ROE ETHRIDGE AND FIA BACKSTRÖM

FIA: I see your work as communal in terms of a community of images. You allow each image to work as an individual yet somehow, despite the non-classic sequencing, you manage to create this bond or glue for their togetherness. An ordinary way of setting up that bond as an object-maker could be to use purple all the way, or, for example, how Mao used the uniform for visual and conceptual cohesiveness. In your case—granting one sees the images as social presence—you use more contemporary techniques to make them come together.

ROE: You're giving me the framework of the communal, which makes sense to me, although I don't think of it that way. For the past ten years—gasp—I've thought of the work in terms of a fugue; more like a musical arrangement than a social structure. But now that I think of the "communal," the fugue could be seen as a similar structure.

FIA: That's funny. I use the braid as a useful structure, with leitmotifs woven through . . .

ROE: Lately I thought of embracing some of that in a new sort of image, trying to resolve an issue, like an affection for something, depicting it as an artist. And where is the line between the sort of objective view of the object of affection, using the objective as an artifice but still trying to figure something out through it? I'm thinking of the surfing pictures, in particular. There's some distance there for me. I feel that they're very generic sports pictures. I was thinking of them as surfing posters, with that kind of image source. But it's also something I want to keep to myself. So I'm a little conflicted. I've often thought of the work as something more arbitrary, such as with the tones or the colors, for the past couple of years. Before that, the content was important to me, maybe even more so than what's happening between the images or in the literal content-linking. Maybe it's like a leap of faith into rationally putting these disparate works together. I think it's much more altered: playing with the themes, making the work less about content and more about the color and the picture—what it is—while still wondering, is it okay to do this?

FIA: But with the surfing pictures, seeing surfing as content—there's not one picture with real surfing in your show at Andrew Kreps Gallery, is there?

ROE: I didn't put any surf action in it, no more than the guy standing and looking at his wet suit.

FIA: You have two images of the same sunset, divided by duration, but you don't have that singular surf poster; you divided them into two.

ROE: Well, it was a bit cruel. Everybody seems to really like the surf pictures. So there was a *little bit* of withholding. Maybe I'm not a good member of the community in that way . . .

FIA: Why would it make a good community member of someone who provides, and not withholds, the image?

ROE: Or to fetishize or become grandiose, to make something more out of them. A lot of artists effortlessly shoot their scenes to blur the lines between their life and their work, like a diary. I love that stuff. But for me, I was looking for separation.

FIA: The diaristic or the self-expressive—as if that's where the delivery of the truth of the work is to be found.

ROE: Right. But to give the truth to whom?

FIA: It's funny, there's a parallel to how advertising works—the idea of deferred satisfaction. You're supposed to seduce, but you're not supposed to give satisfaction really, because then one won't buy.

ROE: Yeah, right. That is funny. I didn't know that that's what I was doing. [*Laughs*] You have to have a hook. The sequence is not binary; it's just suggesting more than one. Two suggests more than two, or at least that's how it feels to me.

FIA: Like the fugue . . . . Coming back to the idea of community building—while not going down the Mao way, where every individual has to be molded as the same. A way, rather, where people can work as individuals or separate entities and still stick together. In your show, you connect the two sunsets from consecutive moments in time, following right after some surfing pictures are hung. It turns into a sequence that is not bound together by ONE kind of vision or time; it wanders and shifts around the space.

ROE: Half the labor is in the selecting, pulling images from different inventories.

FIA: To me, one image in the show was key in this sense—the oysters. The smallest in size and perhaps the most "normal" image. Still, it doesn't fly as a food image; the knife is worn down and the table is a bit scruffy. You seem to have made the riff via tones and rhythms, and all of a sudden there is one plain and illustrative image—compared to the ones that went before—which explains it all, but it doesn't really give anything.

ROE: That's nice. That was the last piece that got situated. I shot the oysters at Marlow & Sons in 2005, when I was working on the "County Line" show. I took it out of that group of works because the oysters weren't as perfect as I had hoped. Now I can't figure out what my issue is with the picture. Anyway, the decision to put it in the "Redux" show was pragmatic. It was partly because of content, but it was also because it was reasonable, and it made sense. In one way I liked the image of the half-a-dozen because of the way the room was divided in half; there were two walls—this group and that group. So in a way, I was already thinking about that before the oyster image was in the group. That's what has been so productive about this process, letting an image sit in the flat file or the computer for a year or whatever; the context changes and you forget why the picture was excluded the first time.

