Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

The Evolution of Ownership: A Historical-Philosophical Review from Classical Virtue to the Digital Economy

Jason Jun Xi Zhao

Oregon Episcopal School, Portland, USA
zhaoja@go.oes.edu

Abstract. This literature review examines the evolution of ownership as a central concept in moral, political, and economic thought, tracing debates from classical antiquity to the digital age. It situates the discussion within the broader questions of justice and social order, focusing on the precarious balance between collective responsibility and individual autonomy. As we draw upon comparative historical-philosophical approach, the review analyses primary texts by various philosophers of the times, alongside socio-economic and technological developments. It spans from classical philosophers to medieval theologians, to early modern liberals to industrial and socialist theorists, and finally, to contemporary scholars. The analysis stresses the recurring patterns in which ownership is reinterpreted in response to economic/industrial development economic transformations, and the ever evolving moral reflection of the times. Classical and medieval frameworks emphasised moral stewardship and civic virtue. Early modern thought introduced property as a natural and political right. Industrial and socialist theories shifted focus toward ownership as a social relation structuring the new concept of class and the perpetuating inequality between them. Contemporary debates over digital property and knowledge commons illustrate the ongoing negotiation between ethical responsibility and once again, right to property. This review concludes that ownership is not a fixed economic institution but a dynamic lens through which societies evolve its various ethical principles, contemporary governance structures and other related societal priorities. Recognising ownership as a spectrum rather than a binary concept offers critical insights for understanding the interplay of liberty, justice, and collective well-being across historical and contemporary contexts.

Keywords: Ownership, Property Theory, Collective Responsibility, Individual Autonomy, Digital Commons

1. Introduction

Ownership has long occupied a central place in morality and economic policies, serving as lens through which scholars examine matters such as justice and equality. Over time, debates over ownership have oscillated between individualist and collectivist ethos, reflecting the ever enduring tensions between the schools of thought. From Plato's guardians, who embodied communal virtue, to contemporary discussions of the rights corporations hold over now digital intellectual property, the question of ownership charts the course in which societies decide their obligations towards

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

matters such as but not limited to hierarchies, property and the distribution of goods. These debates demonstrate that ownership is not merely an economic institution but a dynamic reflection of morality and other practices throughout historical epochs. The significance of examining ownership from a historical-philosophical perspective lies in its ability to highlight patterns of continuity and change in how societies respond and adapt to new natural and or technological transformation. Understanding the evolution of ownership helps us paint a clearer picture of how societies have used various philosophical or practical frameworks to balance the rights of the individual with the welfare of the masses. In the twenty-first century, where ownership extends into digital platforms, tracing its historical development offers critical insights into contemporary debates over the rights of fundamentally abstract concepts such as intellectual properties and such.

This review undertakes a systematic review of key intellectual traditions and historical transformations in the philosophy of ownership. Here, it traces ideological debates among classical philosophers, medieval Christian theologians, early modern liberals, industrial and socialist theorists, and contemporary scholars. It examines how notions of property have shifted between moral obligations and practical considerations. Employing a comparative historical and theoretical approach, the study analyses the works of philosophers applied to socio-economic and technological developments, highlighting the interplay between ethical reasoning, political philosophy, and structural change. The objective of this review is to identify the recurring patterns, in the discourse of ownership, emphasising how societies have continuously sought to reconcile personal freedom with social responsibility. The paper argues that ownership should be understood as a continuum rather than a binary, as proven by the ever evolving school of thought, and that effective governance requires institutional reforms that balance autonomy with collective welfare. In this way, the study not only maps the evolution of ownership theories but also stresses their continual relevance for contemporary ethical and socio-economic considerations.

