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Before the digital era, media outlets were centralized hubs in an analog news network. Each outlet gathered information and broadcast it to people reading newspapers, listening to radios, or watching television—perceived as a mass audience of individuals who were isolated from one another (Castells, 1996; McQuail, 2000). The revenue-earning power of each outlet was determined geographically by the size of its audience, which constituted the outlet’s advertising distribution footprint. The business model was based on selling classified advertising and display advertising to cover the cost of providing news products to audiences. Fierce competition among media organizations and even among mastheads of the same organization to scoop new stories meant there was rarely cooperation within or among media companies or organizations. Under these business conditions, collaborating with another media outlet was synonymous with giving away one’s product to business rivals. It was not considered tenable.
The advent of the network society (Castells, 1996, 2007, 2011)—if it has not completely overthrown geolocated media—at least has changed the role of media outlets (Peters & Broersma, 2013). Now that audiences can source news easily and cheaply from anywhere in the world, the value of geographic location is much diminished. Traditional concepts of rivalry over local or regional audience numbers are expanding to encompass potentially global audiences. Under these conditions, organizational collaboration (having staff from multiple organizations work on a story together and agreeing on the timing and content of the publication and/or broadcast) is now a potential benefit. This process did not exist to any great extent until recent years. Journalists, and investigative reporters in particular, have usually operated on a lone-wolf model, with each reporter working on news leads supplied by a trusted network of contacts. Reporters’ employers coveted exclusive stories, which underpinned their marketing edge and thus their financial viability.

Journalists, however, have never been as highly connected with one another, with readers, and with news sources as they are today (Alfter, 2015). Collaboration has long been recognized as a technique for achieving synergistic results in the fields of scientific and medical research, industry, artistic endeavors, political movements, and many other areas of human activity (Cardoso, 2012; Castells, 1996). Collaboration between reporters and between media outlets is beginning to emerge as an important tool for carrying out routine journalism in the networked media environment (Gearing, 2016, p. 279), although its adoption is still slow due to professional conservatism. Digitization is somewhat Janus-faced. While it has weakened many media masthead newspapers, it has also facilitated collaborations that are presenting opportunities for journalism to continue in its watchdog role and extend its impact globally (Ronderos & Lipstas, 2016).

**Theorizing the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists**

An important example of a developing form of collaborative journalism spanning national and continental borders is the work of the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ), which is known for journalistic investigations such as the Luxembourg Leaks and the Panama and Paradise Papers revelations. Our purpose in this article is to improve our understanding of the political, professional, and scholarly implications of this kind of investigative work by theorizing the emergence and role of the ICIJ. An important reason for doing this is that we are experiencing a gap between, on the one hand, academic theories about emerging forms of journalism such as collaborative journalism and, on the other hand, existing examples of such journalism. To our knowledge, this article is the first to connect the work of the ICIJ with relevant theories in the field of media sociology and journalism studies.

To begin, we argue that the existence of the ICIJ presupposes a particular kind of practice among editors and journalists that is more globally oriented than traditional foreign correspondence. When it comes to the practice of journalism in a globalizing context, several theoretical concepts are available, including transnational journalism (Berglez, 2007), global journalism (Berglez, 2008, 2013; Reese, 2010, 2016; Van Leuven & Berglez, 2016; Zheng & Reese, 2017), global crisis reporting (Cottle, 2009), network journalism (Heinrich, 2012), global investigative reporting (Gearing, 2016), data journalism (Fink & Anderson, 2015; Lewis, 2015; Lewis & Westlund, 2015), and cross-border journalism (Alfter, 2015). None of these, however, completely captures the character of the ICIJ. Some of these concepts of journalism emphasize the role of big data and innovative technology as drivers of journalistic transformation (data journalism, network
Background of the ICIJ’s Main Activities

The first significant international collaboration of journalists, the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, began in 1997. The ICIJ was a project of the American Center for Public Integrity founded by Charles Lewis and funded primarily by donations from the Ford Foundation and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. The aim of the ICIJ is to “collaborate on groundbreaking investigations that expose the truth and hold the powerful accountable, while also adhering to the highest standards of fairness and accuracy” (ICIJ, 2017a, para. 3). It was established to report specifically on cross-border issues such as organized crime, corruption, and public accountability (Keena, 2014). Members discuss which issues to investigate and select what to cover based on the global nature of the issues; examples include the international water market and the international trade in carbon credits (Bacon, 2011). Findings of the investigations are released to media organizations free of charge (Ryle, 2013a).

