parents about such circumstances from

¹³⁰ Thibault, interview.

¹³¹ Thibault, interview.

¹³² Vern and Irene Haluschak, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, January 1979, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97. Jim Tester spoke of these circumstances during the interview.

¹³³ Thibault, interview.

that period. Many – if not all – interviewees experienced instances of sparsity earlier in their lives.

This narrative trend shifts with union certification (1944) at the close of the Second World War when, according to Thibault, the company was, “forced to sit down with us.”¹³⁴ Cumulatively from that point forward, every few years through successive contract negotiations between the company and union – both Mine Mill 598 and then United Steelworkers 6500 – workers would acquire better wages, hours, safer working conditions (relative to what they were previously), pensions, seniority rights, benefits and vacation time. With these gains, workers and their families were remembered as experiencing an increase in security as compared to the previous generations of workers.¹³⁵ Women and men articulated a sense of dignity and a cumulative sense of esteem as a result of these emergent gains.

Men whom I interviewed were given the opportunity, as many had done before, to follow in their father’s footsteps. Several interviewees represented the first wave of a more educated cohort and received their initial experiences working at INCO or Falconbridge as summer students.¹³⁶ Pat Byrne, Stephen Heiti, Bryan Murray and Steve Saari were all employed as summer students prior to, or between college and university semesters. The first three were hired in the mid to late 1960s, and Steve in the early 2000s. According to their testimonies, all sons of men working at INCO and

¹³⁴ Thibault, interview.

¹³⁵ Dowdall, interview and Tough, interview.

¹³⁶ Lowe, interview. Mick Lowe observed that this was a “demographic trend” and “over time [the company] has raised the bar for hiring [and that the] ... level of education gradually moved up.” He attests that INCO wanted “pliable [and] malleable people not likely to become militants.” It was common for workers to have little or no schooling prior to, and immediately following World War Two.

Falconbridge were guaranteed a job and received the required training as long as they were enrolled in school.¹³⁷

This practice also functioned as a direct conduit to employment for these students because of the valuable experience acquired each summer. They essentially had a “leg up” on the competition. Stephen Heiti remembered when “[he] was working at Stobie mine in the summer as a student ... INCO was really good they’d hire everybody all the kids ... they didn’t need us we were totally superfluous ... very community-minded as a company.”¹³⁸ Steve Saari recalled the semester before he quit studying mechanical engineering at a college in Niagara. He joked about the decisive instance that motivated his departure, when the lecturer was extolling (what he thought were) lucrative starting salaries in the field, which were minimal compared to what Steve had earned at Falconbridge during the previous summer as a student. Steve got hired full time at INCO soon afterwards and now works for Vale.¹³⁹

Yet some of these men chose not to continue working at INCO or Falconbridge. Three of them having grown up with mining in their family, each decided they “didn’t want *that* life.”¹⁴⁰ Pat Byrne’s father, who suffered a serious neck injury while working underground, never intended his eldest son to work for Falconbridge as a life-long career. Pat eventually became a teacher. Similarly, Stephen Heiti used his tenure as a summer student at INCO to help pay for a university degree and became a social worker. Ron Tough emigrated from Scotland in the late 1950s to continue the family tradition of

¹³⁷ This longstanding arrangement between INCO and its employees and their families is common in resource extraction towns. See High, “They Were Making Good Money Just Ten Minutes from Home,” 12. For this hiring practice in a mining town see Mercier, *Anaconda: Labor, Community, and Culture in Montana’s Smelter City*, 88.

¹³⁸ Heiti, interview.

¹³⁹ Saari, interview.

¹⁴⁰ Pat Byrne, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

working in the mines. He credits the union as a great personal motivator in his deciding to go back to school and change careers. Steve Saari, who *did* follow in his father's footsteps, does not want the same thing for his son. He recalled being fearful at the recent "bring your parent to school" day that his son would be encouraged to work in the mines. Most of the women I interviewed shared this sentiment or were at least critical of the harsh working conditions underground. It was too dangerous, or they felt like the life was a trap. This sentiment runs contrary to the historical acceptance of this risk from earlier generations of miners and their families.¹⁴¹ My grandfather also wanted his children as far away from the mines as possible, instead prioritizing education, and hence opportunities for multiple avenues of employment. In these cases, one sense of security was exchanged for another.

Men and women generally held their careers in Sudbury's mining industry in high esteem. For my interviewees, their sense of security and self-worth was related to how they thrived in their respective environments. Being "underground" in the mines, for example, equated freedom, prosperity and autonomy for workers who could earn their money. Production miners could earn very lucrative bonuses. For tradesmen, the working processes underground constituted their main focus in support. For miners, tradesmen and support staff collectively, their measure for success was how well they could accommodate and help to not only maintain the productive forces underground, but hopefully to exceed and thereby exploit this system. Although the working environment was often described in contentious terms, this "underground" was a place and means to

¹⁴¹ For a discussion of the mining family economy and mining communities in Canada from earlier generations respectively, see Chapters 6 and 7 in Robert McIntosh, *Boys in the Pits: Child Labour in Coal Mining* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

achieve stability or even prosperity. By all reports, the prospect of gainful INCO wages was a key motivator. Most of the men who worked at INCO or Falconbridge, in some capacity, could identify with in some way the sentiment articulated by Dennis Dowdall – while reflecting on his optimism at the time – that being hired on to INCO was tantamount to being “set for life.”¹⁴² The thrill of reliable pay and high wages is a consistent sentiment expressed by interviewees throughout the postwar period. The oldest living interviewee, Essie Byrne, was overjoyed when “sometimes” her husband’s “bonus was almost as big as his cheque.”¹⁴³ Ron Brunette was able to excel in various plants due to his hard work ethic. His trajectory in the mines had him ascend to become a head mechanic with a great deal of autonomy and esteem in his shop.

Similarly, Richard Gouin valued the miner’s autonomy, his elite status as a miner in the industry, and the work environment at INCO. He “loved” what he described as “a family atmosphere underground” and appreciated that “you were “self-sufficient basically ...independent [where] your foreman give[sic] you the lineup and you went out and did your work.” He further reflected that “working as a miner you had the freedom of being your own boss.” This became especially relevant to him when, during the 1978-79 INCO strike, he recalled leaving town to work at another mining outfit in Snow Lake, Manitoba. He described the conditions north of the forty-ninth parallel as “really bad” with “a lot of fatalities.” According to Richard, the working standards at INCO, although “written in blood,” were the highest in the industry. When he contemplated working at a shoe factory in Quebec, he deplored what he observed as “sweat shop” conditions and admitted he “wouldn’t have lasted very long.” He observed workers in a manufacturing

¹⁴² Dennis Dowdall, interview.

¹⁴³ Essie Byrne, interview.

setting, browbeaten, in a pushy and “closed environment [with] people watching you every minute at every time.” His freedom and autonomy at work were key components to a dignified way of life. According to Richard, “some people couldn’t be self-sufficient,” and unionized INCO miners were an exception.¹⁴⁴

Another prominent narrative trend from the interviews demonstrates how this sense of security experienced by workers and their families was perpetually threatened. The period of subsequent contracts or strikes after the 1978-79 INCO strike represents more of a regressive trend. Several interviewees characterize this as a watershed moment for INCO workers and their families due to the perceived gains in the strike’s aftermath. In particular as discussed previously, the “thirty and out” pension scheme signified a total victory and was consistently referred to as such. According to ex-journalist Mick Lowe, “we could never have that kind of breakthrough until that time ... [where with] thirty years of service you were eligible for full pension ... when they were still young and healthy enough to enjoy it.”¹⁴⁵ Linda George recalled the, “huge pension deal in that contract ... based on that unheard of ... thirty years [and] it was another story [with] pensions today.”¹⁴⁶ For interviewees, both men and women, this pension scheme was a watershed achievement, and it signified the beginning of a trend towards the gradual decline of many of those hard-fought gains. They spoke of jobs becoming fewer and fewer with the likelihood of layoffs or lockouts increasing. Added to these pressures from work were increased inflation rates, higher costs of living, and skyrocketing housing prices. Ron Brunette captures this regressive trend succinctly when relaying his

¹⁴⁴ Gouin, interview.

¹⁴⁵ Lowe, interview.

¹⁴⁶ George, interview.

philosophy of strikes when he asserted, “Well no strike is really worth it ... but if you don’t go on strike you don’t get ahead ... a lot of times people don’t realize ... not strike to get ahead but strike to keep what we already have.”¹⁴⁷

In the wake of this most recent strike, the reality for the wealthy “bonus miner” who takes home a purported one hundred and fifty thousand dollars per year was threatened.¹⁴⁸ There were reversals, and workers could not ignore that they were losing some of these hard-fought gains. Steve Saari recognized that circumstances for INCO employees were on a downward swing. He characterized the most recent Vale strike as a loss. He remembers the enthusiasm in the strike’s beginning stages, when eloquent speakers from the union executive preached solidarity chanting, “we will bring the company to its knees!” Steve also recalled the same verbosity and pomp when the time came to ratify the contract. In his mind, they could have accepted the company’s initial (demeaning) offer before they all “lost a year of their lives.”¹⁴⁹ Carol Mulligan concurred in that wages may have been secured for the short term, but, added that, “they were fighting as much to hang on to their defined pension [and that] they did not win that battle ... [N]one of them would lose that pension but any new employees would not have this [.]”¹⁵⁰ There was a sense that workers and their families in Sudbury were losing ground and that the company would take more from them during the 2020 contract negotiations.

¹⁴⁷ Brunette, interview.

¹⁴⁸ A colloquialized monetary figure expressed as common knowledge of what workers earn with the mining bonus.

¹⁴⁹ Saari, interview.

¹⁵⁰ Mulligan, interview.

This sense of security was never taken for granted, as men and women attested to the fact that Sudbury has long been a dangerous, harsh, aggressive and stressful place to live and work.¹⁵¹ Health, safety, seniority, pensions, job security and better wages were key issues in each successive contract negotiation. These key bargaining issues were consistently at the forefront of recollections for both men and women that I interviewed, and this specific concern reflected that they felt the need to fight for their own sense security and protection. An added layer of pressure on top of these aspects were the consistent and cyclical recurrences of contract negotiations, each accompanied by the possibility of a strike, and a regression of these gains. In addition to these external constraints, was the internal drive for men to face the daily grind of punching the clock or for women who were not employed, working to support the family from home. Jan Heppner's older brother Billy provided a sobering reminder from the not-too-distant past of what was at stake through a short biographical reflection (that included a song) about his experiences working at INCO's Creighton Mine in the early 1950s. His attitude towards making a living in the mines was bleak, of which he wrote that:

Mining is the most, filthy, menial, backbreaking, dangerous occupation in the world. As the song says, 'where the sun never shines and the rain never falls.' Underground air is stale, moist and stinks like nothing on earth. The darkness so complete and so black, you can literally poke yourself in the eye without ever seeing the finger coming. When miners get old, they are usually poor, and arthritic. I know of no other occupation that requires the human to work like an animal, smell like an animal and sadly after time to think like an animal. Hopefully conditions are better today.¹⁵²

¹⁵¹ For living and working conditions in Sudbury see Stacey Zembrzycki, "The Sinter Plant Boys: Jean Gagnon and the Personal Costs of Fighting to Compensate Sudbury Families," *Histoire sociale*, no. 900 (2019): 1-32.

¹⁵² Billy Heppner's manuscript provided by Jan Heppner.

Billy's description is on the pessimistic side compared to the interviews I conducted in 2017 and Jim Tester did in the 1970s and 1980s. Essie Byrne, for one, told me that she would, "recommend [this life] to anyone." There was no remorse or regret having been married to a miner. For her, there "wouldn't be a thing I would change in what I had in there ... course we had a few 'ups and downs' but who doesn't?" She nonetheless understood how this way of life was fragile and precarious when she reflected on those desperate hours after her husband's horrific accident underground. She admitted that "oh yes you're scared. It's scary. You think you're in a different country with nobody and four children, no parents to fall back on anything like that."¹⁵³ Men and women consistently conveyed an underlying sentiment that they should not take anything for granted.

The notions of freedom, control and security are core issues at the heart of every strike. It is a test of agency and a trial of dignity for individuals, families and for the entire community. Each interviewee had their own unique struggle. Carol Mulligan's family lost their home and her father died shortly after the 1958 strike. Her work as a journalist covering the 2009-10 Vale strike almost caused her to have a nervous breakdown. Ron Brunette's family lost their store as a result of the 1958 strike, and he remembers his mother having to sell off its goods, while his father was forced to travel to Elliot Lake to work in the uranium mines. Jumping forward in time, Ron retired earlier than he wanted from Vale in 2010, when after the strike a new company policy dictated that he needed to shave his beard. He refused and recounted how he "had that beard on my face longer than I worked here so [now] I don't work here."¹⁵⁴ Richard Gouin started

¹⁵³ Essie Byrne, interview.

¹⁵⁴ Brunette, interview.

hitch-hiking to work when gasoline and car insurance became less important than shelter and food. Combined with their own difficulties, each interviewee recalled situations when other people fell on harsh times. Jan Heppner recalled – the often-cited occurrence – a family that was so ashamed they left their residence in the middle of the night without informing anyone. Similarly, Essie Byrne remembered putting together anonymous parcels of food for families in difficulty during a strike. Anonymity was a significant aspect to this act of charity, to prevent the family any embarrassment about their misfortunes and having it known in such a small community.

These two opposing narrative trends depicted through interviewee testimonies – the gradual acquisition of more “dignified” lives along with the perpetual threat toward these esteemed and prosperous (hard-won) circumstances – culminate at the present moment with the sixtieth anniversary of Sudbury’s first postwar strike in 1958. People consistently remembered and recounted how their lives improved. Working for INCO meant making good money, according to interviewees, especially since many of them have retired. They also spoke about technological automation that has reshaped the working landscape underground as well as the surrounding community “aboveground.” The workforce has dwindled to a skeleton of what it once was. Men and women recall in 2006 when INCO sold its nickel operations to Vale, a “foreign-owned” Brazilian corporation. The new company’s “draconian” methods, particularly bringing in scab labour during the most recent strike, was a common subject and source of frustration. Interviewees even spoke of having a better relationship with INCO by comparison, because the former company “cared about the community.”¹⁵⁵ Interviewees express a

¹⁵⁵ Brunette, interview.

more pessimistic outlook currently, which eerily harkens back to Sudbury's pre-union past. Ultimately, they witnessed the vaunted 1979 pension scheme become a casualty in the most recent and longest 2009-10 strike at Vale. With a contract signed in 2015, and the perceived instability of the market, there is a general sense of frustration and helplessness as 2020 approaches.¹⁵⁶ What more will be lost?

This chapter focussed on how participants and pre-recorded interviewees shaped their memories through narratives. It reveals that memories of Sudbury strikes that were shared with me are gendered and also intergenerational. Their recollections were often framed within the home and within the domestic setting. Notions of community were also very much remembered as a factor of domestic life, and domesticity was an integral factor in community life. Interviewees described how strikes affected the spatial and social aspects of the entire Sudbury community. Another prominent narrative thread that is revealed through these memories is how men and women ameliorated their lives and gained a transitory sense of security and esteem. Their testimonies also reflect how this sense of security and esteem was under perpetual threat, which was especially evident during strikes. These "remembered histories" along with other forms of historical memory became the foundation for the choices I made when imagining a story and characters that would become embodied on stage. The next chapter unpacks this process, identifying some key moments in how the script was written and re-written over time. It also makes clear how the script echoes the key themes of the research; family, community, and (in)security were gendered and inter-generational experiences.

¹⁵⁶ "Vale, Steelworkers agree on contract extension," *Northern Ontario Business*, 24 April 2020. At the time, interviewees were apprehensive and uneasy when they spoke about the upcoming 2020 contract negotiations. Incidentally, due to the global uncertainty caused by Covid-19, workers and their employers at Vale agreed to a one-year renewal of the collective agreement.

CHAPTER THREE: SCRIPT BREAKDOWN

The script for *One Day Stronger* (hereafter *ODS*) was developed for the final June 2019 production through two workshops and readings in May and October 2018. I wrote eight drafts throughout these intervals, culminating with the production version that is featured in the Appendix A of this dissertation.¹ Months prior to the first draft, after completing my first round of interviews in the summer and fall of 2017, there came a perceptible moment when I needed to shift the process. One of my supervisors reminded me that the ‘*play’s the thing...*’ and urged me to begin writing it.² This creative endeavour was quite distinct from the oral history and ethnographic work outlined in the “Remembered Histories” chapter. It would require a different approach and sensibility as I endeavoured to shape the ethnographic material from the interviews into the form of a theatrical narrative.

THE ‘PLAY’S THE THING’

Having accumulated a significant collection of ethnographic and documentary material, the task felt quite daunting. Where and how was I to start? There were many divergent facets to this process, and converging directions, as the project had become a tripartite vehicle as an historical exploration, an artistic/cultural (re)production and, a platform for exploring local historical memory and consciousness. All the processes attached to this project relied upon the creation of this theatrical narrative as a means of exploring the past. I was now a playwright and needed to turn these interviews into a stageable play.

¹ See Appendix A, 263.

² *Hamlet*, Act 2, Scene 2.

I started reading a variety of plays to revisit my influences as a playwright and to determine the type of play I wanted to write. I considered it significant that the bulk of my research and historical material stemmed from interviews. I decided that as a work of public history, this play, both in terms of its style and content, should be first and foremost a “memory play.”³ The biographical “life history” interview approach presented a temporal fluidity. I felt that I could honour the shape of interviewee stories and structure my play and performances as a response and as an invitation for dialogue. This was an opportunity through the narrative power of theatre to explore how people remembered these events that shaped their lives, and how these have in turn, been shaped by their experiences over time. Interviewees and workshop audiences provided feedback following both workshops and they had a direct role in the making of this play. This type of ongoing exchange between myself and interviewees constituted what some verbatim theatre practitioners deem as “feeding back” and a means of sharing responsibility for the work.⁴

My first creative decisions arose in lieu of working through some practical decisions. In terms of budgetary limitations, I knew that I could only work with two actors and a stage manager. As a necessity for wanting to tell an assortment stories, and to provide multiple points of view, both of these actors would have to be able to play multiple parts. In this final version of the script, the actors were responsible for playing fifteen different characters. One of my first decisions was derived from historiographical

³ Tennessee Williams, *The Glass Menagerie* (New York: Random House, 1945). The term was first associated with and coined by this twentieth-century American playwright. In the play’s “Production Notes” he wrote, “[b]eing a ‘memory play’, *The Glass Menagerie* can be presented with unusual freedom of convention.”

⁴ Paul Brown, ed., *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community* (Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010), 4.

considerations: I explicitly wanted the play to explore gendered perspectives. As demonstrated in the “Remembered Histories” chapter, working-class masculinities, especially the notion of breadwinning, was a key thematic subject from my interviews. Yet I also wanted the play to investigate femininities, and I felt that to best accomplish both of these aims, unencumbered by the predominance of the former, the main character needed to be a woman. This choice aligns with other Canadian theatrical works that have explored ordinary women in working class communities.⁵ As we also saw in the previous chapter, their roles within the home, the community, as well as their ‘grassroots’ and community-building efforts, have often been overlooked, reduced or conflated.⁶ Moreover, I wanted to tackle the controversial local legacy of the wives of 1958, as compared to the stories and perspectives from women who were active during the 1978 strike. Most of my drafts were about making *ODS* more LAURIE’s story as a means to focus on the intergenerational experiences of women in the community.⁷

As a point of departure, I compiled a comprehensive document comprised of summaries and working transcripts that contained all the interview material. These included some archived interviews that were conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s featuring people from the previous generation who had experienced the union’s certification in 1944 and the 1958 strike specifically. It was significant to have

⁵ One of my inspirations was Wendy Lill, *Glace Bay Miners’ Museum* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1996) and more recently in a play about a very similar topic and historical and social milieu, Jennifer Wynne Webber, *With Glowing Hearts* (Winnipeg: Scirocco Drama, 2019).

⁶ I base this perception on the observation that the experiences of women get subsumed in cultural representations that often feature workers pitted against “the company.” Unions and strike stories also tend to focus on picket lines, bargaining tables and bars as social and political spaces that were typically dominated by men. For a Canadian example from the agitprop form as an example, see Richard Bruce Wright, *Eight Men Speak, and Other Plays from the Canadian Workers’ Theatre* (New Hogtown Pr, 1976).

⁷ I will be using all character names hereafter in the dissertation using capitals as they were written for the script.

intergenerational perspectives in the play to reflect the changing circumstances, similarities and variety of experiences between each strike in the postwar period. In keeping with this need, the play was taking shape as one that would be “told episodically, as a transgenerational memory play, through multiple points of view” as I put it in the May 2018 press release.⁸ Put simply, I wanted the story to be told through exchanges of memories, chronologically in time, beginning in the Great Depression and culminating in the then-present of 2019.

A live post-show discussion with the audience was also a key component I wanted to build into this theatrical experience. The staged reading (May 2018), workshop performance (October 2018) and final production (June 2019) produced enthusiastic, invested and (in some cases) emotionally charged feedback sessions after each performance. In my first draft, I attempted to build a place into the narrative for this moment of exchange. I had originally constructed the play in three acts, with each section moving forward in time, representing respectively the 1950s, 1970s and 2019, in keeping with this notion of an intergenerational exchange. The final act in the “present,” was set to fully dissolve the “fourth wall,” where the characters reveal themselves to be “actors” at a rehearsal when a “conversation” ensues with the audience. Ultimately, this approach – although interesting for me in many ways – proved much too time consuming with its three-act structure. I felt that having an audience sit for a three and a half-hour play was outdated in terms of meeting contemporary audience expectations and, might also prove counterproductive because it would work against my desire to generate a fruitful discussion afterwards. I justified substituting the third act of the play from the “present,”

⁸ *Sudbury Strike Stories*, press release, May 2018.

with a timely post-show discussion that was to occur in 2019 with a live audience. One of my first key dramaturgical decisions and significant cuts was the entirety of this third act comprising approximately an hour of stage material!⁹

Having conducted a significant amount of thought towards a general shape and purpose for the show. I returned to the story of the transcripts. What was to be the content? How do I use this material to create characters, scenes and a functioning play? What is the best form to work with? What does the narrative want to say? Beyond aesthetics, I consistently paid attention to some key ethical questions and with issues pertaining to authenticity, which will be the subject of exploration in the coming chapters of this dissertation. Whose story am I telling? How am I telling it? Who am I leaving out? Is the portrayal or depiction truthful, accurate or authentic? I felt a significant responsibility towards my interviewees, their memories, and to my future audiences in terms of how they would receive the material. I attempted to answer some of these questions “in process” through the script’s initial drafting, and through two subsequent workshops, culminating with this completed version for the final production.

I approached the challenge of “authenticity” in the script and the stage production along the lines David Dean has used them in his work. According to Dean, “authenticity” means:

[B]eing truthful to our contexts, both our new setting and our own contemporary circumstances. If accuracy can be defined as being faithful to an original, authenticity references sincerity, credibility, and trustworthiness. While there is a tendency to use the two terms interchangeably, or assume that they are

⁹ Dramaturgy is a term that will be used frequently and refers to the theory and practice of dramatic composition. One of my supervisors, David Dean, was a “dramaturge” in the early stages of this process and was the architect behind this key excision and thus restricting my focus to two acts respectively pertaining to the 1950s and 1970s.

interdependent, I suggest that it may be more productive to differentiate between them, seeing them as being in relationship to each other, a matter of negotiation.¹⁰

While I employ Dean's encapsulation of authenticity, in using theatre as a way of doing public history my work should be situated alongside that of practitioners and scholars of documentary theatre, performance studies, and re-enactment studies who are also concerned with notions relating to authenticity, notions of the truth, and 'the real'.¹¹

Character portrayals and creative choices were contested by workshop audience members and deemed accurate and/or authentic depending on an individual's point of view, particularly with regards to the depiction of stereotypes. Disagreement about differing notions pertaining to authentic behaviour, especially for men, was evident from the interviews, and this critique continued throughout the script's development. This chapter will demonstrate how I needed to "negotiate" these aspects on a consistent basis.

Another consideration while writing these characters was that I did not want to portray them as victims who lacked agency. This concern partly derives through my own aesthetic preference based on my experiences as a practitioner. I have always felt that men and women who strategize, seek answers, contend or struggle (successfully or not), with challenges and within difficult circumstances, are more theatrically compelling than

¹⁰ See David Dean, "Negotiating Accuracy and Authenticity in an Aboriginal King Lear," *Rethinking History*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (2017), 257. For a great discussion about authenticity as it relates to performance see also Vanessa Agnew and Julianne Tomann, "Authenticity," in *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, eds. Vanessa Agnew et al. (London: Routledge, 2020), 20-24.

¹¹ This significant discussion about various notions of authenticity in these respective bodies of scholarship identify the interplay (and tension) between 'factual' or 'truthful elements,' as well as their uses, and their perceived authority within the processes and contexts of re-enactment or performance. Similarly, my script work here, in terms of working with verbatim and documentary material, engages with interviewees, performers and audience members, and with their respective notions of authenticity, as part of an open and transparent process. Participants re-engaged with the sources and with the testimonies, and then helped to shape perceptions of what was deemed 'authentic' throughout each stage of this project. See Daniel Schulze, *Authenticity in Contemporary Theatre and Performance: Make it Real* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017); A. Braedder, et. al., "Doing Pasts: Authenticity from the Reenactors Perspective", *Rethinking History* Vol. 21, No. 2 (2017), 171-92; Stephen Gapps, "Practices of Authenticity", in Agnew et. al., *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies*, 183-6.

having them portrayed as victimized from the outset. I also perceive a link between working-class families in my work, with recent scholars writing about migration and stereotypes in performance. I am also interested in transforming “nameless” workers (for my study), “into individual agents with personal histories, memories and identities.”¹² As a theatrical practitioner and public historian, I also perceive a similar need to “resist with the tendency to sentimentalize or simplify [my subjects] by treating [working class men and women] as always and only victims or comedic stereotypes.”¹³ This chapter will demonstrate how I attempted to avoid subsuming the characters as stereotypical victims during strikes, within the hegemonic dynamic between capital and labour.

I wanted the material to “lead the way” in a very literal manner. First, I printed out the transcript material and held the stack of one hundred and fifty pages of interview summaries, as potential for spoken text, themes, and characters in my hands. I decided to use the material as the foundation for the theatrical narrative. I wanted all aspects of story, characters, scenes and other creative elements to derive from my anecdotal exchanges that I had mutually compiled with my interviewees in Sudbury. Through this method, I felt that I could best enable the audience and their stories to be ever-present in the piece.¹⁴ My goal was to foster individual investment for artists, interviewees and audiences. I also wanted to enable feelings of déjà vu, or the “uncanny,” particularly from instances where people could hear their own words, recognize personal anecdotes or be reminded of other such traces, as a means of initiating this participatory historical work.

¹² Daniel McNeil, Yana Meerzon and David Dean, “Introduction,” in *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 4.

¹³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁴ See the discussion involving oral history performance, repetition and “doubling” in Della Pollock ‘Moving Histories: Performance and Oral history’ in Tracy C. Davis (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies* (2008), 128-130.

I systematically recorded these elements, particularly thematic observations that could serve to bridge past experiences as remembered by interviewees, with potential narrative elements that could be fused into the workings of the play. When I set this process in motion, characters, voices, anecdotes, themes and scenes started to pop into my head as I creatively “worked” with and adapted these testimonies. The creative process was forming and constituting itself as the work moved forward. For example, part of the task of making verbatim monologues or sources for dialogue out of interview text required many creative adjustments. In most cases little adaptations were required for the purposes of clarity. Some sections were edited, merged, compressed, combined or tweaked. Some words or sentences sounded better with the slightest of adjustments. My role as playwright gradually emerged as I granted myself the authority to make these changes with a mind towards the creative aspect of the work. I made a conscious choice not to adhere strictly to the word and letter of the testimony.¹⁵ I aimed to use the interviews to serve as the material basis, a point of departure and (above all) as inspiration for the piece.

There was to be a great deal of distilling as I worked through the material. Throughout this process I was able to gradually shift my focus towards the project’s creative requirements. This became quite the mechanical undertaking. I started forming a second document which further distilled and abstracted the interview transcript into spoken sections. These consisted of separate documents for each interviewee that was

¹⁵ See Will Hammond and Dan Steward, *Verbatim* (London: Oberon, 2008), 35. I approached using the verbatim technique where the text could be tailored to meet my creative prerogatives, while also maintaining its underlying spirit of truthfulness. This is on the opposite spectrum to the approach used by Alecky Blythe, for example, who reproduces the words exactly the way in which they were first spoken. This iterative approach extends to performance where the actresses replicate original speech patterns while performing by using recording devices.

comprised of bits of dialogue (one or two lines) or into larger paragraphs. The new document featured sixty pages of usable material without any evident presence of myself as interviewer. From this newly distilled and abstracted material, I created a third document labeled “Monologues” – using theatre parlance – where I titled and numbered each section of text per interviewee.

To further distill this material, I invented a title for each section which remained prominent, while the name of each interviewee was collapsed to just an initial. Using one interviewee’s contributions as an example, the first monologue excerpt for Dennis Dowdall was titled, “D1 – I Hated Them,” and constituted the first of his nine such sections. I repeated this process for each interviewee. I created aggregates with the material in this manner, anticipating when later I would require a repository to create the play’s eventual text and to form fictional and composite characters. I then removed them from the completed “Monologues” document and created an “Individual Character Making” file, where within, each individual had their own separate working section. I adapted and worked with the distilled material from Dennis Dowdall’s interview in a file within called “Monologue Work D.”¹⁶ Once again, I repeated this process for each interviewee. I then printed and physically cut out the sections of distilled text with

¹⁶As a traceable result in this instance, “D1 – I Hated Them,” I later shaped to form a significant speech (almost verbatim word to word) for BILLY near the end of Act One see *A Man and His Home* – (Act 1, Scene 18, A-297). It constitutes the character’s ‘aria’ and climax for that section of the play where BILLY breaks down and expresses his frustration and anger at the close of the 1958 strike. It serves as a precursor to his death and significant (painful) memory for his daughter LAURIE, the play’s main character. In this version I converted this text into a dialogue between father and daughter. “D’s” text also featured prominently in the last scene of the first act *A Man and His Home Revisited From a Coffee Shop*. – (Act 1, Scene 19, A-300). Throughout the piece, D’s anecdotes and meaningful pieces of text are influential in many instances. In terms of main characters, “D” contributes to the composite creations for GUY, BILLY and LARRY. This is also true for several minor characters, especially JAKE and ALBERT from the aforementioned coffee shop scene at the end of Act One. Each interviewee contributed text, monologues, anecdotal ideas and they also served as inspiration for the creation of the play’s characters.

scissors. My process took the form of actively shaping the play using cut-up sections of text.¹⁷

Simultaneously, I started a “Scene” file as another point of departure that coincided with my text and character work. The goal was to improvise my own theatrical exploration workshop using some instances, anecdotes or characters that I discovered while distilling the interview material. I noted in my journal that this was “fun” as compared to the very mechanical process of extracting verbatim text discussed above. Creativity was the rule, and I did not know where it was leading me. I experimented with how these elements could play out in a fictional scenario. Here is where the seeds of the theatrical narrative were formed. A salient example of this is *A Child Eavesdrops* (Act 1, Scene 13, A-285), a scene that is prominently featured in the final version of the play.¹⁸ This particular anecdote transferred quite readily to a theatrical and fictional scenario. This fascination with the adult world, particularly during the 1958 strike was echoed by several of my interviewees. With the hope of channeling this perspective through the play, I transcribed this scenario and accompanying details to the stage. By the end of the process there were twenty such separately titled scene experiments. Each was informed by the process of distilling the text into bits or larger monologues. Not all of them made it beyond the first draft that was completed in January 2017, even though they were thematically relevant.

In Act One, LAURIE travels back in time through the recesses of her own memories, which are fragmented and incomplete. These memories intersect, collide and

¹⁷ I first experimented with a form of this “cut-up” technique of writing during a summer intensive with Calgary’s *One Yellow Rabbit* in the summer of 2004. The OYR facilitators credited their inspiration for this method (with its own tradition) to writer William S. Burroughs.

¹⁸ LAURIE eavesdrops to find out what the adults are talking about downstairs during a strike.

dovetail with memories from BILLY, and ROSE, as each character takes different turns at controlling the narrative. They frequently contest each other's positions through banter, and each have an opportunity to set the scene. This was one attempt to reflect and to honour my exchanges with interviewees in their roles as authorities and storytellers during each session. In terms of the script, the intent was for the text, particularly in Act One, to evoke a presentational style with several instances where characters speak in the form of direct address. The theme of inter-generational exchange is prominent throughout the play, particularly regarding the experiences of strikes. The emotional texture, conflicting tensions and temperature of these anecdotes, laced with vulnerability and resilience, underpins the scene work, particularly in Act Two. These characteristically divisive experiences serve as trials of self-worth and agency for characters in the play, as they have for many Sudburians.

Each scene was numbered and titled, episodically, in the final version of the script. Initially, I wanted these titles to appear on our makeshift projection screen so as to help achieve the Brechtian technique of alienating the audience emotionally in some instances, and, thereby augmenting their level of intellectual engagement.¹⁹ I rejected this approach after the workshops, as much of the staging, documentary elements, as well as the constant switching between numerous characters and episodic composition of the piece, already quite explicitly revealed the theatrical mechanisms at work. There was never any doubt that the audience was, in fact, watching a play. I also wanted to

¹⁹ Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, edited by John Willett (Hill and Wang, 1966), 71 and 78. I was always interested in Brecht's Epic theatrical aesthetic for its dialectical emphasis. One of its central tenets is the Alienation effect (also referred to as *Verfremdungseffekt*). It applied the use of techniques that were intended to distance the audience emotionally during the play by exposing the artificial nature of the theatrical performance. Brecht intended this as an antidote to the prevalent Aristotelian dramatic form that relied on mimesis and aimed to achieve Catharsis, which he deemed 'hypnotic,' coercive and antithetical for an audience to take a critical attitude.

encourage and foster as much of an emotional connection between the audience and the play as possible for my purposes in creating a work of public history.²⁰

ACT ONE

In the opening look during *The Kitchen Table* (Act 1, Scene 1, A-265), it was important for me to establish the kitchen table as a central image for the world of the play.²¹ To honour interviewee contributions, I wanted this play to reflect this familial emphasis. This was not going to be a story centred solely around union politics and labour strife. These political aspects, although significant for a story about strikes, and present to some extent throughout the play, were secondary to matters directly affecting the home. Early workshop audiences approved of this thematic choice and, as a result, the table emerged as a central image within the scripting and then the eventual staging of this narrative. For example, several interviewees spoke of playing cards at the kitchen table and this activity had a very Northern Ontario feel for me, having grown up in the region. LAURIE is also clearly seeing the cards that were metaphorically dealt to her. The electricity to her house has already been disconnected. We find out—at the end of the play—that she is losing her home, and that her husband is leaving town for work. This pivotal exchange between husband and wife has occurred at the kitchen table, a circumstance reported by workshop audiences, performers, and interviewees. The fact that she was playing solitaire is also significant, in terms of how interviewees spoke about the isolation experienced by women in mining families.

²⁰ While I valued and wanted to utilize some of Brecht's alienation techniques to foster my audience's intellectual engagement with the historical material, I also wanted to encourage their emotional and empathetic connection to the characters and subjects within this historical play.

²¹ See "Remembered Histories," 45 and "Performance and Production," 165 about the significance of the kitchen table at various intervals for this project.

Although I rarely offered stage directions in the script, this scene was an exception. It was also important, in these opening moments, for me to introduce the convention of hearing the audio recorded voices of interviewees, as part of this theatricalized method of storytelling.²² I wanted this to be the first voice our audience encountered (aside from music in the preshow playlist) at the start of the play. I also introduced the concept and first instance of using projections, as well as the general look and feel to the playing area, in terms of situating the audience as part of the performance, and in close proximity to the table.

As indicated here in the stage directions, an audio clip adapted from Carol Mulligan's interview ending in "we are always connected to what's under our feet," was used near the top of the show for the final production.²³ Significantly, it replaced a very popular audio clip from the standpoint of our workshop audiences, one in which Mick Lowe diagnoses Sudburians with a form of collective PTSD, as a result of conflicts stemming from strikes and intra-union rivalries.²⁴ In one sense, this previous excerpt—which I used for both workshops—was a perfect prelude for the play. In it, Mick spoke about the need for catharsis in order to address the cumulative and collective trauma suffered by members of this community. Ultimately, I chose Carol Mulligan's voice for dramaturgical reasons, as I wanted a woman's voice at the beginning the play. This

²² See "Performer and Production," 181.

²³ Carol Mulligan, interview by the author, Sudbury, August 2017. For its appearance as an audio cue in the script see Appendix A, 266 (QLAB 2).

²⁴ Mick Lowe, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017. The initial clip was adapted from his testimony as follows: "This community ... I don't think...I know most people don't know this ... understand it... This community was exposed to extreme stress in 58' and the raids particularly. This entire community was traumatized...Post Traumatic Stress Disorder... So, I think that's important. That Sudburians know they were exposed to this extreme stress and it affected them psychologically, whether they know it or not. It happened and it rippled and resonated for decades after, and to some degree it's still present, its latent, even now. That's why what you're doing can be quite cathartic, actually could help to heal."

choice reflected my effort to make this more LAURIE's story, and an exploration of gendered experiences. It also articulates the play's thematic through-line, something that is echoed frequently through LAURIE, who repeats Carol's line throughout the script. In the end, I also felt the need to emphasize the elements of community bonding and solidarity as opposed to the equally valid concept of collective trauma.

See the Cards (Act 1, Scene 2, A-266) was intended to depict LAURIE's present, in an exact moment that would be mirrored at the end of the play during *Late One Evening Before the Move* (Act 2, Scene 9, A-329). The journey through her own memories starts here, where it eventually returns, as a bookend for the piece at the end of the show. The idea was to travel there and back again. In terms of time travel, LAURIE initially began her journey by reading a letter from her father, through which, he reminded her, that "we are always connected to what's under our feet." For narrative clarity and dramaturgical purposes, I replaced the transportive power of this letter, consistent in the workshop script versions, with BILLY's initials— which he carved into the kitchen table—as indicated here in the production script. She remembered when her father said these words, and then recalled the act of him carving their initials into the table.²⁵ This was an action that the actor could demonstrate during the performance. I wanted to simplify this thread in the script, by linking LAURIE's memories to her father's table. As she was already sitting there, I asked myself, why complicate the action by having her pull out a letter? Incorporating this letter through the piece, both in terms of the narrative and its staging, although a lovely idea, was overly complicated. Another advantage to removing the letter was that she could now deliver this message free from

²⁵ *Daddy's Little Girl* (Act 1, Scene 6, A-271) The actor was directed to "carve" both sets of initials into the table during this scene that occurs later in the play as a moment from LAURIE's past.

the page, by directly addressing the audience. These are her words as she remembers them, rather than BILLY, speaking through the device of a letter. Getting LAURIE right, for me, meant making dramaturgical choices that would help me to tell her story and, ensuring that the audience recognized her narrative centrality as well.

A common thread that ran through the interviews was the selective manner in which people remembered significant events from their lives. In the initial stages of reviewing the transcripts, I noted that Essie Byrne's narrative might serve as a good track to base a major character for the memory play, and would be one effective way to demonstrate this notion of optimistic remembering. In *Mother and Daughter* (Act 1, Scene 3, A-267), LAURIE first introduces her mother so that the audience can meet her. In the scene, ROSE recounts an idealized version of her life married to an INCO miner, as well as some cherished details from their home, with glasses coloured as her namesake suggests. LAURIE resists her mother's remembrances of their lives. Much of ROSE's text was adapted from Essie Byrne's testimony, but similarly patterned threads existed in others. It is a relatively short scene and is also the first time the audience meets this matriarchal figure. I decided to have her speak Essie's words regarding "not changing a thing about her life," slightly adapted, and without the "ups and downs," a change I made leading up to the final production.²⁶ I hoped that when the audience later learns more about ROSE's story—including her trials as a miner's wife, or challenges and consequences of being active during the 1958 strike—that these words would resonate as sentimental.

²⁶ Essie Byrne, interview with the author, Sudbury, July 2017. In the interview she emphasized that she wished "to have the same life as [she] had [and that there] wouldn't be a thing I would change in what I had there [...] ... course we had a few 'ups and downs' but who doesn't?" See "Remembered Histories," 76.

I wanted to convey a sense of fragility and unpredictability to memory in this piece, something that was also demonstrated by interviewees. Who is remembering? Is this LAURIE's memory of ROSE, or the latter's version of selective remembering? I wanted this to feel uncanny. Also, I wanted the audience to experience these memories in layers. After attending the second workshop, Lara Bradley wrote that, "the idea of LAURIE remembering her parents at first [,] almost as stereotypes [,] cleaned up less complicated version of themselves—that bit of fun really appealed to me."²⁷ When we later meet BILLY, we have an equally "cleaned up less complicated" version, and as both characters developed and reappeared in memories throughout the piece, their respective complexities and nuances as real people began to emerge. At the tail end of this scene, we even see ROSE resisting how her daughter is "remembering" her. I attempted to create tension through ROSE's use language, as she explicitly contests LAURIE's refutation of her memory with the line, "It's true if I say it's true. Now why would you say otherwise?" I also decided to have LAURIE speak through an aside and in direct address to the audience as a means to instill the concept of multiple versions of remembering. ROSE's and LAURIE's memories dovetail, collide, and conflict, but there is also a sense of them having an exchange in this scene. They come together as they enthusiastically relive and remember their kitchen table.

I wanted to convey the sense—as the play moved from scene to scene—that the character's memories were linked, and that they could move the play with fluidity from one scene to the next. LAURIE reflects upon Creighton miners in *Lively* (Act 1, Scene 4, A-270), and her thoughts turn to her father. The last line, "Still, whenever I smell smoke,

²⁷ Lara Bradley, email to author, Sudbury, 19 October 2018.

I think of my dad,” was intended to invoke the next scene where the audience first meets BILLY. We saw this as an opportunity, as per an individual’s request during the Legion workshop, to explore how the actors could interact with the real voices of the interviewees.²⁸ LAURIE’s line was directly lifted from Jan Heppner’s testimony, and we played it as an audio clip, to echo the actress, after having spoken the text. This was one instance where we tried to infuse the show with real voices.²⁹ It also helped set the tone with the scene transition moving from *Lively* and into memories with LAURIE’s father in *Daddy’s Little Girl* (Act 1, Scene 6, A-271).

The material for *Lively* was adapted from some of Jan Heppner’s testimony regarding her childhood memories, and serves as typical example how much of the play was developed.³⁰ It included text from a letter provided by Jan after her interview, that was written by her mother to her aunt in 1951.³¹ This firsthand description of the fledgling town of Lively became quite lucid when delivered as theatrical material. I felt like it was describing a sense of newness and wonder that could be readily harnessed by a child. It also provides a *Lively* glimpse of the *present*, from the past.

The necessity of telling LAURIE’s story required that I needed to be selective in terms of the narrative. The line, “Any of you would paint a different picture I’m sure,” was a consistent fixture in this section throughout each draft of the script. During the workshops and final production, I directed the actress to step out of the act of describing her memories of living in her hometown of Lively, and to look and speak the lines

²⁸ Name Unknown, workshop discussion, Sudbury, 15 October 2018.

²⁹ See Appendix A, 269 (QLAB 8).

³⁰ Jan Heppner, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

³¹ ‘Netta’ Heppner, letter to her sister, 14 July 1951. Jan Heppner gave me a letter her mother wrote. See Appendix D, 352.

directly to the entire audience. My idea was that she needed to take the time to recognize everyone, while tracking both audience banks. I was conscious that, by choosing Lively as her hometown, I was also *not* selecting the many other small towns in the Sudbury area. My interviews showed that living, working, and striking in Sudbury were subjective experiences for people. These perspectives and stories could not all be accounted for in the play. This line was my attempt to acknowledge this subjectivity, as well as the fact that LAURIE's is just one representation among countless experiences. It speaks to issues of contested memory, argument and perspective, which were intended points of dialogue for this public history project.

Audience members were very helpful with their feedback throughout both workshop processes. In this particular instance, one woman objected during the Legion talkback, to the selection of Lively where, "lots of people weren't living in [those] kind of houses." She thought instead, that the family should come from the town of Creighton. For her, this small town, no longer in existence, "was awful" in the 1950s and—according to her—did not have "plumbing, insulation, running water and showers." She further expressed that "people hearing this for the first time would think it was good," and that, by selecting this location for LAURIE's background, "... you're describing a high middle-class house."³² Her criticisms were fruitful for the ongoing discussion regarding the definition of community boundaries, authenticity and ownership of the story. I recall her telling me her vision for the story, as did many other people following the staged readings. I could see Jan Heppner, whose personal experience was reflected in the scene, remain silent as the woman advocated for these changes. Was her experience

³² Name Unknown, workshop discussion, Sudbury, 15 October 2018.

any more or less valid? Interviewees had certainly shared experiences of depravity and poverty and, in some instances, I tried, through several intervals of scripts, to include these aspects. Ultimately, I felt that the prospect of poverty was more emotionally affective than actual depictions of impoverished circumstances. Dramaturgically, this will be demonstrated throughout this analysis, where the needs and function of the play *as a play*, influenced the decisions pertaining to the historical and documentary material.³³ Moreover, I wanted the play to encourage people to come forward and to contribute their stories, especially where they felt that aspects were missing. It was my hope that the final production would encourage similar feedback and participation.

Daddy's Little Girl (Act 1, Scene 6, A-271) is where the audience is first introduced to BILLY. The father was such a 'larger than life,' prominent, and volatile figure from the interviews. Interviewees frequently reminisced about their departed fathers and held them in very high esteem. Some interviewees recalled that they often dreamt of their fathers. Stephen Heiti remembered having a nightmare about his father's death, at the same time it was happening.³⁴ As a result, LAURIE recounts a nightmare about her father's death, when we meet her as an adult in *My Dad and My Husband* (Act 2, Scene 1, A-302). This severed connection fundamentally affected their lives and is a major thematic trend from the interviews. In the world of the play, BILLY's death is a significant event from LAURIE's childhood. She strives to seek him out as she searches her memories for answers regarding her own family's predicament during the 1978-79 strike. At the beginning of the play, she falls asleep exhausted, which triggers a dream

³³ For example, in early drafts of the script, LAURIE and her mother move to Minnow Lake after BILLY's death. This was supported by interview material and was an opportunity to have other places represented in the script. Ultimately, this was cut in order to simplify the theatrical narrative.

³⁴ Stephen Heiti, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

sequence. She searches through her past experiences and memories while dreaming.

Daddy's Little Girl (Act 1, Scene 6, A-271) depicts the memory of when BILLY carves their two sets of initials into the kitchen table, and reassures her that “we are always connected to what’s under our feet.”

Using a similar convention to when LAURIE first encountered ROSE in *Mother and Daughter* (Act 1, Scene 3, A-267), BILLY contests some of the details from his daughter’s memory. I wanted this scene to function both as a memory and as an encounter. BILLY’s agency allows him to question why he is wearing plaid and smoking a pipe. Instead, he does not recognize the plaid jacket and reminds LAURIE that he smokes cigarettes. I wanted the portrayal of memories to be contested and malleable. The issue of the stereotypical miner, typically wearing a plaid work shirt, was a source for debate in the interviews and talkbacks. I felt that this was one opportunity to explore this tension through the theatrical narrative, as there was some resistance to depicting characters who emulated this stereotype.³⁵ In this case, Jan Heppner recalled her father with the plaid jacket, sitting on their porch, and I used this description as verbatim for LAURIE to first describe BILLY in the previous scene.³⁶ When he enters wearing the actual plaid jacket in this scene, I had an opportunity to problematize this depiction. BILLY explicitly casts doubt as to the authenticity of this look, for him at least. Heppner’s depiction is still authentic, just as much as BILLY or later GUY *not* wearing the plaid is a plausible look.

LAURIE’s dream takes her deeper through a web of memories throughout Act One. ROSE takes over during *Husband and Wife* (Act 1, Scene 8, A-277) from BILLY

³⁵ Linda George, interview by the author, Sudbury, October 2017.

³⁶ Heppner, interview.

through her act of remembering, just as BILLY had done in the previous scene *Tales From an Angry Young Man* (Act 1, Scene 7, A-273) from LAURIE. This version of ROSE is more in focus as compared to the “cleaned up less complicated” version of her that we encountered previously. As BILLY indicated at the end of the previous scene, in text meant to signal the transition, “But you don’t know her as I do.” We meet ROSE, as seen through her husband’s eyes, which could well be buried in the recesses of LAURIE’s memories. With this new focus we see ROSE, as described by an individual after the second workshop, with “her strength and spit fire ways [that] really came through.”³⁷ As a playwright, I found it interesting if this would turn out to be a significant reveal, maybe even a surprising layer. If this were simply BILLY’s story or LAURIE’s, we may never have known the power and strength of ROSE. As she exercises more agency over the storytelling in this scene, we begin to learn about her own story as both part of and distinct from her marriage with BILLY. This is highlighted through the couple’s banter, where they agree, and in how they contest each other’s versions of events. I thought this could address the prevalent dynamic of when we learn about men in stories, great or ordinary, when there is always a woman in the background, at his side. I always find myself asking ‘what is her story?’

A Strike (Act 1, Scene 9, A-280) initiates a sequence of scenes that depict memories linked to the 1958 strike through to the end of Act One. These appear sporadic and fragmented, but this strike’s impact on LAURIE’s family is pivotal. In *A Strike*, BILLY fixates on the “good times,” in a similar manner as had the earlier version of his wife in *Mother and Daughter* (Act 1, Scene 3, A-267). ROSE contests BILLY’s attempt

³⁷ Bradley, email to author.

to reminisce, and she interrupts his moment of nostalgia for those better times. She turns the storytelling in the scene to focus on the 1958 strike, a pivotal event both historically, as well as in terms of the narrative. The interviews depicted strikes as being antithetical to stretches of security for men and women. At the end of the scene, BILLY and ROSE are describing the mood in the town, and the sparsity of necessities—including food.

A Child Eavesdrops (Act 1, Scene 13, A-285), is one of the few scenes, featured in the final version of the play, that did not undergo many edits. This particular anecdote, word for word, doubled quite well, as a fit within this theatrical and fictional scenario. From her interview, Jan Heppner expressed excitement and awe at the anger demonstrated by adults down in the basement during the 1958 strike. She recounted how she would tiptoe, sneak, and eavesdrop, when she was supposed to be in bed. A child's fascination with the adult world, particularly during the 1958 strike, was echoed by several of my interviewees. With the hope of channelling this perspective through the play, I transcribed this scenario, and accompanying details, directly to the page. A younger LAURIE, a composite of Jan Heppner and Laurie McGauley in the play, crawls out of bed and proceeds to recall what she hears, as she gets closer to the voices and the noises. Jan Heppner's memories, depicted within this sequence, transferred seamlessly to the stage, as young LAURIE acts as a witness and relays her discoveries to the audience instead of the tape recorder. I sent Jan a copy of this scene during its development, which was another case where I attempted to facilitate the notion of "feeding back."³⁸ She did not provide feedback on any specifics pertaining to the scene, but she, nonetheless, "found it to be really cool to see my own words written in a play. You really captured the

³⁸ Brown, ed., *Verbatim*, 4.

feeling of fear that I experienced as a girl. The table banging, yelling, and swearing was perfectly captured.”³⁹ Along with this correspondence, she sent me two photographs, one of her family’s kitchen in 1957, as well as a picture of the house in Lively from the outside. We ended up using these pictures as projections in the show.⁴⁰

Matthew Heiti, in his capacity as one of the piece’s dramaturges, commented after the first workshop about the “active immediacy to that kind of storytelling.”⁴¹ This sequence was inspired by Brecht’s “street scene” that he applied as a basic model for his epic theatre.⁴² I used a “natural” incident of an angry meeting in her parents’ house, and anointed LAURIE as an eyewitness, someone who is in the act of showing the audience what she perceived from the commotion downstairs. There were many different styles and methods that I attempted, throughout the process, and this one was consistently effective throughout the workshops. I tried this approach several times, especially in the first act.

This was also an opportunity to include instances of the anger and violence that are typically associated with strikes, without actually including these aspects in too blatant or obvious a manner. Cars exploding, fighting, and acts of sabotage were frequently recounted by interviewees. They are familiar tropes in the storied canon of strikes in Sudbury, and I wanted these instances to be mentioned yet remain peripheral to the main action of the play. I had a similar feeling about the inclusion of swearing as vernacular. While most of my interviewees did not excessively curse, many of them described this as typical of masculine behaviour, especially those who worked in the

³⁹ Jan Heppner, Facebook Messenger, 5 May 2018.

⁴⁰ For Jan’s images “Lively House,” and “Lively Kitchen,” see Appendix A, 333 (QLAB 4 and 5).

⁴¹ Matthew Heiti, interview by the author, Sudbury, May 2018.

⁴² Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, 121.

mining industry.⁴³ Instead, I wanted to have LAURIE reflect on the excessive amount of multilingual swearing without inundating the play with curse words. I did not feel like this was appropriate for my prospective audiences, nor did it reflect the actual words from the interviews. It was also important for LAURIE, as a child, not to be inculcated by the politics of her parents. She “thinks” the Steelworkers are the “bad guys,” and had yet to formulate her position with regards to INCO, which she will do later in the play. This was an attempt to distance the character from holding specific loyalties, as much as it was a type of generational commentary about how these circumstances might be viewed through the eyes of a child.

