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Power Revealed: 
Masking police officers in the public sphere

‘I can see how it would be nice for the police if the officer turned up to the inquest in his civilian clothes’
(Paul King cited in the Guardian 2010).

Demonstrations which spill over into conflict have always required the police to distinguish between members of the public exercising their right to protest, and members of the public engaging in criminal activity, i.e. between ‘good protesters’ and ‘bad protesters’ (Della Porta et al, 2006). Journalists, who have traditionally depended heavily upon official sources when constructing news narratives, have historically reproduced these distinctions (Hall et al, 1978) and, as a result, images of violent protesters have frequently been used to delegitimize protester’s claims (Juris, 2005). These processes of legitimation lie at the heart of public order policing (Waddington, 1999) as they take place on our streets, and are covered in our newspapers.

In this article I will explore the way in which police, rather than protesters or victims of police brutality, have been pictured in the coverage of protest. I will illustrate these augments by focusing on the news coverage of the trial and eventual acquittal of Simon Harwood, the police officer who was pictured pushing Ian Tomlinson to the ground during the G20 demonstrations which took place in London in the spring of 2009\(^1\). Photography, specifically analogue photography, has traditionally made a claim to standing as quasi-scientific ‘evidence of the external world’ (Winston, 1998, p.53). While the advent of digital photography has in many ways sundered the physical connection between the image and the world, the image remains a peculiarly persuasive form of communication.

The coverage under consideration in this article was underpinned by a drama of concealment and disclosure which focused on three interrelated images; Harwood’s uniform, his masked face and his lack of identity tags. The importance of the visual in this incidence is indicated by the lack of traction generated by the solely textual accounts which circulated in the immediate aftermath of Ian Tomlinson’s death. Consequently I will argue that arriving at a ‘common understanding’ (Taylor, 2003, p.23) of social unrest requires us to examine the way in which the police, as well as protesters are made visible in the public sphere.

---

\(^1\) The Guardian’s video of this assault can be found here https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HECMVdl-9SQ&feature=channel_page?
Thompson’s seminal article on the food riots of eighteenth century Europe rejected the notion of social unrest as mere ‘rebellions of the belly’ (Ashton and Sykes, 1929, p.131) and questioned the prevailing understating of social disturbances as being ‘compulsive, rather than self-conscious’ (1971, p.77). He argues that

‘The men and women in the crowd were informed by the belief that they were defending traditional rights and customs; and in general, that they were supported by the wider consensus of the community’ (1971 p. 78)

Thompson calls ‘the wider consensus of the community’ a ‘legitimising notion’ (1971 p. 78) and draws upon a wide range of eighteenth century stories and songs to illustrate the way in which this wider consensus was made manifest. The stories and songs which rang out through eighteenth century popular culture have been replaced in the twenty first century by an intricate network of words and images.

Stafford points out that there is a long and sophisticated line of thought which differentiates between ‘imagery used as equivalents to discourse (or as illustration)’ and imagery used as ‘an untranslatable constructive form of cognition (as an expression)’ (1996, p. 27). According to this second definition, images should be understood not as empty displays of visual rhetoric but as acts of meaning making in themselves. Consequently, the images that accompany the articles we read in our papers and on our screens should not be understood as transparent windows on the world but as ‘the site for the construction and depiction of social difference’ (Fyfe and Law 1988, p.1). As such images play a central role in the formation of consensus within the wider political community.

In recent years, the relationship between images of protest action and public legitimation has been transformed by the advent of mobile technologies. The police once enjoyed sole access to a complex network of aerial surveillance units and closed-circuit television cameras, which they used to monitor the movements of protesters. However, protesters now carry the means to capture and distribute images of the police in their pockets, in the form of a mobile phone. This has enabled protesters to turn the lens upon the police during public demonstrations and, in doing so, has democratised the ability to surveil (Mann et al, 2003). As such, the mobile phone could be read a part of an empowering ground swell of technologies that have transformed the organisation, manifestation and representation of protest in the public sphere (Castells, 1996 Bennett and Segerberg, 2012). This transformation goes beyond the technological affordances offered by mobile technologies. Pictures taken by
protesters require professional journalists to extend their investigations beyond the usual sources identified by authors such as Halloran et al (1970) and Gitlin (1980). In this way ‘the increased gaze of the media’ has forced police, protesters and, indeed, journalists to ‘be more accountable for their actions in the eyes of the public’ (Zajko and Belan, 2008 p.722).