The widely known Panama Papers and Paradise Papers investigations were the results of earlier work that began in 2011, when Gerard Ryle, an Irish reporter living in Australia and reporting on tax evasion, received an unsolicited parcel containing a hard drive with a cache of 2.5 million leaked digital files relating to offshore bank accounts. He could not possibly investigate such a large amount of information by himself in a timely manner. At about the same time, Ryle was offered a job in the United States and moved to Washington, DC, to become director of the ICIJ. There he shared the leaked database with reporters
collaborating with the ICIJ and coordinated an international investigation into tax havens. He worked with deputy director Marina Walker Guevara, who had previous experience of collaborative investigations (ICIJ, 2012).

**Secrecy for Sale (2011–2013)**

The ICIJ tax haven investigation was first proposed in late 2011, when ICIJ members met at an investigative journalism conference in Kiev. Ryle had initially been reluctant to collaborate with other reporters because of the perceived risk of the story leaking, but more staff were required to analyze, verify, and write about the leaked files. Walker Guevara (2013) suggested that collaboration was the only option for undertaking the project.

It became clear very soon that we could not tackle the job effectively from our Washington office or just with the small team of reporters ICIJ initially recruited to analyze the files. We needed to open up the game as much as possible without compromising the investigation or the sources. It was a risky approach, but we did not see any other way around it. (paras. 5–6)

Ten reporters expressed an interest in the investigation (Ryle, 2013a). Individual members of the ICIJ were then invited to join the investigation, and organizations of investigative journalists in other countries were also invited. Over the following 18 months, more reporters were invited to join, and the team of reporters grew to 86 journalists working for various media organizations in 46 countries. To prevent the targets of the investigation from being warned in advance of the investigation, all the reporters agreed to delay release of their articles until a predetermined global release date nine months in the future. Trust is crucial if the organization is to successfully embargo its work to ensure against leaks. By the end of the collaboration, which came to be called Secrecy for Sale, reporters in 58 countries were linked with the ICIJ headquarters in Washington, DC (see Figure 1):
The investigation met with several significant obstacles, including a reluctance among reporters to collaborate. Marina Walker Guevara (2013) said one of the most frequent questions she receives is, "How in the world did you get 86 journalists to work together?" The work was also hampered by complex data and the reluctance of some media outlets to publish the stories.

It took a lot of digging by a lot of reporters to actually find stories of public interest. We also had a lot of setbacks and complications and it was not always clear that we could succeed. Cross-border collaborations are never easy. Some media organizations simply knocked the story back. And not all of the reporters who signed on to the project found stories. That is the nature of investigative reporting—there are no guarantees at any stage. (Ryle, 2013a, paras. 11–12)

Some of the ICIJ reporters were members of large media organizations that did back the project, including Guardian investigations editor David Leigh, who also co-opted the BBC’s Panorama program, and Munich-based Süddeutsche Zeitung senior journalist Hans Leyendecker, who also helped to co-opt the
German broadcaster Norddeutscher Rundfunk (Ryle, 2013a). The investigation attracted more reporters from more countries to participate in the ICIJ, and by 2013 the consortium had almost doubled to 160 journalists collaborating across 60 countries (Ryle, 2013a). Investigations by the reporters in the Secrecy for Sale investigation exposed international tax evasion on a massive scale in the United Kingdom, France, Russia, India, South Korea, Canada, and Israel. The stories revealed how powerful and wealthy people in many countries were taking advantage of offshore tax havens to such an extent that, although the activities were legal, they distorted the global economy (Ryle, 2013b). The coverage relating to each participating country was published simultaneously worldwide on April 3, 2013. Public sector responses included inquiries and legislative changes to reduce or prevent money from being laundered and restrict the use of tax havens (Ryle, 2013b).

