Introduction

On the front cover of the March 8, 1978 issue of the Daily Express, readers were greeted with a striking photograph of American neo-Nazi, white supremacist and Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke. By the late 1970s Duke had emerged as one of the Klan’s most visible spokesmen, and he was dressed in the sweeping white robes which had become an indelible part of the notorious hate group’s visual iconography. Perhaps more distracting than Duke’s Klan garb, however, was the backdrop to the photograph. There were no vistas of the Tennessee valleys or Alabama cottonfields; regions described by Esquire journalist Guy Martin as a ‘Klan Mesopotamia’ which had become familiar to British audiences through civil-rights era news coverage and Hollywood race dramas such as Terence Young’s 1974 film The Klansman. Instead, Duke was backed by the British Houses of Parliament. Under the headline “Get Him Out Of Here!” the Express detailed the bungled efforts of law enforcement officers to apprehend the white supremacist following his arrival in Britain several days earlier, before relaying Duke’s message to the British people that ‘the Klan is here and here to stay.’

The front-page coverage provided by the Express was part of a comprehensive media campaign documenting Duke’s visit to Britain during the Spring of 1978. In keeping with its earlier rejection of Klan leaders such as Robert Shelton, the British press roundly condemned the Klan as a ‘notorious racist organization’ and enthusiastically called upon Home Secretary Merlyn Rees to deport Duke. Yet at the same time, Duke’s ability to evade capture by the authorities proved irresistible news fodder for many media outlets, which kept readers up to date with police efforts to ‘hunt the wizard.’ This was particularly true of the British tabloids, with papers such as the Daily Mail and the Daily Mirror documenting Duke’s ‘Keystone Cops’ antics with increasing glee, as the Klansman continued to evade law enforcement up and down the country in his efforts to ‘put the KKK into the limelight.’
While tabloid coverage sought to cast Duke as a marginal, if entertaining, outsider, their willingness to document his exploits played directly into the Klansman’s talents for media manipulation. Duke’s ability to court ‘the sensationalistic British press’ helped to make him a darling of Fleet Street and an ‘instant celebrity’ across the nation.\(^8\)

That the tabloids would prioritise the human-interest aspect of Duke’s visit is hardly a ground-breaking assertion, and their coverage echoed that of earlier visits to Britain by foreign far-right activists such as American Nazi Party founder George Lincoln Rockwell.\(^9\) However, given the backdrop of escalating racial tensions, ongoing efforts to establish international connections between far-right activists, and hardening domestic battle lines on the subject of immigration, I argue here that tabloid coverage of Duke’s tour warrants further scholarly analysis. In the build up to his visit, anti-racist periodicals warned of growing connections between the Klan and British far-right organisations such as the National Front and the League of St. George.\(^11\) Just weeks before his arrival, contentious public remarks on immigration by Conservative Party leader Margaret Thatcher prompted warnings of an impending ‘race storm’ in British politics.\(^12\) Even as Duke continued to evade the British authorities, a report from a Bipartisan Commons Select Committee recommending stricter immigration quotas sparked furore in Parliament and was described as a ‘gift for racialists’ by the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants.\(^13\) As such tensions persisted in the aftermath of his departure, commentators at home and abroad cautioned that Britain was facing a ‘serious and dangerous racial predicament.’\(^14\)

Drawing extensively on material from the British Newspaper Archives, the Institute of Race Relations, and the Searchlight archives at the University of Northampton, this article situates Duke’s visit, and tabloid coverage of it, within highly contested debates about race, immigration, and the postwar British press. By focusing on Duke’s ‘good-for-a-laugh’ run-ins with law enforcement, the tabloids became pawns in Duke’s efforts to ‘mainstream’ the
Klan and minimised both the longer history of Klan activity in Britain and a short-term surge in Klan-inspired attacks. At the same time, the tabloids failed to effectively situate Duke’s visit within the emergence of what scholars have described as a ‘post-war Anglo-American far right’, or to address the appeal of Duke’s message to British white supremacists eager to establish closer connections with an ‘embattled’ white diaspora.\textsuperscript{15} Perhaps most significantly, the nation’s tabloids did not understand, or were unwilling to acknowledge, that Duke’s visit was more than just an isolated visit by an unwelcome foreign ‘undesirable’; it was a direct response to a worsening racial climate which they had helped to create.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Race, Immigration and the British Tabloid Press}

On a misty summer morning in June 1948, a small contingent of British media representatives gathered at Tilbury Docks in London to document the arrival of the \textit{HMS Empire Windrush}. Providing viewers with panning shots of the ship’s crisply dressed and overwhelmingly male contingent of Caribbean migrants, a bulletin from \textit{British Pathé} offered an upbeat account of ‘citizens of Britain coming to the mother country with good intent.’\textsuperscript{20} Peter Fryer, who would go on to write one of the first major histories of black Britain during the 1980s, was also present in his capacity as a journalist for the \textit{Daily Worker}. Fryer’s account of “Five Hundred Pairs of Willing Hands” reflected the relatively positive, albeit patronising, tone of most early news reports, which welcomed the newcomers as a solution to the postwar labour shortage.\textsuperscript{21} More recent anniversary celebrations of the \textit{Windrush’s} arrival have provided media outlets with an opportunity to reinforce romanticised notions of the ship’s place in what Mike and Trevor Phillips mawkishly described as ‘the irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain.’\textsuperscript{22}

And yet, just as the inconvenient distraction of a scandal over the wrongful deportation of British Caribbean subjects by the Conservative-controlled UK government threatened to
disrupt state-sanctioned narratives of Windrush during 2018, so too did the ‘upbeat and positive tone’ which characterised media coverage of the ship’s arrival seventy years earlier help to mask undercurrents of unease.\textsuperscript{23} J.H Smythe, a member of the Colonial Office Welfare Department who travelled with the migrants from the Caribbean, advised caution, warning that ‘I could not honestly paint you…a very rosy picture of your future in Britain.’\textsuperscript{24} Even as the \textit{Windrush} became a symbol for the hopes and ambitions of post-war immigrants from the New Commonwealth, its arrival raised ‘scarlet flushes of alarm in British newspapers’, foreshadowing the media’s role in the development of ‘a new generation of anti-alien feelings that would drive policy for decades.’\textsuperscript{25}

