

America Tropical Mural In The Interpretive Center

Posted on September 16, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/america-tropical-mural-in-the-interpretive-center/>

David Alfaro Siqueiros's 1932 mural *América Tropical* occupies an important place in the history of public art in Los Angeles because it joined experimental mural technique with an explicit critique of imperialism and racial domination. Painted on the exterior wall of Italian Hall near Olvera Street, the mural rejected the picturesque image of a peaceful tropical paradise. Instead, Siqueiros placed a bound and crucified Indigenous figure at the center of the composition beneath a threatening American eagle, with armed figures positioned in resistance. The result directly challenged romanticized representations of Mexico and Latin America that were popular in tourism and commercial culture. Its later whitewashing, deterioration, rediscovery, conservation, and public interpretation turned the mural itself into a historical record of censorship, urban change, Mexican American cultural memory, and debates over who is allowed to define the meaning of public space.

Political Context and Mexican Muralism

Siqueiros belonged to the generation of Mexican muralists shaped by the Mexican Revolution and by debates over land, labor, education, nationalism, and social inequality. Along with artists such as Diego Rivera and José Clemente Orozco, he treated large-scale public art as a way to address collective history rather than only private aesthetic experience. Murals could reach workers and ordinary residents outside elite galleries and could present historical conflict in a form integrated with architecture and urban life.

When Siqueiros came to Los Angeles in 1932, he was already known for political activism and experimentation with modern materials. He taught fresco techniques and worked with a group of assistants sometimes described as the Bloc of Mural Painters. During his relatively short stay, he produced several murals, including *Street Meeting*, *América Tropical*, and *Portrait of Present-Day Mexico*. These works combined public scale, industrial tools, and political imagery at a moment when Los Angeles contained large Mexican and Mexican American communities facing discrimination, labor conflict, deportation campaigns, and unequal political power.

América Tropical was commissioned for a highly visible commercial area associated with the presentation of Mexican heritage to visitors. The expected image was closer to an attractive tropical or folkloric scene. Siqueiros instead transformed the wall into an accusation. That difference between commission and result is central to the mural's importance.

Imagery, Symbolism, and Anti-Imperialist Meaning

The mural's dominant image is a bound Indigenous figure stretched across a double cross. Above the body appears an American eagle, transforming a national symbol into an image of power and violence. Nearby armed figures confront the eagle rather than passively observing the scene. The composition also includes ruined architectural forms and tropical vegetation, creating a landscape in which historical civilization, conquest, exploitation, and resistance occupy the same visual field.

The crucified figure draws on Christian imagery of sacrifice, but Siqueiros redirects that symbolism toward the political suffering of Indigenous and working people. The body is not presented as a peaceful religious icon. It is restrained, exposed, and placed under the eagle, making domination visible. The eagle's presence allows the mural to connect U.S. power with the exploitation of Latin America rather than presenting American influence as purely modernizing or benevolent.

Mesoamerican architectural references strengthen this argument. Pyramidal and temple-like forms evoke Indigenous civilizations and position the mural within a longer history than modern national borders. Siqueiros did not simply reproduce Maya or Aztec art. He combined references to pre-Columbian culture, revolutionary politics, Christian sacrifice, modern industrial technique, and contemporary international power. This mixture is one reason the mural resists a simple folkloric interpretation.

The armed figures also matter because they introduce resistance into the composition. The central victim is immobilized, but the surrounding political world is not completely passive. The image therefore holds suffering and struggle together. Rather than suggesting that oppressed people are only objects of violence, the mural makes confrontation with power part of the historical scene.

Technique, Architecture, and the Urban Setting

Siqueiros was interested in new materials and mechanical methods rather than limiting muralism to traditional fresco. For *América Tropical*, he worked on an exterior wall and used industrial materials and spray techniques that allowed him to cover a large architectural surface. The mural was approximately twenty-four meters long and occupied a position above Olvera Street where its visibility was inseparable from the surrounding city.

This outdoor location increased both the work's political force and its physical vulnerability. Public murals are exposed to sunlight, moisture, pollution, structural movement, and changes to the buildings that support them. Los Angeles supplied a particularly demanding environment because strong sun, urban pollution, and later seismic activity contributed to deterioration. The experimental technique also created conservation problems because the materials and application methods did not behave exactly like traditional fresco.