Most of *Kitchen Table Bandages* (Act 1, Scene 14, A-287) was directly adapted from a pre-recorded interview with Millie McQuaid, who was married with a young family during the 1958 strike.⁴⁴ She provided firsthand experience of what the strike was like, both in the home, and as an active member of the Mine Mill Ladies’ Auxiliary Local #117. Through her words, which form the basis for *Kitchen Table Bandages* and *Phone Calls* (Act 1 Scene 16, A-291), ROSE can impart the mindset of one woman and the challenges that she and other women faced. The audience learns in this scene that ROSE has injured her hand, and the implication is that she has punched somebody. I wanted to play on a stereotypical assumption that the men were the ones doing the fighting, hitting, and swearing, as they are more often associated with violent behaviour. Interviewees told stories about women who were “very tough too” and, more importantly, were not overshadowed in this regard by men.⁴⁵ As a bit of a reveal, we learn that the table was her

⁴³ See “Remembered Histories,” 56.

⁴⁴ Millie McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, October 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

⁴⁵ McGauley, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

victim instead of a person. BILLY also demonstrates some tenderness towards ROSE, as he is caring for her injured hand, while she speaks to the audience from the table.

A particular feature that I attempted to preserve from the testimony, was McQuaid's manner of speaking. In her interview with Jim Tester, she talked with such a degree of passion and exasperation in some instances. She would jump from one thought to the next, as if she were still searching for that worthy purpose underpinning her past efforts to get involved during the strike. I tried to indicate these instances of searching through the use of EM dashes and ellipses. Quite naturally, while she was describing families in great difficulty, and how the strike enabled the women to organize, she blurted out that the women "NEVER HAD ANY EXPERIENCE IN THAT WAY."⁴⁶ As a playwright, I decided to keep this emphasis, and I capitalized the line as a clue for the actor. I hoped to also preserve Millie's energy and unlock her emotions for the performance. These efforts to transpose the speaking patterns of interviewees had mixed results. Jenny Hazelton studied the actual interviews during the workshop process and attempted to match speaking patterns, while the others did not. By the final production, I was less concerned with matching the original speaker.⁴⁷

There is also a sense of lineage and continuity that is communicated through *Kitchen Table Bandages* (Act 1, Scene 14, A-287). I was struck when Millie likened union men to "religious creatures" who were trying to convert the younger ranks of workers. She described the role that her father played in educating her husband, Tom, about "what to do" as a unionist. The addition of ROSE's father extends the play deeper into Sudbury's past, with roots that preceded BILLY's arrival as described earlier in

⁴⁶ McQuaid, interview by Tester.

⁴⁷ I tried this approach in a few sections as experiments.

Tales From An Angry Young Man (Act 1, Scene 7, A-273). I wanted to reinforce the idea that the story begins long before what transpires in the play. My interviewees often spoke of older people, and what they gained from these individuals, in terms of knowledge and experience. I wanted to also emphasize aspects such as fluidity, continuity and generational exchange, and provide a counterpoint to the equally valid conception of strikes as being compartmentalized, and as isolated events.

Conversely, while upholding the sense of continuity that is inherent to Sudbury's labour story, Millie's perspective allowed me to make a significant comparison between women of two different generations. One of my points of departure for the project was to compare the experiences of women during the 1958 strike with those from 1978. I decided that I could compare and contrast mother and daughter (ROSE with LAURIE respectively, at the same age), and had an abundance of interview material that pertained to the latter. Using Millie's words, ones that were shared in an interview conducted closer to the 1958 strike than some of mine in relation to that of 1978, allows ROSE to speak with a level of plausible authenticity in her present.⁴⁸ In this scene and elsewhere, the pre-recorded interviews such as Millie McQuaid and Pearl Chytuk enable the character of ROSE to describe and relive her motivations for getting involved in the strike, as well as to convey the challenges that were faced, and her immediate fears during that experience.

In *Kitchen Table Bandages*, ROSE describes several significant aspects about her experiences, as a woman involved during a strike, that will be echoed through her daughter's experiences later in the play. First, she acknowledges how they were

⁴⁸ Millie's interview with Jim Tester was approximately twenty years removed from the 1958 INCO strike, as compared to my interviewees who recollected events from the 1978 INCO strike after approximately forty years.

unprepared when the strike occurred. This sense of being caught off guard was universally accurate throughout the postwar period, according to the historical material and interviews. Second, she indicates that her main concern, and her reason for getting involved, is for her husband's safety, and the conditions at his place of work. She also indicates that, as an incentive for her being active, she can be part of her husband's world outside of the home. The nature of this connection between husband and wife, which was a consistent discussion point throughout the interviews, is a key part of this story. In both strikes, subjectively, marital bonds were tested. Third, ROSE speaks about how being connected with other women is a positive experience. The extent to which women felt isolated from each other was also frequently alluded to in the interviews, and this sense of isolation was heightened during strikes. The ideas that are introduced by ROSE in this scene help to form the basis of an ongoing theatrical exploration, and generational comparison of the experiences of women during different strikes. This focus continues over the next few scenes and, positions the audience to confront several specific circumstances and situations, as ROSE is predominantly in control of the memory sequence for the next few scenes.

No More Turkeys (Act 1, Scene 15, A-288) was another instance of my creative experimentation with the interview and historical material. The idea and inspiration for it comes from an essay, written by Jim Tester, entitled, "Pepper Smith would have told them where to shove it."⁴⁹ In a piece designed to advocate for poorly pensioned widows, he describes an incident in the 1950s, when Christmas turkeys were being handed out to employees. This traditional occurrence was intended to be fair but according to Tester,

⁴⁹ Jim Tester. *Son of a Working Man* (Sudbury: Laurentian Publishing Ltd., 1994), 65.

“[t]he practice was different.” Due to a “catch-as-catch-can basis” of distribution, the process was uneven and some missed out on getting a turkey.⁵⁰ Pepper Smith, in Tester’s story, was irate at this treatment, and felt that he deserved better after having worked for years and having paid his dues.

I felt that this was a recognizable and iconic situation where I could explore inherent tensions that people experienced during the 1958 INCO strike, and in others that followed. I could also pit characters against one another, people who would normally be on the same side. Significantly, I wanted to put working-class masculinities under the microscope, especially the tensions experienced by breadwinners during strikes. I borrowed specific elements from Tester’s narrative, such as the annual tradition of handing out Christmas turkeys, the disgruntled unionist and equally frustrated worker tasked with distributing the goods, the idea of the confrontation, and the resulting frustration and lack of resolution at the incident’s conclusion.

The scene begins when ROSE is working at the hall, helping to distribute donations and goods to striking workers and their families. It is an exchange of dialogue between longtime friends. This aspect was key, as tensions during strikes put pressure on friendships and between family members. The resulting frustrations were often directed towards spouses, family members and friends as opposed to the company. Simply, GERARD as a breadwinner, wants a turkey, and ROSE, who is volunteering at the union hall to help distribute strike relief and goods, does not have one to offer him. To intensify the issue, ROSE reveals that her family was able to acquire a turkey before the supply ran out. The idea was to facilitate a frustrating situation for GERARD who, because of the

⁵⁰ Tester. *Son of a Working Man*, 65.

strike, is unable to take care of his family. ROSE *can* provide for hers and, is in a position to help do the same for GERARD, who is now reliant upon a woman. ROSE also has to navigate his bruised sense of masculinity, a frustration she experiences with her own husband at home.

The scene also exposes the tension between those viewed to be in “need,” versus people who were perceived to have taken advantage of strike assistance through “greed,” that was very evident from the interviews. This theme was already explored in the play, as both ROSE and BILLY, in other scenes, comment on both extremes of poverty and exploitation. I chose this combination of characters because I wanted both perspectives to be “right.” Whereas a similar tension was previously explored through BILLY and BEN in *Two Men Search Another Man’s House* (Act 1, Scene 11, A-282), when the latter was following his union’s distribution policies, this scene is more personal. There is an added layer of desperation, with the pressures of the holidays on families, as well as an element that touches on an individual’s primal need for survival.

I heeded some sage advice from playwright Colleen Murphy, during her workshop about the craft, when she recommended using a dynamic of “right versus right,” as opposed to “right versus wrong,” when creating drama.⁵¹ I felt that this approach was both more compelling and less didactic. This scene provoked significant discussions with the actors, and from workshop audiences, throughout the process. It was even recorded, as part of a taped interview, for a local CBC radio morning show.⁵² The

⁵¹ Colleen Murphy, “Regional Women Lead Playwriting Master Class” (masterclass, Playsmelter, *Pat the Dog Theatre Creation*, Sudbury, ON, 3 May 2019).

⁵² Rick Duthie, “History student writes play about mining strikes in Sudbury as part of his thesis,” interview by Markus Schwabe, *Morning North*, October 15, 2018. <https://www.cbc.ca/listen/shows/morning-north/segment/15614947>.

process of developing this scene was ongoing and fruitful for the project, in terms of exploring the power and role of empathy used in theatre and in historical projects.

On the subject of empathy, one woman applauded this aspect following the Legion workshop, when she said that the antagonism shown in the play between the rank and file, and their union representatives, was an effective choice. Ultimately, she felt that this could have gone further, and that a more empathetic depiction of GERARD should be explored.⁵³ In earlier drafts, including both workshops, the character storms out of the scene, and dumps his coffee on the way out. According to that audience member, he came across as a bit harsh. Some people agreed with her, and some did not, preferring to empathize with the fact that he had every right to be angry, and that sometimes that anger is justifiable, although unfortunately, as in this case, directed towards friends. She appreciated, as did others, my attempts at complicating a story that frequently depicts an oversimplified “Us versus Them” dynamic. I softened his edge during edits leading up to the production draft. I removed some of the barbs exchanged between ROSE and GERARD, and highlighted more aspects of their friendship. I decided to retain, tried to sharpen, and highlight those moments of confrontation. In terms of staging, both actors physicalized this action, and explicitly moved towards each other at centre stage. GERARD now exits the scene with his coffee intact, and ROSE is left alone, more in a stage of contemplation, rather than in one of frustration.

Each character in the play is a unionist per se, and only here, in this scene, through GERARD’s assertions, does the audience become privy to accusations levied at the union, such as corruption, mismanagement, negligence and favouritism. These

⁵³ Name Unknown, workshop audience member, discussion facilitated by the author, Sudbury, 15 October 2018.

accusations from unionists, as well as from others, are prevalent in my interviews. There were several instances when people expressed how they were disappointed by the promises made to them by union leaders at the outset of strikes, and how their stories predictably shifted when it came time to ratify a bad contract. Aside from GERARD's, these critical voices are virtually nonexistent in the play. I regret that I was unable to include these dissenting points of view from within the whole community, in the play, as I could not fit them dramaturgically into LAURIE's story.

Through *Phone Calls* (Act 1, Scene 16, A-291), I wanted to explore a specific aspect of what families, and especially women, experienced in their homes during a strike. Once again, mostly through the words of Millie McQuaid, ROSE speaks about her difficulty in distinguishing between people who needed help, as opposed to union members who were trying to take advantage of strike relief. She also talks about the prevalence of threatening phone calls. This is the first of three scenes that feature the telephone, and its ubiquitous role within the household is reflected in the set design.⁵⁴ It is one thing to have ROSE (re)describe her fear, intimidation and powerlessness, while receiving these phone calls, but it is quite another to explore and attempt to depict what this experience felt like.

I revisited the use of Brecht's "Street Scene" concept as I had previously in *A Child Eavesdrops* (Act 1, Scene 13, A-285), when LAURIE depicted the noisy adults, downstairs. BILLY becomes the "eyewitness," to narrate and to re(play) this "natural" occurrence of when ROSE receives a threatening phone call.⁵⁵ Significantly, BILLY is

⁵⁴ See "Performance and Production," 167.

⁵⁵ Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, 121. The idea is that BILLY becomes the witness as ROSE is the scene's object.

absent from the scene, and can thereby tell the story, set the tone, and perform the other voices, so that ROSE can be the primary object of focus. It was intended to be as if he was invoking each telephone ring. The scene occurs at night and, later as director, ensured that the rotary phone was extra loud and jarring to the ear. LAURIE is awakened, as is the baby, who cries. ROSE is thus awakened and is forced to travel quite the distance to answer the phone, which is an anxious task from the start. In addition to her children having been awakened, her husband is also away. In accordance with the “rule of three,” ROSE went through this sequence three times.⁵⁶ The tension increased with each time the telephone rings in the middle of this night. I decided on having the second and third calls come from BILLY. This was an opportunity for humour, as well as the fact that I wanted to soften the scene’s conclusion. I felt that the point was communicated, and that there was no need to repeat the threatening call.

The Arena (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294) was my attempt to tackle a contested historical event when, according to Mine Millers such as Millie McQuaid and Jim Tester, the arena rally was a hoax, and ROSE and BILLY relay that point of view throughout this scene.⁵⁷ Without directly subscribing to any historical conspiracy theories that involved the city’s mayor, Sudbury’s elite, the local Catholic Church, United Steelworkers, and INCO — all of which are part of this story — I deliberately used this contrary, yet plausible, point of view because it was an authentic position from that time and chose to present it through ROSE and BILLY.⁵⁸ Significantly, nobody I spoke with in the interviews held this perception. I had a difficult time reconciling the prevailing narrative,

⁵⁶ My comedic colleagues always emphasize the rule of three. Three rings seemed to be the best choice for the scene.

⁵⁷ See “Remembered Histories,” 32.

⁵⁸ These plausible local conspiracy theories reflect the pro-Mine Mill 598 position from the 1950s.

with the accounts from men and women who directly experienced this event. I decided to facilitate a forum, using verbatim text, for these viewpoints to have a platform.

While working with verbatim material, in this case, there was an opportunity to shift into a different style of storytelling. As with Tectonic Theatre Project's *The Laramie Project* (2000), I wanted the characters, during part of this scene, to display a play-by-play depiction of a real-life event.⁵⁹ The scene was written so that the actors could be directed to shift their focus outward and to move throughout the playing space, where they could attempt to make eye contact with as many audience members as possible. I wanted to challenge the audience with this perspective and to enable dialogue about how memory involving this incident had shifted. This is one of two scenes where characters in the play directly implore the audience, and present their polemics. This form of direct address differs stylistically from other scenes in the play, as ROSE and BILLY serve mainly as vessels for the description of the infamous arena rally. They are also demonstrating their solidarity to each other, an instance of unity within the marriage, which I hoped to mirror and contrast with LAURIE and GUY, in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out* (Act 2, Scene 7, A-322) in the second act.

As the playwright, this was my second attempt at staging this arena scene. It is such a significant event in Sudbury's labour story that I felt it had to be addressed, particularly in this exploration of living, working, and striking. For another project, I attempted to stage the actual incident, as part of a play, that was exclusively about the 1958 INCO strike.⁶⁰ My earlier approach would not work for this play. As I look ahead to

⁵⁹ Moises Kaufman and the members of Tectonic Theatre Project, *The Laramie Project* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001).

⁶⁰ Rick Duthie, *What Struck in '58*, Public workshop presentation, "PlaySmelter," reading series of new plays, presented by 'Pat The Dog' Theatre Creation (Sudbury, Ontario, May 2013).

future drafts of this script, this scene is on my list of required edits. Unlike the *Laramie Project*, which pertains to a community's struggle to come to terms with, and to mourn, a recent horrific incident, my play is insular by comparison, as the narrative is structured around one family's experiences of several strikes. Also, *ODS* spans a longer period of time. My attempt at focussing on this one specific event was a challenge in terms of adapting the historical material within this theatrical narrative.

The scene did, however, make visible and audible the tensions that were inherent to strikes in Sudbury, especially in terms of women's experiences. ROSE's struggle with having a voice in this dispute, as well as her frustrations with the limitations of her actual ability to speak persuasively, is a significant part of this story. ROSE is a member of The Ladies' Auxiliary. The notion of women having a voice is such a key theme in this working community's history and is reflected in my interviews, and hence it became a central aspect of the play. I revisit this reality through LAURIE in Act Two during the 1978 strike in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out* (Act 2, Scene 7, A-322). At this point in the script, ROSE is upset because she wanted to accomplish more using her voice at the Sudbury Arena rally. She laments her lack of persuasiveness and in her ability as a speaker. She is disappointed that another woman's voice has superseded her own. She perceives that this woman has been instrumental in dictating public perception of that significant event, when women were accused by some then and later to have "thr[own] their men under the bus."⁶¹ Even a Mrs. Breen, who BILLY labels as "the skyrocket," on whom ROSE's antithesis at the arena rally is based, and was the spokeswoman for the rally, was credited by Jim Tester and Millie McQuaid with that ability to be persuasive

⁶¹ Bryan Murray, interview by the author, June 2017.

and to “speak better.”⁶² However, the men ultimately voted for a contract and decided whether or not to withhold their labour. I wanted to explore this idea of women, their roles and agency of their voices, and how, or if, these aspects changed over time. I wanted the scene, and its twin in the second act, to provoke discussion along these very significant and gendered lines of both history and memory.

A Man and His Home (Act 1, Scene 18, A-297) is a key moment and an emotional climax within the narrative, as LAURIE retakes control of her role as storyteller and moves closest to the heart of her memories. Her search takes her back through a traumatic experience from her childhood, when a group of men threatened the household, attacking it with taunts, rocks, and bottles. Shortly after, she revisits her father’s death, after finally having the opportunity to connect with BILLY, as she seeks answers from within her present predicament. I wanted the scene to evoke the menace and unpredictability of a mob. An adult version of LAURIE, as the “eyewitness,” was able to re(play) this memory, even though she was also present during this event as a child. LAURIE is able to describe the scene, set the tone, speak as the assailants, as well as evoke and expand the storytelling in this section—to move beyond the play’s oft-repeated dynamic of two people speaking with one another. I often asked myself as a playwright, throughout this process, how to write scenes that could suggest crowds of people, especially in terms of how this could be communicated by two actors.

⁶² Millie McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, October 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97. Directly taken from McQuaid’s interview with Tester. The former wished she could have spoken better while the latter labelled Mrs. Breen a skyrocket, presumably from her want of the spotlight. Mrs. Breen was listed as the spokeswoman at the rally in “2000 INCO Miners’ Wives Urge Men Return to Work,” *The Globe and Mail*, December 13, 1958.

A Man and His Home Revisited from a Coffee Shop (Act 1, Scene 19, A-300) is an anomaly in terms of where it sits *vis a vis* time within the world of the play. It takes place closest to our present, and I wanted to use hindsight as a tool to move the play out of LAURIE's past and her memories. I also wanted to bring the audience back to the present for the intermission, and to leave them on a more uplifting note. The scene provided concrete facts regarding BILLY's death, as well as the detail that it occurred at the ratification vote in 1958.⁶³ Through the dialogue, they demonstrate the subjectivity that accompanies memory and storytelling, which is part of a significant discussion, in terms of reflecting on the process of disseminating historical material through narrative. More specific to this play: Was it a violent mob out after BILLY on that night, or just a few angry and inebriated individuals? ALBERT and JAKE present both explanations, and this was my way of acknowledging this subjectivity that underpins any historical narrative, especially one based on memory.

ACT TWO

In *My Dad and My Husband* (Act 2, Scene 1, A-302), at the top of Act Two, I wanted LAURIE to speak from the kitchen table and to deliver a frank exchange with the audience. This was my ideal opening image. This section serves as a bridge between both acts. The audience is reminded that this is LAURIE's narrative, and that what had previously transpired on the stage during the first act was a story told through her memories. It also signifies a reset in terms of the manner of storytelling. LAURIE is an adult, and what will follow in Act 2 is a (re)play through her more recent memories. The historical distance in relation to LAURIE's *present*, at the beginning the play when she

⁶³ Several interviewees recalled their fathers having heart attacks.

first falls asleep, is much shorter. It is as if she were moving closer to waking up, and, as such, her dreams become increasingly lucid. In more of a literal sense, LAURIE recounts a recurring nightmare about BILLY's death. This, once again, reflects the bad dreams, fears, and loss of loved ones experienced by interviewees. Most of this monologue is a composite of Carol Mulligan's and Jan Heppner's interview material. I also included one little humorous anecdote from my conversation with former USW 6500 President Dave Patterson, who remembered demanding a long extension cord in order to watch the moon landing while on strike in 1969.⁶⁴ I decided to use this scenario for GUY and LAURIE's first date, something which fittingly takes place on the picket line.

LAURIE's monologue went through many edits during the writing process. I needed to focus and trim the text. Significantly, this final version features BILLY, and is noticeably missing ROSE. Specifically, for ROSE and LAURIE, there is little mention of their lives after his passing. ROSE's story was more prominent in earlier drafts, and while I was editing, I made a conscious choice to make the relationship between LAURIE and BILLY more central to the action of the play. The father figure was much more prominent from my interviews and I was struck when Millie McQuaid, while extolling her father's stature as a union man, reflected on the fact that her, "mom was just there in the background."⁶⁵ She obscured her mother's whole story in one comment. This never left my mind while I was writing the play. I felt that the same could be true for LAURIE, for whatever reason. I had come up with the backstory, and it would make compelling substance and basis for another play. Through these edits, I also jettisoned an opportunity

⁶⁴ These stories come from an informal dinner with the onetime union president at Cathy Milroy's residence.

⁶⁵ McQuaid, interview with Tester.

to contrast the more favourable living conditions in Lively as compared to Minnow Lake. ROSE and LAURIE are forced to move there when BILLY dies, since they had been given three months to leave company housing. These narrative traces and rich details, provided by interviewees and collected throughout my research, could not all fit within this narrative. I was inspired by Tom Stoppard's absurdist play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* (1966).⁶⁶ Just as there are many possible elements to this narrative that are silenced or made invisible, there are other plays happening simultaneously to the one that is occurring here.⁶⁷

It was also an opportunity to complicate the point of view of LAURIE's parents and show different intergenerational perspectives. We see a different ROSE and BILLY through her eyes and with the hindsight and perspective of LAURIE, now as an adult. I wanted to try a simple means of distancing, complicating, and destabilizing the prevalent and pro-Mine Mill point of view exhibited through her parents, in the first act. I was acutely aware, throughout my research and interviews, and then while creating the script, how easily a play using this material was at risk of becoming boosterish. The archive and pre-recorded interviews are replete with this viewpoint, as much as it contains its detractors. Interviewees demonstrated that the picture was much more complicated than reducing the story to a matter of conflicting partisan loyalties. LAURIE acknowledges the fact that her father was a strong unionist and that he was heavily involved with Mine Mill. However, she was not inculcated with the same rhetoric, nor was she familiar with

⁶⁶ Tom Stoppard, *Rosencrantz & Guildenstern Are Dead* (London: Samuel French Inc., 1967). The whole action of the play transpires simultaneously to the plot and events of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

⁶⁷ Walter Benjamin, *Illuminations* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1968), 257-258. It also reminds me of Benjamin's angel of history and his chaotic conception of the passage of time. While writing this play it felt like I was grasping stories and traces while many other possibilities slipped past my grasp.

the specifics of the strike, or with the political aspects of her father's union. Her sentiments are more directed towards her present circumstances, which is reflective of my interviewees.

The title *My Dad and My Husband* is deliberate as LAURIE's life, in the play, is defined by two respective eras, dominated by the figure(s) of her father and her husband. I perceived tension at this prospect in the interviews, as women resisted these categories and spoke explicitly about them critically. I wanted to explore this further and decided to situate LAURIE within this gendered dynamic. There is a brief moment in the play where she is free—and that is here in this scene, for two paragraphs—as she describes what life was like for her mother, as well as for other women living in this “man's world.” Again, she is free, but her focus of this reflection pertains to the men, especially to her father, and to his role in her household when she was a child. Finally, after the reflection, LAURIE concludes that she will never marry and take on these roles. In the next breath, though, she admits to meeting GUY, and the rest is history. Ultimately, I wanted LAURIE to exist as part of that cycle, as did many women in Sudbury, who were born into mining families, and then started their own households, through marriage.

When the audience is first introduced to GUY in *I'm Not a Miner* (Act 2, Scene 2, A-304), the scene begins in tension and with a disagreement. I wanted to juxtapose the tone and circumstances in LAURIE's household as an adult, as compared to her recollections from her parent's house, which were featured in Act One. The interview material provided much of the text and anecdotes here, but I exercised more creativity with its usage. This relationship is different, and demonstrates a scenario where the experiences of strikes problematized the commonly assumed sense of solidarity between

husbands and wives. There was a thematic tension from the interviews between opposing notions of unity and disunity, especially as pressures increased in the community, and within homes during a labour dispute. The scene explores the emotional impact of these tensions using live actors. This is the first of several scenes where LAURIE and GUY must work through some challenging circumstances during the 1978-79 INCO strike.

Stylistically, the scenes in the second act are more rooted in realism, with a few exceptions.⁶⁸ They are typically longer, occur within a linear sequence in terms of time, and throughout, the characters speak to each other, less as witnesses through a presentational style, as was frequently practiced in the first act. This shift in style evolved through the editing process. In previous drafts, both acts frequently exhibited this presentational style. Instead, here the characters are speaking to each other with the immediacy and stakes from the present moment. For example, in this scene, LAURIE's direct involvement with the bean supper, and the fact that she was asked to give a speech at an upcoming fundraiser during the strike, were new additions prior to the final draft. She thereby has an immediate reason to leave the house after the scene, and GUY and LAURIE now have to figure out who is taking care of their child when, and if, she travels to Toronto to speak at this event. In earlier versions of the script, without these built in circumstances, it seemed as though the couple was merely frustrated and were bickering at each other. These changes ensured that the underlying frustrations and banter were rooted in real everyday tensions and problems, especially as they were exasperated during a strike. I felt that, as a rule, it was more compelling to have them attempt to work through their problems, rather than to simply demonstrate that they were frustrated.

⁶⁸ Several scenes in this act feature the psychological realism of a Tennessee Williams play. I mean this in the sense that my primary focus for these scenes was on the interior lives of characters and their motives.

Collectively, the scenes in this act were works in progress. I was constantly negotiating issues relating to stereotypical depictions of men and women and subsequent gender roles. As a playwright, working with performers, we consistently explored the needs and desires of these characters. We sought the balance between finding the love in the scene, and the humour alongside the anger and frustration. With feedback from workshop audiences, I assessed the accuracy and fairness of these portrayals, as well as their authenticity, in terms of honouring my interviews. The exploration was particularly significant in this scene. For interviewees and workshop audiences, there seemed to be a great deal at stake, and personal investment, with issues relating to identity. Who was GUY? Who was LAURIE? How was I to depict the relationship between LAURIE and GUY, as a husband and a wife? I was always asking myself questions about the dynamic between LAURIE and GUY. Where was the love? What were their rules, or lines not to cross? Were they going to be okay? I was never certain if this relationship would survive the strike. I felt like I was working it out alongside the characters, in process. Each participant in the project (performer and creative team, interviewee, audience members) cared about these aspects. For example, instances of divorce as a result of strikes were frequently alluded to by interviewees. This scene situates LAURIE and GUY's relationship leaving the audience to wonder whether or not they could work their way out of it. Another challenge was how to depict these men. Who were they? Some interviewees were wary of stereotypical depictions of both men and women. Others were not as sympathetic. There were multiple issues and dynamics that required choices, and the characters slowly evolved. Something that I was completely certain about was the

idea that the men in the second act needed to be more realistically portrayed as opposed to BILLY, who was depicted perhaps more favourably, through LAURIE's memories.

To ascertain the most plausible dynamic between LAURIE and GUY for this story, I worked from several conflicting premises from the interviews. Yet more than what I could accomplish through the script, the most plausible fit emerged from working with the performers.⁶⁹ They were able to discover emotional truths, while enacting the material and bringing the characters to life in the present. While enacting the material and bringing the characters to life in the present, the performers were able to discover emotional truths not yet evident in the script and this informed by subsequent edits. One concrete example in this scene is the lumping together of INCO workers as "miners." I wanted to use this issue as a means of highlighting some of the tensions in the home during a strike. This was a source of contention for interviewees who worked there, including Ron Tough, who commented that, "working in a mine and being a miner are two different things."⁷⁰ This was a point of pride, as well as a perceived and unfair generalization, depending with whom I spoke.

This distinction is explored through the characters at the beginning of the scene, where GUY takes offense to LAURIE's description of him from in *My Dad and My Husband* (Act 2, Scene 1, A-302), while introducing her husband she speaks the line, "Yep, I married a miner." GUY is a mechanic, one of many streams of employment historically at INCO, and a means for me to illuminate the diversity and complexity of mining operations that were reflected in my interviews. Also, BILLY was a hard rock miner and I wanted GUY to represent another perspective. He proceeds to explain this

⁶⁹ See "Performer and Production," 148.

⁷⁰ Ron Tough, interview by the author, Sudbury, June 2017.

distinction, to which LAURIE, who clearly understands what her husband does for a living, dismisses his frustration, and the dialogue continues. Her response evokes another premise put forward by several interviewees, that husbands kept their work lives separate from their lives at home. The irony is that, even if this were the case, here the characters are at home talking about his work.

Other premises and point of departures in this scene that I used to explore emotional truths for these characters, were the perceived prevalence of swearing as a masculine form of behaviour, as well examining the patriarchal dynamic within the home. The former was a manner of practicality. GUY could utter one swear word and be reprimanded for what was common practice. This would mean the audience would not be subjected to an onslaught of swearing, as this well-known aspect of masculine behaviour has been addressed in the script. In the spirit of accuracy, LAURIE inadvertently swears once in this scene as well. The swear in this instance (dog fucker), is used as part of a colloquial term denoting laziness, as interviewees frequently drew distinctions between those who worked hard, and those who did not.⁷¹

The latter premise, pertaining to patriarchy, was difficult to pin down through my own experiential lens as a cisgender male. I decided to preserve a detail from Cathy Mulroy's story that was used in the scene, about when her husband at that time expressed his displeasure at the prospect of her giving a speech at a fundraiser. I thought it would be good fodder for the performers to negotiate this sequence, where GUY attempts to "put his foot down," and expresses his discomfort with the prospect of his wife becoming involved politically during the strike. His viewpoint reflects what Ron Tough termed as

⁷¹ Ron Brunette, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017. Several interviewees were familiar with this term.

an “old school mentality” that he felt was still prevalent.⁷² I did not give GUY the power through the script to forbid her from taking this action, although many women lived historically under this sort of domestic patriarchal rule, but I wanted GUY to make this position known. Women’s and men’s agency were the underlying source of tension in this scene, as it was complicated by the fact that the “man” of this house is at home during this strike, essentially occupying his wife’s space. I wanted to recreate this sense of disorder for LAURIE and GUY and have them work through it in front of our audiences.

Much of the content from *Buddies Shooting the Breeze* (Act 2, Scene 3, A-308), now pertains to the shared memories of GUY and LARRY about when they first worked at the smelter, as well as their reflections regarding the Wildcat strike at INCO in 1966, and the company’s next legal strike in 1969. Aside from content and the sharing of experiences, I wanted to convey a sense of continuity to LAURIE’s familial story, and to also reinforce a cyclical sense and the cumulative nature of strikes in Sudbury. I attempted to bridge the gap through this scene, between 1958 and 1978 – the two INCO strikes that had become more prominent within the narrative – and to also demonstrate the passage of time, through two individuals who can speak to this experience. In earlier drafts, other strikes were more integral to the script. Interviewees spoke mostly of 1958, 1966 (wildcat), 1969, 1978-79 and 2009-10, and did not touch upon a few others in this period.

The dialogue was also written with an added element of uncertainty on the part of the characters, as they attempted to grasp specific dates and details from their memories.

⁷² Tough, interview.

This pattern reflected the manner from my interview conversations, as interviewees often questioned their own memories. One audience member at the Legion workshop, felt that it was a strong choice how the characters had difficulty pinpointing specific dates.

According to him, “when we talk, that’s how we are, we’re not quite sure...[.]”⁷³ This was also an opportunity to present different viewpoints and a means to destabilize facts based on memories, or vice-versa. Was the chopper shot down in 1966 or 1969? Both options are presented regarding this local myth. When LARRY brings up marijuana use at INCO and then asks about a particular year when six workers died, GUY does not respond to this actual fact about a singularly dangerous year, in terms of fatalities in Sudbury’s mining industry.⁷⁴ LARRY reminds GUY that the 1969 strike was not as uneventful as he seems to recollect. Conversely, it was where he first met LAURIE. Once he is reminded, this memory is triggered, and GUY elaborates with his own version of their first date, from his point of view, which differs from LAURIE’s account from *My Dad and My Husband* (Act 2, Scene 1, A-302) earlier in the act. I also felt like it provided a sense of historical distance between *now* in the play (1978-79 INCO strike with LAURIE and GUY as adults) and *then* (1966 GUY is young and starting out at INCO, and, 1969 where he meets LAURIE), which needed to be definitively *after* the 1958 INCO strike and LAURIE’s childhood, in terms of this narrative.

Another significant component to this scene was the exploration and staging of the actual act of men socializing. This aspect was consistently reshaped, both within the writing and in terms of staging for this scene, as well as others throughout *ODS*.

Specifically, the amount and frequency of alcohol consumption and the resulting levels of

⁷³ Name Unknown, workshop discussion, Sudbury, 15 October 2018.

⁷⁴ Brunette, interview and Richard Gouin, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

intoxication exhibited by the characters shifted from severe to more moderate by the end of the process, as I sought to depict the historical prevalence of a drinking culture that was reflected to me by my interviewees.

Having grown up in Sudbury, I was well versed in its reputation for hyper-masculinity and for excessive drinking. My own impressions were supported by interviewees, who reflected on the common practice of going to the hotel socially or drinking in the home. Alcohol has traditionally been a cultural staple in this community. Conversely, not everyone had the same experience, and some people do not identify with this type of behaviour, as typical from their own experiences. How was I to portray this aspect while honouring the historical culture and dissenting viewpoints about stereotypical depictions? What were the implications for my resulting choices in terms of identity?

The scene begins with several lines of dialogue, split between LARRY and GUY, that were lifted from an interviewee describing a typical evening when leaving work: Drinking in the car and then proceeding to the hotel before going home. The stage direction indicates that they have a “stylized” beer, which was a remnant from earlier drafts.⁷⁵ The idea was that this gesture was meant to physically symbolize excessive beer drinking, and that I wanted them to drink heavily in this scene, as well as to have the bottles pile up on the stage. In earlier incarnations of the script, both characters were extremely inebriated, slurring their speeches, one character urinated offstage, and both

⁷⁵ “Stylized beer” refers to a physical gesture and exchange between the two characters that was intended to symbolize the process of binge drinking. It was repeated throughout previous incarnations to indicate a progression and increase in levels of intoxication. This stylistic choice was adapted to fit the scene that was intended to be more naturalistic or ‘real’ by the final version of the script. See *Buddies Shooting the Breeze* (Act 2, Scene 3, A-308).

were throwing up by time the overall sequence was finished. This included the picket line scene *Boys Will Be Boys* (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316) which previously followed this scene. As a result of having them “tie one on,” LAURIE was forced to clean up the mess when it was time for them to sober up. The actress literally tidied up the stage, while the actor recovered from his hangover. After the second workshop, Linda George had some concerns regarding how men were depicted in the play. In an email after the presentation, she wrote:

I didn't understand the reference to the amount of beer drinking. In telling the untold story about the history of women in Sudbury's labour movement, why would the men be portrayed as stereotypical, uneducated beer guzzling INCO workers who showed more passion for a hockey game than anything. Yes, there was beer, there was drinking and pot...but at social events. I recognize[,] however, that it does give the opportunity for humour, which is needed to tell a story. I don't know how to explain it, but it felt like a repeat of another portrayal of a stereotypical INCO worker. Repeating a story that is too often told.⁷⁶

As always, I took the feedback seriously and felt that the answer lay somewhere in between the workshop depiction and a more moderate portrayal, without eliminating what I felt was a significant cultural element. I decided to be specific and selective in instances that involved drinking throughout the play. Often, coffee or tea were substituted for beer or whiskey, and this was supported through our selection of props.⁷⁷ I decided to limit the beer in the play to one six-pack, and it was consumed in Act 2, four were consumed by GUY and LARRY in *Buddies Shooting The Breeze* (Act 2, Scene 3, A-308) and, two were sipped by JAKE and DORTHY in *Old Man and an Old Woman Discuss Early Retirement* (Act 2, Scene 8, A-324). Similar to my approach with the issue of swearing, I felt that the idea of a “drinking culture” was now communicated, without

⁷⁶ Linda George, email to author, 7 May 2018.

⁷⁷ See “Performance and Production,” 172.

overtly demonstrating the behaviour in a gratuitous fashion. Due in part to this issue, and more to do with larger structural shifts towards making this more LAURIE's story following the workshops, both "imbibing scenes" were no longer part of a consecutive binge sequence. LARRY and GUY exit to the hotel, and the *Boys Will Be Boys* (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316) scene at the picket line happens on another day. It is implied that the drinking continued well into the night, but the behaviour was no longer the central focus for this scene. I consistently made adjustments regarding my depiction of working-class masculinities especially in Act 2. I was comfortable with the overall portrayal by this final version, even though I was well aware that - for some audience members - it would always be too much.

Another thematic observation was the evident sense of individual pride and self-worth that men and women elicited, when they described what they "did." Working and "doing" were significant aspects for interviewees, whereas strikes were a barrier for these men and women who simply wanted to live their lives. I attempted to honour this through the inherent storytelling processes within the play, and its performance. In *Buddies Shooting The Breeze* (Act 2, Scene 3, A-308), GUY and LARRY have a conversation that seemingly takes on a life of its own. Both men and women that I spoke with worked hard, and this was a central and core component to their identities. As emulated through the characters of LARRY and GUY, they enjoyed recounting the details, processes, daily efforts, and tasks from their pasts, much in the same way that BILLY enjoyed talking about working underground in *Tales From An Angry Young Man* (Act 1, Scene 7, A-273). Several of them pointedly remarked when other men did not work hard, as reflected through GUY, as he had done in the previous scene. One of the frustrating consequences

for men specifically, who were involved in any strike was that it removed their ability to succeed and to thrive while conducting their work. GUY and LARRY take the audience through a jumbled sequence, as they try to piece together, remember, and share a sample of what LAURIE, in the previous scene, termed “all your damn stories.”⁷⁸

A Phone Call (Act 2, Scene 4, A-313) is one of three new scenes that were added to the play after the final workshop. As such, they did not receive any development prior to edits that I made, on the fly, during the rehearsal process, in preparation for the final production. Two of these scenes depict LAURIE in a conversation on the telephone, and they mirrored ROSE’s experience from *Phone Calls* (Act 1, Scene 16, A-291). While unifying mother and daughter in terms of one aspect of their respective experiences during strikes, I also wanted to demonstrate a wrinkle to this scenario. LAURIE is on the receiving end of a call from a friend in need. In this instance, LOUISE has received the threatening phone calls, and is concerned that her house is being watched. Again, issues reflected in this scene pertaining to company surveillance, intimidation, and children bullied at school during strikes among others, were frequent and universal in Sudbury throughout the postwar period according to interviewees. It was also an opportunity to have two women speaking to one another, something which is a rarity in this play.

In terms of the dramaturgical process of making this more about LAURIE’s story, I established her involvement with helping out at a bean supper, in support of the strike. In previous drafts, her explicit and distinct involvement through both domestic and political tasks was vague. There was one mere reference to her involvement at one such event by GUY in the next scene *Boys Will Be Boys* (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316). I feared,

⁷⁸ LAURIE, *I’m Not a Miner* (Act 2, Scene 2, A-306).

after the second workshop, that the play did not reflect effectively the process of how historical grassroots work and community building efforts (mostly by women) become muted and invisible in memory. I needed to inscribe LAURIE's active involvement at one of these events as an integral component of this narrative. The bean supper, and later the fundraiser speech in Toronto, are points of contention between GUY and LAURIE, as the former prefers to not get actively involved with the strike.

As a symbol, the telephone represented a means for women to combat the prevalence of isolation in their lives. LAURIE's phone here acts as a lifeline, as much as it represented a threat to ROSE's household. Aside from LAURIE's scene with ROSE (played by a male) at the beginning of the show, this telephone scene with LOUISE, and another at the end, are the only set of instances where two women are featured in a scene together in *ODS*. This was a deliberate dramaturgical choice. As a playwright, I wanted this sense of isolation to be reflected, both thematically and structurally, through this theatrical narrative. My idea was that the audience could witness women speaking from the background (with one exception of LAURIE's fundraiser speech), or with the men in their lives. I wanted to explore this tension for women whose lives primarily revolved around men. Also, their agency within this type of story and subject—labour strikes—tends to remain largely peripheral or in the background as we saw in the “Remembered Histories” chapter. The story could both reflect and push against this traditional dynamic between the sexes, as had my interviewees in their retellings. A play solely about women in this community would be compelling, but it would be a different story, without the presence and influence of men. Furthermore, it would not allow me to explore and then

re-present the fundamentally gendered structures and experiences that occurred in 1958 and 1978, and within the memories and narratives of 2017.

Following the workshops, members of the creative team and several audience members made this observation and expressed that it would be worthy to explore having more scenes that featured women. It was at that point that I added these telephone scenes and provided LAURIE with LOUISE as an outlet. Again, this scene features two women, but one is noticeably absent from the stage, and is *only* present through the telephone. Through these quasi-isolating circumstances, the two women provide a counterpoint to the substance and masculine perspective presented through the dialogue of LARRY and GUY in the previous scene. Of note, LAURIE expresses her frustration regarding GUY's sexist "macho" behaviour and his negative reaction to the prospect of her giving the upcoming Toronto speech. She also echoed how several interviewees felt about Stompin' Tom Connors' depiction of Sudburians, in his iconic song, "Sudbury Saturday Night."⁷⁹ For the sake of artifice, LAURIE does not pull this reference out of thin air. Instead, the song is playing on the radio during the scene, and she has the impetus to turn it off and to vent her frustration.⁸⁰

Boys Will Be Boys (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316) did not get cut leading up to the final production because I felt that the play needed some representation of a picket-line, as it was an iconic location for strikes and was often referred to by interviewees. This scene also underwent significant changes and shifts throughout the workshop process. It may be redundant when it comes to my final evaluation of the play moving forward, as it once

⁷⁹ Stompin Tom Connors, "Sudbury Saturday Night," *The Northlands' Own Tom Connors* (Audiorecording, 1967).

⁸⁰ See Appendix A, 313 (QLAB 63).

again features GUY and LARRY within a similar dynamic as *Buddies Shooting the Breeze* (Act 2, Scene 3, A-308). Instead of socializing and storytelling at the kitchen table, the characters are standing by a fire bin aside a makeshift hut on the picket line. Again, this was another instance in the play, where I was working to determine how to best depict these men in relation to the masculine drinking culture recollected from the interviewees, while being mindful of male stereotypes and normative social behaviour. There is alcohol consumption, the men consistently rib each other using nicknames, and they demonstrate “horseplay,” a dynamic and term that interviewees frequently alluded to.⁸¹

One element that differed from *Buddies Shooting the Breeze* was that it offered an earnest exchange between these two friends. In rehearsals, we explored the pressures of what it meant, and how much effort it took for these men to open up to one another. These types of exchanges engender vulnerability and occur between intimate friends or family relations. Interviewees did not share them with me through the narrative retellings of their life stories. The first time we met LARRY and GUY, they delivered a constant stream of bravado, humour, and one-upmanship. For a brief moment in *Boys Will Be Boys* (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316), I wanted GUY to tell his friend the truth. LARRY can offer him help in return. It was difficult for the performers to navigate during the process, which reflected the gravity and cost associated with honest communication. Interviewees rarely (if ever) complained about their circumstances, and I wanted the characters in the play to uphold this sense of stoic resilience. Neither GUY, LAURIE, nor BILLY or ROSE ask for help. Curiously, interviewees often reflected on charitable acts, and on the

⁸¹ See “Remembered Histories” 56.

spirit of assisting those in need. However, I did not record one instance that relayed when an individual asked for help. I perceived that there was an underlying shame for many of the Sudburians who I interviewed, participated in the workshops or offered feedback after the show - especially during strikes - when they required assistance. One of my aims while writing the play was to enable performers to expose these latent emotional stakes that were experienced by people during these historical incidences. Such muted truths rarely make it out of the archive, are difficult to express on the page, and more often than not end up buried within the people who experienced these events.

I wanted the play to reflect this reality and its accompanying tensions. I was also trying to reflect what interviewee Pat Byrne described as a pervading feeling of ambivalence towards strikes amongst workers and their families.⁸² GUY explicitly declares, “Frig, this is so boring!” According to the interviews, a bigger threat to the overall cohesion within the community, or an individual’s resolve, was idleness. The longer a strike lasted meant an increase to the emotional, psychological, and financial strain. Surviving strikes meant enduring a prolonged context of attrition rather than a pitched battle or confrontation. This scene is formed using a tapestry of different anecdotes, interactions that occurred from this specific context and location. GUY and LARRY rib each other to pass the time, and the tensions are sitting just beneath the surface.

I felt like LAURIE’s speech during *Women Fighting INCO Solidarity Benefit* (Act 2, Scene 6, A-320) was a very significant inclusion for *ODS*. I wanted to portray the main character, finding her voice in the moment, and gaining confidence from this act.

⁸² Pat Byrne, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2017.

ROSE struggled with this aspect in *The Arena* (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294), which provides a useful contrast between the respective experiences of these two women of different generations. One appears validated and active, while the other felt ignored and disillusioned. This scene is adapted from a section of Cathy Mulroy's recently published manuscript.⁸³ When I met with her, following the last workshop at the Legion (October 2018), I was struck by how elements of her story (including this scene) were a perfect fit for adult LAURIE. It was Cathy's initial suggestion to be more explicit regarding the bean supper, as a significant event organized by the WSSC for the community. In her mind, and she corroborated this thought from a conversation with someone after the workshop, the bean supper line only served to complete a flatulent joke in *Boys Will Be Boys*. For her, this required more context and explanation, as it was important for the audience to understand this reference. Similarly, I felt that—although LAURIE speaks about taking control as a group of women and communicating their opinions next in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out* (Act 2, Scene 7, A-322)—the play had not previously depicted her in the act of *doing* it. In another instance “feeding back,” I asked Cathy if she could talk me through the experience and relay what was said during these fundraisers.⁸⁴ She provided me with her own excerpt depicting the actual event and gave me permission to adapt it for use in this scene.

In terms of style, I once again revisited my notion of Brechtian witnessing as a form of storytelling.⁸⁵ In this instance, LAURIE served as the “eyewitness” for this event, where she was the key participant. She oscillates from the first to a third person point of

⁸³ Cathy Mulroy, *My View from the Blackened Rocks: A Woman's Battle for Equality and Respect in Canada's Mining Industry* (Sudbury, Tellwell Talent, 2019).

⁸⁴ Brown, ed., *Verbatim*, 4.

⁸⁵ Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre*, 121.

view, both *in* the scene it and *outside* of it. Through direct address, the actress can both *give the speech* and *comment on the experience of its delivery*. I wanted the actress and—through her—the audience to experience her lack of confidence, the settling of her nerves, the passion, as well as the infectious enthusiasm and confidence that Cathy exhibited during her interview and through her manuscript rendition. Again, more than just words on the page, or a fact and detailed account that a speech or an event had taken place, I wanted to bring this experience to life using theatre.

When I adapted this section from Cathy Mulroy’s manuscript, I wanted to create an aria for LAURIE, something that could invoke what one interviewee coined as an authentic Sudbury “fuck you...working class kind of feminism.”⁸⁶ It was intended to demonstrate her inculcation as a political activist. Further, I wished to demarcate this version of LAURIE from the domestic space and it is the only scene with her that takes place outside of her home. I also wanted to have her visibly excel as a public orator, and to emulate the trope of the epic rallying union speech.⁸⁷

As previously indicated, LAURIE is in the act of speaking about her political role during the 1978-79 strike in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out* (Act 2, Scene 7, A-322). LAURIE’s position in this scene was modelled on Linda George’s interview, who recounted the overall spirit and accomplishments of the WSSC, and demonstrated how

⁸⁶ McGauley, interview. Used in audio clip see Appendix A, 319 (QLAB 65).

⁸⁷ Before starting this project, I envisioned the potential of writing a dramatic picket-line scene, riddled with excitement, confrontations, and charged speeches. I must have been inspired by my predisposition for Steinbeck novels, major motion pictures such as *The Cradle Will Rock* (1999), or my recent viewing of the documentary film *Harlan County USA* (1976). Contrary to these emotive, contentious, and powerful portrayals, interviewees generally depicted their experiences on various Sudbury picket-lines as being uneventful. Aside from a desirable context for socializing, they recounted spending hours, in all kinds of weather, often in a state of boredom. There were charged or heated incidents and pranks, but for the most part, a typical experience of picket-duty, according to interviewees, was much more mundane. *The Cradle Will Rock*, directed by Tim Robbins, 1999; and *Harlan County USA*, directed by Barbara Kopple, 1976. John Steinbeck was a prominent American author in the mid 20th century.

their active participation in strikes was a transformative and empowering experience. I wanted to contrast and actively contest this position through GUY's viewpoint, who is apathetic and ambivalent about the strike. I also wanted to complicate the notion of solidarity during strikes, by highlighting the distinction between union leadership and its membership, as well as conflicts between husbands and wives within the home. Interviewees often pointed out these distinctions, and there were ample instances of conflicting points of view.

In terms of style, this was the second of two scenes in the play, where the characters directly implore the audience, and present their positions. It was a continuation of my attempt at provoking discussion and to highlight the distinct experiences of men and women. Following the conventions of *The Arena* (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294), I wrote the scene for characters to present their points through direct address. Contrary to ROSE and BILLY, who were on the same page in Act One, LAURIE and GUY directly dispute one another's positions. GUY wants to go back to work and ratify the company's latest offer, whereas LAURIE wants the men to continue the strike and to hold out for a better contract. GUY makes it clear that it is not her place to get involved, and that she should support his decision. I wanted to demonstrate within the microcosm of this family, that women's entrance into the political arena was, for some, a source of tension, as it positioned them beyond their traditional roles as mothers.⁸⁸ I wanted to reinforce that there could also be discord within the home. Women, if they assisted during a strike, were expected to help out by organizing and supplying food, blankets, and provisions. These efforts were valued as much as they were valid. Conversely, this particular group

⁸⁸ See "Remembered Histories chapter," 36.

of women who were represented through LAURIE, were politically active, and felt that they had contributed to winning the community's support during that strike.

Perhaps the most invigorating instance for these women, depicted through the character of LAURIE in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out*, was when they demonstrated their autonomy by creating a press release regarding a long-awaited contract offer. I selected this prominent event from the 1978 strike for the play, to be the equivalent of the “infamous” wives rally from the 1958 strike as depicted in *The Arena* (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294). These were signpost events for interviewees. I also wanted to demonstrate here the second of two scenarios: First, from 1958 in *The Arena*, women allegedly pressured their husbands to take a bad contract. Second, from the present in 1978-79 in *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out*, women publicly express their opinions about *not* ratifying a bad contract. My conclusion is that women were reprimanded either way, regardless of whether or not they felt empowered, or if they had summoned their voices. I wanted to leave it to the audience to discuss this comparison.

Lastly, the ratification vote's personal significance was highlighted by acute feelings of loss at the strike's termination just a few weeks later. Linda George described the strike's conclusion as having “fizzled out...,” which was an inspiration for this scene.⁸⁹ Through LAURIE, I wanted the audience to experience her feeling of loss, and to impart this ephemeral aspect to strikes. It needed to be clear within the narrative that she mourns the loss of her purpose and identity as a community activist during the strike that was now finished.

⁸⁹ George, interview.

ENDING THE PLAY

My intention for *Late One Evening Before the Move* (Act 2, Scene 9, A-329) was to have LAURIE revisit the preceding moments leading up to her present, from *The Kitchen Table* (Act 1, Scene 1, A-265) and *See the Cards* (Act 1, Scene 2, A-266) in Act One. This included the “looping in” of the play’s opening dialogue at this scene’s conclusion, to act as a bookend for the piece, and a means to satisfy my intentions with the historical timeline.

LAURIE is faced with the prospect of her husband leaving town for work, and with having to move into her in-law’s basement, until the couple are able to recover financially. It is the night of GUY’s departure, and I wanted to depict the immediacy and emotional difficulties presented through a typical scenario for INCO employees and their families in Sudbury. People losing their homes due to strikes was frequently alluded to, including several interviewees who had experienced this firsthand. The prospect of losing the family home was a trope and represents a devastating result for people who were unable to save money, or successfully navigate the pressures associated with temporary unemployment. Foreclosures were commonplace, particularly in months following strikes in Sudbury.⁹⁰ People simply fell behind in paying their bills and could not recuperate their deficits. There were many different experiences and situations that I could have chosen and assigned to these characters in this narrative. Some people were good at saving their money, while others were apparently better fed during a strike.⁹¹ Many of these outcomes are invisible in the historical archive. I chose to have these characters

⁹⁰ Tough, interview.

⁹¹ McQuaid, interview with Tester.

experience a foreclosure, after the fact, as another means to illuminate the cyclical experience of strikes from the familial perspective.

This scene went through several significant changes and adaptations over the course of the workshops, but essentially it depicts LAURIE and GUY within the process of working through and addressing their current predicament. In earlier drafts of the script, the couple was preparing for a midnight move. Several interviewees and workshop audience members recounted stories where people fled their homes in the middle of the night. Also, many people left Sudbury as a result of these strikes (as well as for other reasons) and never returned. These unceremonious departures accurately reflected reality, and I felt it would not be out of place within this narrative, that the protagonists be forced to leave town, and have their stories continue elsewhere.

