

Unidentified Submerged Objects: A Critical Evaluation of Key Cases and Evidence

Unidentified Submerged Objects (USOs) are mysterious objects reported under water, often linked to UFO phenomena. In UFO research, *USO* describes any unidentified object seen moving in or emerging from water, suggesting “transmedium” capabilities (travel between air and sea)^[1]. Over decades, numerous USO cases have been documented globally, spurring investigation by governments, militaries, and independent researchers. Below, we examine major USO incidents, assess source credibility, consider skeptical explanations, and discuss the influence of USOs on public and official discourse. We also highlight key sources and research avenues to clarify these unresolved mysteries.

Historical and Factual Background of USO Cases

Reports of USOs date back at least to the mid-20th century and span the globe. Some of the most notable cases include:

- **1946 “Ghost Rockets” (Scandinavia):** In the aftermath of World War II, hundreds of “rocket-like” objects were reported streaking across the skies of Sweden, Finland, and Norway, with many seen crashing into lakes^[2]. Witnesses described missile-shaped craft, and in at least one instance an object was seen to splash down and propel itself across a lake’s surface before sinking^[3]. The Swedish military performed dive searches in affected lakes but **found no wreckage**, only occasional impact craters on lakebeds and torn-up aquatic plants^[4]. The lack of recovered debris left the ghost rockets unexplained; at the time officials suspected secret Soviet missiles or meteors, but no definitive cause was proven.
- **1950s Military Encounters:** Both NATO and Soviet forces reported USO-like incidents during the Cold War. For example, during **NATO’s Exercise Mainbrace (1952)** – a large naval exercise – multiple crews reported unusual flying objects; in one account a shining object was observed rising from the sea near a British ship (though documentation is sparse, the case gained fame in UFO lore). On the opposing side of the Iron Curtain, recently declassified Russian Navy records indicate that a surprisingly large share of UFO encounters occurred over water. One Russian naval officer noted **“50 percent of UFO encounters are connected with oceans. [Another] 15% with lakes”**, suggesting UFOs “tend to stick to the water”^[5]. Soviet submarine crews even claimed to track *underwater* objects moving at impossible speeds – on the order of 230 knots (400 kph) – far faster than any known submersible, “as if the objects defied the laws of physics”^[6]. In an **alleged 1982 incident** at Lake Baikal, the world’s deepest lake, Russian naval divers reported encountering humanoid beings in silver suits

underwater; a rapid ascent to escape these entities reportedly left three divers dead^[7]. These Cold War-era reports, while dramatic, come mainly from military anecdotes and declassified memos rather than publicly verifiable evidence.

- **Shag Harbour Incident (1967, Canada):** One of the most famous USO cases took place off Nova Scotia. On October 4, 1967, numerous witnesses – including fishermen, airline pilots, and Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers – saw a string of bright lights in the sky that seemed to dive into the waters of Shag Harbour. Believing a plane had crashed, authorities mounted a search and recovery operation. **No wreckage or aircraft was ever found** despite days of searching the waters^[8]. Canadian military and police reports from the time explicitly referred to the incident as an “unidentified flying object” crash, with **no conventional explanation forthcoming**^[9]. The event is often called “Canada’s best-documented UFO sighting” due to the paper trail of official telexes and reports it generated^[10]. Some researchers later hypothesized that the object traveled underwater to a nearby site and departed days later, but this remains speculative. To this day, Shag Harbour’s USO remains unexplained, with only witness testimony and official reports documenting the strange occurrence.
- **Modern Naval Encounters (2000s):** In the 21st century, USO reports have come primarily from military surveillance systems and leaked videos. A notable example is the **USS Nimitz carrier group encounter (2004, U.S.)**, in which Navy pilots engaged a **“Tic Tac” shaped UFO** over the Pacific. As pilot eyewitnesses Cmdr. David Fravor and Lt. Cmdr. Alex Dietrich approached, they noticed a **“churning” disturbance on the ocean surface** – as if something large was just below the water – with a white oval object hovering above it^[11]. The oblong craft then accelerated and maneuvered in extraordinary ways with no visible means of propulsion^[12]. Navy radars also tracked unexplained targets that day. This encounter, corroborated by multiple naval personnel and sensor data, was later publicized in a Pentagon-confirmed FLIR video. It suggested the presence of a transmedium craft capable of both aerial flight and underwater travel, though the object itself was never recovered or identified.
- **Aguadilla UAP Incident (2013, Puerto Rico):** In April 2013, a U.S. Customs and Border Protection aircraft captured infrared video of an **unidentified object flying at low altitude** over the shoreline of Aguadilla, Puerto Rico. The **thermal footage** (later leaked to researchers) showed a small, round object that crossed the airport, flew out to sea, and then **dove into the ocean without slowing**. Remarkably, the object **re-emerged and split into two identical objects** before flying off^{[13][14]}. An in-depth analysis of the video by the Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies (SCU) concluded that the object’s speed, heat profile, and maneuvering ruled out birds, aircraft, or balloons. The SCU report noted the object entered the water with **no obvious splash** and traveled underwater for over half a mile^[15]. No craft or debris was recovered. This case, while lacking official government acknowledgment, is supported by the video evidence and a detailed independent study, making it one of the more compelling modern USO encounters.

