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Tello’s “Lost Years”:
1931-1935
Richard E. Daggett
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, retired

INTRODUCTION

In a memo dated October 9, 1930, Julio C. Tello was notified that he had been removed as Director of the Museo de Arqueología Peruana in Lima (Figure 1). He had been replaced effective September 30, by Luis E. Valcárcel (Tello and Mejía 1967:172). According to his good friend Samuel K. Lothrop (1948a: 52),¹ this was a tremendous blow to Tello and it began for him a five-year period of poverty and obscurity. What does the record show?

Were these “lost years” for Tello? In a word, no. Instead of being the beaten man willing to accept an ignominious fate that Lothrop suggests, I will show that, during these years, Tello lived up to his reputation as a “human dynamo” (Kroeber 1944:5) and a “fighter” (Valcárcel 1947:288). Through extensive use of Lima press reports I will demonstrate that, contrary to the impression created by Lothrop, Tello rather quickly reasserted himself in the affairs of his nation’s cultural patrimony. Though the subject at hand deals with the years immediately after Tello’s loss of position, a brief discussion of the prior years will document Tello’s rise to this position and, thereby, set the stage for what follows.

Prelude

On April 30, 1909, Tello earned the titles of Doctor and Surgeon from the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos in Lima. Then, on August 21, he was awarded a two year scholarship by the national government to study abroad. He decided on Harvard University where he was awarded a Master’s Degree in Anthropology in June 1911 (Mejía 1948:9-10). In a government resolution dated September 2, 1911, Tello’s scholarship was extended for a year (Mejía 1948:8). He traveled to Europe and attended the University of Berlin (ibid.:ix). A resolution dated December 16th obligated him to present a paper at the upcoming XVIII International Congress of Americanists to be held in London in 1912. He was then made an honorary delegate to the congress (Mejía 1964:81). In addition to presenting the required paper (Tello 1912), Tello visited libraries and museums in England and in France (Mejía 1967b:ix). He returned to Lima in January 1913. On March 13 he petitioned the government for a position in the Museo Nacional de Historia. Specifically, he requested that an anthropological section be created within the museum and that he be named chief of this new section. His requests were approved on June 12. His tenure, however, was brief and contentious as he and the museum director, historian Emilio Gutiérrez de Quintanilla, vied for control. On March 20, 1915, Tello tendered his resignation (Tello and Mejía 1967:96-100).

¹ The strength of their friendship is attested by the fact that Lothrop was granted the rare privilege of being on a first-name basis with Tello (Willey 1988:207).
Within weeks Tello began an extensive archaeological reconnaissance of southern Peru culminating in excavations at sites in the Nazca Valley on the South Coast (Mejía 1964:87-92; Tello 1959:44-47). As an official delegate, Tello then attended the XIX International Congress of Americanists held in Washington, D.C. late in December 1915. He exhibited a collection of artifacts he had collected, principally from the Nazca Valley (Hodge 1915:lii). Overlapping this conference in time was the Second Pan American Scientific Congress that was also taking place in Washington, D.C. (Swiggett 1917). Tello presented a paper (1917) in which he reported on his recent excavations in Nazca. Meanwhile, Peru's lower chamber of Congress, the Cámara de Diputados, was in session in Lima. During a debate centering on the budget for the Museo de Historia Nacional, Tello was attacked by supporters of Gutiérrez (Gutiérrez 1922:58-74).

Toward the end of July 1916, Tello joined a Harvard University expeditionary team conducting research in far northern Peru (Mejía 1964:93; Noble 1921). Subsequently, he learned that the incumbent for the Huarochirí seat in the Cámara de Diputados had decided not to seek reelection. A native of Huarochirí, Tello began his campaign for the position on January 6, 1917 and on June 19, 1917 he was declared the winner of the election. Tello represented Huarochirí for more than a decade, choosing not to seek reelection in 1929 (Mejía 1964:94-96). On November 4, 1917, he proposed a law to reorganize the Museo Nacional de Historia and give him effective control of it by placing it under the aegis of the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (Tello and Mejía 1967:106). He reintroduced this plan during the September 17, 1918 session and ignited a fierce debate between himself and supporters of Gutiérrez (Gutiérrez 1922:80-130).

Unsuccessful in this attempt to wrest control of the national museum from Gutiérrez, Tello turned his attention toward creating his own museum at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. In order to do so, he needed proper affiliation within the university. On August 6, 1918, he attained formal affiliation when he presented his doctoral thesis (1918) to the Facultad de Ciencias (Mejía 1967a:4). Then, after initiating a series of lectures at the university (Santisteban 1956:20), he submitted a proposal for a major archaeological expedition on November 25 (Mejía 1967a:4). Tello’s proposal was accepted unanimously (Mejía 1964:97). Beginning early the following year, he conducted an expedition lasting nearly five months. His focus was much of the Central Coast and Highlands north of Lima. Excavations were carried out at a number of sites, but principally the highland ruins of Chavín de Huantar. The materials brought back to Lima formed the basis of the university’s new Museo de Arqueología that was founded on October 21, 1919 (ibid:97-98).

During September 1919, Tello agreed to help Víctor Larco Herrera establish a permanent archaeological exposition in Lima to coincide with the first centennial of Peru’s independence. This resulted in the official formation of the Museo Arqueológico Víctor Larco Herrera on November 3, 1919 (Mejía 1948:20-21). Because of a disagreement over the running of the museum, Tello resigned from Larco’s employ in May 1921 (Tello and Mejía 1967:121).

Tello then published a major theoretical work (1921) in which he argued for the indigenous development of prehistoric civilization in Peru and in which he first noted the presence of a Chavín culture in Central Peru. Two years later, he was named professor of general anthropology in the university’s Facultad de Ciencias (Santisteban 1956:20). Then, in 1924, he conducted his first seminar in archaeology (Buse
Thus, by 1924, Tello had become well established at the university, as director of its museum of archaeology and as a teacher of archaeology. This may be viewed as a partial victory in his battle with Gutiérrez over control of Peru’s archaeological heritage.

Complete victory came with the sale of Larco’s museum to the government on December 6, 1924 and its incorporation into the new Museo de Arqueología Peruana. The previous day, Tello had been named director of this new national museum of archaeology and it must have given Tello great satisfaction when, on January 22, 1925, the government ordered the transfer to his museum of all archaeological materials held at the Museo Nacional de Historia (Tello and Mejía 1967:137). These official actions certified Tello’s victory over Gutiérrez and established Tello as his country’s preeminent archaeologist.

Tello had become synonymous with archaeology in Peru. His fame achieved international proportions with his discovery of a major site on the Paracas Peninsula. With the help of the American archaeologist Lothrop (1948b), Tello discovered the ruins of Paracas on July 26, 1925 (Mejía 1950). After months of fieldwork, the discovery was announced in Lima (Anonymous 1926b) as well as in New York City (Anonymous 1926a) and London (Anonymous 1926c). In May, Tello (1926) published a report on the discoveries made at Paracas in the Lima press, a report later presented at the XXII International Congress of Americanists held in Rome (Tello 1942b:689). Then, on October 25, 1927, a team that Tello had sent into the field discovered the first of what were to prove to be hundreds of mummy bundles at Paracas (Mejía 1950).

