

Pantheatre Professional Performance and Teacher Training

An ANNEX on the Roy Hart Certification & Deontology

Updated 12 March 2024

Roy Hart Certification

Parallel to the *Pantheatre Diploma*, it is possible to train for the Roy Hart pedagogical certification (officially: *Teacher Certification approved by the Roy Hart Centre*). This is a specialized in-depth briefing in Roy Hart's practice and philosophy of the voice - centered on a "canonic" model of what Roy Hart called **a singing lesson**. SEE <http://www.pantheatre.com/pdf/2-formation-pan-RH-canon-gb.pdf>

Requirements to apply through Pantheatre :

- To be in advanced training with Pantheatre.
- To have a broad knowledge of Roy Hart's voice philosophy and practice, and of its different contemporary developments.

The awarding of the Roy Hart certification is done in collaboration and in accordance with the Roy Hart Centre's regulations (obtainable on request).

Practical Notes

The Roy Hart certificate is regulated by the *Roy Hart Centre* (France), and approved in consultation with the applicant, Linda Wise and/or Enrique Pardo as main mentors, and one or two other 'Roy Hart' certified teachers.

The training consists in principle* of two periods:

1. General training in voice, singing, voice performance and choreographic theatre. The work is done in private classes, workshops, courses, internships, master classes and laboratories; it includes cultural studies and supervised dialogues.
2. The Roy Hart pedagogical training is done in private and master classes, with supervision dialogues. It can include classes and workshops with Pantheatre collaborators and other Roy Hart Centre teachers.

* IMPORTANT : each of these two training periods is equivalent to a two-year commitment. The actual duration of these periods depends on each individual, their previous experience and expertise and on their assiduity.

Deontology / Notes by Enrique Pardo

My position regarding the "Roy Hart Voice Teacher" certification, which is the usual name employed by most teachers and the general public, is as follows.

First: the idea of an institutionalization of Roy Hart's teaching is relatively recent and is based on the model of the individual singing lesson - which is both a psychotherapeutic and a musical model: teacher and student alone with a piano for one hour. This model, which I call "canonical", is the reference on which, in my view, a certification using Roy Hart's name should be based. The practice of group classes, voice or corporal, I consider to be a matter for each artist / teacher to determine according to his or her pedagogical and artistic preferences.

That said, when I worked with Roy Hart (from 1968 until his death in 1975), he taught exclusively in group therapy (analysis) meetings, through spoken group exchanges. The vocal / singing work done by his close collaborators was supposed to act as a psychosomatic activating 'motor' for these meetings. His teaching

was, therefore, fundamentally interpretative (hermeneutic). To me, this is a fundamental part of work that calls itself *Roy Hart*.

Two notes commenting an official proposal for the Roy Hart Center's certificate (April 2020) - obtainable on request.

- First, my opposition to bringing back the use of the title *Roy Hart Theatre*. Since the early 1980s I consider myself to have been in the lineage of Roy Hart - but NOT of the *Roy Hart Theatre*. That was HIS theater. This was the reason I created my own theatre: Pantheatre. I also stand by the official decision voted in 1989 not to use the title *Roy Hart Theatre*.
- In the recent proposals (some years ago now) for an APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM of the Roy Hart Center, there was a section titled *Learning Models*, which stated the following:

“The Roy Hart Theatre tradition is based on the principle of transmission through close personal mentoring similar to the models of learning found in the skilled trades, oriental musical and martial arts, and agricultural knowledge transmission.”

I commented, "My own transmission of Roy Hart's work lies at the intersection of performance art and psychoanalysis (broadly defined). It includes but goes far beyond such craft models of transmission. I also situate the notion of *deepening* as posterior to any notion of apprenticeship - in reference to depth psychology.

