

No Winners in Third Trump-Clinton Debate: Did Trump's Final Shot Fall Short?

By [Larry Chin](#)

Global Research, October 21, 2016

Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

The [third US presidential debate](#) between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton was an awkward affair that probably did little to alter existing perceptions.

Trump entered the debate with critical and urgent tasks:

- Head off the existential threat of a nuclear war with Russia over Syria; a war the Hillary Clinton would start.*
- Expose Hillary Clinton as a criminal and a terrorist, with such force and detail that she would be removed as a presidential candidate, and removed from public service entirely.*
- Clearly and convincingly articulate an agenda for reform and world peace that can disrupt the entrenched New World Order oligarchy.*

In this final opportunity to educate and convince an international mainstream television audience, within a limited format, Trump failed.

Stylistically, Trump came in seemingly unprepared. He did not bring enough new material to this performance, failed to utilize dozens of new Wikileaks revelations. He repeated too many routines from the previous debate. His glancing, roundabout speaking patterns did him no favors. He went off on tangents, squandering countless opportunities. Trump is not a trained politician who knows how to jam talking points into two minute segments full of “zingers”, and it showed.

Hillary Clinton, by contrast, had the easier job of staying upright and merely surviving. She gave a typical rehearsed politician's performance. She lied with the assurance of an experienced criminal and sociopath. She absorbed Trump's attacks (without effectively deflecting many of them), only losing her composure a few times, and spouted lies and half-truths that sounded factual. She was nasty. Hillary Clinton was Hillary Clinton: typically unlikeable and vicious, but proudly so.

But it was Trump's failures on substance that were most problematic.



The Russian “threat”

Trump did not effectively counter the aggressive “Russia did it” propaganda and war agenda. Hillary called him a Russian puppet who has “encouraged espionage against the United States of America”.

When Hillary bombastically declared everything from Wikileaks and Trump himself as agents of a [massive Russian espionage operation](#) of Putin to “infiltrate the US election” “from the highest levels of the Kremlin”, “proven by 17 government agencies”. Trump shot back “No puppet, you’re the puppet”, but failed to immediately attack Clinton’s idiotic rhetoric and her claims of proof. He declared that Clinton doesn’t actually know who is responsible for the cyberhacks and is blowing hot air.

The “17 agencies proof” is a [total lie manufactured by US intelligence](#) on behalf of Clinton. The “17” is actually one man, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, who committed perjury over NSA surveillance. Trump did not point out that Clinton’s “proof” via her own people—officials of the Obama administration, Obama’s intelligence apparatus, including the compromised FBI Director (and longtime Clinton/Bush co-conspirator) James Comey—is not “proof”.

The mainstream media has parroted these same claims of “evidence” of Russian espionage and cyberattacks as if fact. Debate moderator Chris Wallace even tossed this so-called “proof” of Russian meddling at Trump. Trump failed to counter that [there is no proof to back the claim of Russian hacking](#) and espionage. Perhaps because he actually believes that there is. Worse, *Wallace got Trump to say that he condemns Russian interference in the election. “Of course I condemn it”.* This condemnation of non-existent Russian interference was perhaps the most embarrassing and dangerous failure of the night on Trump’s part.

Trump instead retreated to the same simplistic denials from the last debate: [“I don’t know Putin”](#), “He says nice things about me” but “We’re not best friends”. He failed to turn it back on Clinton, failed to state clearly that *the entire anti-Russia agenda is not only McCarthyist propaganda, but dangerous rhetoric that is provoking a world war, thus the*

fanatical Hillary Clinton is the danger to humanity. Trump could have won over any human being interested in not only world peace but planetary survival, with just a few such lines. He didn't do it.