During September 1928, Tello attended the XXIII International Congress of Americanists held in New York City (Anonymous 1928c). He presented a paper (1930a) in which he expanded his thoughts on the indigenous development of prehistoric civilization in Peru. Then, under the aegis of the Carnegie Institution, he gave a series of lectures at a number of major American universities (Mejía 1948:29). He returned to Lima the first week of December and presented a Paracas textile to the American President-elect Herbert Hoover (Anonymous 1928d; Speers 1928). During 1929, staff at the Museo de Arqueología Peruana initiated the process of opening the mummy bundles found at Paracas (Tello and Mejía 1979:423-445). Finally, on October 16, 1929, the museum opened a new exhibit featuring the Paracas mummy bundles and their contents. Principal speakers at this inaugural event were Tello and the nation’s president, Augusto B. Legúa (Anonymous 1929b). Both men were at the pinnacle of their professions and both were about to fall.

FALL FROM POWER

In 1929 Legúa won an uncontested third term of office scheduled to last through 1934. A successful military coup against his government began on August 22, 1930 and on August 27 the leaders of the coup met in Lima to begin forming a provisional government (Basadre 1961-1964, volume IX:4226-4238). On September 2, Colonel Luis M. Sánchez Cerro was named head of the ruling military junta. His takeover officially ended the 11-year rule of Legúa (Matos et al. 1981:260). This sparked the birth of numerous anti-Legúua publications, including the Lima daily Libertad (Miro Quesada L. 1945: 842). On August 31, in its second issue, a brief anonymous article was printed in Libertad (Anonymous 1930c) in which Tello was accused of having illegally enriched himself while serving as director of the Museo de Arqueología Peruana. A series of authored articles (Degorce 1930; Hurtado 1930; Rodríguez 1930) followed this anonymous one and they served to provide further charges against Tello. Tello (1930b) responded in a letter to the
editor published in *El Comercio*. He addressed each of the charges made against him showing them to be untrue. He then accused the editor of *Libertad*, Francisco A. Loayza, of having written all of the articles in which he had been attacked.\(^2\)

While this public dispute between Tello and Loayza continued unabated, Valcárcel was summoned to Lima to head the Museo Bolivariano, one of the nation’s history museums (Matos et al. 1981:260). In fact, it was so announced in the press (Vega 1930). Before this appointment could take effect, however, he was asked to replace Tello as head of the national museum of archaeology. Valcárcel was reluctant to do so. Loayza’s smear campaign against Tello in *Libertad* disturbed him. Too, Valcárcel was aware that Tello was better suited than he to direct the museum. Valcárcel finally agreed to the change only when it became clear to him that the decision to replace Tello had been made (Matos et al. 1981:260-262).

Upon learning that he had been removed, Tello’s immediate response was angry denial and a stubborn refusal to leave his office (ibid 1981:262). The employees at the museum were stunned, and senior members of Tello’s staff resigned en masse in protest (Tello and Mejía 1967:179). Tello reluctantly concluded that his position was untenable and he stepped down (Matos et al. 1981:262).\(^3\) The public was notified of the change in museum leadership without fanfare (J. R. P. 1930). Tello and loyal members of his senior staff spent the ensuing weeks conducting a detailed inventory of the museum (Tello and Mejía 1967:172-176;180).\(^4\) Upon satisfactory completion of this task, Valcárcel assumed the most powerful and prestigious position in Peruvian archaeology.

**1930-1931: REESTABLISHING AN INSTITUTIONAL BASE**

During the months that followed, a series of government proclamations announced the formation of a new Museo Nacional headed by Valcárcel (Gálvez 1931a, b, d). The Museo de Arqueología Peruana was merged with the Museo Bolivariano and the Museo Nacional de Historia to form this new entity. The Museo Nacional was divided into sections of history and archaeology, with dynamic organs being created for each. The Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas was created to serve as the dynamic organ for the archaeology section. An agreement was reached with the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos which permitted the university’s Instituto Nacional de Antropología to assume the role of this newly created archaeological institute. As head of the university’s institute since its founding, Tello assumed a position in the Museo Nacional when he became director of the Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas. As director, Tello’s first order of business was to oversee the transfer of most of the artifacts discovered by him and his

---

\(^2\) Loayza had published a book (1926) in which he argued that Asian immigrants had influenced the development of prehispanic civilization in Peru. An associate of Tello’s at the national museum wrote an unflattering review of this book (Mejía 1928) which Loayza (1928a) promptly attributed to Tello. This was probably the origin of the dispute between Tello and Loayza.

\(^3\) In a letter dated October 21, 1930, Tello confessed to a feeling of despair that he would ever succeed in permanently establishing a national museum of archaeology. Yet he went on to say that he would persevere with the aid of his loyal collaborators (Mejía 1948:24).

staff on the Paracas Peninsula and in the Nazca Valley during the 1920s from the original Museo de Arqueología Peruana to the new institute. Excluded were the artifacts comprising the Paracas exhibit that had opened in 1929. It was decided that this new institute would be housed at the Museo Bolivariano and transfer of the artifacts began in September 1931 (Tello and Mejía 1967:189; 212).

A number of other proclamations issued by the government during 1931 concerned the safekeeping of the nation’s archaeological heritage. During February 1931, huáqueros excavated tombs on the Paracas Peninsula and artifacts thought to be part of this looted material were offered for sale in New York City (Tello and Mejía 1967:180-181; 194). This prompted the government to issue an edict requiring the registration of all privately held artifacts (Gálvez 1931c). The Patronato Nacional de Arqueología, which had been created in 1929 to oversee archaeology in Peru (Anonymous 1929a), and of which both Tello and Valcárcel were sitting members in 1931, was charged with protecting the nation’s prehistoric heritage (Samánez and Gálvez Durand 1931). In addition, employees of the Museo Nacional, including Tello and his assistants, were charged with the role of inspecting the nation’s archaeological sites (Garido 1931).

As a result of these official actions, Tello was permitted to reassume control over most of the Paracas collection, he was assigned a position within the Museo Nacional, and he was authorized to inspect archaeological sites. This should not be viewed as simply a fortuitous turn of events for Tello. He must have played some role in this. It is highly unlikely that a man who had been active in national politics for more than ten years would have foregone the use of his skills of persuasion and have left his fate entirely to others. It is much more likely that he plied his skills to regain as much of his lost power as he could, and this task would have greatly occupied his attention.

It was not until late in July 1931, when his position in the restructured national museum was secured, that Tello was able to undertake an archaeological expedition (Figure 2). This project was conducted under the auspices of the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (Mejía 1969:118) and may have been inspired by two newspaper articles. The first article concerned the discovery, on January 25, 1931, of the site of Warivilka [Warivilca or Huari-vilca] in the Mantaro Valley. The ruins had been found after an intensive four-year search by Dr. Federico Gálvez Durand of Huancayo (Anonymous 1931d), who then published on his find in the local press (Gálvez 1931; cf. Horkheimer 1950:214). The second article (Gamio 1929; cf. Rowe et al. 1950:121), an illustrated one dealing with the site of Wari [Huari], had

---

5 See Daggett (1991) for a discussion of the discovery of Paracas and Daggett (1994) for an in-depth discussion of the disposition of the artifacts removed from the site.

