Throughout the 20th century, glass and performance art circled one another, crossing paths and finally melding into something new. Both disciplines in their nascent years as avant-garde idioms, glass and performance met across expressions of identity in body art, through the choreography of the live demonstration heralded by the Studio Craft movement, and in experimental approaches to sound, video, and the stage.

At the turn of the new millennium, the relationship between medium and mode solidified into something more formal and rooted in collaboration, both between artists and with institutions. The performance troupe became a central model of making and paved the way for institutional recognition of this outsider-turned-professional art form. In turn, institutions would become increasingly important, not only in their support for glass performance but in shaping this niche genre.

Over the course of 25 years, from 1990 to 2015, multiple collaborative artist groups were established to explore the performative aspects of the craft. The best known include the B Team (1990–98), the Butter Eaters (1999–2014), the Burnt Asphalt Family (est. 2007), Cirque de Verre (2008–10), the Glass Theater (2012–13), and Flock the Optic (est. 2014). Unified by a desire to explore non-objective process and transcend the educational demonstration (but build upon its inherent spectacle), each of these groups approached their foray into the performative with a unique set of artistic concerns, aesthetics, and goals. Some have since disbanded, members returning to their individual practice to open galleries or to work in institutions; however, some continue expanding as new collaborators join original founders. Together, these troupes, teams, and projects have created an ecosystem within the greater field of contemporary glass art which is increasingly relevant today.

During the same period, numerous institutional hot shops were constructed or expanded, including UrbanGlass, which moved to its current Brooklyn location in 1991 and expanded its facilities in 2013. UrbanGlass has since hosted performances and often has an open call for such projects alongside its gallery program. Most of the glass hot shops and theaters that emerged, however, were and are connected to museums, an interesting commentary on the mission and role of museums in the 21st century. These museum hot shops include the WheatonArts Glass Studio, the oldest of the group, which made the transition seamlessly from a 19th-century glass factory to a place of costumed historical demonstrations (known as Wheaton Village), and finally to a home for artists with the establishment of its contemporary glass residency program in 1977, later to become the coveted Creative Glass Fellowship.

Demonstrations at The Corning Museum of Glass (CMoG) also began in industry, with demonstrations by Steuben glassblowers for other glass professionals. (Steuben’s factory became the site of The Corning Museum of Glass.) Later, public demonstrations with narrative were added; The Studio was established in 1996 and an outdoor amphitheater in the mid-2000s. Most recently, a spacious demonstration theater was included in the construction of the museum’s contemporary glass wing in 2015—notably, within the renovated and decommissioned Steuben factory, which closed in 2011. Established in 2002, the Tacoma Museum of Glass—which instituted performance and video art within its founding mission—has a public-facing hot shop that was equipped for demonstrations from its inception. (The largest in the country, it inspired CMoG’s new facilities.) The Glass Pavilion opened in 2006, with space for hot-glass demonstrations at the Toledo Museum of Art in Ohio.
Most impactful in relation to a discussion of performance in glass was the founding of the Perry Glass Studio in 2011 at the Chrysler Museum of Art in Norfolk, Virginia, and the hiring of Charlotte Potter (Cirque de Verre) as founding programming director. Potter inaugurated Third Thursdays, a public-facing series and incubator program devoted to helping artists develop performance work, the only one of its kind nationally. Even after Potter resigned from her position in 2017, Third Thursdays have continued hosting glass performances, supporting artists with infrastructure and a team of assistants. (Not to mention the U.S.’s unique arena that no other craft has sought to emulate. While watching weaving, woodworking, or painting might not offer the same experience of rupture as glassblowing, which has the benefit of fire and drama, metalworking (specifically blacksmithing and foundry work) offers the most ready comparison, including the fire and muscular choreography. Despite this, glass reigns as the craft that has propelled itself into the public consciousness. (Enter Blow Away. Although there is also Forged in Fire.)