- **U.S. Navy “Transmedium” Targets (2019, U.S.):** A series of incidents in July 2019 involving U.S. Navy vessels off California brought USOs into the spotlight of UFO discussions. Navy crews on ships like the USS *Omaha* observed and filmed unknown **spherical objects** maneuvering over the ocean. In one Pentagon-confirmed video, a dark sphere can be seen hovering and then **descending into the water**; personnel are heard exclaiming “It splashed!” as the object disappears^[16]. A search by a Navy submarine found **no wreckage or contact** where the sphere vanished^[17]. These incidents occurred amid swarms of drone-like “UAPs” harassing Navy ships. The footage, obtained by filmmaker Jeremy Corbell, was verified as authentic by the Pentagon^[18]. While UFO proponents suggested these might be advanced transmedium crafts, the Navy’s investigation ultimately pointed toward **ordinary drones** operated by unknown parties. Indeed, internal Navy documents (released via FOIA) show the objects were consistently labeled as unmanned aerial systems, and officials informed Congress that the 2019 swarm had **prosaic causes (drones)**^{[19][20]}. Nevertheless, the image of a “plunging” sphere disappearing underwater caught public imagination and bore a strong resemblance to prior USO tales.

These cases (and others like them around the world) form the core lore of USOs. They range from Cold War spy-thriller scenarios to well-documented military videos. Across these reports, common threads include **official interest** (many involved military witnesses or investigations), a **lack of recovered physical evidence**, and striking descriptions of objects moving in ways that defy known technology or physics (especially underwater). The stage is set for a closer look at how credible these accounts are and how researchers have interpreted them.

Credibility and Reliability of the Evidence

When evaluating USO evidence, it’s crucial to assess the reliability of sources: Who is reporting the incident, and what documentation supports it? USO cases vary widely on these counts:

- **Military and Government Documentation:** Some USO incidents are supported by official reports, which lends them credibility (at least regarding *something* unexplained having occurred). For instance, the Shag Harbour crash was documented in Royal Canadian Navy and RCMP reports that frankly described an unidentified object with **no attempt to debunk it in official correspondence**^[9]. The 1946 ghost rockets were taken seriously by the Swedish defense forces; intelligence memos and a three-week military search of a lake (after a reported rocket impact) were undertaken, though nothing was found^[21]. In the U.S., Navy eyewitness accounts like the Nimitz 2004 encounter were backed by radar logs and later acknowledged through a Department of Defense release of video evidence. Such primary documentation and sensor data mean these events were not just rumors – they were recorded as unexplained anomalies by organizations that generally have rigorous observation standards.

However, “officially unexplained” does not automatically mean “extraterrestrial”; it simply establishes that trained personnel observed something they could not identify.

