On August 17, 2018, underground rapper, director, and Communist activist Boots Riley posted a short, but scathing, critique of the Spike Lee and Kevin Willmott film *BlacKkKlansman* on his Twitter. His criticism emanates from Lee’s portrayal of detective Ron Stallworth as a hero and the numerous omissions made regarding Stallworth’s infiltration and surveillance of Leftist groups, namely, a Marxist-Leninist organization named the Progressive Labor Party (PLP). Riley’s commentary focuses on *BlacKkKlansman’s* failure to account for the police as a foundational aspect of everyday white supremacy, but his thoughts also speak to the use of white nationalists by State officials—specifically the Ku Klux Klan—to repress Leftists and Black radicals at the federal, state, and local levels.

Once a member of the PLP, Riley holds a unique perspective on the antiradicalism of the police and of Stallworth. The PLP and its mass organizations, the Committee Against Racism (CAR) and the International Committee Against Racism (INCAR), received nearly as much attention from Stallworth during his time undercover as did the KKK. In his memoir, Stallworth refers to his operations in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a “co-undercover investigation” and a “double ‘sting’ on the Klan and the Progressive Labor Party.” He also wrote that the PLP “consisted of the most devout and aggressive politically engaged individuals, the bulk of whom were aligned with the Communist ideology” and because of their “conviction of ultimately ‘smashing’ the Ku Klux Klan … They could turn violent.”

Stallworth’s writing displays an anticommunist perspective in line with the era in which he entered law enforcement—the COINTELPRO era. The COINTELPRO era began in 1956 when the FBI planned to infiltrate and destroy Communist Party organizations throughout the United States. However, in the mid-1960s the program expanded its scope and targeted various organizations that the FBI deemed subversive. This included the New Left, Black radicals, and the KKK. Stallworth was not an FBI agent and he joined the police academy the year after COINTELPRO ended, but the program’s use of infiltration proved pervasive throughout all levels of law enforcement. Riley notes that “Stallworth infiltrated a Black radical organization for 3 years (not one event like the movie portrays)” and used COINTELPRO tactics to disrupt their antiracist aims. He also notes, accurately, that Stallworth’s infiltration of the Klan was not unusual; rather, it fit into the regular FBI
and police tactic of using white nationalist groups to “threaten and/or physically attack radical organizations.” Despite the PLP’s significance to Stallworth’s operation, the filmmakers erased it from the narrative in their adaptation.

Riley’s criticisms revolve around the film’s neglect of this persecution of the Left, but creative license remains an essential aspect of adaptation—even when interpreting a memoir. Literary theorist Linda Hutcheon argues that the adapted text “is not something to be reproduced, but rather something to be interpreted and recreated.” The mere process of shifting mediums makes a complete reproduction impossible. Yet, art is also often political, and Lee and Willmott’s film is unmistakably so. The film is set in the 1970s, but their interpretation conveyed a message about contemporary race relations, namely the complicity of the Trump administration in encouraging racial violence from 2015 to 2017. The criticism of this article focuses on how BlacKkKlansman conveys its political messages. Hutcheon notes that literary critics sometimes dismiss the relevance of political “intentionality” in art in comparison to interpretation. However, she contends that the “culturally and historically conditioned reasons for selecting a certain work to adapt and the particular way to do so should be considered seriously by adaptation theory, even if this means rethinking the role of intentionality in our critical thinking about art in general.” Lastly, Hutcheon finds not only that an “adaptation can obviously be used to engage in a larger social or cultural critique,” but that it “can even be used to avoid it” as well. In this respect, the decision making of Lee and Wilmott to avoid, or erase, the Left in their social and political critique deserves further analysis and contextualization. The removal of the PLP during their adaptation process speaks to both the process and the normalization of the Left’s removal from mainstream culture, history, and thought throughout the United States.

I argue that the film’s erasure of the radical Left as a source of resistance to white nationalism and its foregrounding of the police as Klan opposition bolsters an unrealistic portrayal of State efforts to end white supremacy. The film’s erasure of Stallworth’s surveillance of the Left is significant as it obscures the pervasiveness of State anticommunism to mainstream audiences in a way that is counterproductive to truly understanding systemic inequality. Because of this decision, moderate, liberal, and conservative filmgoers alike are presented with the Klan as the main source of racism and law enforcement as divorced from systemic oppression. The film’s erasure of the PLP and Left radicalism allows the misconception of the State as focused on combating white nationalists to persist unchallenged in the discourse emanating from the film. Arguably, the Left’s removal even tempers the film’s most productive adaptation from the memoir—that being how it corrects for the lack of the Black feminist perspective. While the inclusion of the Black feminist character, Patrice Dumar, should be solely a strength of the film, her lack of development as a radical character leaves the film without a Leftist protagonist, despite the constant opposition of Black radical feminists to white nationalism. In this way, the Left erasure in the adaptation polishes the police into heroes and leaves the audience with-
out a radical alternative through which to envision antiracist resistance.

Using both iterations of *BlacKkKlansman*, as well as Riley’s critique, this article frames an analysis of State, white nationalist, and anticommunist repression against a broad spectrum of activism on the Left. I also contrast the various accounts of Stallworth’s career with an event more indicative of historical police infiltrations of the KKK: the Greensboro Massacre of 1979. The event was also subject to forms of historical erasure and—by ignoring the themes of anti-Left repression that it shared with Stallworth’s operation—*BlacKkKlansman* moves these discussions further from the public discourse. The Massacre, briefly alluded to in Riley’s essay, involved KKK and American Nazi Party chapters infiltrated by law enforcement for the purposes of anticommunist and anti-Black repression. Despite the presence of law enforcement infiltrators within these groups, Klansmen and Neo-Nazis murdered five Communist Workers’ Party (CWP) organizers and wounded many more. Not only was this an instance of State-infiltrated white nationalist groups murdering Communist organizers, the episode occurred, as Riley points out, at the exact same time as Stallworth’s operation in Colorado Springs. Yet there was no attempt to reconcile these two events or mention the infiltration tactics seen in these examples in either the film or book adaptation of *BlacKkKlansman*. Once again, the Left is erased, leaving an idyllic version of the State as racism’s sole opponent.