Trump failed to channel, of all people, Joe Biden. Recall in the 2012 vice presidential debate, Biden famously shamed Republican vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan for his hotheaded desire to "take out" Syria and Assad. To which Biden pointedly asked Ryan, "Do you want a war? Is that what you want?" That is all Trump had to do with Hillary Clinton: "*Hillary, do you want nuclear war? Is that what you want?*" Or: "*Hillary, do you think there are any winners in a nuclear war? Are you insane?*" (Ironically, it is Joe Biden who today is planning the coming war against Russia. So he indeed is the one who "wants it".)

When Clinton said that she intends to "take back Syria from the Russians", Trump failed to expose her lie. Syria is being invaded by US/NATO terrorists, and Russia is helping a sovereign nation defend itself from the illegal conquest at the bloody hands of Clinton and the New World Order. Trump should simply be calling for an end to the criminal US/NATO operation: "give Syria back to Syria", and get out of the region. He has not done so.

Instead of defusing the provocative anti-Russia rhetoric, Trump even added to it non-sequiturs about competing nuclear stockpiles. Scary Iranian nuclear ambitions, scary Russian aggression, scary Assad—not that different a viewpoint than Clinton's.

Trump did not defend Wikileaks, and did not counter the charge that Wikileaks and Julian Assange is not a Russian espionage operation. Worse, Trump failed to state that *no matter the source, the substance of what Wikileaks is exposing—the truth—is something Clinton cannot hide from. That substance absolutely exposes Hillary Clinton and the Clinton machine is criminal and treasonous. She and her operatives should be answer to this evidence and be punished for all of it.*

Trump did not differ with the Clinton/New World Order narrative that Russia, Iran and Syria are enemies that have [outsmarted](#) and disrespected Clinton and Obama, and must be opposed by someone better, and "make them respect us".

On Syria and the Middle East

Trump repeated, as he did in the previous debate, that the US and Russia "should be fighting ISIS" together. But he said nothing about the fact that ISIS is a creation of CIA and the Obama administration, and Hillary Clinton directly. He has made suggestions about this in previous speeches, but his failure to do so on this important mainstream appearance squandered a final chance to use the new Wikileaks evidence exposing Hillary's funding of ISIS. *Trump therefore failed to address the source of the problem.* Was this conscious avoidance, or does he not "get it"?

Trump did not disavow the "war on terrorism", has said nothing about getting out of the Middle East. He only says it is a "disaster" caused by Clinton and Obama. Instead of nailing Hillary Clinton for war crimes (for which she orchestrated and carried out with intent, enthusiasm and relish—Libya, Benghazi, ISIS, Syria, etc.—Trump continued with soft criticism of her "ineffectiveness"; accused her State Department and the Obama foreign policy of being "stupid".

Trump repeated the line that ISIS grew out of the "vacuum" left by the Clinton/Obama in

Iraq. In fact, it was not a “vacuum”. ISIS and Islamic terrorism are not “outside enemies”. ISIS is a creation of the CIA and NATO that was not just “allowed to happen” but is *the leading military-intelligence force of NATO and the United States in the region*. Numerous sources expose Clinton and Obama as creators of terrorism. Trump said nothing about this. As for the CIA, illegal covert operations, and the CIA’s running of Al-Qaeda, Al-Nusra and ISIS, Hillary Clinton is front and center in the middle of these atrocities. Trump has never gone there.

Trump invited a Benghazi widow to attend the debate, but failed to attack Clinton for her ruthless and cold-blooded Libya operation, or for the fourth deaths that were meaningless to “What difference does it make?” Hillary.

Trump repeated a stale point from the previous debate, about what he believes is a failure to take Mosul with a sneak attack. Trump entirely misses the point, avoiding the fact that *ISIS fighters are being repositioned, on US/NATO/CIA orders from Mosul into Syria*. Trump failed to talk about the reality that *ISIS and jihadists are run by the CIA and NATO*. If he knows this, he is not saying.

