



INTELLIGENCE REPORT

SECRET

16 August 1946

4. Although sightings of brilliant light phenomena over Stockholm on 11 August created a great furor in the Swedish press and considerable concern among the Swedish public, the Swedish Air Force has not called back its officers from their summer leave, and the Swedish aircraft warning net has not been mobilized to spot reported missiles. Considering the fact that hundreds of reports from all over the country have described cigar-shaped missiles with fiery tails at altitudes low enough for interception by Swedish jet-propelled aircraft, this apparent unpopcern and lack of sustained energy on the part of the military organization is peculiar. Since Sweden has no other landing ground than its own country and all her aircraft are based there, the Swedish Defense Staff obviously wishes us to believe that the reported objects are rockets, yet is taking no defensive precautions, and since they cannot or will not show us any evidence to support their declared belief, there are several possible explanations which should be considered. Each of these hypotheses will be presented in turn, together with any considerations which might cast any light on the subject.

Case 1. Rockets of Russian Origin. The Russians might be launching rockets over Sweden in order to pressurize the Swedes in connection with the proposed Russian-Swedish trade agreement, or to frighten them away from any consideration of joining a Western Bloc. Another motive would be the demonstration of a new weapon to answer our atomic bomb demonstrations. A lesser consideration would be the testing of rockets over a neutral country, as Germany did with the V-2 rockets. Arguments against this theory are that the reported ranges (1000 km) are far in excess of those for any known rocket to date for the flat trajectories described (two or three hundred meters for a cigar-shaped rocket thirty feet long over central Sweden.) This would indicate a new propellant and a far more efficient control system than the best German rockets. It is therefore doubtful that Russia would risk giving away such a secret by launching it over Sweden at altitudes low enough for it to be shot down by Swedish jet fighters. The Swedish communist press ridiculed this idea, pointing out that no evidence of any kind had been found, and that Russia had all of Siberia to test her rockets. The Russian Military Attache in Stockholm also asked the British Assistant RAF Attache for information on the subject. (Paragraph 5, Enclosure (A)). The main reason against the theory of Russian origin is the lack of any tangible evidence. However, the Swedes may be concealing any such evidence which they may have, even though they stated emphatically that they have no such evidence. The motive of such conduct would be to avoid trouble with Russia.

Case 2. Rockets of British Origin. The British Assistant RAF Attache stated that he believed the reported objects were rockets, and has made a financial wager that tangible evidence will be found. He also stated that he would like to "plant" a false clue to worry the Russians, giving a purported course indicating that rockets had been launched from Denmark or British-occupied territory.

The U.S. Military Attache in Stockholm reported that the British are extremely worried about the European situation, and that after a recent visit to his former bomber base in England he found it fully operational, even to the fire-trucks. It is known that the British are worried about our demobilization and would like to keep us armed for the blowup which they expect to occur with the Russians. This would be one way to alert us. It would be possible for the British to launch air-borne rockets over the Kattegat, set to cross over Sweden and fall into the Baltic. However, it is doubtful if the British would embark on such an undertaking because of the risk of disclosure either to us or to the Russians. Furthermore, a strong protest could be expected from Sweden. Again there is the fact that the Swedish Defense Staff is peculiarly inactive and unconcerned, while the British are reported by repeated reports by M.A. Stockholm to be extremely worried about the matter, and to have offered, or are offering, two of their best search radar sets to help the Swedes track down the rockets.

DECLASSIFIED Authority NWD 765854

16 August 1946  
16 August 1946

(a) That the Swedish Defense Staff agreed the origin of these missiles and rockets of Swedish Origin.