- **Eyewitness Testimony:** The credibility of USO reports often hinges on the observers. In many of these cases, witnesses were seasoned military officers, pilots, or sailors – people trained to recognize conventional aircraft and marine phenomena. Their testimony carries weight. For example, multiple crew aboard Navy destroyers in 2019 consistently reported and filmed the odd spherical objects; in 2004, at least **four naval aviators visually confirmed** the Tic Tac object and its extraordinary movement^[11]. Similarly, Shag Harbour had dozens of independent witnesses on record. Such corroboration by multiple observers, especially with technical expertise, reduces (but does not eliminate) the chance of misidentification. On the other hand, some dramatic accounts come from lone or anonymous sources, which are harder to verify. The **Lake Baikal diver encounter**, for instance, was only revealed decades later and relies on recollections of a few individuals without public documentation. Whistleblower and second-hand claims – like unconfirmed stories of USOs tracked on secret sonar systems – must be treated cautiously until supporting evidence emerges.
- **Physical and Photographic Evidence:** A striking feature of USO cases is the near-total absence of recovered objects or clear images. Despite a few instances of alleged material (e.g. unidentified sonar targets or submersible traces), **no actual USO craft or debris has been retrieved** in the cases above. The ghost rockets left only tantalizing craters in mud, and Shag Harbour’s divers found nothing concrete^[8]. This lack of hard evidence is a major gap – it means hypotheses about the objects’ nature (extraterrestrial, experimental tech, etc.) remain untestable. On the visual front, we do have some videos: the Aguadilla FLIR and the Navy’s 2004/2015 cockpit videos and 2019 ship footage. These camera recordings provide an **objective record** that can be analyzed frame-by-frame. Indeed, independent scientists have scrutinized the Aguadilla thermal video extensively. Still, even videos have limitations: infrared images are low-resolution and can be ambiguous (small blobs of light that require interpretation). Moreover, leaked videos often lack contextual data (exact range, radar info) that would help determine size and speed. In short, the evidence base for USOs is intriguing but incomplete – compelling eyewitness reports and some video/radar data, **without the definitive proof** that could settle debates.
- **Scientific and Analytical Studies:** Unlike many UFO sightings that are fleeting, a few USO incidents have allowed for extended analysis. The **Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies (SCU)** report on the 2013 Puerto Rico video stands out as a rigorous attempt to apply physics and geometry to deduce an object’s characteristics. The SCU team considered and ruled out various conventional explanations (planes, birds, balloons) by calculating the object’s heat signature, trajectory, and speed^[15]. Such independent analyses, especially when they are transparent and peer-reviewed, enhance credibility. That said, they depend on the data quality: conclusions are only as solid as the assumptions (for example, the SCU had to estimate distances from environmental clues, since no official range-finding was provided). Government and military agencies

have their own analytic efforts, but results are often classified or only partially released. Notably, the U.S. Department of Defense's **UAP Task Force** (and its successor, AARO) has collected military reports of "transmedium" objects, indicating the government itself is investigating some USO incidents. As of 2021, the Pentagon stated it had found **no evidence of alien origin** in UAP incidents and many had mundane explanations^[22], but officials also acknowledged some cases (potentially including underwater ones) remain unresolved and worthy of further study^[1].

In summary, the most credible USO cases tend to be those with **multiple, corroborating sources** (multiple witnesses plus instrument data) and some form of documentation or media. Cases relying on single testimonies or sensational stories without documentation rank lower in reliability. Even for the credible incidents, however, the information available publicly is often fragmentary. We have "mysteries" recorded on radar and camera, but without an object in hand or a definitive identification, their true nature remains ambiguous. This uncertainty opens the door to competing interpretations, as we'll see next.