6 Warivilka is approximate 22 kilometers east of Huancayo, near the community of Huari (Schniepp 2002). The site was being looted for construction material and, given the fact that he was authorized to inspect endangered sites, Tello may have been acting in an official capacity when he lead his team to these ruins. This is suggested as well by the fact that, following their inspection of the site, the team planned to recommend the appointment of an archaeological commission to oversee the preservation and scientific study of Warivilka, as well as the sites of Kotokoto [Cotocoto] and Okopilla [Ocopilla] (Anonymous 1931d). Okopilla (or La Rinconada) lies barely two kilometers from Huancayo’s central plaza (García 1968:189), while Kotokoto is three kilometers from the city (ibid:57). Lacking corroboration, it is assumed the team visited these latter two sites, while it is known the team did visit the site of Patankoto (Mejía1948:14; Tello 1934c:157) some 15 kilometers from Huancayo. Finally, the team also visited the town of Pariahuanca (Kroeber 1944:99) and surface collections were made at an unnamed site in its vicinity (ibid: Note 37, p. 99).
been published in the Lima press a few years earlier. Perhaps with these articles in mind, Tello planned his expedition.

Tello lead a team to Huancayo, which included the American doctoral student Lila M. O’Neale (Kroeber 1944:99). There they spent three days studying archaeological sites in and around this city in the highlands east of Lima.

The expeditionary team then proceeded to Ayacucho. In a suburb of this city one and a half kilometers to the northeast (García 1968:53), the team investigated the ruins of Konchopata [Conchopata] (Tello 1959:7), but whether this was before or after their investigation of the Wari ruins is unknown. In any case, Tello invited the Prefect of Ayacucho to oversee the excavations that were to take place at Wari (Anonymous 1931e). Wari is about two miles east and southeast of the town of Pacaycasa (Rowe et al. 1950:121-122). In addition to Wari, Tello reported that the team also worked at the sites of Okros, Orcasitas, Aukiwilka (1934c:157-158) and Tanta Orko [Tanta Orqo] (Anonymous 1931g) all within the vicinity of Wari. Tello (ibid.) also mentions the Huanta Museum, suggesting that a visit may have been made to it.

7 Tello’s work at Wari sparked the interest of authorities in Ayacucho, and they visited the ruins after Tello and his team had left the area (Anonymous 1931h).

8 O’Neale’s collection housed at the University of California at Berkeley contains sherds collected at Choqollo Orqo [Chocclo Orqo], a hill near the Hacienda Horcasitas, and at Tanta Orqo, a hill bordering this hacienda. Tanta Orqo is described as a flat-topped hill next to the Hacienda Orcasitas [also Orcasitas or Horcasitas] (Rowe et al. 1950:133). The site of Okros is named after the gully in which it is found, at the head of the Quebrada Tarawaiko immediately below the ruins of Wari (Tello 1942b:684). Tanta Orko, Orcasitas and Okros appear, then, to be sites in the vicinity of the Wari ruins. As for Aukiwilka, it is thought that this site and that of Choqollo Orqo are one in the same (Rowe et al. 1950:135).

The team returned to Lima by way of the headwaters of the coastal valleys situated west of the Mantaro Valley. This took them through the Provinces of Yauyos, Huarochirí, Canta, and Cajatambo. On this return leg of the expedition, the team conducted a broad survey and noted scores of archaeological sites (Tello 1959:7). An interview with Tello subsequently formed the basis for a report on Wari (Anonymous 1931g) that was published in the Lima daily El Perú.

Tello appears not to have made any other field trips during 1931, with the dubious exception of one to the Santa Valley on the North Coast, to interview residents about the “Great Wall” recently discovered there during an aerial reconnaissance conducted by the Americans Robert Shippee and George R. Johnson. In his role as director of the university’s museum of archaeology Tello received an inquiry from the American Geographical Society in New York City regarding this discovery. In his reply, which was published in The New York Times (Anonymous 1932), Tello stated that he had been unaware of the wall until its announced discovery, and that he had been unsuccessful in learning anything about it from the owners of the valley’s large haciendas. Tello had visited the Santa Valley in 1926 as part of an exploration of the North Coast (Mejía 1967b:xvi) and, as such, contacts he had made at that time probably provided him with information in 1931. Had he actually solicited this information in person in 1931, he certainly would have sought out the wall, but he makes no mention of having done so prior to his successful attempt in 1934 (Tello 1938). In any event, it should be noted that

9 Although an initial report on the discovery of the wall was announced in The New York Times in May (Anonymous 1931a), and the discovery was later confirmed in this American daily in August (Anonymous 1931b), its discovery was not made public in Lima’s El Comercio until October (Anonymous 1931i).

10 See also Shippee (1932:11).
Tello was made a Fellow of the American Geographical Society on December 22, 1931 (Mejía 1948:30).11

It was Valcárcel, however, who now received most of the honors and invitations that had once gone to Tello when he headed the national museum of archaeology. Valcárcel was made Corresponding Member of the Society of Americanists based in Paris (Anonymous 1931c), and he was appointed by the government to take part in the VII Pan American Scientific Congress to be held in Mexico City in February 1932 (Anonymous 1931j; Gálvez 1931e). Valcárcel, too, was appointed to the committee organized to oversee the celebration of the fourth centennial of the founding of Lima. He used this as an opportunity to promote the construction of a new facility to house the parts of the Museo Nacional that remained in three separate locations (Valcárcel 1932c).

For his part, Tello focused his attention on organizing and studying the Paracas collection in a less-than-adequate provisional setting. A meager initial stipend to operate the Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas was reduced by one third at the start of 1932, a condition that was to remain in effect until September 1938 (Mejía 1948:24).12 It may have been this inadequate funding which cut short the life of a new journal which Tello had just started. Under his editorship, volume 1 of Wira Kocha came out early in 1931 but volume 2, scheduled to come out later that year, was never published (Espejo 1948:23). It is also possible that problems at the university played a role in the brief life span of this journal.

As noted previously Tello began teaching at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos in 1923. Student unrest there had begun in the latter half of 1930 and a resumption of discord occurred in February 1931 (Matos et al. 1981:268). During 1931 there were periodic reports of continued strife (e.g. Anonymous 1931b; Editor 1931). In May 1932, the government closed the university and it remained shut for three years (Matos et al. 1981:269). This placed considerable hardship on Tello, despite the fact that he was able to secure a teaching position at Universidad Pontificia Católica, a position he held until 1936 (Mejía 1948:28). Not only had Tello lost his job at the university, he was no longer permitted access to its library or to its museum of archaeology where his manuscripts, notes, and other materials were stored (Tello 1975-1976:3).