The urban setting also changed the meaning of the work. Olvera Street was associated with a curated presentation of Mexican heritage, often emphasizing picturesque architecture, food, tourism, and cultural charm. Siqueiros inserted an image of crucifixion and imperial violence into that environment. The mural therefore challenged not only U.S. foreign power but also the selective way Mexican identity could be celebrated commercially while Mexican and Mexican American workers experienced discrimination in the same city.

Censorship, Whitewashing, and Rediscovery

The political content quickly became controversial. Portions of the mural were whitewashed, and the work was eventually covered more extensively. The act of whitewashing is central to its history because censorship became part of the meaning of the mural itself. A work criticizing domination was physically suppressed in a public space, demonstrating the limits placed on radical political expression.

Over time the covering deteriorated, and portions of the original image became visible again. By the 1960s, renewed interest in Mexican American history and the growth of the Chicano movement encouraged attention to Siqueiros's mural. The work could now be understood not only as an artifact from 1932 but as a precursor to later Chicano muralism and public-art movements that used walls to address identity, labor, racism, immigration, and political representation.

The rediscovery also changed the question from whether the mural should be visible to how a damaged and partially surviving work should be preserved. Conservation had to respect the historical material without inventing a new painting that merely resembled what Siqueiros had once created.

Conservation and the Interpretive Center

The Getty Conservation Institute and local partners undertook extensive documentation, scientific study, stabilization, and planning to preserve the mural. Conservators had to identify original materials, understand previous interventions, document cracks and losses, stabilize plaster, and protect the surviving paint from further environmental damage. Digital imaging and photographic documentation created a record of condition that could support long-term monitoring.

A major principle of the conservation project was that preservation should not erase the mural's history. The surviving surface, including areas of loss and evidence of whitewashing, communicates the work's treatment over time. Complete repainting would have produced a visually stronger image but weakened the authenticity of the surviving material. Conservation therefore focused on stabilization and interpretation rather than reconstructing the mural as though censorship and deterioration had never occurred.

The project also required architectural solutions. A protective shelter was designed to reduce direct

environmental exposure, while a viewing platform and interpretive center allowed the public to understand the mural's imagery, political context, technique, censorship, and conservation. The completed public presentation in 2012 made the work accessible at its original location, preserving the relationship between mural and city rather than moving it into a conventional museum.

Historical and Cultural Significance

América Tropical is significant because it brings together several histories that are often separated. It belongs to Mexican muralism, Los Angeles urban history, labor and immigrant history, the politics of U.S.-Latin American relations, the development of Chicano public art, and the history of conservation. Its meaning cannot be reduced to one symbol or one event.

The mural also demonstrates how public art can become contested because it occupies shared space. A privately owned painting can be avoided by viewers who dislike its message; a mural on a prominent urban wall participates directly in the social environment. This visibility gives public art unusual democratic potential but also exposes it to censorship, redevelopment, and political pressure.

For later artists, the mural offered an example of art as collective intervention rather than decoration. Its combination of social critique, monumental scale, and experimental technique anticipated forms of public art that became especially important in Los Angeles during the Chicano movement. The conservation of the mural therefore preserves not only a work by Siqueiros but a lineage of political visual culture.

Conclusion

David Alfaro Siqueiros's *América Tropical* transformed a public wall in Los Angeles into a critique of imperialism, racial hierarchy, and the romanticized representation of Latin America. Its crucified Indigenous figure, American eagle, resistant armed figures, and Mesoamerican architectural references created a visual argument in which conquest and resistance occupied the same landscape. The mural's experimental technique connected modern industrial methods with the political ambitions of Mexican muralism, while its Olvera Street location placed that critique within a city marked by tourism, migration, labor, and inequality. Whitewashing, deterioration, rediscovery, and conservation later became inseparable from the work's meaning. The mural survives today not as a perfectly restored image but as a layered historical object whose damaged surface records both artistic ambition and political suppression. Its preservation at the original site allows the public to encounter a work that continues to raise questions about power, memory, public space, and who has the authority to represent the history of a city.

References

Getty Conservation Institute. Documentation and conservation materials on *América Tropical*.

Goldman, S. M. Research on Mexican muralism and Siqueiros.

Piqué, F., Derrick, M., & Parker, A. Conservation studies concerning *América Tropical*.

Pulido, L., Cheng, W., & Barraclough, L. Research on Los Angeles, public space, and Mexican American history.

Rainer, L., Buzzanca, G., & Palumbo, G. Getty Conservation Institute reports on the mural's preservation.