From Student Group to Performance Troupe
Prior to the Studio Glass movement, the glass studio was synonymous with the factory and production. Artists seeking to work in the medium pursued careers as designers. The entrance of the capital-A artist into such spaces in the form of residencies was a 20th-century phenomenon—for example, at Italy’s famed Venini during the 1970s for artists Dale Chihuly, Dick Marquis, and Toots Zynsky. Inspired by these experiences, the first generation of Studio Glass artists sought to re-create them in the U.S.; however, the expense and resources needed to establish and run such a facility made it nearly impossible to set up a home studio and, unlike artists working in clay or fiber, necessitated a relationship with institutions from the onset. UrbanGlass (founded as the New York Experimental Glass Workshop) and Pilchuck Glass School were established as an open-source studio and an education center, respectively, to fulfill this need. Alternatively, these artists built DIY glass furnaces at the university programs they pioneered during the 1960s.

For the groups discussed, evolved), emerged. A student group founded in a spirit of communal learning and innovation, the trio traveled to university campuses across the country and organized what-if-style demonstrations that sought to inspire questions and unconventional thinking among students of glass. Emerging from the 1980s, a period of mass commercialization in the U.S. that did not spare craft, the B Team, whose name centers their exclusion from the A-list art establishment, aimed to disrupt the focus on formal and technical virtuosity and salability that preoccupied this privileged roster of artists and their galleries.

While the collective came of age in the era of the object, the group had connections to Pilchuck and UrbanGlass and thus was exposed to avant-garde explorations of glass through its relationship with sound, video, and experimental processes pioneered by artists such as Dale Chihuly, James Carpenter, Toots Zynsky, and Buster Simpson, among others. In this spirit, the self-styled punks of glass rejected the final object and focused instead on process, experiment, and fun. The group thrived on the performative aspects of the medium: its molten body, inherent choreography, and the spectacle of fire. The performances and installations were of such a scale as to necessitate months of fundraising and, as the decade progressed, full production teams.

While the type of performances enacted by the B Team harken back to experiments taking place at Pilchuck, RHD, and UrbanGlass before them, they occupy a central place in the history of performance glass. First, they formalized their collaboration for the purpose of enacting this type of work, both historical and contemporary, illustrating the centrality of glass and its live presentation to the public face of contemporary art. Public-facing hot-glass demonstration in museums occupies a unique arena that no other craft has sought to emulate. While watching weaving, woodworking, or painting might not offer the same experience of rupture as glassblowing, which has the benefit of fire and drama, metalworking (specifically blacksmithing and foundry work) offers the most ready comparison, including the fire and muscular choreography. Despite this, glass reigns as the craft that has propelled itself into the public consciousness. (Enter Blow Away. Although there is also Forged in Fire.)
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Prior to the Studio Glass movement, the glass studio was synonymous with the factory and production. Artists seeking to work in the medium pursued careers as designers. The entrance of the capital-A artist into such spaces in the form of residencies was a 20th-century phenomenon—for example, at Italy’s famed Venini during the 1970s for artists Dale Chihuly, Dick Marquis, and Toots Zynsky. Inspired by these experiences, the first generation of Studio Glass artists sought to re-create them in the U.S.; however, the expense and resources needed to establish and run such a facility made it nearly impossible to set up a home studio and, unlike artists working in clay or fiber, necessitated a relationship with institutions from the onset. UrbanGlass (founded as the New York Experimental Glass Workshop) and Pilchuck Glass School were established as an open-source studio and an education center, respectively, to fulfill this need. Alternatively, these artists built DIY glass furnaces at the university programs they pioneered during the 1960s.

For the groups discussed, evolved), emerged. A student group founded in a spirit of communal learning and innovation, the trio traveled to university campuses across the country and organized what-if-style demonstrations that sought to inspire questions and unconventional thinking among students of glass. Emerging from the 1980s, a period of mass commercialization in the U.S. that did not spare craft, the B Team, whose name centers their exclusion from the A-list art establishment, aimed to disrupt the focus on formal and technical virtuosity and salability that preoccupied this privileged roster of artists and their galleries.

