

# JAAH 2013 No 7 Edberg

## Logbook

Rune Edberg: In the Wake of a Viking Ship Tragedy. An Archaeologist's Challenge to a Cold War Cover-up

Received:	2013-03-19
Length:	c. 8000 words
1 <sup>st</sup> Editorial Comments:	The article complied with JAAH policy and the editors approach two referees 2013-04-09
Language edit	YES, as part of the editorial process. Completed 2013-08-28
Copy rights and credits:	Must be fixed
Author's and reviewers' comments:	2013-04-15 Comments from Maarleveld 2013-06-02 Comments from Hillerdal 2013-06-14 Authors' comments 2013-06-14 Revised text
	Editing completed 2013-09-15. Article published 2013-10-01

**Comments on Rune Edberg's article "In the Wake of a Viking Ship Tragedy. An archaeologist's Challenge to a Cold War Cover-up"**

In this article, Rune Edberg revisits his work on the wreckage of the Viking ship replica *Ormen Friske* that sunk under obscure circumstances in the summer of 1950. The current paper is a summary of earlier research previously published in Swedish in 2004 & 2005.

The article provides a fascinating snapshot of Swedish post-war mentality through the tale of the idealistic and somewhat naïve undertaking of sailing a Viking ship through the highly politicised seascape of the Cold War. Edberg reveals how the indulgence of Swedish authorities let 15 young athletes become the scapegoats to avoid stirring up trouble on the political arena. It is also the double story of an experimental archaeology project going horribly wrong in the 1950s and an example of a project dealing in the archaeology of the contemporary past.

Edberg's expertise in building and sailing Viking Ships makes him well suited to investigate the rumours concerning *Ormen Friske*'s seaworthiness and led him to conclude that the accusation of it being an inferior ship is basically false. He then dives into archival material and contemporary reports concerning the accident, to find the answer to why the accident was never properly investigated – implying that the reason behind this might have been political. Despite Edberg's efforts, the question is never convincingly answered and the reader still finds herself wondering what indeed happened to *Ormen Friske*. Even though Edberg reaches the conclusion that the accident was most likely caused by the unfamiliarity of the inexperienced crew with the rough North Sea and in manoeuvring open vessels, the insinuation of US bombardment of the ship still stands. This is enforced by Edberg stating that the official political mentality or ideological consensus led to the accident not being investigated. Thus, despite claiming to deflate rumours of conspiracy, Edberg is rather keeping them alive. Maybe this question can never find its definite answer, but I wonder whether Edberg has not been too cautious in his conclusion.

The attempt to situate the accident and the eventual cover up, in the contemporary Cold War political context is commendable and, without doubt, the strength of this investigation, but this could have been taken much further. Not only is an official cover-up by administrative authorities in line with the political climate of the Cold War era, the very venture of constructing and sailing a Viking ship replica is a testimony to a post-war zeitgeist quite diverging from the "Cold War mentality". *Ormen Friske*'s origin in the non-profit association *Svenska (Swedish) Frisksportförbundet*, with its 1950s

slogan “Against sickness and war; for health and peace” is hardly accidental, and it would be interesting to see Edberg develop a discussion on the relation between the positive post-war nationalistic spirit and its trust in perceived prehistoric, not least Viking Age ideals – here expressed in the building of a Viking ship.

*Ormen Friske* may be gone, but its legacy, Edberg claims, lives on in artefacts and memorabilia from the ship and wreckage and then he seeks to discuss the significance of memory through the engagement of these material remains. However, his discussion does not live up to these aspirations, but is limited to a description of individual relations to single artefacts and personal memories. This section would gain from a concluding discussion on the significance of materiality, material objects and memory and developing the analysis beyond the sentiments of individual persons.

Edberg’s article tells an intriguing story, but my sentiment is that he sails too lightly over certain topics, where he could have dove into a deeper analysis and discussion, thus making the paper more relevant to a wider audience.

Even though this is a summary of previous works, the decision to not include any references is odd, especially considering the fact that this paper aims to make the research available to an international audience, who might not have access to the original work. Before publishing, these references need to be added to the text.

Charlotta Hillerdal

2013-04-15

Review of manuscript submitted to the  
Journal of Archaeology and Ancient History, JAAH.

Title:

RUNE EDBERG, In the Wake of a Viking Ship Tragedy, An Archaeologist's  
Challenge to a Cold War Cover-up

Part 1. Short Advice:

The content of the article is valuable and should be published.

Major improvements/additions need to be made to warrant its publication in a  
scientific journal (see Part 2: Detailed comments)

Review of manuscript submitted to the  
Journal of Archaeology and Ancient History, JAAH.

Title:

RUNE EDBERG, In the Wake of a Viking Ship Tragedy, An Archaeologist's  
Challenge to a Cold War Cover-up

## Part 2: Detailed comments

The content of the article is valuable and should be published. As a whole it seems to be based on thorough and relevant research. The images are informative and well-chosen.

There are, however, three closely interrelated problems with the article's present form.

- 1) Section 3, on Method and source material, is the sort of section that is essential in a student thesis, but in the composition of this text it somewhat breaks the flow of the narrative. The information it contains can perhaps be integrated in the discussion at the end, while parts of it can be deleted or kept in the introductory part. For one thing, the reader of a scientific journal need not be informed about the method of scientific research in each and every article, and certainly not if methodology is not the article's subject. More importantly, however, the section reads as an excuse for not rigidly applying scientific methodology at all. That cannot be the author's intention.
- 2) It is absolutely unacceptable that a scientific article of substance (8000 words is a substantial contribution) in a peer-reviewed journal only contains four references, each of them referring to the author himself on the same subject. This is all the more so since the argument for writing and publishing the present article is that the previous publications are not accessible to an international audience. The article should give the international public access to the research, rather than being an advertisement for the author's previous work. As such it should be self-contained. A reference to the most comprehensive study that the author wrote on the subject is acceptable, but more importantly there should be references to the material on which the author's text is based.

- 3) Contemporary History and Ethnology are as much subject to the requirements of thorough documentation and referencing as Archaeology and Ancient History. If there are reasons to keep an informant anonymous, there should still be a possibility for the scientific reader to assess this. Here lies the major difference between research journalism and accounting for research in a scientific journal.