FIA: I like this idea of content. In art school, you're constantly asked, what is it about. You learn some safe strategies: Well, it's about whale fishing in Alaska and the ecology up there, or whatever . . . . You read up on it and you might all of a sudden think that you're a marine biologist; a lousy amateur version . . .

ROE: Five paragraphs, thesis, completely.

FIA: Then you realize: Actually, that's not really my job.

ROE: Yeah, or, that's not really what it was about, you know? That's the other thing. I remember moving to New York and being in total chaos. I was twenty-seven so I was old enough to know better, but it still just screwed everything up. I couldn't do that thesis, conclusion, homework thing. There was too much shit happening just to pay the rent. You had to agree to do some stuff that you didn't really want to do as an artist. Then looking back, you find some outtakes. Like, that's my photograph? I love that photograph. Suddenly, the context has morphed into another thing and there it is.

FIA: As for withholding, in my White Columns show *That social space between speaking and meaning,* the entire exhibition was visually displayed text, which I had written or lifted. There was no image delivery in the traditional sense. Some people were frustrated that they did not have a chance to read it all; it would take at least two weeks. [*Laughs*] So the content was also elsewhere.

ROE: Or it's not about completion. I think that's really an interesting thing, of the visual overload being textual. And the frustration is, I guess, structural in that it's not about the pleasure-delivery of the work. But it is the most generative for the viewer, because they leave with this feeling of "oh God, there's no way I could have read all that, I did the best I could," when encountering themselves outside the gallery. Even though there's a finite amount of words, it suggests that impossibility

FIA: It would actually be impossible to consume images in this way as well as data. Browsing the Internet, we keep a floating relationship to text. You glance and you go: "Wow, I'm going to click here!" Then you're gone, continuing on. We never worry that we didn't read the whole page or the whole site—as a more current mode of reading . . .

ROE: More fragmented.

FIA: Ordinarily in a gallery, you have that old-fashioned ideal of a complete viewing. For example, in a show with that purple cohesive stuff that I mentioned earlier, you could simply turn around in the middle of the room for a contained experience; whereas, your show is not going to give a lot from that kind of mode.

ROE: When I was talking just a minute ago about the viewer, it's funny now that I think about it—who is that exactly? [*Laughs*] Academically speaking, the viewer is a person who . . . I guess it's me. I hate leaving a show with a sense of completion at the end: Okay, thank you! That was a five-paragraph essay and it was what you said it was.

FIA: Was the image next to the oysters the one with the bird on the top? I didn't really see the bird; I saw it in the book.

ROE: Can I just look at that? Hold on. No, there's no bird. But there is a bird in this one.

FIA: Exactly, that's so nice.

ROE: It is nice, yeah. There are three birds in it, actually. There's one there, and also one there.

FIA: And there are three surfers you can see, but there are more of them there.

ROE: Yeah, there's more than three.

FIA: Apropos data overload. Do you think it comes from an expectation of the narrative in images?

ROE: The thing about the show is that a lot of the works in it are from assignments. The first stage of generating the image is either for someone else or for some other purpose.

FIA: Once I was bummed out because I had some kind of assignment for a show. I told Jutta Koether how much I hate that, and how I really was a "free" artist. She, of all people, called me on it. She said that, traditionally, the artist worked on assignment, just look back at Velázquez or whomever . . .

ROE: Yeah, totally. Obviously, it's a very common thing with photographers, but it's still kind of a dirty little secret that a photographer's work came out of an assignment. It may be less dirty now, but I like to think it's somehow illegal, or against the rules. For the Kreps show, a lot of the work is from *Vice* magazine, which are truly hybrid assignments. It's not just arbitrary; the photo editor there, Jesse Pearson, and I talk enough to know what the common interests are. Those surf images—the guy with the wet suit and that one with the bird on the streetlight—both of them I shot for a *Vice* story. The little nasty edge of it is such a libidinal motivation. It's like . . . something. I don't know what. Maybe it's because of a good, southern Christian upbringing type thing.

FIA: A situation of disobedience?

ROE: Yeah, there's something about it, like staying out late and drinking.

FIA: A while back we were talking about stock images in connection to your work. I had asked permission to insert your work a couple of times into my environments. Sometimes I even call you my stock image provider.