While there are no known examples, it is probable that Sweden, which recovered the first V-2 rocket and has personnel and resources capable of designing and producing rockets, is engaged in a thorough development program of guided missiles, which are the most outstanding defensive weapon recently developed. It is possible that experimental Swedish rockets have been seen and reported by Swedish observers, but that the Defense Staff wishes to conceal the details of its own rockets. Since Sweden has no other proving ground than its own country and adjacent waters, it would be hard to keep any long-range rocket flights from being observed. It has been confirmed that civilian observers have mistakenly reported Swedish Vampire jet-propelled fighters as rockets, and that meteors have similarly been mistaken for rockets by Swedish observers. The August 15th meteoric showers and jet airplanes might account for most of these reports, if it were not for the Defense Staff's insistence that they believe part of the sightings are rockets. They further report, officially, that these objects have been tracked both by radar and range-finders. In view of this, their lack of action is extraordinary. They know that the British are extremely worried and that we are exceedingly interested in verifying these reported sightings, and they insist that they have no tangible evidence. No matter whether the reported objects are Swedish rockets, jet fighters, or meteoric showers, the Defense Staff is encouraging the belief that they are rockets and is issuing evasive reports which are in many ways contradictory. (Enclosure #1 to this Enclosure (A)). One possible motive is that they wish to influence public opinion to back their request for increased defense appropriations. Another is that they wish to alert the West against the Russian expansion menace which they fear so strongly, and which they believe will make Sweden a battleground in any new war. They know how the British fear guided missiles, and that a very inexpensive way to keep Britain mobilized and to alert us would be to create the suspicion that the Russians were launching rockets over Sweden. Their insistence that the objects are rockets, in spite of their admission of a lack of any tangible evidence, is suspicious, as is their failure to cancel Air Force leaves or to use their aircraft to track these missiles. The Defense Staff's memorandum (Paragraph 6 of Enclosure #1 to Enclosure (A)) tends to criticize the Finnish reports, implying that they have been suppressed. Paragraph 12 discourages the hope of finding any evidence, as have most of the press reports, indicating that while the Defense Staff does not want to tell what it knows, it still will not discourage the rocket theory. If the Defense Staff is withholding or suppressing any information of Swedish rocket tests, this could be justified later to the Swedish public on the grounds of national security. However, it should be remembered that it is a national characteristic of the Swedish people to avoid facing unpleasant facts and to avoid stirring up international trouble. The deliberate creation of these incidents would arouse the strong antagonism of Russia as well as the U.S. and Great Britain. This is borne out by the strong reaction in the Swedish press to the article by Marquis Childs, vehemently denying his implications that the Russians were using rockets over Sweden to intimidate them into a Swedish-Russian trade agreement. In spite of this, the Swedish press now agrees almost unanimously that there is no longer any doubt that a foreign power is testing rockets over Sweden. The Swedish Prime Minister stated on August 15th that up to now it was not possible to protest to any foreign power, as it had not yet been proved what the objects are or where they come from.

In connection with the Swedish hypothesis, the reporting officer has gained the impression that the Swedish Defense Staff officers and the Air Force officers he has interviewed are evasive in their replies and are holding back information on orders from higher authority. Their contradictory and confusing replies are not typical of those which an alarmed and alert military staff would make in the event of an enemy threat. The reporting officer feels that there is a possibility of the following:

DECLASSIFIED  
Authority NND 760554  
By SA JARA Date 1/29/00

SECRET  
N.A. Stockholm Report No. 35-846

16 August 1946

- (a) That the Swedish Defense Staff knows the origin of these missiles and would not be worried about them.
- (b) That if the missiles are actually rockets, they are of Swedish origin and under Swedish control over Scandinavia.
- (c) That the Swedish Defense Staff wishes to encourage the belief that there are Russian Rockets over Sweden.
- (d) That the Swedish Defense Staff will conceal any evidence of the true nature of the reported objects, until such time as it is deemed expedient to release the information.

6. In summary, the following possibilities should be considered:
- 1. That the so called "ghost bombs" are a combination of natural phenomena and aircraft sightings, and that the reports are mostly imaginary and the result of public hysteria.
  - 2. That the "ghost bombs" are of Swedish origin and the objective is either experiments or to produce some psychological effect.
  - 3. That the "ghost bombs" are of Russian origin in supplements N/A Stockholm Radio 1054 of 26 July and Report R-278-46.
  - 4. That the "ghost bombs" are of foreign origin other than Russian.

There is no unanimity of opinion even in this office. COMUSNA believes there is a 50% possibility of premise 1, a 40% possibility of premise 3, and a 10% possibility of premise 2. On the other hand, the reporting officer believes the possibility of premise 1 is 70%, 20% possibility of premise 2, 8% possibility of premise 3, and 2% of premise 4.

APPROVED AND FORWARDED:

L.M. JOHNSON  
Colonel, CMC  
Acting Military Attaché

For and in the absence of:  
ALFRED A. HESLER, Jr.  
Brigadier General, USA

Prepared by Military Attaché and Military

R. A. Winston,  
Commander, USN,  
Asst. Naval Attaché.

CG USNPT G-2; CG MPOUSA; CG ONSA; CG of ACC Bulgaria,  
Hungary, Rumania, N/A Oslo, Copenhagen, N/A, S.D Stockholm

Forwarded by *William D. Wright*  
William D. Wright  
Captain, USN  
U. S. Naval Attaché.

Enclosure (A) to N.A. Report  
Report 35-8-46, dated  
16 Aug. 1946

DECLASSIFIED  
Authority NND 765054  
BY SA/USA Date 9/25/96