While the collective came of age in the era of the object, the group had connections to Pilchuck and UrbanGlass and thus was exposed to avant-garde explorations of glass through its relationship with sound, video, and experimental processes pioneered by artists such as Dale Chihuly, James Carpenter, Toots Zynsky, and Buster Simpson, among others. In this spirit, the self-styled punks of glass rejected the final object and focused instead on process, experiment, and fun. The group thrived on the performative aspects of the medium: its molten body, inherent choreography, and the spectacle of fire. The performances and installations were of such a scale as to necessitate months of fundraising and, as the decade progressed, full production teams. (This in a period without the institutional support and framework that would fulfill those needs for later performance groups.) One such well-documented event, Spontaneous Combustion, staged at UrbanGlass in 1997, included performances such as Fear Jar, which incinerated the fears of the audience, written on slips of paper, within a newly blown and still hot jar. In ‘Hot Glass Rain,’ molten glass was poured over a specially fabricated steel umbrella, with team member Thor Bueno below. The next year, the B Team received a Bessie Award from the Dance Theater Workshop for Spontaneous Combustion II, during which member Kelly Lamb danced on a puddle of molten glass while flames burned beneath her feet. While the type of performances enacted by the B Team harken back to experiments taking place at Pilchuck, RHD, and UrbanGlass before them, they occupy a central place in the history of performance glass. First, they formalized their collaboration for the purpose of enacting this type of work, both historical and contemporary, illustrating the centrality of glass and its live presentation to the public face of contemporary art. Public-facing hot-glass demonstration in museums occupies a unique arena that no other craft has sought to emulate. While watching weaving, woodworking, or painting might not offer the same experience of rupture as glassblowing, which has the benefit of fire and drama, metalworking (specifically blacksmithing and foundry work) offers the most ready comparison, including the fire and muscular choreography. Despite this, glass reigns as the craft that has propelled itself into the public consciousness. (Enter Blow Away. Although there is also Forged in Fire.)
conceiving of performance as inherent to the mission of the group. Second, they embarked on full-scale fundraising and organization of production teams, at a time when such a framework was nonexistent for such ephemeral projects. Thus, the B Team helped set the stage for the groups that would follow, creating a model and illustrating the types of gene-splicing works that could be created with glass as its center.

The Butter Eaters were one such group. Founded in 1999 by Levi Belber, Jen Elek, Brian Pike, Joe Thomas, Erich Wolf, and the late Bennett McKnight, in Seattle, Washington, the Butter Eaters had an irreverent attitude infused with a Pacific Northwest vibe that countered the precision and formality required by the day jobs of various members. (Evident in the fact that their name derives from a film by the British Columbia-based, British artist Robbie Miller that featured Thomas eating a pound of butter in an oven.) As put by Belber, “abusing glass after hours was a welcome relief.” The Butter Eaters’ stunts—perhaps a more apt word than performance—were often designed to test the limits of the blowpipe. Over the course of their existence, they would demonstrate the unexpected swapping of water for lubrication, making the use of the blowpipe nearly impossible; and Erica Rosenfeld’s “pack of wolves eating carnivor”, and a complete abandonment of technique, including one demonstration where the group purposefully did everything entirely wrong, to the chagrin of the audience. As put by Elek, “When set free on a shop, we did just that, we got loose…. We were a group that loved each other, blowing glass, sharing food, riding bikes, and… punk rock shows. Our artistic activities mirrored our time and place.”

Butter Eaters Family (Erika Rosenfeld and Jessica Jane Julius) using torches to roast a nectar of four chickens under a chihuahua during Feed Lab at the Chrysler Museum of Art, 2011. photo: echard wheeler.