The increasing number of high profile investigations into the policing of protest in the UK and beyond, mean that police officers are now being subjected to distinctions, in both courts of law and in the court of public opinion, between ‘good police officers’ and ‘bad police officers’. Thus it will focus on the way in which the police appear before others with specific reference to the way in which this has been shaped by mediated visibility in both online and offline media. In doing so, this article will draw on my previous research on the role of mobile technologies in the coverage of Ian Tomlinson’s death (Author, 2015). It will also develop an understanding of the role that masks play in the public sphere by examining the increasing prevalence of images of masked police officers (Ruiz, 2013).

These dynamics will be examined through an exploration of the news narratives surrounding the death of Ian Tomlinson in 2009 and the trial and eventual acquittal of PC Harwood in 2012. It will focus in particular on the role played by images produced by mobile phones and CCTV as they circulated through traditional and new media. These images (and the articles they accompanied) focused on police officer’s uniform, their use of balaclavas and/or riot visors, and their failure to wear identity tags. In the following section I will explore each of these visual tropes in turn.

**News Narratives and the Death of Ian Tomlinson**

Tomlinson died during the G20 demonstrations, which took place in central London on the 1st of April, 2009. Initially he was reported to have died of natural causes, but mobile phone images made public in the Guardian on the 7th of April showed Tomlinson being knocked to the ground by an unidentified officer. On the 9th of April, Harwood was identified as the officer pictured striking and then pushing Tomlinson. As a consequence of these images a second (and then third) autopsy was conducted and an inquest subsequently attributed Tomlinson’s death to the use of force which was ‘not reasonable, proportionate and necessary’ (IPCC Report, 2011). Harwood was tried but acquitted of manslaughter in the summer of 2012. After his acquittal it was discovered that Harwood had been the subject of ten official complaints, none of which had ‘been dealt with properly’ (IPCC Statement, 2012). A year later in 2013 the Metropolitan Police Force apologized ‘unreservedly’ for their behavior,
dismissed Harwood for gross misconduct and paid the Tomlinson family an undisclosed sum in settlement.

My analysis of the online and offline coverage surrounding the death of Tomlinson and the trial of Harwood is based on a corpus of media coverage from April 2009 to November 2012. Nexis was used to generate two samples from all the national newspapers. The first sample used ‘Tomlinson’ and ‘Police’ as its search terms and covered the period between Tomlinson’s death and Harwood identification. The second sample used ‘Tomlinson’ and ‘Harwood’ as its search terms and covered the period between Harwood’s identification and the Metropolitan Police Force’s decision to issue a formal apology to the Tomlinson family. These searches were conducted in the early spring of 2016. These samples were supplemented by an examination of the corresponding online and offline coverage produced by the newspapers in order to access the requisite images.

The research presented in this article draws upon a number of methodological approaches. I began by conducting a broad thematic analysis of the whole sample. This enabled me to identify key issues such as violence, concealment, and the restoration of order, and to examine the ways in which they were constructed in both mainstream and alternative accounts. I then narrowed down my focus and conducted a discourse analysis which was based upon far smaller units of analysis, for example words and phrases associated with transparency and/or cleanliness. I combined this two-step approach with a semiotic analysis of the images accompanying the offline and online texts. This combination of methodological approaches enabled me to explore the ways in which the coverage of Tomlinson’s death and Harwood’s trial actively constructed the events which it appeared to ‘merely describe’ (Carey, 2009, p.15).

The news narrative shifted over the three and a half year period between April 2009 and November 2012. It began as a story about the death of an individual during a public demonstration but became one about misconduct within the Metropolitan Police Force. As such, it can be read as a political scandal in which a ‘second order transgression’ assumes a ‘much greater significance than the original offence’ (Thompson 2000, p.17). In these instances J.B. Thompson maintains that

‘since non-participant knowledge is a necessary condition of scandal, scandals are often characterized by a drama of concealment and disclosure.’ (2000, p.18)

The news narratives surrounding the death of Tomlinson and subsequent trial and acquittal of Harwood was punctuated by a series of revelatory moments. These included but were not limited to the publication of the original mobile
phone footage, the identification of errors in the first pathology report, the identification of Harwood as the officer that pushed Tomlinson and the publication of Harwood’s pre-existing complaints record.

