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INTRODUCTION

Time has proven that like any nation which has risen to greatness, the United States is not without its faults. Despite being considered a global super-power and looked to as a beacon of democracy, it has not risen to this status with an untarnished rapport. The country has also been wrought with internal conflict concerning its democratic principles and values. To its own detriment, the U.S. government has at times exploited a number of minority groups, including Native Americans, African Americans, and Mexican Americans, be it for economic gains, expansion of U.S. territory, or to use the groups as convenient scapegoats for promoting certain political agendas. Much of this government behavior has been driven by a discriminatory majority acting out against various minority groups. Indeed, the election and appointment of prejudiced officials has, through legislation and other means, permitted and even institutionalized horrible acts of injustice against minorities, including slavery and segregation. Overcoming such injustices has been one of the great ongoing challenges that progressive-minded Americas have undertaken to this day.¹

In today’s current political climate, most Americans are aware of the sordid aspects of our U.S. history. Americans are also knowledgeable of the many progressively minded leaders—visionary leaders like Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King, Jr., César Chávez, and their supporters—that have time and again stood up against, helped to overcome many acts of injustice, and led America towards a more progressive path of equality and protected liberty. Despite such progress, some members of the public continue to adhere to discriminatory sentiments or beliefs, lending credence to the notion that it is permissible to exploit minorities,

¹ See Table 1 in Appendix A for a brief overview of some key historical events and developments related to this subject.
that they are perhaps second rate citizens, and that likeminded individuals need to be elected into office for the purpose of pursuing an anti-minority political agenda.\(^2\)

Given the discrepancies of the past and present, a responsibility lies with scholars to continue to study, debate, and address these historical developments and their implications. After all, if history has taught us anything, it is that it is important not to forget and to continue to educate the younger generations about our past. It is only by remembering what has transpired that we can hope to avoid the same mistakes in the future so that the horrible episodes of the past—and the lessons learned from them—are not forgotten or brushed over. After all, America is a country that is defined by its efforts and progress towards becoming a more perfect union—one that values equality among its citizens.

**Examining the FBI’s Impact on Social Movements**

In this thesis, my interest lies in the government’s use of counterintelligence programs (COINTELPRO) to target minority groups. In this vein, I have taken on the task of examining the history of one of our largest and most praised bureaucratic agencies, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Specifically, I explore the impact that the FBI had on the Chicano Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s. During this tumultuous time period, society was changing and the United States government was struggling to cope with the growing demands of minority groups that had long suffered from acts of injustice and the ensuing tension and violence between minority (and nonminority) progressive activists and the strong resistance they faced from opponents. At the same time, many bureaucratic agencies, including the FBI, were themselves evolving in their treatment of minorities amid progressive activism efforts.

\(^2\) A large scholarly literature has been dedicated to exploring and understanding evolving public perceptions of race and ethnicity and their implications related to public policy (e.g., for a recent treatment of this topic, see Peffley and Hurwitz 2010).
While scholars have long explored the changes that occurred in society, as well as the evolution of the U.S. government with respect to the presidency and the legislative and judicial branches, fewer works have explored the evolution of key bureaucratic entities—such as the FBI—within such context. In addition, although there is extensive literature available regarding the struggles of African Americans and the suppressive role played by the federal government, far less attention has been given to the struggles concerning the Chicano movement and the role of the government—most notably the FBI—in suppressing and disbanding the various leaders and groups associated with the movement.

Essentially, my interest in this project began after several conversations with my father, who was politically active during the 1960s and 1970s. From mulling over accounts of his experiences and dealings with the FBI, I began to wonder if the FBI targeted political and social activists in general, certain groups, or whether their actions fell within the purview of their duties. Over time, I began reading books on the various movements and their leaders and wondered if any of their claims might be substantiated. I also wondered to what extent the FBI’s actions were conducted in response to acts or threats of violence from certain groups or individuals, or if the FBI employed a wider effort to affect social movements more broadly, including the use of infiltration and ambush tactics. It was at that point that I began to gather my

---

3 My father would talk of his days of being politically active, largely in the El Paso, Texas area and how, after requesting the FBI file on himself, he learned that at various times he had been followed, subjected to surveillance, and/or even wire-tapped, which he felt was as a result of his political activities. I have submitted a FOIA request for his file but have yet to receive a response.

4 After stumbling across the works of Huey Newton, co-founder of the Black Panther Party (and other activists and scholars), and seeing first-hand the substantial amount of evidence they had to confirm the FBI’s role in the suppression of various African American and Native American leaders and groups, I became curious as to whether the FBI undertook the same types of tactics against other social movements.
own evidence to explore whether, how, and why the FBI played a role in influencing and, to a certain point, suppressing the Chicano movement.

Taking an inductive approach, I have endeavored to uncover what evidence there is regarding the FBI’s role in the suppression of Chicano groups as well as determine if the actions undertaken against these groups was the result of state and local law enforcement taking their own initiatives or due to directives filtered down from top FBI officials to local field offices and law enforcement agencies. In doing so, it is important to note that the goal of this work is not to tarnish the reputation of the bureau, but rather to explore, acknowledge, and learn from the history of the FBI with a focus on its impact on the Civil Rights Movement, and more specifically the Chicano movement, during the 1960s and 1970s. Accordingly, it is my hope that studying and examining these episodes will help to ensure that history does not repeat itself.

**Conducting Field Research: An Inductive Approach**

For this project, I have conducted field research to collect in-depth interview material and archival evidence on whether and to what extent the FBI enacted strategic policies and programs that suppressed Chicanos, including the use of counterintelligence programs. In doing so, I found ample archival evidence that the FBI would conduct investigative activities and filter down instructions and orders to state and local law enforcement agencies to conduct efforts to infiltrate social movements. For instance, in an interview with Officer Tim Chapa, discussed in further detail below, he consistently mentions the presence of the FBI and ATF at briefings with his superiors of the New Mexico State Police (see Gutiérrez 2000). Chapa points out that they not only asked for specific intelligence information, but also provided him with detailed actions

---

5 While the Civil Rights Movement dates back as far as the 1800s and the FBI’s agency history began in 1908 (initially named the Bureau of Investigation), I narrow my focus to take an in-depth look at the challenges faced by the emergent African American and Chicano communities circa the 1960s and 1970s.
he was to take to either frame or target the Alianza Federal de Mercedes group and its leader, Reies López Tijerina (Gutiérrez 2000).

Additionally, while many of the archival documents and memos detail years of surveillance on various groups, it is the documents available on the African American groups, such as the Black Panther Party, that are most explicit in detailing the FBI’s investigative tactics. In uncovering such archival documents and gathering my own interview material, I provide new insights into the evolution of the FBI during that time period and discuss its historical significance and societal impact.

In conducting my field research, the evidence I have gathered from expert interviews suggests that the FBI has, at times, also initiated the removal and/or censorship of a large number of relevant files, especially those located in the various field offices (e.g., see Gutiérrez 1986; see also Bustillos 2012). Those files that were not removed or censored were given over to the National Archives, which, as I have experienced first-hand, are difficult to locate and get access to. According to scholars like José Angel Gutiérrez, such steps were very practical for the FBI to undertake, particularly as they became aware of the various inquiries into their activities and given their requirement by law to grant access to most of these documents under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (e.g., see Gutiérrez 1986).

In my own efforts to obtain government documents, I also attempted to ascertain what guidelines are used in determining how or which FBI files are destroyed and which are kept. Although the FBI website is very detailed about the history of their record keeping system, their reference to guidelines only vaguely states that they adhere to a set of rules agreed to in conjunction with the NARA (National Archives and Record Administration). Elsewhere, it has been noted that the FBI rules instruct the agency to preserve “files with historical significance”,

5
although what falls under this category is unclear (Kelley, 2009). As an example of some files that have been destroyed, I found mention of an article which appeared in *USA Today* referencing the destruction of files pertaining to Walter Cronkite, as well as other important files such as that of Rosa Parks (Kelley, 2009). If these files can be destroyed, then how many countless other files of relevant historical significance may have been destroyed?

Not surprisingly, much of the material used for this project, including numerous internal FBI documents relating to Chicano groups, has been difficult to obtain. In my interview with José Angel Gutiérrez, he spoke about his troubles in locating the various FBI files pertaining to himself, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the American G.I. Forum (AGIF), and other groups and individuals that have fallen under investigation. During my field research, Gutiérrez allowed me to view first-hand the many denials he received for various requests under the FOIA and indicated that he ran into major limitations in trying to pursue his appeals, particularly due to the high financial cost associated with the appeals process (Bustillos 2012). In the end, despite the various obstacles and limitations, I was able to collect a substantial amount of documents for this project with the help of key individuals and with the support of the university. My hope is that this project will also serve as a useful resource for other scholars.

In the following sections, I will provide a historical overview of the topic, a review of key works of literature, an in-depth discussion of my findings garnered from the interview material and FBI memorandums collected through my field research, and a conclusion that addresses my overall contribution to the literature and avenues for future research.

---

6 Gutiérrez proffers that the cost, time, and effort required to gain many of these documents is another tactic used by the FBI to discourage research into their activities.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

An Overview of the African American Struggle

Legislation

In 1788, the United States Constitution was ratified, followed by the Bill of Rights the following year. The Bill of Rights is considered one of the most important documents in our country’s history, as it guarantees certain “unalienable” rights which are guaranteed to every citizen of this country. It was because of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights that many Americans continued to struggle, so that the application of these rights might be afforded to all citizens. As can be evidenced throughout U.S. history, there have been many incidents in which those with political power (as well as those that might influence them) have put forth various roadblocks or barriers in an attempt to use the law (i.e. the Constitution and Bill of Rights) for their own benefit. Usually this was done for the benefit of wealthy landowners, businessmen, or politicians who were largely Anglo-Saxon members of the majority population.

Despite its significance, the Constitution continued to transform with the addition of 17 more amendments, giving us a total of 27. Among these amendments, several are important to reference here. The 13th Amendment (1865) abolished slavery. The 14th Amendment (1868) guaranteed that all persons born or naturalized in the United States were to be considered citizens. It further granted that no state, in any manner, was to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny any person the equal protection of the laws. The 15th Amendment (1869) prohibits the denial of suffrage based on race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Although voting rights were eventually granted to all citizens, the

---

7 The Bill of Rights refers to the first ten amendments of the U.S. Constitution.
8 This last section, commonly known as the Due Process Clause, is most important in criminal cases. However, the first portion, which references citizenship, affected the children of many U.S. immigrants.
implementation of “Black codes” and the infamous “Jim Crow Laws” that targeted race and one’s prior classification as a slave continued to create obstacles that largely prohibited African Americans and other minorities (as well as poor whites) from being able to vote until other changes were enacted across the political branches. For instance, the adoption of 24th Amendment in 1964 subsequently prohibited the revocation of voting rights due to the non-payment of poll taxes, thereby helping to invalidate widespread laws previously enacted by political leaders, especially in southern states, that obstructed one’s ability to vote and had largely given elites monopoly control over the political machinery.9

The above mentioned amendments deal with our rights and protections as citizens, rights we have come to know and perhaps take for granted. These amendments are also important because all of them are linked to important Supreme Court cases decided during this time period, as well as major legislation such as the Civil Rights Act (1964) and the Voting Rights Act (1965). The Civil Rights Act of 1964 helped to end segregation and discrimination in public places. The Civil Rights Act also gave victims of discrimination an outlet to address their issues, and authorized the Attorney General to assist victims. Furthermore, it forbade employers from discriminating against minorities. The Voting Rights Act ended literacy tests and gave the U.S. Attorney General the right to intervene on behalf of those who had been discriminated against. Literacy tests had been another tool used to keep the poor and minorities from voting as many were uneducated and therefore, unable to pass the literacy test.10

---

9 The use of poll taxes also resulted in many poor Anglos being unable to vote but the political elite (again, mostly if not all wealthy) did not mind this.
10 Many of the poor, both minority and Anglo, had to work from a very young age in order to contribute to their families. Therefore many did not have the opportunity to attend school on a regular basis.
These acts and major pieces of legislation are a direct result of the actions many minority group leaders and their supporters took against the injustices they were facing. Also important to mention is Executive Order 9981, signed by President Truman, which declares that there should be equal treatment and opportunity for those in the military without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. Another Executive Order, number 11246, issued by President Johnson, put affirmative action in place for all government contractors, requiring them to give special consideration to prospective minority employees. President Johnson later signed the Civil Rights Act of 1968 which prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of housing.

**Court Cases**

One of the earliest cases regarding the rights of African Americans is Dred Scott v. Sanford (1856). In this case the Supreme Court ruled that all people of African descent, both slave and free, could not be considered citizens of the United States or protected under the Constitution. Forty years later, in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), separate but equal facilities for those of different races was deemed legal. Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954) overturned Plessy v. Ferguson and ruled that separate is inherently unequal and violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, thereby bringing an end to segregation.