The Institution

As stated, the resource-heavy nature of glassblowing/performance glass, inherently tied to the spectacle of hot glass, linked the practice to institutions from its onset, affording them with a level of power. However, the relationship has also enabled a freedom of experimentation that is otherwise inaccessible. While the B Team initiated and produced many of their performances, the Butter Eaters were asked to demonstrate at the then-new Tacoma Museum of Glass as well as the Pratt Fine Arts Center in Seattle, among others. They were also invited to be the entertainment at various openings at local shops. Demonstration as entertainment during events, galas, and parties of various kinds is still the primary manner in which glass-based performance is produced. As a result, it is important to consider how acting as “light entertainment” has (or has not) influenced the content of such performances. For Belber of the Butter Eaters, these “dog and pony shows” provided an opportunity to inflect a little “corporate uneasy about the content” the organizations were funding, suggesting a resistance to such influence.10

In 2000, The Corning Museum of Glass inaugurated 2300°, an annual party that brings “live glassmaking” together with food, drink, and live music. The event, which still continues, deliberately centers live glass, toting the line between casual entertainment and main event. As working within such contexts became more commonplace, subsequent groups became more polished, infused with intentionality and purpose. They would be, decisively, performance troupes, and with that a sense of professionalism emerged.

Institutional influence went beyond functioning as venue and producer, however, to acting as an incubator enabling artists to develop ideas and collaborations. Both the Burnt Asphalt Family and Cirque de Verre credit the Creative Glass Fellowship they received at WheatonArts and the flexible and supportive environment created by then artistic director Hank Murta Adams for the creation of their performance groups. One of the requirements of the residences at this time was to host a demonstration for the public. The prompt contributed to the establishment of the Burnt Asphalt Family, whose founding members were in residence in 2007, and Cirque de Verre the next year.

A New Wave of Women-Led Performance

Although there were female members, including the aforementioned Jen Elek and Kelly Lamb, the first wave of performance troupes was male-dominated in membership and masculine in aesthetic, tending toward feats of endurance. Post TEK, however, women took a leading role in shaping the practice. Both the Burnt Asphalt Family and Cirque de Verre skew female. In addition, the conceits that define the aesthetic of each group, midcentury housewife and the circus, respectively, have a feminine flair in their content but arguably also through the very nature of the thematically styled framework. The prominence of women in performance extends to the importance of Charlotte Potter’s role in establishing the Third Thursday series at the Chrysler Museum of Art’s Perry Glass Studio in 2011, and harkens back to the centrality of women in pioneering performance art in the 1970s. For example, implicit and explicit influences for the Burnt Asphalt Family, comprising co-members Jessica Jane Julius and Erica Rosenfeld with the later addition of Emma Salamon (the trio considers themselves the curators and facilitators of the group, which has grown to more than 30 members), include Julia Child (1912–2004), who inaugurated the televised cooking program; Susan Peterson (1925–2009), who ruffled on Child’s work in the form of a live ceramics television series titled Wheels, Riles, and Clay (1964–65);11 and the eminent feminist artist Martha Rosler’s video performance Semiotics of a Kitchen (1975). Using the framework of the midcentury housewife, the Family (as they call themselves) creates culinary-based performances that critique midcentury U.S. culture, specifically traditional gender roles, consumer capitalism, and the rejection of the handmade, while also drawing parallels between the studio and kitchen as hubs of collective labor and community nurturance.12

The Burnt Asphalt Family’s work, which they see inhabiting the arena of performance, happening, and kinetic installation, uses the familiar experience of cooking (and eating) to collapse the barrier between artist and audience. The performance strives to illuminate collaborative labor, challenging notions of the heroic solo artist, and renders visible the opaque process of making attached to an otherwise ubiquitous material. In their hands, an oven is exchanged for hot glass, and foods such as butter-milk-fried chicken, steak, and apple cobblers are cooked under newly blown cloches by artists in cut-glass glasses, skirts, and aprons printed with cherries. (Period-inspired costumes rarely figure into performances anymore, but the use of thematic garmenting is part of the group’s aesthetic and links them to Cirque de Verre, which

Audience members eating a cast marshmallow chicken with a red-velvet cake stomach attached to a teen-wing during the performance Armed the Cannibals by the Burnt Asphalt Family, Chrysler Museum of Art, 2016. PHOTO: ECHARD WHEELER COURTESY: THE ARTISTS

11 Founded by Kim Harty, Bika Hawes, and Charlotte Potter in 2008, Cirque de Verre presented itself as an exhibition in the hot shop and sought to push and pull the boundaries of what can be made with glass.
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employed a similar strategy.) In the Family’s first performance, they presented a hallowed American tradition, the turkey dinner.

