The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science

http://ann.sagepub.com

Why Not Share Rather Than Own?

Russell Belk

The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 2007; 611; 126
DOI: 10.1177/0002716206298483

Why Not Share Rather Than Own?

By
RUSSELL BELK

Sharing is an alternative form of distribution to commodity exchange and gift giving. Compared to these alternative modes, sharing can foster community, save resources, and create certain synergies. Yet outside of our immediate families, we do little sharing. Even within the family, there is increased privatization. This article addresses impediments to sharing as well as incentives that may encourage more sharing of both tangible and intangible goods. Two recent developments, the Internet and intellectual property rights doctrines, are locked in a battle that will do much to determine the future of sharing. Businesses may lead the way with virtual corporations outsourcing the bulk of their operations. Whether virtual consumers sharing some of their major possessions are a viable counterpart remains an open question.

Keywords: sharing; property; possessions; ownership; intellectual property; Internet

Lone commuters in private vehicles travel billions of miles each day. Not only do these private vehicles contribute to airborne pollution and global warming, but the increased stress of time spent in traffic results in a tripling of heart attack risk a short time later (Peters et al. 2004). By individually sharing via carpooling (or better still, bike-pooling) or by jointly sharing via supporting and using public transportation, these negative consequences could be substantially ameliorated. So why do more of us not share our cars and other individual possessions? Is this an inevitable tragedy of the commons (Hardin

*Russell Belk is the Kraft Foods Canada Chair of Marketing in the Schulich School of Business at York University. He is past president and a fellow of the Association for Consumer Research and past president of the International Society of Marketing and Development. He has received the Paul D. Converse Award, the Sheth Foundation/*Journal of Consumer Research *Award for Long Term Contribution to Consumer Research, two Fulbright Fellowships, and four honorary professorships. He is the cofounder of the Association for Consumer Research Film Festival and has more than 350 publications. His research involves the meanings of possessions, collecting, gift giving, and materialism.*

DOI: 10.1177/0002716206298483

1968) that only state mandates, rewards, and punishments can affect? Or is there hope for sharing outside of our immediate families? A pessimistic view would suggest that we are headed toward *less* rather than *more* sharing. What were once the family radio, the family car, and the family television are increasingly privatized property of individuals within households. And the family meal is becoming a quaint memory. In this article, I explore the nature of sharing and ask whether a more optimistic view is possible.

Sharing is an alternative to the private ownership that is emphasized in both marketplace exchange and gift giving. In sharing, two or more people may enjoy the benefits (or costs) that flow from possessing a thing. Rather than distinguishing what is *mine and yours*, sharing defines something as *ours*. Thus, we may share a vacation home, a park bench, or a bag of jelly beans. We may also share more abstract things like knowledge, responsibility, or power. In each case, all of those involved in the sharing have something (a share) of the costs or benefits of a thing. Sharing, as used here, includes voluntary lending, pooling and allocation of resources, and authorized use of public property, but not contractual renting, leasing, or unauthorized use of property by theft or trespass. We can share not only places and things, but also people and animals (to the extent they are ours to share), as well as our ideas, values, and time. I do not include the simple coincidences that we may "share" a common language, place of birth, or set of experiences. These are all involuntary coincidences that do not depend on volitional sharing. Instead, I mean the act and process of distributing what is ours to others for their use as well as the act and process of receiving something from others for our use. The receipt of shared goods may be for an indefinite or prescribed period of time. And our share may be for our exclusive use or for use by us as well as others. Individuals, groups, and even nations can share. Just as consumption units may share in consuming something, production units may share in producing something, through profit sharing, employee-owned corporations, stock share ownership, and other joint ownership of the means of production. But the focus here is on shared consumption.

Although giving and receiving are involved in sharing, they differ from the giving and receiving involved in commodity exchange and gift giving. In economics' ideal form of commodity exchange, strangers barter or use money as a medium of exchange. Even though notions of customer relationship management might have it otherwise, in economic theory commodity transactions are balanced with no lingering indebtedness and no residual feelings of friendship. In Marshall Sahlins's (1972) terms, these transactions constitute either the tit-for-tat equivalence of balanced reciprocity, or negative reciprocity in which exchange partners seek to get more than they give. In both cases, the underlying model is that of the egoist who is the ideal "economic man." To be self-canceling, these transactions are simultaneous rather than sequential or staggered over time. This dissolves the relationship such that each partner can walk away without needing to ever see the other again. Therefore, Simmel (1990, 227) suggested that money transactions should be between strangers, not between friends or enemies.

If we conceive of a continuum involving these constructs, commodity exchange lies at one end and sharing at the other, with gift giving somewhere in the middle.