**Major Events**

---

11 For a summary of the cases mentioned here visit the Oyez Project website (refer to the various relevant citations in the “Bibliography” section).
12 This decision was overruled once the 14th Amendment went into effect.
13 While many other court cases occurred during the 20th Century and may be considered monumental, they focus on our civil liberties and rights (i.e. due process, Miranda warnings, search and seizure, etc.), which does not directly deal with “civil rights” issues as it pertains to the focus of this paper.
The Civil War, roughly from 1861 to 1865, was fought largely in response to President Abraham Lincoln’s election and progressive stance towards abolishing slavery. During the war, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation which freed all slaves in any state which had seceded. Keep in mind that this did not make the freed individuals citizens but it did declare their freedom from involuntary servitude. With the passage of the 13th Amendment in 1864, slavery was made illegal throughout the entire United States.

Nearly a century later, in 1955, Rosa Parks famously refused to give up her seat to a white passenger, resulting in her arrest. This ignited the famous Montgomery Bus Boycott led by Martin Luther King, Jr., which would last for over a year, ending with the desegregation of buses in Alabama. Just two years later, in 1957, President Eisenhower sent federal troops to force the integration of an all-white high school in Little Rock, Arkansas. In North Carolina in 1960, four black students began a trend of nonviolent “sit-ins” as a protest against many segregated public facilities. The summer of 1961 saw the advent of “freedom riders,” volunteers under the coordination of the Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). 1963 brought further protests, during which many of the protestors experienced brutality at the hands of angry mobs of whites as well as law enforcement officials. That same year in Birmingham, Alabama, four young girls were killed after a bomb exploded at their church, which was a frequent location of civil rights meetings. After their death, riots erupted in Birmingham, leading to more deaths.14

These events were followed by the assassination of Malcolm X in 1965 as well as the race riots in Watts, California that same year. Shortly thereafter, the Black Panther Party for Self

---

14 Many of the events described here (the incident with Rosa Parks, the bus boycotts, sit-ins, and even the deaths of the young girls in an Alabaman church) are general knowledge, which is why no specific citation is provided.
Defense was founded by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale in 1966. On April 4, 1968, Martin Luther King, a proponent of nonviolent protest and leader of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was assassinated in Memphis, Tennessee. The assassinations of both Malcom X and Martin Luther King, Jr. further mobilized many of the groups working for change, including those attending to African American and Chicano causes. Their deaths sparked some people to become more socially and politically active. The death of both of these leaders also became the rallying cry around which the various groups promoted their ideal path for change. For instance, some groups took the death of Martin Luther King as a reason to abandon non-violence, for even this staunch supporter of non-violent means had met a violent death. Still other groups were of the opposite opinion and continued to stand by King’s inspiring message of nonviolence.

The Chicano Movement

The Chicano movement is considered to have various beginnings, with some scholars dating it back to the 1800s when Mexico lost Texas to the United States. In the year 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo essentially dictated a new border between the United States and Mexico. The Rio Grande marked the border up until a point just north of El Paso, Texas and west to where it is today. By agreeing to this treaty, Mexico lost what is present-day California, Nevada, Utah, most of Arizona, and western portions of New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming. Also included in the treaty were provisions to ensure that existing property rights of Mexican citizens living in the land gained by the U.S. were to be honored, although they often were not. The remainder of Arizona and New Mexico were transferred to the U.S. with the signing of the Gadsden Purchase (1853).  

It was with these expansions of U.S. territory and dominance that the Mexican people came under the rule of the U.S. government. It was also the beginning of the

---

15 For a more complete study on the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and Reis López Tijerina, see Blawis (1971).
discrimination dealt by government officials and Anglo settlers moving into the area.\textsuperscript{16} Throughout the history of this country, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, and other Latino minorities have been a source of cheap labor, yet have also been used as scapegoats for the country’s economic problems when suitable to politicians and the ruling elite. It was this constant barrage of injustices that would continue to outrage the Mexican and Mexican-American peoples, culminating in what we now term the Chicano movement.

Certain key events during the Twentieth Century contributed to the rise of the Chicano movement.\textsuperscript{17} In 1917, female trolley passengers, most of them laborers who traveled to El Paso, Texas from Juárez, Mexico daily, revolted and began to protest on the Santa Fe Bridge. What sparked their protest was the practice of requiring border crossers (i.e., Mexicans crossing into the U.S.) to be bathed in gasoline, stripped nude for inspection, and have their clothing treated, before being allowed to cross into the United States (Romo 2005). The purpose of this process was allegedly to kill lice which were thought to carry typhus disease. In addition to the gasoline, various insecticides and other chemicals were also used to “bathe” the border crossers (Romo 2005). Despite the protest which arose in 1917, the practice continued for several years.

Repatriation of Mexicans and Mexican Americans took place in the 1930s. In 1929, the Great Depression hit the U.S. economy hard and immigrants became the easy scapegoat for the country’s problems. Immigrants were blamed for the lack of jobs and for draining the country’s welfare systems. According to Balderrama (2006), the government would stoop to new lows in

\textsuperscript{16}The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was the focus of one of the Chicano Movement’s prominent leaders, Reies López Tijerina. During the 1960s and 1970s, Tijerina would argue that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was violated by Anglo settlers in New Mexico and he fought to have the land rights of the original Mexican land owners honored.

\textsuperscript{17}The Chicano Movement is widely recognized to have reached its height during the 1960s and 1970s. However, many events gave rise to the sentiments that spurred action on the part of Mexicans and Mexican Americans, beginning as early as the 1800s.
an effort to deport Mexican immigrants. He mentions that President Hoover publicly endorsed Secretary of Labor William Doak whose methods included monitoring protests and strikes in order to identify participants and leaders. Doak would then label them as “subversive”, “communist” or “radicals” so that they may be subject to deportation (Balderrama 2006, 76).

In the 1940s, in the midst of World War II, many women, and minorities were employed in the industries and agriculture to make up for the shortage of labor resulting from the war. The Bracero Program was instituted to bring in Mexican workers (see Acuña 2011, 253-255; see also Behnken 2011, 105). The war also resulted in a migration of many Mexican Americans to the cities to industrial and other types of jobs. After the war, and the end of the program, many who had migrated to the U.S. decided to remain, resulting in increased racial tensions throughout the country. It should also be noted that many Mexican Americans served during the war and later in the Vietnam War. Feelings of injustice were common among many Mexican American veterans who were not well-received upon their return. The American G.I. Forum (AGIF) was formed by a Mexican American veteran, Dr. Héctor Pérez García (AGIF 2011). The central focus of the AGIF was to work towards ensuring that returning Hispanic veterans had the same opportunities as other veterans, as well as to assist them in achieving the “American dream” (AGIF 2011).

During the 1950s, the federal government again undertook a program to remove Mexican immigrants, this time targeting “illegal” immigrants. Efforts of this program included targeting Mexican-American neighborhoods for citizenship checks. To make it harder for those who were deported to return, buses and trains took deportees deep within Mexico before releasing them.

In the 1960s, possibly as the result of a culture of resentment towards immigrants mainly of Mexican or Mexican American decent, the term “Chicano” became more widespread. Anglos
used the term in a derogatory fashion to identify and/or label the sons of migrants from Mexico, (this was often an inaccurate identification). Many involved with the Chicano movement used the term to signify solidarity, mostly among the youth, who felt that they were not Americans, nor part of America, and wanted to identify with their Mexican roots. Those who identified themselves as Chicano were thought to be those that were most politically active and worked towards the ideals of the group.

**Court Cases and Legislation**

As with the African American movement, several court cases can be pointed out which directly affected Mexican Americans. The first, *Mendez v. Westminster Supreme Court (1947)* ruled that the segregation of children of Mexican and Latin descent was unconstitutional. Furthermore, in *Hernández v. Texas (1954)*, the court held that Mexican Americans and other historically-subordinated groups were entitled to equal protection under the 14th Amendment. In this case, a Mexican American male was indicted for murder and an all-white jury was selected, which Hernández’s lawyers tried to quash on the basis that persons of Mexican descent had been discriminated routinely in the county where the case was taking place. Hernández’s lawyers also pointed out that no one of Mexican descent had served on a jury in that county in 25 years. He was later convicted and sentenced to life in prison. He appealed, claiming the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment had been violated. The Texas Court of Appeals found that because the Mexican community not previously legally protested their government classification as “white” or “Caucasian” there was no basis for claiming discrimination now. Eventually, the Supreme Court found in favor of Hernández and concluded that the Equal Protection Clause applied to all racial groups who had experienced discrimination. They found
that Mexican Americans had a history of being discriminated against in the county where Hernández was tried.

In 1942, José Díaz was found murdered at a site called Sleepy Lagoon near Los Angeles, California (Acuña 2010, 241). It was known as a common hangout for Mexican American kids in the area. At the time, California Governor Earl Warren used the death of Díaz to begin targeting youth in the area (Acuña 2010, 243). These youth were popularly known as “zoot-suiters” for their style of dress. After the conviction of 22 Mexican-American youths for the murder, riots erupted in Los Angeles; these riots came to be known as the Zoot Suit Riots. During the riots, many sailors and servicemen took part in the beating of Mexican American youths while white civilians cheered on and the Los Angeles Police Department did nothing.¹⁸ The riots ended and zoot suits were banned in Los Angeles. All youths who had been convicted of the murder of José Díaz were later released on appeal.

The FBI

In 1908, Attorney General Charles Joseph Bonaparte formulated a team of agents which was directly accountable to him known as the Bureau of Investigation (BOI).¹⁹ The first major expansion occurred with the passage of the Mann Act in 1910 (see Appendix A, Table 1). Over the next few years the number of agents grew to over 300 (DOJ 2010). Several field offices were opened, mostly in major cities and near the Mexican border. After U.S. entry into World

---

¹⁸ For a more complete overview of the Zoot Suit Riots and the inaction of law enforcement officials, see Acuña (2010, 241-243); see also Alaníz and Cornish (2008, 233-234).
¹⁹ General historical information is summarized from the FBI website (see www.fbi.gov/about-us/history; for a more in-depth historical overview and critique, see Weiner 2012).
War I there was another increase in bureau jurisdiction and focus, assisted by the passage of the Espionage, Selective Service, and Sabotage Acts.\textsuperscript{20}

During the 1920s and early 1930s, the FBI began to use federal statutes to investigate organized crime targeting famous mob bosses, as well as the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) and other entities. After the passing of President Warren G. Harding, his successor, President Calvin Coolidge, installed J. Edgar Hoover as director of the Bureau of Investigation.\textsuperscript{21} Hoover (appointed May 10, 1924), implemented employment standards and performance appraisals as a means of ensuring a quality national police force.\textsuperscript{22} He also established the Identification Division to track fingerprints of criminals, later titled the National Division of Identification and Information. In response to the Great Depression of the 1930s, federal jurisdiction in and of itself expanded. By the end of the 1930s, the BOI had field offices in 42 cities and employed 654 special agents (DOJ 2010). During the 1930s, there was an expansion of BOI jurisdiction with the passing of a federal kidnapping statute and several other laws.

In 1932, the Bureau of Investigation was renamed the United States Bureau of Investigation. Shortly thereafter, the Department of Justice, at the direction of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, began to reorganize its various agencies which had been essentially subdivided by task. By 1935, it had transformed to what we now know as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{20} It was not until after the conclusion of World War II that the bureau’s focus returned to investigating federal crimes.
\textsuperscript{21} As cited in Huey Newton’s work, prior to his appointment as director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover served as head of the General Intelligence Division of the Department of Justice (Newton 1980, 17).
\textsuperscript{22} See http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/history/brief-history; see also the citation for the DOJ in the attached bibliography.
\textsuperscript{23} A brief summary of the evolution of the FBI is also presented in Newton (1986) and Churchill and Vander Wall (1990).
World War II and the continuation of the Depression provided an environment for radicalism in the U.S. (fascism, communism, labor unrest, racial disturbances, etc.). A 1939 Presidential Directive allowed the FBI to investigate subversives; this charge was reinforced with the passage of the Smith Act.\textsuperscript{24} The FBI developed a network of informational sources to gather intelligence in these areas as threats to national security. In 1940, Congress reestablished the draft and the FBI became responsible for locating draft evaders and deserters. After the U.S. actually entered World War II, following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the FBI arrested previously identified aliens who threatened national security. The number of agents once again rose. The bureau also continued to remain involved in civil rights investigations. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation website, Hoover opposed the internment of Japanese Americans and American citizens of Japanese descent, as they had already deported those whom were considered threats (DOJ 2010). However, the FBI was still charged with arresting curfew and evacuation violators. The bureau also established the Special Intelligence Service (SIS), which placed FBI agents in Latin American countries to collect intelligence on those who would aid the axis powers.

Despite the end of World War II, communist fears remained. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower issued executive orders giving the FBI responsibility for investigating allegations of disloyalty among federal employees. In the 1960s, Congress passed several new federal laws aimed at civil rights violations, racketeering, and gambling which once again added to the scope of FBI investigations.