Minor points that need some attention are:

- Sam Svensson is introduced as advisor for the building project. Here references should be made to Svensson's employment and role at SSHM, and it should be discussed how much he acted as official advisor and how much in a private capacity. Were his employers aware of his connection to the project from the start, or not?
- Two of them were 'merchants', tradesmen is perhaps a better word?
- There can be no reason for anonymity of another museum on the North Sea coast
- A west-coast later archaeologist need not stay anonymous either
- Oral interview sounds tautological.

In the attached pdf of the manuscript some sentences are underlined in red that cannot go without reference. Evidently, more references than these should be added.

Otherwise, the article reads well and if the points above are met, it is going to be an important contribution.

# In the Wake of a Viking Ship Tragedy An Archaeologist's Challenge to a Cold War Cover-up

**Abstract:** *Ormen Friske*, a Swedish reconstruction of a Viking ship, was wrecked in a North Sea gale in 1950, with the loss of its crew of 15 young men. At the time the disaster was attributed to bad construction and poor seamanship, and this is still the received interpretation. Although the wreck was available for examination, Swedish authorities decided that it be discarded and subsequently the tragedy was never seriously investigated. Any role by the US in the bombing of the island of Heligoland that coincided in time and place with the sinking of the vessel was also denied or downplayed. The bombing was later acknowledged by US military authorities, but its possible part in the the Ormen Friske disaster is still unclear. This strange affair is here examined within the context of the Cold War. In particular the Swedish consulate in Hamburg wished to avoid annoying the British authorities, which at this time ruled this sector of occupied Germany. Several aspects from working with contemporary and recent sources are discussed. Some parts of the ship and personal belongings of the crew are held in museums or kept by relatives and are treated as bearers of the narrative of the tragedy.

## 1. Introduction

One stormy day in June 1950, the *Ormen Friske*, a Swedish-built reconstruction of a Norwegian Viking ship, capsized in the North Sea. All 15 on board perished. My investigation of this tragedy, exploring its background, causes, aftermath, narratives and memories, is one of the first examples in Scandinavia of a large-scale study in the relatively new research tradition of what has come to be called 'Archaeology of the Contemporary Past'.

This study has been published in book form (Edberg 2004a), and some additional material including further discussion subsequently published (Edberg 2004b, 2005, 2011). These texts are all in Swedish. The following is the first account in English. It presents the questions, sources, methods and results in summary form, while full reference can be found in the above-mentioned works. Emphasis is here placed on work method and experiences that might be of interest to others working within the field of archaeology of the contemporary past.

## **2. Three questions**

My survey of the *Ormen Friske* disaster centres around three questions or tasks. These were formulated after a preliminary review of previous literature on the topic. I noted that there were many allegations of deficiencies in ship design and in seamanship. But this information was not consistent, and there were also worrying reports that the ship had been caught up in an air raid. There were no survivors or witnesses. The first task was therefore to make an inventory of all the source material in order to document the ship, its voyage and sinking; with the aim of obtaining the basis for an independent assessment.

It appeared that even though 15 citizens had died, no government agency in Sweden had undertaken any research into the cause of the accident. This struck me as strange and aroused my scientific curiosity. Task number two was therefore to investigate whether there was any particular reason, and if so what, for this lack of scrutiny.

The standpoint for this work was that archaeology aims to study the interaction between material culture and human behaviour regardless of the time interval. The material culture here consisted primarily of the ship *Ormen Friske*, its function and symbolism, from the hewing of its wood till its wreckage was cleared away. With regard to the time factor, 50 years had passed since the event when I began my study. The prototype for the *Ormen Friske*, the Gokstad ship, dates to about AD 900, and seen in this light, the study spans more than a thousand years.

Objects have affected people throughout all ages and those from the past can still affect us today. When conducting archaeology of the contemporary past, one is challenged to study not only the appearance or usefulness of artefacts, but also their non-material characteristics, such as their meaning, symbolism and potential for reminiscence. As a third task, therefore, I set out to examine any rescued artefacts from the ship and its crew that were preserved for posterity, viewing them in this light.

My overall aim was to integrate these three tasks in a fruitful way, to obtain a holistic understanding of this tragedy.



### **3. Method and source material**

Methodically the survey entailed localizing and obtaining access to sources in the form of remnants of original or narratives, preserved by whatever means; whether printed in book or in magazine form, hand-written as letters, specified in contracts or otherwise, taken as sound recordings, as photographs, on film, or in the form of preserved objects. In addition, I interviewed a number of people about their recollections.

My next step was to delve into the archive material concerning the ship and the course of events leading up to its capsizing. These were found in a number of places. A large amount was available from the archives of *Friskisportförbundet* (more about this organization below). This included minutes, letters from in-and-outgoing correspondence, and many other documents, along with photos and albums of pasted newspaper clippings. I discovered that a Dutch journalist had boarded the *Ormen Friske* for part of the final voyage. He had disembarked before the accident. From The Hague, I obtained microfilms of all his reports and thus had access to a first-hand testimony from an outside observer aboard the ill-fated vessel.

Rich archival material was also found at the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, partly in the ministry's own archives, and partly in the archives of the Hamburg consulate. Thus, as soon as I got the confidentiality ban lifted, I had access to a treasure trove of documents which were previously unknown to the public. Material concerning the identification of bodies was located in the archives of the Swedish National Laboratory of Forensic Science, where I also found personal items, such as samples of the victims' clothing. By searching through several additional archives I was able to collect supplementary material and correspondence.

During this phase of my work, I recorded the names of a large number of people for future contact. Since more than 50 years had passed, many proved to have passed away, as one might expect. But despite this, I managed to contact several persons, and conducted a series of telephone interviews. I even visited some informants in their homes. Personal contact gave rise to numerous suggestions of other people whose names were not known to me; for example, younger relatives who could relate how their family remembered the incident. I also placed an advertisement in a weekly magazine with a nationwide older readership, stating that I sought contact with people who had recollections of the *Ormen Friske*. This provided valuable information.

As a result of these personal contacts, I obtained access to a first rate contemporary source, namely the letters written home by two crewmen during the voyage. Likewise, I was permitted to view pictures from the rolls of film one of these two had posted to a colleague in his home district, only a few days before the accident. These provided information in text and image not just about the sailing procedure but also about life on board and the atmosphere there. Through these contacts I also examined objects kept as mementos by the different families.