End points may be variously conceived as egoism-altruism, stinginess-generosity, and impersonality-personality. Gift exchange in Mauss's (1967) view is, like commodity exchange, based on reciprocity, and the gift cycle is driven by societal obligations to give, receive, and reciprocate. In Gregory's (1982, 1997) formulation, gift giving is the opposite of commodity exchange in that gift exchanges establish qualitative relationships between people and entail encumbrances or debts, whereas commodity exchanges establish quantitative relationships between objects and annul indebtedness (see also Frow 1997; Miller 2001; Osteen 2002). Gift exchange is ideally staggered so that balance is never achieved and therefore a debt always exists. It may even involve Sahlins's (1972) generalized reciprocity in which givers and receivers do not attempt to keep accounts, but rather give without thought to the balance or imbalance of any would-be accounts. Gifts have a highly ritualized character and are normally given with special wrappings and sometimes with special songs, food, clothing, and presentation traditions (Belk 1979, 1996; Sherry 1983). The gift exchange takes on a character that is more social than economic and may even come to involve agapic love (Belk and Coon 1993; Belk 1996). However, as Derrida (1992) and others (e.g., Sherry, McGrath, and Levy 1992, 1993) have reminded us, gifts are often more egoistic than altruistic. On the other hand, Granovetter (1985) and others (e.g., Carrier 1995; Silver 1990) have found reason to believe that many forms of business exchange involve embedded relationships and are better characterized as gift exchanges than commodity exchanges. Furthermore, although money has been found to be taboo in a number of gift exchange relationships (Webley, Lea, and Portalska 1983; McGraw, Tetlock, and Kristel 2003; Belk 2005), there are exceptions, as when giving downward in age or social class. However, despite such exceptions, clear conceptual boundaries between gifts and commodities remain.

Although it has not been well distinguished in the literature, sharing is a third form of distribution that is distinct from both marketplace commodity exchange and gift giving. Although some things can be distributed by any of these three means, there are some things that we can only share, including both positive things like a sunset, correspondence, and quietness as well as negative things like guilt, shame, and the proceeds of a crime in which we participate.

One prototype for positive sharing is income pooling and resource sharing within the family. While anthropologists like Sahlins (1972) and Godbout and Caille (1998) treated giving to close kin as gift giving, in most instances such giving is better construed as sharing. Especially within affluent cultures, this type of sharing is taken for granted. Young children need not work for their food, clothing, and shelter; nor are these things presented as gifts with all the ritual presentation that gifts involve. Children need not ask permission to enter their parents' home; they are not accused of theft if they take food from the refrigerator; nor will they be sued for trespass if they sit on the "family" sofa. They will not be presented with a bill for the expenses their parents have incurred on their behalf. Rather, the Marxian ideal of "from each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs" is very closely approximated within the family, even if there is sometimes disagreement about what each family member "needs" and which of these desires should have the highest priority. Despite the previously suggested exceptions involving privatization within the family, this does not imply that family members are self-sufficient and indifferent to one another's needs and desires. Sharing remains the norm.

Another prototype of sharing that is even more basic than the family is the mother. She literally shares her body with the fetus and her mother's milk with the infant. It is generally unthinkable that she would either charge for these services as commodities or regard them as the special gifts that some suggest (e.g., Godbout and Caille 1998; Vaughan 1997). However, surrogate motherhood and wet nurses show that even these very personal forms of sharing can be outsourced. Furthermore, with access to birth control and abortion, the mother is able to choose whether to share her body in these ways. Unless she was artificially inseminated or has adopted her child, she has also chosen to share her sexualized body with a male partner to become pregnant. That commoditized sex (prostitution) also has an ancient heritage does not eliminate the highly intimate mutual sharing of having sex, giving birth, and child rearing.

Issues in Sharing

A recent hotbed of sharing activity and discussions involves the Internet (e.g., Coyne 2005; Ghosh 2005). Sharing with others online includes open-source code writing; sharing information on Internet bulletin boards (BBs) and chat rooms; publishing blogs (Weblogs), vlogs (video logs), and Web sites; contributing to collaborative online games; helping create or improve entries in online encyclopedias like Wikipedia; participating in P2P (peer-to-peer) file sharing (e.g., Giesler 2006); maintaining listservs; and responding to e-mail requests. Those who make use of these online resources are a part of Internet sharing regardless of whether they make similar contributions themselves. Some see such sharing as the burgeoning of a new age of altruism brought about by the magic of cyberspace, while others suggest that such acts are largely egoistic. The altruistic explanation is closer to the original democratizing ethos of the personal computer (Belk and Tumbat 2005) and the view of computer hackers as heroic champions bringing power to the people. Thus, a key issue in such sharing is the extent to which it is altruistic and the extent to which we may be entering a new age of altruism.