The 1960s and 1970s was a time when the U.S. saw an increase in idealism, with some groups resorting to non-peaceful methods in order to challenge the government. This was also a

\textsuperscript{24} Smith Act. 1940. Ch. 439, 54 Stat. 670, 18 U.S.C. Sec. 2385
time period where the U.S. saw great protest to the war in Vietnam. According to FBI records, 3,000 bombings and 50,000 bomb threats occurred in America during 1970 alone (DOJ 2010). In the midst of numerous antiestablishment groups, civil rights issues, and violence, the FBI played a significant role in using both traditional investigative techniques and counterintelligence programs to counteract domestic terrorism and conduct investigations of individuals and organizations who threatened terroristic violence.\footnote{Keeping in mind that this brief history is summarized from the FBI website, it is important to note that references to the FBI’s role in investigating “domestic terrorism” and the use of COINTELPRO operations are, not surprisingly, largely positive in their depictions.} Shortly after J. Edgar Hoover’s death in 1972, the FBI began to shift its focus to foreign counterintelligence, organized crime, and white-collar crime.
In reviewing the available literature, it is important, once again, to point out that there is an abundance of research that examines the African American civil rights movement, its various leaders and groups, and their struggles during the Civil Rights Era. Some of these are based on first-person experiences (such as in the work of Huey Newton). One could reference any number of these works which speak to instances of injustice experienced by African Americans, Chicanos, and other minority groups at the hands of the FBI. For my purposes, I focus here on the most essential works that pertain to the FBI’s impact on social movements, particularly the Chicano movement as well as comparable works concerning the African American movement. In doing so, I detail the evidence each one presents on a case by case basis in order to provide context and to more easily reference and connect each piece to the archival documents pertaining to the Chicano movement that I examine further below.

**War against the Panthers: A Study of Repression in America**

The Black Panther Party (hereafter referred to as the BPP), as founded by Huey P. Newton and others, was a political social group of African Americans which formed throughout the country. The dissertation written by Newton (1980) examines the extent to which the United States government went to oppress this party, as they feared the consequences of allowing the rise of any minority party, especially one with dissenting opinions regarding government actions.

Huey Newton’s (1980) work brings to light various tactics used by the government to suppress and destroy the BPP, as well as the language used by the government to identify and refer to the group. Newton examines official government documents that, for the most part, had been brought forward during the discovery portions of many of the lawsuits filed on behalf of the BPP against the government and its various agencies. A majority of the evidence he presents
focuses on the FBI as it was the main offender against the BPP. However, he also looks at internal documents from the IRS and CIA. Therein, Newton claims “that the war against the Black Panther Party was a logical extension of ongoing police intelligence practices” already being carried out against other groups (Newton 1980, 23).

The aim of his work is to examine the “rise in the 1960s of control tactics heavily reliant upon infiltration, deliberate misinformation, selective harassment, and the use of the legal system to quell broad based dissent and its leadership” (Newton 1980, 8). Newton feels his work is important because he proposes that the official effort on behalf of the government to destroy the BPP was a result of the party’s political ideology, as well as their potential for organizing a sizable amount of the country’s population that had been historically denied equal opportunity in employment, education, housing, and other basic needs (Newton 1980, 9).

Newton (1980) points out various key incidences to illustrate the oppressiveness of the U.S. government against rebellious groups. He mentions the Haymarket Incident of 1886 in which a clash occurred between labor unions and the police (Newton 1980, 15). Throughout his writing, he cites the formation of multiple government agencies to handle different aspects of intelligence gathering about these groups and their members. In 1908, the Bureau of Investigation was created which later grew and became the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a consolidation of the various agencies, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover. Newton notes that these agencies have been used to gather information on draft evaders, white supremacist groups, anarchists, communists, labor unions, and the like.

Newton notes the creation or reorganization of several agencies to focus intelligence gathering on these groups. Aside from the Bureau of Investigation, the General Intelligence Division, the International Detective Agency, the Bureau of Drug Enforcement (later the Drug
Enforcement Agency), and even the creation by Congress of a Special Committee to Investigate
Un-American Activities and Propaganda in the United States, he details how these agencies used
existing laws to target these “leftist” or “left-wing” groups. Many agencies investigated these
groups under the ruse of investigating vice or drug law violations. He cites many examples of
harassment, not only of the BPP, but of other groups and their members. This includes the
charging of Marcus Garvey, who founded the United Negro Improvement Association. Garvey
was charged for using the mail system to defraud others (Newton 1980, 21).

Newton also mentions other groups that were targeted such as the United Farm Workers,
the American Indian Movement (AIM), the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC),
the Congress of Racial Equity (CORE), the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee
(SNCC), Deacons for Defense, the Republic of New Africa (RNA), and the Nation of Islam.
Newton also names specific persons who were targeted, including “H. ‘Rap’ Brown, Stokely
Carmichael, Elijah Muhammed, and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.” (Newton 1980, 22).

Newton claims that the BPP was the most fervently targeted out of all political groups,
because they possessed a unique ideology that argued for the necessity of fundamental
socioeconomic change, a practical series of survival programs that served the community and
fostered institutional growth and consciousness, and a willingness to employ creative legal
means within the democratic system to achieve their ends (Newton 1980, 38). The BPP was
known for organizing programs to help the Black communities. Some such programs included
the Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (SAFE) program, the Youth Institute, and the free-
breakfast for children program, which was dubbed by J. Edgar Hoover as “the ‘real long-range
threat to American society’” largely because they felt that by providing free breakfasts to young
children they would begin to indoctrinate them at an early age (Newton 1980, 35).
As previously mentioned, Newton largely bases his determinations on the documented evidence unearthed from each agency. However, he also provides data analysis in his conclusions, especially about the FBI, stating, for instance, that “of the 295 documented actions taken by COINTELPRO alone to disrupt Black groups, 233—or 79 percent—were specifically directed toward destruction of the” BPP (Newton 1980, 53). He also makes note of the fact that $100 million of taxpayer money was allotted for COINTELPRO, with over $7 million in 1976 to pay for informants alone (Newton 1980, 53). This was twice the amount used by the FBI to pay organized crime informants. So, while he largely draws on participant-observer information, he does have historical and factual basis for many of his arguments.

*Agents of Regression: The FBI’s Secret War against the Black Panther Party and the American Indian Movement*

In their work, Churchill and Vander Wall (1990, 1) argue that the FBI, from its inception, became focused on promoting themselves as an organization that was a “highly successful crime-fighting machine, composed of honest and brave individuals, utterly committed to the preservation, protection and embodiment of the lofty ‘American ideals’ of liberty and justice for all. Churchill and Vander Wall posit that the FBI promoted this image through the use of media, propaganda, gaining the support of influential individuals, and, if necessary, blackmail.

The FBI, especially under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, promoted the idea that anyone who criticized the bureau or its methods should be considered un-American. The FBI survived, according to the authors; simply by being a bureaucratic institution in and of itself, because bureaucracies, once created, hardly ever see complete dismantling, rather, they grow (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 11). Churchill and Vander Wall also allude to corruption on the part of the FBI and argue that the bureau spent much of its time developing intelligence on
everyday Americans as well as members of Congress, Senators, government employees, Attorneys General, and Presidents (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 11). This information was used to influence these individuals to avoid criticism and investigation into the workings of the FBI, thus allowing them to survive despite many scandals. This information was also used to discredit anyone who might publicly criticize the FBI. The authors largely look into the FBI’s work to quell the American Indian Movement but they also examine the bureau’s actions in regard to other political and social groups.

Churchill and Vander Wall examine the history of the FBI, from its predecessor agencies to the present, and its direct involvement in the arrest, prosecution, deportation, defamation, and other means to subdue political and social movements and groups. In a confidential memo quoted by the authors, J. Edgar Hoover was requested by the president and other government officials to investigate the “subversive activities of this country” (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 27). J. Edgar Hoover is often cited as directing much of the focus of the FBI as its director. Hoover had certain political agendas he wished to enforce and used the bureau as a tool to do so. The authors also cite important legislation which facilitated the bureau’s work to subdue uprisings, among these are the Espionage Act, Smith Act, and Alien and Sedition Act. Many internal government documents were also cited throughout the book.

Churchill and Vander Wall examine Counter-Intelligence Operations (COINTELPRO) undertaken by the FBI at length and the various tactics used in these operations. COINTELPRO is a term now used to describe the systematic campaigns directed by the bureau against domestic political organizations and individuals during the 1960s (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 38). In their book they photocopy an internal FBI memorandum stating the objective of COINTELPRO is the “neutralization of black extremist groups, the prevention of violence by
these groups and the prevention of coalition of black extremist organizations” (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 38). According to the authors, the bureau used various tactics such as wiretappings, illegal entries and burglaries, electronic surveillance devices, informants, direct surveillance, fabricating evidence, and mail tampering.

Several more internal memorandums are provided by the authors as further proof of direct efforts by the FBI aimed at dismantling the Black Panther Party and other social and political groups. These memorandums directed FBI field offices to partake in forging mail between party members with the specific intent of causing factions between party leaders. The FBI also produced large amounts of “Black Propaganda” to misrepresent these groups’ interests, goals, and objectives in order to publicly discredit them and foster tension (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 42). The FBI also repeatedly arrested members of these groups on often bogus charges in an effort to harass, increase paranoia, tie up activists in court, and deplete their resources. The authors indicate that the methods employed by the FBI worked, as evidenced by a COINTELPRO proposal to set up Stokely Carmichael as a CIA agent and distribute this false information to Black Nationalist groups (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 49). Shortly after this information was disseminated, Black Panther Party Minister of Defense issued a statement charging Carmichael as an agent of the CIA.

Under the direction of Hoover, the FBI expanded its COINTELPRO operations to include other groups; however, documents cited by the authors illustrate the direct targeting of militant black militant groups and leaders to “prevent the rise of a black ‘messiah’ who would unify and electrify, the militant black nationalist movement” (Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 58). Among leaders identified for targeting were Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael and Elijah Muhammad. Churchill and Vander Wall allude to the theory that the FBI
was involved in the assassination and/or neutralization of these individuals. This direct targeting of black leaders is claimed given documentation of the FBI’s involvement surrounding the assassination of the Chicago BPP leader, Fred Hampton, the targeting of Geronimo Pratt (L.A. BPP leader) for criminal prosecution under the Smith Act and other false accusations (see Churchill and Vander Wall 1990).

In all, Churchill and Vander Wall went to extensive lengths in their book to cite specific government documents to back up their well-proven theory that these political groups were directly targeted by the FBI. Therein, the documentation used by the authors, such as specific FBI files, supports the findings of Newton’s work.

*The Political Repression of a Chicano Movement Activist: The Plight of Francisco E. ‘Kiko’ Martínez*

James Barrera’s (2002-2004) discusses his research on Kiko Martínez, a Chicano lawyer from Colorado whom he claims was targeted by the FBI’s COINTELPRO operations. Barrera begins with a brief description of COINTELPRO and its beginnings. Like Churchill and Vanderwall (1990), he too cites J. Edgar Hoover as directing these operations to target social movements. According to Barrera, Martínez regularly represented Chicano clients, including inmates, students, and migrant workers. It is because of Martínez’s work that he becomes a “political target” (Barrera 2002-2004, 119). Barrera identifies a political target as “one selected by the federal government for criminal prosecution because of their political activity, when they [government officials] can fabricate evidence against that person and suppress evidence proving that fabrication, and prosecute a person(s) and put them in prison for any amount of time, including for life” (Barrera 2002-2004, 119).
In 1970, Martínez joined the Crusade for Justice, formed by well-known Chicano movement leader, Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales. In 1971, he organized the Latin American Development Society in the Colorado prison system as a response to mistreatment of Chicano inmates and to address the over-representation of Chicano (Hispanic) inmates in the Colorado prison system. According to the author, Hispanic inmates comprised fifty percent of all incarcerated persons in the state’s penitentiaries (Barrera 2002-2004, 121). Due to his involvement in these efforts, as well as his involvement in the Ricardo Falcón murder case, Martínez became a target of COINTELPRO.

Barrera backs up his claim by citing a 1973 traffic stop in Scottsbluff, Nebraska in which an illegal search occurred, followed by Martínez’s arrest for possession of an explosive device. This search and arrest was later declared unconstitutional for violating Martínez’s Fourth Amendment rights and he was found not guilty (Barrera 2002-2004, 125). Later the same year, Martínez faced three charges in Colorado for allegedly mailing bombs to an African American policewoman, a school board member, and a motor cycle shop. Intense media attention followed, shortly thereafter Martínez’s license to practice law in Colorado was suspended, and fearing further harassment and possible assassination, he fled to Mexico. Martínez returned seven years later only to be prosecuted for the alleged crimes. Again, a flurry of media attention aimed at influencing the public and tarnishing Martínez’s reputation ensued. After several mistrials, it was discovered, among other things, that the federal judge assigned to his case regularly consorted with the FBI regarding the proceedings, even going so far as to install a

---

26 According to Barrera, Ricardo Falcón was murdered by gas station owner Perry Brunson in Orogrande, New Mexico (1972). Falcon and others, including Martínez, were on their way to attend the national convention for the La Raza Unida independent political party in El Paso, Texas. Falcón was shot by Brunson after a dispute began when Brunson refused Falcón and the others water for their overheating vehicle.
hidden camera in the courtroom (Barrera 2002-2004). Despite these charges having been dropped, the federal government attempted to pursue subsequent charges against Martínez for having provided an alias to the border patrol agents who apprehended him upon his return to the United States. These proceedings were also later dropped.