**Commies vs. Klansmen: The Discussion Thus Far**

In terms of both rhetoric and physical clashes, Communist and Klan organizations have been at odds from the 1920s to the present day. Yet, never has a discussion of Klan anticommunism or Communist anti-Klanism placed this feud into its century-long context. Anticommunism is a recurring theme in the third section of Wyn Craig Wade’s *The Fiery Cross: The Ku Klux Klan in America*; however, Wade’s account lacks depth in discussing COINTELPRO and the FBI as forces of State repression. Periodized works on communism, anticommunism, and the KKK provide more nuance, but rarely emphasize this ideological feud as truly central to their narratives. The work that most closely places these two groups into a discussion with one another is David Cunningham’s book on FBI counterintelligence, *There’s Something Happening Here*. While it is not his central argument, Cunningham shows that COINTELPRO cast Communists and Klansmen as similarly “subversive” and stated that they regularly viewed the latter as the lesser of the two evils. In his study of the program’s various covert actions, Cunningham finds that COINTELPRO launched a nearly identical number of actions against the KKK and Left groups through “COINTELPRO—White Hate” and “COINTELPRO—New Left” respectively. However, the types of actions taken by the program varied wildly between “White Hate” and “New Left,” to the point that distinct FBI goals became apparent. “Hindering individual participation,” Cunningham argues, “became the most commonly used type of action in COINTELPRO—New Left.” Conversely, “the Bureau’s
overall strategy of controlling behavior” in its infiltration of white hate groups “created significantly fewer opportunities to eliminate targets’ ability to participate.” The difference was “control versus elimination.” The willingness by the State to accept the Klan to a degree in contrast to its unwillingness to accept any radical Left organizations at all is perfectly articulated by Cunningham, but this issue extends beyond his historical focus.

My analysis places Cunningham’s arguments into a conversation influenced somewhat by Ellen Schrecker’s work on McCarthyism. Schrecker emphasizes the significance of looking beyond brief historical moments, programs, and individuals, namely Joseph McCarthy, to reveal the persistent narrative of anticomunism within the American State. In this way, McCarthyism was larger than the man and longer than his career. Analyses of COINTELPRO require a similarly broad perspective to show not only the influence of earlier government surveillance of radical groups on the program, but also the manner in which COINTELPRO’s infiltration legacy saturates law enforcement strategies into the present day. While Cunningham provides context for FBI operations before the start of the program, and devotes multiple chapters to discussing some of the lingering effects of COINTELPRO after it was disbanded, his focus is mostly between 1964 and 1971. Cunningham’s periodization is not atypical and aligns with the conventional historiography of COINTELPRO. However, this range misses the longer story of State and FBI surveillance of the Klan and Communists before the program’s creation, during its earlier years, and after its demise.

The Greensboro Massacre of 1979 occurred after this 1964-1971 period. Yet, there were State informants within KKK and Nazi organizations that carried out attacks on a perceived Communist threat. Works that concentrate specifically on Greensboro remain limited, even forty years after the fact, and rarely offer the level of analysis in Cunningham’s work regarding State infiltration. Documentaries contend that the events were somewhat forgotten as Greensboro officials downplayed its significance and because the Iranian hostage crisis pushed it out of national headlines the next day. The fact that much of the work detailing the actual events and the immediate fallout was published in the 1980s speaks to this view of the massacre as “forgotten.” Wade’s aforementioned book and Terry Eastland’s 1980 article “The Communists and the Klan” both briefly discuss Greensboro, but lack a sustained discussion of the significance of State informants—in this case Edward Dawson—within the Klan. The most substantive work produced on the events remains journalist Elizabeth Wheaton’s Codename GREENKIL. Built on a foundation of interviews conducted with survivors and perpetrators, Wheaton’s work is one of few that discusses the Klan and Communist feud from both perspectives.

CWP survivors published a considerable portion of the literature, most notably Signe Waller’s Love and Revolution and Sally Bermanzohn’s Through Survivors’ Eyes. Both books present first-hand accounts of the events, but Bermanzohn’s
ample oral histories, conducted with other survivors, add a greater level of depth to her account. Recently, Waller and Nelson Johnson penned “An Apology for a Massacre,” a retrospective essay in response to the Greensboro City Council’s 2020 resolution which issued an apology for the city’s complicity in the events of the massacre. In it, Waller and Johnson provide only a basic summary of the massacre itself, but they contextualize their own experiences as victims of white nationalist violence as part of the continuing struggle against white supremacy.14 My article further situates the Greensboro Massacre in current discourses surrounding liberation movements and the cooperative efforts between the State and white supremacist groups to curtail them.

Cops and Klansmen in BlacKkKlansman

Riley’s criticism of BlacKkKlansman prompted a response from the film’s famous director, Spike Lee. In an interview, Lee defended his film against accusations that it was pro-police by citing denunciations of law enforcement in his earlier work. He then tempered these previous critiques by stating, “I’m never going to say all police are corrupt, that all police hate people of colour,” and also that “we need police.” When asked about Riley’s comments, Stallworth responded simply, “I pray for my demented and dissolute brother.”15 It is not surprising that Lee and Stallworth responded defensively to Riley’s critique, but it is notable how few of Riley’s comments the director, the former officer, or the popular press addressed. In the few media articles that addressed Riley’s essay, little analysis exists.16 The coverage instead focused on the fact that comments were made, with little to no analysis of the critique itself. Delving deeper into his criticisms can only provide a greater understanding of the relationship between white supremacy and law enforcement, as well as the role of entertainment in obscuring and normalizing this relationship.

The main thrust of Riley’s criticism is that BlacKkKlansman is largely “not a true story,” despite the film’s contention that “Dis Joint is based upon some fo’ real, fo’ real sh*t.”17 While it is true that a Black policeman named Ron Stallworth, along with other members of the Colorado Springs Police Department, infiltrated a KKK chapter in the late 1970s and that the film is based on Stallworth’s memoir, the film embellishes, creates, and omits many details. Most of the action and tension present in the film’s adaptation was fabricated for dramatic effect and absent from the memoir. The reason for this, Riley argues, is to create a narrative in which the police are the heroes and are viewed as such by the audience.18

In the film, many of the KKK members, most notably a Klansman named Felix Kendrickson, are immediately suspicious of Stallworth’s white undercover partner, Flip Zimmerman, as being both Jewish and a policeman. Kendrickson is the most violent and paranoid expression of Klan bigotry in the film and his actions greatly heighten the anxiety of the audience. Kendrickson attempts to force Zimmerman into a lie detector test in his basement to uncover the truth about the undercover officer’s potential Jewish ancestry. Zimmerman only escapes this ordeal
when Stallworth bravely throws a rock through Kendrickson's window as a distraction. Later in the film, Kendrickson's associate identifies Zimmerman as an officer who arrested him years earlier. Not only does Kendrickson immediately realize that Zimmerman is a “Jew name,” but he soon figures out the relationship between Zimmerman and Stallworth, which raises the tension further.19

The rabid and racist Kendrickson character emphasizes the heroic attributes of the Black and Jewish protagonists, but his likeness is absent from the book. There was certainly an abundance of bigotry espoused by the real Klansmen; however, there was no Jewish lie detector, no heroic distraction, and no outing of the undercover officer. In fact, there are far fewer mentions of Judaism in the book than the film. Stallworth briefly mentions the KKK screening for Jewish ancestry among recruits and he references reading about their obsession with the Zionist Occupied Government in a Klan newspaper, but that is all.20 Stallworth’s real partner, known by the alias “Chuck” in the book, was not, nor was he suspected to be, Jewish. Riley points to this bit of creative license as a “made-up thing to raise the stakes and make it seem like the cops were sacrificing more than they were.”21 By having a Jewish officer in the midst of a Klavern, the audience experiences anxiety throughout nearly the entire film. This adaptation also presents a more diverse police force to the audience, which further portrays them as tolerant and likeable.22

