

sovereignty, between indivisible principle and divisible practices—and how private entities engage in and even capture sovereign functions through this ambiguity—form the central contribution of this book. Its discussion between the conceptual issues of “ideal types” against the need for these to form markers along a spectrum for analytical purposes is excellent.

A final thought that the book raises is one of how we go about analysing fundamental concepts in political science. Humankind as knowledge-maker is prone to categorization and ordering of types to make sense of our world. But reality, whether evolutionary or social, often operates along spectra without discrete markers between “types” except those we impose. As Srivastava reminds us, while we may use the concepts instrumentally, we should be mindful that it is a methodological step that risks obscuring nuance and variation that are the source of evolving conceptions. This prompts the final question that is only hinted at in the book: How might this book’s insights inform our understanding of the future evolution of sovereignty? This would entail asking about the conditions through which sovereign power moves between public and private: How large are these hybrid spaces where private entities may wield sovereign power? What causes retreat of the state or of the quasi-sovereign? This has largely been the domain of critical theorists following Carl Schmitt (see Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, 1985; Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, 2005), but the empirical study is sorely in need of updating for the twenty-first century.

Response to Joel Ng’s Review of *Hybrid Sovereignty in World Politics*

doi:10.1017/S1537592723001081

— Swati Srivastava 

My thanks to Joel Ng for his excellent engagement with *Hybrid Sovereignty in World Politics*. As Ng notes, the book is motivated by reconciling the realities of enmeshed public/private relations in global governance with the stylized representations of separate state and nonstate realms in International Relations. The book presents sovereignty as a hybridization of two modalities: *Idealized Sovereignty*, where sovereign authority is represented exclusively in “the state” per the doctrine of indivisibility developed by early modern theorists, and *Lived Sovereignty*, where achieving sovereign competence involves divisible practices of state and nonstate actors in a variety of social relations. In hybrid sovereignty, public/private hybridity is both integral to sovereign power and a challenge to sovereign authority.

For Ng, there is some under-specification in the book’s definition of sovereign functions. I agree, and this is actually an important methodological choice. Rather than begin with a universal definition of what is sovereign, I look for sovereign competence in the organization of three realms: violence, markets, and rights. Within these realms, I argue that sovereign competence takes on many forms such that there are no singly agreed upon ways to exercise violence, organize markets, or protect rights, making the study of sovereignty less deterministic. Indeed, as Ng himself writes, “what powers a sovereign ought to wield are a matter of debate.”

Across the sovereign realms of violence, markets, and rights, the book’s empirical scope concerns transnational organizations since they raise especially thorny questions for global sovereign politics. Ng suggests privileging the territorial aspect of sovereignty and selecting cases “where a state contracted a non-state entity” domestically. While *Hybrid Sovereignty* flags important work in this area, such as on rebel governance or the private provision of public goods, my focus on organizations that operate transnationally, like Blackwater, the International Chamber of Commerce, and Amnesty International, is to leverage the ambiguities of converting sovereign power into sovereign authority outside the standard territorial claims and legitimation debates of domestic politics.

Moreover, the contemporary cases each represent one of three ideal-types of public/private hybridity. Contractual hybridity (seen through Blackwater) features formal, publicized performances where sovereign power is negotiated in public/private contractual exchanges. Institutional hybridity (explored through the International Chamber of Commerce) features informal, partly publicized performances where sovereign power is negotiated through public/private institutional linkages. Shadow hybridity (as revealed in Amnesty International) features informal, non-publicized performances where sovereign power is negotiated in public/private shadowy bargains. The typology was inductively derived from a hundred-year analysis of the English East India Company. The contribution of the ideal-types is to underscore that not all public/private relations in *Lived Sovereignty* are the same (thus, going beyond contracting), nor do they implicate *Idealized Sovereignty* in singularly positive or negative ways.

Finally, I concur wholeheartedly that the book prompts questions about what treating sovereignty as hybrid means for the future evolution of sovereign governance. I hope that other researchers join me in exploring the conditions under which hybrid sovereignty thrives and when changes in *Lived Sovereignty* generate fundamentally new kinds of *Idealized Sovereignty*.