Barrera acknowledges that he was unable to find documentation regarding specific COINTELPRO operations against Kiko Martínez. However, he makes a comparison between the Martínez case and the experiences of other Chicano movement leaders such as Corky Gonzales, Reies López Tijerina, César Chávez, Dolores Huerta, and José Angel Gutiérrez, as well as to some African American leaders.

*The Making of a Civil Rights Leader: José Angel Gutiérrez*

In this work, Gutiérrez (2005) writes what is essentially his autobiography, documenting his youth and family background, how he was raised in Crystal City, Texas, and the many events which formed who he is today. He begins the work describing his childhood, particularly in growing up as an only child to his parents, the stories his father told of working as a medical student during the Mexican Revolution, and the general struggles his parents faced. Throughout his work, he mentions many anecdotes such as the fact that his mother did not finish her schooling because she dropped out due to discrimination. He also mentions that his father would at times refuse to speak English, despite being able to do so very well. Gutiérrez also describes memories of local police bringing the Mexican detainees to his father to treat, always claiming their injuries were self-inflicted or at the hands of other Mexican inmates (although the injured would give a different version once the police were not around). He also remembers local ranchers and farmers would leave injured workers on their doorstep in the middle of the night.
Gutiérrez seemed frustrated with the fact they would assume his father would care for them because he was Mexican as well, and would fail to make payment arrangements.

Gutiérrez also recalled his parents sending him for schooling with a local woman who would teach them in a section of her store. When he actually entered the public school system, he was ahead of most of the other students (even skipping grade levels on several occasions). In high school he was on the debate team and won many awards for public speaking and also became class president. In junior college at Texas A&I, he ran for class president and lost, after meeting a staunch backlash from the white students and administration. Despite this, he helped organize the efforts of the Mexican American community in his hometown to defeat the Anglos on the city council and school board; the Mexican Americans were ultimately able to defeat the Anglo candidates.  

Gutiérrez briefly mentions forming the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO) while attending graduate school at Saint Mary’s University in San Antonio, Texas. Although I am sure much more thought went into the formation of this group, the author does not spend much time explaining the background of the group’s formation. Gutiérrez does mention the group’s activism regarding the need for a legal defense fund. Gutiérrez states, it was because of their meetings with various lawyers about the issue, the group’s militancy, and the Chicano movement throughout the southwest that the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) was established (Gutiérrez 2005, 61).

Gutiérrez describes his falling-out with MALDEF as a result of local politics, essentially the local Congressman, Henry Gonzales, did not want him hired because he felt Gutiérrez was a threat to his position. Gutiérrez also traveled with his family to spend time and visit other

---

27 The fact that Gutiérrez was able to organize the Mexican-American community in Crystal City was of note to the FBI, as evidenced in various memos (see Appendix B).
activists including Martin Luther King, Reies López Tijerina in New Mexico, Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales in Colorado, and César Chávez in California. He explains that, having learned from these Chicano leaders, he returned to Crystal City, Texas and worked toward forming other organizations. For example, Gutiérrez and his wife began a mobile Head Start program that would follow migrant children in the summer, this program evolved into the Texas Migrant Council (Gutiérrez 2005, 63).

Most interesting, and most relevant to this project, is Gutiérrez’s (2005) discussion of what occurred while he was pursuing his doctoral degree at the University of Texas at Austin. At the time, Gutiérrez was teaching a Chicano politics class at the university and working for his doctorate. He was awarded a scholarship from the dean, which he would receive if he stopped teaching. In a conversation with the director of the doctoral program he learned the dean wanted him out of the classroom, which was the motivation behind awarding him the scholarship. Due to the need for money for his family and political work, Gutiérrez accepted the scholarship. Gutiérrez later learned that the dean and other university administrators wanted him out of the classroom at the behest of the FBI. It was not until Gutiérrez began requesting FBI files about himself, the Raza Unida Party and its activists, that he learned the FBI had visited the dean to ask that he be removed from the classroom. This is one of the most blatant efforts of the FBI to suppress a Chicano activist. By teaching at a university, Gutiérrez had been able to educate young people about Chicano and Mexican American history and encourage them to be politically active, something the FBI and federal government were wary of. Knowing that Gutiérrez needed the money to support his growing family, they used the university administration to offer him a grant and get him out of the classroom, thereby also limiting any influence he might have over his students. This action was very direct, making their intent obvious.
Chicanos and Mexicanos under Surveillance: 1940-1980

In this earlier work, José Angel Gutiérrez (1986) analyzes some FBI (and other government) files he obtained through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). He also points out that not all of the files are available and claims that, during the 1970s, the FBI began systematically destroying some of its files in their field offices. Initially, Gutiérrez provides a background on several of the Chicano and Mexican-American groups which were under surveillance by the FBI and the target of various other operations. Gutiérrez also draws conclusions that the FBI, CIA, and National Security Agency have all partaken in covert operations, which he insinuates are illegitimate.

Among other things, Gutiérrez finds that LULAC was investigated as a possibly subversive or communist group by the FBI. He states that after initial investigation, the FBI concluded that the group was not subversive but had been advised by an unidentified “source” that they still warranted investigation because membership dues were being sent out of state and because “Mexicans generally are unreliable and [un]trustworthy” (Gutiérrez 2005). While this is proof of the FBI’s tactics of unjustifiably targeting groups, it lacks a “smoking gun”, so to speak.

Of particular interest in Gutiérrez’s (1986) article is finding that the FBI routinely worked in Mexico, despite various international laws prohibiting the meddling in the affairs of other nations. However, Gutiérrez reports that the FBI and other federal agencies had growing concerns for communist groups in Mexico and feared they were a threat to the United States. Due to this perceived threat, the FBI launched various COINTELPRO operations targeting key

28 Although Gutiérrez does not provide a reference for this statement, in conducting my research on the FBI I have come across similar statements made by other individuals off the record. Therein, some have suggested that the destruction of files has, at times, been strategic while, in other instances, the loss of files was also due to routine discarding of old files (thus, not always necessarily done with the express purpose of hiding evidence).
groups from the 1950s to 1970s (see also Gutiérrez 2005). Having analyzed the FBI files on the matter, Gutiérrez (1986, 40) asserts that the following tactics were used by the FBI:

1. Infiltration of organizations, informants and use of established sources.
2. Harassment.
3. Publication of prepared FBI articles and suppression of Mexican publications.
5. Collusion with the authorities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to arrange for fake interviews; canceling of Border Crossing Cards; recruitment of applicants for Border Crossing Cards as informants; and blackmail with Border Crossing Cards.\(^{29}\)
6. Printing of Scurrilous leaflets and hand bills.
7. Surveillance of commercial bookstores that handled literature deemed subversive.
8. Rumor mongering by false innuendo.
9. Utilization of United States consular equipment for these activities.
10. Interest in home-made bombs.
11. Made terroristic threats to individuals.

Gutiérrez then proceeds to list more than 10 groups who were the target of this program. He also states that students and professors in the Baja California area were also the subjects of surveillance. This was the main focus of many FBI field offices, as they worked in apparent disbelief of the loyalty embedded within the Articles of Incorporation of the LULAC group. These tactics were used as part of the Border Coverage Program (BOCOV) initiated by the FBI,

\(^{29}\) According to Gutiérrez’s article it was through the use of this practice that potential informants, infiltrators and saboteurs were recruited by the FBI in exchange for a border crossing card or the threat of revocation of such a card (see Gutiérrez 1986, 42).
a COINTELPRO operation.\footnote{Gutiérrez brings light to the fact that despite the investigation by the senate committee to investigate government operations with respect to intelligence (commonly referred to as the “Church Committee”) the BOCOV Program was never officially acknowledged as a counter intelligence program undertaken by the government.} Gutiérrez emphasizes that later memos point to the success of BOCOV and the “use of fictitious letters to business partners, the hiring of student agitators, and the use of paid provocateurs became commonplace in the San Diego and El Paso field offices (Gutiérrez 1986, 43).

Other tactics were brought forth in a case that occurred circa 1985, which Gutiérrez explains was filed by a number of plaintiffs against the Los Angeles Police Department for abuses committed by their Anti-Terrorist Division (ATD). This case revealed that the ATD was, among other things, planting informants in Chicano studies classes at California State University at Northridge, infiltrating La Raza Unida Party, and working to promote dissention between Chicano groups (See Gutiérrez 1986, 48-49). Other tactics used by the ATD included the promotion of the use of violence against local Chicano leaders, even agent-initiated discussion of assassinations. These reports, generated by ATD, were regularly shared with the FBI.

\textit{ Occupied America: A History of Chicanos}

Historian Rodolfo F. Acuña (2011) provides a comprehensive overview of Chicano history, which ranges the gamut from the origins of the Chicano peoples, which references the Mesoamerican civilizations, to the state of Chicanos in the U.S. today.\footnote{In fact, this text has often been used in various Chicano Studies programs as required reading.} Within his work, Acuña mentions repeatedly that the FBI made multiple attempts to put an end to the Brown Berets. He describes an America in which Anglos had such fear of the Brown Berets that they were made the subject of intense efforts to infiltrate and subdue them. Acuña states that law enforcement agencies infiltrated the Berets with informers and special agents who would attempt to induce
members to commit acts of violence rather than focusing on the group’s other activities, which included dealing with various community needs related to food, housing, employment, and education (Acuña 2011, 304).

Acuña also refers to the work of Jennifer Correa (which I will subsequently examine), and the evidence she was able to amass, including some 1,200 FBI files which revealed that FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover desired a complete investigation into the group to determine if they were “a threat to national security” (Acuña 2011, 305). Acuña mentions the FBI’s use of agent provocateurs such as Fernando Sumaya, Louis Tackwood and Eustacio “Frank” Martínez (Acuña 2011, 314). Tackwood testified that he was hired by the Los Angeles Police Department and assigned to work with officers who, “in cooperation with the FBI”, planned to kill minor officials at the Republican Convention in California to force President Richard Nixon to use his presidential power to break up the movement (Acuña 2011, 314).

Acuña next describes the work of Officer Fernando Sumaya who also worked undercover to infiltrate the Brown Berets (see also Montes 2012). Sumaya attempted (and was somewhat successful) in setting up the Brown Berets during a speech by Governor Ronald Reagan at the Biltmore Hotel in California.

Finally, Acuña conveys the story of Eustacio “Frank” Martínez who, at the behest of an agent of the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division (ATF), infiltrated MAYO and the Brown Berets. Martínez admitted to carrying out violent acts in order to provoke others (members and police) to take part in further violence. He also attempted to spread rumors within the Chicano Moratorium Committee, allowing him to eventually take a leadership position (Acuña 2011, 314).
Both of these works, written by Enrijeta Shino (2011) and Jennifer G. Correa (2004), respectively, deal with the plight of the Brown Berets and their subjection to targeting from the FBI. They begin by providing an overview of the history of the Brown Berets, although Correa’s writing appears more detailed and begins from just prior to the formation of the Brown Berets, with background on the Chicano movement in general and the context in which it occurred. Each author also endeavors to explain the demise of this Chicano group and what led to its end. Many of the same topics and incidences are covered by both authors although, once again, Correa delves deeper into the analysis of her research material and draws several conclusions. Correa was also able to interview two Chicano activists, Carlos M. Montes and Ernesto Chávez regarding their knowledge and experiences of the Chicano movement. Both activists essentially confirmed earlier findings in reference to events that took place during the Chicano movement.

Of particular interest are the interviews conducted by Correa as they provide a unique perspective on certain events that initially seemed unimportant to this researcher. For instance, some of the FBI Files and other literature reviewed mentioned instances where surveillance was kept on the Brown Berets. One instance in particular was the plan of the Brown Berets to protest at a hotel where Governor Ronald Reagan was set to speak. The Brown Berets were later blamed for attempting to cut the speaker wires for the microphones and setting fire to the upper floors of the hotel. In Correa’s interview with Carlos Montes he explains that the Brown Berets were always suspicious of infiltrators and saboteurs, especially after having previously discovered one outright. During the trial of Montes and the other Brown Berets it was disclosed
that it was indeed the work of an LAPD infiltrator, Fernando Sumaya who had set the fires in order to frame the Brown Berets (see also Acuña 2011, 314).

As an aside, I was personally able to attend a lecture given by Carlos Montes in which he briefly spoke about these events and stated he believes he is still targeted by the FBI. He reported that on September 24, 2010 his home, as well as the homes of 22 other activists were raided by the FBI and he feels they were targeted for their anti-war organizational efforts (Montes 2012). Montes stated that the FBI has been, and continues to be, a tool of repression which advocates acts of violence and would work with state and local police to stop social movements.

Correa also cites the infiltration of the Brown Berets by Eustacio (Frank) Martínez. Martínez was coerced by the ATF to infiltrate the Brown Berets in exchange for dropping pending federal charges (see also Acuña 2011, 314). Martínez reported that he was under pressure from the ATF to gather information, cause confusion within the organization, and to provoke incidents. Martínez admitted that in order to give ATF an excuse to raid the Chicano Moratorium Office he allowed himself to be seen walking in front of the building with a rifle. This incident did result in a raid by ATF. In a separate incident he was responsible for inciting violence at the Chicano Moratorium Conference, which resulted in 1 death and between 13 to 24 injuries (Correa 2004 79).