Workshop audience members were divided in terms of the couple's plight and with how play should end. Several expressed that they wanted the characters to remain in Sudbury and to continue the struggle. They felt that, in keeping with everything LAURIE learned from her father in Act One, she should naturally make that choice. For some workshop audience members, this story was personal, and their connection to it was strong enough that they wanted it to further reflect their own stories. I realized that many in my Sudbury audiences derived from and comprised those who "stayed." Throughout the process, I asked myself what ending I owed my audience, while remaining truthfully committed to telling LAURIE's story. Laurie McGauley (whose name I borrowed for the title character), an interviewee and audience member for the second workshop, shared her criticisms about my original ending, and also spoke about how it failed to honour the audience members and their perceived role in this story:

I know I missed the first reading, so I'm coming in late, but I have to say that the ending didn't flow for me. There was the audience reaction of the people around me; they had lived through the strike and stayed. I think focussing on those who left sort of made them feel unrecognized, and, might have missed a key message about fighting back. But even if you stick to this ending, I think it needs more work. I did not feel the level of desperation behind this decision to leave in the middle of the night. It took me by surprise, and seemed almost anticlimactic...⁹²

Her observations, as well as the general discussion about the play's ending during the workshops, had a significant influence regarding the scene's final version. This was one of the most frequently discussed topics during talkbacks and general feedback. Not everybody agreed with McGauley, and some people felt that it was perfectly acceptable that the family be forced to leave town.

Greg Tremblay, a performer in the first workshop reading, expressed more of a middle ground. Whereas he was one of the proponents of the couple leaving town based on fact, and that it reflected his own family's relocation to Windsor due to economic pressures, he astutely pointed out that earlier versions of the play never explicitly revealed the characters actually leaving. According to Greg, "she woke up...they didn't actually leave."⁹³ In addition, he felt that it was not our responsibility as creators, to "spell that out," and that the story continues beyond the play. Greg felt that the ending should be ambiguous, and that the characters be seen asking themselves the question: "Do we stay, or do we go?"⁹⁴ He also felt that it was important to explore this from an emotional standpoint within LAURIE and GUY's immediate circumstances. Moreover,

⁹² Laurie McGauley, email to author, 17 October 2018.

⁹³ Greg Tremblay, interview by the author, Sudbury, May 2018.

⁹⁴ Tremblay, interview.

he wanted it to be clear that even if staying meant continuing the fight, leaving did not necessarily equate to “running away.”⁹⁵

Ultimately, I sided with McGauley in the sense that I wanted the play to reflect the stories of my interviewees, most of whom stayed in Sudbury following strikes. I felt like I was honouring their testimonies by changing my original ending. However, this was not intended to be a sequence solely denoting resilience and strength, rather, LAURIE and GUY are reacting out of necessity. I wanted the audience to witness these unpredictable circumstances for LAURIE, who is genuinely caught off guard. She is made aware that her husband is leaving immediately, instead of the following morning, as was the original plan. Neither of them knows what the rest of *today* has in store, nor what will be revealed tomorrow. One of the last sentiments shared between husband and wife before the dialogue from the *present* in Act One is repeated, is that the couple *will figure it out*. I felt that the character’s personal struggles highlighted their inherent vulnerability, especially the tensions within their marriage, and I wanted the audience to experience more of this aspect. I felt that perhaps this resilience was a source of strength worth celebrating.

The Kitchen Table / Where it All Began (Act 2, Scene 10, A-332) is the third and final telephone scene, and the second featuring LAURIE and LOUISE. As previously noted, these were new additions that were not tested during the workshop process and – as such – were written prior the final production. This small concluding epilogue had variously changed, and its development for these final moments is a microcosm of the many cumulative thematic and creative shifts to the ending of *ODS*. I consistently asked

⁹⁵ Trembley, interview.

myself throughout the process: What does it need? What is the dramaturgy of the ending? I added this scene to provide a sense of closure to the story, as well as the notion of continuity for these characters. Initially, the workshop drafts had ended rather abruptly with an almost “French ending.”⁹⁶ LAURIE wakes up at the kitchen table from her dream, and there was no indication of any direction, or of what happened next beyond the present. She calls out to GUY, worried about having slept in. It was implied that they were planning a midnight move. That earlier version of the play ended with her sitting at the kitchen table in a state of confusion.

Instead, through this production version, I wanted to demonstrate that the characters moved forward with their lives and that they were staying in the community. GUY has departed for his sojourn to Elliot Lake before LAURIE falls asleep. In place of an abrupt ending, she is woken up by the telephone ringing, and the scene continues through the resulting conversation between LAURIE and LOUISE. I wanted to include the inverse of the previous phone call scene, instead having LAURIE receive the help and support of her friend. I felt that it was important to emphasize that these acts of support were reciprocal, and a significant aspect to the cohesiveness within this community. I also wanted to provide a contrasting element to the prevalent themes of women’s isolation and divisiveness during strikes, notions that were consistent in the piece already. Interviewees also imparted that their friendships, families, and other interpersonal connections, formed the basis of informal networks of support. This was active, and I wanted to demonstrate—through the play—instances where people *also* sought to help

⁹⁶ Opposite of a ‘Hollywood’ ending, sometimes abrupt, sad or unresolved, as compared to happy and fulfilled.

each other. Moreover, I felt as though their willingness to reach out to one another was a key component to this story.

Even this final version is truncated as compared to the initial one that was used at the beginning of rehearsals for the June 2019 production. I originally entertained the notion of having LAURIE ask LOUISE for help with storing her family's kitchen table, an item that had originally belonged to her father. Ultimately, as the director and writer, I cut out this little section of text, while under some tight time constraints.

Initially, this new scene featured the following section of text with LAURIE asking LOUISE for help. The latter had called on the telephone to "check in" on a friend, the former, is touched and surprised by the gesture. In answer to LOUISE's unsaid offer of "anything I can do for you?" LAURIE responds with the following section of text:

LAURIE: Hey, actually there is something.
(listens)

LAURIE: Do you have room to store my kitchen table? Just till we find a new place?
(listens)

LAURIE: Oh wonderful! It just occurred to me. It's the one thing I'll miss the most. It was my Dad's. Yah, one of those things you don't want to leave behind.
(listens)

LAURIE: Thanks Louise. Oh perfect, tell him I'm here all day so he can grab it anytime.
(listens)⁹⁷

Staging the end of the play in *The Kitchen Table/Where it All Began* (Act 2 Scene 10, A-332) is still ongoing and a work in progress. While working on the scene, Miriam Cusson, as LAURIE, wrestled with the prospect and stakes that underlined what it

⁹⁷ *One Day Stronger*, rehearsal draft, 23 May 2019, 62-63.

actually meant to ask for help. This was a tricky moment for our creative team, which, I felt, could have worked quite well. It was a humbling and a vulnerable moment for the main character. Miriam navigated this moment with grace and courage, in a manner that I felt befitted LAURIE.

Most of this work occurred in the rehearsal hall with the performers. I was pulled toward two possibilities. Having them try it both ways revealed for me that LAURIE wanted to ask for help with the table but could not bring herself to do it. She tried but could not speak the words. We discussed this together in the room, and came to the conclusion that, in light of the family losing their home, the table constituted part of this loss. It felt artificial to impose this minor victory. It did not feel right. Her silenced intention to ask for help spoke volumes about the emotional stakes that have affected many women in Sudbury. These feelings and this emotional reality are latent in the archive and translate quite effectively through the dynamics of a staged performance.

I reflected shortly afterwards, when the public presentation of the play had closed, that the ending needed a final brushstroke. I am still unsure what exactly this entails. I wondered what it would be like to have LAURIE pick up the phone to call LOUISE, as a character calling someone else had yet to take place. I was also really attached to, and previously planned, the possibility of closing the play with LAURIE, sitting at the kitchen table, playing solitaire. I really liked that look. The table was the connection to her past. It symbolically represented homes in this community. It was the central image of the play, and it was lost while staging this final scene. It took too much time (so my internal, insecure director voice insisted) to have the performer leave the telephone, to come back to the kitchen table at the centre of the playing area. Maybe it could have

worked. I did not trust myself under the pressure of the production's time constraints. Even so, and conversely, I was also attached to the look of the telephone setup in Act Two, that had the projection screen behind it. We elected to have her final moment of the play there, while prioritizing simplicity and the economy of movement. After she hangs up the phone, she contemplates. This could be a gesture of loss, or regret, but it is clear, she is moving on. This was followed by the blackout, to reveal the final projection of the now burning smokestack.⁹⁸ Again, what does it need? The creative process is ongoing. I know, in future productions, the dramaturgy will change.

This thematic exploration of the creative decisions and the process of scripting *ODS* demonstrates my intentions as both a playwright and as a public historian, to create a performable theatrical narrative. It also examines the usage of interview material as verbatim text and documentary material. This was a crucial step in my experiment to use theatre as an effective and affective means of doing public history in Sudbury. I sought to honour the substance and spirit of the “remembered histories.” As the characters and the play's scenes were formed using real memories, I wanted these portrayals and depictions to be respectful and honest, and to encourage dialogue with Sudburians about their pasts. An aspect that is already quite evident from the preceding paragraphs, that performers and their process, as well as workshop audience members who contributed feedback, were pivotal to the script-making process. Their roles were also significant while considering aspects relating to my efforts and choices involved with staging the play, which is the subject of the next chapter. The creative decisions, and our intention as director and performers to honour the “remembered histories,” continue to be central to

⁹⁸ For image see Appendix A, 345 (QLAB 76).

the discussion that follows, as this dissertation now shifts its focus on their actualization, impact and the resulting experiences relating to the live performance and production of *ODS*.

CHAPTER FOUR: PERFORMANCE AND PRODUCTION

The subject of this chapter is the overall production of *One Day Stronger* (hereafter *ODS*) that occurred in Sudbury in front of live audiences. While the previous chapter focused on key aspects relating the ethnographic material from the interviews that was used shape the theatrical narrative, this chapter focusses on the immediate dynamics, creative choices and inherent implications of these decisions related to the staging and performance of the scripted material.

Performers and their experiences working with the interview material, developing characters and then performing in the play are the subject of their own treatment following these introductory paragraphs. *ODS* enlisted a host of performers through its subsequent development through two workshops to convey this ethnographic and documentary material to the stage. The roles they performed for the show were just as significant for exploring historical memory in Sudbury as were their own personal and emotional connections to the work. Their individual and familial memories intersected with local memories about strikes in Sudbury. They experienced the blurring of their professional and personal selves, similar with other public history performers.¹ I argue that the rigour and emotional commitment required to do this work, the expertise, and skill required for this artform, as well as the overall stakes involved with a live performance, make this “neglected” forum of public history a uniquely challenging undertaking for the actors.²

¹ Scott Magelssen, *Living History Museums: Undoing History Through Performance*, (Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007); Stephen Hunt, "Acting the Part: 'living history' as a serious leisure pursuit," *Leisure Studies* 23, 4 (2004): 387-403; Amy Tyson, *The Wages of History: Emotional Labor on Public History's Front Lines* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2013).

² David Dean, "Theatre: A Neglected Site of Public History?", *The Public Historian* 34.3 (Summer 2012), 21-39.

The notion of “getting it right,” was central for performers during the workshop stages, rehearsals and post-show interviews. They frequently reflected about working with interviewee testimonies. Particularly evident was their overall concern with being accurate in terms of the historical material or period, and authentic with regards to honouring the spirit and intentions of interviewees. This was in much the same way that I was concerned with these aspects as a playwright in the previous chapter, and as a director in what follows.³ With sincerity and a sense of responsibility, each performer navigated their own personal sense of ownership towards the work, while they negotiated being faithful to the words and intentions of the original interviewee.⁴ It went beyond accomplishing a sense of plausibility for the audience, as our focus was about honesty, ethics and transparency, with the aim of giving people back their own histories in a respectful way. In other words, the actors served as witnesses in the present, and as arbiters within a fiction-based simulation of past strikes that were formed using local memories.⁵ Audiences also witnessed our representation of the past in the present. While their responses and reactions will be the focus of the next chapter, their presence at the performance also contributed to our ‘reality’ theatre making.

According to theatre scholar Carol Martin, “[w]hat makes documentary theatre provocative is the way in which it strategically deploys the appearance of truth, while inventing its own particular truth through elaborate aesthetic devices, a strategy that is

³ See discussion about authenticity in introduction to “Script Breakdown,” 83. For a useful discussion about authenticity as it relates to performance see also Vanessa Agnew and Juliane Tomann, “Authenticity,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, eds. Venessa Agnew et al. (London: Routledge, 2020), 20-24.

⁴ David Dean, “Negotiating Accuracy and Authenticity in an Aboriginal King Lear,” *Rethinking History*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (2017), 257.

⁵ Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, Edited by John Willett (Hill and Wang, 1966), 121. I am referring to my various attempts to apply Brecht’s “Street Scene” concept to my work. See “Script Breakdown,” 101.

integral to the restoration of behavior.”⁶ *ODS* was a historically-centred play based on memories, and we wanted these material traces to further enhance the intended immersive experience and the play’s authenticity for Sudbury audiences. This included their experiences with the verbatim text and other forms of documentary material that were used while constructing this “reality” play.⁷ Why did I make these decisions? What did they mean for the performer in process? How were they received by audience members in the moment?

PERFORMERS

As indicated in the previous chapter, I planned for the play to feature two performers. This was due to financial constraints, as each individual performer was remunerated with comparable professional rates.⁸ Ideally, I wanted to work with the same performance team throughout both workshops and for the final production. Local artists Jenny Hazelton and Matthew Heiti were my ideal duo. They had worked together on numerous occasions and had good chemistry, as demonstrated when they co-created and performed *Plague* (2013) in Sudbury, a play that was presented by their own theatre company Crestfallen. The company’s mandate according to a review of that show in the *Sudbury Star*, was to situate audiences within “seldom-seen or threatened sites,” and to

⁶ Carol Martin, “Bodies of evidence,” *The Drama Review* 50, no. 3 (2006), 10.

⁷ As this play was formed using interviewee material, I approach the use of verbatim as a technique and not a form, which in this chapter, is explored from the perspective of the performer. According to Caroline Wake, “verbatim refers to the origins of the text spoken in the play,” within the final product. See Caroline Wake, “Towards a Working Definition of Verbatim Theatre,” in Brown, *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*, ed (Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010), 2-5. As such, it works within a spectrum of practices, as broadly defined by Wake, under the category of “reality theatre,” in order from audience involvement and the use of their words. I label my approach as “documentary theatre” for the staging of this piece, as it relies on the use of a variety of documents, photographic projections etc, rather than just interviews. For a discussion on this spectrum of practices see Caroline Wake, “Verbatim Theatre Within a Spectrum of Practices,” in Brown, *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*, ed (Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010), 6-8.

⁸ We used comparable rates as per the Canadian Actors Equity Association.

“reanimate both a buried history and contribute to the discussion of how we live, love and work in our city.”⁹ Their artistic sensibilities were a good fit with my own and especially for the purposes of this public history project. I have known and worked with Hazelton in various productions since 2014, and Heiti has been my friend for twenty-five years as well as an artistic collaborator on many occasions. Moreover, and especially relevant to this project, I performed in the initial workshop for his play *Mucking in the Drift*, a verbatim and interview-based historical play which was later produced at the Sudbury Theatre Centre.¹⁰ As a performer, I was privy to Heiti’s process of conducting interviews and working with the material to create a historical play, and much of that experience informed my process for developing *ODS*.

I interviewed each of them in the same manner as my interviewees from the “Remembered Histories” chapter. I gathered their biographical “life history” stories about themselves and their relationship with the community. I also asked them about their notions of work and about their interest in history. Heiti is a local playwright, novelist, actor and sessional instructor. Hazelton relocated here from the Belleville area and was, until recently, a long-standing instructor of acting at Laurentian University with a specialization in physical theatre and clown, as well as a creator/performer and local theatre director.¹¹ You will notice in the following analysis how the unique perspectives and experiences of each performer informed their work throughout this project.

For the purposes of my research, they agreed to write in a journal during rehearsals, and were interviewed after each staged reading, and it was also my intention

⁹ Lara Bradley, “Plague a deft and clever play,” *Sudbury Star*, 27 November 2013.

¹⁰ Matthew Heiti, *Mucking in the Drift*, directed by David Savoy, Sudbury Theatre Centre, October and November 2013.

¹¹ Laurentian University has recently closed its theatre department in 2020.

to do the same following the final production. Working with friends and issuing weekly paychecks was awkward in some moments. I inwardly joked about the dynamic between capital and labour that was creeping its way into the rehearsal hall, as I was all of a sudden thrust into the position as the employer. Aside from my own inner and momentary doubts, the dynamic worked really well.

In a similar manner to Amy Tyson in her study of history workers at Fort Snelling in Minnesota, performers working on *ODS*, enacted a double role while conducting their artistic labour (re)playing in the past.¹² They experienced the blurring of their personal “real” life and their professional “performed” life. Through their exertions as paid history workers, they endured the emotional costs inherent with developing a live performance combined with, the added interplay, and emotional responsibility that they felt towards each other, the interviewees and audience members.¹³ As was demonstrated in the previous chapter, their contributions were significant in terms of developing the theatrical material, as the script’s creation was an ongoing process.

As it turned out, Greg Tremblay performed as the male actor for the first workshop reading, and was replaced by Matthew Heiti, who took on the role for both the second workshop and final production. Jenny Hazelton played the female actor for the first two workshops. When she had to leave the project, Miriam Cusson was cast in her place for the final production, only to be replaced by AJ Laflamme, our stage manager, at

¹² Amy Tyson, *The Wages of History: Emotional Labor on Public History's Front Lines* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2013).

¹³ See also Amy Tyson, "Men with Their Muskets and Me in My Bare Feet: Performing History and Policing Gender at Historic Fort Snelling Living History Museum," in *Enacting History* eds, Magelssen et al. (University of Alabama Press, 2011): 41-65 and Amy Macdonald, "Time Crossing Liaisons: Interpreter/Character Relationships at the Fortress of Louisbourg National History Site", M.R.E. Essay, Carleton University, 2016. My work with performers and these emotional connections was also aided and inspired by Emily Keyes, "I Was Here: (Re)Creating History, The Goulbourn Shooting," M.R.E. Essay, Carleton University, 2016.

the last minute due to Cusson's emergency illness. Caitlin Heppner also joined the production at the same time as Laflamme to operate the show's technical aspects in her stead.

With such unexpected turnaround with the artists throughout this public historical pursuit, our own number of participants increased. As such, the results were spread out amongst seven individuals (excluding myself) as opposed to my initial projection of having three members, including the stage manager. Ultimately, having a variety of project members was an advantage. However, the resulting lack of continuity, differed from my initial plans for having the same performers throughout. Performers may have had a deeper perspective and, perhaps, a more enriched and nuanced experience if they had been involved with the project from start to finish.

Their notions of labour in relation to this process were also significant. I asked each performer when we first met about what they did in terms of work, and what they conceived as "labour." Each had their own unique answer. Generally, on one level, they conveyed that the term "labour" equivocated to some form of exertion. This work is challenging physically, emotionally and mentally. Performers had to construe meanings within an ever-evolving text, and eventually memorize a challenging script. They had to physicalize each of their characters through their bodies, and bring each scene to life, through repetition, in the workshops and in rehearsals. This was a labour of love. Performers were unanimous in the sense that they exhibited and extolled an emotional connection to their work and to the project.

While the above comparison of my performers to Tyson's "emotional proletariats" from her study of living history and museum workers is apt, the fact that this

was an artistic project and not a corporate service environment is a key distinction worth pointing out.¹⁴ Similar with interactive service workers, I tasked my creative team with performing “emotional labour,” and in so doing, they were also required to use their own “emotions” to create “feeling states” in their public (audience).¹⁵ I also (as director) gave them very explicit instructions on how to act, and (as a playwright) what to say throughout the process. My job, in one sense, was also to watch and to ensure that the integrity of these choices was maintained, especially while preparing the production for a live audience. However, if the goal for employers in living history or museum environments as Tyson suggests, is to encourage the empowerment of their employees so that they can be creative, emotionally connected to their work, and be empathic and responsive to their visitors, *ODS* performers already enlisted this emotional engagement and commitment to their audiences as passionate artists, *before* even entering the project. Built into the theatrical process is a ready-made mandate for creativity, exploration, ownership of the work and a sense of responsibility to its audiences. As will be demonstrated throughout this chapter, performers as public history workers are ideally suited for this type of work.

One significant reason why *ODS* performers felt that the project provided emotional value for themselves, was because of how their work connected and resonated with the project’s audiences. This was equally true for both workshops and the final production. Jenny Hazelton equated her sense of this value, to when people “come out

¹⁴ Cameron Lynne Macdonald and Carmen Sirianni, “The Service Society and the Changing Experience of Work,” in *Working in the Service Society*, ed. Macdonald and Sirianni (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996), 3, as cited in Tyson, *The Wages of History*, 14-15. I am using this term in the spirit of how it was applied by Tyson in her work with public history workers.

¹⁵ Tyson, *The Wages of History*, 14.

and see the work.”¹⁶ So much of the struggle for her, as an artist in Sudbury, was in getting people to come out and to support theatre. Matthew Heiti agreed with this sentiment and went a step further by comparing the plight as an artist in Sudbury, to pushing a “Sisyphean bolder up a hill.” Moreover, he observed that, if there is a general cultural indifference to the arts in Canada, in Sudbury it is “a hostility.”¹⁷ Generally, performers for this project concurred with Heiti, who felt that art was necessary, but futile without an audience.

Performers also reflected on having an awareness in the moment while working in rehearsals and performing in the workshops. This work was ephemeral. “Getting it right” and honouring the story, required an emotional investment for those relationships with each other, and to the audience. The fact that the audience demonstrated such a level of care, raised the stakes and gave performers an added sense of responsibility, as compared to other theatre productions and processes. Each performer commented on the “warm” and “invested” audiences. This “warm” dynamic throughout *ODS* is distinct from what can often be characterized by practitioners, as a sterile relationship between audience and performer. Hazelton described it as an energy that was palpable from the beginning. Knowing that the script contains verbatim text from “real people,” increased her sense of responsibility as a performer. She felt that it was a public service and that she had to “do right by them.” She thought that it was “real cool in a different way than a piece of fiction,” and she admitted to having earned a sense of empathy for this community, for a “whole group of people I may not have felt empathetic about.” Ultimately, she felt that

¹⁶ Jenny Hazelton, interview by the author, Sudbury, May 2018.

¹⁷ Matthew Heiti, interview by the author, Sudbury, May 2018.

because of this documentary style “now I care more.”¹⁸ Similarly, Matthew spoke about feeling that we are sharing the “burden” with people in the audience. He felt the “pressure and responsibility,” and that we “are standing up for them.”¹⁹ As a point of convergence, he reflected about the curation of the stories through the piece that is both “drama” and a conduit to “things that aren’t spoken.”²⁰ Heiti had previously reflected following the first workshop, on the notion of “aftercare, people who stay for a bloodletting. Therapy it’s that they want to be validated. There was evidence of this when out of fifty people, thirty-five people spoke up, which was huge. For talkbacks that never happens.”²¹

Performers expressed that they felt an added sense of responsibility, while speaking actual words and portraying characters that derived from real people. During a post-show talkback session, Matthew Heiti spoke of the creative team’s conventional duty to honour the playwright’s words, with an added “communal responsibility,” in this case, to interviewees from whom they originated.²² As such, he felt that audience members felt reflected in the piece and through the play’s characters. Jenny Hazelton, who performed in both workshops, spoke about how the interview material helped to further ground her performance because it was “real text” from “real people.”²³ It gave her extra ammunition and substance as an actor in terms of her craft, as compared to a play that was not based in, or no longer connected to, the interviews. She also felt the

¹⁸ Hazelton, interview, October 2018.

¹⁹ It is notable how he used the word “up” instead of “in,” and is one example of the sense of social responsibility and level of care that these performers exhibited towards their work and their audiences.

²⁰ Heiti, interview, October 2018.

²¹ Heiti, interview, May 2018.

²² Heiti, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

²³ Hazelton, interview, October 2018.

added responsibility for getting it “right,” especially in front of people in the Sudbury community, whom she felt, knew the material, or those who helped to create it.²⁴

Similarly, for the final production, AJ Laflamme felt that this “memory dream play” was inspired by a combination of people’s stories and historical events. In her words, this merger helped to “bridge the gap between fiction and reality.” The words and composite characters made the material more accessible for performers and audiences. She compared *ODS* to when she worked on *London Road* as an assistant stage manager.²⁵ Both shows are interview-based, use a verbatim technique, and feature characters that echo “personal truths.” These respective narratives are told using stories that come from a “place of truth in someone’s memory.” As such, Laflamme believed that the stakes are raised in terms of accountability, as opposed to stories with characters that are not based on real people, with “public lives” beyond the show.²⁶

Performers deal in emotions as currency and as part of their trade. Each of these actors sought emotional connections with the characters in order to align with their needs, wants, and desires. They were, in turn, affected by people in the audiences. Beyond the inherent dynamics within the live performance, the creative team experienced their own emotional connections and tensions associated with the project. Caitlin Heppner and AJ Laflamme, late additions to their roles during the final production, were terrified in the moments leading up to the show. They both felt responsible to the work in part due to their relationship with me. I was also scared and had a lot invested emotionally in the

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Alecky Blythe and Adam Cork, *London Road*, directed by Jackie Maxwell, Canadian Stage, January and February 2014. This was a relatively recent contract, and she reflected on her experiences working on the musical that also utilized a verbatim style, and where its text derived from local community members that were interviewed regarding a series of murders in Ipswich, Suffolk.

²⁶ AJ Laflamme, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2019.

show. Matthew Heiti did not speak of fear, but he demonstrated that he cared deeply for the project as well. The emotional reactions demonstrated by audiences during the feedback sessions reminded him about “how much [he] love[s] this city.” He spoke of how he sometimes felt conflicted living in Sudbury. He “hates a lot of stuff” regarding its current state of affairs, enough that it sometimes “makes [him] want to move.” Then, when he “sees grown people crying [and having] huge emotional moments [it demonstrates for him, how people are] viscerally connected [like]...digging into the rock.” He concluded that, “Oh no, I do have a very present love of this place, but it is to the people more than anything.”²⁷ This was a labour of love and the challenges that accompanied its creation and staging, echoes the emotional investment of interviewees and audience members who lived these experiences.

Each member of the creative team had a unique emotional and personal experience while working on *ODS*. Greg Trembley attested afterwards, upon reflection, that “it got really personal.” He relived the emotions and was unexpectedly reminded of how the 2009-10 Vale strike impacted his life, as the economic pressures resulting from that mining strike severely affected his bottom line as a videographer and photographer. He reflected that he did not “realize this connection,” that this story has “never been more relevant,” and as he pointed out, referring to his connection with the characters in the story, that “everyone has a table.” To that point, he valued learning about a friend’s experiences during strikes. After his performance during the first workshop, he recalled after the post show discussion that “we didn’t even know she went through this.” These audience connections will be explored further in the next chapter in terms of the play’s

²⁷ Heiti, interview by the author, June 2019.

reception, and his reaction is noteworthy. He also recalled several stories about the frustration experienced within his own family while growing up in Sudbury, when during layoffs or mining strikes, out-of-work employees would regularly poach on his father's business as a contractor, often underbidding him. Ultimately, this forced his family to move to Windsor. Greg valued working on *ODS* as a performer because it provided him with a means to "feel what people went through" in the past instead of being lectured about it as a piece of history.²⁸

For Matthew Heiti, the play also enabled him to interact with his own familial memories in a very direct way, particularly those relating to his father. Stephen Heiti, an interviewee, shared his experiences at the beginning of the project. Some of his anecdotes and words contributed to shaping the play.²⁹ According to Matthew, and evident from his father's interview, Stephen Heiti valued his time volunteering during the 2009-10 Vale strike. The experience was "really big" for him, according to Matthew. It provided his father with a sense of "worth" and an opportunity to forge a "big connection to his own father, that he didn't have in life." Matthew recalls Stephen's "romanticizing of Mine Mill," and, because of this, he was attracted to playing the character of BILLY. When he worked on the character's scenes in the first act, Matthew also had the opportunity to connect with his grandfather, whom he never met. He described his approach to playing BILLY as "mythic [and in] kind of the way my dad mythologized his dad." Matthew reconnected with his own childhood memories of his family lore, as an adult. His

²⁸ Greg Trembley, interview by the author, Sudbury, May 2018.

²⁹ Stephen's "Nel's Thibault" anecdote that his father told him was the source of inspiration for *A Man and His Home* (Act 1, Scene 18, A-297).

engagement with them in the present helped to revitalize his connection with the family and its past.³⁰

Miriam Cusson also had the opportunity to interact with memories of her own family. She felt that there were many “common points with the play.” She recalled that her mother spent a great deal of time at the kitchen table. While portraying both LAURIE or ROSE, she felt like she experienced her mother’s or grandmother’s points of view through these characters, their stories, and their respective stations. She recalled the uproar that accompanied her mother’s decision to work, then in her forties, in the late 1970s. Similar to ROSE’s encounter with MURDOCK, she also recalled the story about why she originally quit working, when she was a young and married, having endured sexual harassment from her manager.³¹ Her father was working out of town in Elliot Lake, and the manager “suggested that he should go over to take care of her needs.” Miriam felt “awful that that was the norm,” and that her mother’s only option at that time was to “quit or leave.” Miriam admits that she likes to talk and is “someone who hates conflict.” Conversely, as a performer, she “love[s] playing [these parts] and “it is so energizing” to have the opportunity to “battle,” “give voice,” and to be “a vehicle” for these women in her family, as characters. She felt like this was an act of “giving.”³²

On a related note, the performers also experienced transformations of sorts as they interacted with the audience through the staging of LAURIE’s story. AJ Laflamme became the third actress to have turn at playing the female lead. The “unstable presence

³⁰ Heiti, interview, June 2019.

³¹ See *Husband and Wife* (Act 1, Scene 8, A-277).

³² Miriam Cusson, interview by the author, Sudbury, July 2019.

of LAURIE” faced oblivion, especially when Miriam Cusson was sick in the hospital.³³ AJ credited her ability to do the show to both adrenaline and extreme yet internalized panic, as “cool under pressure is ninety percent why I get hired.” She loved the characters and like Miriam “wanted so much to pay homage” and “do justice to those voices.” Several of those women would come out and see the show, and she wanted their approval. There was a lot on the line and as she was the lead character and the play’s successful execution depended greatly on her. She told me that she took ownership over the role immediately, to stave off any self-doubt. She drew strength from the women who contributed their stories. She was happy, after having completed the performances, when reflecting on how those present from the audience, “said nice things to me.” More importantly, for her, it felt good that the “audience connected with the story and understood it” and that “they didn’t talk a lot about me ... they just talked about the story. They saw the show as a whole [and] that was really nice ... I really enjoyed that.”³⁴ The professional stage manager was impromptu transformed into a lead actress.

Caitlin Heppner joined the project on more short notice than Laflamme and having far less of a connection to working in theatre. Aside from one previous collaborative effort as a playwright, she came into this process with zero experience. She was “terrified,” more so than how she felt leading up to her M.A. thesis defence. It was a lot harder to consider the prospect of making a mistake in “somebody else’s project.” She cried that morning, before agreeing to join at the last minute. This was her first experience as an integral member of a theatrical production, and as part of a live

³³ Heiti, interview, June 2019. Matthew coined this expression depicting the perpetual recasting of LAURIE.

³⁴ Laflamme, interview.

performance. She felt like in doing this, she was, effectively, confronting some of her demons. She expressed that she valued being the person that could be counted on, and that this was a concern from her past. This impending experience was consequently a trigger in terms of diminishing her self-confidence. She also confronted the hidden fears of looking foolish and failing, which, surfaced within the immediacy of doing this play. Her disposition toward this artform was unique among our group. Therefore, it became clear while describing her experiences to me after the fact, that doing this play, for her, had orchestrated a visceral transformation through having confronted these fears. Ultimately, after the run, she believed definitively, that this was something she could do, and that she was really proud of the experience.³⁵

Their personal relationship to the story and to Sudbury's labour history was inevitably complicated. There were moments where performers who otherwise spoke of feeling very connected throughout this process felt disconnected from the project. Jenny Hazelton, a resident of Sudbury for seventeen years, reflected on how she consistently felt a "profound sense of disconnection," not being "from here." She felt that this "might be an effect of working on this piece that brings this to the surface." She admitted to feeling like an "outsider" in Sudbury, having moved here from the Belleville area. As much as the historical and interview material fostered a connection to the work and helped her to form a bond with the audience, these aspects also had the effect of making her feel like an outsider. She reflected on how the historical material and context featured in the play, gave her that "imposter feeling." She felt "self-conscious about feeling ignorant." During the intermission of the second workshop at the Legion, a member of

³⁵ Caitlin Heppner, interview by the author, Sudbury, June 2019.

the audience approached Jenny and asked her to clarify some moments from the play. Before Jenny could respond, the audience member's friend interjected by saying "oh dear, she's just an actress, she doesn't know." During our interview, Jenny acknowledged that the women did not mean any harm yet felt that this exchange derailed her authority as a performer and, in her sense of belonging as a Sudburian. She lamented that "seventeen years, two decades [and I] still feel like an outsider." She felt that her sense of ownership of the play's characters was threatened, having invested a significant amount of effort using the actual testimonies to apply her craft. Furthermore, in terms of needing validation, she wondered if she "needed them to let me in their club?"³⁶

My exchange with Matthew Heiti's father Stephen Heiti, about *A Man and His Home* (Act 1, Scene 18, A-297), highlighted his personal attachment to telling this story. In the exchange, he betrayed an underlying sense of his insecurity, wanting his story to be believable because it had originated from him. He was concerned about certain specific details relating to the scene, that is peripheral to the discussion here.³⁷ His distance from the actual event caused his son, Matthew Heiti, as a performer, to doubt himself in terms of his feeling entitled to perform aspects of this story. Matthew was conscious, throughout the workshop and rehearsals leading up to the production, that he was "doing *that* story."³⁸ He recounted hearing his father's "Nels Thibault story" on many occasions and acknowledged instances when he retold it as well. According to Matthew, "neither of us has any right to tell it. I heard it second hand from him, he heard it from his dad, and

³⁶ Hazelton, interview by the author, October 2018.

³⁷ After the second workshop at the Legion, Stephen approached me and questioned the use of a shotgun for the scene, wondering if that was accurate. I had initially used shotgun because that was his word used to describe the firearm from his story. Subsequently, this reference was changed to "rifle" and "gun." See *A Man and His Home* (Act 1 Scene 18, A-297). See page 174 of this chapter for a further discussion on the use and depiction of firearms during the production.

³⁸ Heiti, interview by the author, October 2018.

his dad wasn't there [,] and I was even less there.”³⁹ This was one among several instances recounted by performers, when they felt like imposters or outsiders. How much of this story was true? Did that even matter?

This was not a typical experience for these actors who frequently work with characters that are fictional creations, drawn in some sense from the real. As such, they are usually tasked with bringing them to life. However, these characters from *ODS* were formed using real testimony. The resulting anecdotes, scenes, words and the verbatim usage of specific testimony were recognizable for audience members. The context of the play's staging in Sudbury, the audience's familiarity with this local history and their sense ownership of that material based on local memories, fostered a sense of co-creation and co-ownership during the performances. In this case, Matthew, and to some extent Stephen Heiti's familiarity and misgivings about the story, served to disconnect them from this moment in the play. Perhaps someone sitting in the audience might have had a more direct experience and connection to that event. Significantly, this level of personal affinity towards the material did not impact or resonate with workshop or production audiences, most of whom appeared to value and recognize this scene as a plausible piece of the Sudbury experience. In terms of having a sense of ownership of the story, it did not matter how Matthew or Stephen felt about it, even though the opposite was also true, because of the value I place on their experiences as participants in this project.⁴⁰

³⁹ Heiti, interview by the author, October 2018.

⁴⁰ Both outcomes are true. Their experiences are valid as participants in the project. Also, none of these feelings or opinions resonate or matter to the audience who are witnessing the staged narrative.

PRODUCTION

“We are always connected to what’s under our feet.”

I found myself reflecting on the significance of this idea that was articulated by Carol Mulligan and is thematically and textually present throughout the play. We are all connected through our stories and our storytelling. This is, in itself, an act of creation. It is an offer and it is voluntary. I wanted to echo in my offering of a show about strikes in Sudbury, the gesture and spirit of sharing that underpinned my initial interviews.

One of my most pressing concerns before the show was that I needed an audience. After all, I panicked inwardly, ‘it is a new work of Canadian theatre and it’s about history!’ I did not even know if there was going to be an audience.⁴¹ Both my responsibilities as a public historian and as an artist depended on this outcome. Among other factors, there can be no show without people watching it.⁴² I needed audience feedback and I felt excessive pressure to successfully execute the material aspects of putting on this production. This is also where I was my least comfortable. I desired audience participation. I wanted to encourage dialogue about people’s experiences in response to the show as featured in the last two chapters of this dissertation. I extended the gesture and performed the necessary work and efforts. It felt risky. There was a sense of urgency in the present. On another level, my feelings were similar to what I noticed with my interviewees, when they first shared their stories. They left me with the impression that it cost them something, emotionally, to share these experiences, and that

⁴¹ The struggle for Canadian theatres to keep audiences is well documented, added to the fact that, based on my experience, plays too loudly labelled “historical” tend to keep people away.

⁴² Peter Brook, *The Empty Space: A Book About the Theatre: Deadly, Holy, Rough, Immediate* (New York: Scribner, 1968), 9.

this dynamic within the exchange was important. Many of them expressed relief after sharing.⁴³

I was relieved that each of the three shows was very well attended. This was the most significant form of participation. People came out and watched a play on a beautiful first weekend of summer. I recall telling someone who enquired, that it had turned out better than I could have imagined. I meant this generally, after having completed such a challenging stage of the project. In terms of audience turnout, I felt so grateful that approximately fifty (and more for one show) attended each performance. We had that number of chairs available and, had to pull out more as needed. Prior to the production, I expressed that I would have been content with twenty spectators per show. I took this as evidence that people supported the play and felt that it was important. Furthermore, many of them contributed their feedback and some participated in the discussion afterwards. This project includes contributions from many individuals, in addition to my initial interviewees.⁴⁴

AJ Laflamme was largely responsible for implementing the set design, costumes, and technical aspects. As a creative team, we wished to curate an immersive experience for our Sudbury audiences that was inspired by the idea of conveying a familial setting within a familiar community-hall environment. The entire set was designed to make the audience feel like they were in LAURIE's home. The table being the central element of the show, transformed, like the actors, from scene to scene. We constructed a home-like setting complete with a telephone table, makeshift icebox and shelves (constructed using

⁴³ See "Remembered Histories," 27-28.

⁴⁴ Brian Sison, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019. Brian travelled from Toronto for the show and he volunteered at our box office and as an usher. He spoke about variety of role players that were involved within this collective assembly.

wooden theatre boxes) and cardboard moving boxes that we scattered throughout the set, as a constant visual reminder that LAURIE is losing her home.

Figure 4.1 - Table

The kitchen table resonated for performers and audience members as a pivotal location, symbol, and set piece for *ODS*.⁴⁵ As the central piece within a domestic setting, the set and setting kindled familial memories. Most people who responded or provided feedback related on that level. Many people mentioned family members, parents and memories associated with sitting at the table. Audience member Kim Fahner observed that “[a]t the centre of the play is the symbol of a kitchen table, the place around which families share food and stories. [The play] creates a space for community, just as that table serves as both a touchstone and a vehicle for telling important stories about our

⁴⁵ See “Remembered Histories” and “Script Breakdown,” 45 and 165, for discussion about the table as a “commanding stereotype” at various intervals in this process. The term borrowed from Daniel McNeil, Yana Meerzon and David Dean, “Introduction,” in *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 6. On the ways in which publics connect with the past through objects and material culture in historic sites, museum and theatre see Max Page and Randall Mason, *Giving Preservation a History Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Sharon Macdonald, ed, *A Companion to Museum Studies*, 1st ed., Vol. 12 (Oxford Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011) and Alison Forsyth and Chris Megson, *Get Real: Documentary Theatre Past and Present* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

town's history."⁴⁶ The opening of Act Two is a good illustration of what captured Fahner's description (Act 2, Scene 1, A-302). There are playing cards in front of LAURIE, and at some point during her speech, she pours herself a cup of coffee. From the audience's vantage point, everyone could just sit in this kitchen and listen to LAURIE while she spoke from the kitchen table. It was her story, told from within her setting, and it evoked her perspective. The intimacy of the set and the positioning of the audience helped them share in this personal, everyday moment.

The table served multiple purposes as a set piece in addition to its main use as an actual table. As such, it switched locations from one side of the playing area to the other at the intermission. When it was not functioning as a table, it often moved and was repurposed for other uses depending on the needs of each scene. For example, in *No More Turkeys* (Act 1, Scene 15, A-288), it was flipped onto its vertical (shorter) side and used as ROSE's counter at the hall. The table is fixed on the opposite side of the projection screen for *Boys Will Be Boys* (Act 2, Scene 5, A-316), but we used its chairs as a makeshift firepit for the picket line. Also, in *Old Man and an Old Woman Discuss Early Retirement* (Act 2, Scene 8, A-324) we wanted to highlight the reality that hockey and sports were very popular in Sudbury historically, both as sources for recreation and entertainment. The performers flipped the table on to its horizontal (longer) side to create the impression of a large television screen in the middle of the playing area, to emphasize its prominence within this home. This was also supported using audio clips from an

⁴⁶ Kim Fahner, Facebook post, 22 June 2019.

actual NHL game from that time period, as well as projected images.⁴⁷ It was as if the playing space had been transformed into a living room.

The most abstract use of the table was when we staged *Tales From An Angry Young Man* (Act 1, Scene 7, A-273). Both Heiti and I enjoyed staging this scene, having neither of us ever worked underground. We were always fascinated by this environment, and it gave us the opportunity to explore without having to follow in anybody's actual footsteps. We mapped out and performed the unique actions that could have taken place along interviewee Ron Tough's "ten-minute walk" that was used as inspiration for this scene.⁴⁸ He had a makeshift light that was attached to a mining helmet on his head, and we darkened the space. BILLY is reliving the experience of walking through a dark mine, a daily trek that several of my interviewees recounted, and many others experienced in the community. I directed Matthew to use the table and chairs as tunnel and ladders, as a part of this physical sequence. Furthermore, we included a loud audio clip of an explosion to evoke the dangerous environment and ever-present threat of death, that was a reality for workers and their families. Speaking with my dad a few weeks after the show, he reminded me of the significance of working underground in terms of the play's reception in Sudbury. In a rare moment of emotion, over the phone, he spoke about how his experiences working underground as a mechanic came flooding back during this scene. According to him, this was the moment in the play that "brought it all back to me."⁴⁹ He mentioned that he thought my grandfather would have appreciated it, who had also worked underground at INCO.

⁴⁷ We used actual audio footage from a famous 1979 playoff matchup between the Boston Bruins and the Montreal Canadiens. For image see Appendix A, 345 (QLAB 73).

⁴⁸ Ron Tough, interview with the author, Sudbury, June 2017.

⁴⁹ Patrick Skanes, phone conversation with author, Sudbury, August 2019.

Staging the telephone sequences were also noteworthy in terms of its immersive impact on the audience and performers, especially in the very tense *Phone Calls* (Act 1, Scene 16, A-291) scene. We used an old rotary phone borrowed from the Sudbury Theatre Centre (STC) with a very long cord. As director, I ensured that the rotary phone sound effect was extra loud and jarring to the ear. We also borrowed an infant's especially urgent and grating cries from an audio recording. Moreover, in Act One, the phone table was at the far end of playing area (stage side), opposite to where the bedrooms were situated (projection side). ROSE had a great distance to travel each time the telephone rings, all the while reassuring a young LAURIE, then a crying infant, and quelling her own fears during this harrowing experience. Miriam Cusson, while rehearsing this scene, reflected on how she, "love[d] the chaos during the PHONE SCENE... and how it affects...[.] [I] will fight off my control freak tendencies to let it 'inhabit' my space."⁵⁰ The sequence was quite overwhelming, both for performers enacting this domestic trial, and for audience members as witnesses.

I originally wanted the entire show to be presented in the round, with the kitchen table as the main focal point.⁵¹ The idea was to create the effect of having the audience experience the play as if they were sitting at the kitchen table in someone's home. The stories and testimonies were relayed to me in this manner during my interviews, and I felt like this was a good way to create the atmosphere of home. In terms of staging, the actors could just sit and talk naturally, while drinking a coffee. I wanted to simulate everyday conversation within a familiar setting as a means of providing an immersive experience. This concept would also enable a level of intimacy between performer and audience

⁵⁰ Miriam Cusson, process journal entry, 12 June 2019.

⁵¹ Theatre in the round is where the audience surrounds the stage.

member. Text could be spoken and heard with little effort similar to how one would talk to a friend or family member. This particular configuration did not work out due to logistics, but we still applied the same strategy for our set design. Instead, we decided on using an alley configuration, with the audience situated on two opposing banks, to accommodate the use of our projection screen. A laundry basket with a sheet hanging on a clothesline framed the far end of the stage, where there was no audience. This clothesline held some of the wardrobe pieces that the actors would use to embody the variety of characters in the show, but the primary purpose was for it was to act as the actual projection screen with the projector disguised behind it.

Figure 4.2 - Projection Screen

On the opposite side from the projection screen sheet, the playing space ended at the foot of a raised proscenium stage that was already in place in the hall. This was one example of when we experimented with Richard Schechner's practice of environmental theatre. Schechner's Performance Group (based in New York in late 1960s and 1970s) sought to enhance the immediacy of audience experience. They adapted the theatre space or area to conform to each play as I have also attempted here. Audiences were conceived of as part of the performance with an emphasis on the space as, "an attitude. Start with all

the space there is and decide what to use, what not to use, and how use what you use.”⁵²

Audience members were witnessing the play in a traditional community hall setting, which included the wooden floor, old smells, and an authentic look for people from the Sudbury area. We wanted to use the hall as is and not pretend we were in some neutral space. We used the hall’s built-in-stage as part of the show for LAURIE’s fundraiser speech in Toronto in *Women Fighting INCO Solidarity Benefit* (Act 2 Scene 6, A-320). We used alternate lighting sources to light this area that were already present in the hall, creating a different look from the rest of the show.

Figure 4.3 - Podium End of Set

We also staged and situated a variety of tables with tablecloths and chairs around the space, to hold the box office, programs and snacks. Initially we wanted to serve coffee to audience members as if they were sitting in an actual kitchen and thereby immersed within the action that was taking place in this memory play. Due to the summer heat and logistics, we settled on water and with refreshments laid out around the space (with baked goods), and it elicited the feeling of a community hall meeting.

We lit the show using sixteen high-performance LED lighting pods and three Par Can lighting fixtures that were already present in the hall. The LED’s were mounted on

⁵² Richard Schechner, *Environmental Theater* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1973), 25.

tripods and situated at each of the four corners of the playing space. Laflamme's design for the lighting scheme favoured using sepia tones for flashback sequences. She wanted an "ethereal" look when LAURIE interacts with people from her past. She also favoured the use of practical light sources onstage, whenever possible. For example, she used candles – because electricity has been cut off to the house according to the script – which were augmented by blue tones to give a late-night-feel. In a later scene, a headlamp was used for BILLY to create the effect of him crawling through the mines with the rest of the stage in darkness. The space was already naturally lit with sunlight through multiple windows, which we attempted to darken by pinning the halls' burgundy curtains with clothes pins. The effect was not perfect as some light inevitably spilled into the space, despite our efforts. We created some basic looks with the LED's to signify LAURIE's dream world, flashbacks, a cut-scene light, among others.⁵³ In one specific instance, we used a pulsing red light that gradually intensified to signify BILLY's heart attack which culminated in a sharp snap into stark light to evoke LAURIE's sense of loss and sorrow.⁵⁴ The battery-operated candles were used at the top of the show and were augmented with a slight glow from the LEDs to reveal GUY and LAURIE at nighttime, before their big move. This sequence was then recalled at the end of the show to bookend it nicely.

⁵³ See Appendix A for lighting looks during each scene.

⁵⁴ For this sequence of cues see Appendix A, 298-299 (QLAB 51, 52 and 53).

Figure 4.4 - Top of Show

Laflamme's wardrobe design for the show was minimalist in the same manner as for the props and set. Both actors played multiple characters that needed to be distinguishable. One costume piece was selected to represent each character. These were added as needed to the actor's base layer, which was selected to be 1970s GUY and LAURIE, during the "present" of the play. Costume pieces were set on a clothes lines, a coat rack, and in a laundry basket, to make it appear as if they were part of the overall household environment. Finding the look that we wanted for ROSE was notably challenging. The easy choice was to give her an apron to represent a stay-at-home mother, but that felt wrong for her character. We decided on a headscarf, evoking the image of both "Rosie the Riveter," as well as the mother, wife, cook, and "everywoman." The scarf was versatile and could be worn in many ways to represent all the facets of ROSE. We also, avoided putting LAURIE in a dress, and we felt that she would be better suited to jeans or slacks. BILLY wore the plaid jacket and GUY did not. This choice was deliberate, as per my process of addressing stereotypical depictions of men and miners.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ See "Script Breakdown," 123.

We used realistic items whenever possible for props and set dressing throughout the space. All hand props were practical and made to look period specific. A metal lunch box, radio, milk crates and cardboard boxes were situated at various corners of the playing space. These could contain props, extra costume pieces or serve as packing boxes for LAURIE and GUY in the story, who were preparing to move the next morning. Along the hall's stage-side corners of the alley playing space (opposite the projection screen side), we created a makeshift fridge with the hollowed ends of stacked wooden staging blocks, to hold the beer bottles and formed extra shelves that held pots, potatoes, glassware and all of the *things* that the actors used. Across from the "kitchen" we set up a telephone table for Act ONE, which was then shifted to the other side of the playing area (close to the projection screen along the same audience bank) to create a different look for LAURIE's home in Act TWO.

In each corner of the performance space, we displayed playing cards, coffee cups, pots and battery-operated candles, among many other items, that were used as they were required by the dramatic action. These *things* or props were added to give actors "business" onstage during the scenes such as pouring drinks, peeling potatoes and putting dishes away. This kind of busy-ness was important to keep the action moving within the alley configuration. Coffee was poured from a coffee urn and water was consumed from beer bottles. The coffee was actual coffee (cold) and the wine and liquor were safely dyed water to create the effect when these liquids were visible. We wanted both audience and performer to be surrounded by these material traces to evoke the period, and some sense of the domestic setting. We wanted these material traces to further enhance the intended immersive experience.

A salient example of this occurred when we rehearsed *Two Men Search Another Man's House* (Act 1, Scene 11, A-282). As a union representative, BILLY is trying to verify if his friend BEN is eligible for strike relief. While staging the scene, we explored the impact and tension of this situation through dramatic action. The actors could accomplish this through what is *unsaid*. While BEN is retrieving his paperwork and proof of his impoverished circumstances, BILLY, innocently looks in a pot on the kitchen table. The noise of the lid alerts BEN's attention, and both he and BILLY exchange a moment *as if* the latter was checking what the former was having for dinner. This slight action, both innocuous and habitual, is amplified during a strike. Nothing comes of it, as the main perpetrator in the scene is KEN, but the suggestion remains that these suspicions and tensions could erupt at any moment.

Similarly, when we staged *A Child Eavesdrops* (Act 1, Scene 13, A-285), the tensions really came to life. LAURIE is sneaking around late at night during the strike to hear what all the adults are yelling about. In the final production, we removed BILLY's physical presence from the stage, and directed LAURIE to travel across the space from one end of the alley to the other. She knocked over an actual chair, in accordance with her line, to (re)create and mimic the exact sound she was hearing from downstairs. It was *as if* she was moving through the space normally designated as the kitchen, that looked like a kitchen, but was not. We also activated her track to both maintain the dynamic of direct address, while giving her a sense of purpose and something to do. We used the projected image of a darkened door, with light spilling from underneath. Finally, we used sound effects to invoke voices that were increasing in terms of volume and anger.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ See Appendix A, 285 (QLAB 32, 34, and 35).

Staging the actual gun was challenging in terms of my overall concern with finding the most believable and safe way to do this. We started out having BILLY manipulate the broom as if it were a firearm. We liked the idea and versatility of using domestic objects in multiple, meaningful, and creative ways. In the end, we felt that the effect was too much in the style of caricature, and it was not consistent with our design concept of frequently using realistic props. However, the idea of using an authentic firearm was disconcerting. A gun is a very powerful symbol, and it added a host of threatening associations for our audience. I felt that using a replica, a stage gun, carried with it a serious responsibility. On the one hand, we wanted our audience to experience the stakes and volatility of BILLY's predicament, while on the other hand we did not want to intimidate, frighten, or scare members of our audience. As we had situated the audience in banks on two different sides of the playing area, where was Matthew supposed to point the gun? Ultimately, as a design team, we felt that we could accomplish the appropriate levels of threat, violence, and volatility in this scene without using a realistic firearm. Instead, LAURIE describes the scene and BILLY confronts the mob, while the actor Heiti, stands in silhouette. He was backlit using the projector light, so as to direct focus to the descriptions and words. The actors became symbolic representations, and the audience was then free to imagine the actual scene in their minds.

PRODUCTION: VISUAL ELEMENTS

The visual elements offered audience members an opportunity to personally connect to the play as well as to make connections with the larger historical period. The projections were intended to bring in visual representations from actual historical events by using newspaper articles, photographs, pamphlets or other pieces of documentary

material. Other images were used to place the location of a given scene, or to complement what was being discussed in the play. A general sentiment held by workshop and production audience members, and one that I shared, is that they complemented the aesthetic of this historically-centred play by providing documentary and material traces. Some of these aspects were otherwise very difficult to incorporate into a theatrical narrative. When I scanned the audience during the performances, I noticed that they were both drawn towards the action on the stage as well as to the images that were projected on the screen. Aspects relating to the overall audience reception of these projections and the historical material will be explored further in the next chapter, but in terms of their overall experience during the show, performers and audience members had conflicting views about their inclusion.