In another skit, a still-hot blown glass bottle is filled with liquid and erupts into a gushing fountain before crumbling. The scene is completed by a recliner-turned-marver bench and a chandelier lit with molten glass that drips into a tower of champagne glasses. Importantly, the culmination arrives in the food’s atmosphere of a nighttime rain storm” with “smoke, steam, and projection”; artist Bohny Yoon and musician Kishi Bashi combined their talents in a performance with glass instruments, vocals, and feedback loops; and Jocelyne Prince created a hot-glass doppelganger with the aid of the 19th-century illusion Pepper’s Ghost.

Post-Glass, Glass Performance

In 2014, Abram Deslauriers, David King, and Liesl Schubel met at Pilchuck Glass School, connecting through late-night music share sessions.” They subsequently established flock: the optic, an art collective that creates performances comprising “installation, interactive sculpture, music, video, and theatrical storytelling.” As the most recent addition in a lineage of performative glass, flock: the optic upends the trajectory of performance troupes charted thus far. They consider themselves an art collective rather than a performance troupe, working across media and disciplines both ephemeral and static, which include the aforementioned assistants, opening the program to a wide range of artists, and are ticketed with the performance as the main event.

Early Third Thursday performances included Jocelyne Prince’s “Pepper’s Ghost,” Laura McFie’s “Enquisite Corpse,” the Studio’s team creating optical devices, and Harty and Porter, who collaborated on a production called The Glass Theater: Phantom, which held onto the tropes of Cirque de Verre through the printed programs and use of various acts, though in this instance the duo removed themselves as actors (their word) and maintained a directorial role. Staged in 2013, The Glass Theater was composed of three acts: Robin and Julia Rogers conjured the “ominous atmosphere of a nighttime rain storm” with “smoke, steam, and projection”; artist Bohny Yoon and musician Kishi Bashi combined their talents in a performance with glass instruments, vocals, and feedback loops; and Jocelyne Prince created a hot-glass doppelganger with the aid of the 19th-century illusion Pepper’s Ghost.

Where food served as the bridge between artist and audience for the Burnt Asphalt Family, Cirque de Verre used the familiar framework of a circus. In residence at Wheaton Arts in 2008, Charlotte Potter, Kim Harty, and Rika Havers responded to the same prompt for a public demo that had catalyzed the Burnt Asphalt Family, and the trio decided to produce a show comprising various acts and sideshows complete with “costumes, choreography, staging, and props.” They invited the other artists and staff on site to participate, developed circus-themed posters and banners, and became a troupe. Embodying a baroque aesthetic, they dressed in “fabulous, steampunk costumes of velvet burgundy and frilly, expanding beyond the parameters of individual practices and comfort zones. Again, the collaborative effort allowed each to break some personal rules.”

Cirque de Verre saw their work as straddling the line between performance and exhibition, and included video and other “displayed” works as elements of the sideshows and performances. Such performances have included acts such as “Sam’s Flying Ladle,” where member Sam Geer showers the hot shop with molten glass from above (backkering back to the B’Tsam’s “Hot Glass Rain”); Harty’s “SynchroBlow,” a choreography of synchronized glassblowing, as the title suggests; feats of strength using glass barbells, and fire dancing. The group confronted the nebulous line between art and entertainment head-on, leaning into the latter, both earnestly and tongue-in-cheek. The troupe’s mission statement reads: “We whole heartedly embrace art-as-spectacle and artist-as-performer. The line between art and entertainment is tenuous and we are the tightrope walkers.”