**Viva La Raza: A History of Chicano Identity & Resistance**

In this work, Alaniz and Cornish (2008) provide a general overview of Chicano history and also consider the role of women in the Chicano movement. They also attempt to discern whether or not Chicanos are a nation and/or if the Chicano community is moving toward nationhood. They pose three main questions: 1) Could Chicanos evolve into a nation? 2) Are
Chicanos an oppressed nationality? and 3) Are Chicanos an “internal colony” of the U.S.? (Alaníz and Cornish 2008, 60). In doing so, they touch on a number of subtopics covered in previously mentioned works, such as the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and Reies López Tijerina, “Corky” Gonzalez, César Chavez and the United Farm Workers, José Angel Gutiérrez, La Raza Unida Party, and MAYO.

Unfortunately, although they provide extensive insight and exploration of the subject, they are unable to fully answer their key research questions by the end of the text. In addition, Alaníz and Cornish never really delve into outside factors which may have contributed to the wane of the Chicano movement or deterred them from nationhood, but more so focus on problems within the movement itself. The authors therefore do not cover in detail the role of the FBI or the ATF in subverting the movement but do make the claim that the Texas Rangers and the Border Patrol were created with the intent of suppressing Chicanos and Mexican Americans, although they do not support this statement (Alaníz and Cornish 2008, 233). Nevertheless, they do mention, if only in passing, claims that there were special units located within local police units run by sheriffs and other law enforcement agencies that employed agents of the FBI, CIA, and ATF with the purpose of suppressing Chicanos and Mexicanos (Alaníz and Cornish 2008, 233). For instance, they do note that the Brown Berets experienced “harassment, spying, attacks, infiltration, and sabotage” (Alaníz and Cornish 2008, 184). Additionally, they note that movement leaders were murdered, framed, and defamed as a result of the work of these actors (Alaniz and Cornish 2008, 234).

**Fighting Their Own Battles**

Last, Behnken (2011) presents an examination of the history of the African American and Mexican American civil rights movements as they occurred simultaneously, with a particular
focus on the movements in Texas. Behnken’s focus on Texas is due mainly to its large Mexican American and African American populations. Using a comparative method, the book examines how events, leaders, and tactics differed between the two movements, as well as why and how they intersected and diverged at different times. Aside from historical events which set the movements on their paths, he also evaluates extensively the plans enacted by the different groups and the actions and rhetoric used by the key leaders. In some cases, he even documents some of the more controversial incidents concerning movement leaders.32

Behnken differs from other authors examined above in that he also takes into account the efforts of popular religious leaders, such as Wallace B. “Bud” Poteat and Father Sherrill Smith, in supporting the movements. He also points out that aside from dealing with racism on the part of Anglos, the two groups also encountered racism on the part of both African Americans and Mexican Americans in dealing with one another (although often by select members and not a group in its entirety). Subsequently, racist language and the avoidance of coalition forming fostered distrust among the two groups.

Behnken also explores the role of various politicians, such as governors, mayors, and police chiefs in either supporting or working against the African American and Chicano movements. While some politicians acquiesced to the various demands of the movements, others chose to keep their current practices, sometimes using law enforcement as a tool of suppression and harassment. In one instance, Behnken describes how a group came together to protest the placing of dumps in African American neighborhoods after the death of an African American youth in the dump. Surprisingly, despite this legitimate reason for protest, undercover

32 In one example Behnken cites José Angel Gutiérrez as stating, “We have got to eliminate the gringo, and what I mean by that is if the worst comes to worst we have got to kill him” (Behnken 2011, 154). Behnken states that these words caused controversy among Mexican American leadership and with Anglos.
Houston police officers were used to keep tabs on the group (Behnken 2011, 157). These officers inferred that persons from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committing were calling for violence, and it was thus inferred that, because most SNCC members attended Texas Southern University, that the potential threat of student violence was present (Behnken 2011, 157). As Behnken puts it, it is these types of far-reaching “inferences” that caused many people to become targets of law enforcement and politicians and to be negatively perceived by the Anglo community. For instance, this particular case resulted in a college dormitory being raided and some 500 students being arrested on false charges (Behnken 2011, 159). Elsewhere, countless similar stories are described by Behnken throughout the text. Behnken also mentions, that in addition to the state and local law enforcement agencies, the FBI had a role in actively undermining, infiltrating, and suppressing various other key groups, even some of the more well-regarded, non-violent groups such as the Poor People’s Campaign (Behnken 2011, 151).
FIELD RESEARCH AND FINDINGS

Interviews

While discussing my thesis work with faculty at the University of Texas at El Paso, I was provided contact information for scholar and former activist José Angel Gutiérrez and was able to meet with him in conducting my field research and speak with him directly about many of the incidents he wrote about (see Bustillos 2012). I was also privy to look through the massive amount of FBI files and other records that he has collected over the years. Dr. Gutiérrez also provided a copy of the transcript of his interview with Tim Chapa (see Gutiérrez 2000), a former undercover agent, or agent provocateur, who has worked for various law enforcement agencies including the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, the DEA, and the New Mexico State Police.33

Below I first detail Gutiérrez’s interview with Chapa and then move to my subsequent interview of Gutiérrez.

Gutiérrez Interview of Chapa

In Gutiérrez’s interview, Chapa describes various activities which he undertook in order to infiltrate and undermine not only the Alianza Federal de Mercedes group (from this point largely referred to simply as “the Alianza”) but even leaders of the American Indian Movement (AIM). Chapa recounts how he initially got involved with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as an informer while wrestling professionally. He was approached by agents to help gather information on wrestlers who were smuggling marijuana into El Paso, Texas. Later, in 1965, one of his brothers was reportedly killed in Albuquerque, New Mexico by a guy who was on drugs. Chapa approached a Federal Bureau of Narcotics officer, Robert Gilliland, and told him

---

33 Chapa also took orders from the ATF and FBI while in his position as an infiltrator of the Alianza de Mercedes group run by Reies López Tijerina, although officially employed by the New Mexico State Police.
he had information on people dealing drugs. He was then placed on the payroll of the agency but later joined the New Mexico Mounted Police. Chapa mentions that at this same time Tijerina was already active in northern New Mexico.

Chapa was then approached by Robert Gilliland to infiltrate the Alianza, run by Reies López Tijerina. Chapa states in the interview that he received instruction on intelligence gathering from an FBI agent and that his initial task was to find out who came to see Tijerina, get their names and information, and report it to Gilliland. He was also tasked with infiltrating the Students for a Democratic Society group at the University of New Mexico. He would attend their meetings and would debrief once or twice per week. Chapa also states that there would be an FBI agent present at these debriefings telling him “what to look for, what to do” (Gutiérrez 2000, 9). Aside from reporting to Gilliland and the FBI, he would occasionally debrief Hoover Wimberly, second in command of the New Mexico State Police; Chapa claimed most of the orders came from Wimberly.

Even while working as an infiltrator of the Alianza group, Chapa claims he was given instructions to “take out a black militant” who was with Tijerina during an incident in Coyote if given the chance (Gutiérrez 2000, 15). Chapa believed the individual to be a member of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and received instruction that if the person took out a weapon he was to take the opportunity to eliminate him (Gutiérrez 2000, 15). He also divulged that during one of Tijerina’s caravans, this one to Los Alamos, New Mexico, per the instructions of the ATF, he was to start trouble with guns if the chance arose (Gutiérrez 2000, 49). Tijerina had advised the group not to take weapons, but Chapa and the individuals he rode with carried three rifles. Some of them attempted to point the rifles at other people but were stopped by another individual.
Chapa also reported that after a while, his superiors talked of wanting to “smoke” Tijerina, to eliminate him, once even suggesting he push Tijerina over a cliff (Gutiérrez 2009, 24). They also instructed Chapa to get anything he could on Tijerina in order for them to get him out of the picture. This included instructing Chapa and others to burn clinics, fences, haystacks, poison water, and other things in order to attempt to frame Tijerina.\textsuperscript{34} Chapa also pointed out that he, Gilliland, other NM State Police officers, and ATF agents were often housed together and worked with local Anglo ranchers on strategies to get rid of Tijerina. Chapa speaks of one local rancher, Mundy, who wanted to catch Tijerina on his property in order to be able to shoot him (Gutiérrez 2000, 22). Chapa points out that one of the ATF agents personally drove him and another infiltrator to the medical clinic they later burned.

Chapa added that aside from trying to find grounds to either arrest or eliminate Tijerina, he also tried to frame Tijerina’s family members, specifically his son David. Chapa divulged that he would try to get David to do illegal things or do things that would allow them to frame him (Gutiérrez 2000, 28). Chapa describes one incident in which the state police provided him with a machine to write bonded checks. He was to give it to David in order to get his fingerprints on it and then the police would pick him up with it. Chapa explains that David did not want to accept the machine, much less touch it, and that it was placed behind the Alianza building. Chapa reports that his superiors were upset that he was unable to get David’s fingerprints on it.

Chapa also recalls working to set up other Alianza members, or even suspected members, for crimes such as robberies and burglaries (Gutiérrez 2000, 31). They also attempted to frame Tijerina’s other son, Cristobal, for a car theft (Gutiérrez 2000, 34). Chapa and another individual

\textsuperscript{34} Chapa disclosed later in the interview that the chemicals used to poison the rivers and streams were provided by Kirtland Air Force Base.
had asked to test drive a car from an Albuquerque dealership and drove it to El Paso, where they were to meet Cristobal who was returning from Mexico, and were to give him the car. Cristobal would have been unaware that it was a stolen vehicle, however, Cristobal never met them and they were unable to set him up.

Although not personally involved, Chapa disclosed the involvement of the state police in the burning of property that had been donated to Tijerina and the Alianza (Gutiérrez 2000, 32). The apparent motivation was that the property would be used as a school for the group. Chapa also admitted to burning trailer houses where Alianza members lived, believing that Tijerina might live in one of them. Chapa even alludes to the fact that he believes Gilliland killed Eulogio Salazar, a murder for which Tijerina was tried and convicted (Gutiérrez 2000, 36).

While Tijerina was in prison, Gilliland was reassigned and Leroy Urioste took his place at the New Mexico State Police. With Tijerina temporarily out of the picture, Chapa was mostly given tasks of intelligence gathering and began to focus on the Black Berets and their connections with Alianza. Chapa was also tasked with infiltrating both the Brown and Black Berets and became a self-defense instructor for the Black Berets. Within the Black Berets four individuals were specific targets: Rito Canales, Antonio Córdova, Richard Moore, and a female only identified by the last name of Trujillo (Gutiérrez 200, 51). Chapa recounts how state police made arrangements for him and the Black Berets to be able to steal some dynamite in order to carry out bombings in the area (Gutiérrez 2000, 55). When the Black Berets failed to follow through with one plan to blow up a police station, Chapa was instructed by Urioste to make up a story that “Corky” Gonzales from Colorado wanted to buy the dynamite. Chapa and other state and city police formulated a plan to assure that at least some of the targeted Black Berets would be in his company to steal more dynamite. The plan was for Chapa to take these Brown Berets,
which ended up being just Rito Canales and Antonio Córdova, up to a bunker at a construction site where they had stolen the dynamite the first time. Chapa was to remain at the bottom of the hill and when Canales and Córdova would arrive at the bunker on top of the hill they would be taken out by officers waiting. The plan worked and both Canales and Córdova were killed while attempting to steal the dynamite.

Chapa also speaks about the murder of a young student, Bobby García, who was the leader of the MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán) on the Albuquerque, New Mexico campus (Gutiérrez 2000, 75). Chapa believes the same or similar set up may have been used to lure him out of the city and murder him, although it was reported as a suicide. Chapa reveals he believes Gilliland, or someone Gilliland knew, was responsible for the death of García. Aside from this murder, Chapa speaks to an instance where he drove an Indian activist Larry Casuse\textsuperscript{35} to kidnap the mayor in Gallup, New Mexico and then to a sporting goods store which ended in a shootout between Casuse and New Mexico State Police. According to Chapa, the shootout could have been prevented, but was allowed to happen.

The interview of Tim Chapa by José Angel Gutiérrez is monumental in beginning to make the links between targeted counterintelligence action taken against Chicano groups and their leaders. The actions depicted in the interview with Chapa clearly indicate that not only was the New Mexico State Police involved in deploying various tactics against Reies López Tijerina and the Alianza Federal de Mercedes group, but also against activists within Native American and African American groups. What is most disturbing is that, based on this interview, the FBI and ATF had deep involvement in planning operations against these persons and groups. Equally disturbing is the mention of military involvement in furnishing weapons (dynamite and

\textsuperscript{35} Casus is as close to the name as Chapa could remember. A quick search on the internet showed the spelling to be “Casuse”.

bomb-making materials) to be used against these groups whether to kill their membership and leaders or to frame them for crimes they did not commit. Additionally, Chapa narrates how the FBI and ATF directly assisted Chapa and others commit crimes to frame the Alianza. While the two murders Chapa describes do not directly involve the FBI, they were aware of the planning of these murders and were regularly present at briefings where Chapa was present and plans were orchestrated. Several of the events involving Reies López Tijerina and the Alianza can be further substantiated in Tijerina’s book entitled, “They Call Me ‘King Tiger’: My Struggle for the Land and Our Rights” (see also Alaniz and Cornsh 2008). ³⁶ Although Tijerina was not aware of the involvement of these agencies, he describes many of the same events from his perspective, and it is through Chapa’s interview we learn the details.