Viewers of the film will be surprised upon reading the book to see the high tension of the movie replaced with almost comic levels of ineptitude on the Klan’s part. In Stallworth’s memoir, the Klansmen quickly embraced Chuck as one of their own and their attempts to promote him are met with universal approval. In the film, Kendrickson ardently protests this promotion, but in the book, the only issue that arose was whether an undercover officer could legally run a KKK chapter. Stallworth was all for the idea. “I felt this was excellent for the investigation,” he contended, “By being in a position of semi-leadership, we would have so much more knowledge and information at our disposal.”23 Stallworth’s perspective aligns with the strategies of COINTELPRO, as the FBI encouraged informants, such as Gary Thomas Rowe in Alabama, to climb as high in the ranks of the organization as possible.24

This is a key difference between the film adaptation and the book. In the film, the audience is led to believe that the infiltration of the KKK by the police was an unprecedented scenario fraught with danger. The book presents a less perilous operation. For example, Chuck was never exposed as an officer. In fact, the department eventually placed a second informant, officer James W. Rose, within the Klan chapter along with Chuck.25 The climactic car bombing seen in the film was also added. The Klansmen in the book talked of violence, but Stallworth claims he redirected their attention and thwarted all would-be cross burnings. He contends that the infiltration ran smoothly; however, he also never puts forth a compelling argument for what the successes of the operation really were. No Klansmen were arrested through the intelligence gathered, nor were any charges brought against
them. The police presence within the Klavern seemingly never sewed dissent within the group either. Stallworth mainly points to the lack of cross burnings in the area during the operation as their main achievement. This accomplishment should not be ignored, but soon after the operation ended a cross burning occurred just outside of Colorado Springs. Therefore, the only accomplishment of the operation was a brief stay of cross burnings; indeed, there was not a grand dissolution of the chapter nor were any identities of KKK members exposed to the public.

While this was not an FBI operation, it remains nonetheless indicative of Cunningham’s findings about State infiltration of the Klan. The goal was control, not elimination. The tactics of Stallworth’s operation are easily reconcilable with law enforcement tactics regarding the Klan, yet the film and memoir still bear little resemblance to examples pointed out by Riley. In Greensboro specifically, Klansmen and Nazis murdered five CWP marchers with the help of police and ATF (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives) informants and not one of those white supremacists ever saw prison time for murder. Conversely, in the film adaptation of BlacKkKlansman, the police thwart the Klan’s plot to murder Black activists and arrest the Klanswoman bomber. In fact, the only deaths are those of three hapless Klansmen who unknowingly park next to a car bomb. No deaths occur in the memoir, but Lee’s film still presents an operation in which the State thwarted Klan terrorism.

When presented with these outcomes, audiences viewing the police as heroes and part of the fight against white nationalism proves easier. However, law enforcement routinely operates in concert with white nationalists and to obscure this reality only hides the true role of the police in perpetuating systemic racism. As Riley wrote, “to the extent that people of color deal with actual physical attacks and terrorizing due to racism and racist doctrines, we deal with it mostly from the police on a day-to-day basis.” While both iterations of BlacKkKlansman present the KKK as a threat in need of obliteration, neither sufficiently address the manner in which the State allowed for their continued existence.

Lee and Willmott’s Trump Card
In fairness to the filmmakers, their main goal was less about offering a full account of Stallworth’s memoir and more about presenting an indictment of Donald Trump. The film adaptation contains scenes throughout that stress the link between Trump’s rhetoric and the views of the radical Right. The film opens with a monologue by a fictitious Klansman named Dr. Kennebrew Beauregard, played by noted Trump impersonator and critic Alec Baldwin. Throughout the monologue, Beauregard espouses the standard racist and anti-Semitic rhetoric of midcentury Klan leaders. He rants and raves about the dangers of miscegenation and the International Communist and Jewish Conspiracies that control Civil Rights organizers. However, there are a few subtle additions to his speech that place it squarely into the modern language of white supremacy.
Firstly, Beauregard uses nostalgic oration, such as “we had a great way of life,” and pines for a lost America in the same vein as Trump’s “Make America Great Again” rhetoric. Secondly, he accentuates the term “super-predators” in his references to Black male rapists. The fixation on the myth of Black men as rapists is nothing new for whites in the US, but the term super-predator is specific to the hyper-criminalization of young Black men during the late 1980s and 1990s. Political scientist John DiLulio Jr. popularized the term in his 1995 essay “The Coming of the Super-Predators,” in which he emphasized what he saw as the unprecedented “moral poverty” of contemporary urban youth. DiLulio’s race-baiting term proved influential to the point that Hillary Clinton infamously described Black youths as super-predators in 1996. Trump never used the term publicly at that point, but his demands for the execution of the wrongfully convicted Central Park Five only a few years prior thrust him into the super-predator conversation as well. The “super-predator” controversy reemerged during the 2016 Presidential Election cycle as director Ava DuVernay tied both candidates to this fixation on Black criminality in her documentary 13th. The writers of BlacKkKlansman seem to reference this contemporary controversy, perhaps insinuating that the modern rhetoric of major political parties can be placed within the Klan rhetoric of the mid-twentieth century.

The commentary tying Trumpism to white nationalism continues once the film progresses into its main plot. Shortly before Grand Wizard David Duke first contacts Stallworth, the officer converses with his superior, Sergeant Trapp, about the Klan leader. Trapp explains Duke’s views and political aspirations to Stallworth and reveals Duke’s potential to take white nationalism “mainstream.” Duke will accomplish this, according to the sergeant, by demonizing affirmative action and immigration while also supporting tax reform and harsher prison sentencing as coded racial issues. Trapp essentially explains “Color Blind Racism” to Stallworth, or perhaps more accurately to the audience. After hearing this, Stallworth chuckles and informs his sergeant that “America would never elect somebody like David Duke president.” Trapp’s response: “Coming from a black man, that’s pretty naïve. Why don’t you wake up?”

The decision to have a white police officer explain the degree of racism held by most Americans to a Black man in a film set in the early 1970s is noteworthy. Stallworth would have grown up during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s and witnessed the election of Richard Nixon in 1968. He would have recently experienced a racist reaction by white voters to Black progress, making Trapp’s explanation superfluous. One interpretation of this scene is that it was a meta-commentary by Lee and Willmott regarding the modern political moment. In this way, the dialogue was not about the Klan of the 1970s; instead, the conversation focused on the election of 2016 being the realization of Duke’s dream of legitimizing white nationalism in the US. Considering Duke’s support for both Trump’s 2016 and 2020 presidential campaigns, this seems an understandable argument to make. Still, when grappling with the racial dynamics of this scene, it is difficult not to re-
turn to Riley’s assertion about the goals of the film adaptation: to make the police likeable. Viewers would be hard pressed to see the police as part of a white supremacist system while white police sergeants are explaining systemic racism to their subordinates.

