Ukraine War Leaks & NS Parallels

Qui bono and what's a trajectory?

Ignasz Semmelweisz
Apr 9

♡ 7   💬 3   ↑   ⋯

Key elements of the Ukraine war leaks include:

1. That they exist

2. Where they surfaced

3. Whether they were publicised and in which spheres

4. What they contain, who benefits and who suffers

5. What statements, narratives and stories they enable

1. Existence

That these documents have surfaced does not actually enable any certain positions to be taken on why they exist or the motives of the leaker. To assume anything based purely on the existence of a "leak" is totally unjustified. To even believe that this is a leak is to be told what to think.

2. Original outlets

The narrative tells us that the docs surfaced on a Minecraft discord server and some Telegram groups.

A discord server only requires registration with an anonymous email address and has potentially millions or more users across a range of ages. Perhaps it would make sense for Minecraft discord servers to replace Wikileaks, if the culprits aren't found.

Various Telegram channels including Donbass Devushka had jpgs of some of the documents up. If you want to track down the docs yourself, start with the moonofalabama.org blog, take a look at their open threads on Ukraine and search for telegram links and you should be off to a good start.

What does the discord server mean? Literally, nothing. Anyone can put stuff there and it will be found. What do the Telegram channels mean? Nothing in and of themselves. Such channels are guaranteed to cycle any information that comes their way on the conflict that they find useful or sympathetic.

3. Publicity and in which spheres?

The Western outlets of NYT and WaPo broke the story of the "leaks" and the Pentagon's desire to "delete the internet".

Both the NYT and WaPo are propaganda arms of the state. They have just deliberately drawn full public attention to the leaks, confirmed sufficient authenticity and recounted a desperate and impossible Pentagon request to erase everything, which adds "value" to the documents. If NYT and WaPo hadn't said anything, a lot fewer people would have been aware while the Pentagon did what it claims it can to clean up the spillage (hint: it can't do anything and it knows it).

The story was duly cycled by all outlets to confirm the documents are real. The Pentagon's desire to erase the documents is directly contradicted by publicity from NYT and WaPo. This means that this is a deliberate information operation, irrespective of whether the documents are genuine or of value. The US is running an op.

4. What they contain, qui bono & qui patitur

The documents VST has seen comprise:

- Theatre map with force unit positions.

- Friendly force unit composition information (some types and numbers, some locations).

- Out of country training burden (mostly DE, some US and other), including type of training e.g. Patriot unit completing June 2024.

- Casualty & kill estimates for both sides' manpower (less detailed than the Russian MOD's detailed tracking of military unit kills) that actually comport with independent analyst's calcs in favour of Russia on a circa 4:1 basis, which pins Russia in the 20-50k KIA zone and UA to 3-4x that figure.

The US doesn't lose out from the information. Literally nothing in there is damning or damaging to the US. One might argue that the "leak" itself is the damage, but this is woefully inadequate. It's a belief that Kate Moss would ascribe to a "basic bitch". If the leak doesn't damage the primary war fighter, then it was either an ineffective leak or it was never a leak at all. The US does benefit from the information. It now has the ability to label UA as further unreliable, incapable, untrustworthy, corrupt and ineffective at fighting war at a basic information security level. The US can say "we did everything we can to support UA, but, in the end, they showed us

that they just weren't up to the task. Such a shame," and can fall back on example after example, both true and invented, where that would be the case. The establishment media is being fed constantly with UA-negative stories about corruption, losses and bad tactics. The US isn't by its own narrative "calling the shots", it's just giving support to a friend who is free to do as they see fit, and that friend is being hung out to dry. Everyone knows this independence narrative is false, but that is the narrative that continues to be spun even off the back of this information. If this information perpetuates the standing narrative, it's likely that this information is part of that narrative and nothing more.

Russia doesn't lose out from the information. This doesn't affect their plans or way to fight. At best, the Russians would cross-compare the information against their own intel, verify and validate it then ask "why has this become available in the way that it has?" i.e. why has this information entered the public sphere and then been deliberately publicised by the state and attached to even more clown-like inflammatory requests to "delete the internet!". What the Russians care about on a force basis is what's in the field now, supply and logistics, who fights and how, what's coming and how reinforcement gets distributed and to what effect. After that, defence and offence layout and capability beyond today's frontline (in both directions) matter for any Russian advance, hold or retreat. These documents do very little to change or add to the Russian information sphere. VST imagines that at worst, if Russia were to believe that the declared counteroffensive will happen where and when the Ukrainians say, Russia would be mistaken. But there's literally zero need to listen to UA's statements on any aspect of combat when you prosecute war on your own direct terms and intelligence. What UA says about the war is not for the Russians. They are messages for Western sponsors and citizens via which to spin false narrative demanded and laid out by the Western Masters, to which money is attached. They are messages that create pathways for money flow. None of Zelensky's claims about how the war would go have been correct, indicating that he is either a liar or incompetent, or both.

It is Ukraine who loses on a PR and informational front, and gains nothing from the verified-real information. Now UA's public claim of its casualties and RU's casualties are shown as false. The extent of US support is shown again in a different way, showing up UA as a literal prole of a state that cannot exist without the US directly operating it as a nation. The numbers indicated in a possible counteroffensive are circa 45,000. This, if vaguely true, gets pitted against 200k+ RUs along the front, before weapon strike types are factored in. Some analysts state directly that 45k troops and limited weapons anywhere on the front will not result in a significant breakthrough or different outcome. If that force is directed onto a specific point that triggers a deliberate RU withdrawal, the same effect as seen in September may result, as well as a new cauldron. Combine additional RU air power and that could be another slaughter that takes a

couple of months to play out. Meanwhile, RU can still execute independent strikes elsewhere on the front or beyond it. This is all public knowledge and child's play logic.