As scholars such as Kennetta Hammond Perry, Clair Wills and Darrell Newton have eloquently noted, the British media played a critical role in shaping public understandings of, and reactions to, post-war immigration and the subject of ‘race relations.’\textsuperscript{26} However, what is often less commented on is how discussions of immigration and the ‘race problem’ developed within a postwar British media industry that was undergoing a period of significant change. While television ownership in private domestic households had reached more than 18 million by the beginning of the 1970s, arguably the most significant development in British media history post-World War II was the ‘tabloidization’ of the popular press.\textsuperscript{27} Despite, or perhaps because of declining circulations across the newspaper industry from the 1960s onwards, popular British newspapers such as the \textit{Express} and the \textit{Mirror} adopted more sensational headlines and embraced content that privileged conflict, outrage and scandal. By the second half of the 1970s almost all surviving popular dailies had converted to tabloid format, while Rupert Murdoch’s decision to rebrand \textit{The Sun} as a tabloid following its acquisition in 1969 had seen its circulation surge to more than 3.5 million by 1975.\textsuperscript{28}
The ‘tabloidization’ of the British press during this period can be read as a reflection of the democratisation of the national media and of British society as a whole. Certainly, the embrace of the tabloid format gave editors and publishers increased license to address the cultural and sexual mores of the ‘Swinging Sixties’ and paralleled the ‘modernising agenda of the Labour Governments of Harold Wilson.’\(^{29}\) However, the process of tabloidization also helped to produce more sensational and, in many cases, more negative depictions of race and immigration, with popular dailies bombarding readers with a ‘powerful concoction of stereotyping of black people, sensationalism, scaremongering and scapegoating.’\(^{30}\) While the introduction of race and immigration programming on British television has been read by Gavin Schaffer as ‘a powerful corrective to restrictionist voices which frequently presented black and Asian people as unwanted outsiders’, the British tabloid press increasingly looked to construct issues of race and immigration as ‘threats’ to social order.\(^{31}\)

In this regard, many British media outlets took their cue from American coverage of the ‘race problem’, where discussions of blackness were routinely linked to crime, violence, or rioting. Not for nothing did prominent black nationalist leader Malcolm X, during a speech at the Oxford Union as part of a 1965 tour of Britain, note that the ‘American press…has tricked your press into repeating what they have invented.’\(^{32}\) On an individual level, the arrival of American ‘race extremists’ garnered tense media coverage and fed concerns over the ‘Americanization’ of British race relations – a term which came to be associated with heightened civil rights protest, racial confrontation, and the spectre of race riots. For tabloid newspapers such as *The Sun*, Malcolm was a harbinger of ‘revolution and danger.’\(^{33}\) A similar response greeted ‘Black Power prophet’ Stokely Carmichael during a 1967 visit, with Rob Waters contending that print and broadcast media ‘were quick to read Carmichael as representative of the violence sweeping American cities.’\(^{34}\)
Such concerns cut across the colour line, with visits or attempted visits to Britain by figures such as Ku Klux Klan leader Robert Shelton also sparking a backlash from the British press. While negative media coverage contributed to Shelton being barred from entering Britain in 1965 by Home Secretary Frank Soskice, it reinforced a false equivalency over the ‘dangers’ posed by civil rights campaigners and anti-racist activists on the left, and the racist threat of far-right activists and white supremacists. In other cases, the press appeared willing to play the furore created by far-right activists for its own benefit, such as when prominent American neo-Nazi George Lincoln Rockwell was smuggled into Britain in 1962 by Colin Jordan, a key figure within the post-war British far right and the head of the nascent National Socialist Movement. Rockwell’s ability to evade police capture delighted many media outlets and helped the neo-Nazi to become ‘a minor tabloid media celebrity.’ For Frederick Simonelli, tabloid coverage of ‘the photogenic and quotable young American Nazi’ revealed a distinct lack of media accountability, and the willingness of the Daily Mirror and other papers to document Rockwell’s antics was attacked by critics as ‘the lowest form of journalism.’

More broadly, tabloid handwringing over the status of British race relations served to reinforce the concept of non-white immigration as a ‘problem’, and, in the case of features such as the Daily Mirror’s infamous ‘shock issues’, to connect race with issues such as slum housing and child abuse. Following the 1958 Notting Hill riots, a report from the Institute of Race Relations noted that ‘wide and vivid reporting’ of the disturbances had contrived to ‘make coloured people in Britain “news”’ and heighten fears as to the ‘implications of racial clash.’ Discussion of health concerns, a long-standing feature of anti-immigration anxieties, also proliferated following the British smallpox outbreak of 1961-2. As Roberta Bivens has noted, the tabloid press clamoured for tighter immigration control and wildly overstated the threat of the outbreak, with right-leaning dailies such as the Daily Mail calling upon the
government to “KEEP OUT THE GERMS” and warning that non-white immigrants in particular represented a ‘peril to the population.’

The continuing influence of the tabloid press, and its increasingly confrontational representation of racial politics, exacerbated an already fractious debate about race and immigration within British politics. The 1958 race riots prompted Conservative Party Prime Minister Harold Macmillan to ‘look again at the immigration question.’ While the Labour Party initially responded to the riots by rejecting calls for immigration control, its abandonment of this position was met by dismay by black British publications and signalled a rightward shift in national immigration policy. The passage of the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, which dramatically tightened immigration restrictions, set the tone for subsequent immigration reform and emboldened conservative politicians to embrace a more openly racist and anti-immigrant platform. By the end of the decade anti-immigration sentiment had become entrenched at the highest levels of British politics, with Conservative MP Enoch Powell using his infamous 1968 “Rivers of Blood” speech to decry the influx of non-white Commonwealth immigrants as a critical threat to British identity.

As Camilla Schofield has argued, Powell’s incendiary commentary on race and immigration overlapped with the emergence of ‘new forms of representation and contestation in the media’ and paralleled an increasing distrust of broadsheet newspapers, the traditional voice of authority within the British media landscape. While the tabloids reacted with apparent horror to Powell’s contention that ‘in 15 or 20 years' time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man’, his politically polarizing remarks were catnip for a scandal-hungry press. As a result, ‘virtually every utterance by Powell on race or immigration’ was given extensive publicity, elevating him to a de-facto status as ‘a national expert on race relations.’ For socialist writer John Thackara, the media’s willingness to provide Powell with a stage was compounded by its failure ‘to ensure that his contentious “proposals” are put
in critical context.'\textsuperscript{49} Such failures, which would also underpin the tabloid response to Duke’s visit ten years later, helped to normalise white nationalist discourses and threatened to bring far-right philosophies into the political mainstream.