Sharing has been the norm since the Scientific Revolution in the "open science" model of rapid disclosure and dissemination of new inventions and discoveries (David 2005). Prior to this time, the scientific model, especially in alchemy, involved secrecy in the quest to discover "nature's secrets." But starting in the seventeenth century, scientists began to realize that science would advance much more rapidly with the free and open sharing of information. This model now holds for academics generally. But the same Internet revolution that some see as fostering a new age of altruism is also fostering a new age of expanding intellectual property rights (IPR) that threatens to replace the altruism of sharing with the egoism of commoditization. At the present time, this battle is especially fierce regarding digital information (e.g., books, papers, music, films, software) and medical products (e.g., pharmaceuticals, genetic products, and bioprospecting—Hayden 2005; Kelty 2005). Similar issues arise in sharing human organs, eggs, semen, and blood and personal information (e.g., government surveillance, data mining, and identity theft). At issue here is what can or cannot be shared and under what conditions.

Sharing is a culturally learned behavior. The same is true of possession and ownership (Furby 1976). In the West, children learn about possession and ownership first and only learn to share as they get older (Furby 1978). But because of their nomadic heritage, Australian Aborigines learn sharing at an earlier age and more thoroughly than they learn possessiveness (Gould 1982; Testart 1987). Possessions are a burden in a nomadic society. Sharing such things as food, weapons, and tools is imperative for survival. The vestigial and strongly ingrained sharing ethos among Aborigines led to a number of problems following the introduction of automobiles (Gerrard 1989) and European private property laws in Australia (Maddock 1972).

Sharing is also more the prescribed norm in China with the concept of *zhanguang* (share the light). It is illustrated by the expectation that a villager who smokes in a public place should bring enough cigarettes or tobacco for everyone (Yan 1996). There are many prescribed instances of sharing in Japan as well, as with someone who gets a hole in one in golf being expected to share his or her good luck by buying gifts for the entire golf club (Rupp 2003). It is even possible to get insurance to indemnify such a "lucky" golfer. And there is a strong tradition in Africa that those who do well should share their wealth with extended family, to the extent of housing and feeding relatives who might come to town for months at a time (Belk 2000).

It is easiest to envision more sharing of intangible goods like information, opinions, images, and ideas, especially when these things are in digital form and we do not lose them by sharing them.

Thus, sharing is an interpersonal process and is sanctioned and prescribed by culture. Sharing by a giver can be judged as generous or stingy, altruistic or selfish, and fair or unfair, all according to cultural norms. We can feel that we have gotten our fair share, more than our fair share, or less than our fair share. Sharing can reduce envy and create feelings of community, or it can create dependency and foster feelings of resentment and inferiority. When someone shares with us, we can perceive his or her action as a sincere effort to please us or as an insincere sop designed to pacify and placate us (Foster 1972). Sharing can take place under conditions of excess, but it can also occur under conditions of insufficiency. And we may share broadly with anyone and everyone or narrowly within a couple, a family, or a business corporation.

Impediments to Sharing

For there to be sharing, there must first be feelings of possession, if not ownership. Otherwise, we have nothing to share. In communes, kibbutzim, cooperatives, and communism, possession and ownership may be to hold things in common for those who wish to use them. These contexts bear reexamination, but they will not be considered here.

We can come to feel possessive about and have a sense of ownership toward things that are not our property—a panoramic view, our children, a seat in a classroom, and even our beliefs (Abelson 1986). If ownership allows sharing, feelings of possessiveness and attachment toward the things we own or possess discourage sharing (Belk 1992; Kleine and Baker 2004; Wallendorf and Arnould 1988). To the extent that we feel a possession is a part of our extended self, we are more likely to wish to retain it (Belk 1988; Kleine, Kleine, and Allen 1995). For example, the more we cathect or feel that a particular bodily organ is a part of our identity, the less willing we are to become an organ donor or pledge to donate the organ in the future (Belk 1987, 1990).

Another factor that inhibits sharing is materialism, defined as the importance a person attaches to possessions. Materialists believe that possessions are the key source of happiness or unhappiness in life (Belk 1985). One of three operational components in this conception of materialism is nongenerosity, suggesting a partial explanation for why those who are more materialistic are also less willing to share.