In 2014, a result of the global coverage was that tax havens were placed on the agenda of the G20 meeting held in Australia in November, resulting in a global political focus on the issue and new legislation in many countries. This was significant because the G20 represents 20 nations or groups of nations (such as the European Union) and accounts for 85% of the world economy, 76% of global trade, and two-thirds of the world’s population (Australian Government, 2014).


The LuxembourgLeaks investigation involved 4.4 GB of data and the leaking of 28,000 tax files from some of the world’s largest multinational companies (Bowers, 2014; Wayne, Carr, Walker Guevara, Cabra, & Hudson, 2014). Files belonging to international accounting agency PricewaterhouseCoopers were leaked to journalists, who then wrote about the contents in articles published in 26 countries (Wayne et al., 2014). The secret financial documents included details of how PricewaterhouseCoopers had helped more than 300 companies across the world to drastically cut their tax bills. A secure cyberforum called “Enterprise” was created to enable the reporters to upload documents, audio, and video; search for and download relevant documents; communicate safely with one another; and assist one another with the technical aspects of the work (Keena, 2014; Walker Guevara, 2014).

The reporters set a joint publication date five months ahead to allow television crews enough time to film and to allow the reporters enough time to work through the extensive and complex documentation. More than 500 individual tax rulings were indexed by country, company, and other categories. The tax rulings, signed and stamped by the country’s officials, were made searchable and available to the public (Caruana, Cabra, Williams, Díaz-Struck, & Boland Rudder, 2014). The newly installed European Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker was revealed to have been instrumental in establishing corporate tax avoidance schemes while prime minister of Luxembourg. As the stories by ICIJ reporters began to roll out, governments and the European Commission were forced to act. Banking secrecy, which had been the norm in Luxembourg, was challenged.

1 The 4.4 GB also paved the way for two other leaks during the same period (2013–2015): the ChinaLeaks and SwissLeaks (see Ryle, 2014; Zalac, 2015).
The European Commission announced probes into at least two companies, Amazon and Fiat, which had obtained tax rulings in Luxembourg. It also opened infringement procedures against the tiny Central European country, claiming that Luxembourg authorities had refused to provide all of the documents that the Commission had requested. (Walker Guevara, 2014, para. 13)

The series of reports, dubbed “LuxLeaks,” detailed how 343 companies, including Ikea, Deutsche Bank, and Apple, paid little or no tax in the countries where they were based by channeling profits through the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (Mahony, 2015). Investigative reporter Colm Keena (2014) believes the leak was made possible by the miniaturization of data storage.

It appears likely that the documents, given their volume, were leaked using modern technology, such as USB sticks. In that sense it is a very modern journalistic story, one that might never have come about if a person had had to carry several heavy boxes out of an office. (para. 5)

During 2014, the ICIJ began building a new collaborative social network platform (Global I-Hub) to function as a secure virtual newsroom enabling reporters to chat with colleagues, discuss topics in forums, and share files. Cross-border connections can be made and shared within the network. An ICIJ reporter in Spain, for example, found a connection with Argentinian footballer Lionel Messi in a database and shared it with the newsroom.

We knew we had things connected to FIFA and to UEFA, we knew there were soccer players, we knew that sports and offshore were intimately connected, but it’s at that point that’s it’s so useful because he says, “Oh my god I found Messi!” and all of a sudden everybody has Messi and everybody’s covering Messi. (Cabra & Kissane, 2016, para. 24)

Secure international communication in an embargoed newsroom enabled reporters to immediately begin collaborating on a breaking story. This example from the cyberforum illustrates how the networked collaboration works in real time and generates simultaneous coverage in many countries.

**The Panama Papers (2016)**

Based on similar forms of collaboration as described above, a subsequent investigation into the activities of Panama-based global law firm Mossack Fonseca by 370 ICIJ reporters culminated in coverage by more than 100 news organizations around the world in April 2016 in the largest cross-border collaboration ever undertaken. The willingness of reporters to collaborate was based on the realization that having more than 100 news organizations publishing at the same time would not necessarily fragment their audience but could instead create a critical mass capable of generating a “firestorm of attention” (Hare, 2016). The basis for the investigation was a leak of 11.5 million documents, known as the Panama Papers, which revealed that political leaders, wealthy individuals, and companies had created 214,000 shell companies to hide offshore assets, launder money, and avoid paying taxes (ICIJ, 2016). The 2.6 TB of files were related to
people and companies in more than 200 countries and territories and spanned almost 40 years, from the late 1970s until the end of 2015 (ICIJ, 2016).