The thin veil that masked Lee’s shots at Trump is completely discarded in the film’s coda, which is a montage of the violent unrest at the Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, VA during the Summer of 2017. In the most powerful scene of the movie, footage of street brawling, anti-Semitic chants, Tiki torches, and the murder of Heather Heyer by James Alex Fields Jr. replace the enjoyment of fiction with the unease of reality. During the montage, the film introduces the real David Duke for the first time, as he is shown speaking to reporters in Charlottesville and endorsing Trump’s message of taking America back. The montage also features clips of Trump’s tepid response to these events, in which he spoke of “some very fine people on both sides” days later. The film ends with two photographs shown in succession, the first being a picture of Heyer, to whom the film is dedicated, and the last the US flag turned upside-down, which symbolizes a signal for distress. The final message of the film is not about the Klan; rather, the film concludes with Trump’s encouragement of white nationalist violence. Still, the main avenue of resistance to this white nationalist violence provided in Lee and Willmott’s adaptation remains the State itself. While the film connects the Klan of the 1970s to Trump and Charlottesville for audiences, it does not provide the audiences space to question police complicity in acts of violence against Leftist counter-protestors.

Left Erasure and the Radical Women of BlacKkKlansman

While additions made to the film heighten the relatability or likeability of the police, the omission of Stallworth’s targeting of antiracist and Leftist groups aids in this process as well. When comparing the film to the memoir, Communist activism is drastically downplayed. The openly Marxist-Leninist PLP was a major source of resistance to the Klan in the Western US during the late 1970s. In California, the PLP—as well as its mass organizations CAR and INCAR—engaged in street fights with the Klan chapter of infamous white supremacist Tom Metzger. In a grim harbinger for the CWP’s upcoming anti-Klan campaign in Greensboro, Metzger’s Klan received preferential treatment from the police. Outside of a 1978 screening of D.W. Griffith’s The Birth of a Nation in Oxnard, California, the police served as security for the KKK and fought with PLP counter-protestors. The film BlacKkKlansman features a police-guarded screening of the same racist epic as well, but a Leftist counterprotest did not make the cut in Lee’s adaptation.

Stallworth targeted Colorado branches of these Leftist groups, classifying them as dangerous organizations in his memoir. In one example, Stallworth recalls a community meeting held in December of 1978 to discuss opposition to the Klan, which he attended “in an undercover capacity.” The meeting had attendees from the local chapters of INCAR, People for the Betterment of People, and the Col-
orado College Black Student Union (CCBSU) among others. The officer wrote that the “most disturbing” suggestions came from a Doug Vaughn, who “proclaimed membership in both INCAR and the PLP” and “called for a violent confrontation with the Klan.” Stallworth also reminded the reader that “PLP members tended to be staunch, devoted Communists.” Yet, the film leaves the PLP out of the story completely, despite their multi-state record of Klan opposition in the late 1970s. Instead, the filmmakers chose a fictionalized version of the CCBSU as the pillar of local resistance to the Klan. Stallworth references the CCBSU briefly, but nowhere near as frequently as the PLP or INCAR. This was because the CCBSU was less confrontational in their resistance to the Klan. Their suggested tactic at the 1978 meeting was “to completely ignore them” and “show the Klan that they lacked the public’s support.”38 Despite their portrayal in the film as a Black Power organization, Stallworth never mentions any revolutionary rhetoric espoused by the CCBSU.

For the most part, the CCBSU in the film is defined by its fictional president and Stallworth’s love interest Patrice Dumar, a radical Black feminist whom Stallworth playfully refers to as “Sister Angela Davis” and “Sister Kathleen Cleaver.” The film comes closest to truly relaying Black radical critique during Dumar’s dialogue. While on a date with the undercover officer, she quotes W.E.B. DuBois’ theory of Double Consciousness and laments that the existence of Black police officers does not address the fact that “the system is racist.”39 In many respects, however, Dumar’s character remains underdeveloped, both in terms of her almost nonexistent backstory and her radicalism. For example, she only makes a brief reference to “capitalist oppression” during a date with Stallworth, and even then quotes something that noted Black Power leader and Pan-African socialist Kwame Ture told her.40 Considering Stallworth compares her to Davis and Cleaver, having Dumar discuss Marxist-influenced critiques of capitalism would make her a more true-to-form representation of those legendary Marxist-feminists.

Some might view the Dumar character simply as a crude love interest for the protagonist. While their relationship provides that trope for the film, her inclusion makes up for a notable lack of women’s—especially Black women’s—voices in Stallworth’s memoir. Women are largely absent from the book BlacKkKlansman and, when the author does recall the presence of women at various events in his life, they are usually trivialized or, in some cases, sexualized.41 Police forces have often been as defined by misogyny as they have been by racism; therefore, the absence of women is perhaps not surprising. That said, Stallworth’s surveillance of radical groups should have placed him into the orbit of an abundant number of women activists. Little evidence of that exists in the memoir. At points, Stallworth references a Denver Professor named Marianne Gilbert as a representative of CAR and INCAR, but he always brings his focus back to Doug Vaughn of the PLP as the more important representative of radical Leftism.42 Numerous scholars emphasize the central role of women of colour, such as the aforementioned Davis and Cleaver, in the Civil Rights Movement, the Black Power Movement, and various
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radical Left movements over the last century. So, to present such an overwhelmingly male account, as Stallworth does, is highly questionable.\textsuperscript{43} Even with her flaws, the inclusion of Dumar in the film presents a more likely portrayal of what the CCBSU probably looked like at the time of Stallworth’s operation.

However, Dumar is not the only significant woman character created for the film. Connie Kendrickson, the wife of the Felix Kendrickson character, serves as the Klanswoman counterpart to Dumar. Although the two characters never truly interact, Cunningham noted in his review of the film that they “convey the pivotal, complex, and counterpoised roles that women have always played in these struggles.”\textsuperscript{44} Much like Dumar, Kendrickson plays an important role in correcting for the lack of women in Stallworth’s book. The leadership of the Far Right tends to be overwhelmingly male, in keeping with their emphasis on gender hierarchy and heteronormativity. As a result, it is perhaps not surprising that in Stallworth’s memoir the KKK he presents is entirely male, but this is not as reflective of the Klan’s history as many might assume.