5. What statements, narratives and stories the leak enables

Put simply, nothing VST saw was either shocking or constituted anything of significant material advantage to Russia. All the "intel" is either already in the public domain or detectable through the act of prosecuting modern war. AWACs, drones, recon and actual contact all provide a reasonably clear picture of the frontline unit locations and nature, which is already reflected in various public channels and maps. Satellite recon, military intel and spying provide ongoing movement and build-up behind the frontlines. This is the business of war. Russia knows that troops are being trained out of country and can guess cycle times and make worst case assumptions of unit numbers and capabilities. Ukraine has been loudly declaring an intention to launch a counteroffensive soon. Why? If you were the Russians, would you take anything at face value or would you do your own intel and analysis first, assess your defensive posture and assume an attack is coming from any of the locations with sufficient enemy manpower, at any time, including all at once? What kind of war fighter would you have to be to need an announcement from the other side of its intention to launch an attack on Zaporizhzhia, before you decide to prepare a defence from an attack there and nowhere else? If you did that then the

attack came at the other end of the front, what would that say about you? This is all simple stuff and makes the leaks' military value non-existent.

VST points out that none of this information is a leak of military importance, for people who are capable of fighting wars and running intelligence services. On that basis, these leaks aren't for the military.

They are for you.

These leaks are the pre-conditioning narrative tool that allows the US to ramp up a failure and withdrawal narrative that pins more of the blame on UA and therefore builds towards "the last resort" of a negotiated settlement as a necessary inevitability.

The end will not arrive abruptly, despite Zelensky's increasing desperation to abandon his previous demands and decrees to have Putin removed from power before any negotiations occur. The end will not arrive because Macron has begun to beg China for some kind of theatrics under the instruction of the USA. The end will come when Russia and China agree it is politically convenient to move into an end phase, which will include a negotiated settlement that delivers Russia's key requirements dressed up in thick wrapping of peripheries. At that point, the USA will be publicly citing this leak as an instrumental UA failing that was the nail in the coffin of the USA's benevolent, hands-off sponsorship of UA's burgeoning star of democratic hope on the borders of Russia.

Another measure of when this war will end is when the allocated $110bn has been spent. So far, we're up to about $65bn, with $2.5bn being released every two to three weeks. That gives us roughly three to five more months before all the allocated funds have been robbed by the ruling elites.

Nord Stream Parallels

A day after VST's Playing Poker with Sy Hersh, Sweden's public prosecutor, Matts Ljundqvist, declared state sponsorship of the NS terrorist attack as the "likely scenario" given the explosives required. This statement has two levels to it. The full scale implication is that, in fingering UA operatives, the US is declaring UA as the attackers and then telling us that the USA is the **true** culprit as parental sponsor. That's the real implication of the Swedish statement, combined with Sy Hersh's output. The USA did it and it doesn't really matter now if you know or not because not one of you can do a damn thing about it. The second sub-level is that the US is publicly compartmentalising NS. It has fingered the UA operatives and what Sweden has just

said "only" means that it was the UA state that sponsored them and no one else. It wasn't the US. That's the containment done. This containment does two things:

- It locks the narrative onto UA and stops the bleed across to the US. This is what you will see cycled through the establishment press if needs be. This enables the jettisoning of NS with UA in one deft swoop when the end comes. "The UA meant well, but they had questionable methods that didn't help it in the end, despite what advice we gave."

- It employs a supposedly respectable and credible third party, Sweden, to tell us this US-sponsored narrative as though it was an independent, Swedish narrative. This gives the US the ability to say "we didn't make this up! It's not *our* propaganda!". This absolves the need for the USA to take or field questions on NS any more. They just deflect to Sweden with a holding statement of "we defer to the capabilities of the Swedes and their great job." According to the US, it isn't even looking into NS so it has no investigative results to tell anyone or compare with anything, so there's no point asking the USA questions.

The Swedish statement is also a full pre-conditioning action. The Swedes have said that they can't find the culprits and probably never will. That is designed to justify the lack of further curiosity across the press and also to shut down your questions because you believe what you're told - it's too hard a problem for reasons you haven't even been given and don't stop to consider.

What this part of the Swedish narrative is telling you is that the entire global intelligence, security, police and investigative construct is totally unable to effectively investigate and find the perpetrators of the biggest terrorist infrastructure attack of the 21st century. This is despite the fact that those perpetrators left a massive trail of evidence and clues including passports and traces of explosive, and had to hire a boat that someone's found and photographed. By contrast, this garbage global network can find the perpetrators of the MH-17 shootdown within hours of the event occurring and after a month or so, start naming individuals. It can do the same in the Skripal and Litvinenko cases as well. In short, it can be high fidelity and instantaneous when it wants, just not now. What's the key takeaway? *Committing boat-based and underwater crimes has the highest chance of success against the global anti-terror system.* Who'd a thunked it?

3 Comments

Write a comment...

Joe Van Steenbergen Apr 9

Remember; trust nothing that you can't verify for yourself. Nothing (especially like this) happens accidentally, nothing. If we haven't learned this by now, we never will.

♡ LIKE   💬 REPLY   •••

Clarence Wilhelm Spangle Writes Nordic Pagan Soldier   21 hr ago

Volodymyr Zelensky is an Israeli operative, the Ukrainian parliament is full of Jewish apparatchiks.

Ukraine's Azov Regiment Visits Israel: 'Mariupol is our Masada' . . .

https://nationalvanguard.org/2022/12/ukraines-azov-regiment-visits-israel-mariupol-is-our-masada/

♡ LIKE   💬 REPLY   •••

1 more comment…