The Panama Papers leak consisted of unstructured data, including millions of e-mails, database files, and images, in many different formats. The Apache Solr software was used to index the files, and Apache Tika was used to reformat the documents (Cabra & Kissane, 2016). Optical character recognition software, Tesseract, was then used to process the millions of documents into searchable files. The files were then made available to the journalists and the public and were made easily searchable using Project Blacklight software to create a user interface to interact with the database (Cabra & Kissane, 2016).

Journalists then needed to be able to represent the data graphically to make it understandable by readers. This was accomplished using Linkurious and Neo4j software to create visualizations of the data and the networks of people and companies in the database (Cabra & Kissane, 2016). ICIJ reporters who were less tech savvy were able to use these tools to create The Power Players—an interactive database showing political links between more than 70 politicians and companies around the world (ICIJ, 2016).

The connections between the reporters, and their association with the Washington ICIJ hub, contributed to enabling stories to be published despite threats and retaliation against reporters and media outlets for publishing stories based on the Panama Papers (Fitzgibbon, 2016). Reporters in Finland were threatened with police raids on their homes to seize documents. Reporters in Panama needed bodyguards after receiving threats and being called traitors. In Ecuador, journalists working on the stories were harassed and accused of politically motivated discrimination (Fitzgibbon, 2016). In China, the China Digital Times claimed that media censors instructed websites to delete all content about the Panama Papers. Media outlets were also targeted in Spain, Tunisia, Mongolia, Turkey, and Niger. Nigerian reporter Mousa Aksar commented that the protection of the partnership of the ICIJ enabled his work to be published, because the partnership provided him with access to important sources of information and strengthened the public’s trust in his work (Fitzgibbon, 2016).

The Paradise Papers (2017)

In 2016, another smaller cache of data was leaked to the German newspaper Süddeutsche Zeitung. The 1.4 TB data cache became known as the Paradise Papers. This leak, of 14.3 million documents, led to investigations by 381 journalists in 67 countries that produced global coverage rolled out by 95 ICIJ media outlet partners (Hopkins & Bengtsson, 2017). The papers detail individual and company investment activities from 1950 to 2016, exposing tax minimization schemes by celebrities, royalty, and global companies such as Facebook, Apple, Disney, Uber, Nike, Walmart, Allianz, Siemens, McDonald’s, and Yahoo. The name Paradise Papers refers to the exotic locations (“tax paradises”) where individuals and companies create entities to minimize their tax liability. The leak included documents from Bermuda law firm Appleby and government records of corporate registries in 19 countries, including Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, the Cook Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Labuan, Lebanon, Malta, the Marshall Islands, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Samoa, Trinidad and Tobago, and Vanuatu (Hopkins & Bengtsson, 2017).
ICIJ as Global Network Journalism?

**The ICIJ and “Leak Culture”**

The achievements of the ICIJ need to be understood in relation to the assumed expansion of a “leak culture.” The Internet, digitization, big data, networked relations, and the “culture of sharing” all these processes are assumed to generate (Cardoso, 2012) in the “age of transparency” (Sifry, 2011) pave the way for an increase in and “normalization” of whistleblowing practices (Baack, 2016, p. 1). This process makes the revelation of hidden information ever more important in politics (in conflicts, campaigns, elections, public relations strategies, etc.).