2. Classical foundations: virtue and the good society

The earliest systematic reflections on the moral and political foundations of ownership can be traced to classical antiquity, where debates over communal and individual property first articulated distinct visions of justice and social order. In Republic, Plato envisioned a radical form of enforced egalitarianism through his guardian class, who would hold property, spouses, and children in common. To him, private ownership generated corruption, jealousy, and moral degeneration [1]. A just polity, he argued, required the subordination and relinquishment of individual attachments for the greater good of the masses, ensuring that these rulers acted free from self-interest. While this system does share much similarity with modern socialism and communism, it's a form of hierarchical communalism which focuses on societal harmony through merit, not class struggle. In contrast, Aristotle's Politics directly countered this view. He regarded private property as a natural extension of human rationality and moral agency, essential for cultivating responsibility and civic virtue. People, he argued, care most for what belongs to them; ownership encourages generosity, friendship, and participation in the polis [2]. Excessive communalism, by contrast, would breed neglect and resentment, since shared resources lack the personal accountability one would put into property they would otherwise hold dear to. Despite this, Aristotle did not wholly dismiss communal values: he still stressed the importance of strong morals to establish harmony and create a high trust society. The philosophical divide between Plato and Aristotle thus laid the conceptual groundwork for two enduring poles in political philosophy: the pursuit of collective harmony through shared ownership and the defence of private property as the foundation of freedom and responsibility. Collectivism and Individualism.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

3. Medieval synthesis: property as divine trust

During the medieval period, classical ideals of ownership were reframed through the lens of Christian theology, which introduced the concept of stewardship and transformed ownership from a natural or moral right into a moral obligation. Influenced by both Plato and Aristotle, theologians such as Augustine of Hippo and Thomas Aquinas conceived property not as an absolute entitlement but as a trust conferred by God, the use of which must promote the common good [3]. The Church maintained that private ownership was necessary for social stability (as shared resources lack the personal accountability from anyone in particular), yet simultaneously insisted that wealth entailed ethical responsibilities, such as hospitality and charity for the less fortunate. In Matthew 19:21, Jesus teaches that wealth is more fruitfully deployed in the hands of the needy, thereby challenging the moral legitimacy of accumulation for personal gain [4].

Within this framework, ownership became inseparable from duty: to possess was a right, but also an obligation to the community. Monastic orders, particularly the Benedictines and Franciscans, embodied the hardline form of this ethic by renouncing private property entirely, pursuing spiritual purification through collective ownership and shared labour. However, beyond the hallowed monastic walls lie feudal structures which entrench hereditary privilege and systemic inequality,. This persistent tension between Christian ideals of moral stewardship therefore became the new focal point of the times. Consequently, the medieval synthesis reinterpreted the right to private property as a moral trial, in which legitimacy was judged not by possession itself but by its righteous use [5]. This reconceptualisation illustrates the enduring interplay between idealistic moral philosophy and the harsh reality of feudalistic ownership at the time.

4. Early modern revisions: property, liberty, and inequality

The early modern period saw a decisive transformation in the understanding of ownership, shifting from property as a moral obligation to property recognised as a political and legal right. This transformation unfolded in the face of a growing urban society and a rising middle class (commonly known as bourgeoisie nowadays) who don't fit into the traditional feudal pyramid. Philosophers such as John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau reinterpreted ownership within the frameworks of natural law, embedding it in new emerging notions of individual liberty.

Locke's Second Treatise of Government advanced a labour-based theory of property: by mixing their labour with natural resources, individuals acquired legitimate ownership, which functioned both as a moral entitlement and as a visible expression of liberty and productivity [6]. For Locke, property existed prior to political society; the state's foremost purpose was to protect this natural right. In his view, ownership was closely tied to human reason, self-possession, and the ethical exercise of freedom. The very state of being able to own things is a fundamental natural right of man, on the same level as right to life and liberty. He argued that governments are established to protect these rights among others. The link between labour and property also reinforced a new normal: property rights incentivised industriousness , of which a government that respects individual rights must uphold.

Rousseau, by contrast, criticised this overtly optimistic framework. In Discourse on the Origin of Inequality, he called private property the act of declaring "This is mine," which enables social hierarchy and moral corruption [7]. Property was neither natural nor inherently just; it engendered domination over others which goes hand in hand with systemic inequality. While Locke associated ownership with civic virtue and incentive to work harder, Rousseau emphasised its role in producing conflict over limited resources. His critique foregrounded the ethical consequences of property,

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

anticipating further conflict down the line on primarily the perpetration of continual inequality and the moral legitimacy of new economic arrangements.