Oral information is one of the features of archaeology of the contemporary past. I handled these sources as is the practice in today's Scandinavian ethnology. There is a rule of thumb that while one must be cautious with the facts one is given, but pay attention to the interviewees' personal memories concerning impressions, moods and reactions. Anonymous sources are accepted in ethnology and this became necessary in some cases, when the interviewees stated that they did not want their names revealed. Incidentally, the oral interviews that I collected were so rich in detail that they could only be partially used within the framework of my study. Also, additional interviews were held with persons that I came into contact with after my book was published in 2004. That material will be published separately.

...

The daily newspapers played an important role in my source material, as they were the dominant media for spreading news and opinions at that time. Critically observed, it was interesting to note how the story of the accident and its causes were reconstructed (cf. Narrative, below). However, newspapers were otherwise generally quite a good source of information. The

reports and interviews conducted during, and in direct connection with, the actual voyage were very valuable through their immediacy in time and space. This primarily refers to the writings of the accompanying Dutch reporter, but even to others, such as the local newspaper in Ystad that published a detailed article that included interviews with crew members, just days before the accident. Newspaper clippings also provided a comprehensive picture of the public reaction to the concept of a replica Viking ship, its construction, voyage, capsizing and the aftermath.

## 4. The ship and its capsizing

The *Ormen Friske* was a reconstruction of the Norwegian Gokstad Ship, approximately 23 metres long and 5 metres wide. Excavated in 1880, documented and then reconstructed, the Gokstad Ship is one of three original crafts that have long been on exhibition in the famous Viking Ship Hall in Oslo. The *Ormen Friske* was built in the spring of 1949 on the initiative of Sten Schröder, an engineer by profession, who was a leader and former vice-chairman in an association called *Friskisportförbundet*. This was, and is still, an independent non-profit and non-political nationwide movement that promotes the physical fitness and mental wellbeing of its members. It advocates outdoor activities and simple and healthy eating as well as total abstinence from drugs, alcohol and tobacco. In 1950 one of its slogans was 'Against sickness and war; for health and peace'.

Sten Schröder's testimony indicates that the purpose of building the ship and putting it to sea was partly to promote the ideology of the movement. Employing the icon of a Viking ship would tie in with romantic and popular notions about our ancestors' daring voyages and (allegedly) healthy lifestyle.

The boat was built at the association's training centre in Stensund, situated on the Baltic coast near Trosa, about 60 km south of Stockholm. Schröder had managed to engage a sailing-ship expert, Sam Svensson, as adviser, and together they constructed the drawings of the vessel. These were based on the detailed scientific publication of the Gokstad ship construction. The foreman for the project was a young boat builder, Bror Westerlund who that spring, along with five helpers, completed the ship in six intensive weeks.

The steering committee of *Friskisportförbundet* had been hesitant to invest in the project, mainly because of the organization's weak economy, which had in its own way led to some personal conflicts. Schröder was known as an enthusiastic and charismatic leader, but keeping within planned budgets was not considered one of his strengths. The association therefore abstained from backing the venture, and Schröder himself had to take financial responsibility for both construction and voyage.

As soon as the ship was built it was sailed to Stockholm to partake in a sports exhibition. For a few weeks it offered daily rowing and sailing trips to paying passengers. Schröder devoted the rest of the season to sailing demonstrations, trying to recuperate funds to cover his boatbuilding debts. His success was minimal, but then suddenly there came a break-through. In the summer of 1949, a Danish replica of a Viking ship, the *Hugin*, sailed across the North Sea to England receiving a great deal of positive attention. Now the organizers of a maritime fair to be held in Rotterdam in the summer of 1950 also desired to be visited by Vikings. Schröder got the job and the financial guarantees he requested. (Figure 1)

On 4 June 1950, the voyage, which would be the ship's last and end in disaster, began. *Friskisportförbundet* was essentially a youth movement and the crew was composed of its well-trained male members. Schröder was 38 years old and the oldest on board. Most of the others were around 20-25. The majority were working class. A few were university students.

The voyage began with a ceremony at the Viking trading centre of Birka on Lake Mälaren and continued south from there through Södertälje Canal and out onto the Baltic Sea. After eight days in mainly adverse winds and severe weather the ship arrived at Ystad on the southern tip of Sweden. (Figure 2) Some damage to the rudder and rig was repaired with the help of members of the town's yacht club and additional equipment was installed. The voyage continued to Kiel and through the Kiel Canal. On 21 June the ship reached the German Bight, where it would go under the following day. (Figure 3)

On the morning of June 21 when the men on board the *Ormen Friske* set sail for Rotterdam, it was a beautiful day with a moderate wind. But that evening it blew from the southwest, and a storm rose the following night. Examining the filed weather reports, I noticed that neither the Danish, German nor Dutch services had warned of the storm, which formed very suddenly.

The disaster first became known four days after it happened, when wreckage and dead bodies started to float ashore on the islands of North Frisia. It became clear that Schröder himself and all his 14 crew members had drowned.

The closest Swedish representation, the consulate in Hamburg, was alerted by the local press and the vice-consul was sent to the coastal area. He immediately pronounced himself very critical and categorical about the ship to Swedish journalists who came to the scene. He explained that 'the thick bottom planks apparently were broken like matches by the North Sea waves and in collision with sandbars.'

Wreckage was salvaged by locals on the islands of Pellworm, Sylt, and other North Frisian islands. Reports streamed in to the nearest relevant German authority which was the *Wasser- und Schiffahrtsamt* in the coastal town of Tönning. Its head officer was Martin Bahr. He took it upon himself to conduct a hearing, and then compile observations, from eyewitnesses among the seafarers who had observed the *Ormen Friske* after the ship had left the mouth of the Elbe. It was revealed that as the *Ormen Friske* sailed into the German Bight a large number of boats were out fishing lobsters. The Swedish ship passed straight through these fishing grounds and was observed both from lightships and the fishing boats. In this way it was possible in retrospect to trace its voyage fairly closely.

According to the report of Martin Bahr, completed two weeks after the accident, the change in the weather had forced the entire fishing fleet of the German Bight to seek refuge in a safe harbour. Many cutters had gone in to the island of Heligoland, where there was the chance of protected anchorage and mooring. Just before the probable time of the accident, the *Ormen Friske* was sighted by some fishermen who were on the pier. They had been out fishing north of Heligoland and reached the harbour through its northern entrance. The *Ormen Friske*, according to these eye-witnesses, set course to the narrow southern entrance of the port which was at that time fully exposed to the wind.