Another impediment to sharing is the perception that resources are scarce and if we share we may miss something we might have enjoyed. Consider the case of fine art. It might be argued that there is only so much truly fine art and that even apart from its unaffordability, there is simply not enough to go around. But public art museums, reproductions, and copies provide democratized access to fine art, as André Malraux (1967) proposed. In its early history, the Boston Museum of Fine arts displayed copies of sculptures (DiMaggio 1982). Eventually, however, the reproductions were relegated to the basement of the museum and only originals were publicly displayed. One reason may be found in Walter Benjamin's (1968) lament that we lose the "aura" of the original when we substitute a mechanical reproduction. Another explanation, however, is that we lose the status-conferring power of the scarce original when we attempt to substitute a reproduction. We may disparage such copies with the labels forgery, fake, or counterfeit.

Incentives to Share

Incentives to share intangibles

Despite such impediments to sharing, sharing occurs beyond the immediate family in virtually all cultures. Consider the culture of academic scholarship. We claim ownership of our academic ideas by presenting them and publishing them. If we instead borrow "others' ideas," we may be accused of plagiarism. To seek to profit from our academic ideas rather than to freely share them with others is generally viewed with disdain. The scholar is supposed to be motivated by the joy of creating and sharing ideas. So, we freely participate in a giant potlatch of ideas with our colleagues and students, often from a sincere and joyous desire to share our discoveries, creative theories, and critical interpretations. We are satisfied with the fame or reputation that may result and the people we may inspire, even if we enjoy indirect economic benefits through the promotions, fame, and salary increases that may accrue.

Although sharing our data (Sieber 1991) could make research much easier, eliminate redundant data collection, allow specialists to collect data, and subject our insights to triangulation by multiple others, we are reluctant to do this, unless forced. We may be part of a community of scholars, but we would rather that our scholarly neighbors come over and admire our flower garden rather than borrow our seeds, tools, and potting soil. Nevertheless, this sharing of primary data is exactly what has been done with DNA sequences in the Human Genome Project, and this has led to great breakthroughs in biology and medicine that could never have occurred without such data sharing (Love and Hubbard 2005).

There are, however, some things that we can share or give away without losing them—a song, a joke, a story, our bodies, things we put up on our Web sites, or music files shared on the Web. Even with earlier information goods like books, journals, and videos, it is possible to make copies that can be shared freely (Varian 2000). Unlike some other works of art, these copies are virtually indistinguishable from the originals. With the advent of the Internet and e-mail, some have suggested that consumerism is being replaced by the gift economy (Pinchot 1995), the hi-tech gift economy (Barbrook 2005), or the society of the gift (Coyne 2005). But here, too, these forms of give and take are better characterized as sharing than gift giving in that they lack the ritual presentation of the gift and because donors and recipients are often anonymous and unknown. With open source software like Linux, numerous people contribute source code anonymously and freely (Bergquist 2003; Bergquist and Ljungberg 2001). Benkler (2005) called this "commons-based peer production." Other examples include music and video file sharing (Giesler 2006), software or "freeware" sharing (Raymond 2001), and a variety of virtual communities sharing information via online bulletin boards, chat rooms, and Web sites (Barbrook and Cameron 2001; Rheingold 2000).

Coyne (2005) considered possible motives for giving away our possessions and productions on the Internet. One is "cheap altruism": although we give away the digital equivalent of a song, computer program, photograph, or text file, we still have it. In Annette Weiner's (1992) terms, it is a way of keeping while giving. But this does not explain why someone would contribute at all rather than act as a free rider. A second explanation that Coyne offered is that this is true altruism and a return to tribal society in a digital age. In this view, the Internet is leading to a global community of sharing, communicating, and giving, with a free flow of information providing equality of access. A related view that Coyne most fully embraced is that the Internet precipitates something that has always remained beneath the surface in humans—the primordial and playful gift economy. But once again, the concept of the gift is less apt than the concept of sharing. Just as the parent who shares with intimately known others in the family seldom packages the things they give as a gift, contributors to open source code or Internet bulletin boards help anonymous others because they can. The apt model here is that of a cornucopia. Motivations may include the notions of somehow "paying back" the benefits previously received from the Internet. Although keeping while giving is not irrelevant, the sense of paying back and at the same time keeping the cornucopia flowing is the factor that is needed to explain why many people choose the giving involved in sharing over being a free rider. Although he was speaking in terms of gifts, Hyde (1983) suggested an imperative for constant movement. We are impelled to continue to share when someone has shared with us, although not necessarily with the same person. Thus, if someone allows us to merge into heavy traffic (effectively sharing the road with us), we may be more inclined to do the same for others. We might also apply this to our own academic giving in reviewing papers, for example.