ROE: Yeah, for sure, I love that idea. I think that's a part of being a worker. I work in the image service industry.

FIA: Coming back to the Christian idea. You compared your images to the ones of saints in churches, the idea of a shared repertoire of images.

ROE: I think that was in reference to the model portraits, maybe? Is that what you're talking about?

FIA: No. This was before. I think it was in connection to iconicity in images. It was about stock images in general, and how they operate in society.

ROE: Like church paintings?

FIA: Yeah! If we look at Dutch seventeenth-century still lifes, for example, we don't really know what a rotten peach with worms means today, whereas the Dutch—who were thoroughly brain-coded to this visual language—didn't have to think twice before they understood. With the saint painting, as with contemporary stock images, people were familiar with the stories, so as a painter you only had to introduce the slightest element and the whole story came to life. Today we need education for these, but for commercial imagery, we are unaware of our knowledge to see or to read these stock images in their wealth of visual codes.

ROE: Yeah, I hope so.

FIA: And in the image of the oysters, I read this as a failed lifestyle package.

ROE: An anecdote about that picture—which I shot at the same time as I shot the girl with the striped shirt and the Mary Beth image. Those oysters were seeding, not the best time to eat an oyster. So I thought, that's not the oyster that everybody identifies as such. I was getting hung up on the difference between the iconic image I was trying to create and the result, the actual picture. That changed over the course of three years and became less important to me, that self-captioned image faded in its neurotic compulsiveness. I was no longer looking at it as a failed image. I was just looking at it as an image and seeing that it really worked with this group.

FIA: The Mary Beth image is a great example of iconicity in terms of contemporary visual legibility. She's blue by accident, while the color blue in our image-based society easily brings up a Prozac ad. Blue liquids also appear in advertisements from diapers to feminine pads. There is always blue for anything human that we want to conceal or clean.

ROE: That's right, that's true. [*Laughs*]

FIA: When you clean the house, it's always blue that takes away all the dirt. Your image uses the codes, but wrongly, or too much . . .

ROE: Yeah. Someone recently told me the term Avant-Normal, which is an almost-experimental mode. I had two negatives sandwiched together, accidentally. The negative that hit the contact sheet made the contact sheet blue, which we made into the picture of Mary Beth. Originally, it didn't have any of the quality of the Avant-Normal; it was only after wrestling with the Avant-Normal contact sheet that it became clear. I wondered why it was so compelling. It became clear that this had something to do with those print advertisements about depression with only a single tone of blue.

FIA: So it's another way to be avant-garde.

ROE: I think rather it's a negation, a deferral. Perhaps it is about images in a community trying to fit in despite the fact that they are hybrid and maybe a little experimental. Not all of them are, but there are several double exposures and even a digital photo mixed with an old-school, pure-looking image shot with a four-by-five.

FIA: So this would reveal "normal" tropes?

ROE: Yeah, it could. What's interesting to me about it is that it functions as a loop. It goes and comes back. I just keep coming back to the fucking church example. I feel like this is a therapy session. It's like we're about to finish up, but I'm realizing how all the connections . . . . [*Laughs*] Anyhow, I spent a lot of time at a Methodist church when I was growing up. In the sanctuary, there were no images allowed. That was a big tenet of Protestantism.

FIA: You can't stop yourself now . . .

ROE: Well, every Sunday school class, especially in the South, you can go to these church stores, like Christian product stores and strip malls to buy posters that have photographic images on them with a bible verse at the bottom. So in that imagery, the photograph is there. It's not a Catholic image, it's not a saint—it's whatever. A sun refracted through a cloud as one of God's miracles. Then there's a scripture about that. When my eyes opened as a baby, that's how I saw it. I never saw a painting in a cathedral. I saw a cinder block wall with a sunset on it and a scripture taped to it at the bottom.

FIA: The idea of being a good Christian is interesting, regarding the assignment. You were disobedient and treated the no-image idea in a Protestant-Calvinist way. You were not supposed to . . . you were just overflowing—

ROE: Yeah, but we all are. That's the thing—

FIA: For me, it's convenient that I don't need to make them . . .

ROE: Right, yeah. I'm glad that I can help you out. [*Laughs*]

FIA: I defer that job . . .

ROE: I tried to do that in art school, but I felt like—

FIA: You mean use others' images?