Bahr corresponded for several months after the accident with the consulate in Hamburg. He wanted to know what should be done with the parts of the wreck that had been salvaged in various places, and which remained in situ pending expert inspection. Bahr even offered the names of local experts who could undertake the work, if the Swedes so wished.

The bodies of 9 of the 15 crew members, many badly mutilated, were found subsequently and sent home to Sweden for burial by their families. The consulate involved itself in the identification of the bodies, but no other initiatives were taken. On one of the days immediately following the accident, the vice-consul announced that Sweden did not have any interest in the wreckage recovered, and that the finder could keep it. And finally, close to six months after the accident, Bahr received information by letter from the consulate that it was decided that no Swedish inspection or investigation into the wreck would take place. It could be discarded. I found copy of this letter, with this hitherto unknown and remarkable content, in the previously confidential consular archives.

## **5. Context – world affairs**

Sweden had certainly suffered very lightly during the Second World War; but the blockade had been effective and trips abroad were something that a young generation could only dream of. The voyage of the *Ormen Friske* would traverse a Europe that was now beginning to open up after the war, even if passport and currency restrictions still existed. The expectations of the participants of this adventure were great.

However, at the same time as the *Ormen Friske* fell into difficulties in the German Bight, another event occurred that gives this idealism and optimism for the future surrounding the voyage a doomed perspective.

American aircraft had begun bombing the island of Heligoland from a height of 6000 meters. The island was at that time vacated of its population and used as a practice site for the strategic bombers of the Western Powers, launched from bases in England. No warnings about these bombings were ever given. They were usually conducted in bad weather and visibility from the plane to the target was zero. Their purpose was the practice of radar attacks. This was before the time of nuclear submarines and long-range missiles, and the only way to deliver a bomb load against an enemy, i.e. the Soviet Union, was to fly them in. All known types of World War II bomber planes were utilized to train new crews. From 1949 the Americans included their new six-motor giant bomber, the B36, 'Peacemaker', the first in a new generation of strategic bombers, developed for nuclear war. In a real situation, the plane would have nuclear weapons on board. For Heligoland conventional charges were used.

Heligoland is a rocky islet in the North Sea, slightly over 2 km long and c. 700 m wide. Just over 1 km east of Heligoland lies its low neighbouring island, die Düne, 2 km long and 300 m wide. During the two World Wars, Heligoland had been set up as a 'North-Sea Malta', an important base to protect the German ports of the North Sea. During the Hitler era a submarine bunker with a concrete roof several-metres thick was built there. At the end of the war British military spokesmen designated Heligoland as a danger to peace and declared that the island should be wiped from the face of the ocean.

In 1947 the underground sections of the base were shelled by the victorious powers. In total, 6,700 tons of explosives and all kinds of ammunition were used, the largest-ever non-nuclear explosion. As a result of its use firstly during the war, and then subsequently being blasted and bombed, Heligoland had the appearance of a moonscape by 1950. The crews of the German lobster boats were well aware of the risks they exposed themselves to when they sought shelter there. But the island was always, and still remained, crucial for them when far from their home ports. They were also able to survive bombing sessions by taking refuge in wartime bunkers. As the bombs began falling, the fishermen on the pier, mentioned above, had to run for shelter just after having noticed *Ormen Friske* in its dangerous situation.

Four weeks after the accident, a United Press telegram was published in several Swedish newspapers: 'American third flight division headquarters in London announced on Friday that their bombers conducted exercises over Heligoland on June 22 and thereby could have caused the sinking of the *Ormen Friske*'. In a statement from the bombing headquarters the same day, the American press officer added to the Swedish newspaper, *Svenska Dagbladet*: 'Normally, these exercises are carried out at a height of 6000 meters or more, which means that our pilots would not have been able to see the Swedish ship if it entered into the training area as a result of the storm or other causes. This was a very tragic event.'

In Europe the focus of the Cold War was on Germany. After the end of World War II, the country was divided into occupation zones. Hamburg, badly bombed, lay in the British zone, as also did Heligoland. The Swedish diplomats in Germany felt it was vitally important to be on good terms with the British, being totally dependent on the latter for offices, housing and even food rations. It can be gleaned from the Hamburg Consulate archives and oral sources that the Swedes, both for business and in private, sought to avoid anything that could irritate the British.

The sinking of the *Ormen Friske* coincided with an acute major political crisis. On 25 June

1950, the same day that the first bodies and wreckage from the ship were found, the Korean War broke out. This major conflict would last for three years and was close to sparking off a nuclear war between East and West. The received opinion in Sweden was that the Korean War illustrated the aggressive intentions of the Soviet Union and China. Western armament was seen as defensive and legitimate and hence beyond criticism. Anyone who tried to moderate this worldview was branded a crypto-communist.

## 6. Narrative and silence

As soon as the accident became known the major Stockholm newspapers and several others from Sweden flew reporters to the area. When they arrived there was still no certain news about how or when the accident had happened; the only traces being the bodies and salvaged wreckage witnessing that a tragedy had occurred.

It was during these first two to three days that the official story (the narrative) about the loss of the *Ormen Friske* was formulated. In the absence of any concrete knowledge about the causes of the accident, the reporters embellished their own speculations. The rhetorical device was a reference to fictive sources for authority: ‘experienced seamen’, ‘expert opinions’, and the like. The only named source was the Swedish vice-consul who had said that he did not believe that the voyage had any prerequisites for success. Images of badly wrecked ship timbers were presented as evidence of poor construction. Neither the vice-consul nor the reporters seem to have considered the possibility that the splintered nature of the wreckage was the result of the accident, and not automatically its cause.

The general account in the newspaper reports those first days was that the ship had broken up in the storm because it was poorly built. The young sportsmen were dead, which in itself was very tragic, but they were naïve idealists who had set out in heavy weather in a feeble boat. They were ‘frail vegetarians’ who had ‘panicked’, so it was claimed. This story, since the day it was first formulated, has been repeated, not just in the mass media whenever the tragedy of the *Ormen Friske* is mentioned but also in scientific texts written by researchers. Many quote the *Ormen Friske* as an example of what can go wrong if one does not carefully comply to Viking Age principles when building a reconstruction, is negligent about the ballast, etc.