Interview with Gutiérrez

As previously mentioned, I also had the occasion to interview José Angel Gutiérrez in reference to his experience as a Chicano activist (Bustillos 2012). Gutiérrez briefly narrated key events, which are also in his autobiography, before shifting focus to his experience with law enforcement as a scholar and an activist. Gutiérrez indicated he was always vaguely aware of the involvement of the government, especially in his personal experiences and the complaints of other activists and groups, which were never investigated. While working with the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO) he was also aware that they were being constantly followed and photographed. Gutiérrez even references a photograph in which they are taking pictures of the police photographing them while they are having a planning session in a park. He stated it was not until later when he began to submit Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests that his suspicions were validated. Gutiérrez has spent years gathering hundreds if not

³⁶ This book was originally written in Spanish by Reies López Tijerina and later translated to English by José Angel Gutiérrez.
thousands of FBI documents substantiating the fact that Chicano groups and activists have been the target of surveillance and counterintelligence (COINTELPRO) programs for decades.

When asked if he was aware if he had been the target of the FBI or any law enforcement agencies, Gutiérrez confirmed he believed it to be the case. He mentioned that on several occasions his vehicle had been broken into and notes and address books were stolen. He also points to the “scholarship” he received while teaching as a PhD student, as he uncovered an FBI memo indicating agents from the bureau had visited the dean of his college telling him to offer him a scholarship in order to get him out of the classroom. He also describes that during his time as a county judge he led a group of people to a dam in reference to getting their water rights. Despite his position as a county judge, several law enforcement officers were present and had their weapons drawn. He later learned that, should the opportunity have presented itself; he was to be their main target for elimination (Bustillos 2012).

Gutiérrez also believes the government has used the IRS to target him, pointing to the fact that he has been audited seven times as an individual and three as a lawyer (Bustillos 2012). He believes the audits would have continued but stopped once he complained. Gutiérrez also explains that over the years he has been kidnapped twice, both times by Chicanos but, according to Gutiérrez, at the behest of “Gringos” (Bustillos 2012) He has also received several death threats and continues to receive them to this day, even at the University of Texas at Arlington where he teaches. He also stated that there have been attempted bombings of his offices and bomb threats to his home. Gutiérrez also stated that he is on the “No Fly List” as an agitator or threat and is consistently subjected to more scrutiny (such as questioning and thorough baggage checks) when traveling by plane (Bustillos 2012). He believes the motivation behind all of this
could be to possibly scare or intimidate him, or to get him to tone down his rhetoric and statements.

When asked about the suppression of the Chicano movement in general, Gutiérrez stated he believes that Mexicans have always been the “historic enemy” and considered a threat to national security, sometimes because of their continued ties to Mexico. He believes that the targeting of Chicano groups began with Hoover and Kissinger and not only continued beyond them but grew. Gutiérrez believes that the FBI uses state and local law enforcement agencies as their “foot soldiers” to help carry out some of their work. Gutiérrez stated that state and local law enforcement began creating so-called intelligence units which collaborated with the FBI; again, this is supported by the statements of Chapa (Gutiérrez 2000).

**FBI Memorandums and Documentation**

I was privy to look through the many FBI files and memos amassed by José Angel Gutiérrez, many of them, although not as blatant as the interview with Chapa and Gutiérrez, provide evidence that the FBI was at the very least targeting Chicano groups and activists for decades. A few of the documents also indicate the tendency of the FBI to use other measures and non-traditional (i.e. COINTELPRO operations) against these groups, although none explicitly detail actions to be taken, as was the case with African American groups.

---

37 Gutiérrez points out that the leadership of LULAC, because of their work with the Mexican government and Mexican consulate were classified as subversive by the government.
38 Henry Kissinger served as Secretary of State from September 22, 1973 until January 20, 1977 as well as Assistant to the President on National Security Affairs from January 20, 1969 until November 3, 1975.
39 Recall that Chapa worked with the New Mexico State Police as an employee and infiltrator in the Alianza and indicated more than once that the FBI was not only present at briefings but would also give direction as to operations that should take place and how/what intelligence should be used.
Many of the earliest memos Gutiérrez was in possession of dated back to the 1920s. One details the FBI’s surveillance of artist Diego Rivera because of his membership in the PCM (Mexican Communist Party). Several memos reference the activities and travels of Rivera. Indeed, one memo from the Director of the FBI clarifies to field offices that Rivera’s file should be marked under “treason” due to his radical acts.\textsuperscript{40} A subsequent memo references the denial of readmission by the PCM and acknowledges that PCM did advise Rivera to work against “the espionage efforts of the imperialists in Mexico which were conducted through a great number of the agents of the FBI located in Mexico.”\textsuperscript{41} This memo does not confirm or deny this accusation by the PCM. A later memo from the San Diego field office to the Director of the FBI advises that in their opinion they should play one group (within the PCM) off another in order to create dissension amongst them.\textsuperscript{42}

Later memos, from the SAC (Special Agent in Charge) of the El Paso FBI field office to the Director of the FBI advised that the situation with the Popular Socialist Party (PPS), the Alianza Cívico Democrática Juarense (not to be confused with Tijerina’s Alianza de Mercedes), and the Emiliano Zapata Study Group did not allow the opportunity for counterintelligence to be used.\textsuperscript{43} However, the memo clearly states that the groups will be closely followed should the opportunity to use counterintelligence present itself.\textsuperscript{44}

Separate memos from the FBI field office in Phoenix to the Director of the FBI explain that the circumstances in the Phoenix area did not lend themselves to counterintelligence activity

\textsuperscript{40} FBI File #100-155423-X11
\textsuperscript{41} FBI File #155423-X5, FBI File # 100-155423-X11, and FBI File # 100-434445-46
\textsuperscript{42} FBI File #100-434445-46
\textsuperscript{43} FBI File #100-434445-40
\textsuperscript{44} FBI File # 100-34445
in that area but did in the Cananea area (an area south of the Arizona border with Mexico). 45

The memo contained many deleted paragraphs, with the other paragraphs acknowledging the use of informants and the success of informants in Cananea in disrupting the various groups (socialist in nature) and causing them to blame one another. Despite the opinion that counterintelligence was not currently appropriate in Phoenix, the memo states that “Phoenix will remain vigilant for the possibility to use counterintelligence” and especially for “the opportunity to focus public attention on subversives and their communist affiliations.” 46

FBI memos that appear much later detail the activities of the Crusade for Justice (CFJ) and its leader Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales. Of special note was the rally held in Denver, Colorado in support of Huey Newton, leader of the Black Panther Party from Oakland, California. The memo states that Gonzales supported Newton and Black Panther Party ideals, and then proceeds to identify the Black Panther Party as a “violence-prone” black militant organization. Additional memos continue to chronicle the activities of the CFJ and “Corky” Gonzales including their plans to develop La Raza Unida Party, plans for the Chicano Moratorium to protest the war in Vietnam, their support of the “Chicago Eight”, demonstrations against the Denver Police Department and school districts, and their participation in anti-draft activities.

As previously mentioned none of the FBI files located are as explicit in describing COINTELPRO tactics such as those evidenced in much of the research available on the Black Panther Party, however, memos that were located allude to the fact that these tactics were almost assuredly used against Chicano social groups as well. One such memo from the Director of the FBI to the Denver field office clearly reads, “Personnel handling investigations in this field

45 FBI File # 100-434445-38
46 FBI File # 100-434445-38
should be reminded that the Bureau will not accept a passive or routine handling of these matters.”

Close surveillance was conducted of other Chicano movement groups just as was done with the PCM, its members, and other socialist groups. Several of the memos stress the importance of finding connections between groups and subversive and/or communist persons and groups. As with the PCM, the FBI monitored the links between the CFJ and other groups such as Reies López Tijerina’s Alianza Federal de Mercedes. Despite its work or alliance with other Chicano groups of the time, the Crusade for Justice was, perhaps along with the American G.I. Forum, one of the most peaceful, if not loyal, groups operating at the time. This is evidenced clearly in their Articles of Incorporation of the Crusade for Justice (see Appendix B).

We then have evidence of the surveillance of the La Raza Unida Party and their activities, especially the activities of their leaders including, once again, José Angel Gutiérrez. One memo from the San Antonio field office of the FBI to the Director describes Gutiérrez as a “militant exponent of the Mexican American and an open and caustic critic of Anglo Americans”. In a separate memo the Director of the FBI advises the Special Agents in Charge of the El Paso and San Antonio offices that the La Raza Unida Party is considered a legitimate political party but “the FBI is concerned with infiltration by subversive elements”. The memo addresses the La Raza Unida Political Convention held in El Paso, Texas and outlines which Chicano leaders were in attendance. Specifically pointed out was that the largest delegation to the convention was from Denver, Colorado led by “militant” “Corky” Gonzales and that members of the Communist Party United States of America (CPUSA) were present.

---

47 FBI File # 105-178283-51
48 FBI File # 157-8887-11
A separate memo, addressed to the Director of the FBI from the Dallas field office, takes note of a La Raza Unida meeting in Lubbock, Texas at which members of the Brown Berets were expected to attend and that José Angel Gutiérrez was scheduled to speak. The memo noted that neither showed to the meeting, at which there was altogether poor attendance. The Dallas field office continued to articulate that Gutiérrez had been involved “as victim, complainant, or subject in a number of civil rights cases. A case on Gutiérrez under [unreadable] character is presently pending and a comprehensive report will be submitted, along with appropriate recommendation as to whether or not Gutiérrez should be included in the Security Index or Agitator Index.”

This handful of memos is a prime example of how African American and Chicano groups were a prime target for surveillance and COINTELPRO tactics since the 1920s. As evidenced here, the FBI not only targeted groups which may or may not have been prone to violent action, such as the Black Panther Party, but continually targeted those groups which embodied loyal, American ideals, and that were operating under the ideal of nonviolent, peaceful protest. As the evidence demonstrates, the FBI was a strong proponent of the use of surveillance and counterintelligence tactics against various groups within not only the African American but the Chicano movement as well. From the research conducted here, it is obvious that many of the tactics employed by the FBI were unwarranted, unethical, and at times illegal. In the handful of documents that have been gathered to date, it is apparent that the FBI targeted these movements with the express goal of suppressing them and their leaders.

49 No FBI File number was discernible on the memo (but see the Appendix B image on page 68).
CONCLUSION

Given the sometimes tumultuous historical relationship between the United States government and Chicanos, it is not surprising that these groups have at times been viewed as threats to national security. During the period under study, many actions on the part of Chicanos and the organized movements associated with the community were watched with much scrutiny, as evidenced by some of the FBI memos presented here. Granted, one must acknowledge the need of the state to protect its security interests to ward off potential threats and one could even concede to the notion that surveillance, both domestic and abroad is, at times, necessary and permissible, particularly in the face of violence. However, this certainly does not mean that the state, nor its entities, should be allowed to participate in acts of racial profiling, sabotage, infiltration, harassment, or otherwise illegal tactics, especially when the goal becomes not to protect national security, but to suppress any social movement which is considered to be contradictory to a certain political agenda.

Looking as far back as the initial memos on Diego Rivera from the early 1920s (reproduced in Appendix B), I began to uncover evidence of FBI infiltration of the Mexican Communist Party, even going to the extent to send agents to Mexico. Moving forward through the 1960s-1970s and beyond, it becomes increasingly evident that the FBI extended its efforts to conduct more widespread investigations on numerous emerging Chicano groups. Oftentimes, when a Mexican-American or Chicano worked to unite their people, no matter the cause, the government, particularly the FBI and other law enforcement agencies, used the opportunity to disband, disrupt, or defame these groups or their leadership. The fact that they were uniting their people for action and spoke out against injustices caused them to fall under the microscope of the FBI. This is further evidenced by the fact that even groups seemingly patriotic, such as the
American G.I. Forum and LULAC, were targets of surveillance and other tactics on the part of the FBI and other law enforcement agencies.

Apart from the increasingly systemic targeting of Chicano and other social movement groups, I have also noted the particular types of tactics the FBI was willing to employ. For instance, in examining the Appendix C memo that references “Black extremists”, it is stated that COINTELPRO had as its objectives the neutralization of black extremist groups, the prevention of violence by these groups, and the prevention of the forming of a coalition of black extremists (see Appendix C; see also Churchill and Vander Wall 1990, 39). However, they do not qualify who gets placed into the category of a “black extremist.” By comparison, while the available FBI memos pertaining to Chicano leaders and groups are not as blatant as to the tactics and goals of the FBI, when compared to those referencing the African American movement groups and leaders, one can only conclude based on the interviews conducted and available literature and documentation that the FBI may have continued using some of these tactics and had become more adept at concealing or censoring sensitive information related to such acts.50

In addition, as pointed out earlier, a number of Chicano and African American groups initiated programs to feed their community and increase education, as well as address other community needs, yet these groups were still considered “extremists” and a threat to the nation. As evidenced in the supporting documents pointing to the use of racial profiling, sabotage, infiltration, harassment, and other tactics to target and suppress key groups and leaders (e.g., Gutiérrez 1986, 2000, 2005), one can argue that the FBI went beyond its scope in the actions taken against both the African American and Chicano movements.