The dynamics of ‘making public or making visible’ (Thompson, 2000, p,19) emerged in the language of journalists covering the developing scandal. Headlines in the period immediately after Tomlinson’s death began by describing police behavior as ‘misleading’ or ‘sanitized’, however over time these descriptions were replaced by the repeated use of terms such as ‘substantially false’ and ‘a crude deceit’ (Ruiz, 2015). The articles accompanying these headlines are characterized by the repeated use of terms such as ‘withholding’, ‘concealing’, ‘scrutiny’, ‘cover-up’ and ‘whitewash’. This lexicon is accompanied by a series of visual images to which I will now turn.

Protester, bystander and even individual police accounts of the demonstration had already verbally contradicted the official police accounts of events. As early as the April 5th, the broadsheets were reporting that witness had seen Tomlinson being ‘rushed from behind by a riot officer with a helmet’ (Observer, 2009). Moreover, four days before the mobile phone footage was publically released – in other words on or around the 5th of April – three police constables had told their senior officers that they had seen Tomlinson being ‘struck with a baton and pushed to the ground’ (Guardian, 2012). However, these verbal accounts failed to gain traction within the wider public sphere and these testimonies were only legitimized once they were made visible as a series of images.

The grainy images taken from CCTV cameras and mobile phones spread out across a variety of different media platforms. Initially they appeared on alternative websites of media activists keen to challenge the police narratives such as Bristle’s Blog from the BunKRS, Total Banker and Bloggerheads². However, when they were admitted in court as evidence they became a central feature of more mainstream news narratives. Indeed, the way in which Tomlinson’s ‘slow progress’ was ‘captured’ by ‘shaky hand held amateur video’ ‘in forensic detail’ creating a ‘montage’ or ‘compilation’ of images or ‘brief glimpses’ (Guardian, June 20th 2012; Guardian, May 4th 2011; Guardian, June 19th 2012) became a mainstay of the story as it developed over time. In this way, a proliferation of digital images was assembled in order to be reattached to the ‘real world’ in a complex process of coding, decoding and re-coding across

---

² These alternative news narratives sprung upon these websites in the immediate aftermath of Tomlinson’s death and pieced together a well-documented alternative account of the demonstration.
different media platforms which ultimately led to the delegitimization of the role played by the police during the G20 demonstrations.

In a letter published shortly after Harwood was cleared of killing Tomlinson, the former Metropolitan Police Commissioner Sir Ian Blair\(^3\) identifies ‘public sympathy’ as the ‘principal weapon’ used by police officers attempting to maintain order during public demonstrations (Times, 2012). He goes on to write

> The British system of controlling disturbances was, and is, designed to emphasis police legitimacy, as citizens in uniform struggle with other citizens without recourse to specific weaponry (Times, 2012).

This understanding of the relationship between members of the police force and members of the public depends upon the idea of reciprocity between officers and citizens (Zajko and Beland, 2008 p.722). However this understanding of the police as citizens in uniform is highly problematic. A police officer enjoys rights and has responsibilities that are not afforded to citizens more widely. For example police officers, unlike citizens, are able to stop, search, question and detain. Police officers also have recourse to very specific weaponry, namely cuffs, batons and sprays, while the police force as an institution has recourse to a plethora of other weapons including reinforced vehicles, taser guns, water cannon, etc.

**Uniformed Police Officer in the Public Sphere**

These important power differentials are signaled to the wider public by a police officer’s uniform. Much of the news coverage surrounding Tomlinson’s death used Harwood’s uniform to frame his behavior. For example, the Guardian describes images in which Tomlinson can be seen ‘receiving a blow from a uniformed arm’ (20th 2012). Similarly revelations about Harwood’s previous acts of misconduct are also couched in terms of uniform. Thus, the Guardian states that Harwood ‘allegedly punched, throttled, knee and threatened other suspects while in uniform …’ (Guardian, 19th July 2012). Furthermore, an editorial in the People uses uniform to highlight the breakdown in reciprocity between police and citizens pointing out that ‘we can’t have one section of society jailed for breaking the rules and others protected just because they’re wearing uniform…’ (July 22nd, 2012).

---

\(^3\) Sir Ian Blair’s view is particularly significant because he was the Metropolitan Police Commissioner at the time of Ian Tomlinson’s death.
Surveys indicate that a ‘police officer’s uniform conveys impressions of safety, competence, reliability and intelligence’ (Balkin and Houlden 1983, Singer and Singer 1985 both cited in Johnson 2005 p. 58). Joseph and Alex point out that ‘by permitting the use of its uniform, a group certifies an individual as its representative and assumes responsibility for his actions’ (1972, p.723). They go on to argue that this assumption of responsibility means that the wearer of a uniform is ... not normally permitted the means used by ordinary citizens to express attitude’ (1972, p.722). In other words, the use of a uniform backgrounds the individuality of the wearer. This masking of individuality has two consequences that are of relevance to the discussion in this article.