The divergence between Locke and Rousseau exemplifies the broader intellectual shift of early modern political thought, from otherwise purely metaphysical and abstract morality to largely empirical and political questions regarding tangible wealth and living conditions. Property was no longer assessed solely in moral or theological terms but scrutinised for its institutional and distributive effects. Between property as a natural right and as a socially constructed source of inequality, the new central axis of modern political philosophy was born this way. It also set the stage for later theoretical developments, from industrial-era liberalism and socialism to contemporary debates over economic justice, intellectual and digital property and well as the management of welfare or otherwise resources dedicated for those in greater need. The early modern revision thus represents not merely a conceptual realignment but a critical lens through which to understand the evolving interplay between liberty, ownership, and social hierarchy across subsequent centuries.

5. Industrial modernity: property and production

By the nineteenth century, the meaning of ownership had become inseparable from the structural dynamics of industrial capitalism as the world powers into the industrial era. Rapid industrialisation, urbanisation, and the decisive shift away from feudalism into capitalism further transformed property from a primarily moral or philosophical concern into a central axis of economic and social power. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, writing through the lens of historical materialism, rejected traditional moral conceptions of property, arguing instead that ownership constituted power and control over the means of production [8]. Private property, in this framework, was not merely a neutral entity which people call their own, but a mechanism enabling capitalists to appropriate surplus value from the fruits of other's labour, systematically perpetrating exploitation and further entrenching class hierarchies [9]. For Marx and Engels, communal or collective ownership was not a utopian ideal but a historical necessity: only by restructuring and redistributing wealth could human freedom and social equality be realised. Property thus became inseparable from broader questions of class and once again the new contemporary ethical legitimacy of economic arrangements. Their philosophies represent arguably the most revolutionary interpretation of its time, and remain a powerful force in politics well into today's world.

From a liberal perspective, John Stuart Mill sought to reconcile the productive and distributive functions of ownership. While affirming private property as an incentive for industriousness and economic growth, similarly to that of Locke, Mill advocated cooperative associations, profit-sharing, and related enterprises as mechanisms to mitigate inequality and align economic activity with social welfare [10]. In this way, he highlighted that ownership was simultaneously a source of individual freedom, economic efficiency, and moral responsibility. Both Marx and Mill recognised that by the nineteenth century, property had evolved beyond personal possession: it structured social life, shaped power relations, and influenced moral and political values [11].

This period therefore represents a pivotal transformation in the conceptualisation of ownership: from a moral right or philosophical principle to a constitutive element of social and economic systems. It lay the groundwork for the place of the working man in the new industrial economy of the time, and the more theoretical concepts of class which remain relevant well into today's world. Moreover, the nineteenth century set the stage for twentieth-century debates over state intervention, welfare, and the balance between individual rights and collective obligations, demonstrating that the various aspects of ownership are inseparable and mutually constitutive.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

6. The twentieth century: ideological polarisation and pragmatic synthesis

The twentieth century witnessed the translation of these philosophical tensions into competing political orders. The Russian Revolution and ensuing Cold War transformed the theoretical dialectic into a global confrontation between communism and capitalism. Marxist regimes abolished private property in favour of state control, seeking equality through centralised planning. Yet, as Hannah Arendt observed in The Human Condition, such systems often replaced private domination with bureaucratic coercion, extinguishing individual agency and public deliberation [12]. Conversely, Friedrich Hayek warned in The Road to Serfdom that even well-meaning state planning leads to coercion, advocating market competition and private ownership as bulwarks of liberty [13]. Karl Polanyi, however, argued in The Great Transformation that both unregulated markets and total planning subordinated society to economic logic, eroding autonomy and reciprocity alike [14].