1932-1934: REGAINING A VOICE

Tello all but disappeared from public view in 1932, but he did surface on a couple of occasions. On April 17, 1932, the Lima press published the announcement of emergency actions being taken by the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología to discourage huaquero activity and the illicit shipment of artifacts outside the country (Sayán 1932). This action was being taken because of pillaging that had occurred at Paracas in February and July the previous year (Tello and Mejía 1967:180-181;194-195). On May 23, 1932, El Comercio published an editorial that referred to the looting at Paracas and the emergency actions being taken to prevent a recurrence (Editor 1932). This editorial elicited two responses. The first, signed by Valcárcel (1932a) in his role as Secretary, provided the official position of the Patronato. The second, signed by Tello (1932), was a scathing letter in which the author was highly critical of the

---

11 While Tello’s correspondence may have lead to this honor in New York City, the impetus behind his becoming a founder and life-long member of the Pacific Geographic Society on June 24, 1931 (Mejía 1948:30) is unknown.

12 Though a similar cut in funding was experienced at the Museo Nacional the financial situation at this institution was rectified in 1933 (Matos et al. 1981:347).
measures taken to protect the site of Paracas. This forced Valcárcel (1932b) to answer in defense of the role of the Museo Nacional in this matter. Tello’s outspoken criticism was likely aimed not at Valcárcel, but at two of his employees at the Museo Nacional.

Subsequent to the sacking of Paracas in July 1931, Valcárcel had led a team of researchers to Paracas that included Jorge Muelle and Eugenio Yacovleff. Both had worked for Tello at the Museo de Arqueología Peruana and Yacovleff had been among the senior staff to resign en masse upon hearing of Tello’s discharge. However, both Yacovleff and Muelle then agreed to work for Valcárcel at the Museo Nacional, becoming highly valued archaeologists there (Matos et al. 1981:284, 287). Muelle (1931) and Yacovleff (Yacovleff and Muelle 1932) each published on the results of the work they had conducted at Paracas in 1931, the latter in the Museo Nacional’s new well-funded journal. Tello’s anger was likely fueled by the fact that “his site” was now in the hands of those he felt had been disloyal to him.

Tello’s frustration may have led him to publish in the Lima press an invitation he had received to attend the upcoming XXV International Congress of Americanists to be held in Argentina (Levene and Vignato 1932a). The invitation was ignored by those empowered to act upon it. In response to Tello’s apparent ploy to elicit public support for his attendance, a like invitation to Valcárcel was also made public (Levene and Vignato 1932b). It was the architect Hector Greslebin, however, who went as the official delegate of the Museo Nacional (Amaral 1934, volume 1:xx). Though Tello received an honor from the University of London on July 25, 1932 (Mejía 1948:30), this would have occurred in his absence. He was in no position to travel, apparently not even inside Peru as no field trips are reported for him during 1932. Instead he devoted his attention to museum research and, in January 1933, he and his staff reinitiated the opening of Paracas mummy bundles (Tello and Mejía 1979:362-384, 445-446).

During this period of research Tello was reminded of an invitation he had received six to seven years earlier to see a then recently exposed painted mural at Cerro Blanco in the Nepeña Valley. He had ignored the invitation because the description of the mural suggested a culture relatively late in date and his interest was focused further back in time. It was with this invitation in mind that Tello agreed to accompany Lucy Bentick and her mother on a trip to the North Central Coast (Tello 1933b). As the wife of the English Ambassador to Peru, Lucy Bentick drew the attention of the press.13 She and her traveling companions visited the Hacienda San Jacinto (Figure 3) in the Nepeña Valley (Anonymous 1933d) where they were shown photographs of the above mural, Cerro Blanco being a few miles lower in the valley. After leaving Nepeña, they drove south, first stopping in the Casma Valley (Anonymous 1933e) and then at Huacho in the Huaura Valley (Anonymous 1933f). While in this latter valley they took note of a series of prehistoric walls (Carrión 1933) that had first been seen from the air by members of the Shippee-Johnson expedition (García 1968:173). This trip inspired Tello to lead a team on an expedition to the North Coast a few months later. Tello and his team first explored the Chicama Valley and the Cupisnique Quebrada just north of it (Mejía

---

13 According to Valcárcel (Matos et al. 1981:294), Tello cultivated American and British friends in high places. On one occasion the wife of the British Ambassador is said to have spoken with the President of Peru about giving Tello back his directorship of the national museum of archaeology.
They then excavated at the site of El Cortijo near the massive ruins of Chan Chán on the outskirts of Trujillo in the Moche Valley, after which they continued southward exploring the Virú, Chao and Santa Valleys before reaching that of Nepeña (Tello 1933b).

On September 10th, Tello (1933a) announced in the Lima press the discovery of the ruins of Cerro Blanco in the Nepeña Valley. This he did through the publication of a letter dated August 21, 1933 he had written to the Minister of Public Education. These ruins, because they were Chavín in nature, were very important to his long-held argument that South American prehistoric civilization, in general, and that of Peru, in particular, was indigenous in nature (e.g. Tello 1921). In his letter Tello requested government funding to finance his excavations. The Ministry of Public Education was responsible, in part, for overseeing the nation’s museums so, in effect, Tello was going over Valcárcel’s head to request help. Receiving no response, he continued his excavations at Cerro Blanco and the ruins of Punkuri further up valley. This he did with the aid of men (Anonymous 1933h) and money (Basombrio 1933) donated by the nearby Hacienda San Jacinto. Tello’s request and his continued work stirred up a controversy. An investigative team, which included Valcárcel, was formed and sent to Nepeña (Olaechea 1933). Shorty after Tello’s initial announcement about his discovery in Nepeña and his request for funding, Valcárcel (1933b) announced that the Museo Nacional had received government funding to conduct a massive project of archaeological clearing, repair, and restoration at sites in and around Cusco. This was to be done in conjunction with the celebration of the fourth centennial of the Spanish foundation of that city. Valcárcel’s announcement caused an editor of Lima’s daily El Comercio to ask why some of the money to be used in Cusco could not be used by Tello in Nepeña (Editor 1933). Valcárcel (1933c) was forced to explain that the money had been appropriated by the legislature specifically for the Cusco work and could not by law be diverted elsewhere. This public discussion served to focus attention on the fact that there was an effort under way to have Cusco

---

14 This expedition included Toribio Mejía Xesspe and two students, Pedro Benvenutto Murrieta and Javier Pulgar Vidal (Santisteban 1956:21). Benvenutto was a student at Católica (Carrión 1933) as was Pulgar (Mejía 1956:320). While neither student continued in the field of archaeology, both had successful careers in related fields. Pulgar went on to become a geographer (Milla 1986, Volume VII:310-312) while Benvenutto became focused on linguistics and folklore (ibid, Volume II:60).