In particular, the development of a leak culture is connected to the breakthrough of the organization WikiLeaks and its global revelations of politically sensitive information, economic corruption, and military secrets. WikiLeaks is associated with networked hacktivism “from the bottom up” (Baack, 2015; Couldry & Powell, 2014), with its suspicion of authorities and mainstream institutions. However, for the sake of “social sense-making” (Lewis, 2015, p. 321) and the need to transform its data into media stories, WikiLeaks collaborates with established media houses. Some suggest that WikiLeaks is challenging and radically transforming the traditional paradigm of journalism (see Wahl-Jorgensen, 2014), but the increasing importance of the ICIJ potentially represents a further media institutionalization of the WikiLeaks trend. Thus, although the leak culture has very much been symbolized by WikiLeaks as well as by a few famous whistleblowers (Snowden, Manning, etc.), the activities of the ICIJ in recent years may indicate that traditional journalism is becoming a more dominant actor in this field, though still assisted by hacktivists and other activists outside the mainstream media establishment.

**What Is Global Network Journalism?**

Rather than pitting WikiLeaks (networked activism) and the ICIJ (investigative journalism) against each other as potential competitors, one can highlight their commonalties. What unites WikiLeaks, with its highly cross-border orientation and transnational context of operation, and the ICIJ is that they both impel professional journalism to break out of its national cocoons. Both organizations strongly signal that, in a globalized society, domestic reporting increasingly often requires going beyond one’s traditional national comfort zone and engaging with sources and complex documents provided by transnational actors. More precisely, in the case of the ICIJ, it requires developing a form of global network journalism—that is, a networked and discursive journalistic practice that is geared toward the global world for domestic purposes.

Theoretically speaking, global network journalism should be viewed as a dynamic combination of network journalism and global journalism. To understand this combination, one needs to closely examine the theoretical origins and practical characteristics of both concepts. To begin with, network journalism derives from theoretical ideas about the rise and development of a network society (Castells, 1996), which includes networked phenomena such as WikiLeaks. In this context, journalism is viewed through the lens of the entire Internet/information age, including the recent decades’ dynamic media technological development (Cardoso, 2006, 2012; Castells, 1996, 2011). Globalization is constituted on relations (economic, political, ecological, cultural, etc.), and in Castells’ version, such relations are first and foremost translated into
complex networks. Castells and others suggest that the technological revolution is reshaping human relations and creating economies that are deeply interdependent—in effect, a global society that is defined by its networked connections—a network society.

The ICIJ could be viewed as journalism’s natural and necessary response to the development of a more networked social reality. What make ICIJ’s practices networked are primarily (1) the transformation of networked big data into publicly accessible media content in a global context; (2) the adaptation to as well as development of methods for secure use of networked information and digital technology; and (3) the dynamic development of new networked forms of collaborative work (cyberforums; global virtual news rooms, the Global I-Hub).

First, network societies are built on information and complex global information systems, generating ever larger data sets about human life and society (Fink & Anderson, 2015). The data, whether they are comprised of 4.4 GB/28,000 tax files (Luxembourg Leaks) or 1.4 TB/14.3 million documents (Paradise Papers), can be viewed as compressed footprints or traces of individual and institutional connections across national and continental borders within an unmanageable globalized network that is nonexistent for the public until journalism makes it visible. While network society basically consists of structures built of nodes and their complex relations, the challenge for journalism is to translate, by means of its own “language” (news values and framing, journalistic storytelling), “data reality” into social knowledge (Lewis & Westlund, 2015)—that is, into publicly relevant information about society.

Second, for journalism, security—protecting information and establishing trust among involved actors (sources and media producers)—becomes essential. This is not a new phenomenon. However, network society’s technological infrastructure facilitates surveillance techniques and systems that practicing journalists and editors are forced to manage (Fuchs, Boersma, Alberchtslund, & Sandoval, 2012) and circumvent (Al-Saqaf, 2014)—for example, by means of encrypted forms of interaction and hidden IDs.