`White World Solidarity’ and the Rise of David Duke

While British far-right activism during the interwar period had been primarily organised around the anti-Semitism of fascist leaders such as Oswald Mosley, anxieties over the loss of Empire and the onset of mass migration following World War II led to the formation of new organizations such as the League of Empire Loyalists and the White Defence League, a paramilitary group headed by Colin Jordan, which foregrounded the threat of a growing immigrant population and an increase in interracial relationships in a renewed push for ‘fascist political mobilisation.’\textsuperscript{50} The creation of the British National Party in 1960, which made opposition to non-white immigration its guiding principle, solidified a concern that Daniel Trilling has placed ‘at the heart of every subsequent far-right movement.’\textsuperscript{51} In 1967 the BNP merged with League of Empire Loyalists and members of the Racial Preservation Society to form the National Front. Uniting behind the existential threat of non-white immigration, the Front would quickly become the most significant British far-right party since Mosley’s British Union of Fascists during the 1930s.\textsuperscript{52}

By embracing white ethnonationalism, far-right activists sought to restrict the racial boundaries of British identity and to push back against the perceived ‘invasion’ of non-white immigrants from the Commonwealth. At the same time, far right campaigners increasingly looked abroad for inspiration in the fight to preserve ‘white heritage.’ National Socialist Colin Jordan was just one member of the post-war British far right to become preoccupied with the notion of ‘white world solidarity’, and, through his connections to figures such as George Lincoln Rockwell, endeavoured to build up contacts with neo-Nazis and white
supremacists in Europe, the United States, Australia and South Africa.\textsuperscript{53} Anxieties over the future of the ‘white race’ were compounded by the rise of Black Power (and its coverage by the press), with the ‘long hot summers’ which engulfed America during the second half of the 1960s providing far-right campaigners with compelling ‘evidence’ of the dystopian future awaiting British patriots if the country did not curb non-white immigration from the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{55}

For Paul Jackson, the friendship between Jordan and Rockwell is an instructive example of how a ‘mutual understanding’ between neo-Nazis and white supremacists on both sides of the Atlantic helped to cultivate a ‘post-war Anglo-American far right’ alliance.\textsuperscript{56} Many British far-right campaigners enthusiastically supported massive resistance to desegregation in the United States. In turn, American segregationists saw clear analogies between their own struggles for ‘racial purity’ and those in other sections of an endangered white diaspora. As Daniel Geary and Jenny Sutton have noted, figures such as Medford Evans, a regular columnist for US segregationist publication the \textit{Citizen}, identified strongly with white minorities in European colonies in Africa and other regions. Predicated on an embrace of Nordicism and racial Anglo-Saxonism, white supremacists from Birmingham, England to Birmingham, Alabama sought to frame their activism ‘as part of an international struggle to maintain both democracy and the primacy of white civilization.’\textsuperscript{57}

A clear example of this push for ‘white world solidarity’ can be seen through the post-war revival of the Ku Klux Klan, the notorious white vigilante hate group founded in the American South during the aftermath of the Civil War. Following the emergence of the ‘first Klan’ during Reconstruction, and the ‘second Klan’, which proliferated during the second two decades of the twentieth century, a third Klan revival occurred as a response to the postwar civil rights movement and in collaboration with conservative white politicians, law enforcement and Citizen’s Councils. However, whereas the second Klan had enjoyed mass
support and mainstream respectability as a fraternal organization – cultivating a membership of more than five million before internal divisions and the criminality of its leadership precipitated a speedy decline - the ‘third Klan’ was fragmented and largely confined to the South. Its virulent anti-black racism ensured the postwar Klan became an unsavoury emblem for the kind of unreconstructed white prejudice the nation was attempting to overcome, and the 1968 membership had dropped to just 14,000.

Conscious that it would be impossible to regain the popularity enjoyed by the organization during the 1920s, Klan leaders increasingly looked to establish connections with white supremacists beyond the confines of the continental United States. Robert Shelton, who unified multiple Klan factions into the United Klans of America during the first half of the 1960s, openly spoke of his desire to create a ‘subsidiary movement’ in Europe and to see ‘white-sheeted, hooded Klansmen in the streets of race-troubled towns’ up and down the British Isles. Such efforts were stymied by the reluctance of British far-right activists to – at least publicly – endorse the Klan, and Shelton’s own aims of a transnational alliance were derailed by a criminal conviction after he refusing to hand over copies of subpoenaed Klan membership lists to Congress. However, in private the Klan appealed to many British far-right activists who had become alienated by the movement’s relentless in-fighting.

Similarly, American far-right campaigners continued to harbour dreams of establishing a transnational white supremacist network to help offset the perceived marginalization of their racial ideologies.

This goal would be revisited during the 1970s, as predictions of the Klan’s demise once again proved to be premature. Taking advantage of nativist opposition to the landmark 1965 Immigration and Naturalization Act, the emergence of the New Right, and lingering white resentments over civil rights legislation and affirmative action policies, a ‘new Klan’ emerged, eager to attract younger followers and to spread its message over a larger
geographic area. By 1977, at least a dozen competing factions had helped return the Klan to the national spotlight. However, New York Times columnist Dwayne King noted that ‘while today’s Klansmen might wear the same sheet, they are definitely not bedfellows.’ Splits over leadership and ideology sparked a series of rancorous internal battles. Some activists remained loyal to existing Klan groups such as Shelton’s United Klans of America, which had slowly rebuilt following its leader’s release from prison in 1969. Others turned towards new cohort of more politically polished Klan operators who promised to drag the organization ‘out of the cow pasture and into hotel meeting rooms.’