At this time no one knew exactly where the accident had taken place since the witness accounts, indicating the route taken by the *Ormen Friske* during its final 24 hours, had not yet been collected. Thus, since it was not known at this stage that Heligoland was the location of the accident, the press understandably made no mention of or connection to any bombing raid in that area.

A week after the tragedy some relatives of the lost crew visited the sites where the largest pieces of wreckage had come to land, and noted that they were heavily scratched. This damage, supposedly caused by the ship beating against the dreaded underwater reefs that surround the southern entrance to Heligoland harbour, was not mentioned at all in the newspaper reports.

However, Martin Bahr, who examined the wreckage, wrote that in his opinion the ship had broken apart ‘in collision with some sturdier material than a sandbank’. He wrote further that, in his personal opinion, after having studied the evidence and listened to witnesses, the ship was not as unfit as was stated by the Press, and that the crew through their actions showed that they were fully able for their task. The *Ormen Friske* had, according to Bahr, gone down not because of any faults in the ship or defects in the crew, but because of a chain of unfortunate events.

By the time Bahr’s report became known, the journalists had returned home and the immediate novelty of the event had passed. Furthermore, since Swedish officials paid little attention to this new information it received only limited airing and was short lived. Similarly, Washington’s official recognition of their bombing raid did not receive much attention when it arrived a few weeks later. It only received brief newspaper articles or mere one-column notices. The press at that time was generally very respectful of the government, and the types of journalistic confrontations that often occur in today’s news reports were practically non-existent. Therefore no demands were raised that the accident be investigated.

With regard to the *Friskesportförbundet*, much positive publicity had come its way through newspapers, radio and cinema newsreels concerning the building of the *Ormen Friske* in 1949; the plans for sailing it to Rotterdam in 1950 and the launch of the voyage. The association was the recipient of much goodwill, which was gratefully accepted, considering that the media otherwise tended to refer to its membership as ‘vegetable fools’. Many members were indeed vegetarians, which was then by many considered highly curious and odd.

The association, as previously noted, did not officially support the voyage, even though in its own magazine it praised the venture as 'the greatest propaganda success story in the association's history'. The chairman of the association described the project in a letter as 'a brilliant idea'. But in formal terms, Sten Schröder was solely responsible, as the spokesman for the association was very careful to point out after the accident. The association also feared that it would be forced to pay the project's debts and even face insurance claims from relatives of the victims.

It is also possible that underlying political motives were present. The archival material indicates that the pro-American feelings, typical for the time, were very well anchored among the association's leadership. For example, members who had signed the so-called 'Stockholm Appeal' against atomic weapons, were chastised and threatened with expulsion: the Appeal being described as 'communist propaganda'. The leadership saw themselves as 'apolitical', which according to the language of the time meant pro-American. To question the actions of Swedish diplomats seems to have been as foreign to the leadership of the association as it was to the newspaper editors.

Although 15 members perished, the association thus officially refrained from demanding an investigation into the tragedy, and by so doing, was in practice accepting the cover-up of the accident. No consideration was made for the fact that this placed the grieving families in the dark about how their sons, brothers and husbands had died. The deceased Schröder became the association's scapegoat. His widow, Doris, and two young sons, were evicted from their small home at the training centre in Stensund.

In stark contrast to the fence-sitting posture of the authorities and the association, some private initiatives were undertaken. The brothers of two lost crew members visited the sites of the beachings shortly after the accident. These were articulate middle class people (two merchants and a pharmacist) who later on, on their own initiative, brought information of Martin Bahr's investigation to Sweden. Having personally met Bahr at the site, he later sent them copies of his report. No previous mention had been made in Sweden about the ship having been caught up in a wholesale bombing raid, and the relatives disseminated the information as best they could. But, as already mentioned, their impact was limited by comparison to the massive news coverage of the actual accident a few weeks before. In my search through the Hamburg consulate archives, I also discovered a press release sent from there, after the information about the bombing had leaked out. The consulate denied that the assault had any role in the sea accident. Correspondence from the consulate to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs indicates that the press release was written solely to counter the brothers' activities. Correspondences in the Foreign Affairs archives also contain condescending comments about this 'attempted vindication'.

As far as I could discover, no other relatives reacted other than bringing home the bodies for burial (the cost of which the families had to bear themselves). This can probably be understood in the light of their social background and the criticism of the ship and crew in the press, which was hard to bear. To single-handedly articulate themselves against the authorities was a major challenge for these families now that *Friskisportförbundet* had declined acting on their behalf. Mourning the sudden loss of a husband, father, son or brother naturally dominated their lives: a brother of one of the dead told me 'Father and mother took it hard. They did not want to delve into the cause of the accident'.

Sailing-expert Sam Svensson, who had been the construction advisor when building the *Ormen Friske* and had designed the rig, was interviewed after the accident. He defended the ship. The strakes were of superior knot-free pine. The wood for the frames certainly was not as good, he admitted, but added 'this cannot have been the effective cause'. Svensson also related that he himself had been able to tack 'well' with the boat, 'so there was nothing wrong with its capabilities'. He surmised that it must have hit a mine, been thrown against a reef or suffered



something similar, that is, found itself in a situation that no material could withstand. Svensson emphasized that he was only an advisor and was not responsible for the construction or voyage. He probably found it best to lie low. Personal relationships and conflicting interests at his workplace, the Maritime Museum in Stockholm, also seem to have played a role.

By law it was mandatory that both major and minor accidents at sea be investigated by a special government agency, then the maritime bureau attached to the Swedish Board of Trade and marine hearings and investigations were routinely conducted at this time. The Swedish foreign consulates often played a major role in the gathering of information. This was not mandatory for non-commercial sea-traffic, which included the *Ormen Friske*. But marine hearings, while not compulsory, could be implemented on demand, or on the agency's own initiative. No documents concerning the catastrophe occurring to the *Ormen Friske* could be found in the department's archives, despite the fact that in the same year other, much less disastrous, accidents involving 'pleasure boats' were investigated. My impression is that the maritime agency could hardly have rejected a specific demand for an investigation of the *Ormen Friske's* disaster from an authoritative source – such as *Frisksportförbundet* – if one had been immediately placed.

## 7. The significance of memory

Graves, memorial sites and objects from the wrecked ship and its crew continue to spark people's memories and perceptions of the disaster.