Audience feedback and performer testimony demonstrated that people were viewing and thinking about the projections during the performances. Some people wanted more information about some of the projections, as in the case of Susie who informed me in an email that “[w]hat caught my eye was the photo of the pray for miners church photo.” She then requested, “[i]f you can see if the article says St. Mary's Ukrainian Church, I'd luv[sic] to see a scanned version of that with *Sudbury Star* writeup.”⁵⁷ After the show, I sent her a digital copy of the article. There were many others who noticed, reflected or commented upon these projections, and they conveyed the impression that this was a valuable part of their experience watching *ODS*.

Conversely, others felt that the use of projections was a distraction. Theatre artists and directors, in particular, had a difficult time with this aesthetic choice. Judi Straughan

⁵⁷ Susie (no last name), email to author, 23 June 2019.

expressed this issue following the second workshop, although she did not reiterate this in her feedback following the production.⁵⁸ STC artistic director John McHenry, felt that they were powerful images and that they complemented this type of project. However, in our discussion after the dress rehearsal on 21 June, he felt like they had the effect of taking people's focus away from the actors and away from the main action of the play.⁵⁹ As a performer, Matthew Heiti agreed. He recalled trying to speak a section of text from the play, only to notice six people looking at the screen. He remembered thinking to himself, "I was trying to tell you something. Why am I competing with these images?"⁶⁰ Although he enjoyed them as pieces of historical content, he was not enthusiastic of using these projections from the outset.⁶¹ Even so, whereas fellow performer AJ Laflamme drew personal inspiration from certain projections, Matthew felt that they hindered his connection to the audience in some instances, and thought that the projections jeopardized his emotional connection with them.

This is the sort of technical and aesthetic element that, from my experience, theatre practitioners (myself included) would single out. As the director of the show, I think these criticisms are valid. It was my responsibility to curate the experience for my audience, and to tell the story through its staging. In the professional practice of text-based and mainstream theatre, especially in English, there is a commonly held perception that the actors on the stage and the playwright's words are sacrosanct. I am also of this school, to some extent, even as I stand by my decision to use the projections. This was not an attempt a recreating traditional modes or practices within mainstream theatre. As

⁵⁸ Judi Straughan, email to the author, 23 June 2019.

⁵⁹ John McHenry, post show discussion, Sudbury, 21 June 2019.

⁶⁰ Heiti, post show interview by author.

⁶¹ Heiti, interview by the author, October 2018.

an audience member myself, I watched the actors perform their actions in the playing space throughout the play, and rarely, if ever, exclusively focused on the images. Each individual was free to look where they chose. There was a unique view from any vantage, as well as the possibility of obstructions. The staging was fluid and the configurations within the playing space were always shifting. However, when people arrived earlier and inquired about the best vantage point, I often guided them to one of the two banks that were situated furthest from the projection screen. This was because, unconsciously, I wanted them to have both the action and the projections in view for most of the show. I endured many moments of doubt regarding my decision of having a bricolage, with multiple creative aspects working in concert, to stage this piece of documentary theatre.⁶² Was this approach not better suited for a museum exhibit, where consumers are, to some extent, free to mediate their own experience? Although Susan Bennett has suggested that “theatre and museums have increasingly become symbolic and actual neighbours,” I sometimes questioned whether the combination of these elements undermined the audience’s engagement within this embodied performance.⁶³ There were instances that when people chose to look at the projected material they were taken out of the action of the play.

To my surprise, incorporating projections as part of *ODS*, in some instances, had the effect of complicating the distinction between fiction and reality. According to theatre scholar Carol Martin, “[p]erformance of the real can collapse the boundaries between the

⁶² I may have, at times, suffered from my aesthetic indecision regarding the style of this play. On the one hand, I wanted to stage a character-driven and psychologically motivated story (particularly in Act Two), while on the other, I wanted to situate them within my avant-guard-inspired staging and conception of space, using the various documentary elements.

⁶³ Susan Bennett, *Theatre and Museums* (London: Red Globe Press, 2013), 3.

real and the fictional in ways that create confusion and disruption or lead to splendid unplanned harmonies in the service of the creation of meaning.”⁶⁴ Martin’s notion of these collapsing boundaries was generally evident throughout the *ODS* process, and it was specifically relevant in the dialogue between audience members and the creative team about the use of photographs and projected images. One photograph, in particular, depicts a man named Carl Chace holding up a placard at Queen’s Park during the 1958 INCO strike.⁶⁵ We used it in the program, and this caused some confusion for Dennis Dowdall, who was adamant that this man was “Earl” Chase and not “Carl” Chase.”⁶⁶ Dennis indicated that he knew “Earl and his brother,” and as a result, we were then discussing the necessity of honouring the spirit of the interviews and the necessity of getting the details right. We learned, from the second workshop at the Legion, the consequences for selecting spurious photographs. A house in Creighton could not be used when an image of Lively is called for in the script. Similarly, a jackleg drill, from the 1950s could not be accompanied by a projected photograph of a drill from the 1970s.⁶⁷ We were consistently negotiating these aspects as they related to perceptions of fact and truth. Both were not necessarily synonymous. Audiences were quite vocal about their notions about the accuracy of these visual elements.

In another play, perhaps, without the personal associations or historical proximity of the audience to the period, we could use these photographs with more creative flexibility. We could then use the best available image of an old house from the 1950s in

⁶⁴ Carol Martin, *Theatre of the Real* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7.

⁶⁵ Photograph of Carl Chase during a demonstration at Queen’s Park, *Toronto Telegram* (source), 3 December 1958, Box 69, F 1280-10-1, Mike Solski fonds, Archives of Ontario. See *One Day Stronger* Program in Appendix G, 356.

⁶⁶ Dennis Dowdall, post show discussion, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

⁶⁷ These were some of the lessons that derived from the workshop discussion after we first experimented with projections at that Legion workshop presentation 15 October 2018.

the Sudbury area, and it would still serve the play. Yet if we were not beholden to actual places, people and historical events, we could never expect to have such an invested audience, which is essential for myself and the performers in this public history project. We needed our audience to hold us accountable and to scrutinize our choices. Earl Chase's impromptu inclusion in the play and this project was a resurrection of sorts. His name is clearly written as "Carl" in Mine Mill 598's photo album of the 1958 strike.

Similarly, Cathy Mulroy and Linda George experienced tensions personally, as the historical traces depicted on the projection screen conflicted with, and distanced them from, the fictional aspects of the play. Linda spoke of how one of the photographs of her in her early twenties was a spitting image of her granddaughter.⁶⁸ Seeing this image caused her to reflect on the sadness she feels regarding how members of a younger generation in her own family have no idea about her active role during the strike. For her, both the images and familiar voices caused her to re-experience "the pain of those times."⁶⁹

Cathy Mulroy, in a post-show discussion a few weeks later, mentioned having a moment of panic when we showed the green "INCO fundraiser flyer" in a projection.⁷⁰ As a replica of the exact flyer that was circulated leading up to the original event, and subsequently reprinted on green paper as per her initial memory, we also adapted it to have LAURIE's name on it in place of Cathy's.⁷¹ The flyer appeared in a projection

⁶⁸ Linda George, post show interview by the author, Sudbury, August 2019. See Appendix A, "Bean Supper 1," 341 (QLAB 64).

⁶⁹ Linda George email to the author, 22 June 2019.

⁷⁰ See Appendix A, 340 (QLAB 59). For an enlarged version of this image see Appendix F, "INCO 'Solidarity Benefit' Flyer (edited)," 355.

⁷¹ Cathy Mulroy, interview with the author, Sudbury, November 2018. The green flyer was used as a projection and was also used as a prop. The original "INCO Fundraiser flyer" was on white paper. We chose to change its colour because this was an important detail from Cathy's initial memory of this flyer.

during that scene and Cathy recalled seeing the names of two other women along with LAURIE PIQUETTE. She was jolted out of the experience of watching the play when she realized her name had been removed. Moreover, she recalled exchanging a look with Linda during the performance, whose name was still prominent on the flyer. She recalled having to reassure herself that this was a play, and that the use of this flyer had been in service of the story. In that moment, she experienced the familiar feeling, and fear, of being dismissed.⁷² When she told me this, I realized that this was a mistake on my part. I should have changed all of the names on that flyer. Also, as LAURIE is a composite and is the only speaker, I only needed to use one name. The mixing of real and fictional names did not work in this situation. We either had to use the documentary material *as is*, or adapt it fully, in order to accommodate the story. Through its use during the performance in this case, we were all caught between fiction and reality.

PRODUCTION: RECORDED VOICES AND SPEAKING TEXT

“Thank you for listening, researching and actually hearing our voices... .”⁷³

In terms of the sound design for *ODS*, it was always part of the plan to use the actual voices of interviewees, while respecting the underlying intentions of their text. My deliberate intention in using real voices was to further immerse the audience and to set an emotional tone. It was also a way for me to have interviewees participate in the live performance. I felt that the audio excerpts would resonate for the people who were recorded speaking the words, for those who knew the original speakers, and for people who might think they knew or recognize a voice or a spoken sentence. When we tested the use of audio clips during the public workshop performances, the audiences were

⁷² Cathy Mulroy, interview with the author, Sudbury, July 2019.

⁷³ Linda George, email to the author, 22 June 2019.

enthusiastic about this choice. I recall thinking that it was very powerful, uncanny and that the voice of the ‘original’ and its inclusion lent a sense of authority to the piece.⁷⁴

Aside from interviewee audio clips, music was used to underscore the emotion of scenes, and sometimes these selections were diegetic. Voices and music were also used to cover transitions between scenes and to enhance the effect of the projections. Other sound effects were used to create ambience or to satisfy requirements dictated by the script.⁷⁵

Hearing the actual words spoken by interviewees in sound clips affected both performers and audience members. Although sound clips were not the subject of extensive discussion and feedback, they were valued as useful components to the overall experience. Ralph MacIntosh felt that the, “audio [and] visual components added a great deal – the interviews and file photos made it real!!”⁷⁶ According to interviewee Jan Heppner, the “choice of using the voices of the people you interviewed ... gave authenticity to the play.”⁷⁷ Carol Mulligan, mentioned that she was a little bit taken aback hearing the sound of her own voice but admitted that these clips, “were really important [and she further questioned] how would the play be done without recorded voices?” Several interviewees, like Carol, were emotional at hearing their own voices and through the memories they served to reconjure. This also had the effect of briefly taking them out of the performance. Part of this initial reaction was due to an element of self-consciousness, an awareness or sense of awkwardness at hearing themselves speak or at what they sounded like. For ‘originals’ it was also a question of accountability as they were now part of the play. Similar with Stephen Heiti’s apprehension about his Nels

⁷⁴ For a brief discussion on the first instance of this in the play see “Script Breakdown,” 91.

⁷⁵ See Appendix A for audio cues in each scene.

⁷⁶ Ralph MacIntosh, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

⁷⁷ Jan Heppner, email to the author, 22 June 2019.

Thibault story and his son Matthew's hesitation about performing it, other interviewees wondered aloud if they had said what they had said, and whether or not what they had actually spoken, was accurate. It seemed as though interviewees who heard their own voices were fed through a memory loop back to our initial interview, and then further back into to their own memories, before returning to the present.

One observation was that these voices would carry no meaning outside of the context of a local audience in Sudbury. That notion remains to be tested, but we did find out by accident what the experience would have been like for Sudburians without the audio clips. As it turned out, some audience members experienced the show without these recorded voices, due to technical issues. Merle Smith wrote that he, "really enjoyed [the] show. Had no idea what to expect and my hearing is terrible so [I] missed a lot of it..." I recall speaking to him at the intermission and, he informed me that he could not hear any of the sound clips. Judi Straughan concurred when she wrote, "[y]es, the sound system and speakers need to be better, but that's a tiny detail easily solved. Maybe even think about how you transition in and out of the voices."⁷⁸ With an audience that consisted of many senior citizens, this attempt at including voices from people in the community, needed to be better executed. As more bodies gathered in the space to witness the play, the sound was swallowed up. It is ironic, in this case, that the practical aspects involved with staging the play, were ultimately responsible for silencing these voices that were otherwise a valuable and immersive component for interviewees, audience members and performers.

⁷⁸ Judi Straughan, email to author.

For actors, this value and affect were especially perceivable when they listened to actual interview excerpts, and more so as they encountered them during scene transitions while performing. I noticed in rehearsals they would stop and listen upon hearing the audio clips for the first time. Sometimes the voices of interviewees would have the effect of distancing performers from their characters. Performers consistently navigated their own sense of authenticity and responsibility toward the original interviewee, while maintaining their creative ownership and authority over the words spoken by their characters. Hearing the actual interviewees blurred this distinction for them and served as yet another instance from this work of collapsing boundaries between the real and the fictional.⁷⁹ During rehearsals, Miriam Cusson conveyed that hearing excerpts from the text spoken by their originators, felt foreign.⁸⁰ She needed a moment to reassert her sense of ownership over the words. Matthew Heiti performed with the awareness of hearing his father's voice. Initially, this self-awareness pulled him out of character. AJ Laflamme expressed to interviewees during the second talkback session, that she found that "hearing your voices ... really impacts me," and that they helped her to build confidence. As the show's designer, she developed a much closer relationship to the interviews than the other performers and was inundated with the material. While performing, she felt like she earned strength, through each instance when she spoke words from "your mouth and your mouth and your mouth...[.]" She felt authorized to speak those words in the present and she committed to the notion, that by so doing, she was "building for the next

⁷⁹ Martin, *Theatre of the Real*, 7.

⁸⁰ Miriam commented on this aspect during rehearsals.

generation.”⁸¹ Even so, she demonstrated an implicit self-awareness and distance while uttering someone else’s words.

In another relevant instance to the discussion of working with interviewee testimony – writing, staging, and performing ROSE was one of the more complicated aspects of the show. It presented some challenges as well as opportunities, while working with verbatim material. Originally, the character of ROSE was Ukrainian and spoke with a thick accent. This was attempted through using verbatim material from one interview. In my first attempts to write the scene, ROSE’s text presented the particular intonations of Pearl Chytuk’s speech patterns.⁸² Pearl spoke English with a very noticeable, thick Ukrainian accent. Earlier in the process of creating drafts for *ODS*, the lines were frequently taken directly from the oral testimony, where possible. I used ellipsis to demarcate separations, pauses, and spaces between pieces of text within each spoken section of dialogue or monologue. This was part of an attempt to match the speech patterns, and my method of inscribing them.⁸³ Since the text underlying ROSE’s lines were originally spoken by a Ukrainian-Canadian, I decided to give the character the same nationality. In earlier scripts, BILLY introduces her as a “Ukrainian Dynamo.” When Jenny Hazelton was not doing an accent in one of our first rehearsals during the first workshop, Greg Trembley repeated this description, as if to indicate that she needed to have an accent. The line then became “Hello Rosie, my Ukrainian Dynamo.” From that point on, Hazelton fully embraced this, for both workshop readings, and worked with the accent using Pearl’s recorded interview as a guide.

⁸¹ AJ Laflamme, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

⁸² Pearl Chytuk, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, November 1978, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

⁸³ See “Script Breakdown,” 103.

I lifted the speech patterns so that LAURIE's mother hailed from "the old country," and the audience could recognize this fact through her manner of speaking.⁸⁴ By the final production, and is reflected in the version of the script included in this dissertation, ROSE ceased to be BILLY's "Ukrainian Dynamo."⁸⁵ Any notions pertaining to specific cultural affiliations for the characters became completely dependent on audience and artist perceptions and associations. BILLY is an "Anglophone with a French last name."⁸⁶ GUY has a French first name but also speaks in English. Miriam Cusson, as the performer delivering the lines, had a discernable French-Canadian accent, and I wondered if the audience might pick up on that.

I changed my thinking about ROSE's Ukrainian nationality by this final version of the script, in the time leading up to the production. First, the scene went through several edits and was much shorter. As a result, the punctuation had changed significantly, and it no longer emphasized Pearl's speech patterns. Also, other interview sources that I used to form ROSE as a composite were from different backgrounds. Why select this one? Second, I felt that I could not justify this choice, that was initiated by simply lifting Pearl's manner of speaking. In addition to Pearl, I had access to several pre-recorded interviews with Ukrainian-Canadians, but I did not feel like I had the authority to tell that story, as I am not a member of that community. Perhaps the biggest reason why I shifted this characters' background – and significant for this discussion about the production – was due to the fact that Hazelton had departed from the project after the second workshop. As a performer, she had a consistent run at developing ROSE

⁸⁴ ROSE, Act 1, Scene 3, A, 268.

⁸⁵ This was the line in a previous draft prior to the production.

⁸⁶ BILLY, Act 1, Scene 7, A, 273.

through two workshops. She was instrumental to bringing this Ukrainian character to life, which for me—as the show’s director and writer—felt authentic. She was working with the tapes and mimicking Pearl’s manner of speaking. When Miriam Cusson joined the project and took on the role, it seemed natural to remove the specific indicators in the text of ROSE’s Ukrainian descent. As the script had gone through significant changes and edits, the speech patterns from the interview material were less discernable. As a result, it was less useful for the performers to work with the actual interview material that underpinned their lines. I gave Cusson the option to use an accent, to which she responded, “which one?” and “why?” It is I was inwardly disappointed because I was mourning the loss of Hazelton’s process and portrayal. At the same time, I had gained a performer in Cusson, who had just taken ownership over the role, and I knew her portrayal would eventually feel authentic for me as well. Even so, it felt as if the process of scripting had colonized the story, and then subsequently, meanings attained through performance liberated certain aspects, while obviating others.⁸⁷

PERFORMANCE REFLECTIONS

One of my explicit points of departure from the “Remembered Histories” chapter was to explore the historical controversy regarding the infamous Back-to-Work rally during the 1958 INCO strike. This was a specific line of inquiry as part of my more general approach towards the respective experiences of men and women during strikes. I wanted to tackle the myth that the women had “thrown their men under the bus,” in order

⁸⁷ The idea that comes to mind is how performance is as much about forgetting as remembering. That “which disappears, or that which persists transmitted through a non-archival system of transfer... [.]” See Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Duke University Press, 2003), xvii. See also Joseph Roach, *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1996).

to have it reevaluated as part of a local discussion following the show. My attempt to stage *The Arena* (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294) posed some challenges and it did not achieve my desired intention for the scene as a playwright.⁸⁸ Unfortunately, audiences and performers appeared to be unfamiliar with this event. Moreover, the controversy that surrounded the event seemed to no longer unearth any disagreement. This battle appears to have become latent. For example, labour activist Madeleine Parent, who spoke to the membership during the 1958 strike, is mentioned by ROSE as a source of inspiration, but I wondered while watching the show if anyone in the audience still recognized the reference, or if her name still carried any weight.⁸⁹ As a result, I feel that my overall depiction in *ODS* is too simplistic and does not convey the significance of this event, at least on the level of the people who experienced it. For it to work, I needed the audience to feel connected to this conflict. On one level, I failed to activate these aspects, theatrically, as the director. Also, my assumption as a playwright was that the scene had a premise that would be recognized and could provoke engagement with this historical controversy.

Similarly, performers had a difficult time connecting with this scene throughout the workshop and production process. Even as they became familiar with the sequence and specifics of that historical event, the references were obscure, tangential, and thereby difficult to play. The actors were directed to shift their focus outward and to move throughout the playing space, where they could attempt to make eye contact with as many audience members as possible. As intended while writing the scene, I wanted to

⁸⁸ See "Script Breakdown," 110.

⁸⁹ Millie McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, October 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97. I needed to communicate the idea theatrically.

challenge the audience through direct address with this narrative that the Back-to Work rally was a hoax and, again, to enable dialogue with them about how memory involving this incident had shifted. As indicated in the previous chapter, this was one of two scenes where I wanted to have characters in the play directly implore the audience and to present their polemics.⁹⁰ I felt that its counterpart in Act Two, *The Whole Thing Fizzles Out* (Act 2, Scene 7, A-322), once performed, was more effective both as a theatrical excerpt and a means for facilitating dialogue. Audience members were more familiar with the 1978-79 strike and the conflict for the characters was clear and explicit. I directed GUY to exit the stage so that LAURIE was alone while experiencing her sense of personal victory, as well as her sense of reclaiming that feeling of control. I wanted her to be isolated from her husband in this moment. Audience members recalled the enthusiasm and shared their positive memories regarding the huge celebration that ensued, and this will be further explored in terms of the scene's emotional reception in the next chapter.

Perhaps more fruitful in terms of theatrically exploring the gendered experiences of strikes in Sudbury, was how the performers approached their characters. While in the process of developing the characters leading up to the final performance, Miriam Cusson reflected on the roles of women in her rehearsal journal. For her, a woman was not only "fighting through the 'strike' the union business, she is constantly negotiating this complex web of gender politics."⁹¹ My initial interviews reinforced the fact that women were at a hierarchical disadvantage, both in public and in their homes. As Jan Heppner and other interviewees reminded me, if her husband was on strike, she was still responsible to put food on the table. If possible, she was free to urge or to persuade her

⁹⁰ For my ideas and intentions while writing these scenes see "Script Breakdown," 110-113 and 133-135.

⁹¹ Miriam Cusson, process journal entry, Sudbury, 15 June 2019.

own husband to vote for a contract. Lisa Laurin, a self-proclaimed “miner’s wife,” having experienced several strikes in her own life, spoke during the first workshop of this, as a “cycle [that] does not end.”⁹² While unfamiliar with the events of the 1958 strike and aforementioned Back-to-work rally, she acknowledged that women could be vilified for their public support to end that strike, but conversely, she empathized with their plight. From her standpoint, “we know what husbands are sacrificing” during a strike and she also implored that “something’s gotta give.”⁹³ One true and simple fact is that this narrative has been accepted in this community, that women, organized, or otherwise, were responsible for the union’s capitulation during that strike, if it is even thought of at all. Moreover, it reinforces Cusson’s observation that these gendered politics are historically entrenched.

There was some confusion with the switching of these roles (males playing females and vice versa), especially, for those not as familiar with theatre conventions. Dan Ross, a friend and volunteer for the production weekend, expressed that it was strange for people to have to play all of these different parts. He thought that some audience members were confused, particularly near the beginning of the play when Matthew was playing one version of ROSE. He felt that if we had another actress, Matthew would not have had to play the female part. Dan attributed this to my budgetary constraints, and that, in future productions, having more actors would alleviate these issues.⁹⁴ The extent to which his concerns were shared by others is unclear. There were many audience members who valued the rigour and versatility of the actors playing

⁹² Lisa Laurin, post workshop discussion, Sudbury, 5 May 2018.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Dan Ross, discussion with author, Sudbury, July 2019. He also said that clarity in terms casting more actors would lead to the same in terms of communicating about strikes effectively in this form.

multiple parts. Overall, audience members appreciated the consistent switching of characters, and with how each performer portrayed both genders. France Huot felt like this was a “good choice” and wanted more of this kind of exploration.⁹⁵ This was one advantage to having budgetary limitations.

The performers certainly benefited and learned from playing these men and women, especially their binary opposites. Matthew reflected that he rarely had the opportunity to play “bad guys” or the “Stanley Kowalski” types.⁹⁶ A friend came up to him after the show and complimented his performance by remarking that he had, “never seen you as a bastard before.”⁹⁷ We further discussed and concluded that GUY was a “likeable bastard” and that “we all know this guy.” Playing GUY also afforded him the opportunity to experience the consequences of the character’s behaviour towards his wife. He recalled the line when, as GUY, he tells LAURIE that “you’re such a lousy public speaker.”⁹⁸ Matthew recounted that he felt a palpable dislike from women in the audience after that moment, during each performance.⁹⁹ It was unnerving for him when the “women groaned,” and this was not an experience he was familiar with. As a male playing ROSE, he showed poise and a sense of grace. Miriam observed, in rehearsals, that “Matthew played a beautiful mother [and that he put] thought behind the mannerisms.”¹⁰⁰ I felt like her comments were spot on, as she further observed the

⁹⁵ France Huot, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

⁹⁶ Stanley Kowalski is the iconic male character from Tennessee William’s *A Streetcar Named Desire*. It is the masculine character made famous by Marlon Brando in the 1950s.

⁹⁷ Heiti, post show interview.

⁹⁸ GUY, Act 2, Scene 2, A, 305.

⁹⁹ For a great ethnographic study about practitioners approaching factual drama and playing real people see Tom Cantrell, and Mary Luckhurst, eds. *Playing for real: Actors on Playing Real People* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

¹⁰⁰ Cusson, post show interview.

concerted effort to channel the character using his upper body. I was not alone in wishing throughout the process that there were more opportunities for him to portray women.

If GUY was a “likeable bastard,” his counterpart of LARRY pushed the envelope further in terms portraying male stereotypes. Similar to Matthew’s way of entering into the character, physicality was the means through which both AJ and Miriam approached playing LARRY. Both focused on their lower bodies. Miriam worked with the character by “pushing my pelvis forward” and, for AJ, everything moved through “her crotch.”¹⁰¹ Audiences were very warm towards LARRY, in no small part due to the fact that the character was portrayed by a female. There was fun and a sense of play in this act without sending it up. From my perspective, it lightened the severity with which the stereotypical “macho” impression landed on the audience.

Miriam saw things differently. For her, it was “way easier to play LARRY than LAURIE. I’ve been watching LARRY my whole life. It’s the guy, he’s always there but he’s not the macho stereotype, he’s the sidebar.” She felt he was “totally interesting [and] always around. A little bit off and aware of other things. I went to high school with LARRY.”¹⁰² We talked about this notion of “knowing LARRY” in rehearsals, and I recall introducing the idea that he was the “smartest guy in the room.”¹⁰³ I based this on my impression of how people impose their stereotypical perceptions on blue collar workers. Often, in my experience, these men are unfairly underestimated based on outward appearances and preconceived notions.

¹⁰¹ Ibid and Laflamme, post show interview.

¹⁰² Cusson, post show interview.

¹⁰³ We spoke extensively about each character in rehearsals, especially LARRY, in terms of finding the right note while avoiding the extremes of caricature while maintaining the richness of his personality and his sense of humour.

AJ took a different approach to playing LARRY. Like Miriam, it was “her favourite character.” Unlike Miriam, she “didn’t like him that much till I got to play him.” She felt that “he’s just [such an] over the top stereotypical dude [and that women who get to play this character] just get to live all of their dude vehemence in one, [and] really own that.” Contrary to Miriam, she admitted after the fact that, “no woman really enjoys LARRY...women can’t get away with that shit. We have our boxes we live within...”¹⁰⁴ For AJ, working with LARRY was fun. It was about breaking out of these boxes and trying to reshape them.

As playwright, I remain unsatisfied that the older characters were ever finished in terms of what they represented in the story. Matthew Heiti, in his capacity as one of the project’s dramaturges after the show, expressed that JAKE and DORTHY felt, “like another echo,” and he was “not sure if [he was] seeing something different about relationships [in the sense of them] ‘honouring father,’ similar to BILLY and ROSE.”¹⁰⁵ We talked about further distinguishing this couple from the others, including GUY and LAURIE. After the second workshop, I experimented with having them completely “unsympathetic” to unionists.¹⁰⁶ After the production, I feel like I could go further with this, to avoid both repeating similar voices too frequently within the narrative, and to activate differing historical perspectives that were prevalent during strikes. In the same conversation, Matthew reiterated how he “loved the scene,” but still questioned if it thematically advanced “what it means to be united or disunited in this town.”¹⁰⁷ He also

¹⁰⁴ Laflamme, post show interview.

¹⁰⁵ Heiti, post show interview.

¹⁰⁶ Leading up to this final draft, I experimented with having this couple less sympathetic to strikers in contrast to the very pro-worker stance that is espoused by ROSE and BILLY in Act One.

¹⁰⁷ Heiti, post show interview.

pointed out that there is an opportunity to further explore, through JAKE and DORTHY, the notion of what it means to be retired. He wondered aloud if it were a “safe space [for retirees, who ask themselves:] ...What are you now? [and answer] –This thing and now you are not your thing you are. What are you? When I’m not a miner anymore, I’m not a miner. Fear is there. Getting out of the way.”¹⁰⁸ Many of my interviewees are retirees, and it might be quite effective to have characters who more closely reflect this sense of fear or loss of identity. There are echoes of Matthew’s sentiments from the interviews, and this focus could enhance the play’s emotional impact on the audience. Perhaps these adjustments could make the characters more relatable for both the actors and audience.

As a director, I felt unable to actualize these characters as I saw them in my mind through two workshops, and then in the final production. From my point of view, the performances were too caricatured and exaggerated. Sitting in the audience, I winced in places and felt like some moments were way over the top. As playwright I was frustrated as well, and I think I had something else in mind even though the writing did not necessarily support what I asked of the actors. I also had a hard time communicating about this aspect, and ultimately, I could not get the performances that I wanted.¹⁰⁹ Whether it was with Jenny, Greg, Matthew, Miriam or AJ, in the end, I struggled to have them lessen the aging “dial” in their performances.¹¹⁰ The latter two came closest in the end, to what I felt was the best fit for the scene. It was a point of frustration in moments for both sides. Admittedly, my direction was inconsistent or confusing in moments due to

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ This was the case for both workshops and the final production. We revisited the portrayal of play’s elderly characters frequently, and we could never get on the same page.

¹¹⁰ Blake Brooker, “One Yellow Rabbit Summer Lab Intensive” (three-week intensive, OYR, Calgary, AB, July 2004). Blake used the analogy of a “dial” while working with performers.

my insecurity exacting that role. It was also difficult to demand this specificity in a process where I consistently encouraged “play” and experimentation; when in another interval, I found myself encouraging the actors to really explore and “ham up” a two-page flatulence scene.

Even so, I felt as though the performers were very adept at pushing towards the extreme of caricature in their turns, but, were unable to shift their interpretations in the opposite direction. I hesitate to use the words ‘natural’ or ‘realistic,’ but I wanted the performances to be more believable from my estimation, because they needed to be respectful for our audience. From my standpoint, I saw a variety of different choices they could make. For example, they have several lines referring to their advanced years and ailments. Just because the line indicates that the character is suffering from a bad back, does not necessitate the “mugging” of this injury ad nauseum in an exaggerated fashion. I felt like this exaggerated style of acting and speaking was the easy choice, and they also frequently fell into this trap while playing ALBERT and JAKE.¹¹¹ Moreover, I would reflect—privately—this is one way of playing the line, how about trying to deliver it straight? I am a trained actor, and in some cases, such as this one, it added to my frustration. It also reminded me of how my past directors must have felt when I stubbornly followed my own impulses.

The portrayal of these characters was problematic due to the age difference with the actors, who were significantly younger. Ultimately, throughout the workshops and production process, performers had a difficult time embodying the characters in this scene. What made perfect sense in my head, and on the page, was never actualized during

¹¹¹ Although this was consistent for all portrayals of older characters it was particularly irksome with these two characters from *A Man and His Home Revisited From A Coffee Shop* (Act 1, Scene 19, A-300).

performance. I wanted levity, believability, honesty and respectful portrayals, and instead I felt as though the results, once performed, were artificial and bordered on lampoon. I am still unsure whether or not this can be fixed through writing, or by working on clarifying this portrayal as a director with the performers.

This was a failure on my part through each of the workshops and in the final production. I could not nullify this element to the performances in *ODS*. As a director, I was ultimately responsible that the *mise-en-scène* reflected my vision. In the end, it is theatre, and we ran out of time in the process. To be clear, by no means did I feel that the performances were bad. I was just never reconciled with people in their late 50s and 60s, being portrayed in this way. Specifically, I did not want my aunt and uncle, who would recognize themselves in this scene, to feel like I was making fun of them.¹¹²

I wanted the characters to be believable and for the audience to be able to empathize with this couple. I received some feedback that fed directly into my concerns relating to this subject, and it conveys what is at stake in doing this work. Kim Fahner wrote the following valuable criticism that deserves some attention moving forward:

The only thing I worry about, and you already know this, was that the actors' voices seemed stereotypical with regards to age. I have a thing for the frail elderly...because I took care of my parents before they died...and it always worries me that they are the last stigmatized group in our society. The louder groups (LGBTQ and First Nations) speak about being marginalized, and about being discriminated against, but the one group that is most forgotten are the aging and the elderly. They often don't have advocates...and I guess I'm one of the younger ones who's a bit vocal.¹¹³

¹¹² I based the characters of JAKE and DORTHY in *Old Man and Old Woman Discuss Early Retirement* (Act 2, Scene 8, A-324) off of my Aunt and Uncle. They have a very lively, passionate and loving dynamic that I wanted to capture in this scene for the play. This was very real for me, and I was disappointed because I felt that it did not translate.

¹¹³ Kim Fahner, email to author, 25 June 2019.

Even though I believe that, overall, we did an excellent job with our character portrayals in *ODS*, Kim Fahner's feedback demonstrates that extra consideration was required. It also shows the added responsibility when characters – whom are based on historically real people – are “performed” and raises the stakes in the rehearsal hall.¹¹⁴ Moreover, as Yana Meerzon has recently put forward in her study of performance activism, there is an inherent appeal “to our desire for spectacle.”¹¹⁵ She further suggests that while attending to our social purposes and designs as theatre practitioners, “many productions...create circumstances of an artistic encounter, estrangement and voyeurism.”¹¹⁶ Although we did not intend to lampoon elderly people in the community, our execution was flawed in this instance. An empathetic and emotional connection is a powerful aspect of the relationship between audience and performer, an aspect that will be explored further in the next section. This can also be harmful when abused deliberately, but no less so when the transgression is unintentional.

Not all audience members felt this way, in terms of audience feedback and in witnessing their reactions live during those scenes. Several people, including France Huot, appreciated the humour from these scenes that featured “older” characters. For her, they were good instances of “timing and balance” in a play replete with tensions and difficult emotions. They reminded her that “it almost seems like people find happiness.”¹¹⁷ Even so, as I approach rewriting and restaging *ODS* for future audiences, I

¹¹⁴ For extended analyses relating to the ethics and aesthetics of performing actual people see Brown, ed., *Verbatim*; Forsyth and Chris Megson, *Get Real: Documentary Theatre Past and Present*. and Will Hammond and Dan Steward, *Verbatim* (London: Oberon, 2008).

¹¹⁵ Yana Meerzon, “Precarious Bodies in Performance Activism and Theatres of Migration,” in *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture*, edited by Yana Meerzon et al. (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020), 22.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 23.

¹¹⁷ Huot, post show discussion.

will be looking to balance the humour in these scenes with clearer characterizations and more believable and responsible portrayals.

Women Fighting INCO Solidarity Benefit (Act 2, Scene 6, A-320) presents an opportunity to examine multiple layers of meaning in terms of performance, reception, and “sharing” versus “shared” authority.¹¹⁸ In this scene LAURIE is giving a speech at a fundraiser in Toronto aimed at getting support for the strike. The playwright and director (me), the performers (Miriam Cusson and AJ Laflamme) and two interviewees (Cathy Mulroy and Linda George), each shared responsibility and asserted creative ownership over this performed section of text.

In terms of staging, we used the actual elevated stage in the Ukrainian National Federation. LAURIE sets the scene, while traveling towards a podium onstage, that belonged to the hall. We also used the inhouse lighting, so that it was *as if* the audience were in attendance at the fundraiser. This particular instance was key, in terms of my thematic interest with the agency and experiences of women during strikes. When I reflected on its significance, it was the emotional value that resonated. It was the sense of personal risk and her struggle, underpinning the community’s struggle against INCO, that becomes historically invisible at the strike’s conclusion. This act was ephemeral and I wanted to highlight this personal struggle to have that voice, and to demonstrate its value.

Having worked with it as a director in rehearsal, with two actresses, and having watched it ultimately performed by AJ, I was not satisfied with the scene’s execution. From my standpoint, as a playwright moving forward, I need to take another pass. In my

¹¹⁸ For a discussion about the tensions between experiential authority vs scholarly authority see the introduction of Stacey Zembrzycki, *According to Baba: A Collaborative Oral History of Sudbury’s Ukrainian Community* (UBC Press, 2014).

opinion, as a composite rendering of three different voices from the actual event in Cathy's manuscript, my latest interpretation was too long, polemical, and repetitive. I was not satisfied with this newest addition to the script. From a theatrical perspective this is simply part of the process. In another drafting of the script, I will have no problem doing this. As a historian on the other hand, I was always mindful while editing and adapting historical content. There was always a tension with my wanting to preserve the essence and substance of textual traces as historical material. However, as the scene was adapted from the rough draft of a manuscript, it was also rough and clunky as a historiographical narrative.

As performers, for both Miriam and AJ, this scene in the play was significant. Miriam identified this as her most memorable scene, and one that she had a strong connection with, in a post-show interview. The emotional journey was "fun" for her, from navigating LAURIE's initial feelings of intimidation and "fear of giving the speech," to the moment when she gains the opportunity to "deliver something delicious." She felt like she was performing in "such an epic" moment with "short sentences" that culminated to convey "an 'at all cost' mentality." She relished the opportunity to energize the crowd. This call for solidarity during a moment of crisis reminded her of that "show must go on" mantra as a performer.¹¹⁹ It was an opportunity for her to really dig into the material and to get up on the soap box. She sensed the gravitas of that moment. She never had the chance to perform it in front of an audience, but from my standpoint, she was very ignited during rehearsals. She is such a talented and skilled actress, the words matched up well with her unique intensity. She gained a real sense of the cadence from

¹¹⁹ Cusson, post show interview.

Cathy's text, and it truly was a powerful performance, that never happened. She was very remiss for having to leave the play and her part in it, especially missing out on performing this speech. From my directorial point of view, she had a sense of the necessary builds and the timing to execute this scene. She is a performer in the truest sense, and she is assertive and has a certain swagger. Cusson made me feel like I was watching Clarence Darrow in the courtroom or John Turturro in *The Cradle Will Rock*.¹²⁰ Maybe what Madeleine Parent would have sounded like, had I not lost her speech.¹²¹ "If she could only just get the lines down," I thought at the time.¹²²

AJ was also enthusiastic for the speech, but was intimidated by this moment in the play. She had a difficult time executing it in rehearsals. There were numerous reasons for this. The most plausible is that she had a script in her hand. She also only had three tries reading it as a part of a full run prior to the show's opening, and it was the first time acting in fifteen years. Also, as her director, I felt that this type of speech was not in her immediate comfort zone and would have liked more time to work with her on it. She does not gravitate towards the spotlight in terms of her personality, and while that works in this scene at its outset, by the end, the character really needs to seize this moment and claim her voice. I think she would have gotten there, and that she did a formidable job.

We tried to run this scene whenever we had spare time. There is an asterisk to any kind of

¹²⁰ *The Cradle Will Rock*, directed by Tim Robbins, 1999. In my mind I am envisioning the feeling of witnessing the epic rallying cry or speech. I get this sense or feeling from Turturro's performance in the film or from an excerpt from one of Clarence Darrow's speeches found in Mike Solski and John Smaller, *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895* (Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1984), 12. Clarence Darrow was a famous American Lawyer who successfully represented several prominent leaders with the Western Federation of Miners, the pre-cursor to IUMMSW in Canada and the United States.

¹²¹ I had the perfect speech that the activist had given at a meeting during the 1958 INCO strike. I lost it and have not been able to rediscover its whereabouts.

¹²² The text was tricky for Miriam and she was having issues memorizing her lines before she took ill.

commentary on AJ's performance, but generally, the execution of this speech did not get to where I wanted it. More of an issue, again, is that I think the text needed to be workshopped, condensed and retooled prior to this final production.

Both AJ's sense of enthusiasm and her intimidation at the prospect of performing this speech, were enhanced by having formed a relationship with Cathy Mulroy. She was immediately impressed by Cathy's passion, when we visited the interviewee's residence, to acquire photographic material to use as projections for the show. The two women immediately hit it off. AJ admires Cathy, and she is inspired by her stories about being one the first women working in a "man's world" at INCO in the 1970s. AJ shared her own experiences with Cathy about working as a contracted employee for professional theatres, ones that often featured a unionized body of technicians mostly comprised of men. As a gigging stage manager, she has consistently experienced sexist behaviour and considers Cathy to be a trailblazer. AJ strove to channel Cathy's assertiveness, and being a "firebrand" herself, she wanted to do Cathy's words justice.

She felt a sense of "responsibility and enormous pressure," knowing that two of the women who spoke the words were in attendance.¹²³ It forced her to re-examine the Toronto speech and she recalled thinking, "I met Cathy and I know [and needed] to channel what Cathy" would do.¹²⁴ It made her ask: "What is this experience really like? What's on the line?"¹²⁵ This section was most closely associated with Cathy and, through it, she had an opportunity to confront some of the tensions and obstacles from her own professional life. As a result, she had a completely different experience with this speech

¹²³ Laflamme, post show interview.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

than Miriam. Her familiarity with Cathy enhanced her sense of responsibility to the text. It had the effect of changing how she valued “doing” the performance.

The value of the *Women Fighting INCO Solidarity Benefit* scene was enhanced for Cathy Mulroy and Linda George, when they witnessed it performed by AJ. During the “Third Act” discussion following the second show, Cathy provided some post-show feedback when she said, “On a personal note for LAURIE, I loved the speech.”¹²⁶ A knowing pause immediately ensued, followed by a burst of enthusiastic laughter. Her statement communicated two meanings. First, Cathy indirectly declared her connection with the speech and most people who were present, acknowledged that association. Second, she wholeheartedly complimented the performer on its execution, which was reinforced when the exchange continued and AJ nervously, yet wittily, replied, “Yay...I was shaking in my non-heels.”¹²⁷ This was also met with a few laughs and when they subsided, Linda George said to AJ, “you did a good job.”¹²⁸ Cathy followed that up with, “I’m really proud of you.”¹²⁹ Cathy and to no lesser extent, Linda, acknowledged and validated AJ’s performance from their positions of authority, having given speeches at that actual event in 1978. AJ enthusiastically received this feedback in acknowledgement of her expertise, effort, and emotional work.

As the playwright, I was uncomfortable during this exchange. It felt like I was on that “brink of disaster” (in a Ukrainian hall) with Stacey Zembrzycki, when in *According to Babba* (2014), she describes the actual challenges of “sharing authority” *in situ*.¹³⁰ It

¹²⁶ Cathy Mulroy, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

¹²⁷ AJ Laflamme, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019. AJ was referring to the fact that as LAURIE she kicks her shoes off of her feet for fear of falling.

¹²⁸ Linda George, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

¹²⁹ Mulroy, post show discussion.

¹³⁰ Zembrzycki, *According to Baba*, 12.

felt as though the personal connections of interviewees superseded the narrative as a result of my “giving up control and seeing where that leads.”¹³¹ I felt tense when Cathy claimed ownership of that section, because I wanted people to see it as LAURIE’s speech, particularly what it represented in terms of this point of high confidence in the character’s trajectory. This is not Cathy speaking anymore. This is the play. Linda agreed with me, on one level, during her post-show interview. She felt that this scene was important as it depicted a proud, empowering and politicized moment, but during the talkback, she felt like people were making it more about themselves.¹³²

I wondered if LAURIE’s successful emergence as a political activist overshadowed her husband’s lack of support for this activism, or the fact that the strike is a disaster for her family? I realized that, as the playwright, I was especially focussed on the story, and I was assuming everyone looked at it through the same lens. Although nobody from that Saturday evening audience declared this specifically, it appeared as though the character’s plight was secondary. LAURIE, through AJ, emulated their own past triumphs. They owned this aspect of the story. People shared memories and personal experiences that were initiated through the act of watching the play. It was a source of empowerment for them to relive these moments in the present. I was grateful that, while I intended for the discussion to be about the play, soon afterwards, people made it their own. The audience’s sense of ownership over the story will be explored further in terms of the play’s reception in the next chapter.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Linda George, interview, August 2019.

My reservation(s) stemmed from the fact that the female characters in this play (especially LAURIE) rarely, if ever, pass the Bechdel test.¹³³ Seldom is the focus of their spoken lines not about a father or a husband, including LAURIE's fundraising speech in the previous scene. The only scenes between females either occur on the telephone (when she is alone onstage) or between LAURIE and ROSIE (played by a man). Although this was through necessity, and by design, I spoke about this notion of empowerment with the creative team after the fact, and we acknowledged—in our own ways—different sentiments regarding this moment in the play as compared to that of the Saturday audience. Matthew mentioned the Bechdel test and its relevance to the play's female characters. He thought, however, that this play featured moments which reflected modern feminism as it existed in Sudbury in the 1970s.¹³⁴ Caitlin felt like the women could have been stronger. She was unsure of the authenticity of the relationships between men and women, having grown up in a house with only women. LAURIE's moment of political activism could not overshadow the misogynist world of men from which she operates.¹³⁵ AJ commented on how this was her favourite section to perform, having just given this rally speech, and now her exertions became focused on taking control via this vote. There was a feeling of euphoria and a cause for celebration. Yet in her mind, the instant that followed, she questioned, "Now what?" She felt like these moments were both empowering and transformative, but that she was also struck by their absence once they ultimately "fizzle out."¹³⁶

¹³³ Oxford Dictionary defines the Bechdel Test as: a way of evaluating whether or not a film or other work of fiction portrays women in a way that is sexist or characterized by gender stereotyping. To pass the Bechdel test a work must feature at least two women, these women must talk to each other, and their conversation must concern something other than a man.

¹³⁴ Heiti, post show interview.

¹³⁵ Heppner, post show interview.

¹³⁶ Laflamme, post show interview.

This chapter examined how, as a creative team, we endeavoured to provide an authentic and immersive experience for audience members. Using performer and audience reflections as well as my own as the show's director, it reflected on the experience of the actual live production and aspects that related to its staging. This included more discussion pertaining to verbatim text and other forms of documentary material that were used to stage this historical play. It also provided a dynamic exploration of performers and how their experiences working on the production of *ODS* is a significant feature and dimension for this public history project in Sudbury. It illuminates one of its key assets when using theatre as a means to study and to practice history, namely that performers are uniquely invested in the creative process, and through how much they empathize with, care about and take ownership of the work. This level of commitment is indispensable for any public history project, as much as it is infectious. Joining with their efforts as performers, audience members were responsive, invested, and they also took ownership of the material. The next chapter provides a more specific focus on audience reception and *ODS*, where, viscerally, we were able to affect people emotionally, and thereby bring the past to the present, using theatre. As such, my work joins with others that feature more interactive experiences as part of history's "affective turn."¹³⁷

¹³⁷ Vanessa Agnew, "History's Affective Turn: Historical Reenactment and its Work in the Present," *Rethinking History* 11, no. 3 (2007): 299-312. See also Juliane Brauer and Martin Lucke, "Emotion", in *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, eds. Venessa Agnew et al. (London: Routledge, 2020), 53-56 and Erin Hurley, *Theatre and Feeling* (London: Red Globe Press, 2010).

CHAPTER FIVE: RECEPTION

*"We are always connected to what's under our feet."*¹

This penultimate chapter focusses on the overall reception of *One Day Stronger* (hereafter *ODS*) as a theatrical experience. Audience members, performers and interviewees participated in post-show discussions, and they were also invited to provide feedback in various ways. These instances for dialogue with Sudburians who witnessed this event will serve as the basis for the following analysis. These post-show discussions were an optimal example of the type of active engagement envisioned in the United States by David Thelen and Roy Rosenzweig and their calls for a "participatory historical culture."² Similarly, audience members joined with the project's interviewees and its performers as collaborators in this local public history project. The act of participating through witnessing, telling personal stories or sharing experiences was a necessary aspect of this dialogue.

The chapter is organized into four thematic categories that I discerned from the feedback and post show discussions. "Memories and Emotional Connections," demonstrates how witnesses engaged with *ODS* through their memories, especially those relating to their families. This manner of remembering mimicked my initial interviews, as well as feedback from the workshops, where participants re-connected with their past experiences. Several people reflected on how painful, traumatic, empowering or uplifting experiences during strikes had slipped their memories but were reactivated through seeing the play. While articulating their reflections, they were very much remaking their

¹ Act 1, Scene 2, A-266.

² Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (Columbia University Press, 1998), 190.

memories and past experiences in the present. Crucially, these acts of sharing were often unintentionally and unpredictably emotional. “Intergenerational (Ex)Change” illustrates that there was also a strong sense and value attributed to a perceived identity for this local mining community, but this was also contested and complicated. As such, an intergenerational divide and disconnect was a consistent theme throughout the reception process. “Valuing, Complicated and Divisive Histories” reveals that as much as people valued the social, labour, local, and ethnographic histories that were integral to this memory play, their engagement with it (and with each other) foregrounded the fact that these histories were not straightforward and were instead complicated and even divisive. The chapter concludes with “Women and Their Voices,” a meaningful subject and theme for audience members, performers and interviewees.

Carol Mulligan was a significant figure for this project and her slogan used for the chapter’s epigraph permeated throughout the multi-faceted process of *ODS*.³ During a post-show “post-mortem” interview, I noticed that she often reflected back to stories from our initial interview in August 2017. She once again, revisited her own personal experiences of strikes and reiterated some of her anecdotes, particularly those about her family’s experience of the 1958 INCO strike. She did not recall saying anything particularly insightful or profound, and also confessed that there were instances at the beginning of the show when she was nervous. As discussed in the previous chapter, she questioned if she had “misremembered” or “over dramatized” some details only to

³ “Don’t you know we all live ten less years here.” – (Act 1, Scene 17, A-294) This line in the play was inspired by something Carol mentioned in her interview about the relative life expectancy in Sudbury, as compared to elsewhere in Ontario. Two years later, her words resonated as a powerful reminder that life is ephemeral. Carol passed away suddenly, nine days after I spoke with her at a coffee shop for our post-show interview. It came as a shock, as she was vibrant and talking passionately about future projects. She seemed invincible. It was sad news for many people in Sudbury, including myself. She was a prominent figure who touched many lives with her passion and uncompromising dedication to helping the disadvantaged.

confirm that “I know it was exactly what happened.” Watching the play and revisiting her memories was a very emotional experience. She felt that the play captured what “it was like for families.” It made her “proud of her heritage.” She felt that it was jarring to hear her voice speaking those words cited above, off the top of the show. This sense of “doubleness” was common for interviewees, who had to distinguish between what they remembered versus what they remembered telling me, and then what they witnessed again during the performance.⁴

Speaking to Carol in that post-show interview about her takeaways from the performance, she remained adamant about this interconnectedness, and her resolve that this was an important story. She indicated that this could be Sudbury’s version of *Anne of Green Gables*, and part of its cultural fabric moving forward.⁵ Many other audience members seemed to be in agreement with Carol. This was communicated to me during participation in post-show discussions, by filling out feedback pamphlets that were inserted into the programs, and by sending emails and messages via social media. I also met with some individuals who shared their perspectives over coffee after the show closed. One audience member, at a chance YMCA encounter, articulated that he saw value in this retelling and that he felt reassured when he saw young people “valuing” in the present what he “valued” in his past.⁶

⁴ Pollock, ‘Moving Histories: Performance and Oral history’ in Tracy C. Davis (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies* (2008), 128-129. See “Witnessing” subsection of Pollock’s chapter used here in relation to issues relating to ownership of the original words and in the discussion about oral history performance as repetition.

⁵ L.M. Montgomery, *Anne of Green Gables* (Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1908).

⁶ Don Kuyek, post show discussion, evening performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019. I ran in to Don at the Y.M.C.A. a few weeks after the show.

A significant number of people voluntarily gathered after each show, for what performer Matthew Heiti coined, “The Third Act.”⁷ These post-show chats, or “Third Act(s),” lasted approximately thirty minutes. They proved to be an opportunity for people to share and to discuss their own experiences living, working, and striking in Sudbury. This forum for discussion became an integral part of each performance. In fact, it became clear that the talkbacks were themselves performances with each audience member playing a role. I prefaced each of these post-show discussions by outlining their significance to the project and also encouraged an informal quality to the conversation. I asked that we all sit together as a group in a closer formation, in order to break away from the formal division between artists and audience. I wanted to echo the spirit of exchange from the interviews.

In many cases, before contributing to the conversation, people would introduce themselves and indicate how they were connected to this story. Some people pointed out where they saw themselves in the play. The three “Third Acts” were distinct and reflected the makeup and interests of the participants. The opening Saturday matinee featured a comparatively older audience and the discussion afterwards reflected the relative age and experiences of that group. The second talkback was comprised of several assertive individuals who were actively involved in the 1978-1979 INCO strike, and they spoke a great deal about that event. The discussion that followed the closing Sunday matinee featured a comparatively younger audience. This group was very inquisitive about the play and they expressed concerns about how its themes related to the current state of the world. Everyone who attended the performances, as members of the community,

⁷ For the emergence of this “Third Act” see “Script Breakdown,” 82.

audience and artistic ensemble, actively engaged with each other. This convergence constituted a forum for renewed dialogue within this mining community. The act of participating through witnessing, telling personal stories or sharing experiences was a necessary component to this dialogue and towards facilitating our own performance as ethnokinesis.

The notion of speaking also caught my attention during the talkbacks. The role of a “speaker” is as powerful as it is subtle. This applies to the play’s characters speaking text that was selected and adapted from interviews, as much as it also applies to speakers during the talkback sessions. Those who dominated the discussions often took up space, where others may have participated. They needed to speak. This was important. I noticed who was speaking and often wondered who was not. In my capacity as facilitator, I was hesitant to curtail a speaker or to cut their contribution(s) short. At the same time, I wanted everyone to feel like they could participate. I also did not want to isolate anyone and put them on the spot by asking them direct questions. As a result, each post-show discussion took on a life of its own, and they were driven by those who participated. There were consequences to this approach as will be demonstrated further in this chapter, especially with regards to the difficulties for some of the women in attendance who attempted to speak about their past roles in strikes.