Firstly, granting primacy to the institution rather than the individual offers the wearer of a uniform a significant degree of personal anonymity. Anonymity has regularly been framed as problematic in relation to protesters. For example Fernandez quotes a police lieutenant in Washington who argued that ‘a person who feels anonymous in a march or protest is the person that is more likely to do a violent act or improper conduct’ (2009, p.119). However, these dynamics can just as easily be applied to police charged with the management of protest. Indeed recognition of these dynamics underpins calls for police in the UK and the US to be equipped with body cameras which ‘enhance police legitimacy and transparency’ (Barak, A. et al, 2014, p.510)

Secondly, the institutional requirement for visual uniformity inevitably highlights any breaches of this protocol. It was quickly noted that the uniform worn by the police officer later identified as Harwood differed from the officers around him. As the Guardian put it

‘one man stood out. He was the only officer with no shield and with a badge number missing. His face was covered with a balaclava and his baton poised on his left shoulder...’

This is significant because ‘Deviation in the uniform entails tampering with the legitimacy of symbols. ... implying that the group is not in control of its own process of certification’ (Joseph and Alex, 1972, p.724). This sense of a lack of control was further exacerbated when, in the early stages of the investigation, the police attempted to account for these deviations by suggesting that the officer in the video was in fact a ‘protester in a policeman’s uniform...’ (Daily Mirror 2012). This suggestion was widely ridiculed in the public sphere and contributed to the impression that the Metropolitan Police Force were neither in control of their officers nor the news narrative about their officers.

According to Joseph and Alex
The uniform masks the wearer’s status much more visibly than other types of dress: it minimises the possibility of confusing members with non-members (1972 p.722).

In this instance the discrepancy between the uniform worn by Harwood and the officers around him created a visual glitch that set him apart from the wider public but which failed to incorporate him seamlessly into the police force. Thus, the then anonymous Harwood is described as ‘standing out’ (Guardian 2011) and being ‘easily identifiable’ (Guardian 2011) because his ‘distinctive dress which marked him apart from the other officers’ (Guardian 2011).

**Masked Police officers in the Public Sphere**

The images of uniformed police officers fanning out across Threadneedle Street were made particularly troubling by the fact that the faces of many of the officers (including Harwood) were masked. This is an aspect of the incident that is mentioned repeatedly by all of the papers. For example, the Independent describes Harwood as wearing ‘a balaclava up to his nose and a helmet’ (Independent, 2012) while the Guardian describes his face as ‘covered with a balaclava’ (Guardian 2011). This was/is by no means unusual as regulation issue balaclavas and/or police helmets frequently hide the faces of police officers during public demonstrations. However, the Metropolitan Police Force’s inability to account for the actions of the as-yet unidentified Harwood made these usually unnoticed dynamics acutely visible.

As Castells points out, ‘the simplest message is the human face… it is the symbolic embodiment of a message of trust around a person, around the character of the person’ (2007, p238). Police officers use of riot helmets not only backgrounds the identity of the individual wearer, but it actively prevents the observer from identifying the individual officers. Consequently the images accompanying articles covering the death of Tomlinson and the trial and acquittal of Harwood constructed a visual paradox. The officers in the time-stamped freeze-frames that appeared on the front pages of the broadsheet papers called attention to their collective role in the maintenance of public order through their use of high-vis jackets, whilst also and at the same time concealing the identity of the individual officers whose everyday policing practices enacted the enforcement of order. The paradoxical dynamic between visibility and invisibility here was encapsulated by the evidence given by the American businessman who took the original mobile phone footage. Christopher La Jaunie
was reported as telling the court ‘I saw who it was, I couldn’t see his face’ (Guardian, 2011).