ROE: Or not to take pictures. I would use posters and rub them on sandpaper, or run over them with a car or whatever, trying to transform something, not just showing it as it was. I saw Jeff Koons's book and thought that was a really good idea. At some point I surrendered to making stuff and took a large-format four-by-five class, and the Germans . . . . That chill I got from the German objective photography. Using the camera became something else, which led to the place of this suburban white male, who was interested in *not* taking pictures, to start taking pictures again. What are you going to do? It lead to this exploration of pre-existing imagery; using the apparatus for what it can do at the same time.

FIA: The other day, a student brought up [Paul] Outerbridge in relation to your show . . .

ROE: Well, I bought the dress that appears on the invitation card because it reminded me of Outerbridge. So, this image, you might say, is like Outerbridge.

FIA: Not only the fabric—the Germanic woman by the pedestal, the doors, the checkered patterns, and so on.

ROE: Yes, definitely. I can't say it's accidental, because we had the Outerbridge book open and out in the studio when we made that one. So, yeah.

FIA: When are his images from, the '40s?

ROE: They go from the '20s to the '40s. I don't know exactly what happened, but there was some scandal with the nudes. They were considered too un-artistic.

FIA: Too nude, like Manet?

ROE: Yeah, he was shunned and went to Hollywood. I don't know if that had anything to do with using that image. I always loved Outerbridge. For me, his work is a reference point before the "decisive moment," after pictorialism, and after the collapse.

FIA: That point in history when he is attacking German still-life photography—those early advertisement still lifes—to de-stabilize that kind of image. He seems like a relevant source in order to think about that move. What's the title again, the German's book?

ROE: *The World is Beautiful* by Albert Renger-Patzsch, from 1928. Outerbridge came through the Clarence White School of Photography. At the time it was unavoidably fractured already between applied photography and fine art. Though there's this intermingling, there's Man Ray making money, not from his artwork but off of his photographic commissions. Things happened quickly, but they also proceeded in a slow, labored way, because of the type of camera. Especially in some of the later Outerbridges, those ads. Even the nudes look incredibly normal.

FIA: I think your nude with the breasts just overflowing is hard to call normal today.

ROE: Yeah, definitely. They're exaggerated in that pose, sort of a mannerist version. I hope the picture is seen more as an homage than a snarky joke. And it is not where my interests begin and end in image-making. It's just another thread. It may be that it's the end of my Outerbridge thread.

FIA: Christopher Williams made a show with the same title as the Renger-Patzsch book, *The World is Beautiful*. I just saw a piece by him that is the white, reverse side of the cover of an exhibition catalogue for *Change the World, Poetry Must be Made by Everyone*, from 1968 at Moderna Museet in Stockholm. You can't see through the white; the book is only identified by the title. This very same catalogue is one of my Outerbridges. I used that title: "Poetry Must be Made by Everyone," for my letter/press release, but I left out "Change the World." Though there was wallpaper with keywords from Getty images, and protruding walls with subway advertisements—those commercial slogans that have a radical call to action. As usual I parasited off your work and hung one of your mall signs, *Dunwoody*—with black text on white diagonally across it—super high, diagonally on the same wall as yet another layer, which you could read or not read, or see.

ROE: Do you really think that it is parasiting?

FIA: Why do you ask?

ROE: Because that gets back to the question of it not being very communal of you, but also just what you said—

FIA: Why is the burden laid on me to be communal? There are other ways of coexistence or of producing content . . . . If I lift this image of yours, yes I parasite off of your signification system. Your abyss of images and the set-up relationships between them become freebies for me feeding into the setting, so that not only the image and all that this gesture of me lifting it in carries, but also your signification gets layered and can reverberate within it.

ROE: Yes, I see that, but that seems more like your work takes what's free, but asks for what's not. The parasite doesn't ask.

FIA: But are you sure it's not the other way? Are you saying signification is free?

ROE: I don't see your work in that way. It does play close to exploitative edges, but more in a sort of searching for words in a less parasitic way and a more complicit way. It requires complicity, unless it's something that's free. I think that's what indicates this in your work, which may also be the thing about my work, these issues of complicity versus the radical, which takes and breaks and transforms and punctures. It's coming from a different sort of assumption of the terms. It requires complicity to participate. But it's not collaborative.