There were also moments of recognition between audience members and impromptu reunions that resulted from the experience of coming out to see *ODS*. Merle Smith wrote of “something eerie,” that happened:

There was an older fella who kinda looked at me and smiled and kinda waved. Between acts [I] met him in the hallway and he asked me where I worked and said the Sudbury Star.[sic] He said he worked at INCO with a guy and was sure I was him. He worked with a guy named Smitty at Frood mine in the 60s and 70s. I said my dad was ken Smith[sic] and that is who he thought I was. I know looking at pictures of my dad in his 60s and what I look like we do look a lot alike. [It] gave me chills that he knew my dad and remembered him as a pipefitter and later on in the shaft. Small world sometime.⁸

Much to my surprise, I witnessed Ron Brunette and Richard Gouin conversing after the show with grins on their faces, and they were in the process of exchanging phone numbers. I was unaware that they had previously known each other. Their testimonies formed much of the composite material for GUY and LARRY. Similar to Merle, it felt “eerie” seeing this connection renewed. Ron Brunette was my onetime landlord and my friend’s stepfather. Richard Gouin is a long-time family friend of my stepfather and grandfather. When I asked Richard about it after the show, he informed me that he had not seen Ron in many years since they worked together. I cannot recall if he said smelter or machine shop, as both men had similar career paths at INCO. This similarity in terms of their respective working trajectories makes perfect sense, and it is clearer when I think back on both of their interviews. I gained a newfound understanding of why their stories meshed so well to form characters for the play.

Many felt that their conceptions of “local” and “history” were essential and that the play needed find a larger audience. Children in schools were often the subjects and a means to infuse some local history as part of the school curriculum. In the discussion following the first matinee performance, Judi Straughan enlisted others to do their part and to send an email to the Sudbury Theatre Centre (STC).⁹ She asserted that it would

⁸ Merle Smith, Facebook Messenger, 24 June 2019.

⁹ Judi Straughan, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

only take “ten of us” to reach out to artistic director John McHenry to have this on a bigger stage. Mr. McHenry emailed me a few days after, having seen the show, and wanted to talk about its future at STC. I am not sure if the play’s inclusion at Sudbury’s regional theatre is due to requests from audience members, but I do recognize that people felt like they could take ownership over their sense of place, memory and a story that belonged to them. These efforts (among others) continue to re-make this connection so that we continue to be, “always connected to what’s under our feet.”

MEMORIES AND EMOTIONAL CONNECTIONS

Memories are shifty, temperamental, and consistently in flux. They also proved to be a wonderful means of connecting people with this story in the present. Many shared the sentiments with Leslie Flowers, who felt that the play “brought me down memory lane” and that it “told the truth.”¹⁰ For Harvey Wyers, it was also a “trip down memory lane [and that] ... the story was so real at times, especially since I have told these stories hundreds of times myself and [the playwright] did a stellar retelling.”¹¹ Barbara Timchuk wrote that, “this play resonated with a flood of memories. Thank you.”¹²

Audience members responded to seeing *ODS* as though they had been transported back in time through their memories. Often these associations related to family members, and in many cases, respondents acknowledged that these memories had been dormant. Helen (no last name) wrote that it was a “good reminder that what our parents did [,] and what they had to do to raise their children up and what we took for granted.”¹³ Merle Smith noticed “so many little instances ... with my family and my mom and dad having

¹⁰ Leslie Flowers, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹¹ Harvey Wyers, Facebook Post, 24 June 2019.

¹² Barbara Timchuk, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹³ Hellen (no last name), *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

those exact conversations.”¹⁴ Jamie West “thought it ... brought back many memories of growing up in Sudbury—and of the struggle/tension [sic] of being on strike and stressed out.”¹⁵ There were many other such comments, which demonstrated that memories were a key point of connection for audience members who witnessed the performance of *ODS*.

Audience members typically referenced and connected with the familial aspects reflected within the play’s domestic setting. Colleen Carroll felt that the play “tells a real story about what brought families and people together and what tore them apart.”¹⁶ Similarly, Heather Campbell wrote that she, “was fascinated by the generational impact on families” and Pat (no last name) noted the, “[f]amily importance [of] sticking together through good/bad times.”¹⁷ There were many more of these familial references owing to the fact that, as one individual mentioned during the second talkback, the play “touches us personally.”¹⁸ In addition to engaging with familial memories, there were a few instances when audience members demonstrated that the play helped them revisit their sentiments regarding loved ones in the present. Tamara Parker wrote that, “I am incredibly grateful for your curiosity and passion on the topic of strikes – I appreciate so much more deeply where my grandfather and father come from – both miners. So much sacrifice and the dedication needed to raise a family in Sudbury.”¹⁹ Her newfound sense of appreciation appeared to have enhanced some long-held notions or helped her to reshape memories from the past.

¹⁴ Merle Smith, Facebook Messenger.

¹⁵ Jamie West, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹⁶ Colleen Carroll, Facebook Messenger, 20, June 2019.

¹⁷ Heather Campbell, email to author, 24 June 2019 and Pat (no last name), *One Day Stronger*, feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹⁸ Name unknown, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

¹⁹ Tamara Parker, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

To that end, audience members revealed that their memories could be revisited, resulting in a shift from their original perceptions. One elderly woman spoke during the second talkback, of “memories ... things I’d forgotten oh yes yes ... gone from my mind ... now [we] will remember for the rest of our lives.”²⁰ Similarly, Lorraine Skanes’s perception shifted after watching the play, when she concluded that, “it was harder than I remembered.”²¹ In some cases, people admitted to having their points of view enhanced as a result of seeing *ODS*. Judy Blais admitted that she “probably could have done more than I did to help the striking families. At the time [,] I thought I did a fair amount but, in hindsight, this play has made me think differently.”²² For Louise Vitols, the play “opened my eyes to what my dad went through [and] I was happily surprised to myself—how did my mother experience the strikes—this I haven’t thought of before now.”²³

This sense of rediscovery through watching *ODS* was evident beyond the production and post-show discussion for my aunt, Barbara Beausoleil. Her mother informed her during a phone conversation after the show, of how she had been shamed while trying to pick up strike vouchers during the 1958 INCO strike. Some men had confronted and intimidated her for being undeserving of union assistance, since her father had left town to find work in Elliot Lake. She felt ashamed and revealed to Barbara that, as a result, she never stepped foot in a union hall, even though her husband retired from INCO in the 1980s. This act of revisiting occurred as a result of Barbara seeing the show and speaking about it with her mother. She may never have known this version of events

²⁰ Name unknown, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

²¹ Lorraine Skanes, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

²² Judy Blais, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

²³ Louise Vitols, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

from her mother's memories. I wonder how many other such stories or conversations occurred as a result of audience members taking a trip down memory lane?²⁴

Emotions were conspicuous, both onstage and off, and were a significant analytical lens for *ODS*. I attribute this salience to two factors. First, the personal investment in the play for many in this audience, some of whom contributed their stories, while others recognized their own. Second, this impact was facilitated through the use of theatre, as a powerful emotional medium, with live actors engaged in a drama that was embroiled with high stakes, tensions and conflict. These emotions were evoked consciously and unconsciously, and this outpouring appeared to be indicative of a much bigger need for catharsis. Michel Bisaillon appreciated that the production captured the elements of “conflict and emotion,” which he felt were integral for any story about labour.²⁵ Linda George, during the talkback as well as her post show interview, harkened back to Mick Lowe's quote —the audio clip we had previously used in both workshops to start the show — where he diagnosed people in Sudbury with PTSD, due to the collective trauma incurred during the strikes and raids.²⁶ The emotional frequency and quality of the feedback and discussion(s) confirm his conclusions. Jan Heppner felt that the play “brought back so clearly the feelings our family felt during the strike and showed how the effects of a strike carry through the generations.”²⁷ The play definitely struck a chord for those who were present. I felt like this is was just the surface, and that there were a lot of unresolved memories and feelings.

²⁴ Barbara Beausoleil, discussion with the author, Sudbury, August 2019.

²⁵ Michel Bisaillon, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

²⁶ See “Script Breakdown,” 91.

²⁷ Jan Heppner, email to the author, 23 June 2019.

Several audience members commented on how they were affected emotionally, as watching this play caused their memories to resurface. Harvey Wyers was visibly emotional during the talkback, and later shared via social media that he had experienced that “trip down memory lane with some really good memories and some that ripped at my gut.”²⁸ Gail Laurin wrote in an exclamatory manner, “Old Memories! I remember being afraid when my husband went to meetings.”²⁹ For Alice Lundigran, the play brought back memories of her father, who was a “strong union man [and] was heavily involved with the Mine Mill Union. He was called a communist and was denied entry into the US to support a union there. Sadly, he was killed in a mining accident.”³⁰ She acknowledged that, during the play, “[a] few times I was tense and very tearful because the portrayals hit home. The instances of humour helped to ease the tension I was feeling.”³¹ Hellen (no last name provided) fixated on LAURIE’s thematic through line, as she recalled it, “we are always connected to what is beneath our feet.”³² She felt, on reflection, that it was “really profound.” She identified that she belonged to “an INCO family[,] and [that] this play, now years after the strikes[,] brings into focus the ‘harsh’ reality of working for a big company, the feelings that were ‘buried’ and what [was] done to extract mineral from the ground.”³³ She concluded by expressing that, “[i]t is like our lives have been hostage for a wage and fear of losing a job.”³⁴ In a similar manner, Barbara Timchuk reflected on the:

²⁸ Harvey Wyers, Facebook Post, 24 June 2019.

²⁹ Gail Laurin, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

³⁰ Alice Lundigran, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Helen (no last name), *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

Absolute palpable feeling that pervaded our home even though I was only seven at the time. My parents would speak in Ukrainian so I couldn't understand. I know he spoke of the prejudice against different ethnicities and even though he had a university education it made it worse for him. We always had a garden, preserves and food. Thanks [to] mom or Thanks Mom.³⁵

In addition to their own personal experiences while watching the play, audience members also witnessed other people experiencing emotional reactions. I sat in the audience for each show and regularly noticed people crying or laughing. The design of the space, and of how the audience members were seated within two banks facing one another, facilitated a dynamic where one could “look as well as be looked at.”³⁶ This extra layer of immersion caused Judi Straughan to applaud the “1950s choice of Elvis’s ‘Love Me Tender’ [that] was perfect. I could see a man across from me tear up when father and daughter danced in the kitchen.”³⁷ She looked through the performers at a man who reacted emotionally to the action on the stage. Colleen Carroll thought that the play “must have been historically accurate as the couple beside me were both filled with tears at times.”³⁸ Moreover, she noticed during the talkback that this couple “also showed the same pride as the characters portrayed in the play, about the events and everything surrounding it.”³⁹

The Saturday evening performance presented such a powerful moment of positive memories, and people were almost reliving a pivotal moment from the 1978-1979 INCO strike, step by step, through their dialogue with one another. One man remembered that it

³⁵ Timchuck, feedback pamphlet.

³⁶ Eugenio Barba, *On Directing and Dramaturgy : Burning the House* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 46-47. I borrowed Barba's preferred spatial arrangement that he used most frequently which he described as a “‘river’ [that] had two banks on which the spectators were placed facing each other. He felt that it worked for multiple spaces while maximizing features such as proximity and intimacy. See “Performer and Production,” 168.

³⁷ Judi Straughan, email to author, 23 June 2019.

³⁸ Carroll, Facebook Messenger.

³⁹ Ibid.

was a “really big night,” it was filled with laughter, and he recalled being “so happy right now.”⁴⁰ The excitement and emotions were palpable for those present, especially since this incident fits within the pervading perception that the 1978-79 INCO strike was an empowering experience. Moreover, for those who were present, this was a signpost event in Sudbury’s labour story, particularly the much vaunted “30-and out” pension scheme that was achieved in its aftermath.⁴¹ These sentiments were especially valid for the Saturday night audience, although an individual from the same cohort remembered events with some fondness the next day. People were finishing one another’s sentences and engaging with each other. They enthusiastically responded vocally to speakers with their own “uh huh.” I found it noteworthy that this discussion took on a rather celebratory manner, particularly as it pertained to lauding the significant role played by these women.

There were numerous men who were crying and demonstrating vulnerability during each of the talkback sessions. They seemed compelled to take over the discussion in some cases, through prolonged verbal outpourings. Don Kuyek, a local lawyer and long-time activist, was visibly emotional as he spoke after the show. He could barely hold back his tears as he recounted both hardships and moments of perseverance from the 1978-79 INCO strike. Harvey Wyers, Dennis Dowdall, and several other men over the course of three post-show discussions also demonstrated emotional vulnerability. Moreover, this was a very public display among strangers, following a live theatrical

⁴⁰ Name unknown, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

⁴¹ See “Remembered Histories,” 34 and 73.

performance. This behaviour complicated standard (even stereotypical) associations with blue-collar masculinity.⁴²

These public instances of men displaying their emotions were noteworthy for members of the creative team. Caitlin Heppner assumed that these men “probably don’t go to the theatre,” and referenced as an aside, the stereotypical notion and their possible motivation was that “my wife dragged me.”⁴³ At first, she did not understand why they allowed themselves to be vulnerable in public. Similarly, AJ Laflamme was struck by the fact that “any time a man spoke he had tears in his eyes. You don’t often see men cry in public, especially while talking.”⁴⁴ Both of them, noticeably, associated and contrasted these men with the men from the play. During strikes, it was difficult to fulfill their prescribed roles and take care of their families, which was a source of shame. They both referred to LAURIE’s line, “Since when do husbands – Do YOU – come home and talk about anything to do with work?”⁴⁵ They expected these men to remain silent. Women were visibly emotional as well, but generally remained in the background.

The performers recognized that there was a real need for these men to share their experiences. Their laughter and tears represented a public reckoning and an emotional release. Caitlin felt that it “was really cool that we gave them that space. It is OK to make them feel better.” She spoke of “Miner Men,” who are supposed to be “stoic” and were “walking around with an emotional burden.”⁴⁶ Similarly, AJ wondered “how long it

⁴² Joan Sangster, “Gendering Labour History Across Borders,” *Labour History Review* 75, 2 (2010): 143–61; Steven Maynard, “Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History,” *Labour / Le Travail* 23 (1989): 159-169.

⁴³ Caitlin Heppner, post show interview by the author, Sudbury, June 2019.

⁴⁴ AJ Laflamme, post show interview by author, Sudbury, July 2019.

⁴⁵ LAURIE, Act 2, Scene 2, A-304.

⁴⁶ Heppner, post show interview.

would have taken for people to talk about these experiences, if they ever would.”⁴⁷

Matthew felt that these feedback sessions were necessary and useful as compared to other instances when artists only received “pats on the back.” There were a lot of compliments following *ODS*, but generally during the discussions, people “made the play their own thing.” Matthew reflected on our responsibility or prospective “duty” to allow that space for these men who needed to cry during the feedback sessions. He likened this process to a form of “acupuncture,” as relief from Mick Lowe’s diagnosis of the community’s “PTSD.”⁴⁸ AJ thought that these men, at one time, belonged to a “community under threat.” She compared it to how people in her hometown of St. Catharines, Ontario, carry and repress the horrific murders of Kristin French and Leslie Mahaffy, in the early 1990s.⁴⁹ From her experience, talking about these aspects helped to “trigger buried emotions” and “made the past present.”⁵⁰ Similarly, Caitlin perceived the need to unburden people and was enthusiastic about the fact that we “tapped into” this.⁵¹ Sudburians are carrying these memories that need to be released in the present.

I hesitate to associate the term catharsis with *ODS* due to its association with the Aristotelian tragic form of theatre.⁵² Yet the emotional currency of the talkback sessions and visceral reactions during the performances indicated that both the audience and creative team were able to experience some degree of emotional release. However, beyond having these memories (re)surface in tandem with emotions—both difficult and

⁴⁷ Laflamme, post show interview.

⁴⁸ Matthew Heiti, post show interview by author, June 2019.

⁴⁹ Residents from St. Catharines were traumatized by this series of abductions and murders that were perpetrated by Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka. This despicable moment received wide national coverage.

⁵⁰ Laflamme, post show interview.

⁵¹ Heppner, post show interview.

⁵² The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines catharsis as “the process of releasing, and thereby providing relief from, strong or repressed emotions.”

warm—I questioned to what extent this process was therapeutic. In an email sent to me after the show, Linda George thanked me for “listening, researching and actually hearing our voices and experiences.”⁵³ She then expressed some reservations in a final comment, that “[b]ecause I hear my own voice and feel the pain of those times, I cannot tell if this determination to be listened to and the pain from the growth of this experience is being portrayed. I am too close to the story to tell.”⁵⁴ She questioned if these significant aspects were portrayed through the play, such as the determination to be heard and the notion that any growth incurred through her activism came with a personal cost. This suggests that she experienced difficulty parsing her role in these events from that of the performer in the play. When I spoke with her a few weeks later, she mentioned that, incrementally, through two workshops and a production, it became easier for her to watch these experiences replayed.

INTERGENERATIONAL (EX)CHANGE

There was a noticeable and genuine wish articulated that people needed to learn from this history and these experiences presented in the play. There was a prevalent impulse for what should be learned or passed down. Carol Mulligan spoke passionately about this play reaching bigger audiences, especially children in schools who, “don’t know mining history.”⁵⁵ Michel Bisailon, a retired public service employee, expressed the notion that we all have a responsibility to educate people, in advance of us heading for what he believes are “tough times,” due to the current upsurge in “right wing politics.”⁵⁶ He thought it would be helpful for younger audiences to witness the emotional

⁵³ Linda George email to author, 22 June 2019.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Carol Mulligan, post show discussion, matinee performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

⁵⁶ Bisailon, post show discussion.

value of “people fighting for themselves” and instances where they are “working together.”⁵⁷ They needed to know that people fought hard for what they now have. Ralph MacIntosh, a retired music teacher, echoed this sense of responsibility towards people who “don’t know what they don’t know.”⁵⁸ He put stock in the multi-generational experiences of many people living and working in Sudbury, and that many of them have been able to recognize what is at stake during a strike. However, he added, “once you know, there is a responsibility” to instruct others.⁵⁹

The impetus for teaching younger people about the significance of this history was accompanied, unintentionally in some instances, with a bit of vexation, particularly when people were speaking about younger people who “don’t know what they don’t know.” Dennis Dowdall recalled when his daughter-in-law told him that “unions don’t do anything for you.”⁶⁰ He informed those assembled for the talkback that she had, “benefits coming out of the yin yang,” and that he asked her if she thought that, “the company gave you those things out of the goodness of their hearts?”⁶¹ He then went on to share how he imparted his wisdom through dialogue, and that she now, as a result, possesses a different point of view. His exasperation with the uninformed was shared by Jamie West, who termed it “revisionist history,” in instances where people appear to hold the belief that local mining companies such as “INCO and Falconbridge decided to give benefits one day because [it was] the right thing to do.”⁶² Jamie, in his capacity as Sudbury’s NDP MPP, suggested that this is the same kind of deference that curtails efforts towards

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ralph MacIntosh, post show discussion, matinee performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Dennis Dowdall, post show discussion, matinee performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Jamie West, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

compelling big companies to adapt their practices to help combat climate change.

Furthermore, he asserted that, “no company is going to spend one billion dollars altruistically,” for such a purpose, unless they are pressed to do so by the people.⁶³

Some audience members said that they were frustrated with and even ashamed of young people. They felt that they were ignorant regarding the current state of affairs in the workforce. Merle Smith, a retired *Sudbury Star* employee and son of a miner, wrote that it was “too bad more young people would not take an interest and get an education[,] as they think all they have in the workplace today these big companies just were so nice and gave it all to the workers.”⁶⁴ Moreover, he felt that these young people ignored the fact that “[w]ithout sacrifice of so many with strikes and loss of life and loss of health these things came to pass.”⁶⁵ For Merle, this ignorance was a disservice to those who came before. For Albert S, a student employee at INCO for three summers from 1974-76, it was a source of shame. He experienced three major strikes in Sudbury and remembered vividly, in 1978 and 2009, feeling like his community was under siege. He wrote that, “I loved (and love) my community so it hurt a great deal.”⁶⁶ His next few lines reflected his shame as he continued: “I can’t help but feel how spoiled and entitled we have become those men laid the ground work for us to waste more it seems than we use today. Those INCO workers would look at us with disgust at the decadence we today think is normal.”⁶⁷

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Merle Smith, Facebook Messenger.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Albert S, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

Men and women who were involved with the 2009-10 Vale strike were the least present in terms of providing feedback or contributing to the discussions. These individuals were noticeably scarce in our audience (with a few exceptions). Coincidentally, this age group and its relationship to unionism incurred the most criticism. A controversial and stereotypical caricature, that frequently appeared in the interviews, also surfaced in the talkbacks. People referred to the frequently cited and gendered description of the self-congratulating, 2000s 150k-per-year bonus miner in Sudbury, with his big truck, big pension, benefits, better safety conditions, mortgage and expensive toys. His ignorance as to the origins of his current windfall was also frequently cited, as well as the fact that he was probably fortunate compared to his predecessors, because his wife was able to work and help support the household.⁶⁸ This critique of the members of the current generation, who are taking their circumstances for granted, is not unlike the way in which members of Jack Quenneville's generation viewed their own successors; many of whom were the senior members who contributed the most during the discussions following *ODS*.⁶⁹

It is a matter for debate, whether or not audience members agreed with Carol Mulligan and others, who still maintain that Sudbury is first and foremost a "mining camp."⁷⁰ Although people differed on this point, most agreed that the demographics had shifted. Mechanization and its effects on production mining in Sudbury was identified as a main reason for this, among other factors. People agreed that fewer Sudburians were

⁶⁸ This stereotypical depiction of the miner is gendered. I have not been privy to a woman meeting this description.

⁶⁹ Jack Quenneville, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, November 1978, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97. Of younger unionists in the late 1970s, Quenneville expressed emphatically that, "They were born and there was always a union...[.]" See "Remembered Histories," 33.

⁷⁰ Carol Mulligan, interview by the author, Sudbury, August 2017.

currently employed by local mining companies relative to their predecessors. From this accord, audience members put forward other conclusions regarding present day workers and their experiences. Several men, following each of the three shows, felt the need to teach and to explain. Harvey Wyers, commenting on unionists and the state of unionism during the 2009-10 Vale strike, felt that the quality of participation was “watered down.”⁷¹ He could not, however, speak as much about the commitment of these workers than he had previously witnessed from his father’s generation involved in the 1958 INCO strike, and from his own cohort’s experience in the 1978-79 INCO strike. In addition, one man reminded everyone present during the second talkback, that the “fear isn’t there anymore,” as compared to the past, when “so much of the community was dependent on that workforce.”⁷² Somehow, the stakes were not as high in 2009-10.

I was as sensitive as I could be when listening to these statements about this generation of workers and their families. There was a noticeable absence of them in attendance at the play, people who could speak from their perspectives. The implications of some of this posturing made me uncomfortable. It came across as unsympathetic in some instances. I did not want people’s experiences to be diminished in any way. Many of my interviewees were present, active, and could recount experiences of the 2009-10 Vale strike, but only one of them was under the age of forty at the time of his interview. I did little to curtail these sentiments or present any counterarguments, as I wanted the discussions to follow their own courses. I recall one instance when an elderly individual implied that today’s miners were entitled or spoiled during the discussion following the final matinee. I saw Steve Saari sitting quietly out of the corner of my eye. Steve was

⁷¹ Harvey Wyers, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

⁷² Name unknown, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

close to thirty years old during the Vale strike. He had much to recount during our interview in terms of his involvement with fellow strikers, including his growing disillusionment with the union, as well as the disturbing impact of that strike on his home and family life. Perhaps he did not feel comfortable as a public speaker in that environment. Having known him for twenty-five years, I am sure some of these comments did not sit well.⁷³

This intergenerational commentary was prominent, particularly as directed towards the younger generation. One gentleman, speaking for retired activists, acknowledged that the responsibility as caretakers for the world in its current state belongs to younger people who, he felt, were at a disadvantage. He told them that, the “ball is in your court now,” and ironically suggested that one course of action was “maybe another play.”⁷⁴ Although there was a noticeable absence in participation from Vale workers and their spouses, younger voices comprised of individuals forty or under were definitely prominent during the talkback sessions. They were especially present and vocal, during the “Third Act” that followed the final show on Sunday 23 June 2019.

The voices came from the creative team, fellow artists, family members, friends and people who came out to the show out of personal interest. In addition to questions or feelings relating to the play, their responses following *ODS* often reflected how they were also very concerned about the current state of affairs. They expressed their fears about ever-increasing economic and social disparities, ultra-right-wing politics, environmental degradation, and the unchecked power of multi-national corporations. They reflected on

⁷³ I briefly asked Steve Saari about this recently. He mentioned that he noticed a lot of people had a great deal to say and that he preferred to stay quiet and listen. I did detect a slight level of frustration in his voice.

⁷⁴ Name unknown, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

these threats, pressures and feelings of powerlessness in relation to the play. These voices did not represent or articulate any one unified perspective. Rather, they seemed to evoke confusion, frustration, and the need to make sense of these inherited circumstances. They also appeared to search for lessons to be learned from living, working, and striking in Sudbury.

France Huot, a performer from Sudbury, felt disconnected from people in the story. She empathized with “people that [were] stuck in that cycle,” especially families and how they were affected.⁷⁵ Even though she is from the area, she felt like an outsider – as others have previously shared with me – because she is not part of that generation and not part of these mining stories. She was still very much concerned with the current circumstances of the world. Chantal Skanes, within an almost boosterish environment, during the second talkback that was dominated by several ex-Steelworkers, levied some criticism towards unions and unionists. She felt like “unions lost sight of what is important [and that they were] more like corporations.”⁷⁶ As the self-proclaimed “youngest person” present, she felt like they “need to be reminded what they are actually supposed to be doing [and that they] needed to re-evaluate [their mandate], structure and values as an organization...”⁷⁷ Marie Pierre Proulx, artistic director at the Theatre du Nouvel-Ontario (TNO) in Sudbury, felt that the many voices that were used in the telling of the story of this one family helped to depict a universal and timeless experience, past and present. According to her, audiences in multiple localities would be able to connect

⁷⁵ France Huot, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

⁷⁶ Chantal Skanes, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

to this play whether the work revolves around resource extraction, manufacturing, or even services. She believed that “you did it though all those voices.”⁷⁸

Nicholas Carella, a filmmaker and performer, was intimidated by the circumstances facing the characters in the play, especially those closest to his own age. He was struck by the audio clip about not being able to face a previous generation, if you lost what they fought for.⁷⁹ He felt like this fight was ingrained and cyclical. Workers and their families were stuck “between a rock and a hard place,” there were no alternatives, and they had nowhere else to go.⁸⁰ He imagined living here, and what it would be like to “go back to work for someone who doesn’t value you.” He also questioned, “can you ever leave your caste?” As an outsider from “somewhere else,” he wondered, “What else could you do?” He admitted that he was seeing parallels in the play from a time “when we are living in a generation now, [and it is] the first time where we don’t think the future is brighter or [a] better world for kids.” Nicholas, along with other people present, articulated their pessimism regarding the present world.

Both AJ and Caitlin echoed Nicholas’s pessimism, and they expressed that the solution for younger people in the present is to learn from the past. AJ thought that many of the issues facing the characters in the play are not discussed by young people. They do not know, “what it takes to get what you deserve [and] to be treated like a human being.” She felt that people were regressing “back before 1958” and needed to rediscover for themselves, in the present, the “value of labour, personal worth [and that] we need to stick together as a community.”⁸¹ Caitlin also spoke about lessons that were once learned

⁷⁸ Marie Pierre Proulx, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

⁷⁹ For the specific audio clip featuring the voice of Jamie West see Appendix A, 328 (QLAB 75).

⁸⁰ Nicholas Carella, post show discussion, 23 June 2019.

⁸¹ Laflamme, post show interview.

and have since been forgotten. She reminded me of the first time we met, when she asked me, “Why would anybody waste their time studying history?” She attributed this to having been instructed by “boring history teachers.” She has since changed her position and sees value in learning about the past. She posited that “history was repeating itself right now [and that] we are sitting in 1932 Germany [in terms of] value shifting between right and left,” and the overt presence of “racist” and “homophobic” points of view. Caitlin attributes these circumstances to “people like [herself] saying who gives a fuck about history.” Moreover, she sees the “need to remember how we teach and talk about history [as well as] how we moralize and judge people in the past because we are the same.”⁸²

VALUING CONTESTED, COMPLICATED AND DIVISIVE HISTORIES

It was quite evident that audience members valued their local mining history, aspects that they felt were underplayed in our culture. As discussed above, many of them expressed how they wished to preserve and to pass on this knowledge for future generations, and that this was important for them. People appeared to value different aspects of this history, depending on their points of view. During a post-show discussion, retired labour and military historian Dr. Dieter Buse, from an academic standpoint said, that he wanted to “compliment [me] and say social history and labour has ceased to exist and if you bring it back I applaud you for it.”⁸³ Colleen Carroll equated the historical accuracy of the play with how it affected audience members on an emotional level.⁸⁴ Many audience members spoke about the social and cultural dimensions of their pasts,

⁸² Heppner, post show interview.

⁸³ Dieter Buse, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

⁸⁴ Carroll, Facebook message.

and frequently responded to the familial themes that were prominent in this play. A Jesuit priest, who was advanced enough in years to recall the 1958 INCO strike as an adult, felt that “the play echoes very well the social background of that time... [and that] ... the play sequences are not overwhelming.” He also spoke about how, what he described as, “illusions[,] help you remember – those who don’t know, I don’t know if they connect – [but these] illusions [help] to get back to what people [were] talking about.”⁸⁵ In our post-show interview, Linda George pointed out that we were “preaching to the converted.”⁸⁶ This was a significant observation, as there were many differing views and perspectives from people who did not voluntarily come out and see the show. Moreover, these social and labour histories are not straightforward but are complicated and divisive.

Audiences recognized and articulated some aspects of this sense of divisiveness in Sudbury within the narrative of *ODS*. In the first talkback, Ralph MacIntosh reflected on how Sudbury was “not a happy place” when he moved here in the early 1980s, during a prolonged lockout.⁸⁷ He demarcated two oppositional camps, when he said that “there is always pro-union and anti-union ... Sudbury is a union town versus non-union [town] [and it is always] one side or the other. [People] always have an opinion.”⁸⁸ He wrote, as a response to the play on his pamphlet, that he now had “a better understanding of the animosity that exists in Sudbury between unions and employers, and about why some people are so anti-union (both employers and workers).”⁸⁹ Kim Fahner in a description of the show that she posted on social media, highlighted the sense of disunity within the

⁸⁵ Name unknown, post show discussion, Sudbury, matinee performance, 22 June 2019.

⁸⁶ Linda George, interview by the author, Sudbury, August 2019.

⁸⁷ Ralph MacIntosh, post show discussion.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ralph MacIntosh, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

familial context. Within the play, she describes that “[w]e see husbands and wives struggling in their jobs and marriages, as well as children who have memories of adults arguing about strike happenings in family kitchens.”⁹⁰ For these two audience members, the play encapsulated and helped to illuminate these instances of disunity.

Some individuals were critical that significant perspectives remained outside of the narrative. John Closs and Oksana Kuryliw provided their feedback regarding my selected choices for the narrative, saying that there were elements that they felt were missing.⁹¹ The latter, in our discussion over coffee after the show, revealed that my interview subjects consisted predominantly of members who belonged to one faction from within a schism that divided the Steelworkers.⁹² He mentioned specific names of my interviewees who were active during the 1978-1979 INCO strike, and identified that their adversaries referred to them as the “B team.”⁹³ For Closs, the point of view from this “B team” is quite evident in the second act of *ODS*, and he suggests that the political slant of the story would be quite different if I had spoken to more people outside of that group. Audiences demonstrated that partisanship as well and I had not considered this aspect prior to my meeting with Closs.⁹⁴

Although people contributed a variety of opinions from various points of view, on the main, and in accordance with Linda George’s observation, they were generally warm, supportive and exhibited political and social uniformity. While it is conceivable that

⁹⁰ Kim Fahner, Facebook post, 22 June 2019.

⁹¹ Oksana Kuryliw, email to author, 27 July 2019.

⁹² John Closs, discussion with the author, Sudbury, August 2019.

⁹³ Ibid. There was, in fact, a schism within the leadership of the Steelworkers during and after the 1978-79 strike. The “B team” was used to describe the “progressives” by their adversaries who considered themselves “moderates.”

⁹⁴ I was aware of political divisions within the USWA 6500, but assumed this was consistent during any era. A play without this “B team” of progressives would have been quite different. I was unable to secure any interviews with the “A team.”

individuals kept private and contrarian thoughts to themselves, it is more likely that what they did articulate was reflective of the general perceptions held by those who were present. For instance, there were consistent references and anxiety expressed in regard to the dangers that are apparent within the contemporary political context. Namely, they expressed fears of the perceived upsurge in extreme right-wing politics, politicians, and “the one percent” whom they represent. The concept of unionism, revived and revisited, was put forward as a solution.

Conflicts and notions of disunity that were explored in the play were also reflected by members of the audience. I knew of one disagreement stemming from the 2009-10 Vale strike that affected one person’s experience of *ODS*. Pat O’Hearn and Steve Saari were friends in high school and had a huge falling out following that Vale strike. Steve felt strongly that Pat’s father was a “scab” and told him so at that time. He had apparently identified his name from a circulated list and was not sympathetic to any of Pat’s explanations to the contrary. There was a heated argument, followed by a lasting animosity between them. The two had not spoken since, and found themselves in the same audience during the final matinee performance. Pat later informed me that he did not stay to participate in the discussion because he did not want to start an argument. There is more complexity and nuance to this exchange, and both Pat and Steve are justified in their positions. Their lack of empathy toward one another and their inability to resolve these prior transgressions as a result of the strike, is very much in the realm of what I hoped to explore within the theatrical narrative. I was curious if this situation could have been remedied through dialogue, or how other people would have reacted if they took up this argument in the present.

Partisan audience members demonstrated a sense of ownership over this narrative, and also sought to reshape or reinforce what they felt needed to be made more explicit or accurate in the play. Dennis Dowdall pointed out his personal connection with the character of ALBERT. He informed everyone during the first talkback session that, “I’m the guy that wants to be retired from INCO as long as I worked there...”⁹⁵ Taking the opportunity to share, he conveyed that he felt like the play’s depiction of “the social aspects” during strikes was “authentic.” He also made reference – with some added bravado akin to ALBERT in this scene – to some anecdotes about clandestine acts such as throwing rocks at staff or shooting at a helicopter, which, he made sure to add, that “it wasn’t me.” During this exchange, he demonstrated “with a smile on [his] face,” what I describe as a certain swagger that I discerned from my interviews. I also frequently notice this aspect, when talking to people who work(ed) in the mines or smelter. They often, from my experience, display a ‘devil-may care’ persona. I recall my interview with Dennis, where he spoke about how miners are often considered unjustly to be uneducated. In counter-distinction to this stereotype, they have learned to rely on demonstrating resilience, craftiness, as well as a sense of humour and rowdiness. These are valued traits, at least from my perspective, living here and working on this project. As a result, ALBERT and some of the other male characters evoke these characteristics.

Yet, in the next breath, he also demonstrated that, for him, conveying an accurate portrayal of miners was just as important as being clear as to what they were fighting for during strikes. All joking and bravado aside, Dennis Dowdall wanted to quell possible implications from an audio excerpt we adapted from Bryan Murray’s interview. The clip

⁹⁵ Dennis Dowdall, post show discussion. Dennis was identifying his connection to ALBERT (Act 1 Scene 19, A-300).

features Brian, speaking about how the men had achieved nothing in the aftermath of the 1958 strike. His exact words, at one point, were that these men “went back for nothing. They went on strike for nothing.”⁹⁶ Dennis was adamant that he did not “want it being represented that they struck for nothing.” For this issue, the self-proclaimed “joker” kept his smile, but became serious. He wanted to remind people who were present during this talkback of the gravity of these situations, for workers and their families. He spoke of always being under the threat of layoffs. He earnestly reminded everybody that the conditions that came with this life entailed that they fought for safety, pensions, benefits, seniority, and vacation time, as well as other aspects. He identified the significance of making gains in contract language and in areas relating to what he called “social justice.” Financial gain was always desirable, and it was a part of these little victories, but it was hardly the whole story. Furthermore, he shared that the reason he was able to retire at fifty was because of these incremental gains from those previous strikes. He finished by saying that we “presented that perfectly, other than the fact that I wouldn’t want to see that we had struck for nothing.”

Perception regarding this particular optic was also a key issue for other audience members. Dieter Buse, a retired local history professor and social historian, during the same conversation, said that he agreed with Dennis’s point. He spoke of the many different perspectives and sub-themes attributable to this story, having both studied strikes academically as an historian and also experienced them directly as a resident who moved here in 1969. Specifically, he mentioned how many people were affected by the housing crisis of that year and that, “people in the pubs didn’t have a problem [whereas]

⁹⁶ For the audio clip see Appendix A, 296 (QLAB 49).

people who weren't there did." I took this to mean that this narrative sliver was missing from the play, and that he was acknowledging that the subject(s) within the story were constructed using the experiences of people I spoke with. He was not being overly critical. Instead, he said "I think your play is great. I really love the *mise-en-scène*." The next aspect he complimented was our use of a newspaper article in a projection with the title, "56 people who died underground since 1950."⁹⁷ He felt that the use of this material in projections was very effective because it represented another aspect "of things they were fighting for," namely improvements to "health and safety." He recalled a deadly sintering plant in the region and the ensuing fatalities. He circled back to his first few years in Sudbury, his story, in which he acknowledges that "two miners per month were dying."⁹⁸ As was the case with Dennis, Dr. Buse reiterated and touched on pertinent aspects that, he felt, should not be overlooked, namely, the notion that mining life was dangerous and deadly.

ODS provided an opportunity to continue this discussion and encouraged people to provide input about what should be central to this story. In some instances, while admitting that they enjoyed the play and found value in the experience, it left them wanting more. John Closs, a retired carpenter, professor, unionist, and past president of the Sudbury and District Labour Council for three terms, wrote in his email that the play "told a complex and nuanced story well. You created sympathetic characters that were a good distillation of the many stories that make up the history of the working-class community."⁹⁹ He also said that "there were some areas of the play that deserve

⁹⁷ For the projection image titled "People Killed by INCO" see Appendix A, 338 (QLAB 48).

⁹⁸ Buse, post show discussion.

⁹⁹ John Closs, email to the author, 24 June 2019.

criticism.” He listed a number of helpful observations about the play, but the following articulates Closs’s need for specificity and nuance regarding the plight of workers:

Finally[,] strikes tend to be the focus of examinations of the union movement but far more work is done between strikes; contracts both good and bad are negotiated and settled; those contracts are enforced in the workplace with varying degrees of success and diligence; governments are lobbied for improvements in legislation and regulation governing health and safety and employment standards; and elections are fought. All of these are part of the workers’ struggle to wrest as much value as they can from their labour.¹⁰⁰

John Closs exhibited a similar impulse as Dennis Dowdall and Dieter Buse, who all wished to demonstrate what else this story was about. That the latter two individuals needed to speak of it implies that they wanted more in terms of content, or that they felt that these certain aspects were peripheral. Whereas, the former, took the time to articulate in writing, a well thought and nuanced schematic of worker relations. Closs’ feedback about the play reads as a political description and one singular aspect of that “strip of human behaviour.”¹⁰¹ The shared cultural understandings about this “secular ritual,” encouraged multiple perspectives¹⁰² Moreover, one of the limitations of this play is that it ultimately reduces many of these significant aspects that are germane to people’s experiences living, working, and striking in Sudbury.

People demonstrated that they felt comfortable contributing their expertise and criticisms by engaging in the post-show discussions directly, or through email or social media after the fact. It appeared as though most people who attended *ODS* accepted it for

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Victor Turner, and Edith Turner, "Performing ethnography," *The Drama Review: TDR* 26, no. 2 (1982), 33. To borrow from anthropologists Victor and Edith Turner, and their work with ethnographic performances of rituals or social dramas: “Culture, social experience and individual psychology combine in complex ways in any ‘bit’ or ‘strip’ of human behaviour.” I use this concept here to reiterate the complex and comprehensive aspects to this social drama and to its reception.

¹⁰² Steven High and David Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (Between the Lines, 2007), 25.

its merits as a story. Complementing this noticeable investment for those familiar with the subject, was a genuine interest and assertiveness from people who were unfamiliar with this local history. These audience members expressed that they wanted to know more. For example, Nicholas Carella said that he “would love to know more about some of the issues they were striking about.”¹⁰³ Nicholas thought that more supplemental material would assist in providing context for audience members like himself, who have only a rudimentary understanding. He did not “think its pedantic to put more context in,” especially for audiences outside of Sudbury. Furthermore, he correctly acknowledged my hesitation to “put too much reading in,” but still asserted that more historical material was desirable. Several queries regarding historical content occurred during the last talkback, which was comprised of a much younger group of participants. Nicholas Carella did not think more information in the show would result in “too much reading” or be excessively “pedantic.”¹⁰⁴ He felt that this historical context provided the necessary “backdrop for the familial trial.”¹⁰⁵ In addition, it was a “brand new story” for him, as “an outsider,” and there was “more to learn.”¹⁰⁶ He felt that he benefitted from “seeing those [historical] parallels, at a time when ... we don’t think the future is brighter.”¹⁰⁷

Michel Laforge and France Huot, both from Sudbury, spoke about wanting additional historical context from the play. Their following exchange demonstrates the necessity for dialogue after this show:

¹⁰³ Nicholas Carella, post show discussion.

¹⁰⁴ Carella, post show discussion.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

Michel: I think it would have been interesting to see the relationship between Mine Mill and Steelworkers explored a little more.

France: Oh, so they are not the same thing?

Michel: No.

France: Ok, I just got that.¹⁰⁸

According to Michel, who holds an M.A. in history and is familiar with this local topic, the contextual background relating to the Cold War, and the intra-union rivalry was important because it “helps to add clarity.”¹⁰⁹ He felt that this needed more development, but that it was already in the play, just “below the surface.”¹¹⁰ France thought it would help audience members who might be unfamiliar with this history, “to understand what it is [the characters] are talking about.”¹¹¹ As an historian, I think people living in Sudbury should, at the very least, understand the distinction between these two unions. I was surprised by France’s comments, and they reminded me that this local story is not taught to students at the elementary or high school levels. In addition, there are many instances where these two unions are treated as separate entities in the play, especially as it moves forward chronologically. I asked myself, as I did throughout the play’s development, whether or not I had made this clear enough. In France’s case, the answer appears to be no and emphasizes the importance of having these “Third Acts.” She left after seeing the play knowing more about this city’s history.

Nicholas, Michel and France expressed the need within the presentation for more of the political and “capital H” history in the piece, elements that are more likely to be taught in a university classroom.¹¹² On this subject, John Closs, rather, felt that “the play

¹⁰⁸ Exchange between France Huot and Michel Laforge, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

¹⁰⁹ Laforge, post show discussion.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Huot, post show discussion.

¹¹² Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (Columbia University Press, 1998). I was reminded of the debates in this work that revolved around notions of popular, academic and professionalized history.

was too caught up in Mine Mill versus USW, and that [it] did not explore the more revealing pattern of workers confronting INCO then pulling back after defeats.”¹¹³ He also felt the “portrayal of the pressure [on] the community to end [the] strike in 1958 was a bit rote” and that the play did not sufficiently incorporate the “many undercurrents in that conflict that reflected the very active Cold War and the importance of Nickel as a strategic metal.”¹¹⁴ During the second talkback, Gary Skanes asked if I discovered any connection between a “bad contract” in 1958 and the membership’s conversion to USW, as this aspect was not made clear through the play.¹¹⁵

Aside from these instances, the very significant narrative of the USW takeover of Mine Mill remained dormant or reduced, as it had throughout my initial interviews. Collectively, those who remember, having experienced this conflict first-hand, are advanced in years and fewer in number. In most cases, the oldest interviewees and audience members were slightly younger than adulthood at that time. Harvey Wyers, while comparing the 1958 and 1978 INCO strikes, designated each as instances of progress, with the latter as the peak.¹¹⁶ His sentiments were echoed generally by those “in the know” who spoke with authority on the subject. They conveyed that the story of strikes in Sudbury follows a line of cumulative progress, something which is trending in the reverse direction with the 2009-10 Vale strike as the antithesis to 1978. Furthermore, people seemed generally pessimistic in anticipation of the looming 2020 contract negotiations with Vale.

¹¹³ John Closs, email to author.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Gary Skanes, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

¹¹⁶ Harvey Wyers, post show discussion.

There were several audience members who were well-versed in Sudbury's labour history. Perhaps, like the Jesuit priest, they recognized that this over-arching narrative is peripheral to this story. Or like John Closs, they had criticisms, but accepted this first and foremost as a story and as a work of fiction.¹¹⁷ Even so, there were acknowledgements to some of the lore involving Mine Mill Local 598 and its celebrated cultural contributions. Michel Bisailon complimented the project by likening it as an extension and continuation of Mine Mill's legacy of "building their own culture."¹¹⁸ He made reference to the time when the union hosted blacklisted singer Paul Robeson at its hall in the midst of the Cold War, and the historical significance of that event. In a separate talkback, Don Kuyek could not contain his enthusiasm, when he spoke about when the Royal Winnipeg Ballet was forced to cancel its performance at that same hall due to pressures from the United States State Department.¹¹⁹ These instances of reverence were never tempered with any reference to the raids or to that union's demise and capitulation to USW. Many in attendance were, in fact, Steelworkers at one time. Besides Gary Skanes' question, and the aforementioned exchange between France and Michel, it was hardly mentioned. I was reminded of some constructive criticism that I received after the workshops from Dr. David Leadbeater.¹²⁰ He felt that the play missed the mark because it does not touch upon the achievements and progressive politics espoused by Mine Mill. Particularly, he felt that this takeover should be represented as a seminal moment in Sudbury's history and,

¹¹⁷ John Closs, discussion with author.

¹¹⁸ Bisailon, post show discussion.

¹¹⁹ Don Kuyek, post show discussion. I was also overjoyed by these comments as they were very much aligned with some of my previous research. See Rick Duthie, "'What's that tutti frutti [dance] stuff?': Mine Mill Local 598's Cold War Cultural Tool," Master's Research Essay (Laurentian University, 2014).

¹²⁰ Dr. David Leadbeater is an Associate Professor of Economics at Laurentian University.

similarly, as a defeat for the labour movement in Canada. This is the view once held by Nels Thibault and other Mine Mill supporters of that era.¹²¹

Diane Ikonen, daughter of Nels Thibault, described those earlier INCO strikes in an email after having watched the play. She was twelve years old during the 1958 strike. They lived in the same house and were separated by only one generation. As a result, her encapsulation of these events was much different from how her father described them:

What I took away from watching this play was a walk down Memory Lane, remembering so much about the era of the 1958 strike, and feeling so grateful to the union members and families who were so valiant in 1958 and 1978 for their perseverance to achieve outstanding, standards-setting Collective Agreements.¹²²

Ikonen demonstrated that what was an imperative political moment for members of her father's generation, had now softened through the recesses of memory. Her position was now commemorative.

WOMEN AND VOICES

Many in attendance appreciated the play's focus on instances when characters were given a voice, particularly women. LAURIE's activism, and her gaining a sense of "control" in the second act, was when—for audiences—this aspect was most evident. Particularly inciting, was the moment in the play when LAURIE informs the audience that the men have voted to reject a poor contract offer, at the latter stages of the 1978-79 INCO strike, especially during the talkback following the second performance. Several people who stayed for that discussion had either contributed their stories beforehand, or, were also active and recalled this moment. This was a life defining moment that was

¹²¹ Nels Thibault, interview by Mike Solski, Winnipeg, May 1981, The Jim Tester Fonds, Archives of Ontario, C 97.

¹²² Diane Ikonen, email to author, 28 June 2019.

being (re)played for them. One man expressed that this was the “best night of my life.”¹²³ For Linda George, in terms of growth, without this experience, “I wouldn’t be who I am today.”¹²⁴ There was a great deal of applause as people, both men and women, discussed this important vote, its legacy, and its meaning within the community.

Members of the audience approved of the decision to tell this story from a woman’s point of view. The post-show commentary and feedback following *ODS* validated this creative decision, which ultimately proved to be an essential talking point. After the first show, Michel Bisaillon shared a story from his experience participating in a strike involving health care workers. He described the nuns in his story as “wallflowers,” until their active participation during that strike “transformed” them “overnight” into car-kicking agitators, warning those drivers not to “go one foot farther.”¹²⁵ His story echoed the transformative spirit that was conveyed through anecdotes from the interviews, which I then wanted to integrate into the play. A number of people appreciated this aspect, and acknowledged that this focus was necessary. Kim Fahner wrote, that she “especially loved how you wove the women’s stories into the play. So often, women’s voices have been erased...but you brought them back...and that is not an easy thing for a man to do well.”¹²⁶

People communicated that they were impressed and surprised in some instances, with what women did during strikes. One woman named Nicole admitted that she “wasn’t aware of the role the women played. Very commendable!”¹²⁷ Similarly, but

¹²³ Name unknown, post show discussion, evening performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

¹²⁴ George, post show discussion.

¹²⁵ Bisaillon, post show discussion.

¹²⁶ Kim Fahner, email to author, 25 June 2019.

¹²⁷ Nicole (no last name), *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

closer to home, Louise Vitols was “happily surprised to ask [herself] – [H]ow did my mother experience the strike[?] I haven’t thought of that before.”¹²⁸ Heather Campbell wrote that she was “intrigued by the role of girls and women during labour strikes.”¹²⁹ She also felt that “it was an odd situation where women wanted to work but were barred, [and were] organizing when a strike hit the men.”¹³⁰ It is within this sense of *doing* where women could distinguish themselves from the men and be recognized as contributing members in the community. The exploration of women as community builders and ‘grassroots leaders’ was one of my initial aims. I also wished to investigate what I perceived as an absence of recognition for these women. Judi Straughan touched on this underlining idea when she applauded “that the play focuses on women and we see their confidence and courage grow throughout both strikes and time.”¹³¹ Responses from audience members confirmed for me that some recognition of women in this community is wanted and needed. Jamie West, local MPP for Sudbury, supported my contention from a personal standpoint, when he wrote that, “[a] lot of people know me for being an activist. I couldn’t do what I do without my wife. Thanks!”¹³²

The play also resonated for some women who identified with the characters and their circumstances. I recall having a casual conversation with a woman who helps to run the Ukrainian Federation venue. She was adamant about the fact that the circumstances from Act One in the show greatly resembled those from her own life, particularly all the moments which reminded her of being poor and having to make ends meet, while caring

¹²⁸ Louise Vitols, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹²⁹ Campbell, feedback pamphlet.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Straughan, email to author.

¹³² West, feedback pamphlet.

for a young family.¹³³ Linda Cartier related to LAURIE because she was “the child...my mom was in the auxiliary and my father was with Mine Mill.” It “resonated” and was “very touching as I experienced living through several strikes as a child.” She further added, that “[m]y mother was involved with the auxiliary and the women were just as fiery as you portrayed.”¹³⁴ Some women also connected with the adult version of LAURIE and her plight in the second act. Kelee Marion recognized a significant aspect from her life and revealed through written feedback, that her “husband was on strike in 2009-2010. I was active...he was not. I related a great deal about the impact that has on a marriage.”¹³⁵ After the show, she informed me of her divorce shortly after the conclusion of that labour dispute. She admitted that this was due, in large part, to the inherent tensions, as well as their opposing positions during the strike.¹³⁶

When I asked people, during the final post-show discussion, whether they felt LAURIE’s journey was a “happy story,” Lisa Laurin affirmatively answered, “no it isn’t but it’s the truth.” Lisa, a friend of mine from high school, was a “strike baby,” and was born in January 1979. She informed everyone that her dad stayed home with her because he was on strike, while her mother worked on staff at INCO. As an adult, she met her husband, a miner, during the 2009-10 Vale strike. She admitted, “yeah it’s reality, welcome to Sudbury.” For her, the kitchen table is ubiquitous and where “we spend [and] plan our lives ... we gotta plan, save those pennies and prepare for the worst.”¹³⁷ She frequently expressed how valuable this play was to families in this community and how it

¹³³ Unknown name, discussion with author, June 2019.

¹³⁴ Linda Cartier, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹³⁵ Kelee Marion, *One Day Stronger* feedback pamphlet, June 2019.

¹³⁶ Kelee Marion, post show discussion, evening performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

¹³⁷ Lisa Laurin, post show discussion, Sudbury, 23 June 2019.

resonated with her. Lisa was very helpful and supportive throughout this process. She manifested the zeal that I gleaned from women I interviewed, while performing this “grassroots” work in support of my project. She volunteered her time, putting up posters and attempting to wrangle more Steelworkers and their family members to see the show. She made several attempts to secure support on my behalf with the USW Local 6500, and felt discouraged at her perceived lack of success. I was struck by her disappointment and was touched by her level of care and commitment. I could not help but recall her guarantee that her husband “had no choice” and would attend the final show. It seemed important to her that he was there. I noticed when she came to the play that she sat was sitting alone in the audience.