There is also the motivating effect of feeling a part of a community of kindred spirits. Possessions not only symbolize the self, they can act as marker goods (Douglas and Isherwood 1979) that symbolize membership in a group or class. The joint possession of certain goods can also convey status and power by demonstrating the group's command of what are taken to be scarce resources. And consumer goods may be expressive of lifestyle affiliations, some of which may take on cultlike characteristics centered around a brand such as the cult of Macintosh computer aficionados (Muñiz and O'Guinn 2001; Belk and Tumbat 2005). Expressing a similar affection for this particular brand rather than another marks us as belonging to a group of like-minded people. Within brand cults, there is also a sense of sharing a secret: that of the wonder of the brand. And as with sharing secrets and self-disclosure generally, mutual sharing of secrets deepens and reinforces relationships. Perhaps the ultimate bonding form of sharing secrets is to share one's body sexually with another. Yet at the same time, this too is a case of keeping while giving as long as we do not damage our sense of self-worth in the process.

Incentives to share tangibles

Few of us would be churlish enough to decline a request to give directions to a stranger who is lost or to deny someone who asks for the time of day. Sharing such intangible knowledge is often a case where we can keep while giving. But what of sharing tangible goods? In ancient times like those of Homer's Greece, a stranger seeking hospitality would commonly be granted food and shelter (Reece 1993). In the Middle Ages, hospitals extended an unconditional welcome and hospitality to those in need (Roberts 1996). In sixteenth-century France, the tables and beds of high-ranking households were open to visits without notice, although this was restricted to friends, neighbors, and kin (Davis 2000). While such hospitality may still exist with regard to extended family (e.g., Jones 1996), strangers are now less welcome. Fiske (1991) and Komter (2005) saw communal sharing as a model of resource allocation that applies primarily within the immediate family. Why should we share our material possessions outside of our immediate family? Consider the analogy of school girls or boys sharing clothing. Each student gains an apparently larger wardrobe at no cost other than that of risking damage to or nonreturn of their clothing that is lent out. Each has effectively leveraged her or his lifestyle without increasing her or his wardrobe expenditure. An institutionalized version may be found in a service called Bag Borrow or Steal that rents designer handbags for a $50 per month fee, with users being able to trade in for another model anytime they wish (Windfield 2005). Some local car sharing co-ops operate on this principle to make cars available to others when they need them without the costs of unnecessary parking and maintenance. We may also belong to larger groups that share possessions in the case of time-share vacation homes, collectively owned sailboats, shared institutions like museums, and shared resources like national parks. Here, too, we leverage our lifestyles beyond individual possibilities. We get most of the benefits of ownership in each case.

A different explanation is needed for cases like picking up a hitchhiker or giving to a beggar since we are unlikely to have the favor returned by those we befriend. Here, the sense of paying back for one's prior good fortune is one possibility. But so is genuine altruism and helping others to nourish a self-image that we are generous and helpful. Such sharing can be spoiled by money. A dinner guest who pulls out his checkbook at the end of the meal rather than offering flowers or wine to be shared during the meal will be unwelcome in the future (Benkler 2005).

Materialism, possessive individualism, and the conviction that self-identity must be developed by extension into possessions are all factors that inhibit sharing.

A further incentive for sharing tangible things is an extension of the keeping-while-giving motivation identified with nontangible things. Here, the keeping may either be literal as in lending someone a tool that we expect to be returned, or symbolic as in believing that more will come our way. Suppose we are walking on a beach and find some interesting-looking shells that we pick up. A child comes along and admires the shells, so we give her one. We do this in the belief that we are likely to encounter more such shells on our walk. The principle has been called "unlimited good" (Foster 1969). As with the cornucopia image used earlier, as long as we believe that the supply of good things is unlimited, we are happy to share with others. It is only when we believe that the supply is fixed that we become selfish and try to retain our possessions. That is, when we construe life as a zero-sum game, we are less likely to share. And even when we view the supply of a good as limited, there may be an inclination to share when it would otherwise go to waste. This would apply to an unrefundable ticket to a performance that we cannot attend as well as to the leftovers from a harvest that gleaners may be invited to make use of. A countercase involves concert recordings of the Grateful Dead. For years, the band allowed "tapers" to record and trade tapes of their performances, as long as they did not sell them for a profit. But in late 2005, the band made an effort to stop the free downloading of this music from both their own Web site (www.gdstore.com) and a site called Live Music Archive (www.archive.org). As one account of the proposed end of sharing the Dead put it, the attempt to commoditize the concert recordings invoked a vision of the Internet not as cornucopia, but as a pay-per-play cash cow (Pareles 2005). Boyle (2005) has compared this and other attempts to enclose the "commons" of cyberspace to the fifteenth-century closure of the agricultural commons.

