

I wonder whether there is a need for an ID community. The idea of a specific community as somewhere where everyone knows each other can become very enclosed in on itself.

'I feel welcome straight away. Communities can come with a kind of group thing.' (EW)

To keep the ethos of openness and willingness to experiment, the community either needs to be very large and changeable, or nonexistent. I think this is highlighted by participants (Tonny and Hayley) who comment that there isn't necessarily an ID community, but a tangible potential for one.

Maybe community isn't the word, maybe it's the idea of support. Like a collective? Maybe being an organisation is not what ID should be; maybe it should be a collective. If the main idea is about providing people with support, then it would make more sense to have a collective, still with the core members. Then it would match with what they are able to do in terms of capacity and power. Nothing without onus, but then it's real for the expectations. (TA)

Do you think that perhaps making ID into a collective, because London is so big, it would hinder ID's efforts with exclusivity? To keep a collective a collective, and to ensure parallel thought patterns and ideologies (in order to be able to travel through ideas together) it must remain very small. And then there would have to be some kind of vetting. It's hard enough being an independent artist in London and breaking into the scene. If it was a collective you would have to have something to back you up and make your inclusion in this collective valid. You would already have to have credentials to be involved. It becomes a vicious circle in which only the already successful artists are guaranteed support.

Even though ID has very specific ethos', it still has the potential for two separate parts of it to travel two opposite ways at the same time. Therefore expanding it. So it has to be larger and more disparate than a collective. An example being the What if? Festival where the boundaries of choreography were experimented with and links from ID to other organisations were able to be made.

In a collective you wouldn't have the experience of engaging with people that actually weren't professional artists. I personally think it's enriching to have a range of experiences in a dance class, and can also promote modesty.

'Anyone can come – brings excitement and dynamics to the class. I think that's really refreshing, really different.' (EW)

'ID brings a lot of very different and interesting people, which is good for the building.' (HO)

But then where do you draw the line? If it turns into open/community dance classes it becomes something other than professional development. This could be the tipping point that would require very little pushing to get it off balance.

'You don't want it to start becoming like a cattle market with everyone coming and leaving and not getting involved.' (KL)

It's difficult to find the place where you are open, but not too open – where do you draw that line between inclusivity and a certain amount of exclusivity. Perhaps this is why the slightly ambiguous marketing is a blessing. People have to self assess – self vet themselves in terms of going to a 'professional' dance class so it can be slightly open in the sense that no one is turned away.

'An excellent opportunity to meet another dance community. I think this kind of 'cross pollination' feeds my work.' (anon, on Deborah Hay)

'They (participants) are people who in general would like to know more about themselves. More like self reflection or an awareness towards your context, towards your dancing, towards your spirituality.' (VL)

It is also interesting that, after speaking with some participants, they claimed to have more of a feeling for community after having being interviewed. So perhaps this critical engagement with the organisation and the opportunity to learn more about the SDS/ID divide somehow opens up doors. How and whether it is beneficial to integrate this into the programme is the question.

