

# Replicating Obama: Outrage About Trump Exposes “Librul” Hypocrisy

By [Moon of Alabama](#)

Global Research, February 02, 2017

[Moon of Alabama](#) 29 January 2017

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

*The current “librul” outrage about Trump’s announced policies is somewhat amusing. Yes, these policies are bad, very bad. Trump is bad. But so was Obama and so is Clinton. Protesting the policies of one while not protesting when the other implemented the same policies is insincere grandstanding.*

Wherever you look, those Trump policies are building directly on, or simply repeat Obama policies. The now theatrically outraged people swallowed those without a word of protest.

A Trump order yesterday introduced a temporary ban on visa holders and visa issuing to citizens of seven Middle East countries. These countries are: Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. Those countries have one thing [in common](#). No terrorist who killed on U.S. soil originated from them. The (few) terrorists who attacked within the U.S. came from the Middle Eastern countries not on the list. Following Trump’s order, outcries on social media and in various papers ensued. People went to airports to protest. TV was there to spread the news.

But it is nothing new that the citizens of those countries are targeted with U.S. visa restrictions. It was Obama who [introduced](#) such in 2015 and 2016. The Trump order links directly to them. It does not name any country but refers to them [as](#) “countries designated in Division O, Title II, Section 203 of the 2016 consolidated appropriations act.”

U.S animosities against these countries is even older. [According to](#) the former general Clark, plans were made to wage war against six of the now named seven countries back in 2001. Yemen was later added while Lebanon was (temporarily?) taken off the list. The administrations change, the selected “enemies” stay the same.

In 2011 Obama stopped processing Iraqi visa requests [for six month](#). That move was quite similar to Trump’s current one. Where was the outcry in 2001? In 2011, 2015 and 2016? Is it only bad when Trump restricts visits for certain people from certain countries?

Sure, Trump introduces his “outrageous” measures loud and abruptly where Obama sneaked them in. But that is just different marketing, not a different product.



It is the coin that is bad, not just one side of it.

This morning CNN headlines: [White House discussing asking foreign visitors for social media info and cell phone contacts](#). HOW OUTRAGEOUS! How can Trump even think of such an invasion of privacy! Fake outrage - Obama had already signed off on this. The plans to collect social media accounts of traveling visitors and citizens were officially introduced in [October 2016](#) and the implementation started [in December 2016](#). The Trump White House is late in discussing the issue.

Yesterday Trump also issued [a memorandum](#) to structure his National Security Council. It says that the Director of National Intelligence and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff "shall attend" when it is pertinent to the issue in question. "Librul" outrage ensues. Trump [excludes](#) the DNI and CJCOS from the NSC! Obama's first Defense Secretary calls it a "huge mistake"! But [a comparison](#) of the text Trump issued with the text Obama issued when he came into office shows them to be mostly similar. Nothing really relevant has changed. The "shall attend" clause is exactly [the same](#).

Yesterday people were protesting at airports against Trump's temporary immigration restrictions. Lots of outrage against Trump ensued on social media over this and the other issues. The hypocrisy here stinks to high heaven. Where were the protest when Obama did similar?

Where are the protests demanding the repeal of the Patriot Act? Where are the anti-war protests? These died as soon as Obama came into office. They never came back even as Obama pursued policies that were, at best, Republican light and far from any progressive ideal. Only fake liberals, aka "libruls", could agree with these. When Dick Cheney is [your witness](#) against Trump you have lost the plot.

Many of the people coming out now against Trump would likely have jubilated had Hilliary Clinton won the election and introduced the exactly same policies. Protest against the system that is incorporated in Trump, just as it is incorporated in Clinton, does not come to their mind. Do they expect to be taken serious?

There was no outrage today from any of the U.S. "libruls" and their media outlets about last nights failed [U.S. military raid in Yemen](#). The rural home of a tribal leader's family, friendly with some Yemeni al-Qaeda members, was raided by a special operations commando. A U.S. tiltrotor military aircraft was shot down during the raid. One soldier was killed and several were wounded. The U.S. commandos responded with their usual panic. They killed anyone in sight and bombed the shit out of any nearby structure. [According to Yemeni sources](#) between 30 and 57 Yemenis were killed including eight women and [eight children](#) (graphic pics). The U.S. military claimed, as it always does, that no civilians were

hurt in the raid.

One of the killed kids was the 8 year old daughter of al-Qaeda propagandist Anwar al-Awlaki. (The targeted family is related to al-Awlaki's wife.) The girl was [a U.S. citizen](#). Under Obama the CIA had already assassinated her father and her 16 year old brother. With Obama's active help the Gulf countries have been bombing and destroying Yemen for nearly two years. No U.S. demonstrations were held against this war.

Yemeni sources say that at least two men were abducted by the U.S. military. The Central Command press release only said that the raid had helped to acquire "intelligence" about possible future terror acts. That probably means that the prisoners will be tortured to unveil such "intelligence" even as they may not have any. The Obama administration had introduced new rules for the military on how to handle detainees. The UN judged that [the application of some of these rules is torture](#). The "libruls" will of course be outraged should any of those rules, which Obama introduced, be used under a Trump administration.

The hypocritical outrage against Trump for things Obama already did is exactly what Trump [wants and needs](#). He keeps chasing the media and the Clintonistas around the block. The impression he leaves, not only with his followers, is that of a man who works a lot. 25 outrages out of 25 headlines in just one week? "Impressive! That is way more than Obama achieved!"

Trump already filed for reelection. Who really wants to beat him will have to attack him on fundamental issues. That is a problem for the "libruls". Obama and Clinton stand for the same terrible policies Trump is pushing for. They are not as loud as Trump and paint their aims in softer colors. But the difference is only one of degree.

The U.S., like many other "western" countries, needs fundamentally different policies and politicians to become a more just and social society. The current "librul" outcries take energy away from achieving such.

The original source of this article is [Moon of Alabama](#)  
Copyright © [Moon of Alabama](#), [Moon of Alabama](#), 2017

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Moon of Alabama](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance

a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)