As with intangibles, yet another incentive to share tangibles is when our extended sense of self embraces other people outside of our immediate family (Belk 1988). As Etzioni (1988) suggested, when we feel a shared identity with others—whether in our neighborhood, group, city, state, or nation—we feel a common sense of moral obligation toward them. And in the broadest sense, we all share a common humanity that may provoke sharing with others with whom we can empathize in their time of need. This sense of commonality is especially relevant to those things that can only be owned in common, as is the case with our stewardship of planetary resources.

Conclusions

This is a preliminary framing of the issues about sharing. Much remains to be done. In the case of the Internet, we shall see whether the increase in sharing or the simultaneous increase in intellectual property rights it has inspired will ultimately predominate in cyberspace. Still, some tentative conclusions may be offered.

As we have replaced social security with financial security, trust in money and things have supplanted trust in people, and economic capital has become more important than social capital. We continue to share resources within our nuclear families, but even families share less these days, as possessions within the family are privatized. Individual bank accounts and credit cards are growing as joint accounts and cards decline. And that part of traditional Christian wedding vows that professes "I do thee endow with all my worldly goods" is negated by the addendum, "Except as stipulated by prenuptial agreements." Perhaps it is because of the decline in sharing within our intimate attachments that we seem to increasingly seek virtual communities online. Ironically, we are becoming more likely to share our deepest secrets, insights, information, and loyalties with someone whom we know only by an online pseudonym than we are with our partners or with other members of our families.

It is easiest to envision more sharing of intangible goods like information, opinions, images, and ideas, especially when these things are in digital form, and we do not lose them by sharing them. But there are limits here as well. As I have argued, academics can only gain credit for their work by freely sharing it. But we are largely unwilling to share their raw data with others. Many of the things we might wish to share are legally protected by intellectual property laws, as illustrated by the prosecution of the music file-sharing site, Napster. The film industry is also battling to stop the online distribution of "pirated" films. And patents, copyrights, and other legal protections are further impediments to freely sharing many ideas.

There are burdens to possession, as any home owner can attest. And with the increasingly rapid pace of technological change, we may see a shift toward shared ownership.

With tangible goods, there are also many laws to protect private property from sharing, while there are other laws granting free shared access through private lands to beaches, fields, and forests. But the larger barrier to sharing material goods is attitudinal. Materialism, possessive individualism, and the conviction that self-identity must be developed by extension into possessions are all factors that inhibit sharing. Although Inglehart (1981) contended that affluent societies are moving into an age of postmaterialism and Pine and Gilmore (1999) suggested that we are becoming an experience economy that values doing over having, there is very little indication that we are ready to sever our attachments to things and become more defined by our attachments to people. We cling to an identity forged in the crucible of materialism. Those who call for downshifting (e.g., Schor 1998), dematerializing (e.g., Hammerslough 2001), or voluntary simplicity (e.g., Elgin 1998) need to confront the tenacity with which we seem to cling to possessions (see also Boyle 1998).

Interestingly, it is business that shows a trend toward less possessiveness and materialism. Virtual corporations retain the right to their intangible brand names but freely outsource everything else from production to management, marketing, and customer service. It is more economical and necessary to remain competitive. By, for instance, belonging to an automobile cooperative rather than owning an individual car, consumers can leverage their lifestyles in a similar manner. Still, it seems that the virtual consumer has less allure than the virtual corporation. But there may be reasons for hope. There are burdens to possession, as any home owner can attest. And with the increasingly rapid pace of technological change, we may see a shift toward shared ownership. For a growing number of car sharing cooperatives like AutoShare of Toronto, the question being raised is, Why own when you can share?

References

Abelson, R. P. 1986. Beliefs are like possessions. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 15:223-50.

Barbrook, R. 2005. The hi-tech gift economy. *First Monday*. http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue3_12/barbrook/index.html (accessed November 1, 2006).

Barbrook, R., and A. Cameron 2001. Californian ideology. In *crypto anarchy, cyberstates, and pirate utopias*, ed. P. Ludlow. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Belk, R. 1979. Gift-giving behavior. In *Research in marketing*, vol. 2, ed. J. N. Sheth. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

———. 1985. Materialism: Trait aspects of living in the material world. *Journal of Consumer Research* 12 (3): 265-80.

———. 1987. Identity and the relevance of market, personal and community objects. In *Marketing and semiotics: New directions for the study of signs for sale*, ed. Jean Umiker-Sebeok. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 1988. Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research* 15:139-68.

———. 1990. How perceptions of the body influence organ donation and transplantation: Me and thee versus mine and thine. In *Psychological research on organ donation*, ed. J. Shanteau and R. J. Harris. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

———. 1992. Attachment to possessions. In *Human behavior and environment: Advances in theory and research*, vol. 12, *Place attachment*, ed. I. Altman and S. Low. New York: Plenum.

