

Conclusion

In effect this is a conclusion, however the idea of 'conclusion' would insinuate a set answer, or at least a summary of answers. So this is more of a culmination of the questions that have arisen from my research. All of my interviews had balance and a kind of cyclical continuation to them, drawing parallels between the work, participants, and organisation as a whole. This is where all of the 'more on this later' is collected in, like pieces of a puzzle, to become something tangible. I would not be so brave as to label ID, however this circular hypothesis, be it simplistic and absent of many variables, appears to be at the core of this organisation.

It's all about balance

One thing that has come out of my research is the idea that ID seems to be at the central tipping point between two different places at any given time and within a variety of contexts. I think this is something to do with the fact that the London dance scene, and dance world in general is constantly moving and shifting, constantly challenging and redefining what dance is, therefore ID's direction needs to continue to expand to stay available to the dance artists that need and want to develop their work.

'It's very good at keeping evolving. It's contributing to the evolution of contemporary dance and art.' (HO).

'Because I'm an independent artist I don't rely on institutions, if you become dependent on other people then you are no longer an independent artist. It's great that they are there, I engage with them but they are always changing and progressing. Like the workshop with Tere; it was a certain thing at a certain time with a certain group of people, so if I were to go there now and expect the same thing it wouldn't work in the same way.' (RJ)

Perhaps this is the key – an organisation that supports independent artists needs to keep changing and evolving because the artists themselves keep changing and evolving. And the teachers also do the same, as well as the artists that lead the organisation.

My conversation with choreographer Tonny Ajoup made me think about the fact that there's always a constantly shifting fine line between what is revolutionary and what is overdone. The art world is in constant movement. Techniques in making and performing that are considered 'contemporary' as appose to classical, are in this day and age mostly outdated and are perhaps becoming classical forms themselves; e.g. Cunningham or Graham technique. Even though the concept of moving away from aesthetic dancing remains the same.

'Although it is very versatile, it is a very concrete and stable organisation.' (VL) It's all about exploration, but at the same time, the kind of exploration is very limited as to what they can deliver in terms of style of practice.

'I see it more of a personality. I suppose their input comes from their experience of what they have discovered. At the same time does it compromise their perspective or direction? I suppose it's always juggling that balance.' (AD)

'It's more about allowing you to know yourself and knowing what you want to do.' (TA) Which stems back to Tere's teachings. It's that pivotal point of independence.

'How do you shape something that is ongoing?'
Tere O'Connor