15 On September 19, 1933, Rebeca Carrión Cachot reported in El Comercio (1933) that she had recently participated in a tour of archaeological sites in valleys north of Lima. This had been at the invitation of Tello. She noted that other participants were Toribio Mejía Xesspe, Beatriz Cisneros, Laura Zegarra, the engineer Enrique Rivero Tremouille, and the La Católica students Pedro Benvenutto and Guillermo Geberding. The participants visited many sites according to Carrión, but most she mentioned only in general terms. Other sites she mentioned specifically. Among them are the wall of Huara and the cemeteries of Doña María and Agua Dulce in the Huara Valley, the ruins of Chankillo near Casma in the Casma Valley, the “Great Wall” in the Santa Valley, and the ruins of Chan Chán in the Moche Valley. Mention was also made of a visit to the Museo Chiclín at Hacienda Chiclín near Chicama in the valley of that name. Though Carrión’s participation in the tour came at Tello’s invitation, it cannot be stated with certainty that Tello himself took part in the tour because he is not specifically mentioned as a participant. It is known that Tello visited the site of Doña Maria in 1937 (Mejía 1956:322). This large cemetery is on the northern edge of the lower Chancay Valley (Strong and Willey 1943:9).

16 This discovery was soon thereafter announced in The New York Times (Anonymous 1933g).

17 Valcárcel (Matos et al. 1981:282) states that Tello strongly objected to the arrival of the commission in Nepeña. See Daggett (1987) for other details about the excavations in Nepeña.
challenge Lima as the nation’s center for archaeological research.

It will be recalled that Hector Greslebin represented the Museo Nacional at the XXV International Congress of Americanists held in Argentina in 1932. There he proposed that the government of Peru spare no effort to restore and safeguard Cusco, and this idea was carried a step further by Martín Noel, the Ecuadorian delegate, who proposed that Cusco be declared the Archaeological Capital of South America (Amaral 1934, Volume 1:xlv; Márquez 1933). With the full support of the Museo Nacional, the Peruvian legislature adopted Noel’s motion, and the idea of a regional archaeological museum being established at Cusco was developed (Cosio 1933). The idea of a national museum of archaeology being created there was then promoted by one of its citizens, Atilio Sivirichi (1933a). Making matters more interesting was the fact that Sivirichi was linked with Tello’s chief tormentor, Francisco A. Loayza.

A native of Cusco (Milla 1986, Volume 8:313), Sivirichi first made news in the Lima press at the end of April 1928 when he participated in a cultural event sponsored by the Centro Cuzco and which took place in the locale of the Sociedad Geográfica de Lima (Anonymous 1928a). Three weeks later an announcement was made in Lima’s El Tiempo (Anonymous 1928b) that Sivirichi and Loayza, among others, were to take part in an archaeological expedition it was sponsoring to the Province of Canta. As director of the expedition, Loayza (1928b) subsequently authored one account of the studies made while Sivirichi (1928) published a second more detailed account. Sivirichi, like Loayza 19 believed that ancient Peruvian civilization was the result of outside influences. He published his ideas in a book (1930a) dealing with the prehistory of Peru. He argued that South America had experienced waves of migrations originating from the north during prehistoric times, migrations that brought civilization to South America. This was an idea antithetical to that held by Tello. Not surprisingly, Sivirichi’s book drew a highly favorable review from Loayza (1930).

Early in 1930, Loayza helped found the Sociedad de Arqueología e Historia (Anonymous 1930a) while Sivirichi later helped to draft the governing by-laws for this society (Anonymous 1930b). He was the society’s first featured speaker (Anonymous 1930d) thus providing him with one avenue to broadcast his ideas. Sivirichi was able to reach an even wider audience with the help of El Comercio. First he chastised Tello for the unscientific nature of his work at Paracas (1929), then he proceeded to publish a series of articles, based on his book, suggesting his own archaeological expertise (1930b-d). Sivirichi, then, had exploded onto the Lima scene at a time when Tello’s own position was about to come under attack.

Given their intellectual differences, Sivirichi must have relished Tello’s downfall at the hands of Loayza in 1930. Following in this vein, it should come as no surprise to learn that Sivirichi and Loayza were Tello’s most vocal critics during the Nepeña crisis. Loayza (1933a) criticized Tello for having conducted excavations outside the law while Sivirichi (1933c) argued that the discoveries made in Nepeña supported the argument that South American civilization owed its impetus to Mesoamerican colonization and not to independent development as argued by Tello. The next day Valcárcel put an end to that argument when he stated emphatically in an El Comercio interview that Tello’s discoveries indeed supported the idea of independent development (Anonymous 1933i). Tello then

---

18 An article published by Valcárcel (1934c) is notable in this regard.

19 See Note 2.
began publishing in *El Comercio* a series of three articles (1933b-d) in which he reviewed the trajectory of his ideas concerning this independent development of prehispanic civilization. Loayza (1933b) immediately expressed his outrage that *El Comercio* would allow Tello such a forum. One can only imagine Loayza’s outrage when it was subsequently reported that the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología had agreed to recompense Tello for all expenses incurred in Nepeña and to return control of the excavations back to him (Anonymous 1933k, l).20

Tello’s renewed popularity was made public by plans for a dinner to be given in his honor and to be attended by many of Lima’s elite,21 including Valcárcel (Anonymous 1933m). The highlight of the evening was a speech by Tello in which he included discussions of his discoveries in Nepeña and at Paracas (Anonymous 1933c). The latter discussion brought a negative response from Eugenio Yacovleff (1933) in which he disputed a number of Tello’s claims and cast doubt on his scientific expertise. Yacovleff was then head of the technical section of the department of archaeology at the Museo Nacional (Finn 1934). In his role as Director of the Museo Nacional, Valcárcel (1933d) immediately issued a response in which he stated that Yacovleff’s views were his own and not that of the museum. Yacovleff’s unexpected death the following year (Finn 1934) probably served to make life easier for both Tello and Valcárcel.

With the Nepeña crisis settled, Valcárcel quickly turned his attention to Cusco. Traveling by way of Arequipa (Anonymous 1933q), where he visited some recently discovered ruins (Anonymous 1933u), he arrived in Cusco (Anonymous 1933r) and assumed overall direction of the Museo Nacional’s archaeological work there that continued until July 1934 (Valcárcel 1946:177). News of this work enthralled the public (e.g., Anonymous 1933s; 1933t; 1934b). Tello was in the news as well. At the start of 1934 he published in *El Comercio* an article (Tello 1934a) which included a reference to the theft of gold artifacts from the Museo Nacional the year before.22 Tello may well have been testing his renewed public standing in publishing this not-so-subtle criticism of Valcárcel and his staff at the Museo Nacional. In any case, illusions that Valcárcel may have entertained that his recent public support of Tello would be reciprocated in kind would have been dashed.23

Tello then became embroiled in a controversy while on a mission for the Patronato

---

20 In this regard, it should be noted that, after his return from Nepeña, Valcárcel specifically stated in an interview (Anonymous 1933j) that he had no intention of interfering with Tello’s work there.

21 A banquet was later held in honor of Loayza who had been appointed by the government to serve as Peru’s Consul in Seville, Spain (Anonymous 1933p). One of his final acts before leaving Peru was to donate some artifacts he had found in tombs in the Chancay Valley to the Museo Nacional (Loayza and Valcárcel 1933).