The practical response to this impasse was the emergence of mixed economies, integrating private enterprise with public regulation and welfare. Western welfare democracies after 1945 further fleshed out this ideal by creating a solid safety net for the working class, while social democracies in Scandinavia institutionalised redistribution through taxation and labour protections [15]. China's post-1978 reforms extended this pragmatic approach by combining market incentives with state ownership in key sectors: a hybrid model dubbed "market socialism" where a heavily digiriste system directs a capitalist economy, balancing growth and social stability [16]. By century's end, the theoretical poles of ownership converged into a spectrum of arrangements calibrated between autonomy and equality.

7. The digital turn: data, commons, and new enclosures

In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, critiques of inequality reinvigorated scholarly attention to both the moral and structural dimensions of ownership. Thomas Piketty's Capital in the Twenty-First Century demonstrated empirically that when the rate of return on capital persistently exceeds overall economic growth, wealth concentration intensifies, thereby undermining democratic institutions [17]. Similarly, David Harvey's theory of "accumulation by dispossession" revealed how neoliberal globalisation extends capitalist domination by privatising public goods and financialising everyday life [18]. At the same time, Elinor Ostrom's research continues to challenge the conventional binary between private and state ownership. Her studies of fisheries, forests, and irrigation systems showed that communities can sustainably manage shared resources through norms, trust, and polycentric governance structures [19]. Collectively, these insights underscore that ownership is not a simple dichotomy of private versus collective but a dynamic spectrum reflecting complex balances between autonomy, equality, and social responsibility.

The digital revolution has further transformed the concept of ownership, extending it beyond tangible property to encompass data and other forms of intellectual property as primary forms of economic and social power. Shoshana Zuboff's theory of "surveillance capitalism" illustrates how one's once private personal information is commodified by corporate platforms, transforming user participation into extractable economic value [20]. Digital ownership in this context is paradoxical: users generate value collectively through social interactions, content creation, and behavioural data, yet retain minimal control or compensation for the resources they produce. Free platforms thus invert traditional consumer logic: users are not the customers but the products, with their data sold to advertisers to generate profit. This phenomenon constitutes a new form of dispossession, echoing Marx's critique of private ownership of the means of production and revealing structural inequalities within virtual spaces.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

Conversely, the "knowledge commons" movement offers an alternative vision of digital property, framing resources as collectively governed and openly accessible, inspired by Ostrom's principles of polycentric governance [21]. Open-source software, digital cooperatives, and Creative Commons licensing enable communities to co-produce, maintain, and share intellectual property while preserving collective agency. These initiatives suggest that digital ownership need not follow a zero-sum logic of private control versus state centralisation; it can function as a continuum of shared stewardship, balancing individual initiative with communal benefit. Emerging technologies such as blockchain, decentralised finance, and tokenised assets further complicate ownership structures, introducing hybrid models that challenge corporate monopolies and state authority alike.

Theoretical reflection on digital property reveals that the historical tension between communal and individual ownership persists, now within the domain of immaterial and networked resources. While classical debates focused on land, labour, or physical capital, contemporary discourse must contend with the governance of knowledge, data, and virtual infrastructures. The ethical and political questions remain analogous: who controls these valuable resources, whose interests are prioritised, and how can autonomy be reconciled with collective welfare? The digital age thus represents both a continuation and an intensification of the enduring debate over property, confirming that ownership remains a central lens for understanding justice, power, and human flourishing in the twenty-first century.

Across this intellectual history, ownership emerges as a moral and adaptive institution rather than a static economic fact. Paradigm shifts respond to social, political, and technological crises: Plato sought unity amid civic decay, Aquinas reconciled hierarchy with virtue, Locke defended freedom during commercial expansion, Marx critiqued industrial exploitation, and Piketty warned against the erosion of democratic equality. As C. B. Macpherson observed in The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism, liberal property theory assumes a self-owning individual, whereas collectivist traditions emphasise interdependence and mutual responsibility [22]. The ongoing dialogue between these perspectives remains unresolved because both articulate essential aspects of human nature: the pursuit of freedom and the need for belonging. Even as technological change reshapes the material basis of ownership, the normative question persists: how can property structures nurture both autonomy and solidarity?