While the radical Right has fewer prominent women leaders than their Left counterparts, historians such as Nancy MacLean and Kathleen M. Blee have pointed to the prominence and high membership numbers of the KKK’s women’s auxiliaries in the past. These authors demonstrated that women played important roles as organizers and promoters of Klan ideology.\textsuperscript{45} Women’s membership was far greater in the 1920s than the 1970s, but Cunningham’s account of the North Carolina United Klans of America (UKA) during the 1950s and 1960s shows that prominent Klanswomen influenced male members through anticommunism and challenges to masculinity. Sybil Jones, wife of North Carolina Grand Dragon Bob Jones, often spoke at KKK rallies of the need for Klansmen to protect their wives by standing up to Communists. Cunningham noted one evocative speech, in which she told the crowd “in Russia, they live behind an iron curtain … I know a lot of you men live behind an iron petticoat … why don’t you step out from behind it and be a man?”\textsuperscript{46} While not as overtly active as Jones, Kendrickson influences her Klan husband and his associates through the domestic sphere.

Just as Dumar offers up the film’s most radical perspective of Black Power, Kendrickson channels the spirit of Klanswomen like Jones and is the film’s most strident articulation of White Power. Felix Kendrickson expresses racism more boisterously, but it is his wife who facilitates the act of Klan terrorism in the attempted bombing of the CCBSU’s house. During Duke’s screening of \textit{Birth of a Nation} at the Klan induction ceremony, the Klanswoman’s cheers ring loudest. In her first scene, Kendrickson appears as a cheerful homemaker serving refreshments during a Klan meeting. However, she quickly interrupts the conversation and brings up Dumar’s involvement in bringing Kwame Ture, or “Carmichael” as she refers to him, to Colorado Springs. She states that the “girl from the Baboon Student Union was attacking our police. I mean this girl is dangerous. She’s like that Commie, Angela Davis, and I just, I think we should shut her mouth.”\textsuperscript{47} In addition to racism
and stereotypes, she delivers a deliberate reference to the most famous Communist in the US at the time, Angela Davis, as well as a show of support towards local police. In this way, she sees the Klan as more or less aligned with the State in a war against Black people and Communists. Her husband eventually silences her in an assertion of male dominance, but her words were not ignored. The Klan’s focus on Dumar increases substantially after this scene at the behest of Klanswoman Kendrickson.

_BlacKkKlansman_’s portrayal of women comes closest to recovering the Left-Right dynamic that was lost in the transition from page to screen. However, the film’s references to Davis are only surface level, as are its discussions of the Left and women of colour feminism. Davis is referenced not by the CCBSU or any of its members, but by a policeman and a Klanswoman. Because of this, Davis’ name serves only as a cultural reference. Her myriad intellectual and political contributions to radical antiracism, which could ground Dumar in Black radicalism, are absent from her dialogue. However, as Kendrickson alludes to, Dumar is responsible for bringing Ture (known previously as Stokely Carmichael) to speak at a local Black nightclub in the film, which, intentionally or not, places her into the Leftist orbit more than her actual dialogue.

As seen in the film, Stallworth did attend a speaking engagement of Ture’s while undercover. The Ture speech is a beautifully filmed and edited scene that focuses on the Black audience members as much as the speech. Their faces framed by the darkness of the room, they watch Ture in awe and project a sense of collective pride that is unmistakable. These shots of the individuals in the crowd pair nicely with Ture’s Black Power message, but the overall message delivered lacked the social complexity of the man himself. By the 1970s, Ture believed in a socialist interpretation of Pan Africanism and espoused the need for African communalism and revolution along those lines. No mention of this can be seen in the film. Perhaps not surprisingly, Stallworth emphasizes this explicitly in his memoir, once again revealing his fixation on radical Leftism. In describing Ture and his reasons for attending his speech, Stallworth notes that the speaker’s “belief in a Marxist revolutionary overthrow of the American political system” was of “concern to my superiors.” This mention of the “concern” of his superiors is telling. In both the film and literary retelling, his superiors were not concerned with the Klan, but with a Black radical socialist speaker. It was the choice of a lone Black detective to pursue the infiltration of the Klan. While Stallworth never expounds on this disconnection, it speaks to the priorities of law enforcement in the US: Right violence is ignored while Left radicalism is surveilled.

Despite Ture’s status as a radical, his only mention of revolution comes during a whisper to Stallworth after the conclusion of the speech. As the two shake hands, the detective, who is wearing a wire, asks Ture a leading question about the inevitability of a race war. Ture responds, in a hushed tone, “Get ready, ‘cause the revolution is coming. Pick up a gun and arm yourself, because trust me, it’s com-
The presentation of Ture is a point of contention for Riley as well, who met Ture through several of the Black Power advocate’s tours. Riley argues that “If you really went up to Kwame Ture and asked him what we should do right now … he would have said what he usually said: ‘Study!!!’ But, it made the Black radical group look more dangerous to have Ture say something that sounded like he was calling for armed insurrection.” Riley might understate Ture’s support for Black self-defense, but studying and development of the mind were crucial to Ture’s approach to Black liberation. There is little attempt to reconcile the centrality of education to Black radicalism in this portrayal of Ture. While the slogans and raised fists are evident, the underlying significance of socialism and communal liberation is erased.

The Ture speech is one of only a few anecdotes that persist throughout every adaptation of Stallworth’s story, but when evaluating the full transition from page to screen, the Left, especially the PLP, received the greatest level of erasure. There is no hint of a co-undercover investigation in the film, rather, a singular focus on the Klan. In truth, most who read Stallworth’s memoir have not read the first edition, but the media tie-in version released in 2018. Flatiron Books, a division of the massive publishing house Macmillan published it in concert with the successful film. Unsurprisingly, this level of media support helped the memoir reach its way into the top tier of the *New York Times* bestseller list. Stallworth’s original memoir was published by Police and Fire Publishing, a small publishing house that deals almost exclusively in memoirs of police officers. During the memoir’s initial release, it received considerably less attention from the general public and only printed a small number of copies; as a result, the first edition is rather difficult to purchase.

However, it is the first edition that the screenwriters adapted into *BlacKkKlansman*. Much in the two editions is the same, but there are a few major differences. Flatiron divided chapters and reordered the memoir for readability. They also added an afterword, in which Stallworth compares aspects of Klan and segregationist politics to modern Republican strategy—seemingly placing his book more in line with the political direction of Lee’s film. Unlike Lee, Stallworth included a comparison between the PLP and the “modern day protest efforts of the so-called Antifa, anti-facists [sic], radical communists, socialists, and anarchists.” He claims that these Leftist groups view the police as enablers of the Klan and that they advocate for violence, because the police “cannot be trusted to act in the best interest of the public because they follow the rules as established in the U.S. Constitution.” In truth, this comparison by Stallworth encapsulates his treatment of the radical Left quite well. He offers no examples of Antifa or PLP violence to contextualize his statement, while also misdirecting Left criticism of the police to an assumed hatred of the Constitution. In these pages, he decries the political unrest following Charlottesville, but his “both sides” approach follows much the same logic as Trump’s response to the same events. Inevitably, the State seeks to frame the radical Left as criminal similarly to white nationalist groups, unless it is presenting it as more dangerous.
The afterword is not the most significant change from the first edition to the second edition. In Stallworth’s original memoir, he devoted dozens of pages to his undercover work as a member of INCAR and the PLP, but these stories disappeared in the popularized second edition. In the latter, Stallworth talks about attending the Ture speech and the forum. Beyond that inclusion, it is unclear how much observation of anti-racist organizers Stallworth conducted. The original leaves no doubt. In the first edition, Stallworth recalls undercover trips, all as an invited guest, to the homes of PLP organizers Vaughn and Gilbert. The author mocks CAR, INCAR, and PLP members for disparaging the police in his company and for criticizing capitalism whilst being middle-class academics. He wrote:

I was a card-carrying member of the Ku Klux Klan and was now a member of CAR, the group dedicated toward the eradication of the Klan and everything it stood for. Inside I was once again stifling laughter at the ignorance of Marianne and Alan Gilbert and their complicity in helping further the ‘sting’ that was this investigation. They and their group were now an official part of the hoax. The fact that they and Doug were such staunch activists, ‘true believers’ in the Communist doctrine and they held such strong anti-police feelings only made the fact that I had been able to reel them in a little bit sweeter.57

An anticommmunist tone is detectable in the second edition, but it saturates the first. Stallworth does not critically engage with the beliefs of the Leftists he surveilled. For example, when Gilbert’s husband—CAR organizer Alan Gilbert—described his political beliefs as “Socialist,” Stallworth provides this aside for his readers: “another way of saying Marxism or Communism.” Stallworth wrote this despite Gilbert explaining his Socialism specifically to differentiate himself from Vaughn, who identified as a Communist. Stallworth’s goal was not to learn through surveillance; rather, he intended to reinforce long-held beliefs about the danger of Leftists. He not only references their discussions about the use of force in revolution as proof of their similarity to the KKK, but expresses his belief that the Gilberts tried to drug him because they offered him food and drink while he was a guest in their home.58 For Stallworth, the mere presence of Leftist activism suggests criminal activity. Indeed, he expresses a warped view of the relationship between Communists, the Klan, and the police. Stallworth writes that “because of their dedication toward destroying the KKK,” Communists “felt privileged and deserving of preferential treatment” and if police “interfered with their objectives they felt law enforcement was aligned with … the Klan.”59

Stallworth did not confront the contradiction of his efforts to weaken an expressly anti-racist organization. At points, he even belittled the legitimacy of concepts like systemic racism. A scene in the film where Stallworth ponders Dumar's
insights on DuBois’ theory of Double Consciousness suggests a level of introspection absent from his memoir. This lack of self-examination is exemplified in his discussion of the Greensboro Massacre. Near the end of the first edition, he devotes several sentences to the murders of the five Communists. That is the only reference to the Greensboro Massacre. Stallworth did not discuss police and ATF infiltration, similarities or differences to his own operation, or a pattern of violence by the Klan against Communists. In the second popularized edition, Stallworth does not mention Greensboro at all. Much like his infiltration of the PLP, the Flatiron editors deemed the reference to the massacre worthy of erasure. If the goal was, as Riley argues, to strengthen Stallworth as a protagonist, then this edit might have been a necessary one.

Infiltration and Reality in Greensboro
The protagonists of BlacKkKlansman bear little resemblance to their non-fictional counterparts. Edward Dawson was not a trained undercover officer, as seen in Stallworth’s operation. In most cases, informants were members of surveilled organizations flipped by the FBI or local police, or, in the case of Dawson, both. Dawson’s colourful pre-FBI history included two AWOL designations during World War II, a conviction for participation in a 1969 race riot in Swan Quarter, North Carolina, and a conviction for being “armed to the terror of the public,” which was the first such conviction in 200 years in the Tar Heel State. He is the true face of infiltration: a Klansman and violent felon, turned FBI informant, turned police informant, and, finally, turned co-conspirator in the murders of Cesar Cauce, James Waller, William Sampson, Sandra Neely Smith, and Michael Nathan of the CWP.60

In terms of local organizing, the CWP, known as the Workers Viewpoint Organization until October of 1979, concentrated initially on radicalizing Greensboro’s Black textile workers. Over time, their leaders became increasingly focused on anti-Klan activism. The first standoff between the two sides came in July of 1979, when the Communists disrupted a KKK screening of The Birth of a Nation in nearby China Grove. As seen in BlacKkKlansman, the KKK screened the racist epic as a recruitment tool well into the 1970s.61 During the protest, the Communists burned a Confederate flag and chanted “Death to the Klan” directly at the Klansmen. In many respects, the Leftist organizers—most of whom were not from the South originally—were naïve regarding the danger they faced in so openly antagonizing the Klan. After the protest in China Grove ended without major injuries, the organizers grew emboldened in their opposition.62

The CWP organizers soon planned a “Death to the Klan” march, held in Greensboro on November 3, 1979. The slogan “Death to the Klan” was a favourite of the North Carolina radicals, but they were not the only Leftists to use it. In his memoir’s first edition, Stallworth included an INCAR leaflet produced in response to Duke’s arrival in Colorado Springs in early 1978. As one would expect, INCAR saw the Klan as enforcers of capitalist oppression and racial inequality in the US.
The title of this leaflet that Marianne Gilbert gave Stallworth read, simply, “DEATH TO THE KLAN!” While the CWP and the PLP were different organizations, the presence of this same branding in both the West and the South suggests that Communists across the country viewed anti-Klan resistance as an important aspect of the fight against capitalism.

In the weeks leading up to the march, the Workers’ Viewpoint Organization rechristened itself the CWP, removing any doubt about their political affiliations. In a flyer announcing the name change, the organizers mocked local newspapers for fearing the Klan. “The newspapers fanned the Klan wildly and said they were strong and people should be afraid of them,” the flyer proclaimed, “But the Workers Viewpoint Organization said ‘NO, they are weak, two-bit cowards’ … the people showed this to be true by burning the Klan’s flag in front of their very eyes!” The promotion of the march was brazen, with CWP organizers Paul Bermanzohn and Nelson Johnson daring the KKK to attend. Johnson published an open letter to North Carolina Klan leaders in late October, in which he routinely referred to them as “cowards” and “one of the most treacherous scum elements produced by the dying system of capitalism.” While this was not the first time that Communist organizers insulted the Klan in the press, the CWP's invitation of Klansmen to a scheduled rally in a Southern state was among the most provocative acts seen during this long ideological feud. The decision to flaunt the Communist name so openly in and of itself spoke to the CWP’s increasing confidence in their ability to resist the Klan and champion working-class causes in Greensboro. However, the choice also suggested a lack of appreciation for the true depth of anti-communist sentiments in the South or a full understanding of how said anti-communism often strengthened the links between the Klan and law enforcement.

As the “Death to the Klan” rally began, approximately forty Klansmen—and several American Nazi Party members—responded to the CWP’s invitation. Within a few minutes, they opened fire on the crowd, killing five and wounding more than a dozen others. As a condition to receive the parade permit, the Greensboro City Council had passed an edict banning firearms from the rally; as a result, the CWP was outgunned. Additionally, despite receiving advanced warning of the potential for violence, there was no police presence at the rally. The only connection to law enforcement present was a man who shouted, “You Communist son of a bitch, you asked for the Klan, here we are!” at CWP organizer Paul Bermanzohn minutes before a bullet struck him in the head. The man who shouted at Bermanzohn was police informant Edward Dawson.