22 During the early hours of January 18, 1933, gold artifacts estimated to weigh a total of three kilos were stolen from the Museo Nacional (Anonymous 1933a). Three suspects were apprehended early the next morning at the museum while attempting to steal more artifacts (Anonymous 1933b; 1933c). Tello and Valcárcel presented a report on this matter at the May 22 meeting of the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología (Tello and Mejía 1967:197). Subsequently, Valcárcel issued a public statement (1933a) in which he indicated that 961 gold artifacts had been stolen, a figure later confirmed by Tello (1934a). This was nearly the entire collection of such objects housed at the Museo Nacional (Tello and Mejía 1967:197). See also Valcárcel’s memoir (Matos et al. 1981:265).

23 Despite these constant attacks, Valcárcel practiced remarkable restraint. It is interesting to note in this regard that, in his memoir, Valcárcel (Matos et al. 1981:282) indicated that his personal relationship with Tello was cordial.
Nacional de Arqueología (Anonymous 1934c).²⁴ He was actively seeking out those responsible for looting tombs at Paracas²⁵ in December 1933 (Editor 1934; Tello and Mejía 1967:196).²⁶ It appears that Tello was enjoying the opportunity to finally express his outrage on matters of real concern to him. He soon caused another commotion, this time in Cusco, with the publication in Lima of a long article in part critical of the manner in which archaeological investigations were being carried out in and around Cusco (Tello 1934b). By implication, this was a criticism of Valcárcel and his staff at the Museo Nacional. Though there was to be a response it was not to come from Valcárcel but from another familiar source.

A series of articles had recently been published in the Cusco press that charged financial irregularities in the archaeological work being conducted on behalf of the city’s fourth centennial celebration (e.g., Anonymous 1934d-e). Valcárcel (1934a) immediately issued a clarification that he and the Museo Nacional were not at fault in this matter. The charges of financial irregularities continued (e.g., Anonymous 1934f; Valdes 1934) and Tello seized that moment to level his criticisms. Sivirichi (1933b) was highly supportive of the archaeological work being done in Cusco and he was at that moment on the North Coast giving a series of lectures promoting Cusco’s fourth centennial celebration (Anonymous 1934g). The Comité Ejecutivo pro-Conmemoración del IV Centenario del Cusco notified him by telegram of Tello’s article and Sivirichi responded with a telegram critical of Tello (Anonymous 1934h). Sivirichi then apparently cut his speaking tour short and returned to Cusco (Anonymous 1934i). A week later Tello’s article was reprinted in the Cusco press (Anonymous 1934j). Sivirichi responded with a letter (1934) in which he chided Tello for his alarmist article and in which he disdainfully proceeded to review what he argued was Tello’s less than sterling career as a scientific archaeologist. Tello apparently chose to ignore Sivirichi and this was to prove to be the latter’s final public salvo against him. Tello had survived years of defamatory attacks and, though a regional center for archaeological research was established at Cusco (Anonymous 1934z), it was never to become the national center that Sivirichi had envisioned. Tello had reemerged as Peru’s most respected archaeologist and his subsequent activities reflected this fact.

**1934 -1935: RETURNING TO THE FIELD**

In January 1934 Tello was granted permission by the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología to conduct explorations at the site of Chavín de Huantar (Figure 3), in the surrounding provinces of Huaraz, Huari, and Pomobamba, as well as along the Río Marañón (Anonymous 1934a). In the months leading up to his eventual arrival at Chavín concern was expressed by local citizens about how well the nearby ruins would survive the current rainy season (e.g., Anonymous 1934l; 1934m; 1934n; Flores 1934) suggesting that Tello’s visit was anxiously awaited. But Tello was then busy with other matters. During May he was asked to teach at the Colegio Antonio Raimondi in Lima, and he did so

---

²⁴ Tello’s traveling companion was Fortunato L. Herrera of the Museo Nacional (Tello y Mejía 1967:196). Herrera, a botanist and native of Cusco, had accepted a teaching position in the Facultad de Ciencias Naturales at the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos in 1932. During the years 1933-1934 he occasionally served as acting director of the Museo Nacional and from 1935-1942 he was chief of that institution’s department of history (Anonymous 1945).

²⁵ Tello is reported to have worked at a Paracas site at Ocucaje, below Ica in the valley of the same name, in 1933 (Lothrop 1948a:53). If so, this is likely when he did.

²⁶ Tello submitted his report on the matter to the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología in a meeting held in April 1934 (Anonymous 1934k).
for the next two years (Santisteban 1956:25). The money he thus earned supplemented the meager salary he was paid by La Católica (Santisteban 1956:20) and anything he may have been paid by the Museo Nacional.

Tello and his team left Lima on July 24, 1934. The group included the American students Cornelius Van S. Roosevelt and Richard Cross. They had been inspired to visit Peru by the Shippee-Johnson aerial expedition of 1931. Specifically, they had come to make a detailed examination of the Santa wall discovered by Shippee and Johnson (Shippee 1932). Upon their arrival the students had promptly visited Tello and learned of his impending field trip. In return for their promise to act as the expedition’s official photographers, Tello agreed to include an exploration of the “Great Wall” of Santa in his itinerary. The first night was spent in Huacho where they photographed the remains of a prehispanic wall (Roosevelt 1935: 21) (likely the one mentioned as having been seen by Tello the year before in the company of Lucy Bentick). A car was placed at their disposal at the Grace Company’s Paramonga hacienda, and they used it to explore the ruins of Paramonga. After stopping in Huarmey, they proceeded to the Casma Valley where they investigated the ruins of Chanquillo and nearby sites before reaching the Port of Chimbote the night of July 26th (ibid:23-27).

Early the next morning Tello and his team traveled to the Hacienda Santa Clara near the ocean in the Santa Valley. The owner provided them with horses and a guide. They inquired about the “Great Wall” but learned little talking with local authorities, and spent the day being shown various archaeological sites. The following day, after one discouraging attempt, they succeeded in following a section of the “Great Wall” up valley. They spent the night at the small farm of Huaca Corral and the next morning, July 28, they completed their inspection of the structure and returned to Santa Clara (ibid:27-32). They had explored approximately 12 kilometers of the wall, stretching from Las Salinas de Guadalupito to Tanguche (Tello 1938). The next day they took the train up the Santa Valley to Huallanca where they hired a truck to take them to Caraz. There they took time to photograph some stone carvings, some of which had been built into local homes. The next two days were spent in the Huaraz area, taking more photographs of artifacts and visiting the ruins of Kekemarca where Tello enlisted local men to help him expose the carved side of a large stele. From Huaraz they traveled to Olleros where horses were provided for their trip to Chavín (Roosevelt 1935:32-36).

Tello and his team were eagerly anticipated by the residents of Chavín (Anonymous 1934o, 1934p) and they arrived on August 5 accompanied by Padre Soriano Infante, President of the Sociedad Arqueológica de Ancash, and Pedro

---

27 Students from this secondary school class were sent by Tello into the field with instructions to trace the Central Coast network of Inca roads (Santisteban 1956:25).