On Aleppo, Trump stated, ignorantly or intentionally, that the US at present “doesn’t know who the rebels are”, but “we’re backing rebels”. This represents some of Trump’s most brain-dead rhetoric. *The US and NATO know exactly who the rebels are. The rebels are NATO’s “freedom fighters”. The US, NATO and the CIA created Islamic terrorists, manage/fund/arm/guide Al-Qaeda, Al-Nusra, and ISIS, all of which are military-intelligence forces operating openly on behalf of Washington and NATO, on orders from the CIA, the Pentagon, the White House, the State Department*. By refusing to state these indisputable (and now even commonly accepted) facts, Trump left an ignorance excuse loophole, through which Hillary Clinton and the powers that be can slither through safely. Instead of nailing these criminals, Trump essentially gives them plausible denial.

When Hillary Clinton predictably went into a favorite propaganda spiel about the “poor bleeding Aleppo Boy”, did Trump point out the Aleppo Boy is most likely [a propaganda hoax](#), at least a blatant piece of propaganda being used to justify war, just as certainly as the “incubator baby” propaganda hoax was used to justify the Gulf War? No. Did Trump mention that there would be no “poor bleeding Aleppo Boy” at all, were it not for the foreign policy of Obama and Hillary Clinton? No. And Hillary Clinton’s contempt for humanity and war criminality, her responsibility for the deaths of thousands, including untold numbers of “poor Aleppo Boys” all over the world was also not mentioned.

When Clinton repeated her desire for a no-fly zone over Syria, Trump failed to point out that *it would be an overt act of war, leading directly to nuclear conflict with Russia*. Her lie about establishing “peacekeeping safe zones” is the classic charade used to justify all previous criminal wars under a “humanitarian” pretext. And that the “negotiations” under Hillary Clinton are never “negotiations”, but intimidations leading quickly to bombing and killing. Trump said nothing about this.

On Clinton’s corruption

Trump did call the Clinton Foundation a criminal organization but did not go into specifics that could have blown it wide open. He mentioned connections to Saudi Arabia and Qatar, but utterly failed to talk about how *Hillary Clinton is a terrorist, who has funded ISIS with Saudi Arabia and Qatar through her foundation*.

He mentioned the Clintons' virtual rape of Haiti, but did not go into adequate detail. Trump used the Clinton Foundation's ties with Saudi Arabia to point out that the Clintons support cultures that are misogynistic and anti-gay, to show that the Clintons are therefore hypocrites. But this is weak. Trump should be attacking the Clintons for the countless other crimes for which they were directly responsible, including political murders, the intimidation of women, their sexual perversions and rape. His use of a treasure trove of Clinton history has been anemic.

Trump went after Clinton on the emails, stating correctly that Hillary should not be allowed to run for president because of the crimes she committed, but did not go into new specifics, even though new information has surfaced.

Trump failed to fully exploit the Wikileaks in which Hillary Clinton spoke of her desire for "open borders" as an example of pure, unadulterated globalism, in the most toxic and large scale form. He did not attack Clinton when she lied that her comment being taken out of context, that "I was talking about energy".

A right-wing agenda

Trump also did nothing to alleviate concerns about some of the right-wing agenda he is pushing seriously. He wants a conservative Supreme Court (actually, so does Clinton). Trump is pro-life (pro-birth), pandering to the Christian fundamentalists. With a conservative Supreme Court, Roe v. Wade will be overturned, Trump would leave abortion rights "to the states" (no mention of the fact that many states are already destroying Roe v. Wade protections). Trump wants "law and order", and is not averse to police state mobilizations, and has not articulated how such "law and order" can be applied peacefully. He advocates guns and the strengthening of the Second Amendment of the Constitution. He wants to cut taxes, but does not articulate how his proposed tax ideas, including tax cuts, benefit the majority of Americans besides the wealthy (Clinton's tax plan also benefits the wealthy). He wants to blow up Obamacare, but has offered no specifics on a better, more equitable option. His stance on immigration is well known.