What set Dawson on his path, and the Greensboro Massacre into motion, was the same force that shaped the events which inspired BlacKkKlansman: COINTELPRO. The tactics employed by Stallworth were the same tactics deployed by COINTELPRO operatives against Dawson and his UKA chapter in the late 1960s. Dawson turned informant for the FBI in 1969 after he was convicted for rioting in
Swan Quarter. He recalled that the UKA did not offer any assistance to pay his court-ordered fine, which irritated him “something furious.” The FBI approached him because, in Dawson’s words, they “figured I was ripe … to become an informant for them.” He accepted the offer and, along with a number of Klansmen, split from the UKA, forming the North Carolina Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.

Elizabeth Wheaton argues that Dawson’s recruitment was emblematic of the tactics routinely employed by the FBI during the COINTELPRO era. The standard approach to the KKK “was to use an informant or undercover agent to create a split to draw members away from an existing group to form a new faction.” This lessened the membership of specific Klaverns and would, in theory, weaken them. According to Wheaton, COINTELPRO tactics aimed at the radical Left “proved far more dangerous,” as demonstrated by the assassination of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton. By the mid-1970s the massive scope of this FBI effort revealed just how entangled the FBI and KKK were. A 1975 Senate investigation discovered that the FBI organized 41 chapters of the KKK in North Carolina alone. Senator Robert Morgan noted that in one Klavern, seven out of the eight members were informants.

Dawson’s Klavern confirms Cunningham’s arguments regarding FBI efforts to “control” the KKK, but it also reflects Riley’s claims about the use of the Klan by law enforcement to surveil Left radicals. Dawson was anticommunist long before his confrontations with the CWP and he made sure his employers at the FBI knew as much. One way in which he showed his anticommunism was similar to the tactics used by Stallworth—infiltrate and surveil local Leftist meetings. In 1974, the informant began attending local meetings of the US Labor Party, which, at that time, espoused Marxist political beliefs and had a small chapter in Greensboro. While they were not technically Communists, Dawson believed they were and relayed information about the group to the FBI, the Greensboro police, and his fellow Klansmen. Dawson even staged a Klan counterprotest to a US Labor Party rally using his inside knowledge, which he designed solely for the purpose of humiliating the supposed Communists. Police protection was heavy at the counterprotest, once again highlighting the close relationship between the KKK and the Greensboro police.

In 1977, following the Senate’s probe into the FBI and the KKK, the FBI fired Dawson, ending their eight-year partnership. While no longer a paid informant, he remained in contact with various agents and local policemen. Interestingly, Dawson remained a member of the KKK into the early 1980s. His continued membership speaks to an aspect of the infiltration process unaccounted for in BlacKkKlansman, one that draws into question its effectiveness as a law enforcement strategy. In theory, informants were intended to misdirect or de-escalate volatile situations, such as Stallworth’s prevention of cross burnings in Colorado Springs. However, when an informant believed in the ideology of the group—as Dawson did—there was little to prevent them from provoking instead of preventing.
The Greensboro Police Department recruited Dawson as an informant in 1979 in response to rising concerns over CWP and KKK antagonism. Much like his years as an FBI informant, he remained committed to the Klan and was heavily involved in planning their response to the “Death to the Klan” rally. Many Klansmen stated in interviews that Dawson cautioned them about the potential for a brawl with the Communists, but also told them “it was our patriotic duty and that everybody should go.” By his own admission, Dawson responded to questions about firearms by telling the men, “I am not your father, I cannot tell you to bring guns, or not to bring guns.” He even personally designed the Klan’s anti-CWP poster, which warned “COMMUNISTS, RACE MIXERS and BLACK RIOTERS” that “Even now the cross-hairs are on the back of YOUR necks.” On the day of the march, he took charge of the Klan’s preparations, even rushing the caravan to their rendezvous point to arrive early. The justification for police surveillance is typically that the intelligence gathered by law enforcement is used to prevent violence, but in the case of Dawson and the Greensboro Massacre, surveillance served no such purpose. Instead, every action taken by the seasoned informant that day hastened violence.

Dawson’s allegiances were no secret to the police. FBI depositions conducted after the killings summarized one Greensboro officer’s view of Dawson as follows: “Mr. [Herb] Belvin … stated that he thought this was an extraordinarily strange type of person to use as an informant since he so clearly believed in the policies of the KKK and advocated their policies.”73 Much as COINTELPRO did in the 1960s, the department tolerated his violent and racist tendencies in exchange for intelligence. Dawson warned both his police and FBI contacts of the looming violence, but those with authority never interceded.

CWP survivors viewed the State as complicit in the Massacre, pointing to the complete lack of police presence at their rally as evidence. Floris Caton Cauce, whose husband Cesar lay dead, shouted at the news cameras present that the “Klan and the State got together and planned this, that’s why there were not no cops here … The State protects the Klan and this makes it clear.” Another grieving protester remarked similarly, asserting that the “police did this, directly or indirectly. They set it up.” When local police finally arrived, and began arresting survivors, the Communists had what they saw as confirmation of a conspiracy between the State and the KKK.74

Much occurred in the years after the Massacre that suggests the CWP cries of conspiracy were accurate. The police distanced themselves from Dawson but, by 1983, Nelson Johnson obtained FBI documents confirming Dawson’s informant status. Johnson eventually sent his documents to the grand jury himself after the Justice Department refused their introduction as evidence.75 The courts gave the CWP little reason not to view the government and the Klan as aligned. In both state (1980) and federal (1984) criminal trials, all-white juries found the accused not guilty on all charges. Paul Bermanzohn expressed the survivors’ pessimism and dis-
illusionment with the legal system, stating “I think they were trying to keep the Klan and Nazis silent with not guilty verdicts.” A leaflet titled “Fight Greensboro ‘Justice’” articulated the Left reaction best: “When the Nazis march hundreds of riot-equipped police protect them, while the Left is allowed to be attacked and ... systematically killed.” Much like the usage of COINTELPRO tactics, the decisions of the federal and state courts regarding the Greensboro Massacre placed it into conversation with Stallworth’s operation. Throughout both KKK infiltration efforts, no Klansmen ever served time in prison. Additionally, Stallworth devoted an entire chapter to his time as David Duke’s personal bodyguard during his visit to Colorado. Yet, he had no anecdotes about his efforts to protect the rights and safety of PLP members.

