Towards the end of his second term, it appears George W. Bush's foreign policy has won few admirers, with pundits and politicians eagerly and opportunistically bashing the tenets of the Bush Doctrine. This provocative account dares to counter the dogma of Bush's Beltway detractors and his ideological enemies, boldly arguing that Bush's policy deservedly belongs within the mainstream of the American foreign policy tradition. Though the shifting tide of public opinion has led many to anticipate that his successor will repudiate the actions of the past eight years, authors Timothy Lynch and Robert S. Singh suggest that there will-and should-be continuity in US foreign policy from his Presidency to those who follow. Providing a positive audit of the war on terror (which they contend should be understood as a Second Cold War) they charge that the Bush Doctrine has been consistent with past foreign policies-from Republican and Democratic presidencies-and that the key elements of Bush's grand strategy will rightly continue to shape America's approach in the future. Above all, they predict that his successors will pursue the war against Islamist terror with similar dedication.

My Personal Review:
If Congress had not amended the law to limit the number of terms a president could serve cynics would no doubt suggest that the co-authors of a book -- taking an historical as opposed to a hysterical look at presidential doctrine -- launched just weeks before the election were courting positions of high office.

As it happens, Bush's second term is nearing its end and he will soon be leaving the capital for Crawford, hence the title of Timothy J. Lynch's and Robert S. Singh's hardback: After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy. All the same the University of London duo could still be on Bush's guest list at the White House before the moving vans
approach 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Though clearly, such an offer is not the be all and end all for Messrs. Lynch and Singh. If anything an invitation from the 44th President of the United States is just as likely given their book's non-partisan, political futurology and for all of Barack Obama's mantra of 'change'.

Their historical reference point is the Truman era and the First Cold War. And their central thesis is that we are in the early stages of a Second Cold War, this time against Islamist terrorism. Notwithstanding Truman remaining the gold standard for presidential rehabilitation the pair never set out to revise Bush and make him into one of America's top ten. Depersonalizing the debate only reinforces their case and prolongs After Bush's existence on module reading lists the world over. (Indeed the bibliography alone, if read, would be enough to earn a master's degree.)

Thus After Bush should be read by everyone from Bush-backer to Bush-basher. That said if you are a Bush (doctrine)-basher and invited to debate with Lynch and Singh, decline. Their witty repartee and ready access store of historical quotations not to mention geo-political savvy, would threaten your myths and misconceptions. For instance by placing Bush's response to 9/11 in historical context, Lynch and Singh frontally challenge the view that Bush was a revolutionary. It is here that the pair is to be congratulated for filling a vacuum in American foreign policy scholarship. (Until now all we had to quote was from the hands of John Lewis Gaddis, Niall Ferguson, Melvyn Leffler and Michael Gove.)

The duo's 300-page hardback is a confident and comprehensive rebuttal to Bush's critics. But that is not to say the co-authors overlook questions pertaining to the legality of intervention, the mismanagement of post-war Iraq and alleged abuses at Abu Ghraib. Rest assured no stone goes unturned.

As a consequence, Lynch and Singh are now among the heavyweights of today: Robert Lieber (The American Era) and Andrew Roberts (A History of the English-Speaking Peoples Since 1900). While Robert Kaufman (In Defense of the Bush Doctrine) and Norman Podhoretz (World War IV) battle it out in the middleweight division. Such an appraisal is based on their historical nuance; historical nuance that would give the likes of Walter Russell Mead (Special Providence) and Robert Kagan (Dangerous Nation) a run for their money.

Longsighted not shortsighted. Practical not polemical. Continuity not change.

For More 5 Star Customer Reviews and Lowest Price:
After Bush: The Case for Continuity in American Foreign Policy by Robert S. Singh - 5 Star Customer Reviews and Lowest Price!