Third, what makes the journalistic practices of ICIJ highly networked is not the organizational collaboration as such but the cross-border character of the collaboration. When journalism becomes cross-border-oriented, it simultaneously tackles and integrates with global network society (Castells, 1996). However, network theoretical understandings of social realities, including media, can glide into technological determinism (Ampuja & Koivisto, 2014) and ideas about a totally integrated world system where everything and everyone are simply a click away. Technological information networks do not automatically generate social relations and unite people who are spatially and culturally separated. The global world—viewed as a complex information-driven network—has not yet been achieved. Not only because there is a digital divide but also because the very network is characterized by relatively disconnected, domestic, networked spheres or circles (Handley, 2014; Zheng & Reese, 2017). The latter could be explained by the continuing importance of traditional national mass media for domestic audiences but also as due to nationally oriented (as opposed to global) social media use and blogospheres. Inspired by the network theory of Burt (1995), Zheng and Reese (2017) suggest that the contemporary global media ecology is characterized by structural holes rather than cross-border integration, in which domestic nodes are being separated from one another (cf. Berglez, 2007; Heinrich, 2012). The very initiative of the ICIJ is characterized by a striving to reduce the collaborative
holes in the field of professional journalism. Instead of trying to scoop one another, media organizations across the world choose to collaborate and release stories together and at the same time.

Interestingly, however, the networked collaborative forms of the ICIJ do not entirely fit into how networked journalism has primarily been discussed in scholarly contexts. Since the turn of the 21st century, innovation and creative developments in journalistic practice have been dominated by network theoretical ideas about professional journalism’s ability to interact with, and thus collaborate with, the public—that is, external actors who are not professionals. In network theoretical contexts, journalistic practice (writing, editing, etc.) is therefore viewed as a rather deindividualized practice and thus a deeply collective/collaborative activity embedded in a “culture of sharing” (Cardoso, 2012), in which information and communication are produced by “journalistic organisations such as the BBC, The New York Times, or Associated Press; however these nodes are also tweeters, bloggers or the independent journalist freelancing on international territory” (Heinrich, 2012, p. 64). From this perspective, a potential weakness of the ICIJ is that, despite its alliances and collaborations with particular activists, whistleblowers, and organizations, the active nodes in the collaborative networks predominately consist of traditional and often influential media houses and companies—that is, “old-school journalists”—rather than being a dynamic combination of professional and amateur actors. However, we suggest that the pressure on media companies and professional journalism to change for the better does not necessarily lead to creative synergies and hybridization of the professional-amateur divide. The reinvention of traditional media/journalism (Peters & Broersma, 2013) might just as well spur the (traditional) journalistic profession to improve and update itself on its own terms rather than imitating trends from, or interacting intensively with, amateur culture. In this respect, media houses and journalists involved with the ICIJ potentially give proof of a progressive change based on ideas about what fundamentally defines professional journalism and its practice. One could view the ICIJ as a significant creative hub for the intraprofessional reformation of journalism and as intentionally or unintentionally posing the following reflexive question to the media sectors in all countries: How should professional journalism continue to do what it has always done, including investigative reporting as well as traditional domestic reporting, in a world that has changed and become increasingly globalized and networked?

Networked journalistic activities involving enormously large data sets, digital technology, and advanced forms of collaboration also generate new forms of discourse. In this respect, the ICIJ’s stories testify to the practice of a global journalism that investigates “how people and their actions, practices, problems, life conditions etc. in different parts of the world are interrelated” (Berglez, 2007, p. 151). Global journalism has been described as foreign reporting’s younger cousin, characterized by a partly novel form of storytelling that is urgently needed in times of globalization. As is the case with traditional domestic reporting, foreign correspondence tends to establish a clear distinction between domestic and foreign space, its main aim being to bring information about the outside world back home to domestic audiences (a train accident in country A, an election in country B, an extreme weather event in country C, and so forth).

Global journalism, however, focuses instead on sociomaterial relations across borders, in which a global outlook is applied to domestic reality and vice versa; it thus avoids categorizing issues as being discretely either/or (Berglez, 2013, p. 5). In this respect, the global network journalism of the ICIJ can potentially remedy not only collaborative holes in the global media ecology but also discursive holes by
semiotically bridging the domestic and the global in the very framing and reporting of social-material reality. This form of journalism could be viewed as an advanced form of domestic journalism in the sense of extending domestic reality to encompass global reality. As important as global network reality may be, the domestic dimension is still essential to engage (domestic) audiences. For example, in the Paradise Papers revelation in November 2017, several Swedish media outlets presented the news as domestic stories and domestic revelations, emphasizing the involvement of Swedish media houses in the ICIJ network while simultaneously toning down the transnational and thus cross-border dimension of the journalistic initiative.