---

50 For replications of the relevant FBI memos with regards to the Black Panther Party, see Churchill and Vander Wall (1990, 38, 41, and 50).
From the FBI memorandums examined within this study, it also appears that FBI tactics and programs were not employed solely by rogue agents within the bureau, nor by the FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover. Rather, the tactics seemed to have become engrained and institutionalized within the bureau and applied nationwide in order to broadly target the African American and Chicano Movement groups and leaders. While much of the direction for action was top-down within the agency, I also found some evidence of vertical and horizontal integration and the involvement and inclusion of other federal agencies as well as state and local law enforcement to assist in the carrying out of FBI directives.

In examining such evidence, I also considered the possible motivations behind the FBI’s choice to partake in these types of actions against social movements and leaders. For instance, were FBI operations a response to national security concerns, possibly due to unlawful or subversive actions on the part of key leaders and groups? In light of the Rivera documents and some concerns raised about possible Communist influences from certain social movement groups, it may have been the case that, at least early on, the FBI was employing a strategy of domestic containment to avoid a volatile situation. It may also have been that FBI actions were, at least in part, a function of differential racialization, one of the main tenets of Critical Race Theory, which suggests that a dominate society may “racialize” minority groups in seeking out a certain political agenda. However, I also found evidence suggesting that, to a certain extent, the FBI’s actions were institutionalized against all social movement groups and leaders under investigation. As such, one cannot broadly apply the tenet of differential racialization or, more broadly, the framework for Critical Race Theory to explain bureaucratic behavior against Chicanos or other groups. Instead, scholars should expand future studies to further determine the extent to with FBI targeting tactics were employed against other various types of groups.
(including, for example, groups as disparate as the KKK versus activists involved with the recent Occupy Wall Street movement).

Elsewhere, there are some other notable insights that can be drawn from other recent studies, which may also help scholars build towards a more comprehensive theoretical framework for future studies to further develop. For instance, one popular viewpoint is that FBI director J. Edgar Hoover was largely the key instigator of the types of policies and counterintelligence programs initiated by the FBI against key groups and leaders, and that he used the bureau to seek out his own political agenda. However, more recent literature has emerged which suggests that some manipulation of Hoover may have occurred on the part of some of our nation’s presidents (see Wiener, 2012). As such, fully understanding the motivations behind the FBI’s policies and directives requires further, extensive research beyond the scope of this study, especially given the relatively limited number of documents obtained thus far.

Taken together, I can conclude the following from the available research and analysis conducted to this point: 1) that the FBI was the main proponent behind the tactics used to suppress the Chicano movement; 2) that the methodology employed by the FBI, although originally may be attributed to its long-time director, J. Edgar Hoover, and some rogue agents within the bureau, appear instead to be more engrained and institutionalized within the bureau than previously assumed; and 3) that COINTELPRO tactics were indeed used against Chicano and African American groups and activists with the intent of ultimately suppressing the movements.

In light of the findings presented here, much remains in the way of further investigation and examination of the FBI’s impact on social movements. The outcome for many Chicano
movement groups at the time varies; however, it is evident in the data collected that many of these groups and leaders were weakened as a result of the tactics employed by the FBI. For example, Reies López Tijerina spent approximately seven years in prison for a murder for which he was framed, largely leaving his group, the Alianza Federal de Mercedes, without a strong leader. COINTELPRO and other operations led to dysfunction within groups such as the Brown Berets and many other Chicano movement groups across the country, a number of which struggled to remain cohesive when faced with such intense targeting.

To further expand on the research presented here scholars should extend the time period of study to see how and to what extent the FBI has evolved from the 1970s to today, both with respect to their procedures as well as with respect to the groups or individuals they are focusing on (presumably, a study concerning the Arab-American community in the post-9/11 phase would be one fruitful avenue of research). Additionally, studies may look further into the period under study here, if only to seek out further archival documentation for the purpose of developing a clearer understanding of the topic. In that vein, scholars could further explore the actions of key personnel within the FBI that had influential decision and policy making powers, whether they used such power to undermine or protect citizen rights, at what level(s) of the organization was such power and influence most notable, and also further explore the role and impact that local level officials had in responding to the FBI’s requests and directives for investigating groups.
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## APPENDIX A

### Table 1. An Overview of Key Historical Events and Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Events/Developments</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>U.S. Constitution ratified</td>
<td>The United States moves one step closer to becoming a federal system of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>Bill of Rights adopted</td>
<td>Individual rights and liberties are strongly and explicitly instituted into the Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>Fugitive Slave Act</td>
<td>Any slave that flees his master will be arrested and returned; anyone aiding a slave to flee shall be fined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Slave Trade Act</td>
<td>Limited American involvement in the trade of human cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Alien and Sedition Act</td>
<td>Extended the duration of residence required for aliens to become citizens of the United States from five years to fourteen years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Constitutional mandate for slavery expires</td>
<td>Importation of African slaves could now be prohibited by Congress, which then banned the practice (although slavery itself remained legal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Indian Removal Act</td>
<td>Authorized the granting of unsettled lands west of the Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Dred Scott v. Sanford</td>
<td>Declared Scott a non-citizen due to his black status and thus unable to sue. The Chief Justice interpreted the constitution to apply only to white men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Emancipation Proclamation</td>
<td>Freed slaves in states that had seceded from the union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>13th Amendment</td>
<td>Abolishes slavery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>14th Amendment</td>
<td>Granted citizenship to freed slaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Plessey v. Ferguson</td>
<td>Supreme Court declares separate but equal legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>FBI created</td>
<td>Created to investigate federal crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Mann Act</td>
<td>Made it a crime to transport women over state lines for immoral purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Bath Riots (El Paso, Texas)</td>
<td>The fumigation of Mexican citizens crossing into the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>19th Amendment</td>
<td>Gives women the right to vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Smith Act</td>
<td>Made it illegal to say things counter to government policy in times of war and national emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Japanese Internment</td>
<td>About 120,000 Japanese Americans were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka</td>
<td>School segregation declared illegal by the Supreme Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Civil Rights Acts</td>
<td>Landmark legislation passes to expand equal rights to African Americans and other minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act</td>
<td>Provided for the use of court-ordered electronic surveillance in the investigation of certain crimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO)</td>
<td>Allowed for the prosecution of organized crime groups for their diverse criminal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Controlled Substances Act</td>
<td>Established a single system of control for both narcotic and psychotropic drugs for the first time in U.S. history; Established a schedule that classified controlled substances according to how dangerous they are, their potential for abuse and addiction, and whether they possess legitimate medical value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>DEA created</td>
<td>A consolidation of various federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Murillo et al v. Musegades, INS</td>
<td>The targeting of “illegal” looking students by Border Patrol agents violated students’ 4th and 5th Amendment rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW YORK FILE #54-31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBI File# 100-155423-X5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX B**

**THIS CASE ORIGINATED AT San Antonio, Texas.**

**REPORT MADE AT:** New York City  
**DATE WHEN MADE:** Oct. 18, 1927  
**PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE:** Oct. 15 to 18  
**REPORT MADE BY:** (Blank)  
**CHARACTER OF CASE:** Mexican Matters

**SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:**

Subject located; arrived at New York on train known as "Spirit of St. Louis" at 2 P.M. October 18, 1927. Agent was met at Pennsylvania Station by Special Agent who took up the surveillance of Subject at this point. For further details see report of Agent on this Subject.

**PENDING**

**ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED**

**DATING OF MESSAGE:**

**NEW YORK FILE #54-31**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION**

**WASHINGTON REFERENCE:**

**FILE NUMBER:** 100-155423-X5

**DATE:** Oct 20 1927

**RECORDED AND INDEXED:**

**APPROVED AND FORWARDED:**

**SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE:**

**CHECKED OFF:**

**JACKETED:**

**CONCEIVED TO:**

**ROUTE TO:**

**COPIES DESTROYED:**

**OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR:**

**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE:**

**FILE NUMBER:** 100-155423-X5

**DATE:** Oct 20 1927
November 8, 1927.
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P. 0. Box 909,
San Antonio, Texas.

Dear Sir:

I am in receipt of your report of
October 26, 1927, in the case entitled "Diego
Rivera," and note that the character of this
case is erroneously designated as a Mexican
radical matter.

Please refer to Chapter 4, Section 2,
of the Bureau Manual, wherein it will be noted
that radical matters are now to be carried under
the caption of "Treason."

Very truly yours,

Acting Director.
This case is being maintained in a closed status, inasmuch as RIVERA’s petition for reinstatement into the Mexican Communist Party has been denied, and inasmuch as he is not considered a key figure in Mexican Communist activities.

In denying RIVERA’s petition for reinstatement, the Political Commission of the Mexican Communist Party pointed out that RIVERA should begin working against the espionage efforts of the imperialists in Mexico which were conducted through a great number of the agents of the FBI located in Mexico.
Memorandum

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (100-434445)
ATTN: FOREIGN LIAISON SECTION
FROM: SAC, EL PASO (105-788)
SUBJECT: COUNTERINTELLIGENCE - BORDER COVERAGE PROGRAM
OO: BUREAU


On Page 4 of this referenced Bureau letter mention is made of the ineffectual operations of the PCM in Juarez and the excellent informant coverage. In the last quarterly report dated at El Paso, Texas, January 13, 1961 captioned COMMUNIST PARTY OF MEXICO, STATE OF CHIHUAHUA, INTERNAL SECURITY - MEXICO, Juarez active membership is estimated at 15.

Further, the best elements in the PCM in Juarez both from positions within the Party as well as general standing in the community are active. Therefore any disruptive tactics against the PCM in Juarez would most probably disrupt the entire movement. Such disruption would pertain both to the abilities of these individuals to furnish information as well as in their personal lives. For this reason no possibility is apparent at this time, in the opinion of the El Paso Office, for the use of disruptive tactics against the PCM in Juarez.

No disruptive tactics possibilities appear to exist regarding the PCM in Chihuahua City, Mexico since, due to ineffectiveness in the formal organization there as well as in Juarez there is very little to disrupt. Also any attempts at disruption or the creation of factionalism would very likely result in lessening the already limited

Bureau (PERSONAL ATTENTION) (REG. AM)
1 - Phoenix (PERSONAL ATTENTION) (REG. AM) 9 JAN 24 1961
1 - San Antonio (PERSONAL ATTENTION) (REG. AM)
1 - San Diego (PERSONAL ATTENTION) (REG. AM)
1 - El Paso
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DIRECTOR, FBI (100-434445-46)
ATTENTION: FOREIGN LIAISON DESK
RE: Counter Intelligence - Border Coverage Program

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to Bureau letter to San Diego dated January 9, 1961, copies of which were designated for all Border Offices and the Legat, Mexico.

The San Diego Office has, of course, given this matter a great deal of thought taking into consideration the organizational make-up of the PCM, the personality of its various leaders, the projected plans of the organization and the other related groups which could be utilized to disrupt the PCM through the creation of dissension by playing one group against the other.

FBI File# 100-434445-46
Memorandum

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (100-43445-38)
DATE: 2/28/61

SUBJECT: COUNTERINTELLIGENCE - BORDER COVERAGE PROGRAM

SAC PHOENIX (100-3670-0) Attention: FOREIGN LIAISON SECTION


After consideration of the possibilities outlined by the Bureau for implementation of a Counterintelligence Program under BOCOV, the Phoenix Division concludes that no encouraging factors exist for such a program along the Sonora border at this time. The Cananea area would be the only area where such counterintelligence could be entertained at all, and owing to the present complete disorganization of the PCM elements in that area, it hardly appears warranted at this time to jeopardize current informants with a Counterintelligence Program.

It would appear from an analysis of the organizational situation that the apparent current vying for membership and influence on the part of the PCM, UGOCM, and PPS in the

3 - Bureau (RM)
1 - Albuquerque (RM) 10-1
1 - El Paso (RM)
1 - San Antonio (RM)
1 - San Diego (RM)
1 - Phoenix

CLC: mss (8)
Cananea area, is accomplishing the very result that disruptive tactics would hope to accomplish. Each organization is blaming the other for the ills that besets them. An opportunity for accentuating this will be watched by the Phoenix Division.

Phoenix will also be on the alert for a possible means of focusing public attention on the Communist affiliation of strategically situated subversives, but it would appear from a review of Phoenix files that these people have been branded accordingly already. As the Bureau points out, psychological tactics through the anonymous mailing of appropriate literature could possibly be worked out if the right aptitude should come to light in an informant. The Phoenix Division will remain alert to the above possibilities, but is making no recommendations at this time.
Memorandum

DIRECTOR, FBI (100-434445 SUB 48)
ATTN: LATIN AMERICAN SECTION

FROM: SAC, EL PASO (105-788) (RUC)

SUBJECT: COUNTERINTELLIGENCE 

Re: SD letter, 1/22/69; 
Bulet, 1/30/69; 
EP letter to Bureau, 4/3/69; 
O-1, 8/17/70.

Since date of re El Paso letter, the Popular Socialist Party (PPS), the Alianza Civico Democratica Juarense (The Alliance), and the Emiliano Zapata Study Circle are either non-existent or have such attendance as to be almost completely negligible.