The driving force behind a push for respectability was Louisianaan David Duke, who came to national prominence after forming the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in the mid-1970s. Duke’s first meaningful interaction with white nationalist ideology came as a teenager through the New Orleans branch of the Citizens Council. Many of Duke’s biographers have stressed his enduring fascination with National Socialism: Tyler Bridges notes that Duke idolized Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf and American neo-Nazi stalwarts such as Rockwell. Lawrence Powell has reiterated this position, arguing that, while Duke’s ideology and political associations regularly shifted, he is most readily identifiable as a neo-Nazi who saw the Klan as tool ‘to mainstream Nazism.’ At Louisiana State University, Duke was applauded by neo-Nazi publications such as White Power for ‘seizing every available opportunity to present National Socialist ideas to his fellow students.’ However, after leaving college he successfully crafted a veneer of respectability, couching his racist and anti-Semitic views in the language of white rights and ‘the philosophy of radical libertarianism’, even as his continued enthusiasm for National Socialism ‘accelerated the Nazification of the Klan’ during the 1970s and helped to bring figures as Tom Metzger, who would go on to form the White Aryan Resistance during the 1980s, into the fold.
Duke was a brazen egotist and amateur lothario; traits which eventually alienated more hard-line activists such as Metzger and Louis Beam, Jr., whose commitment to white terrorism and paramilitary violence sat awkwardly against their leader’s political ambitions. He was also a charismatic entertainer who ‘displayed a genius for capitalizing on racial tension.’ Educated and boyishly handsome, Duke’s reputation as the ‘thinking man’s racist’ fascinated American media outlets and led to hundreds of radio and television appearances. While even the most rudimentary excavation revealed the extent of his bigotry, most outlets failed to challenge Duke’s mask of chivalry, allowing him to present a ‘path of reasonableness before the media’ and the American public. Duke expertly recrafted the rhetoric of civil rights to present the Klan as a defender of white rights. Another key plank in Duke’s platform was the question of immigration, with the Klansmen organizing publicity stunts such as a ‘patrol’ of the southern border to demonstrate that the Klan was ‘just another citizens’ group doing its bit to help solve a pressing national problem.’

Efforts to moderate the Klan’s extremism through the lens of ‘white rights’ and immigration reform inspired British activists and fed into growing anti-immigration sentiments and a backlash to civil rights legislation such as the 1965 Civil Rights Act and 1976 Race Relations Act on both sides of the Atlantic. Like Duke, National Front leader John Tyndell and other members of the British far-right attempted to present themselves as respectable political figureheads, even as racial violence soared in areas where the National Front maintained an active presence. Fears of political defections prompted Margaret Thatcher to reiterate the Conservative Party’s status as ‘the anti-immigration party’ following her appointment as leader in 1975, while Enoch Powell’s continuing prophecies of racial insurrection were readily redistributed by the popular press. Thatcher’s call for ‘an end to immigration’ emboldened far-right activists and attracted the attention of American Klansmen such as Bill
Wilkinson, a former colleague of Duke’s who broken way to form his Klan organization, the ‘Invisible Empire’.82

Whereas Duke sought to organize Klan activity around perceived racial slights such as ‘discrimination in employment, promotions, scholarships, college entry and union admission’, Wilkinson gained notoriety ‘not for his apparent moderation but for his brazen militancy.’83 Following their split, Duke and Wilkinson rarely saw eye-to-eye, with the former dismissing his rival as an ‘illiterate, gun-toting redneck’, and the latter attacking his former boss as a charlatan and false prophet.84 Irrespective of their differences, however, both men harboured ambitions to take the Klan’s message overseas. In February 1978 Wilkinson made national headlines after news broke that he was planning a secret recruitment visit to Britain, prompting Home Secretary Melvyn Rees to issue a blanket ban on any Klan members entering the country.85 Convinced that the British press, and the British public, was susceptible to his enigmatic appeal, Duke successfully infiltrated the country on March 2, ready to embark upon what Bridges describes as ‘his most intensive effort to take the Klan beyond United States borders.’86

Hunt The Wizard!

Duke was largely unknown to British audiences and law enforcement. However, the Klansman knew that his arrival would ‘create a great story in the sensationalistic British press’, and he immediately set about alerting the media to his presence.87 Duke contacted journalist Jill Evans to break the news of his arrival, and also ‘announced his presence’ in a phone call to the Daily Mirror. Duke’s decision to contact the Mirror may have been guided by its status as the nation’s largest selling daily newspaper, as well as its left-leaning orientation which encouraged an outraged response. The Mirror did not disappoint, broadcasting Duke’s incursion with a full-page front-cover article on Friday, March 3 that
informed readers of his plans to visit Klan sympathisers and attempt to establish Klan groups in cities such as London, Birmingham, Coventry and Brighton. News of his arrival appeared on page 2 of *The Sun*, where journalist Brian Woosey described Duke as a ‘powerful Ku Klux Klan leader’, and relayed his claims that ‘several dozen Klan officials have quietly visited Britain in the last few years.’

The following morning Duke was once more on the *Mirror*’s front page, with the paper excitedly reporting that it had tracked down the rogue Klansman at a boarding house in Brighton. Echoing his publicity tour of the southern United States border, Duke informed the paper of plans to set up an ‘alien watch’ to capture illegal immigrants attempting to enter Britain from continental Europe. The Klansman had apparently been busy since his arrival less than twenty-four hours earlier, with the *Mirror* contending that Duke had already presided over two Klan initiation ceremonies and spoken to multiple groups of Klan sympathizers. His (mis)adventures also featured prominently in other tabloid newspapers such as the *Express* and the *Mail*, which focused their coverage on the political response to Duke’s arrival. Labour politician John Lee offered one of the most direct ripostes, declaring that ‘there is going to be a bloody row about this. This man must be found and sent home – he is clearly an undesirable.’

By expressing incredulity over the Klansman’s arrival and focusing on the question of ‘how he managed to sneak in’, tabloid coverage of Duke betrayed a profound ignorance over the racialised nature of Britain’s borders. As noted in anti-racist journal *Black Struggle*, the nation’s colour bar began at the ‘glass and concrete of Heathrow airport’, with British immigration control functioning as first line of defence in keeping non-white migrants out of the country. Duke’s arrival occurred less than a year before an expose by *The Guardian* revealed that South Asian immigrant women were being subjected to forced gynaecological examinations, one of the most flagrant examples of discriminatory practices towards non-
white immigrants on display at border entry points. That Duke, a young, able-bodied white man, was able to pass through customs unscathed despite his name appearing on a border watch list, was hardly surprising. In his autobiography, Duke interpreted the incident in a different way, framing his alleged ability to outwit a 'lackadaisical' West Indian customs officer as another 'victory' for the white race.

From a different perspective, the widespread and sensationalistic coverage of Duke’s arrival by the popular dailies vindicated Duke’s belief that ‘the British press was ripe for manipulation.’ The Klan’s radioactive reputation preceded him, and Duke expertly cultivated its notoriety by establishing direct connections with journalists at multiple tabloid newspapers, regularly phoning outlets such as The Sun to keep them informed of his efforts to establish Klan branches in Britain. Duke was rewarded by the development of a tabloid narrative that primarily framed his visit as a battle of wits between the ‘wizard’ and the British police. The longer Duke could stay ahead of pursuing law enforcement, the bigger the story became. It appeared that the tabloid press could not resist an underdog; so long as that underdog was a ‘plucky’ defender of white rights, rather than a marginalized racial or ethnic minority. In turn, the Klansman surmised that his visit to ‘capture[d] the imagination of the British people’ and contended that ‘whether or not they agreed with me [they] rooted for me as they would a fox running from the hounds.’