The ICIJ and the Global Fourth Estate

The news media, hobbled by short attention spans and lack of resources, are even less of a match for those who would harm the public interest. Broadcast networks and major newspapers have closed foreign bureaus, cut travel budgets, and disbanded investigative teams. We are losing our eyes and ears around the world precisely when we need them most. (ICIJ, 2017b, para. 4)

This expression of frustration from the ICIJ touches on the parallel existence of what might be described as remnants of early modernity, including its Westphalian order and the late modern/post-Westphalian order (see also Berglez, 2013, pp. 51–56). The Westphalian order is a result of the Peace of Westphalia from 1648, in which several nation-states in Europe signed an agreement to mutually respect one another’s territorial sovereignty. Consequently, the Westphalian order is associated with the rise and expansion of the modern nation-state (Anderson, 1991) and ultimately generated an entire international system of autonomous nation-states. Over time, it also conserved a national outlook—the understanding of nation-states as primarily autonomous entities rather than as intertwined with the outside world. The existence of a late modern/post-Westphalian order, on the other hand, implies that nation-states are being gradually weakened by the overall development of globalization (Beck, 2006), and not least by the impact of (global) market capitalism (Harvey, 2007). Philosopher Nancy Fraser (2007) suggests that, although nation-states might serve as important agents of globalization and neoliberal processes themselves, in the earlier phase of the nation-state (the Westphalian order), “economies were effectively national and could be steered by national states in the interests of national citizens” (p. 5). This is no longer the case, however, as nation-states are deeply intertwined with a global economic system. Not only strictly financial and economic processes but also social, cultural, political, and environmental processes have made the nation-state increasingly influenced by, vulnerable to, and dependent on distant forces and actions. The ICIJ could be viewed as a natural and expected journalistic response to the existence of a post-Westphalian condition.

The fact that nation-states are so intertwined with the surrounding world could be handled in two main ways by national media houses. The easy and comfortable way is to repress the lost sovereignty of nation-states and adopt a business-as-usual attitude. In this context, cross-border issues are, at best, viewed as complementary issues, occasionally presented to media audiences rather than becoming the new mainstream. There are at least three reasons that domestic media continue to largely ignore global change. The first is that citizenship is still exclusively associated with the state or nation-state rather than a globalizing society. The second has to do with economic reasons in that purely national or domestic news is usually easier to sell than news about foreign events and processes (cf. Christin, 2016). The third reason is
practical: producing a traditional national outlook in reporting is, in most cases, a less complex editorial and journalistic task than integrating the global with the domestic and vice versa.

For domestic media, the difficult but rewarding pathway is to actively step out of one’s comfort zone and take on the new reality by developing what could be described as a global fourth estate. From a political perspective, then, the ICIJ and its generation of global network journalism potentially paves the way for a globalized version of the fourth estate “in which journalists hold powerful individuals, businesses, corporations or governments to account” (Gearing, 2016, p. 19). Whereas the fourth estate is strongly associated with state affairs, and thus events within domestic boundaries, the global fourth estate is relevant in contexts where power is constituted on complex relations between actors at local, domestic, regional, transnational, and global levels of social-material reality (Berglez, 2007). The global fourth estate expands the domestic space of politics. In this new domestic-global political terrain, those who could be held accountable for unjust actions might represent global or transnational institutions but also domestic ones. Concerning the latter, for example, the Panama Papers revelations led to a political crisis in Iceland in which the prime minister, Sigmundur Davíð Gunnlaugsson, had to resign. Furthermore, media’s role as a global fourth estate generates reflexive actions (Giddens, 1990) among both global and national political institutions. Concerning the latter, after the Paradise Papers story broke, the Swedish government and its minister of finance, Magdalena Andersson, hastily proposed changes to certain tax laws to reduce tax evasion. Thus, from our perspective, the global fourth estate is to be viewed not as a historical break with, but as an extension of, the tasks associated with the fourth estate in professional journalism.

