

Art history

[History](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Sur The statues of Villa and Kino invoke an ambivalent response on the either side of the borderland. That is Mexico and United States of America. The proponent takes it as reminder of the ideals of the stature that they align with while those that oppose it are a reminder of the perceived oppressive idea that the person on the sculpture stood for (The Arizona Republic 1). The two opposing response has been associated with both Villa and Kino sculptures as follow:

Those that celebrate the sculpture of Kino are on one side of the borderland and perceive it as a source of inspiration that will refocus their international friendship (Arizona Daily Star 2). Through the friendship, the affiliates of Kino sculpture were reassured of free enterprise on the either side of the borderland. More so, the proponents so the sculpture of Kino as the reminder of modernization that will encourage economic development and prosperity through the removal of discrimination. Paradoxically, those who opposed it so took it as a poignant reminder of discrimination that was prominent at his time (Widdified 212).

On the other hand, the Villa sculpture was also received with both hospitable and hostile response. The proponents of the Villa sculpture perceived it as a source of inspiration for the continued pursuit of justice and equality as he did in his time of struggle with impartiality. Widdified, the mission that Villa came up with in Christianity that helped many through faith are among sweet memory the sculpture invokes (220). Those that opposed the sculpture were a reminder of the sad regional history of those days. To them, a sculpture was evocative of the struggle that the two regions have undergone.

Reference

<https://assignbuster.com/art-history-essay-samples-3/>

Stacie G Widdified, Standing on Common Ground, Cambridge MA, 2013 pg
212-244

Tucson: Arizona Daily Star p. 1987 p. 2

The Arizona Republic: 1983