Memorials for those lost on the *Ormen Friske* have been erected in a small number of places. One stands in *Friskesportförbundet's* training centre, Stensund near Trosa, where the ship was built. This is a rough cut sliver of stone, c.2 m tall, containing the names of the dead and the inscription (in Swedish): 'The *Ormen Friske* built on Stensund in spring 1949 capsized off Heligoland 22/6 1950. Fifteen Swedish sportsmen followed it into the deep' and a quotation from the poet J. L. Runeberg's heroic verse *Molnets broder* (in Swedish): 'Not with complaint shall your memory be celebrated, not like those that pass and are soon forgotten'. Sten Schröder had intended to return to Stensund in triumph after a successful sea voyage. Instead the result was a monument in this place to his failure.

For many years *Friskesportförbundet* held a memorial service at the stone during their annual summer school. Gradually, this occurred less frequently, as the tradition bearers within the association grew older. The first time that I visited the site myself, in 1993, the area was covered in forest and undergrowth, and it was still that way during my visit in 2005, when, incidentally, I was invited to speak about the *Ormen Friske*. That same year, I had been interviewed by the local regional TV channel. When I again observed the site in 2009 the spot was opened up and the trees felled. An area around the stone had been neatly fenced in. I like to believe what I was told then, that it was due to my research, and the attention it had received, that the memorial was re-charged in this way.

Another memorial has stood on the North Frisian island Pellworm since 1951. It was erected next to the ruined tower of the island's Alte Kirche known also as St Salvator's Church. It was funded by a voluntary collection in Sweden and was carved by a local firm. It is still lovingly cared for by the local congregation. A copper plate bears the victims' names and the same verse as on the stone in Stensund. (Figure 4). On the 50th anniversary a service was held at the Alte Kirche to which relatives were invited. Five or six of these attended, as well as a representative from *Friskesportförbundet*. This coincided with the opening of the exhibition at the Maritime museum in Husum (more below). Pellworm lies off the beaten track and the stone is not particularly well-known to relatives or the fitness movement in Sweden. However, it is highly charged with local memories, supported by the wreckage displayed in café on the island (see below).

A replica of the memorial stone in Pellworm stands in Kalmar cemetery in Bålsta, Uppland, Sweden. It was erected over the grave of one of the victims, by his father who was a priest in this parish. The text on this stone is not that of Runeberg, however, but taken from the *Book of Revelations*. Other graves on various Swedish locations also form memorials, occasionally mentioning the *Ormen Friske* in their inscriptions. I have a picture of old pals from one victim's local *Friskesportförbundet* club gathering at his grave, 50 years after the accident.

During their stopover in Ystad, Sten Schröder signed up the *Ormen Friske* as a member of the local Yacht Club. The memory of this event is kept alive by their annual '*Ormen Friske* Race'; and after the publication of my book in 2004, the club purchased a number of copies to distribute as prizes over the coming years. A framed canvas signed by the *Ormen Friske* crew members, during their visit in 1950, still hangs in the clubhouse.

In 2000 the Maritime Museum in Husum, *Schiffahrtsmuseum Nordfriesland*, gathered together the largest group of preserved artefacts from the ship, namely its dragon-head, dragon tail and some shields, for the 50th anniversary of the accident; and also arranged for an exhibition concerning the tragedy. On my visit in 2010 the exhibition still stood on the top floor of this magnificent museum at the harbour of Husum (Figure 5). Most of the exhibits came from Pellworm, where also a large portion of the *Ormen Friske's* stern had been a tourist attraction in a

summer café for decades. Although the wreckage subsequently rotted and was cleared away, the café still bore a sign with a Viking ship over the door on my visit in 2010.

I managed to find a small fragment of the ship's planking still preserved; this time at another German museum on the North Sea coast. I was able to borrow the fragment and (in 2003) show it to Bror Westerlund the builder of the ship. He concluded that it probably came from the *Ormen Friske*. This closed the circle in an emotional way, 54 years after its construction.

The compass and tiller, which were salvaged after the accident, were brought home to Sten Schröder's family in Sweden. They are now preserved in the home of one of his sons. He also carefully preserves his father's surviving papers. At the time of the accident this boy was four years old, and his whole childhood was marked by the loss of his father and the complete change to his life situation that followed. The objects from the *Ormen Friske* which the family got back were, so to say, impregnated with their father's bold plan, his failure, and the heavy judgment of posterity.

Memorabilia are also kept by other families. For example, the watch found on the corpse of a dead crew member is treasured by his niece, who also inherited her father's collected letters, newspaper clippings, and more, concerning the incident. Prior to my visit (2003), she had taken things down from the attic. There on a bed of wood wool lay the wristwatch her uncle had worn aboard the *Ormen Friske*. (Figure 6) There were also letters. There was a photo album. There was his membership card from *Friskesportförbundet*. There were photos of his girlfriend. It was evident that the memories and the sensations aroused by the memorabilia were activated by my interest during my visit, and the impression was confirmed in my continued correspondence with this family.

Åke Nilsson, who lost his younger brother Hans-Emil on the *Ormen Friske*, was one of the relatives who travelled to Germany soon after the accident, to conduct their own research and make contact with the authorities there. He was also the initiator of the memorial service at Pellworm in summer 2000. Among his memorabilia from 1950 he showed me a ship-in-a-bottle displaying the *Ormen Friske* in the harbour in Husum, constructed as a gift by the town's harbour captain. (Figure 7).

More than two months after the tragedy a message in a bottle, concerning the bombing, was found on the beach on the Danish side of the border, near the spot where, not too long previously, two corpses from the *Ormen Friske* had floated ashore. The text on the yellowy scrap of paper, possibly torn from a wrapper, read (in Swedish), 'Help! *Ormen Friske*. Bombardment'. The Danish police sent it to Stockholm to what was then the State Bureau of Forensic Science. There it lay for several months before being set aside. The explanation given was that an investigation was unnecessary; no clear reason given. The scrap of paper might, in my opinion, very well be authentic. A collection of samples for analysis of the crew members' handwriting could easily have been arranged in 1950. My own attempts, long after, were unsuccessful.

Wooden shields from the *Ormen Friske* were found by private individuals in Germany and Denmark, and at least one such souvenir proved to be still in the keeping of the person who had found it, on one of the Frisian islands, as a young boy. He was now an archaeologist with a maritime focus, but if the find had any bearing on his career, he could not tell.

