

## Chapter 11

# Law and Governance: The Genesis of the Commons

**Danièle Bourcier**

*Centre d'Études et de Recherches de Sciences Administratives et Politiques (CERSA), France*

### ABSTRACT

*The case of Creative Commons (CC) is a good example for describing how a new way to govern Commons has been invented. The Creative Commons (CC) Project was launched with no particular consideration of governance. Its primary aim was simply to share a common resource with common digital management. Several years on, the question of governance, as a logic of collective action, is coming to the fore. Between legicentrism and over-privatization, can both CC governance and governance by CC be seen as an alternative solution for managing future projects on common property in common?*

### INTRODUCTION

A lot of studies explore the relationship between commons, community and property<sup>1</sup>. Even before the current increase in digital commons Ostrom (1990) drew attention to the importance of governing commons.

Creative Commons is a project that enables the sharing of digital cultural goods through a range of licenses that can be applied to a work, according

to the terms desired. It is based on copyright, but with a new rationale of patrimony. That potential for conceptual innovation has led to the success of this “singular legal object”<sup>2</sup>, but has, however, also attracted criticism. In essence, this initiative is at the center of new tension between the logics of economics (commercial/non-commercial) and the law (exclusive ownership or shared use). How can we analyze these new institutional formats whose equivalents are seen in other contexts, and which require us to review certain legal concepts?

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-3670-5.ch011

At this juncture, our focus is on questions of property, common goods, patrimony and governance.

We will firstly explain the difficulty of defining the goods and contracts concerned, then we will turn to *patrimony* with a view to renewing our approach to this notion. In point of fact, considering only the property regime (purely questions of property) means that some analyses have little relevance to the topic in hand. The question of patrimony goes beyond a simple distinction between public and private goods, for to administer is first to ensure management, that is, the best management possible in response to specific objectives. In other words, the notions of community and patrimony determine new choices of governance. This chapter looks at these choices.

When the market and the state were considered to have different roles, a balance could be found between individual and general interest. However, since the demarcations between market and state intervention are now becoming less clear, as in cases where the state distorts competition and innovation by strengthening regulation in favor of the market, new types of governance emerge.

## **PROPERTY RIGHTS AND GOVERNANCE**

Goods relevant to CC are immaterial and/or digital goods<sup>3</sup>, and may be private or “public.” However, this category of “public goods” is difficult to clarify. For economists, a public good is characterized by non-rivalry and non-excludability. Water, for instance, is not a public good since appropriation of this resource may give rise to rivalry. In this, we see the first signs of possible confusion between economic and legal vocabulary: as far as lawyers are concerned, public informational goods are those subsidized by public funding, intended to be accessible to the public, while the law deals with private goods under the concepts

of property and private heritage. The question of governance arises when the goods are in a gray area between private property and public service.

## **Reconsidering Traditional Notions**

In the case of copyright, some aspects of ownership have been extended to include intellectual property. Creative Commons and Science Commons have reintroduced the concept of commons. We will now return to these fundamental concepts to give a clearer appreciation of their development.

## **Property Rights**

Ownership was defined in the Civil Code at the beginning of the nineteenth century, on the basis of the Roman law de Justinien (*plena in re potestas*)<sup>4</sup>:

Ownership is the right to enjoy and dispose of things in the most absolute manner, provided they are not used in a way prohibited by statutes or regulations (Civil Code Art. 544).

Some characteristics of property such as *exclusivity* are increasingly put into question. From a political standpoint, Angell (2009) stated that property may be considered not as “something owned” but as a government-sanctioned monopoly right which is legally enforced by courts.

However, over the last two centuries, this exclusivity has become limited, particularly where land property and areas covered by the rise in urban planning are concerned. There is now a distortion between fact and law and a growing number consider that a new definition would be desirable. It has been said that this change was the revenge of Greece on Rome, of Philosophy on Law. The Roman concept that justified ownership in relation to its source (family, dowry, inheritance) has been overtaken by a teleological concept that justifies ownership through its aim, its service, and its function. The first draft of the French Constitution in 1946 was thus written:

16 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/law-governance-genesis-commons/77186](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/law-governance-genesis-commons/77186)

## Related Content

---

### Critical Success Factors of IT Strategy

Eng K. Chew and Petter Gottschalk (2009). *Information Technology Strategy and Management: Best Practices* (pp. 102-130).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/critical-success-factors-strategy/23742](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/critical-success-factors-strategy/23742)

### The Use of Developmental Psychology in Ethics: Beyond Kohlberg and Seligman?

Craig Steven Titus (2013). *Ethical Governance of Emerging Technologies Development* (pp. 266-286).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/use-developmental-psychology-ethics/77193](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/use-developmental-psychology-ethics/77193)

### Developing Audit Strategy for PaaS Applications

Harshada Dayasagar Samant and Raghvendra Singh (2023). *Modernizing Enterprise IT Audit Governance and Management Practices* (pp. 95-125).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/developing-audit-strategy-for-paas-applications/333179](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/developing-audit-strategy-for-paas-applications/333179)

### The Impact of IT Governance Practices on Strategic Alignment

Kari Hiekkanen (2015). *International Journal of IT/Business Alignment and Governance* (pp. 1-13).

[www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-it-governance-practices-on-strategic-alignment/138927](http://www.irma-international.org/article/the-impact-of-it-governance-practices-on-strategic-alignment/138927)

### A Multisourcing Maturity Model as an IT Governance Mechanism for Business Groups

Thomas Ph. Herz, Florian Hamel, Falk Uebernickel and Walter Brenner (2011). *International Journal of IT/Business Alignment and Governance* (pp. 1-14).

[www.irma-international.org/article/multisourcing-maturity-model-governance-mechanism/62093](http://www.irma-international.org/article/multisourcing-maturity-model-governance-mechanism/62093)