Trump wants to build a wall to keep illegal immigrants out, and most notably criminal elements. Clinton herself also advocated a wall (but altered her stance for political reasons), and Trump does differ with Clinton's "open borders" agenda, but he failed to expose the extent to which the Clinton/New World Order plan is intentionally (not merely as a by-product) facilitates CIA drug trafficking and the movement of intelligence assets.

Trump is against trade deals like NAFTA and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that Hillary Clinton supports (she did, in fact, call the TPP a "gold standard" but is now lying and backing off). Trump wants to bring jobs back to the United States, but again, failed to give specifics beyond broad strokes. "You're gonna love it, believe me."

On fitness for office and character

Clinton predictably attacked Trump for being a sexual predator and a misogynist. He effectively rebutted the accusations as best he could, stating flatly that the nine accusers were plants of the Clinton/corporate media sleaze machine, and that there was no basis for the charges.

Clinton accused Trump of "patterns of divisiveness" and for "inciting violence". Trump said

nothing in response, when he could easily have countered that she is the one who is actively inciting violence, and engaging in a myriad of activities that are not only “divisive” but knowingly so, and lying about it.

According to [Larry Nichols](#), former Clinton insider/fixer and an original creator of much of the Clinton dirty tricks play book, reality is always the opposite of what the Clintons say, and that *when the Clintons accuse others of something, they themselves are guilty of it*. Why hasn't Trump figured this out? Why hasn't Trump recruited the likes of Nichols and other former Clinton insiders, staffers, and whistleblowers who know the Clinton dirty tricks game, who know how genuinely terrifying psychopathology of Hillary Clinton better than anyone?

Trump repeated the familiar old line about Hillary Clinton being “ineffective” in thirty years of “bad experience”. But he did not accurately depict Clinton as a criminal who has *very effectively* used public office to further the criminal activities of her syndicate.

Clinton called Trump a Russian puppet, but Trump failed to call Hillary Clinton what she is: *the puppet of the New World Order*, and the crime partner of the Bushes. He did not mention of any of the biggest Clinton crimes, including massive drug trafficking using government resources (Iran-Contra, etc.), massive financial fraud and trillions of dollars of looting, terrorism, and major corruption that is far beyond garden variety “pay for play”. And no mention of the murders connected to the Clintons, including Vince Foster, and the recent murders of Seth Rich and others who were poised to rat out the Hillary and the DNC.

Trump has not made clear, or he is not aware that the combined syndicate of the Bushes and Clintons control virtually all of Washington, a huge segment of the world economy, and that they must be stopped from cementing their power for many generations to come.

Trump did deliver a memorable aside towards Clinton: “What a nasty woman”. Factually correct, but not nearly enough.

Donald Trump left Hillary Clinton intact. For that, the world will suffer.

The few positives for Trump

What did Trump do effectively? He brought up the rigging of the election. He called attention to the undercover operation of James O’Keefe and Project Veritas catching top Clinton/Democratic operatives on camera brazenly fomenting violence at political events, brazenly plotting and planning election fraud with orders from the Clintons and the Democrats.

The clips and a post-debate interview with O’Keefe can be seen here:

[Part 1](#)

[Part 2](#)

[Interview with James O’Keefe \(Infowars\)](#)

Trump did warn about the likely election theft: “Be careful, people are going to walk in and they’re going to vote ten times maybe, who knows?”

“Accepting election outcomes” and simpleminded American ignorance

Trump has gotten lambasted for not adhering to the “grand tradition” of committing to accepting the election results, if he loses. “I’ll keep you in suspense.” This seems to be the big “shocking” negative takeaway headline from the debate; that Trump is a sore loser.

The mainstream corporate media will attack Trump for this aggressively.

Clinton’s counter—“that’s what Donald does”, complain when he loses—will also register with those of infantile “playground” thinking, who do not bother to look at the Project Veritas clips showing the Clintons already rigging the election. Or they do not care. It smacks of the same treatment Al Gore and Joe Lieberman received when the 2000 election was contested: “Sore/Loserman”.