Conclusion: Contemporary Reckoning with Infiltration
The confrontation of the Klan in Greensboro gained newfound significance after the 2017 Unite the Right rally. Aspects of direct confrontations and street fights between white supremacists and Leftists during political protests from 2017 to 2020 bear similarities to the events of 1979. Not only have disproportionate amounts of violence and death been perpetrated on antiracist protesters, but they have been carried out by a combination of right-wing groups and branches of local, state, and federal law enforcement. In October of 2020, the Greensboro City Council passed a resolution which offered a formal apology for the Massacre. It also included an acknowledgement of the Greensboro Police Department’s failure to act or stop the events, despite the extensive information Dawson provided them regarding the likelihood of violence.

Former CWP organizers Nelson Johnson and Signe Waller referred to the City Council’s statement as “an official apology of substance” in the months following the resolution. Their short essay is the most recent analysis of the Massacre and its relationship to the longer story of law enforcement enabling white nationalist violence. Much as Lee did with BlacKkKlansman, Nelson and Waller use Klan violence in the 1970s to contextualize modern white nationalism. The authors argue that the 2017 rally in Charlottesville, the murder of George Floyd by the Minneapolis Police, armed far-Right protesters entering the Michigan State House, and the failed plot to kidnap Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer all highlight the State’s preferential treatment towards white nationalists in much the same way that the CWP experienced in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Whereas Lee distanced the police from racism and anticommunism in his film, Waller and Johnson highlighted the complicity of the State in recent examples of far-Right violence.

While Johnson and Waller link law enforcement and white supremacy, they fall into a similar trap as Stallworth did in his memoir: a lack of true critical engagement with their past tactics. Works produced by the survivors, such as the recent survivors’ essay or the previous works of Waller and the Bermanzohns, focus more on State repression than on the CWP’s approaches or potential shortcomings as
antiracist organizers. For example, while the CWP sought to organize predominantly Black and working-class textile workers, the organizers themselves were mostly white, highly educated, and originally from outside the American South. This is not to say that they could not or should not have organized Greensboro textile mills, but these identity issues raise questions about how intimately they understood the scope of Southern anticommunism and its dangers. Beyond the risk that anti-Klan organizing placed them in, the CWP’s fixation on the Klan put the people of colour they sought to organize at greater risk. The flyers produced before the “Death to the Klan” rally showed a disconnect between the Klan’s capacity for violence and the CWP’s understanding of the Klan’s violent history.

Yet, four decades after the fact, there is little attempt by the survivors to analyze, challenge, or justify their decision making regarding their rally or the danger it brought upon the working-class community of colour the CWP sought to uplift. The juxtaposition in the recent essay between Charlottesville and Greensboro amplifies their similarities, but there are differences as well. The Unite the Right rally was an event planned by white nationalists that various antiracist groups counterprotested. The event’s occurrence was beyond the control of the counterprotesters and they were aware of the danger. They took the risk to attend and stand as allies. On the other hand, the “Death to the Klan” rally was not planned by the Right, but by the Left. The CWP organized it, obtained a permit from the city government, broadcasted its date, time, and location, invited the community, dared the Klan to attend, and reassured the potential attendees of safety by declaring the Klan cowards. The only aspect of this addressed in the recent essay is the permit, which the authors mention because “the police acted unconstitutionally to disarm the marchers by banning weapons as a condition for obtaining the parade permit.”

The authors saw this as an unconstitutional decision by the police, but it occurred days before the rally. This action was proof that the Greensboro Police Department would not protect the rights of the CWP. For organizers with roots in the South and an understanding of how anticommunism influenced both police and Klansmen in the region, this ultimatum may have caused contemplation. Yet, the CWP agreed and went forward with the rally, making minimal alterations to ensure the protection of the marginalized groups they sought to aid.

In truth, aside from its lack of killings, the events in Charlottesville bear greater similarity to the Workers’ Viewpoint Organization’s earlier protest in China Grove, North Carolina. In China Grove, there were not attempts to work within the confines of the State by obtaining permits and no one placed families of colour unknowingly at risk. This event was a Communist-organized counter-protest of a Klan event, thus an event where those in attendance knew the risks. They stood as allies in defiance of the Klan and did so in a way that did not turn a marginalized neighbourhood into a warzone. Yet there is no mention of the earlier China Grove protest in their essay, nor do they reflect on their methods as labour and antiracist organizers. Instead, Johnson and Waller focus on placing Greensboro into the con-
text of the long struggle against fascism. This endeavour is incomplete without also grappling with the CWP’s place in the long struggle of Communist organizers with the race question.  

While the sacrifices of the CWP organizers speak to their belief in antiracism, the truth remains that they invited the KKK to the doorsteps of poor Black textile workers and their families. One could just as easily ask if the “Death to the Klan” rally was as concerned with Black life as it was with organizing working-class power. This is not meant to demean those targeted in the Greensboro Massacre, but rather to once again argue for the importance of a full accounting of the ways the Left, the Right, and the State interact with one another. Much as was the case with BlacKkKlansman, creating perfect protagonists may hide questions that could have important answers. Liberation movements necessarily struggle and encounter resistance, but they only grow through honest reflection on said struggles and resistance.

Riley wrote that, “Without the made-up stuff and with what we know of the actual history of police infiltration into radical groups, and how they infiltrated and directed white supremacist organizations to attack those groups, Ron Stallworth is the villain.” Stallworth may not be the villain that Dawson was, but the practice of infiltration was one that curtailed the freedoms of people of colour and radical Leftists. In the film, white supremacy is defined by white nationalist fringe groups, but the lived experiences of people of colour show that white supremacy has always been mainstream. The KKK and law enforcement should not be understood as intrinsic opponents, but rather critiqued as the legal and extralegal arms of the same white supremacist system. A dissection of the similarities between Greensboro and Colorado Springs shows that the legacies of COINTELPRO pervaded them similarly: namely, a fixation on the Left. This comparison is not meant to tear down the film; instead, the comparison works to raise concerns about what the film obscures regarding the continued ambivalence—even comradery—shown by police towards white nationalists as well as their disdain for those perceived as radical Leftists.

White nationalists’ resistance to change fuels their hatred of Leftists, but it does not place them in opposition to the structures of the State. In the weeks following the insurrectionary mob invasion of the US Capitol Building on January 6, 2021, numerous media reports highlighted a Confederate battle flag breaching the building for the first time. However, the mob brought more police badges than Confederate flags. Off-duty police from around the nation brought them in the belief that they would signal the mob’s common cause with the Capitol Hill police and ease their charge into the building. Viewers and readers of BlacKkKlansman might have been surprised to see these supposed foes harmoniously storming the government live on television. What has received less analysis in the media than the flag was a sign at the front of the mob as it broke through the final line of resistance on the Capitol steps. In black and red lettering it read, “the real invisible
enemy is communism.” Simply put, the KKK fits the status quo of the political and economic system in the US, while Marxism does not. This has allowed white nationalists to act as extralegal red squads throughout the twentieth century and it has sustained the State’s tolerance of violence from the radical Right. BlacKkKlanSman may have pulled the hoods from some Klansmen, but it left the veil that conceals their connection to the State.
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