In my book of 2004, I listed all the finds from the *Ormen Friske*, both those that survived and those that were destroyed but previously recorded in some way. They are dealt with in the find list in the manner of traditional archaeological objects. But as this commentary shows, categories such as size, material, type, etc. are not full descriptions, since they need also to be examined in terms of their significance to the event or as carriers of narratives. The objects are each coloured by their own history, similarly to the text in an archival record. A strong force field – or aura – may be seen as surrounding these apparently neutral lists.

## 8. Three answers

By combining the various sources, the three questions that I initially asked could now be answered, each in their own way.

With regard to the design and construction of the ship, the sources showed that it was expertly built with the modern methods available in 1949. The keel was constructed from a 16" beam of laminated wood and the strakes were from pine boards. The frames were not of natural grown timber, a quite serious deficiency. No clarity could be obtained concerning the crew's combined expertise, but they had a certified ship's master onboard as navigator. Being a *Friskisportförbundet* member himself, he had signed off a merchant ship where he was second mate, expressly to take part in this North Sea voyage.

So how did the shipwreck happen? The absence of any accident investigation makes it impossible to assess the role of any shortcomings or weaknesses of the boat or crew. The wreckage is not preserved and the documentation consists of photos and descriptions. These show that the ship broke up, and to some extent how, but not why. According to the last sighting of the ship the accident occurred at about the same time as the American bombs began to fall. There is no evidence that the ship was hit by a bomb, but rather it seems likely that it was smashed against Heligoland's underwater rocks or surf, as Martin Bahr concluded. Perhaps the rig fell overboard first, which would have made the ship inoperable, and have it swing broadside to the waves, filling it with water.

In a discussion about an accident involving a ship such as the *Ormen Friske*, one should not ignore the fundamental problem with open vessels. In rough weather they may fill up with water, making them impossible to manoeuvre. If the ship has ballast it then rapidly sinks, as has happened in recent years with several Norwegian copies of Viking ships. Even if the hull remains afloat, bailing out water is not very practical when clinging to the rails for dear life, close to a treacherous cliff-lined coast in a storm.

Some of the criticism levelled at the *Ormen Friske* was no doubt founded on an exaggerated idealization of the seaworthy properties of Viking ships. If one imagines that the originals were perfect, then as soon as something goes wrong in modern reconstructions or replicas, it is natural to look for errors and deficiencies in the latter, instead of investigating the actual conditions. As is well known, accidents at sea have occurred throughout all ages and still occur, even with the latest ship technology and skilled crews. Incidentally, The Icelandic Sagas hold many tales of Viking Age shipwrecks and drownings.

...

Bisschop

Regarding the absence of any investigation into the accident, I have shown that neither the Swedish consulate in Hamburg nor the Swedish National Board of Trade in Stockholm took any initiative. Instead, the consulate spread rather speculative information as to the cause of the accident before anything was known, and dismissed subsequent information concerning the bombing of Heligoland. The State Bureau of Forensic Science ignored the evidence of the message-in-a-bottle with its desperate call for help. The silence of the Swedish authorities, on hearing reports that the men on the *Ormen Friske* might have had a chance to save themselves, if the ship had not had the misfortune to end up amidst an American air raid, should, as stressed above, be seen in the light of the major political events of the period. This perhaps primarily concerns the reaction of the Swedish consulate in Hamburg, but is also true on several general

levels. *Friskisportförbundet's* attitude changed from approval to dissociation. The fact that they favoured an alternative lifestyle did not mean that they were in general opposition to society. On the contrary, the association's leadership shared the political views of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This also was the standard Swedish view. The fear of economic repercussions was a further reason to bury the event, put all the blame on Schröder, and move on.

This total inactivity viewed now at a distance of over 60 years seems incomprehensible, but should not in any way be understood as a kind of conspiracy. Instead, it seems clear to me that it must be interpreted as the result of a common mentality, an ideological consensus, that was the spirit of the age.

The only force that to some extent broke through this frame was the involvement of the crew's relatives, which gave publicity to politically sensitive information. But it got no response and was given up after a while. For most of the families dealing with their grief took all their strength.

A journey of peace in a Viking ship ending in a rain of bombs was obviously a tragic accident, a combination of coincidences, but in retrospect also a political memento. There was a wedge between the Swedish policy of neutrality with all its rhetoric, and those circles within the political and above all diplomatic and military elite, that throughout the postwar period were in league with the US and NATO. This is the perspective from which the *Ormen Friske's* bleak destiny and legacy must be viewed. The tragedy can then also be understood as a collapse, one of many, of the common people's innocent support of the Swedish official policy of neutrality.

• • •

With regard to memorabilia, I have shown that a large number of objects were preserved and these are surrounded by their stories, or their narratives. The strongest, emotionally, are the personal items that were collected from the deceased, such as watches and rings. The small, insignificant, but in this context extremely important, remnants of clothing preserved in an archive, can fill the viewer with deep respect. The same applies to the message from the bottle, still preserved but never expertly examined.

The surviving objects remain significant by virtue of their history, and they in turn keep the ship alive. The items were snatched from their context by the shipwreck, but can at the same time be seen as carriers of the event's history. A variety of sites related to the ship affect their own social spaces, and thus give the ship an 'after-life'. The wreckage that still survives however appears more neutral as museum objects, and associates in its own way as much to the Viking Age as to the 1950s.

The three questions, and the answers to them, in this study interact. They move between the local and global worlds, the concrete and the abstract. The ship and its demise was thus a measure of the spirit of the age, or, put another way, this little story was played out against the great backdrop of 'History' and is to be understood in relation to it.

## **9. Pre-understanding and reflexivity**

The result of any research is determined, of course, in the encounter between researchers and their objects of study. Also in archaeology, the scholar's own views and presuppositions should be looked upon as important factors.

Traditional archaeological research usually works within large distances of both time and space from its human objects of study, who are considered as nameless 'prehistoric' or 'medieval'

‘people’ or ‘communities’, etc. A form of distancing is integral to the nature of the subject. For archaeologists working with the contemporary or recent past the situation is different. Here there are living people both among the sources and among those directly affected by the text. They may have strong views, be highly emotionally involved, or both.