Historically masks have been used to reveal the usually unnoticed power dynamics that underpin classical models of the public sphere (Johnson, 2001). More recently very differently orientated protesters, such as the Zapatistas in Mexico, black blok activists in Europe and digital activists in cyberspace, have used masks to reveal the ways in which they have been excluded from the public sphere (Ruiz, 2013). In this way protesters have used masks to reveal the hidden dynamics of exclusion which usually frame their (non) appearance within the public sphere. This understanding of masks challenges the usual enlightenment-based view of masks as a barrier to communications and suggests that they can be seen as a communicative route through which alternative truths can be told in mainstream public spaces. In this way masks can be read not as a barrier to communication, but as a transformative threshold which challenges and unsettles pre-existing notions of legitimation.

However, the police’s use of masks does not share this revelatory potential. Their use differs significantly from the way in which protesters have used masks. Johnson points out that the physicality of masks worn during the French revolution draws attention to the act of concealment and, in doing so, the reasons behind the act of concealment. Thus, he argues that

Masks thwart disguise. Disguise hides its ‘masks’. Masks hide a true identity in a visible way. Disguise asserts an identity, a false identity, but the concealment is concealed.
(Johnson, 2001, p.96)

However, the masking of police officer’s faces is positioned as a utilitarian rather than a symbolic act. Thus whilst Sir Ian Blair acknowledges that these uniforms ‘dehumanize and separate’ the police from protesters (2012) he nevertheless argues the use of riot gear is necessary as a form of protection. This was an argument developed in court by Harwood who argued that he wore a balaclava ‘for health and safety reasons’ (Guardian, 2011) and in order to protect himself from ‘possible fires in the area’ (Guardian, 2011) In this way, whilst the indigenous trimmings on a Zapatistas balaclava or the bright colors of a Pussy Riot balaclava draw attention to the act of concealment (Ruiz, 2013), the apparent utility of the police balaclava masks the act of masking, making it sinister rather than revelatory.

Unidentified Police Officers in the Public Sphere
The dehumanizing (some might say even threatening) aspects of a police officer’s uniform are compounded by the way in which riot helmets mask police officers’ faces. This provided the context for the third recurring image under consideration in this article; the police’s failure to consistently wear identity tags. Police officers are required to wear identity tags on their shoulders or breast at all times while they are on duty. They are also required to inform members of the public whom they seek to question or detain of their name, number and station. Activists have frequently complained that the police do not do this. Speigal describes this as ‘retreating in to anonymity’ and points out that this makes ‘it impossible for charges to be bought against them’ (2015, p.791). Harwood was not wearing his identity tags in any of the footage taken on April 1st 2009, claiming that it had been ‘inadvertently dislodged’ during the demonstration (Guardian, 2001).

Whilst protesters’ complaints about police officers’ lack of identity tags had, in the past, failed to gain traction within mainstream media accounts of protest, the need to scrutinize the behaviors of the police now became a central concern. For example a second officer’s lack of identification epaulettes played a central role in the coverage of an assault that took place during the vigil held for Tomlinson on April 2nd. This concern extended beyond the G20 protests, and can be illustrated by the Daily Mail which carried an article about officers at a Tamil protest4 ‘defying a direct order by Met Commissioner Sir Paul Stephenson to display the numbers on their uniforms’ (2009). The Guardian conveyed the concerns expressed by many commentators when it suggested that the police were routinely carrying out their duties with ‘their faces covered, their numbers covered, acting for the state but unaccountable’ (Guardian, 2011).

Articles on public order policing in general and the death of Tomlinson in particular were regularly accompanied by images in which red or white circles were used to highlight the previously unremarkable behaviours of police officers. These circles were used to pinpoint the precise moment in which force was enacted upon Tomlinson, or the discrepancies between masked officers uniform, or the blank space in which officer’s identity tag should have been visible (as seen in figure 1 below). In this way images in the news coverage focused on the actions of individual officers, highlighting their failings with the sort of circle of shame more commonly used by celebrity magazines to highlight the moments in which their subjects are captured ‘off-guard’, ‘unkempt’ (Holmes, 2010, p. 21).

4 Clashes between police and protesters demanding an end to the war in Sri Lanka took place outside the Houses of Parliament on the 7th of April 2009.
This imbued images of Tomlinson and Harwood with a particular potency that immediately unsettled the narrative. Moreover the use of aerial images and Google maps to pinpoint the location of key events and the movements of key officers (BBC, 2009) disturbed the usual flow of the news narrative. Similarly, the flow of time was visually paused, stopped and re-started by the use of event lines that were punctuated with time-stamped images leading up to the moment that Tomlinson was pushed. The moment of contact was further isolated by the repeated use of freeze-frame images which both fragmented and extended the moment in which the as yet unidentified Harwood transgressed the boundaries of acceptable public order policing (Guardian, 2009). Significantly, the images under consideration here were often gathered from CCTV cameras that recorded indiscriminately or from the phone cameras of passers-by that recorded disinterestedly. As such, this footage tapped into ‘the higher truth of the stolen image’ (Sekula 1984, p.29) in which awkward composition, frozen movement and imprecise focus lend authenticity to the non-posed image.