Cirque de Verre found the support to make the work at residencies, auctions, and museum demos at institutions such as MoG during a 2007 party, the Toledo Museum of Art during the “It’s Friday” series, and “Glass30: Four Weeks of Fire,” an event associated with the 2010 Glass Arts Society conference. However, the primary venue for their work became fundraising events, specifically galas. As discussed above, the glass-based performance meets demo as “light entertainment,” as Harty and Potter describe it, is a through line for artists developing this type of work. However, this changed when Potter established the Third Thursday series in 2011. The monthly performance series became an incubator for performance art unlike any other in the country. It encouraged (and does still) work that transcends the moniker of “entertainment head-on, leaning into the latter, both earnestly and tongue-in-cheek. The troupe’s mission statement reads: “We whole heartedly embrace art-as-spectacle and artist-as-performer. The line between art and entertainment is tenuous and we are the tightrope walkers.”
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video, music, installation, and sculpture as well as zines. They also deliberately decentral glassblowing as a performative expression, opting to work with glass (a material the trio have all been trained in) in tandem with found objects and recycled materials, combining them into new works. Playfulness and interactivity take center stage in experiences that are imaginative and open to interpretation, and as a gallivanting crowd flourishing kinetic paper birds on sticks.

The aesthetic concerns, multimedia methodology, and decentralization of hot glass have given Flock the Optic the more flexibility in how and where they perform. No longer reliant on the hot shop, their performances have taken place in galleries and en plein air, during conferences and parties, including the 2017 Glass Art Society conference and as part of the Perry Glass Studio’s Third Thursday series in 2019. The work itself is perhaps better aligned with the avant-garde of a younger (more Brooklynesque) art scene, and their inclusion here begs the question: How much glass and performance, creating performance troupes specifically interested in working with glass as a hot material within theatrical frameworks. Coming to depend on institutional support to provide advanced glassmaking technology, studios, and funding streams, the two (artist collaborations and institutions devoted to hot glass) developed in tandem, influencing each other, and as a result the gray zone between artistic intent and entertainment occupies an area of key consideration during this era.

While collaboration is an inherent aspect of hot glass work, the named performance troupes as an artistic format seems to be phasing out in favor of exploration by individual artists into the performative aspects of glass, harking back to earlier experiences with sound, video, and the stage. The continuation of institutional programs like the Perry Studio’s Third Thursday series, provides the structure (both facility and assistants) through which artists can produce performance. With a system of support and recognition in place, individuals have increasingly taken up the mantle of the performative within glass, and what started as a niche within the larger glass field has increasingly become a dominant mode of making with the material. This development will be discussed in the final article of this series considering the work of individuals and the new systems of support that have emerged.

For the Fun
One thing Flock the Optic does do is remind us that it would be remiss to ignore the pink elephant riding a unicycle in the middle of the hot shop. The elephant being fun! For Rosenfeld and Julius, their collaboration began after hours as a way to release daily stresses and explore community. For Elek, it was “the camaraderie of friends being together and doing what we loved,” and for Belber the group antics brought excitement to otherwise boring days.

A subject matter worth scholarly and critical attention—hence this article—it is also important to acknowledge this core tenet of the collaborative performative work discussed. To put it plainly, to make art with friends, to break the rules that permeate individual art practices or day jobs as gaffers, to offer enjoyment, relaxation, creative outlets, and above all, a place to have fun together.

A (continued) partial conclusion …

Reviewing this pivotal moment in glass history, the relationship between glass and performance becomes further evident. As the 21st century approached, artists formalized their integration of glass and performance, creating performance troupes specifically interested in working with glass as a hot material within theatrical frameworks. Coming to depend on institutional support to provide advanced glassmaking technology, studios, and funding streams, the two (artist collaborations and institutions devoted to hot glass) developed in tandem, influencing each other, and as a result the gray zone between artistic intent and entertainment occupies an area of key consideration during this era.

While collaboration is an inherent aspect of hot glass work, the named performance troupes as an artistic format seems to be phasing out in favor of exploration by individual artists into the performative aspects of glass, harking back to earlier experiences with sound, video, and the stage. The continuation of institutional programs like the Perry Studio’s Third Thursday series, provides the structure (both facility and assistants) through which artists can produce performance. With a system of support and recognition in place, individuals have increasingly taken up the mantle of the performative within glass, and what started as a niche within the larger glass field has increasingly become a dominant mode of making with the material. This development will be discussed in the final article of this series considering the work of individuals and the new systems of support that have emerged.
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