28 The team probably also included Toribio Mejía Xesspe and Vicente Segura Núñez. Tello (1943:152) reports that he sent Mejía to investigate a site in the Chicama Valley while he was exploring Chavín de Huantar. It has also been reported (Tello 1960:62) that Mejía and Segura were at Chavín de Huantar in 1934 and that they helped to draw up a plan of the site.

29 See Bennett (1944:12-13) for a description of this site.

30 On August 1, 1934, a paper written by Tello (1934d) was presented in London at the First International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. This meeting was held from July 30 through August 4, 1934 (Blom 1934:636). Clearly the paper had to have been read in his absence. Tello could not have been in attendance given the fact that he was then conducting fieldwork in Peru.
Vega Gamaro (Anonymous 1934q). The latter, Director of Astrology of the Instituto Arqueológico de Ancash, assisted Tello with making molds of the monoliths at Chavín de Huantar, while the others explored the ruins. Local interest convinced Tello to present a talk on August 8 (Anonymous 1934r). The process of making molds continued, as did the collection of surface artifacts (Anonymous 1934s). Then, on August 12, Tello and Vega left Chavín for exploration of the Marañón. They planned to return around August 18, while Soriano headed back to Huáraz (Anonymous 1934t). The Marañón trip took longer than expected and Tello and Vega did not return to Chavín until August 24 (Anonymous 1934u; 1934v). During their trip they had made archaeological discoveries at San Marcos, just east of Chavín, and at Uco, Chichipón, and Tinyash progressively closer to the Marañón (Tello 1960:5). Tello gave a talk at Chavín the night of August 25, and the next day he was reported to be in San Marcos while Vega remained with the rest of the team at Chavín de Huantar (Anonymous 1934w). Then, on August 27, Tello and Vega left Chavín, thanking the community for its hospitality (Anonymous 1934x).

Tello and Vega were next reported to have been at San Marcos on August 30 (Anonymous 1934y), and then at Caraz on September 8, the latter after having explored the ruins of Tunshucaycco [Tumshukaiko]32 and Incahuain33 (Anonymous 1934aa). It was during September that they excavated at the ruins of Kopa Grande a little to the west of the Hacienda Dextre in Carhuaz, roughly midway between Huáraz and Caraz. In the company of Tomás Dextre34 they explored the tombs of Tullo, situated near Huáraz, a site that Dextre had first explored in 1916-1920. One other site investigated at this time was that of Walun [Hualun] found near Huáraz (Tello 1942b:664-668).35

During January 1935 Tello worked on a manuscript concerning the religious beliefs of the ancient inhabitants of the Lima or Rimac Valley (Shady and Novoa 1999:45-49). He also conducted a visual inspection of the ruins of Mateo Salado or Cinco Cerritos (ibid:96).36 Then, during February, he expanded his archaeological investigations. He focused on the Central Coast and explored sites in the Rimac,

31 In all likelihood the Sociedad Arqueológica de Ancash and the Instituto Arqueológico de Ancash refer to the same entity: the Instituto de Estudios Arqueológicos y Folklóricos de Ancash. This institute was founded by Soriano in 1933, a priest who received his doctorate in theology in 1929 (Garbin et al. 1943-1944:753). Vega, who was awarded his medical degree in surgery in 1929, was a founder and organizer of the Museo Regional Arqueológico de Huaraz. (Ibid:840-841). This museum was created by Supreme Resolution No. 229, dated October 22, 1935. The museum was the inspiration of Soriano, while its first director, Vega, was so-named in Ministerial Resolution No. 7707, dated December 3, 1935 (Tello and Mejía 1967:249).

32 Tello (1942b:702) mentions the ruins of Tumshukaiko in the Caraz area. See also García (1968:361) for a discussion of Tunsacaica and Medina (1930:90) for a discussion of Tunshucayco.

33 See García (1968:135) for a brief discussion of the site of Incahuain situated in Caras Province.

34 Dextre sold 420 pieces of his collection of Callejón pottery to the national museum in Lima (Tello and Mejía 1967:250; 253).

35 For a description of Hualun, see García (1968:116).

36 In a report dated January 26, 1936, Tello discussed the value of archaeological monuments found in the Magdelena Vieja section of Lima. He noted that the ruins of Mateo Salado were among the best preserved of those he had seen (Shady and Novoa 1999:99-100). In an earlier report to the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología dated January 11, 1936, Tello discussed the value of archaeological monuments in the Rimac Valley as a whole (Ibid:1999:43-44). This strongly suggests that Tello was conducting inspections of archaeological ruins throughout the Rimac Valley on behalf of this official government body.
Chillón, and Chancay Valleys (Mejía 1948:15). The sites of Huaral Viejo and Teatino\(^{37}\) are mentioned as having been visited (Mejía 1967a:xvii). Tello remained active during the weeks and months to follow. He prepared a report for the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología (Anonymous 1935e), he gave a series of six lectures in English at the British Legation in Lima during the period May 15 to June 24, 1935 (Anonymous 1935a; Mejía 1948:28-29), and he made himself available to a group of American University professors and students, headed by Edgar Lee Hewett\(^{38}\) that arrived at the Port of Callao on June 27, 1935 (Anonymous 1935b). They had come in response to Valcárcel’s invitation (e.g., Editor 1935) to individuals and to institutions to take advantage of Cusco’s new archaeological institute and to explore the Southern Highlands of Peru. The group spent nine days in Lima, visiting its archaeological museums and exploring various ruins in and around the city. Among others, Tello and Valcárcel provided the group generous assistance (Dutton 1935:97-100). Subsequently the group traveled to Cusco and conducted weeks of exploration in affiliation with the archaeological institute (Annis 1935; Valcárcel 1936).

During this time the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos was reopened, and this meant that Tello was again permitted access to its library and archaeology museum. It also meant that he was again subject to attack by critics. In a letter dated August 13, 1935, but not published until three weeks later while he was in the field, he rebutted recent criticism which held that part of the university’s archaeological collection was missing (Tello 1935). Tello had returned to the field because of discoveries that had been made a few years before at the sites of Kotosh and nearby Shillacoto (Tello 1942b:635). On July 26th, 1935, he and his team\(^{39}\) passed through Canta after having visited the ruins of Kantamarca in the upper Chillón Valley (Anonymous 1935d). In the Huánuco area the expeditionary team studied the ruins of Huánuco Viejo, near La Unión, as well as Choras. They then conducted excavations at Kotosh (Mejía 1967a:xvi) situated about three kilometers west of the city of Huánuco (Tello 1943:152). The team also visited Shillacoto (Figueroa 1940:66). After exploring the Upper Huallaga area of Huánuco Province, the team extended their research into the Callejón de Huaylas (Mejía 1956:320).