The Mirror was just one paper which happily filed the Duke fiasco under the ‘good-for-a-laugh category of KKK activities.’ In one memorable encounter, Duke was reported to have ‘slipped police by travelling down an escalator while they were going up.’ On another occasion, the Sun declared that Duke had ‘hoodwinked’ police officers and evaded law enforcement by spending a day at the beach. The Express’ coverage fell into a similar pattern, with the newspaper delighting readers in a front-page article on March 5 recounting Duke’s success in slipping through police clutches at the Cunard Hotel in London. The
Klansman was reported to have fled from an interview with newsmen after two uniformed officers had entered the Hotel’s lounge, sprinting to safety down Hammersmith Road. For right-leaning tabloids, an emphasis on Duke’s continued abilities to evade capture had the additional benefit of painting Home Secretary Melvyn Rees and a Labour controlled Metropolitan police force in an incompetent light. The *Express* contended that Duke’s visit was ‘making a fool of Whitehall’ and piled pressure on Rees to find a speedy resolution to the situation.

Rees had initially chosen to dismiss Duke’s arrival, describing the Klansman as ‘a nut’ and a ‘silly case.’ However, coverage of Duke’s visit by the tabloid press grew increasingly embarrassing, prompting Rees to openly condemn the visit and set Special Branch men on the racist’s trail. While the tabloid press continued to provide Duke with generous coverage, law enforcement struggled to track him down. The result was a media representation of Duke as both elusive and highly visible – too skilled to be caught by law enforcement, but happy to stage photo opportunities such as hailing a cab in central London or posing outside the Houses of Parliament, the Home Office, and Scotland Yard.

Relishing his status as a provocateur and public trickster *par excellence*, Duke vacated the capital to visit sites of racial tension in the West Midlands. The *Daily Mail* noted that while Duke ‘had the police and the Home Office guessing’, he was keeping the public well informed of his plans through interviews with national newspapers and television outlets, as well as appearances on local radio.

More sinister were reports of Duke participating in further cross-burning ceremonies, with the *Mirror* informing readers that the Klansman had attended once such event at the Warwickshire property Robin Beauclair, a prominent member of the Racial Preservation Society. Yet while such events were denounced, their extremism was moderated by their inclusion within a broader comedic narrative, with the tabloids appearing more concerned
with creating catchy new titles for the ‘Wizard of Evil’ than seriously critiquing his white supremacist philosophy. Perhaps the only tabloid paper which attempted to do so was The Sun, which published an article titled “Truth About the Klan’s Evil Wizard” on March 6.

Written by New York contributor John Raedler, the article chipped away at Duke’s carefully crafted image as a ‘clean-cut young man who looks like a super-salesman and says he wants to give the Klan respectability’, outlining Duke’s neo-Nazi credentials and printing quotes which clearly expressed his virulent racism. Unfortunately, such limited efforts to hold Duke publicly accountable were lost in the thrill of the chase.

The tension between Duke’s dangerous racial views, his reputation as a ‘respectable’ Klan figurehead, and his slapstick public representation could also be seen through his visual depiction, with tabloid newspapers choosing to use both sensationalised images of Duke in full Klan regalia and headshots of a well-groomed Duke dressed in a suit and tie. A study in contrasts, such images demonstrated how the tabloid’s fascination with Duke stemmed in part from the dissonance between popular understandings of the Klan as a backwater band of Southern racists, and Duke’s self-identified and media-cultivated status as an articulate advocate for white civil rights. While the Mirror warned that Duke was ‘dangerous’ and ‘undesirable’, it also noted that he was a ‘smooth, plausible spokesman.’

Influential Express columnist Jean Rook, known as the ‘first lady of Fleet Street’, went one step further in describing an appearance by Duke on the flagship BBC programme Tonight. Rook declared that in contrast to the ‘ham-tongued and extremely rude’ presenter, Duke was able to maintain the ‘polite, white mask of the Southern gentleman.’

Even more serious-minded papers such as the Times and The Guardian could not resist portraying Duke as a ‘cheeky Pimpernel’ or describing police efforts to catch him as a ‘farce.’

Duke’s rapport with the media was so great that Rees attempted to bar British newspapers from interviewing the Klansman. Perhaps sensing an opportunity to position the Express in
a heroic light, reporter Robert McGowan tipped Scotland Yard off about an arranged meeting with the Klansman at a London public house. On March 14 under the headline “Got You!”, a front-page story detailed an apparent end to the length ‘game of hide and seek’ Duke had conducted throughout Britain, as officers cornered Duke at the Fox & Geese public house in Ickenham. However, in another black eye for the nation’s law enforcement, the arresting officer initially targeted McGowan instead of Duke. After an aborted escape attempt the Klansmen was finally served with a Variation Order, although McGowan noted that if Duke decided to defy the order ‘another game of hide-and-seek may well ensue.’ The American did not seem too perturbed by the ordeal, bolstering his reputation as a ‘southern gentleman’ by shaking the hand of everyone in the pub before leaving.115

While the British tabloids had excitedly relayed news of Duke’s exploits during his first two weeks in the country, in the aftermath of his apprehension they appeared to rapidly lose interest in his visit. Their enthusiasm for the ‘chase’ was briefly revived following front-page news on March 18 that Duke’s rival Bill Wilkinson had also slipped across the border.116 However, Wilkinson proved to be altogether less skilled than Duke in the arts of evasion, with the Klansman’s ‘fiery British crusade’ abruptly ended after he was apprehended and swiftly deported on March 20.117 The Daily Mail was able to get in one last jibe at the Home Office, noting that the British taxpayer had footed the bill for the Klansman’s one-way ticket back to New York.118 As he was escorted onto the flight, Wilkinson informed reporters that he had ‘selected and indoctrinated about 15 leaders for the movement here’, before prophesising ‘a violent future for race relations in Britain.’119 Duke’s eventual departure ten days later was largely ignored, with the Express offering a brief paragraph detailing the Klansman’s departure and his regret that Melvyn Rees would not meet in public to ‘argue my ideas.’120

Transnational Connections and the Klan in Britain
If the willingness of British tabloids to drop Duke following his apprehension at the Fox & Geese suggested that their interest in the story was grounded in his ‘Keystone Cops’ escapades, it also reflected a broader failure to fully contextualise the significance of Duke (and Wilkinson’s) visit for their readers. One aspect of this failure can be seen through insufficient efforts to connect their arrival to a longer history of Klan activity in Britain and an uptick in Klan-inspired attacks. As they perused the extensive coverage of the Klansmen’s exploits, tabloid readers could be forgiven for believing that this was the first time Klan affiliates had ever attempted to spread the organization’s message of hate in Britain. Yet fears over the Klan’s influence can be traced back to at least the early 1920s, when papers warned of a potential ‘invasion of England by the Ku Klux Klan.’