8. Conclusion

The study finds that visions of ownership evolve not through simple replacement but through continuous reinterpretation shaped by historical crises and largely technological advances that change the way the economy is interpreted. From Plato's guardians to Piketty's capital owners, each era redefines what it means to own in order to confront emerging forms of inequality. Across this evolution, the moral core of the debate remains constant: balancing individual autonomy with social obligation. Ownership functions simultaneously as a mirror and a maker of civilisation: it both reflects societal conceptions of justice and shapes the capacity for collective life. Historical analysis demonstrates that ownership has never been a fixed concept; rather, it is a dynamic spectrum encompassing collective stewardship, private initiative, and hybrid forms. From Plato's vision of collective virtue to Aristotle's emphasis on individual excellence, from the medieval ethic of stewardship to Locke's natural-right individualism, and from Marx's critique of industrial exploitation to contemporary debates over data and knowledge commons, ownership reveals society's ongoing effort to reconcile autonomy with solidarity. The twentieth century, particularly the Cold War, exposed the limitations of extreme models such as absolute state control and unfettered capitalism. It highlighted the practical necessity and evolution of mixed ownership

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.LD31125

systems, combining private initiative with public oversight. Technological advances and globalisation enhanced the capacity to monitor, regulate, and analyse ownership practices, reinforcing the importance of adaptable institutional frameworks. In the digital era, ownership extends into immaterial and networked resources, challenging traditional frameworks while reinforcing enduring ethical questions regarding control, access, and justice. Contemporary developments, from digital platforms to knowledge commons, underscore that ownership should be understood as a spectrum rather than a binary. Future governance will require highly adaptable structures that preserve individual freedom while promoting collective welfare, ensuring that ownership continues to serve as a cornerstone of both justice and human flourishing. Ultimately, the enduring aim remains the same: to maximise human success and minimise human suffering, while the means to achieve the ends will continue to provoke rigorous debate very well into the foreseeable future.

References

[1] Plato. (2007) The Republic (2nd ed., trans. by Robin Waterfield). London: Penguin Books, pp. 416.
[2] Aristotle. (1995) Politics (trans. Ernest Barker). Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 624.
[3] Aquinas, T. (1947) Summa Theologica, I-II, Q66, Art 1. London: Benziger Bros., pp. 294–298.
[4] The Holy Bible. (n.d.) Matthew 19: 21. Retrieved from https: //www.biblegateway.com/ (accessed 9 Nov. 2025).
[5] Benedictine Rule. (1981) The Rule of St. Benedict (trans. Roland J. Teske). Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, pp. 12–48.
[6] Locke, J. (1988) Second Treatise of Government. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Ch. V, §27, pp. 45–48.
[7] Rousseau, J.-J. (1999) A Discourse on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality Among Mankind. London: Liberty Fund, Part I, pp. 59–63.
[8] Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2011) The Communist Manifesto. London: Penguin Classics, pp. 48.
[9] Marx, K. (2007) Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, pp. 96.
[10] Mill, J. S. (1871) Principles of Political Economy. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, Book V, Ch. X, pp. 741–745.
[11] Wolff, J. (2002) Why Read Marx Today? Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 224.
[12] Arendt, H. (1958/1998) The Human Condition (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 349.
[13] Hayek, F. A. (1944) The Road to Serfdom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 297.
[14] Polanyi, K. (1944) The Great Transformation. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 560.
[15] Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 254.
[16] Naughton, B. (2018) The Chinese Economy: Adaptation and Growth. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 400.
[17] Piketty, T. (2014) Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 696.
[18] Harvey, D. (2003) The New Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 192.
[19] Ostrom, E. (1990) Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 280.
[20] Zuboff, S. (2019) The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. New York: PublicAffairs, pp. 704.
[21] Hess, C. & Ostrom, E. (2007) Understanding Knowledge as a Commons. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 343.
[22] Macpherson, C. B. (1962) The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 220.