Featuring a woman’s point of view exposed tensions and helped to distinguish this particular experience from a man’s perspective. Audience feedback and participation in the talkbacks demonstrated this in terms of what people contributed anecdotally, as well as in how they participated. Merle Smith, whose father was a prominent Mine Mill unionist, touched upon a relevant sub-theme of Cold War rhetoric, when he identified that women were singled out as targets during the 1958 strike. He wrote, in a somewhat disjointed fashion, how “INCO would make sure and go after the wives and in reality [,] they were at the brunt of the strike as they had to feed the family. [INCO] just sowed unrest in the family units.”¹³⁸ According to Merle Smith, women were a key strategic access point for causing disruption within the family unit. In addition, “INCO” promoted the fact that “workers were under someone else’s control,” which he acknowledged was “bull.”¹³⁹ Moreover, the company “benefited” when it “[c]aused lots of arguing between

¹³⁸ Merle Smith, Facebook Messenger.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

parents” who, would then be no longer “united,” and able “to spread the commie [sic] seed...”¹⁴⁰ Merle’s contentions are not so outlandish, when considering that women, historically, were consistently reprimanded and vilified in Sudbury when they spoke out or did not toe the prescribed line.

The second talkback featured a microcosm of how women have historically “coexisted” with men, and in how the latter pushes the former into the periphery. Much of this discussion featured a celebratory treatment of the roles of the “Wives Supporting the Strike” group during the 1978 INCO strike. Several of these women were in attendance and their stories were used as material for the play. Leona Skanes, a retired principal, mentioned that she appreciated learning about the active feminism during that strike, and that she “never heard of that before.”¹⁴¹ She appreciated its incorporation since the previous workshop. Linda Cartier offered some continuity when she added that these women “watched what those women did in 1958 [as children and that] gave them strength to do it in 78.”¹⁴² Yet, within this celebratory environment, the men appeared to dominate and take over the discussion. This one-sided dynamic was quantitatively demonstrated when I reviewed the transcript. It was apparent that the men were not purposefully dominating the dialogue, and that their contributions were enthusiastic and well-intentioned. Linda George illuminates how this experience rested from her point of view:

[W]e are all on the same side, fighting for the same cause, hand in and side by side. However[,] traditionally the women’s voice is drowned out by the man-speak who get to tell the story. Again[,] I am left with a feeling of déjà vu. It was the we [sic]

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Leona Skanes, post show discussion, Sudbury, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

¹⁴² Linda Cartier, post show discussion, evening performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

women, who would not let our voices go unheard who made the difference in 78-79.¹⁴³

In her post show interview, Linda pointed out how dominant speaking men during the post-show talkback, reminiscent of old patterns, effectively obscured women and their points of view. Reflecting on these patterns provides a clue as to the dynamics and past tensions that existed between the sexes historically, and during strikes in Sudbury. Linda, referred to Chantal Skanes' comment, near the beginning of the talkback when she spoke of hearing stories about strikes, often told in a "romanticized" way. "We hear all these great things," she referred to these stories, depicting the vaunted "early days" about unions and their contributions. She further commented that we "never hear the story of struggle from day to day with people and how they were living."¹⁴⁴ Chantal appreciated learning about the social interactions and the fights amongst family and friends.

Linda identified that this "romanticized" manner and point of view—and the men who frequently spouted it—often dominated discussions in the late 1970s, when she was politically active. She described the scenario of having to often placate men, who needed to incessantly talk at meetings. They would consistently "one-up" each other and, in effect, "destroy" the group's effectiveness. She felt like the same pattern was echoed during the talkback. Ironically, the discussion featured a great deal of sharing about the empowering roles and effective contributions of women during that 1978 strike. The discussion centred around her experiences, as one of those women, based on some of her memories that were, in part, reflected on the stage. These men, she acknowledged, needed to speak and had the right to do so. Yet they, once again, took turns during the

¹⁴³ George, email to author.

¹⁴⁴ Chantal Skanes, post show discussion.

talkback, reiterating and “one-upping” each other, and then reverted back to this “romanticized” manner and point of view. She pointed out that this was particularly frustrating, in moments when these men were speaking about women’s contributions, while several of the women present after the play, struggled to have their say.¹⁴⁵

This dynamic between the sexes was quite evident when I reviewed footage of the talkback. Cathy Mulroy was frequently getting cut off by a few men, when she was trying to make a point. These men were not intentionally being aggressive, rather, this behaviour was a symptom of their enthusiasm. True to form, and what I came to expect from Cathy, she responded by pointing out the discord between the sexes during that 1978-79 INCO strike. With command, she reminded everyone present how union men felt like they had to “put these women in their place” and have them toe the line. She recalled when an executive leader with Local 6500, reminded her that, “there wouldn’t be a ‘Wives Supporting the Strike’ if there wasn’t a strike.” This was followed by a huge burst of laughter. Then, sensing the gravity of the situation, in a serious tone, she told everyone that what really struck home for her, was when this same man reprimanded the women and lamented that there was a “difference of opinion here, and that’s what we don’t need.”¹⁴⁶ During one of the talkbacks, a man recounted the view, purportedly held by a large majority of men, that women “should be making sandwiches,” in terms of their contributions to the strike.¹⁴⁷ While there were a number of women who helped out in this way by preparing meals, helping to distribute necessities to needy families or other “domestic” tasks, Cathy and Linda (modelled for the composite character of adult

¹⁴⁵ Linda George, interview, August 2019.

¹⁴⁶ Cathy Mulroy, post show discussion, evening performance, Sudbury, 22 June 2019.

¹⁴⁷ Unknown name, post show discussion, evening performance, 22 June 2019.

LAURIE) belonged to a group of women who wanted to contribute politically. The conflict with women actively speaking their minds in the past was echoed within the discussion dynamics between men and women in the present.

Each of the talkbacks featured men who had a great deal to share. Not all men needed to do this, and they preferred to sit and listen. For those who did frequently participate in the discussion, their predominance could be quite innocuous and innocent. For example, Harvey Wyers, attended the last show on Sunday and afterwards, sent the following as part of a message via social media:

Sue and I stuck around for the discussion later and I may have hogged the discussion too much but I just had to,...[sic]sorry Rick. Sue also enjoyed the play as she was the treasurer of the Wives group and also lived the strike as a wife of a striking INCO worker.¹⁴⁸

Harvey Wyers was quite affable in the manner in which he shared his experiences with, for the most part, a younger group. He did dominate the discussion at points. He was something of an authority on that day, and people viewed him as an elder statesman. His message supports the fact that he felt compelled to speak. He even apologized. Also, through his words, he let it be known that his wife had enjoyed the play, and that it resonated with her experiences as treasurer of the “Wives Supporting the Strike” group, the same one Cathy Mulroy and Linda George belonged to. I did not receive written feedback from Sue, nor did she say anything during the talkback. Similarly, from the first talkback, Dennis Dowdall’s wife also remained quiet while he did his share of speaking. I wonder what they would have spoken about, if at all? Did they feel it was not necessary? Did they feel like they did not have the opportunity, or that what they had to say was not important? Maybe they did not need to speak. Maybe they have always deferred to their

¹⁴⁸ Harvey Wyers, Facebook post.

husbands. This is all guesswork, but this line of inquiry enables constant reminder that there are many voices, past and present, that are contested or remain silent.

The public historian in me felt encouraged, and a sense of affirmation following these exchanges. I was less concerned about adhering to any artistic notions regarding the sanctity of the theatrical narrative. This was exactly my purpose for writing this play. I wanted people to take ownership, speak freely about their experiences, and exchange their feelings and memories. I especially wanted the play to encourage dialogue between audience members and performers about the value of this work as a means of exploring the past. What could we learn from one another? What could we share? This was one of many instances where the post-show dialogue enabled audience members and artists to step outside the necessary confines of a closed theatrical narrative. It helped to open up the historical narrative, give audiences access to the characters, and to breathe life into the story. All feelings and perspectives were valued and necessary. As a result, audience members could more readily accept the emotional journey of the actors, and this experience lessens the extent to which this play acts as a polemic.

This section of the dissertation positioned audience members as key collaborators in this public history project. They engaged with the creative team and with each other through their memories. Often these exchanges were emotional, as they shared their personal experiences about themselves and about their families. As a result of watching this intergenerational play based on memories, they were able to connect with people from different generations within the same local community. The discussions demonstrated that Sudbury's remembered and local histories, while valued, are divisive and complicated. People expressed the need to teach and conversely, others were curious

to learn more about this local history. The discussions also showed how much people valued the voices and roles of women, particularly as “unacknowledged” figures during Sudbury strikes.¹⁴⁹ The concluding chapter that follows assesses and evaluates *ODS* as a public history project. Much of what makes it effective as such, is evidenced by the level of enthusiasm and investment exhibited by audience members during the post show discussions and through various outlets for feedback. This project mattered.

¹⁴⁹ George, email to the author, 17 May 2018.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

[A] play is a blueprint of a past event: a way of creating and rewriting history through the medium of literature. Since history is a recorded or remembered event, theatre ... is the perfect place to 'make history' [.] Suzan-Lori Parks, *The America Play and Other Works* (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1995), 4.

The epigraph from Chapter One served as a source of inspiration throughout this public history project that used theatre to explore the historical consciousness of the performers and audience members involved with it. Yet theatre, as I am sure many practitioners would agree, is not a perfect place to make *theatre*. It is fraught and filled with risk. It is also exhausting, challenging and frustrating as much as it can be rewarding, a source and site for inspiration and an absolutely unique and undeniable experience.

One Day Stronger (hereafter *ODS*) almost did not happen. Miriam Cusson having gone to the emergency room the night before an invited dress rehearsal is tantamount to a theatre production's worst nightmare, and it became my reality. Here, I reflect back on those emotional few hours. I was upset, scared, panicked, angry, delirious, exhausted, sad, shocked and much more. I put my heart and soul into this project for two years and it felt like it was not going to happen. Conversely, all my work as a producer paid off. We had a great audience turnout, which was the most important component to the project, as to any performance. I then recalled, shortly afterwards, that theatre productions have emergency illnesses at the last minute all of the time. It is not that uncommon to have someone come up and do a show with a book in their hand. After all, the show must go on, and more so in this situation, as this theatre-based public history project was more concerned with generating the conversations and the dialogue with Sudbury residents and

artists in its approach and was less focused on making the perfect show in its theatrical form.

The foundation of this public history project was set within a context of collaboration and co-creation. As examined in Chapter Two, I gathered “Remembered Histories” from Sudbury residents, who shared their stories and anecdotes about strikes and their lived experiences. These were acts of sharing, to which I endeavoured as best as I could to honour them through my creative choices while making the script, that were featured in Chapter Three. I then sought to further build upon and to maintain those relationships. “Getting it right,” started with these initial interviews, and this sensibility pervaded each stage through the scripting, workshopping and finally, the performance and final production of *ODS*. As demonstrated in Chapter Four, my responsibility to interviewees and audience members was shared by the performers. Reciprocally, interviewees and repeat audience members saw the process of the play being made and re-made. Chapters Three, Four, and Five show that they became active members of the project, by providing commentary, dialogue, and even materials. For Linda George, it became easier to talk about and to watch these personal and painful experiences. Her engagement with the project started with the initial interview and evolved, as she witnessed each iteration of the script, through both workshops and then the final production. This speaks to the difficult emotions that surfaced while watching the play, but also to the continuity of her participation. As a public history project, the cumulative and collective engagement with *ODS* by its public in Sudbury, including its creative team is remarkable. These points of contact were manifold and were not limited to a singular

exchange between a public and a cultural production, although this was true in some instances.

This noteworthy level of collaborative engagement in *ODS* depended on a sense of accountability and ownership for participants including myself, the creative team, interviewees and audience members. Performers are required to take ownership over their roles, and this was no exception for *ODS*. However, they were also accountable to the original interviewees, on top of their responsibility to the text, the director and the playwright. The idea or notion put forward by Matthew Heiti in Chapter Four, that performers were “standing up” for interviewees and Sudbury audience members, demonstrated a valuable level of commitment, care, and responsibility for any public history project. This sense of ownership and responsibility is integral to the theatrical process as in other public history or service-oriented contexts and it did not need to be encouraged or manufactured. Interviewees, when they recognized their own voices as part of an audio clip, or when they encountered their own words in some form through the script, they needed to feel like they were correct in their original assertions. Did they say *that*? Is that what they remembered? Was it true what they remembered, or had they misremembered? They were accountable to their own roles as direct contributors to the theatrical narrative. On another level, interviewees were joined by local audience members who demonstrated an assertiveness throughout the project, which is especially made evident in Chapter Five, and speaks to their sense of ownership of personal memories and towards this instance for local storytelling. As a recently completed

participatory historical and artistic exploration, *ODS* demonstrates ample evidence in support of David Dean's insistence that theatre is an important site for public history.¹

A common point of convergence occurred when we were discussing notions of authenticity, regarding the manner in which my creative choices reflected or differed from audience perceptions about themselves, their memories and their pasts. This went beyond discussions about historical accuracy or the credibility of specific details. These exchanges became more about finding if and how a character, anecdote, or any aspect of performance material was being portrayed in a manner that was just, respectful, honest, and transparent. This could be messy and awkward at times, and the dialogue throughout the project provided me with an example to assess my own notions of sharing authority and co-creation as a public historian. There was not always common ground to be found. Audience members pushed back and critiqued narrative choices or theatrical decisions, while endorsing others. I incorporated their feedback through subsequent drafts of the script or within the next workshop leading up to the final production. I held firm on some creative choices while adapting others as a result of this dialogue. There were many points of convergence throughout the interviews, scripting, staging, and discussions that followed *ODS*. I feel like more of this work is needed, and that this dynamic is key for opening up what Miller, Little, and High call, "spaces of dialogue and action[.]"² This public history project confirms the possibility for when a "... theatre production [is] only the beginning of the process instead of its end[.]"³

¹ David Dean, "Theatre: A Neglected Site of Public History?", *The Public Historian* 34.3 (Summer 2012), 21-39.

² Liz Miller, Edward Little, and Steven High, *Going Public: The Art of Participatory Practice* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017), 38.

³ *Ibid.*, 38.

As a site for the study and practice of public history in Sudbury, *ODS* revealed that more endeavours such as this are needed and that, more importantly, there is an appetite for historical and community-based projects. It also shows that as public historians, we should strive to know our public in advance, as my efforts here have demonstrated. Having extended that gesture in Sudbury, and then once reciprocated, the ensuing work and exchanges helped to produce the “public” in this local incarnation of public history. The whole experience provided many small moments of discovery. It also encouraged Sudburians to voice concerns about their lives as members of this Northern Ontario mining community and for its future.

Based on my experience in Sudbury, I suspect that this work would be valued in many communities across Canada, and transnationally, especially within the post-industrial era. I started this project with an awareness that local memory and historical consciousness about this epoch of postwar strikes in Sudbury was fleeting. Many people in my grandfather’s generation have already passed away, and there are few that remain who recall experiencing the 1958 strike from adulthood. Moreover, I perceive a sense of loss from my interviewees and from the dialogue with *ODS* audiences. I discerned a similar note of despair and feeling of loss when I first listened to the pre-recorded interviews that were conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s. When provided with a public platform, Sudburians articulated that they valued their local mining history, were proud of that legacy, and were intent on preserving it as a significant form of their local cultural identity. This sense of pride and the overall value for local heritage and history

by participants in this project aligns with and contributes to the works of other public historians and projects in deindustrialized areas.⁴

This public history study has also demonstrated that local mining history and its predominant influence as a signifier for local cultural heritage is a contested issue. The intergenerational assemblage of participants was not all of the same mind when it came to labelling Sudbury as a “mining camp.” To that point, the dialogue unearthed community boundaries as much as it reinforced these shared identities, and the exchanges were, in some instances unsettling, as the play had the effect of challenging audience expectations. My work researching Sudbury mining strikes historically, as well as the experience of making this project, resonates with what Walsh and High have argued, for why historians need to make community a category of analysis rather than treat it as a description of some pre-existing social formation.⁵ In terms of local history, audiences were consistently critical of what was missing from the play. People had very specific ideas of what *should* be part of this story, and this was directly informed by their memories and experiences. Often these criticisms that were directed towards the play, reflected a more general desire for more history teaching and learning. They were curious and wanted to learn, and to have others learn more about the past and about the history of strikes in Sudbury. As a public historian, this was very encouraging. Perhaps there was a disconnect with my messaging for the project, as this show was centred around the

⁴ See Steven High and David Lewis, *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization* (Between the Lines, 2007); James Opp, and John C. Walsh, eds., *Placing Memory and Remembering Place in Canada* (UBC Press, 2010) and Michael C. Batinski, *Pastkeepers in a Small Place: Five Centuries in Deerfield, Massachusetts* (Univ of Massachusetts Press, 2004). For an example of this in an urban context see Delores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995).

⁵ John C. Walsh and Steven High, “Rethinking the Concept of Community.” *Histoire Sociale* 32, no. 64 (November 1, 1999), 255.

“remembered histories” from local Sudburians, and not an attempt to disseminate or to create a traditional work of history. In either sense, more efforts are wanted and needed in terms of doing both approaches, as participants demonstrated that their historical consciousness helps them to make sense of their present lives.

This speaks directly to one of my initial aims for *ODS*, that I wanted it to be a means to re-explore, disturb, or problematize dominant narratives about contentious labour strikes in Sudbury. As the work was compiled through a patchwork of memories and formed into a theatrical narrative, I felt that the experience and resulting discussions with participants helped to both criticize some entrenched narratives and to rejuvenate local interest in history. Sudbury workers and their families were not merely victims of an encroaching and all-powerful international mining conglomerate. They did not uniformly lose or win any strike, nor does the entirety of this story reside with successes and failures at the bargaining table. Strikes were experienced personally, and as the “Remembered Histories” demonstrated, these memories were gendered and intergenerational. The play’s focus was on the community, the home, and on the family, and this creative decision reflected the substance of my interviews. Moreover, the scripting and staging of these memories within the familial setting, enabled audience members to talk about their own experiences as part of a scholarly and commemorative public forum. This act of sharing was cathartic throughout the process for participants, including individuals who chose not to speak publicly and instead preferred to participate via social media, email or through written comments. These personal narratives were just as significant as the real need revealed throughout this project for people to share them. These cumulative and multifaceted exchanges with *ODS* interviewees, performers and

audience members reflect the results of national surveys that identified “family” as an essential category, when people engage with the past in their everyday lives.⁶ This participatory public history project contributes to such findings and offers an explicit means for people to engage with the past using a theatrical experience, that both reflects and (re)plays intimate storytelling from their own homes.

Local perceptions about the roles of women and men during strikes were especially revisited and, as demonstrated throughout this research, regenerated. Women have been routinely subsumed or viewed as subservient as compared to men within prevailing historical narratives and memories.⁷ I started by critiquing the myth perpetuated in historical writing as well as through local memory, that the wives were responsible for throwing their husbands under the bus during the 1958 INCO strike. This line of inquiry very much informed the play’s two act structure, which contrasts the experiences of ROSE with those of her daughter LAURIE, each representing two different generations of women and their experiences during strikes. This comparison was very fruitful, especially as audience members were coming to the show, many of them having directly experienced the most recent 2009-2010 Vale strike. The discussions and feedback after the show demonstrated that this type of myth with regards to any generation of women is superficial, unsubstantiated and misdirected. But how did it

⁶ Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (Columbia University Press, 1998); Paul Ashton and Paula Hamilton, *History at the Crossroads: Australians and the Past* (Halstead Press, 2010); Margaret Conrad, Kadriye Ercikan, Gerald Friesen, Jocelyn Létourneau, Delphin Muise, David Northrup, and Peter Seixas, *Canadians and Their Pasts* (University of Toronto Press, 2013).

⁷ For an article and bibliography that features key feminist writings on Labour and working-class history see Joan Sangster, “Gendering Labour History Across Borders,” *Labour History Review* 75, 2 (2010): 143–61. See also Joy Parr, *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men and Change in Two Industrial Towns, 1880-1950* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998) and Julie Guard, *Radical Housewives: Price Wars and Food Politics in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019).

happen? Why did it emerge and then become accepted? Both women and men spoke to issues relating to agency and their respective roles and experiences during strikes, and this unearthed a great deal of commonality as well as difference. Some people did not even realize that women in Sudbury had previously been given this reputation, or that they even had the power to have such an assertive influence over men during strikes. People were critical of these entrenched perspectives and departed the Ukrainian Federation hall with these discussions fresh in their minds.

As previously identified, this study confirms the conclusions from the various national surveys about people having a very real and active interest in the past, especially through engaging in non-traditional and participatory activities such as theatre. I hope *ODS* is one of many more public history projects that uses theatre as a means to explore the past, local memories and public spaces. *ODS* has just scratched the surface in terms of examining the approaches of playwrights, actors, dramaturges and directors, as historians and as history workers. As my initial aim was to stage a full production, some aspects of the theatrical process were not my singular focus. The scripting or *mise-en-scène* could merit an extended study on their own, and each have trajectories that move beyond the scope and requirements for this project. This was my second attempt at creating theatre from the point of view as a historian.⁸ As such, I continue to see the immense potential for this type of work moving forward. Practice as Research or other forms of performance-based research inquiry, as they gain more traction across the humanities and social sciences, will offer historians and practitioners more examples, tools, means, and inspiration to collaborate, co-create, and conduct performance-based studies. This may

⁸ Rick Duthie, *What Struck in '58*, Public workshop presentation, "PlaySmelter," reading series of new plays, Presented by 'Pat The Dog' Theatre Creation (Sudbury, Ontario, May 2013).

not always entail the scripting and staging of a full production; pedagogical exercises in classrooms or other public history spaces such as museums and archives can borrow from theatrical and artistic practices to enhance student engagement and empathy with people and their pasts.

Theatre practitioners have been doing this kind of work all along in terms of creating a critical experience in the theatre for both audiences and artists. *ODS* is an example of a credible juncture between the respective practices and approaches. Case in point, I became interested in studying public history after having first trained and worked as a theatre practitioner. As we have seen earlier in Chapters Four and Five, verbatim, documentary, and playback theatre techniques are all practical extensions of some of the best oral historical practices and approaches, and they were especially crucial while working with interview material. Similarly, my fascination with Brecht, Boal, Schechner, and with other *avant garde* theatre practitioners, informed and enabled me to deliver an immersive theatrical experience for Sudbury audiences. This public history project builds upon the intentions of those earlier theatre practitioners, with its numerous discussion forums and with its enthusiastic feedback from an engaged and invested public. Reciprocally, as a public historian using a theatrical process, I value the work and experiences of other theatre practitioners. I feel that a great deal more can be learned from their insights moving forward, particularly as theatre and performance-based-literature can provide insights for public historians about their roles as facilitators and performers, and with how they approach and understand their own work.

As a work of theatre, our audiences recognized the overall effort, hard work and skill of the actors, and they viscerally responded to the portrayals on an emotional level, a

medium through which theatre excels. I had also earned the trust and goodwill of many of my audience members because of the process that led up to these final performances. As a result of these factors, this was a warm audience that was invested in the project.

Perhaps we were given a little more leeway due to the recent adversity, as they were made aware of our last-minute replacement of Cusson. The process was fraught, and the resulting volatility increased this emotional connection with audience members. It seemed as though the care and energy poured into the work by the actors, was reciprocated by audience members, who witnessed these extreme efforts – inherent to live performance – unfolding right in front of them. Having people actively ‘doing’ and ‘saying’ things from their past(s), added to this experience, and this was supported by our previously earned and built relationship together that was based on trust. I feel that a great deal more can be learned from this relationship and process moving forward, especially towards creating affective and effective theatre as public history.

This was a uniquely invested exchange between performers and an audience, not wholly unlike other site-specific community-based theatrical and oral history projects. Matthew Heiti and Caitlin Heppner thanked me on an opening night card, for “making the impossible possible with this piece. We know it’s not your ideal(sic) vision but you made it happen! One Day Stronger!”⁹ More than one year after the fact, I feel like what *was not*, now *is* my ideal vision for this project. I wish to articulate that this experience is a product of the efforts, passion and goodwill on the part of everyone who contributed to the making of this play, combined with the vested enthusiasm demonstrated by people who came out and supported it. When the production closed, I certainly felt “*One Day*

⁹ Matthew Heiti and Caitlin Heppner, opening night card, 22 June 2019.

Stronger,” as I reflected on the ephemeral nature of this show that *almost* did *not* go on. I have included my own personal experience here as a glimpse of what was at stake for me, but also to highlight the emotional connections and stakes that characterized this process from start to finish. It mattered. More than any other aspect that was recounted in this concluding section, the level at which people showed how much they *cared* about the project speaks volumes to how theatre is an effective and affective means for doing and studying public history.

ONE DAY STRONGER

**A new play by
Rick Duthie**

c. June 2019

Dramatis Personae

LAURIE – child during 1958 strike, adult during 1978 strike
GUY – INCO mechanic during 1978 strike; Laurie's husband
ROSE – Laurie's mother, Billy's wife
BILLY – INCO miner during 1958 strike; Laurie's father, Rose's husband
BEN – a union member during the 1958 strike; his house is searched
GERARD – a union member during the 1958 strike; he just wants a turkey
ALBERT – a retired INCO employee
JAKE – a retired INCO employee who took early retirement; Dorothy's husband
LARRY – Guy's best friend; also an INCO employee
DAVE – Union President in 1978
DOROTHY – wife of Jake

One Day Stronger – Draft 24 June 2019

Act 1¹

Scene 1 - The Kitchen Table

In blackness we hear an audio clip that speaks about the Sudbury as a mining community ending in: “we are always connected to what’s under our feet.”

The image of a smokeless smokestack appears in a projection. Surrounding a kitchen table, in an alley configuration, but slightly elevated from the actors and playing area, a small audience sits in chairs as if its members have been invited into this kitchen as familiar faces.

Curtain Speech by Rick Duthie² @ End of Curtain Speech – “Enjoy One Day Stronger.”³

Actors enter to their starting positions.⁴

A thirty-year-old LAURIE is playing solitaire. Her husband GUY sits across from her at the table. LAURIE lights a candle to see better. Leading into...

¹ **PRESHOW**

LIGHTS: Look 1 – Preset

QLAB 0:

Audio: *Pie in the Sky* – Oscar Brand; *Poor Girls Waltz* – Don Messer; *Which Side Are You On* – Pete Seeger; *There is Power in a Union* – Linda Sundblad; *Hobo’s Lullaby* – Joan Baez; *1913 Massacre* – Ramblin’ Jack Elliot; *Roll on Columbia/Narration* – Judy Collins/Robert Ryan; *The First Time Ever* – Ewan MacColl/Peggy Seeger; *My Old Man* – Ewan MacColl/Peggy Seeger; *Strike!* – Ry Cooder; *This Land is Your Land/Narration* – Arlo Guthrie/Odetta/Will Geer; *There is Power in a Union* – Utah Phillips; *Which Side Are You On* – Natalie Merchant; *Solidarity Forever* – Pete Seeger

Photo: Video Black

² **QLAB 0.5:**

Audio: *Union Maid* – Judy Collins/Pete Seeger

³ **LIGHTS:** House Lights Out; Look 9 – Blackout

QLAB 1:

Audio: *Union Maid* fades out

Photo: Smokeless Smoke Stack [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan: “I always say that you remember this is a union town when a worker is killed, and then everybody kind of goes into a state of mourning, or when there is a strike and all the stores – everyone is suffering because the miners aren’t spending money. You realize that we are first – we are first, last, and always a mining camp.”

⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 2 – Night Time

Scene 2 - See the Cards

GUY: (*jokingly*) Why did we ever pay our hydro bill when we've got perfectly good candles?

LAURIE: No kidding. At least I can see the cards finally.

GUY: Who's winning?

LAURIE: Very funny smartass.

GUY: Goodnight Laurie.

LAURIE: Goodnight Guy. Call me when you get in. I'll be up.

GUY exits.

LAURIE: (*Runs her hands across some tiny letters carved into the table*) We are always connected to what's under our feet.⁵

She breathes and closes her eyes overwhelmed. She places her head on the table.

GUY enters wearing a kerchief and becomes ROSE. She is carrying a broom and younger LAURIE's costume.

*ROSE begins to sweep.*⁶

⁵ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 2:

Audio: *Little Boxes (Piano Version)* - The Weeds

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan: "*We really are connected to what's under our feet, whether we know it or not.*"

⁶ **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (Sepia)

QLAB 3:

Audio: Fade down *Little Boxes*

Scene 3 - Mother and Daughter

ROSE: Well?! What else do you think I'd be carrying?

LAURIE: (*baffled*) Why do you look more like my husband than my mother?

ROSE: Must be something you ate.

LAURIE: That and you must be pissing me off on some level.

ROSE: Watch your language young lady.

ROSE hands LAURIE the younger LAURIE costume. LAURIE puts on the costume and becomes 10 years old.

LAURIE: (*reaching for the broom*) Let me take that from you. Say hello to the people,
MOTHER. Tell them about home.

ROSE: (*Feeling that sense of theatricality*) Oh, hello everyone. I wouldn't change a thing. But, if I could talk to me ... if I could talk at a younger me ... I'd tell me to slow down. Go slow.

LAURIE: And what are you talking about?! HOME??!!!!

ROSE: You missed a spot. No, right there! Like I was saying, I wouldn't change a thing. I have the perfect life. Lots of work to do. Cooking, cleaning, mending, sewing, canning, baking and much more. My husband has a great job at INCO which provides us with everything we need. We are never left wanting for anything.

LAURIE: That's not true mother.

ROSE: It's true if I say it's true. Now why do you say otherwise?

LAURIE: Because of the strike –

ROSE: We'll not talk of that nonsense.

LAURIE: Ok Mom ... (*Aside*) She's never the same after the strike ... We never speak of it.

ROSE: The day would start at six or seven in the morning, when the husband would be getting up for work, and it ends at night, long after the children are in bed, where I sit with my sewing well in to the late hours. Depending on his shift he might just be getting in and we have a cup of tea. And we sit at this table ...

LAURIE: AH tell them about the table –

ROSE: Don't make me check under the table where I know you didn't sweep young lady.

LAURIE: I did!

(They both sit at the table)

ROSE: It's quite the lovely table. I can picture it now as it is back then, the place for daily dinners, because we all eat at the table. The girls come over once per week, usually on Fridays, and I do their hair. What is the name of that chemical that's all the rage? It smells like bleach. Oh well if you think of it let me know. The house reeks of it when my husband would get home expecting his meal on that same table. It is large, brown and solid.

LAURIE: I know it.

ROSE: It is a spot for food, cards, music –

LAURIE: It's our table –

ROSE: One final thing about our table.

LAURIE: Ok.

ROSE: I have to mention ... We always set an extra place. Anyone is welcome. That was my mother's rule in the old country. If you have it, it's important that you share it.

LAURIE: Thanks mom.

APPENDIX A

ROSE: Now give me that broom. Glad you picture me this way.

LAURIE: Don't take it that way!

ROSE: Next time try remembering me a bottle of wine!

ROSE exits laughing.

LAURIE: Oh yeah. You know what she used to say when people said that their 'floor is so clean that you could eat off of it?' ... 'But we have a table.'⁷ ...

⁷ **LIGHTS:** Look 4 – Dream Lights

QLAB 4:

Photo: Lively House [courtesy of Jan Heppner]

Interview Clip: Jan Heppner: "Well, you know, people say their house is so clean, they can eat on their floor, but, like, I have a table."

Scene 4 - Lively

LAURIE: Hello, my name is Laurie.

My town. Company houses. We are lucky because we have flush toilets. There are three types of houses, and everyone lives in one of them. Ours looks like a bunker, it has a main floor and a basement.

Ah. I hear the coal furnace blasting in the basement. I hear the sweeping up of the dust, as I run from the roar of that stove. Our very own full FULL house!

It's huge! With a long driveway and quite the distance of road to get there.

The⁸ streets are littered with children. There are kids everywhere these days. Parents walk hand in hand in the evenings. They also sit on the front porch with a cup of tea or a coffee. These are dignified times. Can't say the same about everyone though. Any of you would paint a different picture⁹ I'm sure.

It is a whole new INCO town, Lively. Lively indeed. They build sidewalks, lawns and garages for every house. They are building two thousand new homes along with stores, churches and schools. It is sure nice of the INCO company to do that as the rent is only half as much as in Sudbury, but only miners from Creighton can rent them.

My father is a miner, a Creighton¹⁰ miner. Billy is his name. He sits on our porch in the morning, waiting for his ride to work. I sit with him in the mornings. I have to bring him his coffee Thermos that he's forgotten on the kitchen table. He wears plaid and smokes his pipe. Still, whenever I smell smoke, I think of my dad.¹¹

GUY enters the playing space. He lights a pipe, puts on a plaid jacket and becomes BILLY ...

⁸ **QLAB 5:**

Photo:

Lively Kitchen [courtesy of Jan Heppner]

Woman in Kitchen [IMG1682 '58 Photos]

⁹ **QLAB 6:**

Photo: Man with Family [IMG 1684 '58 Photos]

¹⁰ **QLAB 7:**

Audio: Love My Tender (Guitar Instrumental) – Kyosti Rautio

¹¹ **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (sepia)

QLAB 8:

Interview Clip: Jan Heppner: "And he smoked a pipe. And still when I smell smoke, I think of my dad."

Scene 6 - Daddy's Little Girl

BILLY: Hello kiddo.

LAURIE: (*looks at him*) Hi daddy. Say hello to the people.

BILLY: Hello folks.

LAURIE: Keep dancing daddy.

BILLY: I will kiddo.

LAURIE: When my father talked, people listened. (*pause*) Say something!

BILLY: What am I wearing?

LAURIE: Plaid. It's what I always remember you wearing.

BILLY: And you remember me smoking a pipe? I smoke cigarettes sweetie.

LAURIE: Oh.

BILLY: It's OK. This pipe is pretty good. (*smokes the pipe*)

LAURIE: I really miss you.

BILLY: I'm gonna miss you too. But I'll be back soon.

LAURIE: You promise?

BILLY: I promise. When you find yourself missing me, just remember that we are always connected to what's under our feet.

LAURIE: We are?

BILLY: You and me. All of us. Yes, we are.

LAURIE: Even the table?

BILLY: Especially the table.¹² (*then*) Can I have this dance my lady?

¹² **QLAB 9:**

Audio:

Love Me Tender – Elvis Presley

Fade out *Love Me Tender* (*Guitar Instrumental*)

Father and daughter dance a waltz as if it were a wedding. If possible, she could stand on his feet to make up the height difference.

LAURIE: I¹³ never attend any dance school –

BILLY: – I don't force you into that union ballet school –

LAURIE: – I don't want to step all over your feet!

BILLY: You're doing just fine honey. I always love dancing with you and your mom.

LAURIE: Like you do so often on weekends.

BILLY: I think the dance is almost done.

LAURIE: No daddy. Don't go. I need to talk to you.

BILLY: I'll be back before you know it. Now you go on in and help your mother.

LAURIE: Wait! You'll forget your coffee.

BILLY: Don't want that to happen. Thanks kiddo.¹⁴

BILLY opens his thermos and pours himself a coffee.

¹³ **QLAB 10:**

Audio: Fade down *Love Me Tender*

¹⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 5 – Mines / Blue Wash

QLAB 11:

Audio: Fade out *Love Me Tender*

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan: "What I remember is at night, my mom washing us, you know, crying for my dad because I wanted to see my dad."

Scene 7 - Tales From An Angry Young Man

BILLY: Hi I'm Billy. My daughter brings me this coffee. I forget it on the table where my wife is supposed to put milk in it for me. Today I'm drinking it black. Tastes pretty damn good. So where do I start?

LAURIE: Start at the beginning.

BILLY: I grow up in the depression. Farmer from out west. I guess you can describe me – at the time I came to Sudbury – as an angry young man. I seen, such a shortage of goods. Lean years. I could never reconcile, that in a society, country or system...in a society that could destroy food when people are hungry. Maintaining prices. No work. Young men of that generation. The shame. It never leaves my mind–

LAURIE (*interrupting*): I never heard this before.

BILLY: Long before you were born my dear.

LAURIE: Sorry. Keep going.

BILLY: I remember near the end of the depression, two thousand workers lining up at INCO gates. I try two weeks lining up at that gate. I'm an anglophone with a French last name. Everyone here is some mix of something. I work with people from all over French, English, Finn, Ukrainian, Russian, German, Yugoslavs –

LAURIE: Don't forget Italian –

BILLY: Yes, Italian. And many others from all walks. We get on good for the most part. It helps to be an Anglo. I can say things and do things that a lot of other people can't get away with. Most of the bosses are from good old British stock, save only one French Canadian. You are fortunate if the foreman at the gates decides he likes you.

LAURIE: Take a sip of your coffee.

BILLY sips his coffee

BILLY: Where was I?

LAURIE: The foreman decides he likes you–

BILLY: It's all bull¹⁵ work. You are so grateful to have a job. The work doesn't discriminate and neither do we. Even if our bosses do. I hear one of em' complain "I can hire a Hunky any time to a white man, they will outwork ten to one" – he thinks I'm one of him. Meanwhile most of the guys are thinking: 'MY dad came here in 1909 long before you crossed the pond.'

LAURIE: Where are you going with this?

BILLY: This cranky old miner tells me a funny story. He has a few years on me. He tells me, that at the upper¹⁶ level they had mules, the old guy says that it got inhuman because they had to blind them. They spend the rest of their lives just hauling. Then he says, 'inhuman to bring mules anymore, so they brought more of us to do the work!'¹⁷

LAURIE: Terrible! This isn't what I need to remember.

BILLY: This is the INCO you should remember. No longer cap in hand when we get the union¹⁸ going. INCO is never on board. The new laws from the war make them sit with us.

LAURIE: Do you even like working there?¹⁹

BILLY: I begin as a ditch digger and helper...nipper. Then the drill – jackleg – when I started was eighty pounds. It had a leg with it, you learned, initially, if you didn't know it the thing would throw you. You have to get used to it. Cranky old guy on the stope would wait for you to get thrown. Cranky old miners, good, they are good, they show you.

LAURIE: Yeah, but do you like it?

¹⁵ **QLAB 12:**

Photo: Creighton Mine [Internet Image]

¹⁶ **QLAB 13:**

Photo: Mules Outside the Mine [Internet Image]

¹⁷ **QLAB 14:**

Photo: Video Black

¹⁸ **QLAB 15:**

Photo: Blue Mine-Mill Sticker

¹⁹ **QLAB 16:**

Audio: Mining Ambience Sound Effects

Photo: 6 Various Mining Photos from Internet (1950's Jackleg, Falconbridge Muckers, Mine Cart, Miners with Jackleg, Falconbridge Ladders x2)

BILLY: I really like it. Some say that going underground is like going to sea. It keeps calling you back. I love the environment, the people, it is a family atmosphere.

Type of work you are self-sufficient, basically. Your shift-boss give you the line-up and you go out and you make your money.

LAURIE: Is it scary?²⁰

BILLY: A ten-minute walk along a drift. I can hear the ground moving. A lot of miners are nervous, I'm no exception. Down ladders, old ladders. Is there something on my shoulder? Nobody's here. I listen to noises. I have to stay on my toes. If I hear something cracking, I pay attention to it. Sometimes there is no warning²¹ –

LAURIE covers her ears.

BILLY: (*Continues*): – guys get hurt or killed.

BILLY comforts LAURIE.

Your mind can play little tricks on you. I sometimes feel like I can hear your voice down there.

²⁰ **QLAB 17:**

Photo: Mine Tunnel [Internet Image]

²¹ **QLAB 18:**

Audio: Mining Explosion Sound Effect

LAURIE: What am I saying?

BILLY: You tell me to come home.

LAURIE: Home.

BILLY: I meet your mother. Would you like to see her?

LAURIE: I think I've met my own mother.

BILLY: But you don't know her as I do. Your mother has blazing fires for eyes when she gets all riled up.²²

LAURIE becomes another version of ROSE²³...

²² **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 20:

Interview Clip: Dennis: “You know, once, once you got on INCO, you could, you had the world by the nuts; uh, had it made for life.”

²³ **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (sepia)

Scene 8 - Husband and Wife

ROSE: Hello Billy.

BILLY: Hello Rosie.

ROSE: You've got that look in your eyes.

BILLY: Dance with me for old time sake.

ROSE: (*They come together for a brief waltz.*) I never want you to stop dancing.

BILLY: (*dramatically*) Sometimes the song has to end.

ROSE: You're a great dancer but a terrible ham!

BILLY: ... the sentences become words trapped between two periods ...

ROSE: Ok Stop!²⁴ Almost as horrible as your singing.

BILLY: (*singing*) And you are a terrible cook! But I love you horribly anyway.

ROSE (*punching his arm rather hard*) You're so sweet. You never even complain about my cooking all these years.

(*They both burst out laughing*)

BILLY: I eat anything you put in front of me.

ROSE: That much is true, and I'm rewarded with all your commentary.

BILLY: You give it right back. You and your temper.

ROSE: My temper! I remember you BIG FARMER ... man ... all piss and vinegar ... Wartime, we go to Garson, Missus Wasilew, takes me under her wing ... she is a shrewd business woman ... big heart, I have a job in Garson in a drug store My husband – that is you –

BILLY: That is me –

ROSE: – holds a job at INCO for two years. When Albert gets sick (*draws a cross indicating 'May he Rest in Peace'*) ... a foreman, 'listen here YOU' to you, do you remember that husband? Do you remember what you say next?

²⁴ **QLAB 21:**

Audio: Fade down *Little Boxes (Piano Version)*

BILLY: I say, 'I am not a YOU I gotta name!' –

ROSE: – Followed up by an exchange of words.

BILLY: That's putting it mildly.

ROSE: The guy reports you – they let you go – YOU ...

BILLY: 'Prices are down' – they tell me.

ROSE: When you reapply at INCO they give you an envelope. Do you remember that?

BILLY: Refresh my memory, would you?

ROSE: No more Garson. Good thing I am able to find work until you sort everything out. They give you this big, big envelope to give to your next foreman. It says, 'THIS MAN IS KNOWN TO HAVE A BAD CONDUCT.' Sealed in the envelope, don't tell you what is in it.

BILLY: I'm glad one of us thinks of opening the damn thing!

ROSE: My temper. Rich. Tea calling the kettle black.

BILLY: I take milk in my tea.

ROSE: Always the joker.

BILLY: We need a good laugh once and awhile.

ROSE: Don't I know it. You remember that INCO security guard?

BILLY: Murdock.²⁵

(Figure of Billy becomes the body of Murdock while he is present in her story)

ROSE: Security guard for INCO, navy uniform. My HUSBAND is on graveyard and he comes to the house.

BILLY: My you're so young and pretty. How can your husband work graveyard?'

²⁵ **LIGHTS:**

Board #1 – Look 2 – Night Time

Board #2 – Look 5 – Mines / Blue Wash

QLAB 22:

Audio: Snap Out Little Boxes (Piano Version)

APPENDIX A

ROSE: Old enough to be my father.

BILLY: World War One veteran.

ROSE: Some security guard.

BILLY: Make me a drink.

ROSE: 'Billy and I don't drink,' – (*aside*) I lie –

BILLY: Make me a coffee.

ROSE: Oh, my baby's awake. He almost followed me into the bedroom! I grabbed Albert really petrified, went outside.

BILLY: Years²⁶ later, old Murdock is killed in a car accident.

ROSE: He finally meets his maker.

²⁶ **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (sepia)

Scene 9 - A Strike

BILLY: Now²⁷ comes the good life, right?

ROSE: (*Laughs*) Of course dear husband. Once I reign in your wild ways.

BILLY: That doesn't happen.

ROSE: Cheers - Well it was worth a shot. (*dramatic*) While I am dealing with your wild ways, everything starts to level out. We²⁸ are very religious in those days. I love my god, but I hate my church. Get these visits from the priest, I know you remember those – and when I'm not venting about you – I'm getting the question: 'Why aren't you having more kids?' ... 'Not doing your wifely duties?' I have to laugh. The good lord wants miracles (*laughs*). If he is so concerned, he shouldn't take them away before their time²⁹ (*draws a cross indicating 'May he Rest in Peace'*).

BILLY: (*Consoling her*) Steady work. You don't work anymore ... you have enough of a job running the house –

ROSE: – And you –

BILLY: (*starting to struggle*) – And me. We get our own house. We aren't rich, but there is always a full table. Our kitchen table – center of everything ... reunions, place for cards, radio. In the living room, we have a black and white TV with two channels. Everything happens ...

ROSE: (*with finality*) For a time.

BILLY: We don't have to talk about that right now.

ROSE: Then there's the strike.

BILLY: Then there's the strike. The Church³⁰ is involved. Catholic Church is speaking against Mine Mill, calling them Communists. Before 58, I'm a Catholic. The church is strong.

²⁷ QLAB 23:

Audio: *Working Man (Instrumental)* – Wil Peters

²⁸ QLAB 24:

Photo: News – Mayor Asks to Pray (19 Sept 1958 3 (2))

²⁹ QLAB 25:

Photo: Video Black

³⁰ QLAB 26:

Photo: News – Pray to End Strike (22 Oct 1958 3)

BILLY (Cont'd): Once a year the priest would come around the house – they even mention it in the sermon, they really have no reason to get into politics, but they are – he comes, he calls it a parish visit once a year, he usually leaves with five or ten dollars. So, when he shows up, I still have the sermon on my mind, about Mine Millers and communists, so I tell him, I say: 'I'll give you two ways of leaving, with your hat, or after your hat.' That is me, 'all piss n' vinegar' as you say. And you are a staunch Catholic. I never go back to church after that, but I'm pretty sure I see you throwing holy water on the windows, pretty sure lightning was going to hit the house.

ROSE: With³¹ all your blaspheming, I thought I was buying us time.

BILLY: Ordinary working people falling in a rut and believe it because it's happening.

ROSE: I mainly feel sadness. The town feels down, drab and sad. I feel it and then, you get like THIS.

BILLY: People are sent to the wall!³² We go to the Valley and some farmers let us dig for potatoes in the frozen ground.

ROSE: I find infinite numbers of ways to cook potatoes, but they are 'still potatoes.

BILLY: Then we start going into people's homes to see if they're worthy of strike pay³³.

ROSE becomes BEN³⁴...

³¹ **QLAB 27:**

Photo: Video Black

³² **QLAB 28:**

Photo: News – Vouchers for Potatoes (7 Oct 1958 p1)

³³ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 29:

Photo:

Couple with Soup Pot [IMG 1420 '58 Photos]

Man Collecting Voucher [IMG 1438 '58 Photos]

Men Lining Up for Vouchers [IMG 1432 '58 Photos]

Security Checking Strikers [IMG 1390 '58 Photos]

Interview Clip: Essie Byrne: "You'd eat anything. I never had, uh, any of them because I-I just put it down and they had to eat."

³⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 6 -Scene Light / General Wash

Scene 11 - Two Men Search Another Man's House

BILLY is accompanied by KEN who is out of view.

BEN: Well you're here.

BILLY: Don't make a big deal. We have to do this.

BEN: So, go ahead and get this over with. I've got places to be.

BILLY: In your pyjamas?

BEN: Just hurry up.

KEN begins to search the premises.

BILLY: Do you have your paperwork?

BEN: I already told it to the secretary at the hall.

BILLY: Yes, I need to see it. Sorry Ben. Things are pretty dicey right now.

BEN: You're telling me. Here. This is proof that my wife and I have nothing in our bank account, nor a penny to our name.

BILLY: Ok. *(To Ken)* It's legit cross him off the list.

BEN: Hey! Get out of my cupboards. What's the big idea!

BILLY: Ken lay off!

BEN: *(Grabbing his hockey stick)* I'm giving you five seconds to get out of my house!!!

KEN runs out of the house.

BEN: *(Chasing him to the door)* Don't come back you PRICK!

BILLY: Sorry about this Ben.

BEN: You guys have some nerve you know that?

BILLY: Just come to the hall and pick up your vouchers.

BEN: Humiliating! I pay all these dues and you send some clown to inspect my pantry.

BILLY: People are ripping us off.

BEN: It's alright.

BILLY: It's cold in here. Are you out of firewood?

BEN: Last couple twigs. I'm saving it for when the old lady gets home.

BILLY: I got some in my truck. I'll bring some in for you. Hold on.

BEN: Thanks, Billy. Not going on a list though, is it?

BILLY: Nope. This is from me to you.

BEN: Do you have any beer in your truck?

BILLY: No. I actually thought I was going to confiscate some from you. For official union business.

BEN: (*Stares*)

BILLY: That was a joke.

BEN: This still doesn't let you off the hook for being an asshole. Then again, you've always been an asshole. You were an asshole twenty years ago and you're still an asshole-

BILLY: YaYaYa I got it I got it. You're an asshole. Come grab a couple of handfuls with me.³⁵

BEN gooses BILLY on the way out. BILLY screams with laughter as LAURIE re-enters the kitchen³⁶...

³⁵ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 30:

Audio: *Union Maid (Instrumental)* -Friends of Old Puppy

Photo: News – Reds Recruit 7yr Old [scan of Telegram article]; News – Strike is Suicidal (22 Sept 1958 p1)

News – Solski on Frood Picket (25 Sept 1958 1)

Interview Clip: Richard B: “I always had an old saying – there’s three sides to the story: both parties and the facts.”

³⁶ **LIGHTS:** Look 4 – Dream Lighting

Scene 12 - It's a Lockout!

LAURIE: (*aha urgency*) Finally! The STRIKE!

BILLY: (*Pounds his fist violently on the table.*) NOT A STRIKE IT IS A LOCKOUT!

LAURIE: I know, Daddy, I remember.

BILLY: Three sides to every story, both sides and the facts. Here is a fact: Three thousand workers are laid off in the months leading up to the strike. Workweek cut to thirty-two hours from forty. Sound familiar?

LAURIE: Maybe to them. (*Indicates the audience*)

BILLY: Memory is fickle my dear. The most recent retelling is what we know best. Pliable little fools, locals, acting like pawns for the Church, the company, United States government, Steelworkers...chasing Communists. I cannot be convinced that they know what they are doing. These pliable people. Actors – the tools – can't ignore these kinds of actors and the roles that they play, and they betray the miners.

LAURIE: What about US?

BILLY: ALL of us.

LAURIE: I could hear you guys at night³⁷ ...

³⁷ **LIGHTS:** Look 5 – Mines / Blue Wash

QLAB 31:

Audio: *Which Side Are You On* – Natalie Merchant; People Arguing Sound Effect

Photo: Door with Light Underneath [Stock Photo]

Scene 13 - A Child Eavesdrops

LAURIE: It was a very scary night. One night during the strike. I hear the yelling downstairs. Fists are banging on the table and beer is being spilled. I distinctly hear my mother yelling at them to stop spilling their beer on her curtains.³⁸ They are sooo mad. Big scary mad!

She lets out her biggest best-est attempt at the yelling she remembers:

LAURIE: Roarrrr!!!!!!!!!!!!!! It is kind of muffled, so I have to approach my door to get a better listening spot, and I put my ear to the crack in the door.

Then

LAURIE: *(she knocks over a chair)* a chair is knocked over. I hear some curse words! EEEEEK! I run back to my bed and dive under the covers ...

She pops her head out of her covers as if still trying to stay hidden.

LAURIE: It's pure chaos down there! I wanna go down so bad but I'm scared to get caught. My father has a sixth sense for these things. I MUST FIND OUT.

She summons up her courage and leaves the safety of her bed.

LAURIE: Lots of swearing! I know swears in both French and English. Oh, I think that was a Finnish one. Yes, definitely Finn. And followed up with a smattering of Italian. Universal swearing going on here. This is GREAT!³⁹

She gathers up her courage and squeaks through her bedroom door.

LAURIE: Fists are being pounded on the table. Steelworker this! They are the bad guys, I think. INCO that! I don't know if they are bad or good – did someone just spit on my mother's floor????!!! Bang! Bang! Bang! Bang!⁴⁰

Then

³⁸ **QLAB 32:**

Audio: Fade Up *People Arguing*

³⁹ **QLAB 34:**

Audio: Fade Up *People Arguing*

⁴⁰ **QLAB 35:**

Audio: Fade Down *People Arguing*

LAURIE: Silence and whispers. What is going on?? I hear hushed tones. I creep further down the stairs. There are some very loud whispers that ... I Can't Quite ... Make ... Out Something about Wooooe CARS being tipped over and somebody lit someone's car on FIRE! I hope it wasn't my dad, I don't want him to get in trouble. What are they saying ... ?

(As she leans in further to listen) Creeeeeak!!!!

BILLY: Laurie, you better be in your room in bed by the time I get up there!

LAURIE: Zooooooooommm foiled by the creaky stairs!

She bolts into her bed and pretends to be asleep in that obvious way that children do.

One eye pops open.

LAURIE: What? I totally look like I'm asleep. I'm a pro at this.

BILLY: I can hear you awake! Go to sleep!

LAURIE: *(She rolls herself into a real sleeping position.)* I don't think I can. Pure insanity down there! I wonder what all the fuss is about? Mom! Dad!⁴¹

LAURIE becomes ROSE and joins BILLY in the kitchen⁴²...

⁴¹ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 36:

Photo: Handing Out Food [IMG 1444]; Man Collecting Food [IMG 1446]; Man Looking at Pants [IMG 1426];

Strike Vote Ballot [IMG 1351]; Picket Line / Decent Contract [IMG 1355]; Men Gathered at Line [IMG 1363];

Men with Sacks Walking [IMG 1367]; Picket Line Abbey Road [IMG 1371]; Two Men with Strike Sign [IMG 1377]; Men in Picket Booth [IMG 1382]; Men Outside INCO gates [IMG 1404]; Empty INCO Parking Lot [IMG 1412]

Interview Clip: Jan Heppner: *"Our house was loud. I remember meals very clearly. You always sat at the kitchen table to have meals. There were always people yelling about – arguing or – I had a – my – I have a brother..."*

⁴² **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (sepia)

Scene 14 - Kitchen Table Bandages

Rose is attempting to clean off the kitchen table from an eventful night before. She is trying to do this with one hand as her other one has been injured.

BILLY: Good thing it was the table you hit that hard. *(laughs gently)* Remind me never to piss YOU off.