In 1926 the Daily Mail reported that American Bishop Alma White had founded a Klan branch in London and that the group, resplendent in Klan robes, had staged a public appearance at Memorial Hall on Farrington Street.

During the decades following World War II newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic continued to suggest that the Klan movement had ‘apparently leaped the ocean and taken root in British soil.’ Scattered newspaper reports of arson, burning crosses, and other forms of intimidation offered worrying evidence that the Klan’s name was being used to bolster the cause of British white supremacists, regardless of whether such activities were officially sanctioned by American Klan leaders. Escalating racial tensions in Britain, leading to flashpoints such as the 1958 Notting Hill riots and the murder of Antiguan immigrant Kelso Cochrane one year later, intersected with growing fears that the Klan was ‘branching out.’ Barry Troyna contends that the Klan ‘had representatives working in British cities for at least nine years’ prior to the heavily publicized formation of a West Midlands Klan branch in 1965, and the American press seized upon cross-burnings and the desire of Shelton and other Klansmen to visit Britain as evidence of the country’s growing racial problems.
While the Klan failed to establish a significant foothold in the 1960s, that the organization ‘retained a pull on the collective imagination of British racists’, and Duke’s visit was immediately preceded by another wave of Klan-inspired violence and intimidation.¹²⁷ In May 1977 a cadre of white airmen staged a cross-burning on a US Air Force Base in Lakenheath, Suffolk.¹²⁸ In Plymouth, a police station was vandalized by Klan slogans, while in Bolton five men connected to racial violence claimed to have been solicited by ‘the invisible empire.’ Black-owned and community bookshops in cities such as London and Southampton were vandalized and peppered with Klan literature.¹²⁹ A petrol soaked Klan cross was planted in the garden of a by-election candidate in Birmingham, prompting supporters to guard the home from possible attack.¹³⁰ The *Mirror* reported that a gang wearing Klan hoods had ‘brought terror’ to a black communities in the West Midlands through a spate of violent assaults.¹³¹ After a spate of fresh incidents in January 1978, David Lane, the chair of the Commission for Racial Equality, described the Klan presence as ‘a new turn in the series of lunatic fringe attacks.’¹³²

Despite such activities, the tabloid press chose to largely address Duke’s visit in isolation, helping to divorce his March 1978 tour from both a longer history of Klan activity in Britain, and a clear rise in Klan-style intimidation during the months leading up to his arrival. Apart from events on the US Air Force base in Lakenheath, it is unlikely that American Klan affiliates played a direct role in many of these racist attacks or intimidation campaigns, with Klan slogans or paraphernalia most commonly seen as a ‘flag of convenience’ for the British far right.¹³³ However, they reflected a clear and reciprocal desire to develop closer connections between American Klansman and the British far-right.¹³⁴ Throughout 1977, Wilkinson’s newspaper *The Klansman* reported that the organization was continuing to ‘gain wide acceptance in Britain’, and he reiterated such claims in an interview with Radio 4.¹³⁵ In a March 1978 letter addressed to the ‘Central Office’ of the Klan in Britain, Wilkinson
informed an unnamed Klan to prepare for ‘a meeting in the near future of all the area leaders in the U.K.’, suggesting some level of formalized Klan infrastructure.\textsuperscript{136}

That Duke’s visit to Britain was predicated on an attempt to cultivate international support for the Klan was no secret. News of Klan-inspired attacks in Britain may well have helped to convince Duke that ‘the time was certainly right’ to take his message of racial hatred overseas, and the British press helped to turn his visit into an extended publicity tour.\textsuperscript{138}

Throughout his visit, Duke explicitly appealed to British activists by rooting the Klan’s message in issues of immigration and white diasporic anxiety, promising to help ‘stop non-white immigration to Britain, repatriate non-whites living here and encourage healthy whites to increase their families.’\textsuperscript{139} The Klansmen openly cavorted with British far-right organizations and activists, with Keith Thompson, a prominent member of the League of St. George, accompanying Duke on his impromptu dash from police officers at the Cunard Hotel.\textsuperscript{140} Despite such evidence, the tabloids appeared to uncritically accept a public rejection of the Klan by the National Front as ‘another foreign import we can do without’, or to present such incidents as little more than serendipitous encounters between like-minded bigots removed from any broader ambitions or far-right organizational infrastructure.\textsuperscript{141}

By contrast, left-wing journals contended that reports of Klan inspired attacks in Britain ‘had merely shown the tip of the iceberg’ with regards to the deep connections between domestic racists and their white diasporic counterparts.\textsuperscript{145} Arguably the most strident voice among these periodicals was Searchlight, a leading anti-fascist journal founded by former Community Party member and trade union organizer Gerry Gable, which had operated intermittently since the mid-1960s.\textsuperscript{146} Following its relaunch as a monthly periodical in 1975 Searchlight published a flurry of articles documenting the deepening transnational connections between the ‘new Klan’ and British far-right activists. This included a July 1976 meeting in Belgium, where Duke connected with a British contingent which included Keith
Thompson, Mike Griffin and Della Aleksander from the League of St. George, Brian Baldwin from the British National Party, and a number of National Front members, including Ian Clarence and Don Sawyer. Two months later, a far-right conference in New Orleans further strengthened ties between the Klan and British far-right campaigners, with white supremacist journals in the United States reprinting articles from British fascist publications such as the Spearhead, the National Front’s monthly propaganda outlet.

