

Did America Really Know About ‘Wagner’ Rebellion Before It Happened?

By [Drago Bosnic](#)

Global Research, July 03, 2023

[InfoBrics](#)

Region: [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author’s name.

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

For weeks before Russia launched its special military operation (SMO) in Ukraine, the United States insisted that Russia was planning this and that it would do it. After the SMO started, Washington DC used this to bolster its intelligence-gathering reputation by claiming its numerous ISR (intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance) platforms and assets are second-to-none. However, despite its potent capabilities in this regard, the US had known how Russia would react years or even decades ago simply because its aggression against Moscow was designed to achieve precisely that – a Russian response that would ensure Ukraine never becomes part of NATO. And while Russia tried achieving this through negotiations, [the political West made sure this doesn’t happen](#).

Now, Washington DC seems to be using this deceitfully acquired reputation to claim it knows everything weeks or even months before it happens, all in an attempt to reinforce its image of an [“all-powerful” and “indispensable” global hegemon](#). Perhaps the best example of this is the recent abortive “rebellion” by the Russian “Wagner” PMC (private military company). Namely, US intelligence officials are claiming they knew that “Wagner” head Yevgeny Prigozhin was planning to “make his move” against Moscow days in advance. What’s more, American media are insisting that even Congress was also briefed by various US intelligence services about it. Allegedly, ISR observed “Wagner” forces and “found out” they were preparing to take action against the Russian military.

On June 24, The New York Times reported that American intelligence supposedly had “solid info” on Prigozhin’s plans and “worked to refine that material into a finished assessment”. Rather “strangely”, the said statement was released only after the controversial events took place. Quite expectedly, a US official claimed that “the information shows the US was aware of impending events in Russia, similar to how intelligence agencies had warned in late 2021 that Vladimir V. Putin was planning to invade Ukraine”. However, the troubled Biden administration supposedly “chose to stay silent ahead of the dramatic events [in hopes that it would destabilize Russia and hamper its military operations in Ukraine](#)”. And yet, these

claims proved to be futile as the “rebellion” led to no frontline gains for the Kiev regime forces.

“U.S. officials felt that if they said anything, Mr. Putin could accuse them of orchestrating a coup. And they clearly had little interest in helping Mr. Putin avoid a major, embarrassing fracturing of his support. While it is not clear exactly when the United States first learned of the plot, intelligence officials conducted briefings on Wednesday with administration and defense officials. On Thursday, as additional confirmation of the plot came in, intelligence officials informed a narrow group of congressional leaders, according to officials familiar with the briefings who spoke on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to speak publicly,” [the NYT insists](#).

US Secretary of State Antony Blinken also claimed that the Wagner controversy allegedly “[exposed real cracks in Putin’s government](#)”, stating that “Prigozhin himself, in this entire incident, has raised profound questions about the very premises for Russian aggression against Ukraine in the first place, saying that Ukraine or NATO did not pose a threat to Russia, which is part of Putin’s narrative”. Needless to say, such claims are even more laughable than the idea the US supposedly “knew what Prigozhin would do”. [NATO’s crawling Barbarossa 2.0](#) serves as a direct testament to the fact that the belligerent alliance is a [direct, existential threat](#) not only to Russia, [but the entire world](#). The political West has [proven this in its countless aggressions against the globe](#) over the course of its brutal, [half-a-millennium-long colonialism](#).

However, despite these tall tales coming from the very top of the US establishment, their reactions during and after the “rebellion” indicate something very different. Had Washington DC really known (especially days in advance) that such an event would take place, it wouldn’t have taken it so long to release a public statement, other than the immediate claim the US didn’t have anything to do with it. Still, as previously mentioned, the belligerent thalassocracy saw this as a perfect opportunity to once again bolster its reputation as an “all-seeing superpower” that is supposedly “always in the loop about everything that’s going on everywhere”. Such self-delusions can be extremely dangerous and might explain Washington DC’s tendency to act rashly, [even against near-peer adversaries](#).

Apart from this, the US is also trying to present the recent controversy as alleged “proof” that the self-defeating sanctions against Russia are [supposedly “working”](#). The mainstream propaganda machine is now aiming to convince everyone that the [much-touted sanctions and restrictions](#) have allegedly “resulted in a split in the Russian elites”, as well as the “weakening” of Moscow’s central authority, eventually leading to the abortive “rebellion”. However, the results have been quite the opposite. The Russian people overwhelmingly rallied around their president, realizing that any sort of internal destabilization would only benefit those that want harm to their country. Worse yet (for the political West), this has only strengthened Russia’s determination to accomplish all the goals of the SMO.

On a geopolitical level, the “rebellion” proved to be even more damaging to US interests, as [the fast-growing multipolar world](#) overwhelmingly [sided with Moscow and its leadership](#). The “rebellion” itself was [dealt with swiftly](#), proving that the Russian society and establishment are anything but “full of cracks” and that the Eurasian giant’s enemies can only hope to achieve success by fanning up its internal issues, as [they’re powerless against Moscow in](#)

[terms of external attacks](#). And yet, even attempts to escalate these divisions are failing miserably (and even backfiring). Meanwhile, [the US and its "leadership"](#) are once again [embarrassing themselves](#) precisely in front of one of the premier multipolar powers.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Drago Bosnic](#) is an independent geopolitical and military analyst.

Featured image is from InfoBrics

The original source of this article is [InfoBrics](#)
Copyright © [Drago Bosnic](#), [InfoBrics](#), 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Drago Bosnic](#)

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