Let me explain further. In an autobiography (circa 1990) I wrote: “The model of the individual singing lesson, as practiced by Roy Hart’s close collaborators at the time I met and worked with him (1968 to his death in 1975), was a variant to the psychoanalytic models of *transference* prevalent in the 20th century. After Roy Hart’s passing, and uncomfortable with some of the implications, particularly the potentially ambivalent use of therapy, I stopped teaching for several years. I began long dialogues with psychotherapists - which was for me like a third education - which led me to meet with [James Hillman](#) and [Rafael Lopez-Pedraza](#), as well as Charles Boer, Paul Kugler, Ginette Paris, Nor Hall, Sonu Shamdasani and the circle of archetypal (post-Jungian) psychology that was to inspire my work and that of Pantheatre. This was in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Today, along with my collaborators, I insist, without leaving aside the quest for personal self-knowledge, that it is our modes of perception and appreciation, our political and cultural ideas that need therapy (cultural analysis and criticism). Hence the emphasis on mytho-poetic and intellectual challenges, in a work that is otherwise very physical and imaginative.

Of course, there is plenty of craftsmanship in the practical work, but even there I place the accent mainly on culture and meta-psychology. Hence the importance I give to “psychological creativity”. The models cited in the Centre’s *Apprenticeship Program* were mostly technical (agriculture?!). The fact that psychology was not included seemed to me a radical omission. In addition, Roy Hart was explicitly opposed to having his work described as “technical” or “specialized”.

Here I would add something else: Roy Hart was an amazingly charismatic guru; I even say, “an ethical genius”. With him, the mention of “close personal mentoring” falls way short, and there is professional danger in role-playing and watered-down imitation. I say this, knowing perfectly well that mimesis is essential (and inevitable) in pedagogy. Did I imitate him! In psychoanalysis, mimesis (and charisma) are part of the transfer and counter-transfer dynamics. The tact and experience of these dynamics are, for me, the most important aspects in the training of a ‘Roy Hart’ teacher and, again, for me, in any advanced artistic training.

I also add that, in saying that the psychoanalytic model is one of the bases of my teaching, I do not pretend to be a clinical professional, or a healer. In this I follow the thinking of James Hillman (Carl G. Jung's main successor as far as I am concerned) - but also the thinking of Roy Hart, from what I experienced with him. He used to say, with characteristic Talmudic humor: 49% therapy, 51% artistic. The problem is that the use of his work, today, at the Roy Hart Center is almost entirely for personal development and well-being - not artistic. This poses even a problem of deontology.

It should be noted that Roy Hart did not speak of a "voice lesson" but of a "singing lesson": it was a philosophical and militant choice. It is in this sense that I speak of the "canonical model" of the singing lesson - which must include knowledge and experience of its philosophical and psychoanalytical foundations.

A value judgment. Roy Hart's proposal, "singing", is simple, direct and 'genius': to sing is to enact the performative transformation of a feeling, an idea, a fiction. His idea of "singing" includes the dark shadows of humanity: limitations, resistances, violence, not to mention hatred and jealousy. In the poem that Roy Hart made his manifesto - *Biodrama*, (1972), written for him by Serge Béhar, he says: "I aggressed my body in order to get closer to you." (Some years later, during one of Pantheatre's laboratories, James Hillman echoed this by saying: "Body equals resistance".)

I did not meet Roy Hart's teacher, Alfred Wolfsohn (1896 - 1962) so, I do not include here historical references to his roots in German Romanticism, nor to early twentieth century psychosomatics. Plus, to delve deeper into Wolfsohn's and Roy Hart's ideas, one would have to include their Talmudist legacies (both were Jewish) and, in the case of Roy Hart (pseudonym for Ruben Hartstein), the model of Georg Gurdjieff (1866 - 1949).

One conclusion: Roy Hart's idealism is an integral part of my own work. And although it has been now almost fifty years since his death, and I have traveled extensively artistically and philosophically, Roy Hart's singing lesson remains fundamental; I even feel an obligation to convey its essence and practice to my collaborators and those for whom ideas and ideals matter as much as practice - hence my involvement in the 'training' of Roy Hart teachers.

Enrique Pardo, Paris, updated March 12, 2024.

PS. Establishing a "Roy Hart" institutional scheme was not and still is not an easy enterprise. Those interested, can consult the archives of Pantheatre on this question (by request): they include my first editorial version of 2015, and a portfolio of articles and exchanges, some of them highly controversial. See also my BLOG articles, categories [ROY HART and/or VOICE](#).

I am grateful to Annie Murath and Gonzalo Pinto, of *Pantheatre Chile* :
their thorough interrogation helped me define these points.
And to Linda Wise: "We put our heads together".