

John W. Morse, SSgt
422/C
Unknown POW Camp

My Theory on the "Surprise Attack"

Almost everyone seems to have a theory about the "*Surprise Attack*" of the Battle of the Bulge. When I wrote my little book, *The Sitting Duck Division*, I told the story of a small town kid growing up in the infantry during WWII. I still had many questions about what had happened and why. I have done a lot of research over the last two years to find answers.

I discovered the cover up and it shocked me! Dereliction of duty is a serious charge and a threat to those involved. From what I've learned there was a cover up and it worked. Generals returned as decorated heroes. Eisenhower was elected president of the United States. Promotions and a secure place in history depended on the Academy clique putting up a solid front. They did. My view is that the Supreme Command simply could not lose track of the many men, tanks and big guns... a huge force, if they were paying attention.

Ike took the calculated risk of moving to a hideaway on the golf course Northwest of Reims with his young English lady driver many miles from SHAEF headquarters to manage the war. They discussed getting General Marshall to, "*come out to discuss the matter.*" Field Marshall Sir Alan Brooke, of the British Imperial Staff, was quoted as saying, "*..finally decided to see the PM to discuss the situation.*" The situation?

Some SHAEF and around the front were worried. It is a matter of record that Japanese diplomatic traffic intercepts reported that Hitler was planning a large scale offensive in the West some time after November 1944. Numerous warning from dozens of sources were ignored. It appears that most of the First Army brass were convinced that the German army was done for and posed no major threat. They were snug in their castles and manor houses. Montgomery was planning a holiday in England while Patton was busting a gut to mount an offensive while, at the same time, making plans to head North if things got sticky for the VIII Corps in the Ardennes... something he warned SHAEF of.

Why not the Ardennes? Germany used that route in WWI and, again in 1940, with great success. Maps, aplenty!

William B. Breuer's *Unexplained Mysteries of World War II*, "*Evidence of a High-Level Cover-Up*," pages 48, 49, 50, and 51) (John Wiley & Sons, Inc.) sums up the dereliction of duty in a nutshell. Richard Peterson's, *Heading The Child Warrior*, quotes the official Army Historical Library account of General Eisenhower's written effort to cover up details of the Battle of the Bulge a YEAR AFTER the event. Richard Peterson wrote: "*In response to suggestions to commemorate the anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge, General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, on December 18, 1945, wrote to Robert Patterson: "I am unalterably opposed to making any effort to publicize at this time any story concerning the Ardennes Battle or even of allowing any written explanation to go outside*

of War Department. I thoroughly believe we should say nothing whatsoever to anyone except in response to casual inquiry from our friends."

Patterson to Eisenhower December 19, 1945. *"I believe the main features of this operation (Ardennes Battle) — the events leading up to it, the incidents of the fighting and the outcome — should be made known to the American people. Otherwise they will think the Army is covering up."*

The sanguine attitude toward any discussion of the largest land battle in history by the former commander of SHAEF is astonishing. In spite of Eisenhower's desire to limit discussions to *"casual inquiries from our friends,"* the confusing story continued to unfold.

According to, *Unexplained Mysteries of World War II*, and others, twenty-five years after the event General Strong (SHAEF Chief of Intelligence) learned that a covert after-action investigation had been made in 1945. Both copies of the report (SHAEF and London) were *"missing"* from the files. Surveying papers *"had been doctored"* according to High M. Cole, the U.S. Army's official historian. Many other authors offer the same story. Yes, there was a cover up. Careers depended on it. and, it worked!

So, why bring all of this up after all these years? Well, 19,000 GI died, didn't they?

Now, we, as a nation, are attempting to become the world's police force... invading when and where we want. More lives are at stake. The future of the world is at stake. If it takes 25, 50, ... or 60 years for the truth to come out about those responsible for the actions taken, or not taken, what have we learned from the past? Responsibility should be assigned DURING the career period of our leaders... not covered up.

Perhaps I don't understand the BIG PICTURE. I can't claim to be a military or government expert. My experience was as a rifle squad leader and a POW during WWII. I can, however, study accounts other than the self-serving and self-protecting *"Brass"* histories (they call it spin these days). Just as the CIA and FBI failed to connect the dots before 9/11, the High Command in Europe failed to react to the dots available to them and take those warnings to react to the dots available to them and what was available before the Battle of the Bulge. Nineteen thousand of our fellow GIs paid the ultimate price. It is time to set the record straight for their sake. And, to discourage spin cover ups in this day and time.

Source: *Bulge Bugle* February 2005

<http://www.battleofthebulgememories.be/stories26/us-army25/722-my-theory-on-the-qsurprise-attackq.html>
Henri ROGISTER, webmaster