In the weeks leading up to Duke’s arrival, Searchlight printed an array of documents which argued that the Klan viewed the National Front ‘as part of the world fascist movement.’ In contrast to the tabloids apparent willingness to accept Front criticisms of Duke and the Klan at face value, Searchlight’s editors had little patience for such obfuscation. Gable contended that while Martin Webster, a Spearhead columnist, had attempted to ‘wriggle round’ Duke’s visit, this standoffish approach contrasted with the attitudes of rank-and-file Front members, who were reported to have been ‘hobnobbing away with Duke like there’s no tomorrow.’ Front members were present at fascist film screenings in Kensington and at meet-and-greets with Duke in the Midlands, while Keith Saxon and David Goddard were just two prominent Front organisers and political candidates reported to have met the wizard. The Anti-Nazi News also reported that Duke stayed with Front supporters as he toured the country, helping to prolong his game of catch-and-mouse with British police.

In documenting such connections, anti-racist and anti-fascist journals highlighted the hypocrisy of the Front’s public efforts to distance itself from Duke. Indeed, Searchlight suggested that the Front’s evasiveness stemmed in large part from Duke’s ability to garner press attention, which risked drawing attention to the many philosophical similarities between the organisations. Indeed, even as Front spokesmen such as Webster attempted to distance themselves from Duke, they contended that many of Duke’s comments which were disseminated through the tabloid press and other British media outlets ‘contained a
substantial element of truth. Such slippages in the Front’s efforts to effect respectability lead Searchlight to the following conclusion; ‘the Front’s only real objection to the Klan is (a) the fact that Martin thinks he’d still be recognisable in a white sheet, and (b) that they are afraid of the competition.’

The Klan and the ‘Race Storm’ in British Politics

Tabloid treatment of Duke’s visit also takes on greater significance when placed against coverage of a brewing ‘race storm’ in British politics and an increasingly fractious public debate over immigration policy. Despite net immigration remaining in negative figures for every year between 1964 and 1978, hysterical coverage of flashpoints such as the Kenyan Immigration crisis contributed to the ‘criminalisation of immigration’ in the British tabloid press. At the same time, discussions of race became increasingly pejorative; present in the national press only ‘to the extent that it is bad news…because everything to do with coloured people takes place against an underlying premise that they are the symbols or the embodiments of a problem.’ The tabloids were particularly susceptible to this trend, choosing to uncritically reproduce racist stereotypes and promote racialised anxieties over immigrant. Leftist publications such as the Anti-Nazi News and Big Flame, the paper of the Revolutionary Socialist Publication, contended that tabloid ‘racist scare stories’ and anti-immigration propaganda was directly responsible for ‘white youths murdering blacks on the streets.’

By the early 1978, columnists in right-leaning tabloid papers such as the Express were openly pushing the possibility of a reconciliation between Enoch Powell and Thatcher’s Conservative Party, with Daily Express reporter Michael Harrington contending that ‘to get Powell on the Tory side again would be to win a great prize.’ Conservative MP George Gardiner also used the Express to champion this idea and to offer a reappraisal of Powell’s
“Rivers of Blood” speech as a prophetic warning of the immigration ‘problem.’ As such rumours grew louder, Merlyn Rees launched a searing attack on Tory immigration policy, which he warned would do ‘nothing but cause harm to race relations in Britain.’ In response, Thatcher offered her first public endorsement of the Tory’s new ‘closed-door policy’ on immigration in an infamous interview for Granada television on 27 January. The Conservative leader declared that ‘people are really rather afraid that this country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture’ and reiterated the need for ‘an end to immigration except, of course, for compassionate cases.’

As Camilla Schofield has argued, the imagined ‘people’ in Thatcher’s statement on immigration are most clearly interpretable as white ‘victims’ who took precedence over the experiences of non-white (and by insinuation non-British) citizens. Thatcher’s speech was met with praise by right-leaning tabloids, with the Daily Express reiterating her view that ‘we are a British nation with British characteristics.’ By contrast, the Daily Mirror contended that the address was a blatant attempt to win back supporters who had switched their allegiances to the National Front. Terence Lancaster, the newspaper’s esteemed political editor, suggested that Thatcher’s anti-immigration rhetoric was further evidence of her ‘madcap ride to the Right.’ Irrespective of the editorial position taken by individual newspapers, the collective tabloid response to Thatcher’s Grenada speech and the ensuing political fallout reinforced the position of race as an explosive and potentially dangerous social and political issue. Use of violent or incendiary language proliferated, with the Labour response seen to be characterised as a ‘war on Mrs. Thatcher’ and as evidence of widespread ‘race fury.’ The importance of race as the ‘burning issue’ of the moment was bluntly summarised by the graphics accompanying an article published in the 13 February issue of The Sun, which chose to print the word ‘RACE’ in capital letters with the ‘A’ set ablaze.
Against this confrontational backdrop, and without an adequate interrogation of his racist views, tabloid coverage of Duke’s visit arguably did as much to promote his philosophy to the British public than to dismiss it. An unknown figure to most British citizens prior to his arrival, widespread tabloid coverage of the Klansman’s presence provided Duke with a major platform to disseminate his message and to promote the philosophy of the ‘new Klan’; one which (at least publicly) was less an embrace of anti-black racism and more a politically relevant push for immigration reform. Duke repeatedly used his media platform to reassure the British public that ‘we don’t go around killing people and burning property. That’s the Hollywood image that we have.’ The Klansman also used the tabloids to promote the idea that he had ‘found considerable support’ among the British public. For police commissioner James Jardine, the bungled response to Duke’s arrival and the sensational coverage of his visit provided by the tabloids ensured the Klansman received ‘all the publicity Mr. Rees, the Home Secretary, wanted to deny him.’

Duke’s later claims that ‘the British people treated me royally’ and that ‘almost everyone who recognized me had something complimentary to say’ are stronger evidence of his famed narcissism than clear support for the Klan’s ideas. Nevertheless, Duke’s message may well have found an audience, with the Daily Telegraph contending that 58 percent of Labour supporters and 84 percent of Conservatives endorsed the sentiments expressed by Thatcher in her infamous “Swamped” speech. Similarly, his calls to establish an ‘alien watch’ on the south coast appeared no more extreme than those of media-appointed race relations ‘experts’ such as Powell, who received front-page tabloid coverage throughout February and March 1978 with his message that ‘one million blacks in Britain must be sent home.’ In turn, the Klansman’s promise to help white’s fight for ‘their culture and heritage’ complemented the views of right-wing tabloid journalists who framed immigration as an existential crisis. One month before Duke’s arrival, Express columnist George Gale offered a warning that could
have come directly from the Klansman’s own mouth: ‘their faces and beliefs, their ways of life, are not ours…their birth-rate exceeds ours…their settlement thus poses a threat to the society we have grown up in.’