A concept closely akin to the global fourth estate is the networked fourth estate, which is discussed, for example, in relation to WikiLeaks (Benkler, 2011) and the Snowden revelations (Russell & Waisbord, 2017; cf. Chadwick & Collister, 2014). To an even greater extent than with the global fourth estate, the networked fourth estate tends to be centered on the development, through Internet and digital technology, of hybrid forms of news media that are “both traditional and novel” (Benkler, 2011, p. 315; Chadwick, 2013) and the challenging of the professional-amateur distinction (Russell & Waisbord, 2017, p. 858). In our interpretation, the concept of the global fourth estate highlights how the fourth estate is developed and updated primarily by traditional media houses and editors and journalists, such as in the ICIJ, whereas the networked fourth estate more strongly captures the dynamic deconstruction of the professional-amateur divide. For example, processes such as the Me Too movement from 2017 should primarily be associated with a networked fourth estate. This is because, here, in contrast to cases such as the Paradise Papers story, professional journalism is not the originator and dominant agent of the process but one agent among others in a complex communication and information network or assemblage (Reese, 2016), which includes celebrities communicating via their social media accounts, bloggers, and, not least, user-generated content from numerous contributors.

Concluding Discussion:
Could the Basic Practice of the ICIJ Become More Mainstream?

The crucial question is whether journalism performed by advanced networked organizations such as the ICIJ could become not just an occasional phenomenon but something much more mainstream. It appears that industry reticence is the only stumbling block to greater collaboration, because the ICIJ has
proven that it is possible to coordinate simultaneous investigations by many reporters speaking many
different languages across national borders and time zones. The challenge for the media sector as whole,
however, will be to adopt a transnational journalism culture (Handley, 2014; Hellmueller, 2017). One way
to do this might be to develop collaborative technologies and attitudes on a smaller scale. As they work on
investigations, smaller groups of reporters could be expected to be faster, more agile, and more flexible
than the much larger but slower global collaborations undertaken by the ICIJ. Smaller collaborations could
be better suited to address issues affecting two or more countries rather than issues affecting the global
community in general. Furthermore, smaller groups could potentially perform global network journalism
while avoiding the extremely time-demanding work and high costs associated with the ICIJ. Many small
media houses may dismiss cross-border forms of journalism as too complex, too resource-intensive, and so
forth without having considered the possibility of deploying micro versions of global network journalism. In
this context, it is important to imagine global network journalism tackling issues other than tax havens.
Globalization and the network society naturally bring forth diverse cross-border issues such as climate
change, biological diversity, antimicrobial resistance, Internet surveillance, net neutrality, the energy issue,
and trafficking (Berglez, 2013).

Media and journalism research could identify and analyze existing best-practice examples of
microscale global network journalism involving only a few journalists and/or media companies (cf. Alfter,
2015). For example, a collaboration by Australian reporters working for the same media organization
investigating the deadly collapse of a clothing factory in Bangladesh’s Rana Plaza was carried out by two
reporters: one in Bangladesh and one in Australia (Doherty & Whyte, 2013). Another example is a
collaboration among three reporters working for two media outlets in different countries. In this
investigation, reporters in Australia and England investigated a child abuse scandal in which an offender
moved back and forth between the United Kingdom and Australia over the course of more than 50 years.
The coverage by two reporters in Australia and one in England was published prominently in national
broadsheet newspapers in both countries on the same day (McKenna, Gearing & O’Neill, 2013; O’Neill,
McKenna, & Gearing, 2013). Interesting examples of the practice of global network journalism in individual
organizations exist as well, such as the weekly television news magazine Korrespondenterna (the
Correspondents), produced by the Swedish Public Service Broadcasting Company (SVT). In each episode,
SVT instructs a few of its foreign correspondents, spread around the world, to report about the same issue—
for example, corruption, the water crisis, renewable energy, China, and opinions about Trump and the United
States—thereby generating a global outlook on the topic.

Finally, research examining the changing perspectives of journalists working in the ICIJ as well in
small-scale cases will help quantify the emergence of a global or at least cross-border outlook in journalism,
which might further confirm its gradual emergence in the field of mainstream media and journalism (cf.
Gearing, 2016). This will facilitate demonstrations of important examples (best practices) from media
education and journalism schools worldwide—examples that might inspire future journalists and teach them
to dynamically combine rather than separate global and domestic realities.
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