FIA: I don't necessarily see an opposition between the complicit and the radical, at least not in our time. It's weird to say exploitative, because it's not clear who is exploiting whom. But collaborative it is not, at least not in any traditional use of the term. When I give talks about the work and show images, most of the images are pointless in terms of information. Once I showed an image of the bake sale, which includes your image [*Liberty Square*], and some people started to read your sign out loud, literally as if they were thirsty for information or readability.

ROE: That is a kind of withholding on your part. There are Lutherans in Sweden, right?

FIA: Oh, that's what it is—I'm a Lutheran.

ROE: Are you? I'm just saying that in your stock image selections, maybe it's a way of enacting this withholding, while still deferring the responsibility for it. So it's not an irresponsible act; it's a very deliberate act of selection.

FIA: You mean that I say: He did it?

ROE: Or that it's not your fault, or maybe it's not that it's not your fault. As if you were saying, it is my fault, but you're not going to get it out of me. There's a kind of negative authorship.

FIA: Or expanded authorship .... In your show, the key image became the oysters for me. When I insert your work, it's a way of setting up that key image, which is not even mine. I guess as if giving while at the same time withholding, but I definitely don't agree that personal responsibility and classic authorship coalesce. Today this would be closer to choosing or presenting an act or frame with your name on it.

ROE: Well, there's also something else to it. Again, you wouldn't let me off the hook. I remember suggesting you just take the image. I said, why don't you get the book in order to scan it?

FIA: Oh, this is a huge one. On negative authorship, perhaps only by not touching or by out-sourcing can one go in reverse?

ROE: Right. That's funny. I'd like to out-source more.

FIA: I actually once scanned one of yours (*Apple and Cigarettes* (2004/6))—to make the coasters in *Apple, A Hanging Proposal for a Photograph by Roe Ethridge* (2007). Then I printed it out, color corrected it, etc. It was terrible.

ROE: I liked the coasters. I used one as an ashtray for a while, not very effective as an ashtray. Why do you think it was terrible?

FIA: Hmmm. I am not very interested in that schoolgirl/medieval copyist modality, which it entails, that kind of fidelity. To converse with the signification of another piece or to wrestle with images, they need to be somebody else's, and not my homemade copy, or it would simply be another voice of me. The exchange is more important. It starts in a conversation, and then my persuasion to be able to hang your image, for example, upside down or make coasters of it.

ROE: But I also don't mind the good old-fashioned appropriation—I remember when I was showing slides to freshmen at SVA and was going over the Walker Evans images. I just got a cold shiver. You could call it an epiphany. There was the classic, eighteen-year-old response. It was almost impossible to explain without saying, you're fucking idiots.

FIA: Yes, those images are still far-out radical, but the social dimension of originals as social presence from their auras and as agitator stand-ins is really important, not only their status as commodity.

ROE: Definitely.

FIA: When I was hanging *Marybeth* in the Whitney, there was a nervousness around the object. I wasn't allowed to touch your image to set her dinner placement around the table.

ROE: When I see installation shots of something inserted, I think, I have to be brave.

FIA: Why is that, do you think?

ROE: I don't know. The feeling is not unpleasant. In fact, it's sort of the opposite. It's almost as if this is what they are supposed to do: Surprise me and move it on down the line to continue that sort of hallucinatory, hallucinogenic quality of context, whether you're using my intent or the anecdote. In the case of the Prozac effect on the Mary Beth picture, your pleasure in the anecdote or the intent is also part of using the image as a convenience.

FIA: It also exists within the construction of your work. I don't know how many images you have, but you could surely be a part of fifty different group shows at the same time. The images could fit into any of these content-driven group shows, which, in a sense, also makes them into nothing. That makes for the sluttiness of images, if they can work along such a broad situation.

ROE: That promiscuity is maybe the most hostile part of the work. It's intentional, but it's also about letting it happen. Some kind of unreliability.

FIA: It is interesting to me that whenever I've asked to borrow a piece, you've never really said no. Very few times you've cringed; in fact, only the time with the dove. But consistently you've been very generous and ... daring. It's interesting that you say you have to be brave when you

see the images. Do you think it's a failure that there have been no arguments or conflicts?