**Isolating Police Officers in the Public Sphere**

The circles which appeared in the coverage of the death of Tomlinson can be read as purifying acts of containment. Mary Douglas argues that

> There is no such thing as absolute dirt: It exists in the eye of the beholder...Dirt offends against order. Eliminating it is not a negative moment, but a positive effort to organize the environment.
> Douglas, 1966, p2

Like the stories and songs of the 18th century these images and texts offered a range of interpretative devices which ordinary people used to arrive at a common understanding. For example, while the Independent on Sunday stressed that Harwood was ‘not the miraculous self-invention of a lone operator’ (2012), the Daily Mail positioned him as a ‘rogue officer’ (2012), while the Times described him as ‘effectively freelance’ (2010). The People sought to reassure its readership by claiming that ‘for every lout there are scores of decent officers ...’ (July 22 2012. While the use of circles highlighted moments in which police misconduct became publically visible, these images also isolated and contain the behaviors of individual ‘bad’ officers. In this way the articles and images which

---

5 Figure one circulated widely during this period and is taken, in this instance, from the Daily Mail http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1168315/Hundreds-protesters-march-silence-man-died-G20-protests.html
constituted the coverage of Tomlinson's death and Harwood's trial contributed to the organization of the wider publics understanding of public order policing.

Jackson, Monk and Gilmore point out ‘most representations of police violence reduce it to the work of bad apples, acknowledging only that individual officers may have over-stepped the mark... the institutional and systemic violence that is, and always has been, at the heart of the police project remains obscured’ (2016, p.90). This is a dynamic that emerged shortly before the inquest when the Metropolitan Police Force suggested that Harwood seek voluntary retirement. Interestingly, this was a move opposed by the families of both Tomlinson and Harwood on the grounds that any responsibility for the death of Tomlinson should be accepted by the police force as a whole rather than by an individual officer. Harwood was eventually visually and materially expelled from the police force. This act of isolation and individualization preserved the purity of the police force more generally enabling the Metropolitan Police Force to re-impose a narrative in which the police are once again understood as ‘citizens in uniform’ (Blair, 2012). This ‘resolution’ was signaled by the Independent Press Complaints Commission when it stated that having been held accountable for his actions Harwood would ‘never again wear a police uniform’ (IPCC Statement, 2012).

Power Revealed

As outlined above, three tropes came to characterize the images constructing the public debate surrounding the death of Ian Tomlinson at the hands of PC Harwood during the G20 Protests. These images made visible the ‘drama of concealment and disclosure’ at the heart of the scandal and shifted the parameters of the ‘common understanding’ (Taylor, 2003, p.23) or ‘wider consensus’ (Thomson, 1971, p.78) which underpinned the legitimacy of the Metropolitan Police Force. The newly public nature of these dynamics ran through Blair’s open letter which focused on the way in which ‘police operations in public space’ were increasingly observable ‘here and all over the world’ (Times, 2012). Moreover in his view the political potency of these images was exacerbated by the ease with which they could be reproduced and then circulated. Thus Blair focused on the way in which these images were available to ‘film and replay’ and could be ‘played back again and again...’ underlying the importance of the ways in which both protest and public order policing is pictured (Times, 2012).

The police’s apparent lack of control over the process of identification in relation to Harwood, combined with journalists’ initially uncritical construction of a substantially false narrative, created an information vacuum which was quickly filled by citizen investigators. In the days after the appearance of the video
footage on the Guardian website, a forensic piecing together of evidence took place online. This effort was later replicated in the inquest into Tomlinson’s death and the criminal proceedings against Harwood. This collective effort worked towards constructing a series of images that challenged the police’s interpretation of the world as it was initially presented to journalists in the media and citizens in the wider world. The images produced through mobile technologies and circulated through social networks foregrounded three interrelated anonymity tropes – the use of uniform, the masking of individuality and the failure to use identity tags. The circulation of these images produced by mobile technologies extended the visibility usually afforded to the public and subjected police and journalists to the processes of (de) legitimization which are more commonly experienced by protesters.
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