Just days after Duke was finally apprehended at the Fox & Geese, a Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration released a report based on an 18-month long study of the ‘race problem.’ The Committee, compromised of five Conservative and five Labour MPs, unanimously called tighter immigration controls and a ban on ‘invasions’ by legal and non-legal immigrants. The report was immediately criticised by a flurry of race relations organisations and Liberal politicians, with Lord Avebury describing it as ‘pandering to the worst elements in society which have been trying to whip up hysteria.’ The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants went one further, denouncing the report as ‘a gift for racialists.’

By contrast, right-wing tabloids such as The Sun, the Daily Express and the Daily Mail aggressively promoted the report as evidence that it was ‘time to close the door’ on immigrants and as an opportunity to push for more restrictive citizenship and nationality laws.

Even as such papers championed the Committee’s recommendations, its report detailed how political partisanship and sensational media coverage had fostered a bitter racial climate, and, by extension, had cultivated the conditions which made Duke’s visit possible. While tabloid newspapers applauded the ten MPs involved on the Committee for illuminating the ‘peril’ of immigration, the Committee’s report and the response to its publication in the popular dailies underscored their complicity in exacerbating the ‘fierce, near hysterical row over race and immigration.’ Right-leaning tabloid papers in particular appeared to see little tension between their denunciation of the ‘Klan man’, and their enthusiastic support of draconian immigration reform and the conflation of whiteness and national identity: issues which were key rallying points for both ‘new Klan’ leaders such as Duke and far-right activists in the
UK. While left-leaning popular dailies such as the *Mirror* appeared willing to criticise anti-immigration rhetoric, their coverage of Duke existed in a vacuum removed from the broader context and tenor of British politics. In both cases, the isolation of these two concurrent media narratives powerfully highlight the racial myopia and racialised coverage of Britain’s tabloid press.

**Conclusion**

Upon returning to the United States, Duke maintained his public appeals for a transatlantic Klan, prophesizing in an interview with *South* magazine that ‘someday we’ll have more members in Birmingham, England than Birmingham, Alabama.’¹¹³² The League of St. George and the National Front press office would go on to advertise copies of speeches by Duke, leading *Searchlight* to suggest that the organisations were ‘becoming less concerned about their Nazi and Ku Klux Klan connections.’¹¹³³ In his later autobiography, Duke characterized his 1978 British sojourn as ‘one of the most interesting and effective’ of his efforts to establish the Klan internationally.¹¹³⁴ Despite his rival receiving the lion’s share of media attention, Wilkinson also aggressively promoted his visit as a success and distributed letters to potential new recruits declaring that ‘THE KLAN LIVES IN BRITAIN!’¹¹³⁵ Indeed, while Duke hogged the headlines, Wilkinson may well have made greater strides in establishing some kind of formal British presence for his Klan organization, with subsequent news releases and letters between Wilkinson and an unnamed British ‘Grand Drag’ discussing the creation of Klaverns in southwestern counties such as Devon and Cornwall.¹¹³⁶

Ultimately, Clive Webb suggests that attempts to establish a British Klan ‘only further factionalised an already divided British far right.’¹¹³⁷ In turn, tensions between the Klan’s American factions rapidly worsened following Duke’s 1978 visit to Britain, with aides such as Karl Hand abandoning the Klansman on account of his ‘self-interest and greed.’¹¹³⁸ As
Duke was eclipsed, the Klan’s media image retreated ‘from “respectability” to lawlessness’ \(^{189}\) ‘New Kluxers’ such as Tom Metzger returned to their neo-Nazi roots through white nationalist organizations such as the White Aryan Resistance, cementing the transition from ‘traditional rituals to more militant underground tactics’ for many hardliners and hastening the end of the Klan’s ‘renaissance.’ \(^{190}\) Despite such divisions, white supremacists on both sides of the Atlantic continued to harbour dream of ‘white world solidarity.’ Reports of Klan activism would sporadically attract tabloid attention throughout the 1980s and 1990s, with the *Mirror* seizing on a spate of cross burnings in 1997 to declare that the Klan ‘is on the march in Britain.’ \(^{191}\) On each occasion, the Klan’s ‘arrival’ was presented as a new threat; a narrative which, like tabloid coverage of Duke’s 1978 visit, did little to connect such moments to the longer history of transnational far-right activism and longstanding attempts to establish a Klan presence in Britain.

In retrospect, Duke’s British tour was one of his last major publicity stunts as a Klan leader. By the end of the decade he had abandoned the organization in an attempt to further ‘mainstream’ racism through a career in electoral politics. Duke’s departure was celebrated by Wilkinson, who had warned British supporters in 1978 that Duke was ‘not to be taken seriously’ and that ‘the only reason for being here…is to take advantage of the publicity generated by the organisation.’ \(^{192}\) However, while Duke’s rivals pointed to his obsession with publicity as a mark against his Klan credentials, Duke’s ability to use ‘the vast power of the media against itself’ – a skill perhaps most clearly seen through his 1978 tour - provided a media playbook for publicising white ethnic grievances, making racist ideologies palatable, and advocating for the development of ‘white world solidarity.’ Certainly, it is not hard to draw parallels between Duke’s emphasis on white civil rights and the politics of victimhood weaponised by contemporary iterations of the Anglo-American far right, his media-conscious college aesthetic and the efforts of American neo-Nazi Richard Spencer to present himself as
‘a clean-cut, palatable spokesman’ for white nationalism, or his presentation as a ‘truth-teller’ with British far-right provocateurs such as Tommy Robinson.193

On face value, tabloid coverage of Duke’s visit offered a strong rejection of the Klansman as a ‘wizard of hate’ whose unsavoury views were fundamentally at odds with the values of British society. Yet at the same time, the tabloid press helped to significantly raise Duke’s public profile, providing an unknown activist with a degree of political legitimacy. By focusing on Duke as an individual and framing his visit through a series of ‘good-for-a-laugh’ encounters with law enforcement, the tabloids ignored the extremity of his racial views, the potential appeal of his anti-immigration and white rights message for British activists, and the ways in which their own coverage had alerted American activists to the ‘race problem’ in Britain. As this article has argued, the Klansman’s 1978 tour did not occur within a vacuum. His appearance must be connected to a worsening racial climate and an increasingly contentious public debate over race and immigration, a debate which the British tabloids had helped to cultivate and exacerbate.
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