ROSE: He's lucky it wasn't his stupid face.

During the following exchange Billy gently cares for his wife's hand. He ices it and then he bandages it.

ROSE: I cut my teeth on a union button. When Billy gets involved with the union, I work with the ladies' auxiliary. My dad is a very militant union man – forever remember him being union. He has a great deal to do with Billy being educated into what you do. Union men – like religious creatures – they're trying to make converts too ...I guess I better be active with him if I want to see him. I enjoy being with the other women, talking about safety and conditions. I am always very apprehensive. We go after better conditions underground. It's dangerous. Surface too yes, my main concern is because my husband is going underground.

I am active in the 58' strike. Many, many weary hours. There are families in great difficulty and the strike helps us to organize – NEVER HAD ANY EXPERIENCE IN THAT WAY. We want to make sure the help gets to people who really need it ...

So, we set up a store⁴³ ...

BILLY becomes GERARD. It is a snowy night and the hall is crowded. Several tables are set up where vouchers are being handed out. Others have clothing and other necessities. ROSE is helping at a station and drinking a coffee⁴⁴...

⁴³ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 37:

Photo: Turkey at Grocery Store [IMG 1694]; Dad & Child with Turkey [IMG 1695]; Union Hall [IMG 1440]

Interview Clip: Ron Tough: "We stayed and toughed it out and you-you buggered off. So there's that kind of, uh, resentment, right? That builds up. But that quickly dissipates. You know, because some people understand if you've got a mortgage and you have a family and four or five kid and you - you're making strike pay twenty bucks a week, whatever it is you get; it's not enough to feed them."

⁴⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 6 – Scene Light / General Wash

Scene 15 - No More Turkeys

GERARD: Hello Rose. You guys look busy here.

ROSE: Hey Gerard. Yah, there's a lot to do around here.

GERARD: Better to be busy, I guess.

ROSE: Yes. Good to get out of the house. Plus, Billy is at home and he's driving me nuts.

GERARD: *(laughs)* Loretta keeps sending me out on extra errands. I try not to take it personally.

ROSE: Long time no see. How goes it?

GERARD: My roof is gonna hold up. Not so much on the shed ...

ROSE: Oh, that's good. About your roof.

GERARD: Bank's not sending letters anymore. You guys did a good job holding them off.

ROSE: I didn't have anything to do about that. I heard the guys went and talked to all the banks in town. You better check with yours though, some people are still having trouble.

GERARD: Like the mailman maybe forgot my address *(laughs)*.

ROSE: Something like that. You want a cup of coffee?

(gives him one anyway)

GERARD: Ok thanks. I'm not staying long.

ROSE: What brings you by?

GERARD: Yah, Connie next door and George told me you guys had some turkeys to give out for Christmas. I thought I'd come in and pick one up for us.

ROSE: Aww Ger. There's no more left. I'm so sorry.

GERARD: What do you mean there's no more left? I heard there was one for every family.

ROSE: There's a lot of members. More than turkeys.

GERARD: We're having a tough time at the house.

ROSE: Do you guys need any blankets? Toys? We got lots of that stuff.

GERARD: Can't eat blankets.

ROSE: Sorry Ger.

GERARD: Did you get a turkey?

ROSE: Yes, I did, Gerard. I grabbed one soon as the truck came in. My family needs it too.

GERARD: The fact that you're helpin' out here and that Billy is a steward doesn't hurt, though does it?

ROSE: Come on. There's only so much to go around.

GERARD: I pay my dues too. I'm going out on that line. I'm not leaving town for work. You don't see me pulling out of town, driving up to Elliot Lake ...

ROSE: Ger...

GERARD: No this is bullshit. What are you people even here for?

ROSE: Don't you take this out on me Gerard Boulanger. You're not my husband I don't have to listen to your bullshit!

GERARD: I just wanted a turkey. That's fine. I know for a fact that all your friends get first pick of all the stuff here. And there's nothing any of us can do about it. It's a goddamned popularity contest. That's what it is.

ROSE: Are you finished?

GERARD: Yes, I think I am. Thanks for nothing. I'm taking this coffee, hope that's OK.

ROSE: Stop feeling sorry for yourself. Get in line. You're not the only one having a tough time. Talking to me like this isn't solving anything.

GERARD: No, you're right. I think when this thing is all said and done, we're gonna need to make some changes around here. 'Cause all I see here are a bunch of turkeys taking food out of my kid's mouths. That's the way I see it. Not you of course, sorry Rose. I don't mean to come out harshly on you, you're just helping out. Your husband on the other hand ... got a nice cushy job working with the union, but that's not your fault. Good thing for him there's a strike.

APPENDIX A

ROSE: I'll be sure to tell him you said that.

GERARD: Don't worry I'll be telling him myself. Is he here?

ROSE: No Ger. I just told you he's at home with the kids. I think you need to cool off and go home.

GERARD: Fine. (*breathes*) Thanks for the coffee.

GERARD EXITS

ROSE: You're welcome.⁴⁵

ROSE moves back into the kitchen ...

⁴⁵ **LIGHTS:**

Board #1 – Look 13 – Phone Area Light

Board #2 – Look 9 – Blackout

QLAB 38:

Audio: *Union Maid (Instrumental)* – Friends of Old Puppy [with distortion]

Scene 16 - Phone Calls

ROSE: (*Pacing*) Phone calls. Calls come in for emergency cases and some people just trying to get SOMETHING FOR NOTHING! – hoaxes! Some families more well fed during the strike. It's the only time the hall is actually full! OR is this a case where people need help?

Phone calls. During the strike, you get obscene phone calls – almost wish there'd never been the invention – calling me everything but a lady. Heavy breathing and stuff...

BILLY: It is late at night and the rotary phone is ringing.⁴⁶ The noise wakes up the baby who starts to cry.⁴⁷

BILLY: (*as LAURIE from her bedroom*) Mother, the telephone is ringing!

ROSE emerges into the kitchen. She is very tired and slightly on edge. She takes a breath before answering the phone.

BILLY: (*as LAURIE*) Mama the t-

ROSE: I know Laurie! Go back to bed!

*She answers the phone.*⁴⁸

ROSE: Hello?

She listens to a voice that is calling her anything but a lady.

ROSE: Stop calling here.

She takes a breath. Hangs up the phone. Goes back into her bedroom.

(Beat)

⁴⁶ **QLAB 39:**

Audio: Phone Ring [Stock Sound Effect]

⁴⁷ **QLAB 40:**

Audio: Baby Cry - Short [Stock Sound Effect]

⁴⁸ **QLAB 41:**

Audio: Baby Cry - Long [Stock Sound Effect]

APPENDIX A

BILLY: Phone rings again.⁴⁹ Baby cries.⁵⁰

ROSE angrily answers the phone⁵¹ almost tearing the receiver off the wall.

ROSE: I told you to stop Calling here!!!!!!!

(listens)

Oh sorry Hon.

Yah it was one of those calls.

No just the one this time.

Yes, EVERYONE is awake here.

Are you on your way home?

Few more hours?

Door's locked.

No, he's up the street, I don't want to wake him up. We'll be fine.

Ok. Love you too.

She hangs up the phone and goes to comfort the baby.

BILLY (as LAURIE): Mama I want to talk to daddy on the telephone!

ROSE: You can talk to your father in the morning. Go to sleep.

BILLY: Phone rings again.⁵²

ROSE: Jesus Christ!

⁴⁹ **QLAB 42:**

Audio: Phone Ring [Stock Sound Effect]

⁵⁰ **QLAB 43:**

Audio: Baby Cry - Short [Stock Sound Effect]

⁵¹ **QLAB 44:**

Audio: Baby Cry – Long [Stock Sound Effect]

⁵² **QLAB 45:**

Audio: Phone Ring [Stock Sound Effect]

APPENDIX A

BILLY: The baby cries.⁵³

BILLY (as *LAURIE*): Bad word momma!!!!

ROSE: I know Laurie please go to sleep.

*She answers phone.*⁵⁴

I told you never to call here again!!!!

Are you kidding me!!!!???

Yes!!! Bring home some MILK Billy!!!!

I'm hanging up!⁵⁵

BILLY and ROSE are playing cards at the table ...

⁵³ **QLAB 46:**
Audio: Baby Cry – Short [Stock Sound Effect]

⁵⁴ **QLAB 47:**
Audio: Baby Cry – Long [Stock Sound Effect]

⁵⁵ **LIGHTS:** Look 4 – Dream Look
QLAB 48:
Photo: Sign on Car [IMG 1456]; Outside Queen's Park [IMG 1487]; Troubadour [IMG 1498]; People Killed by INCO [IMG 1533]; Women at Arena [IMG 1555]; Mayor at Arena [IMG 1559]; Group of Women at Arena [IMG 1563]; Man Voting [IMG 1670]

Scene 17 – The Arena

ROSE: That time of the strike it's aimed at me. That, I could do without...and so few calls thanking us for what we are doing. I'm sure that gave Laurie nightmares.

BILLY: Those are just bad dreams. She'll get over them.

ROSE: I hope so.

BILLY: We have never been on strike.

ROSE: We don't know what will happen.

BILLY: There isn't enough money for such a large membership. The company knows they can out-wait the union.

ROSE: Madeleine Parent makes two visits during the strike. She has the ability to speak, and forcefully and she's not so damn long winded.

BILLY: Steelworkers are ready and waiting.

ROSE: That woman at that meeting is an experience I'll never forget. I just don't understand any woman who –

BILLY: – Some of the guys are saying that their 'old ladies' throw them under the bus –

ROSE: – They seem to get the upper hand –

BILLY: – I know you don't throw me under the bus –

ROSE: – They get their point across better than we can. I don't understand why these ladies wanted their husbands back on the job without getting a good contract –

BILLY: – Company offered the very same thing or a few pennies more.

ROSE: That ONE time, I am a very upset lady, because I'm not able to speak better. If I could only just speak better, that woman, would not have the same pull she has –

BILLY: Oh, you mean the Barfly? The skyrocket. The dentist's wife speaking for miners.

ROSE: At the arena.

BILLY: An evening meeting at the arena. During the coldest winter in living memory.

ROSE: Very disorganized situation as I recall it ... we call a SUPPORT MEETING FOR THE WIVES!!!! They turn it around COOPTED TO INCLUDE THE MAYOR ... at the arena!

BILLY: Plenty of parking for those who drive.

ROSE: If you look on the surface of something, we are forced to carry the whole brunt of the struggle in this moment. "Our side is right." Oh my god ain't that a fact! Company has to come across looking good. It is very bad timing for us.

BILLY: Strikes of any kind don't help either side...everyone is a loser in a strike.

ROSE: I wouldn't recommend a strike for anyone unless it is the last possible way for you to get what you need.

BILLY: Maybe we can avoid having these long strikes...a few weeks anyone can manage...

ROSE: Such a hardship.

Rose sips her tea and Billy sips his coffee...

BILLY: I swear, Rosie, this strike will be the death of me.

ROSE: Don't you know we all live ten less years here.

BILLY: Fifteen if you're working underground.

ROSE: Twenty with all that drinking and smoking.

BILLY: Thirty with the wife nagging you all the time.

ROSE: Well at that rate, you'll be gone any day now.

BILLY: *(Pause smiling)* If I'm lucky.

ROSE: If I'm lucky.

APPENDIX A

BILLY: Goodnight Rosie.

ROSE: Goodnight Billy.⁵⁶

*ROSE exits.*⁵⁷

⁵⁶ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 49:

Audio: *Love Me Tender (String Quartet)* – Stringsplace String Quartet

Photo: Bright Light through a Doorway [Stock Photo]

Interview Clip: Bryan Murray: *"I'm pretty sure that's the first strike that Sudbury had. They did throw them under the bus and the guys never forgot that. And a lot of guys I know, they say, 'if it hadn't been for the old lady, we would still be on strike.' Like I said, they went back for nothing. They signed actually for nothing. They went out on strike for nothing."*

⁵⁷ **LIGHTS:** Look 7 – Heart Attack Special Look [Back Light]

Scene 18 - A Man and His Home

A grown LAURIE enters narrates the following scene as if she were a witness:

LAURIE: This is it!

Garbage cans are heard being knocked over. Rocks are being thrown at the front door. A car window is smashed with a baseball bat. All we hear are these sounds. Including taunts like: “Get out here you sonofabitch!!!!”

Billy is inside his house.

BILLY: You bastards get out of here!!

LAURIE: Swearing and sounds of an assault continue ...

BILLY: The cops have been called.

LAURIE: A voice is heard taunting: ‘They’re not coming.’

BILLY: I’m warning you. You better clear off!!

LAURIE: Another voice speaks out into the night: ‘You’re all talk Billy!’

More swears and rocks ... one hits and smashes a window. A child is heard crying. I think that’s me.

Some commotion is heard indoors. All of a sudden BILLY explodes through the front door and into the driveway with a gun.

BILLY: Not at my house!

LAURIE: Several moments pass. There are movements and shuffles. He is pointing his gun and he means it.

BILLY: This rifle is no stranger to rats!

LAURIE: It works. The men leave. He remains standing in his yard, wearing only a housecoat.⁵⁸

(Shift)

⁵⁸ **QLAB 50:**

Photo: Bright Doorway Light Fades Out

LAURIE: I remember this night.⁵⁹

BILLY: Remember.

LAURIE: OK Dad.

BILLY: Focus on what it is like during the strike and the mood of the populace.

LAURIE: Got it.

BILLY: Try to remember it is a complicated time, animosity at different levels. I need to convey that like, pissed⁶⁰ off attitude.

LAURIE: Pissed off.

BILLY: I need you to see that a big part of this strike, we have a pissed⁶¹ off attitude towards this massive company that is running our lives and treating us like chattel.

LAURIE: Anger⁶² based on that.⁶³

BILLY: 'We're⁶⁴ gonna make them suffer.' 'We're⁶⁵ gonna show them.'

LAURIE: 'We're gonna get back at them.'

BILLY: It isn't all like, 'yah we gotta⁶⁶ union now and (*nice conciliatory voice*) 'we're gonna get all these things you know we should have' – FUCK⁶⁷ YOU.

LAURIE: (*matching*) FUCK YOU.

⁵⁹ **QLAB 51:**

Audio: Add Distortion to *Love Me Tender* (String Quartet)

⁶⁰ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶¹ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶² **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶³ **QLAB 52:**

Audio: Increase Distortion in *Love Me Tender*

⁶⁴ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶⁵ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶⁶ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red Pulse

⁶⁷ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red HOLD

APPENDIX A

BILLY: 'We're gonna get back at you.' That may not be spoken, but it is an underlying psyche. They use us, and we hate them.

LAURIE: We hate them.

BILLY: Strong word eh?

LAURIE: We hate them.

BILLY: Deep down inside.

LAURIE: We hate them.

BILLY: We hate them for our fathers, for our grandfathers, for our wives, for you.

LAURIE: For⁶⁸ us.

*Billy Clutches his heart.*⁶⁹

LAURIE: I remember later when Billy – My father – grabs his heart as he is experiencing chest pains.⁷⁰

*LAURIE and BILLY become ALBERT and JAKE, two pensioners much later in time*⁷¹...

⁶⁸ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Full Red RELEASE

QLAB 53:

Audio: Distortion Fade Out

⁶⁹ **LIGHTS:** Board #1 – Look 6 – Scene Light / General Wash

⁷⁰ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 54:

Audio: *Pie in the Sky* – Oscar Brand

Photo: Men with Many Ballots [IMG 1680]; Child Welcome Back [IMG 1666]; We Won [IMG 1652]; Heritage Moment [IMG 1640]

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan: *"Mining didn't kill him, but it didn't help."*

Interview Clip: Ron Tough: *"I really believe in union. Without them, we'd all be working for nothing, we'd all be working for bugger all. We would have no health and no safety and no concern. We would be lesser than. Our society would be fucked."*

⁷¹ **LIGHTS:**

Board #1 – Look 9 – Blackout

Board #2 – Look 6 – Scene Light / General Wash

Scene 19 - A Man and His Home Revisited from a Coffee Shop

ALBERT: Billy didn't make it out of that strike. Poor wife. Poor little girl.

JAKE: I heard he dropped dead of a heart attack at the ratification vote. Such a shame.

ALBERT: That's why I wanted to use them, with the money we were getting with each contract, to get a better lifestyle, while I get back at them and you know, I always used to joke and say, 'I want to be retired from INCO as long as I worked there,' which would be thirty and a half years and I'm at twenty something now, and one of the reasons I say that – with a smile on my face – is that deep down I want them to pay for as long as I can make them pay. You know?

JAKE: I don't dwell on those things anymore. I haven't given it a lot of thought.

ALBERT: He faced down a mob out after him one night. Over a hundred guys!

JAKE: A couple of drunken fools is what I say.

ALBERT: Unruly Mob! The likes of which Sudbury has never seen. A bunch of em, drunk out of their tree, against one man with his family inside. In his own house.

JAKE: In the end, the situation was harmless. Unruly Mob! Scared of a guy in his bathrobe?!

ALBERT: You know what I would have done?

JAKE: What's that?

ALBERT: I would've fired some buckshot right at them. Self-defense!

JAKE: You couldn't hit the side of a barn ten feet away.

(They both sip their coffee)

ALBERT: That's why I'd use buckshot.

JAKE: Yep.

ALBERT: It's not right.

JAKE: I heard said that he shamed them enough that they left.

ALBERT: I still would have blasted them to kingdom come!

JAKE: That's always your solution.

ALBERT: Tried, tested and true. How do you think we got the Yanks outta here in 1812?

JAKE: By being British?

ALBERT: We were Canadians, and we were protecting our homes.

JAKE: That's how you fix everything. You shoot one helicopter and you think you're Audie Murphy.

ALBERT: Shh. No one knows about that. And besides, you've got the wrong guy. It wasn't me, my brother did it.⁷²

@ *Start of Intermission Music*⁷³

@ *Stage set for Act Two*⁷⁴

⁷² **LIGHTS:** Look 9 – Blackout

QLAB 55:

Audio: *Strike!* – Ry Cooder; *Solidarity Forever* – Pete Seeger; *Pie in the Sky* – Oscar Brand; *My Old Man* – Ewan MacColl/Peggy Seeger; *Union Maid* – Judy Collins/Pete Seeger; *There is Power in a Union* – Linda Sundblad; *Working Man* – Rita MacNeil; *1913 Massacre* – Ramblin' Jack Elliot; *The First Time Ever* – Ewan MacColl/Peggy Seeger; *Which Side Are You On* – Pete Seeger; *Hobo's Lullaby* – Joan Baez

Photo: Blue Mine-Mill Sticker

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan: "He goes, 'oh, advice?' He said, "you might as well save your breath and blow it on your porridge." (she laughs)"

⁷³ **LIGHTS:** House Lights UP

⁷⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 1 - Preset

ACT II⁷⁵

Scene 1⁷⁶ - My Dad and My Husband

LAURIE:⁷⁷ We are always connected to what's under our feet. Dad told me that. Right here at this table.

(She pours herself a cup of coffee)

I say that out loud once and awhile, when I'm thinking of him. We lost him a long time ago. He was a miner. *(Sighs)* A Creighton miner.

(She bangs her fist on the table in playful homage to him.)

Terrified of dying. I remember him waking up my mother in the middle of the night yelling in his sleep. Her, trying to reassure him. I have these nightmares too, every now and then, since I can remember, where I'm sitting at this table drinking coffee and frantically sewing – I don't sew by the way – while I can see in my mind's eye, a huge piece of muck falling towards his head. He is unsuspecting. I'm sewing frantically while drinking buckets of coffee, but I can't muster up the voice to warn him and just as there's impact and my voice returns – Dad look out! – is when I wake up, drenched in sweat...only I'm still dreaming, I'm that little girl waiting to take his coffee thermos and lunch box. No matter how long I wait for him to come home, he never does.⁷⁸

Heart attack got him. Mining didn't kill him, but it didn't help. Resentment, lifestyle, heredity, stress and worry did him in. I don't have any resentment. I probably had a bit of an anti-union bias. Everybody always told me how strong of a unionist he was and that when 'he talked people listened.' He was heavily involved with Mine Mill. Kids used to tease me at school. I'd get in to fights. Called me a communist. I didn't really understand what that meant. I still don't. It made me angry.

⁷⁵ **LIGHTS:** House Fade Out

⁷⁶ **LIGHTS:** Look 9 – Blackout

QLAB 56:

Audio: Love Me Tender (Guitar Instrumental) – Kyosti Rautio

Photo: Video Black

Interview Clip: Laurie McGauley: “It’s literally a never-ending, *(she laughs)* you know, struggle and, um, it-it takes different forms. But, I think that, you know, strikes are a-a wonderful metaphor, even, for that, you know? It’s just saying, ‘Enough! We’re resisting. We’re stopping this for a while and –’”

⁷⁷ **LIGHTS:** Look 4 – Dream Look

⁷⁸ **QLAB 57:**

Audio: Fade Out Love Me Tender (Guitar Instrumental)

(She lovingly runs her hand across the table's surface.)

After he died, we didn't get a pension or anything – a very small insurance or death payment I think – We got through it though, good neighbours.

(Traces fingers over carved initials)

Without a man in the house I might add, to 'bring home the bacon.' *(laughs)* Never mind the fact that this was a man's world and if he didn't bring home the bacon it was the woman's job to feed the family anyway. Wives, mothers, girlfriends ... Oh my oh dear don't take any offence Daddy if you're listening. My favourite one of your lines was one time when mom was ill: 'Don't worry about those dishes, Rosie, you can do them tomorrow.'⁷⁹ The expectation was that I would grow up and take this role. I remember looking at those roles, 'I will never marry, I can't see this for me.' I didn't say it out loud, I thought it privately, of course. My life was going to be different.

(She pours herself a cup of coffee)

I met Guy in school. He was one of those kids in grade eight who had a mustache, smoked cigarettes, that he kept rolled up in his sleeve, and was old enough to drive. *(laughs)* Or something like that. He promised me the moon on our first date. No shit. He did. *(pause)* Then he invited me to the picket line, where they had hauled out a small black and white TV, with a very long extension cord, and then we sat back by the fire and watched the moon landing, as we passed a joint, summer of love, daring to look upwards at history in the making. We were having a beer and he smiled at me and accidentally spit his beer out. *(Sigh. Then)* Yep, I married a miner.

GUY enters⁸⁰. Pours himself a beer and joins LAURIE at the table...

⁷⁹ **QLAB 58:**

Interview Clip: Jan Heppner: "Here is my favourite line from my father. My mother's not feeling well, she's got all the supper dishes to do. My father – magnanimous man – says, 'Don't worry, Nita. Don't worry about those dishes, you can do them tomorrow.'"

⁸⁰ **LIGHTS:** Look 3 – Flashback (sepia)

Scene 2 - I'm Not a Miner

LAURIE: Nice of you to show up. You're late. I have to go help plan for that bean supper. Janice is at Elizabeth's –

GUY: (*interrupting*) I'm not a miner.

LAURIE: So?

GUY: You told everybody I'm a miner and I'm not. I work at INCO but I'm not a miner. I'm a mechanic.

LAURIE: Yah so?

GUY: And I worked in the smelter before that.

LAURIE: Ok?

GUY: There's a big difference. Not everybody who works at INCO is a miner.

LAURIE: What's your point?

GUY: We don't want to be giving everybody the wrong idea. Right?

LAURIE: (*Pause*) Sometimes I just don't understand you.

GUY: Well, you wanna get it right? No?

LAURIE: Since when do husbands – Do YOU – come home and talk about anything to do with work?

GUY: Yah, but ...

LAURIE: We wanna get it right? No?

GUY: And hey, what's this I hear about you giving some speech in Toronto.⁸¹

LAURIE: What about it?

GUY: (*shows her a paper*) Were you gonna ask me about it first?

LAURIE: No. I wasn't aware that I had to ask your permission to help out with this strike.

⁸¹ QLAB 59:

Photo: Solidarity Benefit Flyer [Wigmore Collection] - Edited

APPENDIX A

GUY: I can get behind you helping on the voucher committee, Ok, or bean suppers, charity stuff –

LAURIE: – Your union president asked me to do it, so I said yes.

GUY: So, you're just going to do it? What about Janice?

LAURIE: What about Janice?

GUY: You'll have to find a sitter. I'm busy at the picket line.

LAURIE: Why can't you find a babysitter?

GUY: You always take care of that stuff while I'm at work.

LAURIE: Well you're not a work.

GUY: I'm not doing it.

LAURIE: So, you'll switch the shifts and stay home.

GUY: Look. I didn't have a problem, you going out with the girls and making your signs or serving soup. But I don't want my wife talking at some fundraiser –

LAURIE: It doesn't really matter what you want, they asked me, I said yes, I'm doing it.

GUY: But you're such a lousy public speaker. You couldn't even get your wedding vows out properly.

LAURIE: That's because I was emotional Guy!

GUY: It's embarrassing, the guys will talk –

LAURIE: You always gotta be so Macho! Macho ... just like every other man in this town puffing out your chests, all the time getting into fights.

GUY: That was one time ... and I had to.

LAURIE: Oh ya, why?

GUY: He was a Habs fan ...

LAURIE: Oh my god. You see?

GUY: He had it coming. No, I'm just kidding, it was about more than that.

APPENDIX A

LAURIE: Oh ...

GUY: But, probably wouldn't have happened if he wasn't a Habs fan. (*laughs and puts his feet on the table*)

LAURIE: Guy!

GUY: What?! (*Takes his feet off the table*)

LAURIE: Feet off the table! 'Who knows' what you stepped in today.

GUY: Geez! A guy can't come home and relax.

LAURIE: Like you don't do enough of that.

GUY: Are we done? I'm tired. I want to go watch the game.

LAURIE: You're nothing like my dad. I've been thinking a lot about him lately. You know when they say women marry their fathers.

GUY: That's just weird.

LAURIE: Oh, you know what I mean.

GUY: Mine Mill guy your dad was.

LAURIE: Yes, he was. When he talked people listened.

GUY: Must be nice. My old man is a tough son of a gun ... He was a miner. My dad was. There's a difference. He made boat loads of cash with the bonus. He got hurt though.

LAURIE: Well that's one bullet you dogged.

GUY: Dodged.

LAURIE: Yah, that's what I said.

GUY: No, you said dogged. And I ain't dogging nothing. I'm no dog fucker.

LAURIE: Watch your language. You all swear all the fucking time. You don't have to bring it in here.

GUY: Just slipped, sorry. And for the record, that is the first time I've cursed in months.

LAURIE: Get out of here!

GUY: Where are you going?

LAURIE: I'm not sticking around for Larry.

GUY: We won't be here long. We're going to the hotel.

LAURIE: Can you tell him not to piss in our laundry sink this time?

GUY: (*Laughs*) That wasn't his fault. It was minus thirty out and our toilet was broken.

LAURIE: (*Sigh*) Fine. I heard all your damn stories a million times. Don't you have anything new to talk about?⁸²

*LAURIE exits and becomes LARRY*⁸³...

⁸² **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 60:

Photo: People vs. INCO [Wigmore Collection]; Picket Line [Wigmore Collection]; Corn Roast 2 [Wigmore Collection]; Effigy [Wigmore Collection]; Corn Roast 1 [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Cathy Mulroy: "And I go, 'I'm speaking in Toronto? Oh, I don't know if my husband is going to let me go.' He grabs the paper back, he goes, 'Well, you don't want it? I'll ask somebody else.' So I grab it back again, and I go, 'No, I want to do it.' So I had a chance to do this. And once I started doing that, it was - it was great. It was really good."

⁸³ **LIGHTS:** Look 6 – Scene Light / General Wash

Scene 3 - Buddies / Shooting The Breeze

LARRY: (*affected*) Hey shit head. (*sits at the table and grabs his beer*)

GUY: Asshole.

LARRY: Still a non-swearing zone?

GUY: The wife went out.

LARRY: She still mad about the laundry sink?

GUY: No ... water under the bridge.

LARRY: Water down the drain you mean. (*laughs at his own joke*) How's she going? Two in the car on the way home ...

GUY: Stop at the hotel for a few more ...

LARRY: Close the place down at seven ...

GUY: ... and home in time for dinner.

(*They have a stylized beer*)

GUY: Remember Old Gilbert?

LARRY: Hook for a hand?

GUY: Yah. I just saw his obituary in the paper.

LARRY: No kidding.

GUY: I met him before he lost his hand. Back when I thought I was going to be warm at the smelter. I froze my arse off!

LARRY: Wind's colder in there than it was outside ... cold enough to freeze the nuts off a bridge.

GUY: Dust and gas and sulfur, we used to use solution bags, baking soda over the face to keep the sulfur, burn the whiskers where you wore it off ...

LARRY: Leave a bare spot.

(*They drink*)

GUY: (*toasting*) To a Cranky old man ... Rest in peace. (*they drink*)

LARRY: Gilbert the grump.

GUY: Gilbert. I got along with him, old guys used to be ... what you see is what you get. All depends how good you get along with them. I wasn't afraid of work. If you want to work, they show you everything. If you're lazy, they won't show you nothing. No one wanted to work with him cause' he was a cranky old man. I worked three or four months with him – most guys couldn't last a day. Dog fuckers. Lots of dog fuckers.

LARRY: And toking. What year was that? Six guys died?

GUY: Toking yes. What?

LARRY: Lots of toking. Why you got some?

GUY: (*Pause*) No.

LARRY: Shoot.

GUY: Gilbert was not all there upstairs –

LARRY: – They were all a little bit haywire in the smelter. Not as much as miners –

GUY: I wound up spending time with him. Learned a lot from him. He was a World War Two vet. Grade two education.

LARRY: Compared to your grade 8, or did you pass that year?

GUY: He had a bad reputation as being part of the Nickel Rash before the war.

LARRY: (*Aside*) INCO's attempt at forming a company union (*To Guy*) Not everyone remembers that.

GUY: Sure. Gilbert had that reputation though, didn't go away. I saw him stab a guy in 66' during the wildcat.

LARRY: That right?

GUY: I saw him stab a guy. He was right beside me. On the first day, a lot of the guys started slowing down the work underground, breaking phone lines and communication, lots of sabotage. Management was pushing back. It was not a great place to work, like two donkeys pulling on a rope. Nobody getting anywhere.

GUY (Cont'd): Almost three thousand walked out at eight AM – could have been nine – when they walked out, a wildcat started. But some didn't come out. I was at the gate watching what was going on. My carpool driver was already out. I remember the train coming, he wouldn't stop. He was coming in with a load full of ore, and guys started throwing rocks at him, smashed all the windows on the locomotive.

There was a lot of drinking going on. It started in the morning and this was going on all day. There were guys spraying water and slapping car windows yelling SCABS! SCABS! Caldwell – he was my driver – he was just standing around pretty much watching everything happen, and then Gilbert came out – you know Gilbert before he lost his hand – they started slapping his car. I guess he come out with a hunting knife and stabbed Caldwell. People were yelling, he jumped in his car and took off, which is probably just as well because he would have been torn apart.

LARRY: Did he go to jail?

GUY: He turned himself in. Three years in court, but he was exonerated because he was 'protecting property in the eyes of a mob.'

LARRY: '66 WAS pretty nuts.

GUY: A moment of emotions.

LARRY: It was a hot potato.

GUY: Was that the when the chopper got shot down or was that in '69?

LARRY: No that was definitely '66.

GUY: Sure?

LARRY: One hundred percent. And it didn't get shot down, it got shot at. Apparently put three bullets in the door. I wasn't there so I don't know. That fella, that told me he put the shots in the chopper, he could have. He had the character to do it. For sure it was 1966.

APPENDIX A

GUY: '66 or '69?

LARRY: '66.

GUY: In '69 – I did my picket duty. I played cards, pretty quiet sitting in the hut. Not much going on.

LARRY: Didn't you start dating Laurie then? During the moon landing wasn't it? Classy guy, you took her to the line... you made me bring in my TV.

GUY: That piece of shit, oh yeah. I had to argue to force them to get us power. Told them we wouldn't stay out there unless they ran that extension cord.

LARRY: You're such a Casanova. My '69 wasn't that eventful. I was already hitched.

GUY: I was at your shotgun wedding.

LARRY: We came out pretty good in that one as I recall. The strike, not the wedding. Three months. Strike pay was twenty bucks or ten bucks a week? It's a voucher not money.

GUY: Wasn't it cash for that one?

LARRY: Not sure. My memory is lousy. Not much difference in money between '58 and 69.' Sick of penny contracts though, we are getting better bang for buck with Steel.

GUY: Cheers. To having lousy memories, and a new contract with Steel. (*They Drink*) Remember how you got the name Noodle?

APPENDIX A

LARRY: Smart ass. How can I ever forget?! I'll never wear short shorts to the family ball tournament again. *(laughs)*

GUY: Come on. You can do something dumber at the hotel to cheer me up.⁸⁴

@ Phone Start Ringing⁸⁵

@ LAURIE pick up phone⁸⁶

⁸⁴ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 61:

Audio: *Sudbury Saturday Night* – Stompin' Tom Connors; Phone Ring [Stock Sound Effect]

Photo: Gifts [Wigmore Collection]; Christmas [Wigmore Collection]; Poster Photo [Wigmore Collection]; Wives singing at corn roast [Wigmore Collection]; Burning Effigy [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Cathy Mulroy: *"And, I mean, we didn't eat well, but, a lot of us got together in groups when we got our voucher. Somebody would buy, you know, a ham, and somebody would also buy potatoes, and somebody else would buy this. And then we would have, like, a buffet of food that would last us a couple days."*

⁸⁵ **LIGHTS:**

Board #1 – Look 9 – Blackout

Board #2 – Look 13 – Phone Call Special

⁸⁶ **QLAB 62:**

Audio: Phone Ring OUT

Scene 4: A Phone Call

Phone Rings LAURIE answers.

LAURIE: Hello. Hi Louise. Don't worry. You can call here anytime.

(Listens)

LAURIE: That's right. If you're on the phone they're not calling you! What time is he getting home? Do you need me to come over?

(Listens)

LAURIE: You see any of those vehicles parked on the road?

(Listens)

LAURIE: You're not paranoid. They'd be plain, insignificant, no markings. We're all being watched.

(Listens)

LAURIE: I'm getting them too. Don from the Northern Life came by and attached a recording device to my phone to find out who it is.

(Listens)

LAURIE: Oh yeah for sure.

(Listens)

LAURIE: Oh no did he get in to a fight at school?

(Listens)

LAURIE: Kids are cruel. You'd think the parents would know better. Yeah.

(Listens)

LAURIE: No, he was a big jerk about it.

(Listens)

LAURIE: (*caveman voice*): "I don't want my wife giving speeches ... It's embarrassing ... the guys will talk ... I'm so manly ..." Blah, blah, blah.

(Listens)

LAURIE: *(She laughs and laughs)*

(Listens)

LAURIE: No worries, I'll just be at the bingo while you guys are getting stinco. Fuck you Stompin Tom!⁸⁷

(Listens)

LAURIE: No, that song comes out ... what, are we a bunch of bad parents?! ... and all we do is get shit-faced ... fight ... and play bingo?

(Listens)

LAURIE: No. There's nothing wrong with bingo. I didn't mean it like that. It's funny because of the song –

(Interrupted)

LAURIE: Ya! See what I mean?!

(Listens for a rather extended venting session)

LAURIE: Just breathe. It's going to be alright Louise. Call me whenever you want or let me know if you ever need company. I'm here.

(Listens)

LAURIE: I'll bring the girls with me and Eileen can teach us how to play bridge.

(Listens)

LAURIE: Oh, he's home? Good. Ok I'll talk to you soon. Which bean supper are you helping out with?

(Listens)

⁸⁷ **QLAB 63:**

Audio: *Sudbury Saturday Night* OUT

LAURIE: Good! Me too. I will see you there. Jenny came up with the slogan, “the company gets the gravy, but we get the beans.” Not bad eh?

(Listens)

LAURIE: I think so too. Ok. I will see you there. OK bye.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 64:

Audio: *Strike!* – Ry Cooder

Photo: Bean Supper 1 [Wigmore Collection]; Bean Supper 2 [Wigmore Collection]; Bean Supper 3 [Wigmore Collection]; Bean Supper 4 [Wigmore Collection]; Pollution Sign [Wigmore Collection]; Picket Line 1 [Wigmore Collection]; Picket Shed [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Linda George: *“It doesn’t matter to me what – who it is who is going out on strike. I will always support them because nobody ever makes that kind of decision lightly. I know that what you hear about what the strike is about is never what it’s about. What the media says is going on is never really what is going on. I know that to be a fact. I don’t even doubt it.”*

Scene 5 - Boys Will Be Boys

GUY and LARRY fashion a makeshift hut and fire in a garbage bin like on a picket-line⁸⁹...

LARRY: Get that fire going. Jeez it's cold out!

GUY: You'll be fine. Not even below zero yet. Quit bossing me around. And get me a coffee. There's some left from the thermos.

LARRY: The one the church ladies brought over?

GUY: Yes. And grab some cookies if there's any left.

LARRY: Look who's the boss of me.

GUY: I am the management sort, I must admit. You, – fix this fire – I'll be right back. (He leaves the shack)

LARRY: *(Adding newspaper kindling, and other fire business. Satisfied with his fire he backs up and sits down in a lawn chair. He lifts his leg and lets out a silent flatulent and checks to see if anyone saw him).*

GUY: *(entering with coffee and other 'provisions')* Hey! You'll never guess what I ... OH YOU DIRTY BASTARD!

LARRY: *(can't conceal his laughter anymore)* Something died in here tonight. I don't know what happened.

GUY: *(trying to air the place out)* I mean, even with all this flowing air, and burning smoke, you still managed to ... I gotta get out of here! You're such a pig, Noodle! *(He exits)*

LARRY: That's what they call me so don't wear it out ... Good stuff, some coffee. And a cookie. Hey, thanks for the treats.

GUY: You're welcome. Is it safe to come back?

LARRY: Yah it's fine. The skunk is gone. *(laughs)*

GUY: You sure now? My god, what do you eat that rots inside of you like that?

LARRY: I was at that big bean supper the other night. They had it at the hotel to raise money for the families. I'm full of beans.

⁸⁹ **LIGHTS:** Look 8 – Picket Line / Evening

APPENDIX A

GUY: My wife helped out with that.

LARRY: Well you can thank her for whatever comes out of me the rest of the shift.

GUY: Yep.

LARRY: Yep.

(Sip their coffee.)

(pause)

GUY: Frig this is so boring!

LARRY: Beats working.

GUY: Where's the money going to come from?

LARRY: I heard it grows on trees.

GUY: If only.

LARRY: Too bad all the trees are gone around here in the CRATER city of Sudbury.

GUY: *(tries not to laugh)* You're such an asshole.

LARRY: Asshole – guilty as charged.

GUY: Yes, Noodle, but as far as assholes are concerned, you're the real McCoy. The genuine article. If I'm gonna spend time with an asshole it may as well be you.

LARRY: Thank you. That's one of the nicest things anyone but my wife has ever said to me, and she had to say it in church.

GUY: Lucky for you.

LARRY: I thank my stars every single day.

(pause)

APPENDIX A

GUY: I'm behind on my mortgage payments.

LARRY: How bad is it?

GUY: Pretty bad. Even if we get a new contract soon.

LARRY: Does Laurie know?

GUY: Not the whole picture.

LARRY: I was thinking of working with my uncle in Elliot Lake if this thing keeps dragging on. I can probably get you on if you want.

GUY: I might take you up on that. Thanks.

LARRY: Don't mention it.

GUY: I have an idea.

LARRY: What's that?

GUY: *(Pulling out a bottle of wine from the provisions he'd brought in earlier)* The old Finn gave it to me when I went to grab the coffee. Kippis!

(Pours wine into their empty coffee cups)

LARRY and GUY: Kippis! *(They Drink)*

LARRY: Wow! This stuff is great. It's just cool enough, and slightly darker than a rosee. Don't ask, I'll tell you about my adventures in wine some other time.

GUY: Cut it out. I know your wife is the wine expert! Especially at the Christmas party last year –

LARRY: OK leave my wife out of this ... just because she passed out into her turkey dinner doesn't mean there's anything out of the ordinary *(laughs. They both laugh)* Seriously, don't make fun of her about that, she was on this new medication, and the extra gallon she drank really mixed badly *(they both laugh)*.

GUY: Hey, you don't think they sit around making fun of us all day, do you?

(Pause in consideration)

LARRY: I never passed out on a turkey dinner? Did you?

LARRY and GUY: Kippis. *(they drink the rosee)*

APPENDIX A

GUY: Hope we get a contract soon. I'm fed up with this. (*silence*) Hey, how much time do we have left?

LARRY: Just under two hours. Why?

GUY: Some of the boys left their golf clubs.

LARRY: Fire the foreman?

GUY: Fire the foreman.

LARRY: Great idea.

GUY: I think we have time for one ball each. Then we've got to book it back, so we don't get caught.

LARRY: Another Great idea.

GUY: Box of beer says I'll hit his truck first.

LARRY: You're on! But if you win, you're sharing.

GUY: Like they said at that meeting, it's time to "bring the company to their knees."

LARRY: One swing at a time. Let's go!

LARRY and GUY make a club swinging gesture.

GUY: FORE!

LARRY: - MAN!⁹⁰

LARRY and GUY exit⁹¹ to find the golf clubs...

⁹⁰ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 65:

Audio: *Windflower* – Herd Ellis & Remo Palmier

Photo: Cans [Wigmore Collection]; Wives Singing [Wigmore Collection]; Cat Speaking [Wigmore Collection];

Dave Patterson [Wigmore Collection]; Wives Supporting Strike [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Laurie McGauley: *"The labour movement was very influential in the kind of feminism that we had here in Sudbury, as well. Like, it was – it was a very kickass kind of 'fuck you' feminism. We were very much a working – working-class kind of feminism, I think, here in Sudbury."*

⁹¹ **LIGHTS:**

Look 9 – Blackout

Auditorium PAR Can Lights ON

Scene 6 - “Women Fighting INCO Solidarity Benefit”

LAURIE: The night arrived I was nervous. I didn’t know anyone. My stomach turned and knotted. I was excited and scared. My heart sank, my mouth dry, my legs shook when I looked down at the borrowed heels I wore, not feeling very comfortable in them. I kicked them off afraid of twisting an ankle crossing the stage.

Music from a string band played to open the party. *[wait for the string band music]*

The audience cheered with excitement⁹² *[Actor gets the audience to cheer from excitement and repeat convention throughout scene].*

It was my turn. A woman introduced me to the crowd. I heard my name: Laurie Piquette.

My entire body shook as I walked to the lectern, very modest and shy and I began to speak:

(To audience) Hi my name is Laurie and my husband is a member of the United Steelworkers of America Local 6500.

The words rolled off my lips like I had been saying it for years. *[The crowd applauded]*

(To audience) Every citizen hates INCO and we are here on behalf of strikers and their families. The company has milked the city of Sudbury for almost one hundred years. It’s our strike too.⁹³ Thank you for putting on this benefit. The money raised here will go to the children’s Christmas party. We are supporting our husbands. The company will not set us against our men like they did in the past. We are part of this strike, it’s our company too. In the words of my dad, a Creighton miner through and through, we are always connected to what’s under our feet.⁹⁴

[The crowd howled in excitement]

⁹² **QLAB 66:**

Audio: Auditorium Cheers [Stock Sound Effect]

⁹³ **QLAB 67:**

Audio: Crowd Applauding [Stock Sound Effect]

⁹⁴ **QLAB 68:**

Audio: Large Crowd Applause [Stock Sound Effect]

(Audience) We are here to fight to the end, if that contract would have been offered to us in September it may have been accepted.

[voice raised a little.]

But now they are asking us to give up things that our fathers, brothers and uncles fought for years ago. The wives are trying to care for the material things with a thirty dollar a-week food voucher. We plan to spread the word about trade unionists too.

[voice softer now]

It's fear that makes you want to go back to work. We are not afraid, we will survive. This is not going to be a repeat of 1958 when the company got the women to stage a massive rally to get the men back to work. They went back just before Christmas for a bad contract. The women got blamed. Not this time. We are going to stand beside our men.⁹⁵

At the end of my speech the crowd was still on their feet. The energy in that room was so powerful.

The Union President seized his opportunity. The crowd was silent.

DAVE: Hey Laurie. I know we're on strike, I know we are poor, I see you're not wearing any shoes. So here are mine.

LAURIE: Thanks Dave. All I've got to say is: ... "I can fit into your shoes anytime."⁹⁶

⁹⁵ **QLAB 69:**

Audio: Big Cheer [Stock Sound Effect]

⁹⁶ **QLAB 70:**

Audio: Large Crowd Applause [Stock Sound Effect]

Interview Clip: Cathy Mulroy: "And here we are, all these years later, in the same type of position. The only difference is, these women, they had balls, okay? These women had balls. And they said, 'we're going to do it. We're going to say what we have to say. Before the men vote.'"

Scene 7 - The Whole Thing Fizzles Out

LAURIE: We were angry, living under the shadow of constant layoffs. If anybody had the feeling that once you got a job you could work there for life, now it's hanging over you that you could lose your job tomorrow.

GUY: There are a number of layoffs that happen.

LAURIE: By the time they eliminate some of the workforce they go down from something like eighteen-thousand to something like twelve thousand.

GUY: I am fifty on the list from the bottom.

LAURIE: So, the next one you're gone.⁹⁷

GUY: 78. It's a long one.

LAURIE: When the strike happens, it is the wrong time.

GUY: Everybody will tell you INCO has a huge stockpile ...

LAURIE: – But for us, I think it is that we are able to take control of what is going on, fueled by the anger of what is happening. I have this sense of wanting to take control of my life.

GUY: Could you keep it down Lor?

LAURIE: Honestly Guy, I'm surprised you're not more concerned about this.

GUY: More meetings, accept or reject a contract, to later accept the contract or they'll lay you off or you'll go on strike. I'm more of a backbencher, listener. A Lot of yelling and screaming and name callers. I'm quiet, talking with the guys, but not to get up in front. People are mad, disappointed, pissed off, you name it.

LAURIE: Leading up to the ratification vote I remember being glued to the television, watching for the results, waiting for the local news to come up definitely knowing that I was going –

GUY: I was going you mean –

⁹⁷ **LIGHTS:**

Look 4 – Dream Look

Auditorium PAR Can Lights OUT

QLAB 71:

Photos: Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1 (*10 photos from Wigmore Collection of individual women*)

LAURIE: – don't wanna use the word support – really hoping the men would not accept that lousy insult of a contract the company was offering at the eleventh hour.

GUY: It's better than the one they offer us at the beginning of the strike.

LAURIE: We put out a press release saying we don't support it. By⁹⁸ making the statement as a group of women who never have control – I don't want to say that it influences the vote – but our opinion is known ...

GUY: You ladies have no business getting involved. You don't have a vote. You should stand behind me. I'm your husband.

LAURIE: We win the support of the community. We gain a 'Thirty and Out' pension plan. So, it's all worth it.

GUY: No strike is really worth it, but if you don't go on strike, you don't get ahead. A lot of times people don't realize, not strike to get ahead, but strike to keep what we have. We have no choice. But after eight months and a bit, I vote for the contract.

LAURIE: Most of the men don't vote for it. A huge celebration. Fuelled us again this feeling, the control, I think. Just being pushed in to a corner. The feeling I have no control and all of a sudden, doing something where I – we – take back, take it back.

(Pause)

LAURIE: Two weeks later they sign the next contract.

(Pause)

LAURIE: The whole thing just fizzles out. It just fizzles out. Like somebody just put out a match, something that was burning and now it's gone.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ **QLAB 72:**

Photos: Women of '78 Montage Part 2 (3 photos from Wigmore Collection of women in action)

⁹⁹ **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 73:

Audio: Canadiens-Bruins '79 playoff game commentary

Photo: Fair Share Sign [Wigmore Collection]; Plant Gating [Wigmore Collection]; Joan & Heather [Wigmore Collection]; March in '78 Smelter [Wigmore Collection]; Wives Meeting [Wigmore Collection]; 1979 Guy Lafleur Playoff Game Image

Interview Clip: Ron Brunette: "Well, no strike is really worth it, but then, if you don't go on strike, you don't – you don't get ahead. But-but the thing is, a lot of people don't realize, we went on strike not to try and get ahead, just try and keep what we already have."

Scene 8 - Old Man and an Old Woman Discuss Early Retirement¹⁰⁰

DOROTHY: What time are Guy and Laurie getting here?

JAKE: *(over the hockey game)* Soon.

DOROTHY: Get off your duff and set the table!

JAKE: Shhhhhhhhh Yeahhh!!!!!! Avantage numerique!

DOROTHY: Turn that damned TV down!

JAKE: Dorothy can you bring me a beer!?

DOROTHY: What do I look like ... ? –

JAKE: Et Le But!!!!!!!

DOROTHY: – your damn servant *(muttering to herself)* here you go here's your beer *(Sits down beside him and starts drinking the beer.)* Go Leafs! Yahooo!!!!!!

JAKE: We're not even playing the Laughs! Hey! Where's mine!!!!?

DOROTHY: OOOO even better go Bruins!!!!!! Oh, did you want one? I couldn't hear you over all that yelling.

JAKE: I'll yell all I damn well want, it's my house. *(real dramatic get's up)* ohh my back ... If you're not going to be nice enough to get YOUR POOR HUSBAND a beer with his sore back ... *(this continues on his way to the fridge and all the way back to his chair).* ---

DOROTHY: *(matching his thespian instincts)* Your poor back. Yes, my POOR HUSBAND. What did you do today but sit on your duff. If I could just get you to help out around here once and awhile ... Been clinging to that hope for thirty-five years!

¹⁰⁰ **LIGHTS:**

Board #1 - Look 6 – Scene Light / General Wash

Board #2 - Look 9 – Blackout

JAKE: I went up on the ladder and cleared the leaves out of the trough.

DOROTHY: Oh my, well...

JAKE: Because MY LOVING WIFE wanted me to do that ...

DOROTHY: Well thank you Jake. (*Goes to give JAKE a kiss*).

JAKE: (*Receives this kiss very sentimentally*).

DOROTHY: Are you sure you're still OK with this? Me? Full Time?

JAKE: I could ask you the same thing.

DOROTHY: I'm fine with it. You just stay out of my way and try to be useful.

JAKE: I'm useful.

DOROTHY: (*Gives him that look*).

JAKE: Don't look at me like that?

DOROTHY: Like what?

JAKE: You know how I mean. Besides. I even helped you with supper tonight.

DOROTHY: What do you mean?

JAKE: I turned down the roast and gravy so's you wouldn't cook the bejesus out of em' like you always do.

DOROTHY: You did NOT turn it down! It needs to COOK Jake! (*Gets up to save her roast*)

JAKE: (*Laughing with his beer, reclining in his chair*).

DOROTHY: It hasn't changed ... (*sees him laughing*) oh VERY funny.

JAKE: I know. You should see the look on your face (*Laughs*). You don't think I would do any "woman's work" do you?

DOROTHY: Oh, big surprise there! ... (*Bruins Score*) Middleton yes!!!! You deserve that!

JAKE: Damn! That was OFFSIDE!!!! Goddamn Zebras!!!!

DOROTHY: Oh, come on now Jake, the refs are fair and always have been. As my dad used to always say: 'It's the hardest job being a referee'

JAKE: Ya Ya Ya wise words.

DOROTHY: What is that supposed to mean?

JAKE: Nothing. He was a good man.

DOROTHY: He was, wasn't he.

JAKE: Don't see too many like him around. Times are different. I don't blame Guy for wanting to leave town for work. It's all watered down. They are born and there was always a union. Now young guys don't give a shit, they don't have the balls.

DOROTHY: Different times, I guess. And you can't talk to Laurie about it. She's going to ruin the rest of her life by doing these speeches. I want to say to her, 'don't you realize the effect this will have on your future and your daughter's future?' She shouldn't be involved. She'll get him blacklisted. But I won't say anything.

JAKE: I'm sure of one thing though.

DOROTHY: What's that?

JAKE: Yes!!!!

DOROTHY: Shoot!!!

JAKE: ... (*Continues*) If it meant us not having a place to go, your old man would have done the same thing. He did things the right way.

DOROTHY: And all any of it ever got him was poor health and an early grave.

JAKE: He also got you. (*Pats her leg*).

DOROTHY: Yes, he did. And so do you.

JAKE: Are you going to tell the kids, or am I?

DOROTHY: What? Is that woman's work too??

JAKE: I'll tell em'.

DOROTHY: Good. I'll be right there beside you.

JAKE: What do I say?

DOROTHY: Jake, would you like me to tie your shoes for you too?

JAKE: I'm serious Dorothy?

DOROTHY: The truth Guy –

JAKE: – I'm Jake!

DOROTHY: – Jake – Guy same thing! – Tell them you took early retirement because you love your wife so much ...

JAKE: Oh, that's what I'll say all right!!! (*laughing*)

DOROTHY: Well, if you don't want to be charming about it, you can just tell them that you took early retirement because of all the layoffs before, like some of the guys did, to make room for 'YOU young people.' And because you're not working anymore, we can't help them out with the bank, but they are more than welcome to come stay in our basement till they get on their feet.

JAKE: Why do I ever need to say anything? You do it so well.

DOROTHY: You'll be fine Jakey.¹⁰¹ (*Knock at the Door*) Oh, they're here.
(*Leaves the room to answer the door*) Turn that goddamned TV off. It's family time!

JAKE: (*Reclining in his chair, taking a sip of his beer prolonging his hockey time.*) Yes dear. Coming Dear. YES!!!!!!¹⁰²

JAKE and DOROTHY become LAURIE and GUY¹⁰³...