———. 1996. The perfect gift. In *Gift giving: A research anthology*, ed. C. Otnes and R. F. Beltramini. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green University Popular Press.

———. 2000. Consumption patterns of the new elite in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Macromarketing* 20:204-5.

———. 2005. Exchange taboos from an interpretive perspective. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 15 (1): 16-21.

Belk, R., and G. Coon. 1993. Gift giving as agapic love: An alternative to the exchange paradigm based on dating experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research* 20:393-417.

Belk, R. and G. Tumbat. 2005. The cult of Mac. *Consumption, Markets and Culture* 8:205-18.

Benjamin, W. 1968. The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In *Illuminations*, ed. H. Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Benkler, Y. 2005. Coase's penguin, or, Linux and the nature of the firm. In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bergquist, M. 2003. Open source software development as gift culture: Work and identity formation in an Internet community. In *New technologies at work: People, screens, and social virtuality*, ed. C. Garsten and H. Wulff. Oxford, UK: Berg.

Bergquist, M., and J. Ljungberg. 2001. The power of gifts: Organizing social relationships in open source communities. *Information Systems Journal* 11:305-20.

Boyle, J. 2005. Fencing off ideas: Enclosure and the disappearance of the public domain. In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh, 235-58. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boyle, T. C. 1998. Filthy with things. In *T. C. Boyle stories*. London: Penguin.

Carrier, J. 1995. *Gifts and commodities: Exchange and Western capitalism since 1700*. London: Routledge.

Coyne, R. 2005. *Cornucopia limited: Design and dissent on the Internet*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

David, P. A. 2005. From keeping "nature's secrets" to the institutionalization of "open science." In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Davis, N. 2000. *The gift in sixteenth-century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Derrida, J. 1992. *Given time. I, Counterfeit money*. Trans. P. Kamuf. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, P. 1982. Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: The classification and framing of American art. *Media, Culture and Society* 4:303-22.

Douglas, M., and B. Isherwood. 1979. *The world of goods: Towards an anthropology of consumption*. New York: Norton.

Elgin, D. 1998. *Voluntary simplicity, revised edition: Toward a way of life that is outwardly simple, inwardly rich*. New York: Harper.

Etzioni, A. 1988. *The moral dimension: Toward a new economics*. New York: Free Press.

Fiske, A. P. 1991. *Structures of social life: The four elementary forms of human relations, communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing*. New York: Free Press.

Foster, G. M. 1969. Peasant society and the image of limited good. In *Applied anthropology*, ed. G. M. Foster. Boston: Little, Brown.

———. 1972. The anatomy of envy: A study of symbolic behavior. *Current Anthropology* 13:165-82.

Frow, J. 1997. *Time and commodity culture: Essays in cultural theory and postmodernity*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon.

Furby, L. 1976. The socialization of possession and ownership among children in three cultural groups: Israeli kibbutz, Israeli city, and American. In *Piagetian research: Compilation and commentary*, vol. 1, ed. S. Modgil and C. Modgil. Windsor, UK: NFER Publishing.

———. 1978. Sharing: Decisions and moral judgments about letting others use one's personal possessions. *Psychological Reports* 93:595-609.

Gerrard, G. 1989. Everyone will be jealous for that mutika. *Mankind* 19 (2): 95-111.

Ghosh, R., ed. 2005. *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Giesler, M. 2006. Consumer gift system: Netnographic insights from Napster. *Journal of Consumer Research* 33:283-90.

Godbout, J. T., and A. Caille 1998. *The world of the gift*. Trans. D. Winkler. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gould, R. A. 1982. To have and have not: The ecology of sharing among hunter-gatherers. In *Resource managers: North American and Australian hunter-gatherers*, ed. N. M. Williams and E. S. Hunn. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* 91 (November): 481-510.

Gregory, C. A. 1982. *Gifts and commodities*. London: Academic Press.

———. 1997. *Savage money: The anthropology and politics of commodity exchange*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Hammerslough, J. 2001. *Dematerializing: Taming the power of possessions*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

Hardin, G. 1968. The tragedy of the commons. *Science* 162:1243-48.

Hayden, C. 2005. Benefit-sharing: Experiments in governance. In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hyde, L. 1983. *The gift: Imagination and the erotic life of property*. New York: Random House.

Inglehart, R. 1981. Post-materialism in an environment of insecurity. *American Political Science Review* 75:880-900.

Jones, A. 1996. Philanthropy in the African American experience. In *Giving: Western ideas of philanthropy*, ed. J. B. Schweewind. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kelty, C. 2005. Trust among the algorithms: Ownership, identity, and the collaborative stewardship of information. In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kleine, S. S., and S. M. Baker. 2004. An integrative review of material possession attachment. *Academy of Marketing Science Review* 1:1-39.