When working with recent material one's fundamental views of contemporary or present issues play their unavoidable part. For example, the person who excavates one of his own country's war-time crashed airplanes, has a better chance of identifying with (or even deifying) the crew, than the person whose family was at the receiving end of their weapons. The researcher's choice of perspective, can, in such a case, be invisible to those concerned while obvious to an outsider. Also, research questions, which may seem inescapable to one scholar, may very well seem irrelevant to another. To try to consider one's own research context and personal point of departure in a reflexive manner, is thus as relevant as any general source-critical position.

The researcher's scientific curiosity is also a kind of commitment. Here it is obviously necessary to keep a balance, to be aware that we are influenced by our personal identity and that we cannot step out of the scientific tradition in which we were trained. To examine closely one's own personal incentives, as far as this be possible, may thus be relevant to one's interpretations. If this seems naive and romantic, I cannot see the harm in at least trying: Why did I myself start examining the *Ormen Friske* tragedy? This was partly because of my long-standing interest in experiments with Viking ship replicas, and my research into prehistoric travel. But I also felt an affiliation between the *Ormen Friske* project, carried out by a group of idealists, relying on themselves and friends with very little external support; and my own research which benefited from plenty of moral support from fellow scholars, but (at the time) had very little financial backing. However, I felt no need for prudence, either when labelling the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' diplomatic actions, in the wake of the disaster, as a cover-up; or when describing the abysmal response of *Friskesportförbundet* as cowardly. In this respect, my independence (even if partly unintentional), turned out to be an advantage.

## **10. References**

Edberg, R. 2004a. *Vikingaskeppet Ormen Friskes undergång. Ett drama i det kalla krigets skugga*. (Södertörn Archaeological Studies, 2.) Huddinge: Södertörns högskola.

Edberg, R. 2004b. *Ormen Friskes sjödrama*. Arkeologisk förklaring efter 50 år. *Populär Arkeologi* 4/2004. Pp 8–10.

Edberg, R. 2005. *Samtidsarkeologi och moderna vikingafärder*. (Stockholm Marine Archaeology Reports, 4.) Stockholm: Institutionen för arkeologi och antikens kultur, Stockholms universitet.

Edberg, R. 2011. *Samtidsarkeologi och moderna vikingafärder*. Revised and enlarged edition. (Stockholm Marine Archaeology Reports, 6.) Stockholm: Institutionen för arkeologi och antikens kultur, Stockholms universitet.

These works are available at [www.academia.edu/runeedberg](http://www.academia.edu/runeedberg)

**Acknowledgements.** I am grateful to the Åke Wiberg Foundation for a research grant. Uainnin O'Meadhra helped me greatly with the English text.

### **Figure captions**

Figure 1. Sten Schröder preparing to launch *Ormen Friske* at Stensund for its second season. Photo taken by Sam Svensson 1950, courtesy of the Maritime Museum, Stockholm.

Figure 2. The crew of the *Ormen Friske* man the rails on arrival at Ystad, dressed in blue gangplank outfits. Photo 1950, courtesy of the Ystad Yacht Club.

Figure 3. *Ormen Friske* capsized off Heligoland. The tidal streams carried the bodies and wreckage to the Frisian coast. The stern was salvaged on Pellworm and a memorial erected there later. Map author.

Figure 4. Memorial at the Alte Kirche on the island of Pellworm. The author lays flowers 60 years after the accident. Photo Helena Lindstedt 2010.

Figure 5. The 'Dragon tail' from the *Ormen Friske*, on exhibition in the Maritime Museum in Husum, Germany. The sign says 'Original wreckage'. Photo author 2010.

Figure 6. A watch kept as a memento by a niece of one of the dead crew. Photo 2003, courtesy of Annika Mattus-Tufvesson.

Figure 7. Åke Nilsson's brother died on the *Ormen Friske*. Åke Nilsson, a pharmacist, was one of the relatives engaged in finding out more about the accident. The bottle ship was a 1950 gift from the harbour captain of Husum, Germany. Photo 2002, courtesy of Åke Nilsson.

-----

1)

Svartbäcksgatan 108 A, 753 35 Uppsala  
Tel. 018/551801 – mobil 070/4871893  
[rune.edberg@yahoo.se](mailto:rune.edberg@yahoo.se)



## Author's response on reviewer comments

Rune Edberg

2013-06-12

### Comment to C. Hillerdal.

Hillerdal acknowledges the aim and scope of my research, which I find very encouraging. She rightly points out that questions of what happened exactly when Ormen Friske went down still stand. Nevertheless, I think that I have rounded up all possible circumstantial evidence and interpreted the situation and suggested a credible scenario. In fact, I feel so intimate with the boys on board and their ship as if I were part of the crew myself.

The reviewer also appreciates the discussion of the Cold War mentality versus the Viking Ship project but suggests it could be taken further. I agree and I am preparing a follow-up study, also using some new sources, including personal interviews. However, such matters are indeed delicate when 'contemporary people' are involved. Regarding the significance of memory and the after-life of the ship, my paper gives a selection of examples, keeping to the archaeological tradition of focusing on the material. The universal applicability of these matters, as discussed by other scholars, was my inspiration and hopefully, my contribution may have some value for other workers in this field of research.

Hillerdal also suggests that I add more references. I have done so now, but this issue needs a few words. The written and narrative sources forming a major part of my research material are very extensive and mainly in Swedish. In addition, the bulk of it consists of non-published archive documents, private letters and oral interviews. A very good mastery of Swedish is indispensable for anyone wishing to check on these sources or proceed with the research on the Ormen Friske disaster. Such an effort must naturally be based on what is already published. Therefore, I think it is reasonable to point to my books in Swedish on the subject for detailed references and keeping the number of references here quite short. The present article in English is, as declared in its text, a summary. It presents the highlights of my research with emphasis on work method and experiences that may interest other scholars working within the field of archaeology of the contemporary (or recent) past.

### Comment to Thijs Maarleveld.

This reviewer strongly recommends that more references be added, and I have heeded to this call, as stated in the comment to reviewer C. Hillerdal above. To help things further, I have also added a certain number of explanatory additions in the text proper, several of which on points suggested by this reviewer.



I am somewhat puzzled about how this reviewer designates Archaeology as science. To my mind, Archaeology rather belongs to the humanities, Humanwissenschaft. This, needless to say, has implications for my approaches.

I wish to thank both reviewers warmly for their valuable comments and suggestions. Subsequently, I have been able to make several improvements to my original text.