¹⁰¹ **QLAB 74:**

Audio: Door Knock [Stock Sound Effect]

¹⁰² **LIGHTS:** Look 12 – Transition

QLAB 75:

Audio: Love Me Tender – Linda Rondstadt

Photo: Smokeless Smoke Stack [Wigmore Collection]

Interview Clip: Jamie West: *"What happens is, because of the legacy, we have three or four generations of-of people working in the company. So, you can't look your dad in the eye if you gave away what he fought for for eight months, right? You can fight and lose, but you can't just accept it, right? 'Cause what do you do, right? That's-that's your family. And like I was saying earlier, your family often is all people who moved here to work in the mines."*

¹⁰³ **LIGHTS:** Look 2 – Night Time

Scene 9 - Late One Evening Before the Move

LAURIE: I hear little feet on the stairs Janice. Don't make me come up there before I come up there!

The door opens enter GUY.

GUY: Hi.

LAURIE: Hi. How was the hotel?

GUY: Didn't go. Helped Larry at his Dad's. You OK?

LAURIE: I'll be fine. Everything we can take is packed up.

GUY: That's good.

LAURIE: Didn't take long. Not much space over there.

GUY: How did Janice take it?

LAURIE: (*Shaken*) I told her we were going to Grandma and Grandpas tomorrow for a long sleepover –

GUY: That's probably the best way.

LAURIE: Some help around here would have been nice.

GUY: Laurie.

LAURIE: Or more notice about how bad things are. Maybe I could have helped.

GUY: Like I already said, I make the money, it's my business. We fell too far behind with the strike –

LAURIE: – Bullshit Guy! Foreclosures don't happen overnight.

GUY: Laurie, it's going to be fine –

LAURIE: Oh, Guy shut up.

GUY: We talked about this.

LAURIE: No, you talked about this. Now Janice and I just have to leave everything behind and move in to your parent's basement.

APPENDIX A

GUY: It's just till we get on our feet.

LAURIE: I have to leave my Dad's goddamned kitchen table!

GUY: It's just a table.

(Awkward Pause)

GUY: Ok, I better get going.

LAURIE: What do you mean?

GUY: I need you to stay calm OK?

LAURIE: I'm calm.

GUY: It's got to be tonight. I have to meet Larry in Elliot Lake, and we start early tomorrow.

LAURIE: What are you talking about?!!!!

GUY: Keep it down. I told you –

LAURIE: – no you TOLD me you needed to be READY tonight.

GUY: I'm sorry.

LAURIE: You might as well stay till morning so we can see you off.

GUY: I can't. The shift starts too early.

LAURIE: Oh.

GUY: I'm sorry.

LAURIE: Well it's nine-thirty...

GUY: Do you think she's still asleep?

LAURIE: I'll check.

(goes to do so and returns quickly)

LAURIE: She's out like a light.

GUY: I'll call tomorrow.

APPENDIX A

LAURIE: That would be nice.

GUY: (*Gives her a kiss on the cheek*) We'll figure this out.

LAURIE: I know we will.

LAURIE lights a candle to see better.

GUY: (*jokingly*) Why did we ever pay our hydro bill when we've got perfectly good candles?

LAURIE: No kidding. At least I can see the cards finally.

GUY: Who's winning?

LAURIE: Very funny smartass.

GUY: Goodnight Laurie.

LAURIE: Goodnight Guy. Call me when you get in. I'll be up.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ **QLAB 76:**
Photo: Smoking Smoke Stack [Wigmore Collection]

Scene 10 - The Kitchen Table / Where It All Began

GUY exits.

LAURIE: We are always connected to what's under our feet.¹⁰⁵

She breathes and closes her eyes overwhelmed. She rests her head. She falls asleep.

Phone Rings Waking LAURIE from her sleep.¹⁰⁶ She answers the phone:¹⁰⁷ ...

LAURIE: Hello? *(pause)* Yeah, my phone still works *(laughs)*, for now. Hi Louise. Everything OK?

(listens)

Oh, thank you so much. No, I'm fine.

(listens)

Pretty much have everything under control. All ready to go. Yep.

(listens)

It's only temporary, till we get on our feet.

(listens)

Yeah, that's the hardest part.

(listens)

Thanks for checking in. It means a lot.

(listens)

More than you know. I'll see you soon. Okay Bye.

LAURIE hangs up the phone and sits in silence.¹⁰⁸

THE END

¹⁰⁵ **QLAB 77:**

Audio: Phone Ring [Stock Sound Effect]

¹⁰⁶ **LIGHTS:** Board #2 – Look 13 – Phone Call Special

¹⁰⁷ **QLAB 78:**

Audio: Phone Ring OUT

¹⁰⁸ **LIGHTS:** Look 9 – Blackout

QLAB 79:

Audio: *This Land is Your Land* -Arlo Guthrie/Odetta/Will Geer

Photo: United Steel Workers Logo

Interview Clip: Carol Mulligan Montage: *"We are first, last, and always, a mining camp. Mining didn't kill him, but it didn't help. We really are connected to what's under our feet, whether we know it or not."*

APPENDIX A – *One Day Stronger* PROJECTIONS

ACT ONE

QLAB 1
Smokeless Smokestack [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 4
Lively House [courtesy of Jan Heppner]

QLAB 5
Lively Kitchen [courtesy of Jan Heppner]

QLAB 5
Woman in Kitchen [see AO index #1]

QLAB 6
Man with Family [see AO index #2]

QLAB 12
Creighton Mine [Internet Image]

QLAB 13
Mules Outside the Mine [Internet Image]

QLAB 15
Blue Mine-Mill Sticker

APPENDIX A

QLAB 16
1950s Jackleg [Internet Image]

QLAB 16
Mine Cart [Internet Image]

QLAB 16
Falconbridge Ladders #1 [Internet Image]

QLAB 17
Mine Tunnel [Internet Image]

QLAB 16
Falconbridge Muckers [Internet Image]

QLAB 16
Miners with Jackleg [Internet Image]

QLAB 16
Falconbridge Ladders #2 [Internet Image]

QLAB 24
News – Mayor Asks to Pray
*Sudbury Star, 19 Sept 1958, 3 (2))

APPENDIX A

QLAB 26

News – Pray to End Strike *(22 Oct 1958, 3)

QLAB 29

Couple with Soup Pot [see AO index #3]

QLAB 29

Men Lining Up for Vouchers
[see AO index #5]

QLAB 30

News – Reds Recruit 7yr Old
[Toronto Telegram, 7, Dec, '59]

May Exchange Union Vouchers For Potatoes

ASLDA — The Bowdoin Valley's potatoes may be exchanged for May-Mill union vouchers, if the current strike of the union against the International Nickel Company continues for the next few weeks.

A meeting of May-Mill representatives and Bowdoin Valley farmers was held in this village to discuss an agreement whereby the union would exchange vouchers for potatoes for the strikers.

Union officials Albert Gaudet and Bill Gaudet outlined the plan to the farmers in the Bowdoin Valley township municipal hall. They said payment would be in the form of vouchers supplied by the union.

Shipments to Sault Ste. Marie and other areas were discussed. A. Gaudet, a farmer and Bowdoin Valley township Council member, was chairman at the meeting.

QLAB 28

News – Vouchers for Potatoes * (7 Oct 1958, 1)

QLAB 29

Man Collecting Voucher [see AO index #4]

QLAB 29

Security Checking Strikers
[[see AO index #6]

QLAB 30

News – Strike is Suicidal * (22 Sept 1958, 1)

APPENDIX A

QLAB 30

News – Solski on Frood Picket
 *(25 Sept 1958, 1)

QLAB 36

Handing Out Food [see AO index #7]

QLAB 36

Man Looking at Pants [see AO index #9]

QLAB 36

Picket Line/Decent Contract [see AO index #11]

QLAB 31

Door with Light Underneath [Stock Photo]

QLAB 36

Man Collecting Food [see AO index #8]

QLAB 36

Strike Vote Ballot [see AO index #10]

QLAB 36

Men Gathered at Line [see AO index #12]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 36

Men with Sacks Walking [see AO index #13]

QLAB 36

Picket Line Abbey Road [see AO index #14]

QLAB 36

Two Men with Strike Sign [see AO index #15]

QLAB 36

Men in Picket Booth [see AO index #16]

QLAB 36

Men Outside INCO gates [see AO index #17]

QLAB 36

Empty INCO Parking Lot [see AO index #18]

QLAB 37

Turkey at Grocery Store [see AO index #19]

QLAB 37

Dad & Child with Turkey [see AO index #20]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 37
Union Hall [see AO index #21]

QLAB 48
Sign on Car [see AO index #22]

QLAB 48
Outside Queen's Park [see AO index #23]

QLAB 48
Troubadour [see AO index #24]

QLAB 48
People Killed by INCO [see AO index #25]

QLAB 48
Women at Arena [see AO index #26]

QLAB 48
Mayor at Arena [see AO index #27]

QLAB 48
Group of Women at Arena [see AO index #28]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 48
Man Voting [see AO index #29]

QLAB 54
Men with Many Ballots [see AO index #30]

QLAB 54
We Won [see AO index #32]

QLAB 55
Blue Mine-Mill Sticker

QLAB 49
Bright Light through a Doorway [Stock Photo]

QLAB 54
Child Welcome Back [see AO index #31]

QLAB 54
End Strike [see AO index #33] (adapted)

ACT TWO

QLAB 59
Solidarity Benefit Flyer
[Wigmore Collection] - Edited

QLAB 60
Picket Line [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 60
Effigy [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 61
Gifts [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 60
People vs. INCO [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 60
Corn Roast 2 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 60
Corn Roast 1 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 61
Christmas [Wigmore Collection]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 61
Poster Photo [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 61
Burning Effigy [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Bean Supper 2 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Bean Supper 4 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 61
Wives singing at corn roast [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Bean Supper 1 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Bean Supper 3 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Pollution Sign [Wigmore Collection]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 64
Picket Line 1 [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 64
Picket Shed [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 65
Cans [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 65
Wives Singing [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 65
Cat Speaking [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 65
Dave Patterson [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 65
Wives Supporting Strike [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 71
Women of '78 Photo Montage Part 1
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 72
Women of '78 Montage Part 2
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 72
Women of '78 Montage Part 2
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 72
Women of '78 Montage Part 2
[Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 73
Fair Share Sign [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 73
Plant Gating [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 73
Joan & Heather [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 73
March in '78 Smelter [Wigmore Collection]

APPENDIX A

QLAB 73
Wives Meeting [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 73
1979 Guy Lafleur Playoff Game Image [Internet]

QLAB 75
Smokeless Smokestack [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 76
Smoking Smokestack [Wigmore Collection]

QLAB 79
United Steelworkers Logo

APPENDIX A

INDEX OF ARCHIVES OF ONTARIO PHOTO REFERENCES [AO Index]

#1 Mrs. Anne Allison, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #179, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#2 Jack Allison, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #177, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#3 Mr. and Mrs. Gordie Taylor, [photograph], The Toronto Daily Star (source), December 19, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #41, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#4 Issuing food vouchers, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #50, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#5 Issuing food vouchers, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #47, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#6 Chief Bert Haig at Copper Cliff gate, [photograph], Fall 1958, Box 24, File SR2, #21, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#7 Arrival of truckload of non-perishable food, [photograph], The Sudbury Daily Star (source), November 25, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #53, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#8 Harry Edwards distributing food, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #54, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#9 Gordie Taylor, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #44, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#10 Counting strike vote ballots, [photograph], Sudbury Daily Star, September 13, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #1, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#11 Pre-Strike walkout at Garson Mine, [photograph], September 19, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #4, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#12 First day of 1958 INCO strike, [photograph], The Sudbury Daily Star (source), September 24, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #7, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#13 First day of 1958 INCO strike, [photograph], September 24, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #9, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#14 Local 598 on the picket line at Copper Cliff smelter, [photograph], September 24, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #11, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#15 Outside the Local 598 Mine Mill Hall, [photograph], September 23, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #14, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

APPENDIX A

#16 Picket station, [photograph], Fall 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #17, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#17 Picket line at Frood gate, [photograph], Fall 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #30, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#18 Copper Cliff during the strike, [photograph], Fall 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #35, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#19 Buying a Christmas turkey, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #175, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#20 Buying a Christmas turkey, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #176, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#21 Issuing food vouchers, [photograph], September 24 - December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #51, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#22 Guy Chute and John Roberts in Queen's Park cavalcade, [photograph], Sudbury Daily Star (source), December 2, 3, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #59, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#23 Cavalcade to Queen's Park, [photograph], December 3, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #74, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#24 William 'Red' Sproule plays the guitar, [photograph], The Telegram (Toronto) (source), December 3, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #79, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#25 Cavalcade to Queen's Park, [photograph], December 3, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #96, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#26 Meeting of Mine Mill Wives, [photograph], December 10, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #107, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#27 Local mayors and reeves at a 'back-to-work' meeting, [photograph], Sudbury Daily Star (source), December 12, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #109, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#28 "Back-to-Work" Meeting, [photograph], The Sudbury Daily Star, December 12, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #111, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#29 John Martin votes on terms of agreement, [photograph], December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #168, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#30 Norman Dupuis and William Boyuk with 'yes' votes, [photograph], December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #172a, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

APPENDIX A

#31 Roger Simard with Mike Solski, [photograph], December 20, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #166, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#32 Marie Thibault, [photograph], December 20, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #159, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

#33 John Laframboise, [photograph], The Toronto Daily Star (source), December 22, 1958, Box 69, File 58ST, #153, F1280-10-1, Mike Solski Fonds, Archives of Ontario.

Sudbury Interviews Table

NAME	AGE	GENDER	PLACE OF BIRTH	PLACE OF RESIDENCE	OCCUPATION	DATE OF INTERVIEW	LOCATION OF INTERVIEW
IN-PERSON INTERVIEWS							
Ron Brunette	73	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Mechanic Inco	20-Jul-17	Ron's home
Essie Byrne	93	Female	Kilronan, Ireland	Sudbury Ontario	Housewife	27-Jul-17	Essie's seniors residence
Patrick Byrne	68	Male	Kilronan, Ireland	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Teacher	06-Jul-17	Pat's home
Dennis Dowdall	73	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Trades Inco	22-Jun-17	Gus' Restaurant
Linda George	60	Female	Liverpool, England	Sudbury Ontario	Housewife	26-Oct-17	Gus' Restaurant
Richard Gouin	70	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Gogama Ontario	Retired Miner Inco	29-Jul-17	Gus' Restaurant
Jan Heppner	65	Female	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Teacher	03-Jul-17	Home of Matthew Heiti
Stephen Heiti	69	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Social Worker	05-Jul-17	La Fromagerie Restaurant
Mick Lowe	70	Male	Omaha, Nebraska	sudbury Ontario	Retired Journalist	14-Jul-17	Pioneer Manor residence
Laurie McGauley	61	Female	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Professor Laurentian U	12-Jul-17	Laurie's home
Carol Mulligan	65	Female	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Journalist	22-Aug-17	Old Rock Café
Cathy Mulroy	62	Female	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Inco Employee	06-Nov-18	Hard Rock Gastropub
Bryan Murray	77	Male	Truro, Nova Scotia	Sudbury Ontario	Retired Inco Employee	22-Jun-17	Home of Barbara Beausoleil
Steve Saari	39	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	Vale Employee	24-Jun-17	Home of Matthew Heiti
Ron Tough	78	Male	Aberdeen, Scotland	Sudbury Ontario	Actor	20-Jun-17	Ron's home
Jamie West	45	Male	Sudbury, Ontario	Sudbury Ontario	NDP MPP Sudbury	01-Nov-17	Jamie's office

Interview Questions: Community Members

Life History Interview

Family

How far back in time do stories go back within your family? Were you told stories about your great-grandparents? Where are they from? When did these stories get told? Did you know your grandparents? How did they earn a living? Did they help bring you up? Were you close to them? Tell me a bit of your earliest memories of them? **What did they do for a living?** Where were they from? **How did you end up in Sudbury?** For those of you who settled in Sudbury, what brought you here? What were your first impressions? How were you received? What was most difficult in coming to Sudbury? Where did you find support? Did Sudbury become home? If not, why not? If so, when?

Childhood

Can you describe your childhood neighbourhood to me? Describe your house? What do you remember about your childhood home? Who lived in the house? What was it like growing there? Was it a good place to grow up? Was it safe for children? Youths? Where could you/couldn't you play? Did you ever sneak into places where you were not supposed to go? Are there any distinctive sounds or smells that remind you of these times?

School

Where did you go to school? What was it like? While you were at school did you have any part-time jobs? Where did teenagers in your neighbourhood hang-out/play sports/etc.? Was this typical? What did you want to do when you grew up? Did you want to follow in your father's/mother's footsteps? What did they want you to do?

Work

What chores did you have to do at home growing up? When did you start to earn wages? How did you get the job? Was it hard work? What other jobs did you have early-on?

When did you leave your parent's home? How did you make your living? **Tell me about the first time that you got a full-time job?** Was it through family connections? Do you remember your first day at work? What did you do there? Describe your workplace. Was it dangerous work? If so, tell us why. Did people play practical jokes on each other? How did people make work more fun? Was it ever nasty?

Did you work with others from the neighborhood? Did men and women work together? Anglophones and Francophones? Different races or ethnic groups? Did the workforce change over time? Did you like working there? What did people do during lunch/on break/after work? Were there nearby restaurants or taverns?

Was there ever any conflict at work? How did it play itself out? Did you belong to a trade union? If so, were you active in it? **Did you every go on strike?** Were there hard-times (layoffs, etc.)?

APPENDIX C

Did you have other family members in the workplace? Did the **older generation** get along with your generation at work? How about **those who came after you**? Did people's work ethic change over time? If so in what ways?

Strikes

How did strikes in Sudbury affect your career/life? Which particular strike to you most closely associate with? Why? How does it compare to others?

If you participated in one directly or indirectly, please describe what that time was like? What was your involvement? How did it impact your life? The life of your family? Did you feel the same way at the beginning as compared to when it ended? How do you feel about it now? Did you receive strike pay/support? How did your family react to the news? Do you have any mementoes? Why did the strike happen? Could it have been avoided? Did the community or the union help your family through this crisis?

Any stories, your own or from other people that you would like to share? Has your opinion of these events changed over time? Do you agree with **what you read in the newspapers** (*Sudbury Star*, *Globe and Mail* or *Toronto Star*) or in books about strikes as compared to your experience? If you were **to see a play or a movie about these experiences**: A. Which actor would you cast to play you? B. What story would you like to see? What wouldn't you like to see? What would be a must?

APPENDIX D

July 14, 1951

We have been talking of selling our house and moving to Lively. That's about 2 miles from Abe's work. Where we are is 19 miles one way to work and it's too hard on both Abe and the car. We can sell our house and get a new one at Lively. It's a whole new INCO town all company houses. We want a 6 room house. They are all modern; basement furnace, running hot and cold water, 3 piece bath, and insulated very warm. So we think we are better off to move there than Abe and Billy are close to the work. I hate to leave my good garden, but I think we can make a good garden down there too.

We all joined the Lutheran church this spring and got Billy, Vic, and Verna baptized. Leonard was baptized in Belleville United Church. So now we all go to church Sunday morning. We think it's very nice to do that. It's a little different customs than our church but it's the same Bible that we were taught from. We have a very nice old Minister too. He's just like a regular old grandfather to all.

Next year Verna and Victor both go to high school in town. They built a great big new one. It cost over a million dollars, but there is everything in it you can think of. Sudbury sure is booming all over.

One of Jake Rempel's daughters got married and moved to Sudbury so we have at least someone here from our people. She was here last night. Everything is very new to her yet. I often wonder that not more Lowe Farm people come here as there is so much jobs waiting here. Mining and carpentry. Like at Lively they are building about 2000 new homes, stores, churches and schools. It is sure nice of the INCO company to do that as that rent is only half as much as in Sudbury but only miners from Creighton mine can rent them. They build sidewalks, lawns and garages for every house. We might move there in the beginning of September. Vic and Verna get their bus fare paid to high school in Sudbury till we get a high school in Lively. That amounts to about \$100.00 a year here at Minnow Lake to Sudbury for the 2 of them, but the Minnow Lake school board pays that here too instead of building a high school here.

Love, Netta

Artist Interview Questions

Rick: *(something like)* Here's what I'd like to ask you about. I'm going to try to get a sense from you in terms of what performing history means ... for you. You are uniquely positioned at this stage to speak to the experience of acting in an historical play ... You live here locally and have a sense of your town ... etc.

First let me ask you about your **background**. (general)

How far back in time do stories go back within your family? Were you told stories about your great-grandparents? Where are they from? When did these stories get told? Did you know your grandparents? How did they earn a living? Did they help bring you up? Were you close to them? How did you end up in Sudbury? Tell me a bit of your earliest memories of them? What did they do for a living? Where were they from?

Where and when did you grow up? How did you end up in Sudbury? What are your first impressions of living in this town? Is Sudbury your home? If so, why? What did your parents do for a living? What did your grandparents do for a living?

Did you grow up affected by or aware of the labour movement? Strikes? Labour agitation? How do you react to the statement that Sudbury is first and foremost a “mining camp”?

Are there any distinctive sounds or smells that remind you of Sudbury?

Artistic Labour [What they DO]

How it feels to be an **artist in Sudbury**? What is your craft? Why do you do it? Why is it important to you? Do you consider it labour? If yes, how so? If no, why not?

Historical consciousness [like history?]

Were you interested in history growing up? Are you now? What explains your level of interest (either way)? **Does a sense of the past inform your work as an artist?** If so, how?

[Okay, now that you have kept it broad, you can get very specific and focused. And explain that to the actors: **that you want to reflect now on the specifics of the play and the moment you are sharing with them.**]

How would you describe your awareness of Sudbury's history? Where you aware of the history that is the subject of this play: labour strikes in Sudbury?

Were the stories told in the play ones that seemed familiar to you? **Were there stories that surprised you?** Why do you think some things were familiar and others less so?

APPENDIX E

Did performing the stories re-shape your awareness of this history in any way? **Did your notions of this history shift** or change as a result of performing in the staged reading of this play?

What (if at all) do you feel is significant about this work?

Describe your experience 'playing in the past.'

So, the last couple of questions were asking you to think about the performance itself and the role you played in it.

As an artist, what are some challenges and/or opportunities while tackling this work? **Did anything surprise you?** What approaches would you take (if any) moving forward, that differ from your habitual practice? How would you articulate **the value of this work** from your point of view?

Do you see yourself in this story?

Could I get you to describe to me what you feel this story is about?

How do you feel your audience responded to the performance? What stuck out to you from the talkback?

What worked well? What is missing? What do you think could have been explored further from the creation side of things?

Since you are helping to create a play about this subject, A. Which type of character would you most like to play? ... or most identify with. Which moments? Which moments were you less connected to?

Which story shouldn't we be telling?

What is an absolute must for this creative process?

What are your general thoughts after having worked through this process?

How does this experience compare to some of your other experiences working in theatre?

Final thoughts for posterity? What ideas do you have as the project moves forward? You would like to see ...?

INCO 'Solidarity Benefit' Flyer (edited)

INCO

SOLIDARITY BENEFIT

Speakers:

Laurie Piquette—Inco Strike Wife
Joan Kuyek—President of *Women Helping Women*
Linda Obansawin—*Wives' Strike Support Committee*

Entertainment & Party

OISE Auditorium
252 Bloor St. W., Toronto

\$2.00 Cover Charge

Friday December 8th
8 P.M.

Sponsored By:
United Steelworkers Local 6500
Organized Working Women
International Women's Day Committee
Ontario Federation of Labour
NDP Women's Committee

One Day Stronger Program

SUDBURY THEATRE CENTRE 2019.2020 SEASON

ALIVE

FOUR

ONE

Subscriptions
on sale NOW!

26 SEP - 6 OCT 2019
**Playing With Fire:
The Theo Fleury Story**
written by Mitchell McElhinney
5-14 DEC 2019
Dickens' A Christmas Carol
adapted for the stage by Jeremy Moeb
20 - 29 FEB 2020
**From Judy to Betty:
The Stars of Old Hollywood**
written - performed by Rebecca Perry
16 - 25 APR 2020
Inner Elder
created - performed by Michelle Thrush

stc
sadburytheatre.com
705.674.8381
JOHN McLENNAN Artistic Director

THEATRE
One Day Stronger
NEWS

No. 1 Vol. 1 SUDBURY, ON June 2019

Feature

HISTORY ALIVE!

"A play is a blueprint of a past event, a way of creating and rewriting history through the medium of literature. Since history is a recorded or remembered event, theatre ... is the perfect place to 'make history'."

Suzan Lori-Parks

I am so pleased to welcome each of you to experience *One Day Stronger*, the final theatrical staging and culmination of my *Sudbury Strike* story dissertation project. This has been a very rewarding journey that began at Mount Royal University in Calgary. The prof showed an NFB documentary called *The Uncommon* (1996) and I distinctly recall hearing about West Red, Wembley Drive, and Sudbury. As my attention began to fixate on this exciting and rich topic, it dawned on me that I had absolutely no clue that this history, Sudbury's history, happened in my hometown.

I wrote my first 'snarky play' *What Struck in '58'* for *Programmer* in 2013. Afterwards, I was struck by the

passionate discussion that followed. Especially in instances where the play triggered difficult emotions and memories. I next wrote my MA paper about Mine Mill Local 598 and its cultural programs during the 1950s. I wished to continue my research in to this area of cultural history at the doctoral level. I also wanted to take a practice-based approach to the relationship between the arts and historical study using my background in theatre.

I needed to hear more stories. I wanted to facilitate a situation where people in the community could engage in dialogue and exchange points of view about their experiences living, working and striking in Sudbury. This play is such an attempt. Its characters, themes, anecdotes and much of the text were developed using interviews with Sudburians. I hope you recognize or can share your own stories. Thank you for participating in this continuing discussion.

RICK DUTHIE, Historian

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP

Miriam Cusson Laurie & Orlan
Matthew Reid Gay & Orlan
Rick Duthie Director/Playwright
AJ Laframme Production Designer
Caitlin Heppner Graphic Designer
Gregory Tremblay Videographer

APPEAL FOR FEEDBACK

As part of the research for this project, feedback about your experience today is essential. Please be sure to fill out your questionnaire included in this program. If you did not have one in your program, they can be found at the Box Office table. Thank you!

DECEMBER 3, 1958 - in front of the Legion, a group of men. On the right is Paul Chane.

Mine Mill members (SOURCE: *The Tele-Columbian* - *gram - Toronto*)

Canada

Carleton University

ONSTAGE THIS WEEK:

NAME: Miriam Cusson
ROLE: Laurie / Various
Miriam Cusson is a bilingual director, playwright, actor, designer and literary adviser.

Credits : ACTING- *Violette sur la terre* by Carole Fréchet (2001), *Stuff on les aventures en catalogue (2007) and Front Life : Fred et Crêdo de l'écologie (2010)* by Miriam Cusson and Méliana Rockham; *À la gauche de Dieu* by Robert Mariner (2009), *À la mort* by Sarah Magneron (2013) and *Blind Nickel Pig* by Lara Bradley (2017). WRITING AND ID-REACTING: *Trounquille* with FFF (2005); *Non here du Nord* (2013); *Parmi les éclats-Shattered* (2017).

OTHER: Miriam also teaches at Laurentian University's Programme de théâtre, at the Manitoulin Conservatory for Creation and Performance as well as Ottawa University's Département de Théâtre.

The Creative Mines

NAME: Rick Duthie
ROLE: Director / Playwright
ABOUT: Rick is an actor, performer, playwright and academic. He has performed and written for audiences in Sudbury, Calgary and Toronto. He is currently a PhD Candidate studying Public History at Carleton University. For his dissertation, he researched, scripted and is now (right this instant!) staging a site-specific historical play that focusses on the postwar incidences of strikes in Sudbury. He is thrilled to integrate his artistic passion and practice with his academic interests. He wishes to use theatre and performance as a means of exploring the past. He looks forward to an ongoing dialogue between artists, audiences, academics and activists.

OTHER: Rick has a Master of Arts from Laurentian University and a diploma in Acting from Sheridan College.

(Continued on next page)

AUGUST 20, 1938 - Comic from Mine Mill News, Page 2

NAME: Matthew Heit
ROLE: Guy / Various
CREDITS: Acting: Receiver of Wreck (Playsmelter), Closer (Encore Theatre), Macbeth (Bard in the Barnabas), Upcoming: Scrooge in A Christmas (Playsmelter), Plague (Crestfallen), Masking in the Drift, Black Dog 4 vs. the wild (STC), Avianix (Curbbox Theatre).

Carol (STC 2019) / Directing: Blind Nickel Pig (Playsmelter), #TheWaterTower (STC), The Monument (Encore Theatre) / Writing: Receiver of Wreck (Playsmelter), Plague (Crestfallen), Masking in the Drift, Black Dog 4 vs. the wild (STC), Avianix (Curbbox Theatre).

OTHER: Graduate of Ryerson Theatre School. Teaches Theatre and English at Laurentian University. Writer of the novel The City Still Breathing (Coach House Books). Watch for: Crestfallen's production of *Carzo*, in October 2019.

A Strong Union Means Security

The Creative Mines

(Continued from previous page)

NAME: AJ Laflamme
ROLE: Production Designer
CREDITS: (as a designer) *Cannibal The Musical*, The Rocky Horror Show (Toolkit Productions) (as a Stage Manager)

across Canada with companies such as Soulpepper, The Musical Stage Company, Vancouver Opera, Highlands Opera Studio, Tapestry Opera, Thousand Islands Playhouse, The Globe Theatre, Citadel Theatre, National Arts Centre, Sudbury Theatre Centre, Crow's Theatre, and seven seasons with Canadian Stage.

OTHER: AJ is also a writer and her play, *Empty Boxes*, was produced in Toronto in 2013. She is currently working on her first full length novel.

ABOVE: 1978 INCO STRIKE - Men on the picket line during the strike.
(CREDIT: Dorothy Wignore)

SPECIAL THANKS!

I would like to sincerely thank the following people who participated in the project by sharing their stories:

Ron Brunette	Mick Lowe
Essie Byrne	Laurie Megawley
Pat Byrne	Carol Mulligan
Dennis Dowdall	Cathy Mulroy
Linda George	Brian Murray
Richard Goun	Steve Saari
Stephen Heit	Ron Tough
Jan Heppner	Jamie West
Pat and Leona Skans	
Ukrainian National Federation	
Royal Canadian Legion Branch 76	Bonita Georgekish
Sudbury Theatre Centre	Barbara Beansoleil
Pat The Dog Theatre Creation	Dan Ross
Dr. David Dean	Manny Gavilan
Dr. John Walsh	Judi Strangman
	Rob Kempson
	Dorothy Wignore

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

The Frank H. Underhill Endowment of the Department of History, Carleton University.

Carleton University Department of History

Underhill Publications Fund

Carleton Centre for Public History

LEFT: 1978 INCO STRIKE - Women Supporting the strike perform in a concert for the Union Members.

(CREDIT: Dorothy Wignore)

Office of Research Ethics
4500 ARISE Building | 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6
613-520-2600 Ext: 2517
ethics@carleton.ca

CERTIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ETHICS CLEARANCE

The Carleton University Research Ethics Board-A (CUREB-A) at Carleton University has renewed ethics approval for the research project detailed below. CUREB-A is constituted and operates in compliance with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS2).

Title: Sudbury Strike Stories [Rick Duthie]

Protocol #: 106704

Project Team Members: Rick Duthie (Primary Investigator)

Prof. David Dean (Research Supervisor)

John C. Walsh (Research Supervisor)

Department and Institution: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences\History
(Department of),

Funding Source (If applicable):

Effective: **May 13, 2020**
2021.

Expires: **May 30,**

Please ensure the study clearance number is prominently placed in all recruitment and consent materials: CUREB-A Clearance # 106704.

Restrictions:

This certification is subject to the following conditions:

APPENDIX H

1. Clearance is granted only for the research and purposes described in the application.
2. Any modification to the approved research must be submitted to CUREB-A. All changes must be approved prior to the continuance of the research.
3. An Annual Application for the renewal of ethics clearance must be submitted and cleared by the above date. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the closure of the file. If funding is associated, funds will be frozen.
4. A closure request must be sent to CUREB-A when the research is complete or terminated.
5. During the course of the study, if you encounter an adverse event, material incidental finding, protocol deviation or other unanticipated problem, you must complete and submit a Report of Adverse Events and Unanticipated Problems Form, found here: <https://carleton.ca/researchethics/forms-and-templates/>
6. It is the responsibility of the student to notify their supervisor of any adverse events, changes to their application, or requests to renew/close the protocol.
7. Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans 2nd edition* and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Upon reasonable request, it is the policy of CUREB, for cleared protocols, to release the name of the PI, the title of the project, and the date of clearance and any renewal(s).

In light of the COVID-19 outbreak, The REB has developed guidance for human participants' research at <https://carleton.ca/researchethics/>. However, the situation is evolving rapidly so please check back regularly to keep up with any ongoing changes to this guidance.

Please email the Research Compliance Coordinators at ethics@carleton.ca if you have any questions.

CLEARED BY:

Date: May 13, 2020

Natasha Artemeva, PhD, Chair, CUREB-A

Janet Mantler, PhD, Vice Chair, CUREB-A

Bibliography

Archives of Ontario

Archives of Ontario. F 1271. International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers (Local 598) fonds. Union Executive Correspondence Files.

Archives of Ontario. C 97. Jim Tester fonds. Interviews.

Archives of Ontario. F 1280. Mike Solski Fonds. Photographs.

Newspapers

Northern Ontario Business

The Sudbury Daily Star

The Toronto Telegram

Globe and Mail

Mine Mill News

Photographs

Dorothy Wigmore Collection

Selected from Jan Heppner

Sudbury Interviews June 2017 – November 2018

Conducted by Rick Duthie

Ron Brunette, Sudbury, Ontario, 17 July 2017.

Essie Byrne, Sudbury, Ontario, 27 July 2017.

Patrick Byrne, Sudbury, Ontario, 6 July 2017.

Dennis Dowdall, Sudbury, Ontario, 22 June 2017.

*Linda George, Sudbury, Ontario, 26 October 2017.

Richard Gouin, Sudbury, Ontario, 29 July 2017.

Jan Heppner, Sudbury, Ontario, 3 July 2017.

Stephen Heiti, Sudbury, Ontario, 5 July 2017.

Mick Lowe, Sudbury, Ontario, 14 July 2017.

Laurie McGauley, Sudbury, Ontario, 12 July 2017.

*Carol Mulligan, Sudbury, Ontario, 22 August 2017.

Cathy Mulroy, Sudbury, Ontario, 6 November 2018.

Bryan Murray, Sudbury, Ontario, 22 June 2017.

Steve Saari, Sudbury, Ontario, 24 June 2017.

Ron Tough, Sudbury, Ontario, 20 June 2017.

Jamie West, Sudbury, Ontario, 1 November 2017.

(Assisted by Caitlin Heppner*)

Artist Interviews May 2018 – August 2019

Conducted by Rick Duthie

Miriam Cusson, Sudbury, Ontario, 15 July 2019.

Jenny Hazelton, Sudbury, Ontario, 8 May 2018 and 24 October 2018.

Matthew Heiti, Sudbury, Ontario, 12 May 2018; 19 October 2018 and 24 June 2019.

Caitlin Heppner, Sudbury, Ontario, 25 June 2019.

AJ Laflamme, Sudbury, Ontario, 25 October 2018 and 9 July 2019.

Greg Trembley, Sudbury, Ontario, 8 May 2018.

Artist Journals from October 2018 and June 2019

Jenny Hazelton

Matthew Heiti

Miriam Cusson

Post Workshop and Production Discussion Archival Recordings

Facilitated and audio recorded by Rick Duthie.

*(*Filmed by Greg Trembley)*

*‘*Playsmelter.*’ Workshop reading. Sudbury Theatre Centre, 5 May 2018.

Sudbury Strike Stories. Staged workshop reading. Royal Canadian Legion Branch 76. Sudbury Ontario, 15 October 2018.

**One Day Stronger.* Public performances. National Ukrainian Federation. Sudbury Ontario, (three shows), 21 and 22 June 2019.

Production and Archival Footage

Filmed by Greg Trembley

“*One Day Stronger.*” National Ukrainian Federation. Sudbury, Ontario, 21 June (evening) 2019.

One Day Stronger feedback pamphlets, June 2019.

Follow-up Interviews in Sudbury August – September 2019

Conducted by Rick Duthie

Linda George, Sudbury Ontario, 20 August 2019.

Cathy Mulroy, Sudbury Ontario, 17 July 2019.

Carol Mulligan, Sudbury Ontario, 2 August 2019.

Audio Recorded Interviews, Jim Tester Fonds (C97), Archives of Ontario, Toronto (AO)

Vern and Irene Haluschak, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, Ontario, 31 January 1979.

Stella Haluschak, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, Ontario, 22 November 1978.
Tom and Millie McQuaid, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, Ontario, 11 October 1981.
Pearl Chytuk, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, Ontario, 24 November 1978.
Jack Quenneville, interview by Jim Tester, Sudbury, Ontario, 17 November 1978.
Nels Thibault, interview by Mike Solski, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 25 May 1981.

Secondary Literature

Abella, Irving Martin. *Nationalism, Communism, and Canadian Labour: The CIO, the Communist party and the Canadian Congress of Labour 1935 to 1956*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Agnew, Vanessa. "History's Affective Turn: Historical Reenactment and its Work in the Present." *Rethinking History* 11, no. 3 (2007): 299-312.

Agnew, Vanessa and Juliane Tomann. "Authenticity." In *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, edited by Vanessa Agnew, Jonathan Lamb and Juliane Tomann, 20-24. London: Routledge, 2020.

Ashton, Paul and Paula Hamilton. *History at the Crossroads: Australians and the Past*. Halstead Press, 2010.

Artaud, Antonin. *The Theater and its Double*. Grove Press, 1958.

Barba, Eugenio. *On Directing and Dramaturgy: Burning the House*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Batinski, Michael C. *Pastkeepers in a Small Place: Five Centuries in Deerfield, Massachusetts*. Univ of Massachusetts Press, 2004.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1968.

Bennett, Susan. *Theatre and Museums*. London: Red Globe Press, 2013.

Boal, Augusto. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Translated by Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1979.

Braedder, Anne, Kim Esmark, Tove Kruse, Carsten Tage Nielsen, and Anette Warring. "Doing Pasts: Authenticity from the Reenactors' Perspective." *Rethinking History* 21, no. 2 (2017): 171-192.

Brauer, Juliane and Martin Lucke. "Emotion." in *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, edited by Venessa Agnew, Jonathan Lamb and Juliane Tomann, 53-56. London: Routledge, 2020.

Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, edited by John Willett. Hill and Wang, 1966.

Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space: A Book About the Theatre: Deadly, Holy, Rough, Immediate*. Simon and Schuster, 1968.

Brookfield, Tarah. *Cold War Comforts: Canadian Women, Child Safety, and Global Insecurity*. Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 2012.

Brown, Paul, ed. *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010.

Brundage, William Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*. Harvard University Press, 2009.

Cantrell, Tom and Mary Luckhurst, eds. *Playing for real: Actors on Playing Real People*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Cofman-Simhon, Sarit. "The Suitcase as a Neurotic Container in the Israeli Theatre: The Return of the Wandering Jew." In *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture*, edited by Yana Meerzon, David Dean and Daniel McNeil, 77-99. Springer Nature, 2020.

Cole, Arda L. and J. Gary Knowles. *Lives in Context: The Art of life History Research*. Altamira Press, 2001.

Conard, Rebecca. "Complicating Origin Stories: The Making of Public History into an Academic Field in the United States." In *A Companion to Public History*, edited by David Dean. Oxford: Wiley, 2018.

Conrad, Diane and Anita Sinner, eds. *Creating Together: Participatory, Community-Based, and Collaborative Arts Practices and Scholarship in Canada*. WLU Press, 2015.

Conrad, Margaret, Kadriye Ercikan, Gerald Friesen, Jocelyn Létourneau, Delphin Muise, David Northrup, and Peter Seixas. *Canadians and Their Pasts*. University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Dean, David, Yana Meerzon, and Kathryn Prince. *History, Memory, Performance*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015.

Dean, David. "Theatre: A Neglected Site of Public History?". *The Public Historian* 34.3 (Summer 2012), 21-39.

-----, "Negotiating Accuracy and Authenticity in an Aboriginal King Lear." *Rethinking History*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (2017), 257.

Dudley, Kathryn Marie. *The End of the Line: Lost Jobs, New Lives in Postindustrial America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Dunk, Thomas. *A Working Man's Town: Male Working Class Culture*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

Forsyth, Forsyth and Chris Megson. *Get Real: Documentary Theatre Past and Present*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Frisch, Michael. *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*. Suny Press, 1990.

Gapps, Stephen. "Practices of Authenticity." In *The Routledge Handbook of Reenactment Studies Key Terms in the Field*, edited by Vanessa Agnew, Jonathan Lamb and Juliane Tomann, 183-186. London: Routledge, 2020.

Guard, Julie. *Radical Housewives: Price Wars and Food Politics in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019.

Grotowski, Jerzy. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. London: Methuen, 1968.

Hammond, Will and Dan Steward. *Verbatim*. London: Oberon, 2008.

Hayden, Delores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.

Heron, Craig. "The Labour Historian and Public History." *Labour/le Travail* 45 (2000): 171-197.

High, Steven and David Lewis. *Corporate Wasteland: The Landscape and Memory of Deindustrialization*. Between the Lines, 2007.

High, Steven. "They Were Making Good Money, Just Ten Minutes from Home': Proximity and Distance in the Plant Shutdown Stories of Northern Ontario Mill Workers." *Labour/Le Travail*, 76 (Fall 2015).

-----, "Sharing Authority: An Introduction." *Journal of Canadian Studies*, Vol 43, No 1, (Winter 2009), pp. 12-34.

Hunt, Stephen. "Acting the Part: 'living history' as a serious leisure pursuit." *Leisure Studies* 23, 4 (2004): 387-403.

Hurley, Erin. *Theatre and Feeling*. London: Red Globe Press, 2010.

Jameson, Elizabeth. *All That Glitters: Class, Conflict, and Community in Cripple Creek*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

Kean, Hilda and Paul Ashton. "Introduction: people and their pasts and Public History today." In *People and their Pasts: Public History Today*, edited by Hilda Kean and Paul Ashton, 1-20. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Keck, Jennifer and Mary Powell. "Women into Mining Jobs at INCO: Challenging the Gender Division of Labor." In *Mining Women: Gender in the Development of a Global Industry, 1670 to 2005*, edited by Jaclyn J. Gier and Laurie Mercier, 280-295. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Lowe, Mick. "A Short History of Sudbury Labour." *Northern Miner*. Toronto, Ont: Business Information Group, April 1, 2006.

------. *The Raids*. Montreal: Baraka Books, 2014.

------. *The Insatiable Maw*. Montreal: Baraka Books, 2015.

------. *Wintersong*. Montreal: Baraka Books, 2017.

Macdonald, Cameron Lynn and Carmen Sirianni. "The Service Society and the Changing Experience of Work." In *Working in the Service Society*, edited by Macdonald and Sirianni, 14-15. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.

Magelssen, Scott. *Living History Museums: Undoing History Through Performance*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2007.

Macdonald, Sharon, ed. *A Companion to Museum Studies*, 1st ed., Vol. 12. Oxford Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Martin, Carol. *Theatre of the Real*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

------. "Bodies of evidence," *The Drama Review* 50, no. 3 (2006), 8-15.

Maynard, Steven. "Rough Work and Rugged Men: The Social Construction of Masculinity in Working-Class History." *Labour / Le Travail* 23 (1989).

McIntosh, Robert. *Boys in the Pits: Child Labour in Coal Mining*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

McKeigan, Bruce. "The Rise and Decline of local 6500 United Steelworkers of America," in *Mining Town Crisis: Globalization, Labour and Resistance in Sudbury*, edited by David Leadbeater. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2008.

Meerzon, Yana, David Dean, and Daniel McNeil, eds. *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture*. Springer Nature, 2020.

- Meerzon, Yana. "Precarious Bodies in Performance Activism and Theatres of Migration." In *Migration and Stereotypes in Performance and Culture*, edited by Yana Meerzon, David Dean and Daniel McNeil, 21-38. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- Mercier, Laurie. *Anaconda: Labor, Community, and Culture in Montana's Smelter City*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- Miller, Liz, Edward Little, and Steven High. *Going Public: The Art of Participatory Practice*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017.
- Montgomery, L.M. *Anne of Green Gables*. Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1908.
- Morgan, Cecilia. *Creating Colonial Pasts: History, Memory, and Commemoration in Southern Ontario, 1860-1980*. University of Toronto Press, 2015.
- Morrow, Martin. *Wild Theatre: The History of One Yellow Rabbit*. Banff, Alta.: Banff Centre Press, 2003.
- Mulroy, Cathy. *My View from the Blackened Rocks: A Woman's Battle for Equality and Respect in Canada's Mining Industry*. Sudbury, Tellwell Talent, 2019.
- Murphy, Mary. *Mining Cultures: Men, Women, and Leisure in Butte, 1914-41*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Nelson, Robin. *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances*. Springer, 2013.
- Oddey, Alison. *Devising theatre: A Practical and Theoretical Handbook*. Routledge, 2013.
- Opp, James and John C. Walsh, eds. *Placing Memory and Remembering Place in Canada*. UBC Press, 2010.
- Page, Max and Randall Mason. *Giving Preservation a History Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Palmer, Bryan D. *Working Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1800-1991*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1992.
- Parks, Suzan-Lori. *The America Play and Other Works*. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1995.
- Parr, Joy. *Domestic Goods: The Material, the Moral, and the Economic in the Postwar Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

------. *The Gender of Breadwinners: Women, Men and Change in Two Industrial Towns 1880-1950*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Patrias, Carmela. "Employers' Anti-Unionism in Niagara, 1942–1965: Questioning the Postwar Compromise." *Labour / Le Travail* 76 (2015).

Pollock, Della. "Moving Histories: Performance and Oral history." In *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*, edited by Tracy C. Davis, 120-135. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Portelli, Alessandro. "Afterword." in *Oral History Off the Record: Toward an Ethnography of Practice*, edited by Anna Sheftel and Stacey Zembrzycki, 273-286. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Prendergast, Monica and Juliana Saxton, eds. *Applied Theatre Second Edition: International Case Studies and Challenges for Practice*. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2016.

Radforth, Ian. *Bushworkers and Bosses: Logging in Northern Ontario, 1900-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Ramirez, Bruno. *Inside the Historical Film*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP, 2014.

Ritchie, Donald A. *Doing Oral History*, 3rd ed. Oxford University Press, 2015)

Roach, Joseph. *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1996.

Rosenzweig, Roy and David Thelen. *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. Columbia University Press, 1998.

Sangster, Joan. "The Softball Solution: Female Workers, Male Managers and the Operation of Paternalism at Westclox, 1923–1960." *Labour/LeTravail*, 32 (Fall 1993), 167–199.

------. "Gendering Labour History Across Borders." *Labour History Review* 75, 2 (2010): 143–61.

Saarinen, Oiva W. *From Meteorite Impact to Constellation City: A Historical Geography of Greater Sudbury*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2013.

------. *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: A Historical Geography of the Finns in the Sudbury Area*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1999.

Schechner, Richard. *Environmental Theater*. New York: Hawthorn Books Inc., 1973.

Schlehe, Judith, Michiko Uwe-Bormann, Carolyn Oesterle, and Wolfgang Hochbruck, eds. *Staging the Past: Themed Environments in Transcontinental Perspectives*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010.

Schulze, Daniel. *Authenticity in Contemporary Theatre and Performance: Make it Real*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.

Solski, Mike and John Smaller. *Mine Mill: The History of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Canada Since 1895*. Ottawa: Steel Rail, 1984.

Steedman, Mercedes. "The Red Petticoat Brigade: Mine Mill Women's Auxiliaries and the Threat from Within, 1940s-70s," in *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the creation of Enemies*, edited by Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse, and Mercedes Steedman, 37-55. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000.

------. "Godless Communists and Faithful Wives, Gender Relations and the Cold War: Mine Mill and the 1958 Strike against the International Nickel Company." In *Mining Women: Gender in the Development of a Global Industry, 1670 to 2005*, edited by Jaclyn J. Gier and Laurie Mercier, 233-253. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Storey, Robert. "Unionization Versus Corporate Welfare: The Dofasco Way." *Labour/LeTravail*, 12 (Autumn 1983), 7-42.

Strangleman, Tim. "Work Identity in Crisis? Rethinking the Problem of Attachment and Loss at Work." *Sociology* 46, 3 (2012):411-22.

Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Duke University Press, 2003.

Tester, Jim. *The Shaping of Sudbury: A Labour View*. Sudbury: Mine Mill, 1979.

------. *Son of a Working Man*. Sudbury: Laurentian Publishing Ltd., 1994.

Tilmans, Karin, Frank van Vree and Jay Winter, eds. *Performing the Past: Memory, History, and Identity in Modern Europe*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2010.

Turner, Victor, and Edith Turner. "Performing Ethnography." *The Drama Review: TDR* 26, no. 2 (1982): 33-50.

Tyson, Amy. *The Wages of History: Emotional Labor on Public History's Front Lines*. University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

------. "Men with Their Muskets and Me in My Bare Feet: Performing History and Policing Gender at Historic Fort Snelling Living History Museum." In *Enacting History* edited by Scott Magelssen and Rhona Justice-Malloy, 41-65. University of Alabama Press, 2011.

Wake, Caroline. "Towards a Working Definition of Verbatim Theatre." In *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*, edited by Paul Brown, 2-5. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010.

------. "Verbatim Theatre Within a Spectrum of Practices." In *Verbatim: Staging Memory and Community*, edited by Paul Brown, 6-8. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Currency Press, 2010.

Walsh, John C. and Steven High. "Rethinking the Concept of Community." *Histoire Sociale* 32, no. 64 (November 1, 1999).

Weinblatt, Mark. "Combining Theatre of the Oppressed and Playback Theatre: A Powerful and Delicate Marriage." Mandala Centre for Change (June 2015).
<http://www.mandalaforchange.com/site/resources/articles/combining-theatre-of-the-oppressed-and-playback-theatre-a-powerful-and-delicate-marriage/>.

Zembrzycki, Stacey. *According to Baba: A Collaborative Oral History of Sudbury's Ukrainian Community*. UBC Press, 2014.

------. "The Sinter Plant Boys: Jean Gagnon and the Personal Costs of Fighting to Compensate Sudbury Families." *Histoire sociale*, no. 900 (2019): 1-32.

Theses

Duthie, Rick. "'What's that tutti frutti [dance] stuff?': Mine Mill Local 598's Cold War Cultural Tool." Master's Research Essay. Laurentian University, 2014.

Keyes, Emily. "I Was Here: (Re)Creating History, The Goulbourn Shooting." M.R.E. Essay. Carleton University, 2016.

Lang, John. "A Lion in a Den of Daniels: A History of the International Union of Mine Mill and Smelter Workers, Sudbury, Ontario 1942-1962." Unpublished Masters' Thesis. University of Guelph, 1970.

Macdonald, Amy. "Time Crossing Liaisons: Interpreter/Character Relationships at the Fortress of Louisbourg National History Site." M.R.E. Essay. Carleton University, 2016.

Miller, Jason A. "Divided We Stand: A Study of the Development of the Conflict Between the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers and the United Steelworkers of America in Sudbury, Ontario (1942-1969)." PhD diss. McMaster University, 2003.

Films

A Wives Tale. Directed by Sophie Bissonnette, Martin Duckworth and Joyce Rock. Sudbury, ON: Les Ateliers Audio-Visuels du Québec, 1980.

Harlan County USA. directed by Barbara Kopple, 1976.

The Cradle Will Rock. Directed by Tim Robbins, 1999.

Plays and Productions

Blythe, Alecky and Adam Cork. *London Road*. Directed by Jackie Maxwell. Canadian Stage, January and February 2014.

Duthie, Rick. What Struck in '58, Public workshop presentation, "PlaySmelter," reading series of new plays, Presented by 'Pat The Dog' Theatre Creation. Sudbury, Ontario, May 2013.

Heiti, Matthew. *Mucking in the Drift*. Directed by David Savoy. Sudbury Theatre Centre, October and November 2013.

Kaufman, Moises and the members of Tectonic Theatre Project, *The Laramie Project*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Lill, Wendy. *Glance Bay Miners' Museum*. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1996.

Stoppard, Tom. *Rosencrantz & Guildenstern Are Dead*. London: Samuel French Inc., 1967.

Theatre Passe Muraille. *The Farm Show*. Toronto: Coach House Press, 1976.

Webber, Jennifer Wynne. *With Glowing Hearts*. Winnipeg: Scirocco Drama, 2019.

Williams, Tennessee. *The Glass Menagerie*. New York: Random House, 1945.

------. *A Streetcar Named Desire*. New York: New Directions Publishing Corporation, 1947.

Wright, Richard Bruce. *Eight Men Speak, and Other Plays from the Canadian Workers' Theatre*. New Hogtown Pr, 1976.

Media Interview and Miscellaneous

Brooker, Blake. "One Yellow Rabbit Summer Lab Intensive" (three-week intensive, OYR, Calgary, AB, July 2004.)

Connors, Tom Stompin Tom. "Sudbury Saturday Night." *The Northlands' Own Tom Connors* Audiorecording, 1967.

Duthie, Rick. "History student writes play about mining strikes in Sudbury as part of his thesis." Interview by Markus Schwabe, *Morning North*, October 15, 2018.

<https://www.cbc.ca/listen/shows/morning-north/segment/15614947>.

Heppner, Billy. Untitled Manuscript. Provided by Jan Heppner (July 2017): 1-9.

Murphy, Colleen. "Regional Women Lead Playwriting Master Class." Masterclass, Playsmelter, *Pat the Dog Theatre Creation*. Sudbury, ON, 3 May 2019.