Kleine, S. S., R. E. Kleine III, and C. T. Allen. 1995. How is a possession "me" or "not me"? Characterizing types and an antecedent of material possession attachment. *Journal of Consumer Research* 22:327-43.

Komter, A. E. 2005. *Social solidarity and the gift*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Love, J., and T. Hubbard. 2005. Paying for public goods. In *Code: Collaborative ownership and the digital economy*, ed. R. Ghosh. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Maddock, K. 1972. *The Australian Aborigines: A portrait of their society*. London: Penguin.

Malraux, A. 1967. *Museums without walls*. Ed. S. Gilbert and F. Price. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Mauss, M. 1967. *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies. I*. Trans. Ian Cunnison. New York: Norton.

McGraw, A. P., P. E. Tetlock, and O. V. Kristel. 2003. The limits of fungibility: Relational schemata and the value of things. *Journal of Consumer Research* 30:219-29.

Miller, D. 2001. Alienable gifts and inalienable commodities. In *The empire of things: Regimes of value and material* culture, ed. Fred R. Myers, 91-115. Oxford, UK: School of American Research Press.

Muñiz, A. M., Jr., and T. O'Guinn. 2001. Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research* 27:412-33.

Osteen, M. 2002. Gift or commodity? In *The question of the gift: Essays across disciplines*, ed. Mark Osteen. London: Routledge.

Pareles, J. 2005. The Dead's gamble: Free music for sale. *New York Times* (online edition), December 3.

Peters, Annette, Stephanie von Klot, Margit Heier, Ines Trentinaglia, Allmut Hörmann, H. Erich Wichmann, and Hannelore Löwel. 2004. Exposure to traffic and the onset of myocardial infarction. *New England Journal of Medicine* 351 (17): 1721-30.

Pinchot, G. 1995. The gift economy. *Context: A Quarterly of Humane Sustainable Culture*. http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC41/PinchotG.htm (accessed November 1, 2006).

Pine, J. B., II, and J. H. Gilmore. 1999. *The experience economy: Work as theatre and every business a stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Raymond, E. S. 2001. The hacker milieu as gift culture. *Future Positive*. http://futurepositive.synearth.net/stories/storyReader$223 (accessed November 1, 2006).

Reece, S. 1993. *The stranger's welcome: Oral theory and the aesthetics of the Homeric hospitality scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rheingold, H. 2000. *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roberts, S. 1996. Contexts of charity in the Middle Ages: Religious, social, and civic. In *Giving: Western ideas of philanthropy*, ed. J. B. Schweewind. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Rupp, K. 2003. *Gift-giving in Japan: Cash, connections, cosmologies*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sahlins, M. 1972. *Stone age economics.* Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.

Schor, J. B. 1998. *The overspent American: Upscaling, downshifting, and the new consumer*. New York: Basic Books.

Sherry, J. F., Jr. 1983. Gift giving in anthropological perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research* 10:157-68.

Sherry, J. F., Jr., M. A. McGrath, and S. J. Levy. 1992. The disposition of the gift and many unhappy returns. *Journal of Retailing* 38 (1): 40-65.

———. 1993. The dark side of the gift. *Journal of Business Research* 28:225-44.

Sieber, J. E. 1991. *Sharing social science data: Advantages and challenges*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silver, A. 1990. Friendship in commercial society: Eighteenth-century social theory and modern Sociology. *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1474-1504.

Simmel, G. 1990. *The philosophy of money*. Trans. Bottomore and D. Frisby. London: Routledge.

Testart, A. 1987. Game sharing systems and kinship systems among hunter-gatherers. *Man* 22 (2): 287-304.

Varian, H. R. 2000. *Buying, sharing and renting information goods*. http://www.sims.berkeley.edu/~hal/Papers/sharing.pdf (accessed November 1, 2006).

Vaughan, G. 1997. *For-giving: A feminist critique of exchange*. Austin, TX: Plain View Press.

Wallendorf, M., and E. J. Arnould. 1988. "My favorite things": A cross-cultural inquiry into object attachment, possessiveness, and social linkage. *Journal of Consumer Research* 14:531-47.

Webley, P., S. L. Lea, and R. Portalska. 1983. The unacceptability of money as a gift. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 4:223-38.

Weiner, A. 1992. *Inalienable possessions: The paradox of keeping-while-giving*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Windfield, Nick. 2005. In a dizzying world, one way to keep up: Renting possessions. *Wall Street Journal*, October 17, p. A1.

Yan, Y. 1996. *The flow of gifts: Reciprocity and social networks in a Chinese village*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.