In view of the above, El Paso still does not deem it advisable to undertake any disruptive action against foreign leftist groups at this time.

This matter will be closely followed and the El Paso Office will make appropriate recommendations to the Bureau if a situation should arise in the future warranting a counterintelligence move by the El Paso Office.

FBI File# 100-434445
SAC, Denver (100-9635)  2/29/68

Director, FBI

CRUSADE FOR JUSTICE (CFJ)
IS - SPANISH-AMERICAN

Reurlet 2/14/68 entitled "Rudolph Gonzales; #212,239
per release 190/"

Referenced letter advised captioned organization
was organized approximately four or five years ago as a
legitimate civil rights group created by Mexican-American
people in Denver. You noted that many Mexican-Americans,
including influential Mexican-Americans, have joined this
organization. You also advised that since Rudolph Gonzales
became President of the CFJ, numerous members of the organi-
ization have become inactive in view of his militancy and since
he has surrounded himself with known Denver "thugs." Refer-

eral letter points out there are no set dates for meetings but
that membership is open and anyone can join.

It is felt an intensive investigation of this organization
should date to m

FBI File# 105-178283
Referenced letter advised captioned organization was organized approximately four or five years ago as a legitimate civil rights group created by Mexican-American people in Denver. You noted that many Mexican-Americans, including influential Mexican-Americans, have joined this organization. You also advised that since Rudolph Gonzales became President of the CFJ, numerous members of the organization have become inactive in view of his militancy and since he has surrounded himself with known Denver "thugs." Referenced letter points out there are no set dates for meetings but that membership is open and anyone can join.

It is felt an intensive investigation of this organization is necessary in order to obtain sufficient pertinent data to make possible an accurate determination of the true character of the organization. Additionally, in view of the possibility of this organization participating in violence this summer, it is necessary that the Bureau be in possession of intelligence data in order to keep interested agencies of this Government advised.

Your investigation of this organization should determine if it is subversive in nature and, if so, attempts should be made to obtain legally admissible evidence. You should also determine the relationship, if any, between the CFJ and the Alianza Federal de Mercedes (AFDM).
TELETYPE

NO 085 SA CODE
PM 145 URGENT 10-2-76 SHP
TO: DIRECTOR
ATTN: DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE DIVISION
DALLAS (157-1763)
FROM SAN ANTONIO

2. LA RAZA UNIDA CONFERENCE, LUBBOCK, TEXAS, OCT. TEN SEVENTY,
IS - SPANISH AMERICAN.

RE DALLAS TELS OCT. SIX AND EIGHT LAST.

ADVEI</s>DF AS FOLLOWS:

MARIO CONTEI, REGIONAL COORDINATOR FOR THE MEXICAN-
AMERICAN YOUTH ORGANIZATION (MAYO), SAN ANTONIO, ANNOUNCED
ON OCT. SIX LAST, THAT DELEGATES FROM TEXAS MEXICAN AMERICAN
GROUPS WILL MEET SAT. OCT. TEN NEXT IN LUBBOCK, TEX. A
PREVIOUS LA RAZA UNIDA MEETING HELD IN JULY, SEVENTY, IN AUSTIN,

END PAGE ONE
PAGE TWO

TEX., WAS ATTENDED BY APPROXIMATELY ONE THOUSAND PERSONS.

ACCORDING TO COMPEAN, CONFERENCE WILL BE TO DISCUSS FUTURE

OF THE TEXAS MEXICAN-AMERICAN MOVEMENT AND WILL BE ADDRESSED

BY JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ, ORGANIZER OF MEXICAN-AMERICAN THIRD

POLITICAL PARTY IN SOUTHWEST TEXAS; RUDY ACUÑA, PROFESSOR AT

SAN FERNANDO STATE COLLEGE, CALIF.; ARLO GUERRA, NATIONAL

MAYO CHAIRMAN, SAN ANTONIO; AND COMPEAN HIMSELF.

NO VIOLENCE

SOURCE WAS OF OPINION THERE WOULD BE NO VIOLENCE AND

MEETING WOULD PROBABLY BE LIKE THE ONE HELD IN AUSTIN, TEX.,

IN JULY, SEVENTY.

END PAGE TWO
Jose Angel Gutierrez is not, repeat not, mayor of Crystal City, Tex.

For info. of Dallas, Jose Angel Gutierrez is head of La Raza Unida Political Party and was formerly state chairman of Mayo. He is a militant exponent of the Mexican American and an open and caustic critic of Anglo Americans. He led his party to political victory in Crystal City where he was elected to the school board. He is at present attempting to have La Raza Unida party placed on the ballot for the Nov., seventy, elections in several Southwest countries in Texas.

Advised recently that Gutierrez has been described by Mexican-American militant leaders as an "Uncle Tom" among Mexican-American leaders.

End Page Three
that captioned conference was held as scheduled and was poorly attended. He said that although the "Lubbock Avalanche Journal" estimated the attendance at 700, he personally did not believe there were more than 400 in attendance. He said that Jose Guiterrez had not attended as scheduled and Albert Pena from San Antonio substituted for him. He said that there were no incidents concerning the meeting and the main theme of the meeting was attempts to get La Raza Unida, a third political party in Texas, on the ballots of additional counties in Texas, and for the Mexican-American population in Texas to boycott the coming November, 1970, elections.

has received no additional information to indicate that members of the Brown Beret from Los Angeles, California, had arrived in Lubbock, Texas, to speak to Jose Guiterrez.

FBI File# 157-8887011X2 (Appendix)
JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ is a former MAYO leader and is presently head of the new political party in Crystal City, Texas, known as La Raza Unida." During the past year, GUTIERREZ has been involved either as victim, complainant, or subject in a number of civil rights cases. A case on GUTIERREZ under "IS - SPANISH AMERICAN" character is presently pending and a comprehensive report will be submitted, along with appropriate recommendation as to whether or not GUTIERREZ should be included in the Security Index or Agitator Index.

TExAS
TO: SAN ANTONIO
FROM: KANSAS CITY (100-NEW)

JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ. SM - MEXICAN AMERICAN.

ADvised THIS DATE

SUBJECT, FOUNDER OF LA RAZA UNIDA, MEXICAN AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTY, IS SCHEDULED TO SPEAK AT INITIATION OF CHICANO CULTURAL WEEK AT WSU, BEGINNING APRIL TWENTYEIGHT NEXT.

INDICATED SUBJECT IS INSTRUCTOR AT UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN,
I recalled that in the Spring of 1970, in the Crystal City Independent School Board Elections, JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ was elected as a candidate who promised to place racial accent on the School Board and School District proceedings.

stated that promptly following Mr. GUTIERREZ' becoming president of the School Board with majority votes of the dominant Mexican-American members, racial strain became apparent to ... Mr. GUTIERREZ was leading a program based on racial criteria rather than simple professional criteria. ... recalled Mr. GUTIERREZ' program for the school office, promising the electorate that he would get people of his own race who think militantly in terms of their race and who would be given the influence in the handling of School District matters.

It appeared to ... that Mr. JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ conducted his campaign in the role of a propagandist who has set certain goals mainly on a basis of race, who having been elected to office, thereupon had to “deliver.”

noted that most of the new replacement teachers of Mr. BRIGGS were persons of Mexican descent.

recalled that one such list of teachers under discussion for hiring. Mr. GUTIERREZ had described the list as having more Anglo persons than Mexican persons. It appeared to ... somewhat ironic that the list under discussion contained the names of some Negroes, probably three. ... explained that he thought this ironic inasmuch as Mr. GONZALEZ’ depreciating remarks about this group of potential teachers was completely oblivious of the fact that there were several Negroes in the list, and Mr. GUTIERREZ

On 10/29/70 at Crystal City, Texas

FBI File# SA-44-1626
was a self-avowed person with essentially race in mind. He said that GUTIERREZ was making a big point of hiring Mexicans as a "minority group", but he had completely overlooked the fact that Mr. BRIGGS' instant list of candidates contained several Negro candidates for employment.

He said he was compelled to believe that JOSE ANGLIL GUTIERREZ was so obsessed with "race" that he could not bring into his judgments the simple issue of competence.

He said that eliminated by Mr. GUTIERREZ were two teachers of Anglo-American extraction: BETTY DODD (now deceased) and MOSELLE WILMON. Failing to obtain a hearing on their dismissal from Mr. GUTIERREZ and his dominant board faction, they had sought recourse to filing a suit in Federal Court in the Southern District of Texas at Del Rio.

Cited another former staff member of the Crystal City School District, whose civil rights appeared violated on strictly racial lines: Mrs. PAMELA SEYMOUR. Mrs. SEYMOUR had been named secretary to the Superintendent during summer of 1970, the then Superintendent being Mr. JOHN BRIGGS. Mrs. SEYMOUR was pregnant at the time and subsequently sought leave of absence from this post. She learned that her job no longer existed when she had her child and was ready to return to duty. She had been replaced by a woman of Mexican-American extraction from outside the city and with less experience or record of professional competence.

Cited another example of Mr. GUTIERREZ laying accent essentially on race and militancy: the appointment of ERASMO ANDRADE to a well-paid position of prominence. Mr. MAYER said that ANDRADE was publicly and notoriously known as an exponent of militant racism - Mexican-American variety.

Noted that it was common knowledge within the Crystal City School District that the now dominant Mexican-American Board members have conveyed to PAUL MATA, the elected mayor of Crystal City, who also is
principal of one of the schools in Crystal City, that he should not get in the way of the actions and deliberations of the dominant Mexican-American group of JOSE ANGEL GUTIERREZ, and give them no opposition at the risk of his job.
1. Unity of all our people regardless of age, income or political philosophy.

2. The right of bi-lingual education as guaranteed under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

3. We demand that the true history of the Mexican-American be taught in all schools in the five Southwest states.

4. We demand a Civilian Police Review Board made up of people who live in our community.

5. We demand that all police officers in the Mexican-American community, must live in the community and must speak Spanish.

6. To want an end to Urban Renewal Programs that replace our barrios with high rent homes for middle class people.

7. To demand a guaranteed annual income of $5,000 for all Mexican-American families.

8. We demand that all Mexican-Americans be tried by juries consisting of only Mexican-Americans.

9. We demand that the right to vote be extended to all of our people regardless of ability to speak the English language.

10. We demand the right to keep and bear arms to defend our communities against racist police, as guaranteed under the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.
APPENDIX C

AGENTS OF REPRESSION

United States Government

Memorandum

TO: Mr. C. D. Brennan

FROM: C. Moore

SUBJECT: COINTELPRO - BLACK EXTREMISTS
RACIAL MATTERS

1 - Mr. Sullivan
1 - Mr. J.J. Casper
1 - Mr. U.H. Felt
1 - Mr. C.D. Brennan

DATE: 3/25/71

1 - Mr. G.C. Moore

To recommend 90-day progress letters submitted by
43 offices participating in this program be discontinued.

COINTELPRO is code word for counterintelligence
program. By memorandum 2/29/68 the Director authorized
submission of 90-day progress letters concerning captioned
program for purpose of stimulating thinking in offices where
black extremist activities are concentrated. Forty-three
offices are currently participating in this project.

This program has as its objectives the neutralization
of black extremist groups, the prevention of violence by these
groups and the prevention of coalition of black extremist
organizations. Since these offices have participated signifi-
cantly in this program, it is felt we can now relax our
administrative procedures by eliminating the 90-day letter.
We will not suffer from this discontinuance as continued
participation in this program by field is followed by individual
Supervisors in Racial Intelligence Section, Domestic Intelligence
Division. In addition, the Inspection Division analyzes each
officer's participation in this program during field office
inspections. In view of the above and to streamline our
operations, it is recommended these progress letters be
discontinued. No change is required in any Bureau manuals.

ACTION: REC-20

If approved, the attached airtel advising of
discontinuance of these 90-day letters will be forwarded to
offices participating in this program.

Inclusions:
100-448006

WH: sf M D

9 APR 5 1971

FBI File number unknown (Indiscernible on document).
CURRICULUM VITA

Crystal Bustillos was born in Dallas, Texas to Andrés Bustillos Jr. and Bernadette Kennedy Bustillos. She moved to El Paso, Texas as a child and continued her education, graduating from Andress High School, El Paso, Texas in 2001. She entered the University of Texas at El Paso in the fall of the same year with two scholarships, the Target All-Around Scholarship and the Buena Vista-Smeltertown Scholarship. During the course of her college education, she was placed on the Dean’s List during the Fall semester of 2004 and Spring of 2005, completed an internship with the U.S. Marshal Service, worked part time at Saint Patrick Cathedral, and volunteered with another local church.

After graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminal Justice, Crystal worked in the professional sphere as a Probation and Parole Officer in New Mexico for three and a half years before returning to school full time in 2010 to pursue a Master’s Degree in Political Science. While taking on a full time graduate course load, Crystal worked part time as a teaching assistant for the Political Science Department under various faculty instructors. In addition, she was one of two students from Texas selected to present this thesis work at the Emerging Scholars conference at the University of Michigan, which showcased up and coming graduate students from across the country.

Permanent Address: 352 Roxanna Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79932