Finally, on October 24, 1935, Tello, Valcárcel, and Sr. Suárez Polar were reported to have been in the Arequipa area (Figure 4), having completed excavations at Wactalacta [Huactallacta] and planning to take the night train to Cusco. In the same dispatch it was reported that Tello, Valcárcel, and a member of the British Legation in Lima were in Arequipa and planned to return to Lima in fifteen days. They were on their way to study the ruins of

---

\(^{37}\) Tello is reported (Mejía 1956:322) to have revisited this cemetery site in 1937. It is to be found in the Quebrada Lachay in the lower Chancay Valley (Strong and Willey 1943:9).

\(^{38}\) Hewett was the founder and Director of the School of American Research and he founded the Department of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico (Fisher 1947:78). During the trip to Peru in 1935, he was assisted by Verle Annis, professor of architecture at the University of California at Los Angeles. The students making the trip were Mary Arthur, Virginia Bebermeyer, Margaret Berkowski, Jean Cady, Bertha Dutton, Albert Ely, Edwin Ferdon, Esther Funk, Nan Glenn, Marion Hollenbach, Alice Leinan, Doris Leinan, Barbara Loomis, Margaret McCarr, Betty McCreery and Honour McCreery (Anonymous 1935c; Lubensky 2007).

\(^{39}\) He was accompanied by the Lieutenant Mayor Alejo Falconi (Anonymous 1935d) and by La Católica student Javier Pulgar Vidal (Mejía 1956:320).
Churajón⁴⁰ and Chuquibamba⁴¹ (Anonymous 1935f). Valcárcel had been granted permission to inspect ruins in the Southern Highlands of Peru by the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología. He had invited Tello because of his expertise and their work had begun with the above mentioned excavations at Wactalacta. Tello and Valcárcel then visited a number of sites in the Cusco area, including Machu Picchu, Salarpunco, Ollantaytambo, Yucay, Calca, Pisac, Pikillacta, Sacasaahuaman, and Kenko. Valcárcel and his team from the Museo Nacional had worked at these sites in 1934 (Valcárcel 1934b). A detailed examination of the material deposited by this team at the archaeological institute in Cusco led Tello and Valcárcel to conclude that the work overseen by Valcárcel in 1934 had been preliminary in nature. That is, Valcárcel was forced to admit that the work done by the Museo Nacional had only exposed the most recent archaeological levels, leaving earlier ones still to be exposed and studied (Matos et al. 1981:298).

At some point during their exploration, Tello and Valcárcel received information that caused them to turn south toward Lake Titicaca (Figure 4). Their destination was the ruins of Pukara (Valcárcel 1937). Valcárcel had excavated there years earlier (Valcárcel 1925). The village of Pukara, situated on the right side of the river of that name, was an ancient pottery-making center and there Tello found artifacts similar to those he had encountered at Kotosh and Chavín de Huantar (Tello 1943:152-153). Two days were spent at this site (Valcárcel 1937:586). Tello and Valcárcel subsequently presented in December a detailed account of their expedition at the next meeting of the Patronato Nacional de Arqueología (Anonymous 1935g). Due to strong public interest in their joint expedition, Valcárcel (1935) then published a summary of what they had accomplished and the conclusions they had reached.

CONCLUSION

Tello did suffer a tremendous loss when he was removed as Director of the Museo de Arqueología Peruana in 1930 and he did experience financial deprivation of a personal and institutional nature during the subsequent years. However, Tello did not pass these years in poverty and obscurity. Such a statement implies that Tello passively accepted these deprivations and this was simply not the case. Instead, as I have demonstrated through extensive use of Lima press accounts, Tello used every resource available to him in an effort to regain what he had lost.

Likely working behind the scene in 1931, Tello regained some of his lost power when he was named to a position in the new Museo Nacional. In 1932 Tello began to use the Lima press to voice his concerns on archaeological issues and in 1933, he used the press to marshal public support for his full return to national prominence. The years 1932-1933, as well as the beginning of 1934, represented a controversial time for Tello, yet not only did he survive the attacks of his detractors, he actually seemed to thrive on them. Finally, the years 1934-1935 were very active ones for him. Tello had reemerged on the national scene seemingly stronger than ever.

---

⁴⁰ These ruins are to be found 50 kilometers from Arequipa (García 1942:79). Valcárcel had previously visited Churajón (or Swaka) on December 27, 1933 in the company of Dr. Bernedo Málega (Suárez and Valcárcel 1934:175). Padre Leonidas Bernedo Málega had earlier reported his discovery of this site (Anonymous 1933n). See Kroeber (1944:13) for further details about Churajón. A preliminary report on Churajón was subsequently published in the Revista del Museo Nacional (Suárez and Valcárcel 1934).

⁴¹ It is unclear whether the planned work at sites in the Chuquibamba area actually took place. Tello (e.g., 1942b) makes no mention of having conducted work there in subsequent publications.
In 1936, Tello acted upon an invitation he had received from Hewett to lecture in the United States (Heliodoro 1937:20). The principal result of his visit was the formation of the Institute of Andean Research (Tello 1956:4-5). The following year, Nelson Rockefeller visited Tello at his museum in Lima and he agreed to help fund the preservation and exhibition of the Paracas collection (Tello and Mejía 1967:213-215). Rockefeller also agreed to help finance an exploration of coastal and highland regions north of Lima that Tello was about to commence and which was supported by funding from the recently formed Andean institute (Tello 1956:5-6). As a result of the discoveries made during this major expedition and because of Rockefeller’s interest in the Paracas collection, the Peruvian government agreed to provide Tello with a new and larger facility. The Museo de Antropología was created in 1938 by presidential decree as an entity separate from the Museo Nacional (Tello and Mejía 1967:217-222).

During 1939, the International Congress of Americanists held sessions, first, in Mexico City and, then, in Lima. In Mexico City Tello presented a major paper (1942a) in which he first detailed his thoughts on the Chavín culture. Then, in Lima, he presented a second major paper (1942b) in which he set out his thoughts on Peruvian prehistory in general. Days after the close of the Lima session Tello hosted a meeting at his home which resulted in the formation of the Asociación Peruana de Arqueología, a national organization of archaeologists (Editor 1940:78-79).

Tello and his staff at the Museo de Antropología were very active during the years that followed and they made important discoveries in the environs of Lima, Cusco, and Chavín. The existing facility proved inadequate to house the growing collection and once again Tello obtained a new and larger facility. In 1945 the Museo Nacional de Antropología y Arqueología was inaugurated. All archaeological collections in Lima housed in state facilities were transferred to this new museum and regional museums were placed under its jurisdiction (Tello and Mejía 1967:225-241).² Tello and archaeology were again synonymous in Peru.
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Figure 1. General map of Peru showing some of the places mentioned in this article. All locations are approximate. We have not been able to place all archaeological sites and haciendas mentioned. Ovals indicate areas of more detailed maps. For the location of Peruvian provinces in Tello’s day see a pre-1985 atlas designed for elementary school students such as the Atlas del Perú published by the Guía Lascano, or other standard geographical source.
Figure 2. Sites and towns to the east and southeast of Lima visited by Tello.
Figure 3. Sites and towns to the north of Lima visited by Tello.
Figure 4. Sites and towns in the Cusco and Arequipa regions visited by Tello.