The naïve, ignorant American still believes in the kindergarten fairy tale version of reality; that America is a “good” country (Hillary’s nauseating line about “America is great because it is good”), and that everything is fair and wonderful, and in the end, “we must all come together”.

Utter nonsense.

This psychosis is exactly how the corrupt elite controls and manipulates its vassals.

Why should anyone accept the outcome of a criminally stolen election? Why should anyone accept injustice and tyranny? It is asinine. Trump should say exactly that, and fight to the bitter end, if he truly is a champion for the people.

Podiumgate redux

Did Clinton cheat again?

It must be noted that Clinton’s podium was lit, suggesting that she again had the benefit of a teleprompter, as in the first debate. If Clinton was wired and/or prompted again, it would explain the “good performance” from a woman with known neurological problems, seizures, and lapses in thinking, as exposed in the Podesta emails.

Seen in footage, Clinton operative [Brady Williamson](#), the white-haired bespectacled mustached who rigged the podium in the first debate and hid the evidence, was also present for this third debate. Williamson, a Democratic Party strategist and lawyer, and a man who has worked for the Clintons for decades once again lurked about the podium this time, snatching away notes used by Hillary.

(Also present was the bald-headed African-American security agent who [shadows Clinton for medical support](#), who carries pens of diazepam anti-seizure medication.)

Who was in charge of the stage for this debate? Why was Hillary once again given a “lit” podium, when Trump was not?

Where was Trump’s security detail? Why wasn’t the podium checked?

Why hasn’t Trump said a word about the Clintons cheating in the first debate, and possibly this one as well? Why wasn’t anyone arrested?

In the second debate, the Clintons demanded that the audience be prevented from using

flash bulb cameras, to prevent Hillary from getting seizures. The same arrangement applied to this event. Why?

Trump half-jokingly wanted Hillary drug-tested for this debate. Why didn't he push harder for this reasonable demand?

Towards the abyss

Much was riding on this event. There will be tragic consequences to Trump's failure to stop Hillary Clinton, and his failure to further distinguish himself to a mainstream international audience (one that may not be versed in the news on alternative media, Wikileaks, the Clinton history, or the details of recent events).

Both sides are furiously spinning the debate. Some of Trump's supporters somehow came away believing that he did well. Some even think it was his best debate performance of the three. Clinton's supporters, and the corporate media that the Clintons control, are ecstatic. No doubt, her corporate media will blare headlines declaring that she "trounced" Trump and added to her "insurmountable lead" via rigged polls. The vicious anti-Trump noise continues unabated. Realities remain upside down, thanks to the near total media control of the New World Order.

[Undecided voters](#) remain confused and undecided. The "average American" still doesn't get it.

There is nowhere to turn.

A Hillary Clinton presidency promises a planetary cataclysm and a New World Order triumph of genuine evil and unimaginable criminality. The Clinton/Bush criminal apparatus will control even more of Washington, even more of the judicial system, and their reign of terror will flourish into the distant future. Political enemies will be find their lives in jeopardy. It will be *Mein Kampf*, applied on a planetary scale that not Hitler could possibly have dreamed of. The conquest of the Eurasian subcontinent begun with 9/11 will culminate in its murderous end game: nuclear war with Russia, and mutually assured destruction.

A Donald Trump presidency, at best, would bring chaos and uncertainty. One inexperienced and unpredictable man, alone in an entrenched criminal apparatus, surrounded by dangerous criminals who still control things, will not be a salvation. Change must begin somewhere, with someone, but is the flawed and unreliable Trump the man to do it?

This most critical of elections lumbers towards a doomsday scenario with humanity literally at stake. It could lead to a genuine civil war within the United States. The election could be cancelled by a false flag operation leading to a war with Russia, before the Obama administration leaves office. This and other large scale atrocities are possible at any time. Even tomorrow.

It is all, as Trump says, rigged. At least Trump issued the warning.

These next weeks could very well be the final ones, of the world which we know. Prepare yourselves.

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Larry Chin](#)

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

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