ROE: Do you wish I would say no? Would that make it more vital? I think it feels good, initially. It's the moment of truth that's the scary part. It's giving you the trust, but I have to say I think I would give—I don't know if I would give it to anyone, but in a way, that's part of your contract in the image service biz. Not literally, but that is part of what happens when you do the assignments. You have to find a way to survive this horrible scenario that goes against the modern ideal that you're free, as in no one's telling me what to do. That is the training.

FIA: Most other people that I have corroborated with, or colluded with . . .

ROE: Corroborated, yeah. Criminal activity.

FIA: There has been much more wariness over signification slides.

ROE: The funny thing is, now that I'm thinking about it, it may be that I'm the parasite in the formula.

FIA: Yes, you may be.

ROE: Because I'm getting thrills off of your context providing.

FIA: Once you referred to it as a layout; not like a layout in magazines . . .

ROE: That does seem slightly unfair. I was just thinking about the pigeon piece.

FIA: That's the only time you got a little bit wary.

ROE: It was because of the white pigeon. It's called a dove, but it was a really aggressive pigeon. I was trying to be certain that it was a dove, the peace dove. Those pigeons were, to me, working in the image service industry, so it was different than a Picasso pigeon. I didn't want it to get muddled in the idea that this is somehow against the war. I shot it in 2001. I guess that's what we were saying about context shifting. I thought it looked great.

FIA: I don't know that it was against the war, per se. I was trying on one side to set up an abyss of images, as you once labeled it, the two doves in the Picasso wallpaper behind your pigeon. One is spreading his wings with a bouquet of flowers in a corny offering, whereas your dove is in an incredibly violent and weird pose.

ROE: Yeah. I remember printing that pigeon image, and I got hungry. It was a big print, and that leg started looking like a chicken leg. And yeah, you can eat these things. [*Laughs*]

FIA: Oh no . . .

ROE: Why does it always come back to food with me? I don't know what that means. I guess I'm just hungry all the time. Those pieces, with the patterns and decorations, were like paintings rather then installations. The way the wallpaper and the photos function together with Eileen Quinlan's photo. There's something almost—since you brought up Picasso . . . [*Laughs*] Matissian about this. It wasn't text, it was image in the service of the image.

FIA: I think text is image too, right?

ROE: I don't.

FIA: But what are your mall signs, then?

ROE: Those are images.

FIA: Are you sure?

ROE: Yeah.

FIA: But people always read from them?

ROE: Yeah, well, it's an image with words in it. I tried shooting those signs straight on, thinking of them flattened and squared up, using the four-by-five for the straight lines. But it felt like they were sort of feigning an "objective" attitude, so I started shooting them from an angle to make it a pictorial image. It felt noirish . . . like an establishing shot for a scene where something bad happens.

FIA: Do you think a logo is text also?

ROE: No. Yes. I don't know.

FIA: Do you think you have to be able to read to see a logo?

ROE: No. I don't read; I see logos all the time. [*Laughs*]

FIA: It works well in countries with high illiteracy.

ROE: I think there's a different kind of pleasure immersed in the image, rather than in the text; you casually scan feeling an anxiety of completion.

FIA: Only I'm trying to make a case here for image as text and text as image. That wariness must come from some academic schoolboy correctness. I would think a contemporary reader or viewer scans text and images in the same way on the Internet, or in the urban landscape. I don't think there is any difference. Art-viewing is old fashioned. We enter a show with the same faculties we use when browsing the Web, but with an anxious, mid-twentieth-century expectation of a correct approach.

ROE: Words are shaming and the image is not. Is that what you're saying? Physically speaking, as in an installation or space where you confront the work, rather than in a book. You regard text differently, no?

FIA: Text can also happen the way of an aesthetic picture.

ROE: I'm trying to think of a beautiful word. It's got to have ornate kerning.

FIA: Is it a belief in text as fact and image as fiction, or some split along these lines, now that fact acts as fiction and not vice versa?

ROE: Or maybe fact is the most sought-after thing. It is like fiction is the smokescreen, but there is still a "real" smokescreen.

FIA: It all is very difficult to understand. We can't call the fact guy!

FIA BACKSTRÖM courtesy of Google/Jan Steen Driekoningenfeest.

ROE ETHRIDGE *Oysters*, 2006; C-print; 24" x 30".

FIA BACKSTRÖM courtesy of Google.

ROE ETHRIDGE *Thanksgiving 1984 (table)*, 2009; C-print; 33" x 40".