Counterarguments and Skeptical Explanations

Given the extraordinary nature of USO claims, skeptics and scientists have proposed numerous **alternative explanations** for the cases above. A critical evaluation must consider these mundane possibilities, which often draw on known phenomena or identification mistakes:

- **Misidentified Natural Phenomena:** Many USO/UFO sightings have plausible natural explanations. The *ghost rockets of 1946* occurred during peacetime when **meteor showers** were active; investigators note that the peak of the Perseids in early August 1946 likely caused many "rocket" reports of bright fireballs streaking through the sky^[23]. Indeed, some ghost rockets were likely bolides (exploding meteors) that could splash into lakes – creating the illusion of a crashed craft – yet leave no trace (since meteoroids can vaporize or sink into mud). Similarly, some purported USOs might actually be meteors or space debris entering Earth's atmosphere at shallow angles and plunging into oceans. *Bioluminescent organisms* and optical mirages over water can also confuse observers: for example, mariners might see an eerie glow or moving light under water caused by bioluminescent plankton disturbed by a submarine or large fish. A famous historical anecdote often cited is Christopher Columbus noting a strange light beneath the ocean – likely bioluminescence or atmospheric refraction rather than an alien submarine. Skeptics argue that without corroborating radar or physical evidence, **human perception can be fooled** by such natural phenomena, especially at night over featureless waters.
- **Conventional Craft or Technology:** What appears to be an "unidentified" submerged object might actually be a *very much identified* object – just not recognized by the witness. In the Cold War cases, for instance, many ghost rocket sightings were initially

suspected to be secret missile tests. It's possible some were exactly that: stray Soviet rockets or high-altitude jets mistaken for something exotic. In modern times, a leading skeptical theory for incidents like the 2004 *Tic Tac* is that the object was an **advanced military drone or decoy**. The logic is that the U.S. or another nation could have been testing experimental high-performance craft or spoofing systems against carrier strike groups, and the Navy aircrew were **not briefed on the black project** – thus genuinely thinking it was otherworldly. No hard evidence for such a specific secret device has emerged, but it's a scenario consistent with the technology development of adversaries (e.g., hypersonic glide vehicles or novel drone subs). The **2019 drone swarm** incidents reinforce this line of thought: what mystified sailors as "UFOs" turned out, upon investigation, to likely be **ordinary drones operated by humans** (perhaps from a nearby private vessel or foreign spy ship)^{[24][20]}. Once the data (flight patterns, lighting characteristics) were analyzed, Navy intelligence confidently labeled them as unmanned aircraft rather than anything truly unknown. This shows that some USO/UAP events can and do receive prosaic explanations once enough information is available.

- **Instrument and Perception Errors:** Some seemingly incredible USO reports might boil down to errors in sensors or human perception. Radar systems, especially older models, can produce spurious targets (ghost blips) due to propagation anomalies over water. Sonar too can mislead – thermal layers in the ocean, schools of fish, or even whale calls sometimes appear as solid "contacts." A submarine crew might calculate an absurd 300-knot speed for a contact if the sonar data was misinterpreted or if multiple objects (like a pod of whales) were mistaken as one fast-moving object. In the Russian "fast USO" cases, skeptics could argue that rather than physics-defying craft, these were likely **sonar quirks or unrecognized natural targets** amplified by Cold War tensions. On the human side, **expectation and stress** can affect interpretation. At Shag Harbour, for example, witnesses initially thought they were seeing a plane crash – so they reported an object with flashing lights descending. It's conceivable that what they saw were lights from an aircraft or meteor that *appeared* to go into the water from their angle, and the subsequent search in the wrong location turned up nothing. Without dismissing the witnesses' honesty, skeptics note that eye-witnesses can be mistaken about distances and trajectories over water, especially at night.
- **Hoaxes and Folklore:** A few USO stories show signs of embellishment or hoaxing. The Lake Baikal divers tale, with its almost sci-fi description of underwater aliens, has never been corroborated by official documents – it surfaced via a retired officer's account and has the hallmarks of a sailor's yarn that grew over time. Likewise, there have been photographs floated around purporting to show USOs (such as a series of 1970s submarine photos of a flying saucer near the Arctic ice) that were later suspected or proven to be hoaxes or misidentified debris. Skeptics urge caution that some dramatic USO claims might be **fabricated for attention** or have become folklore within naval communities (much like sea serpent tales of old). Any extraordinary claim without solid evidence (video, documents, multiple witnesses) warrants healthy skepticism.

- **Specific Debunkings of Key Cases:** Several of the high-profile modern USO/UAP cases have attracted detailed debunking efforts from scientists and skeptics:
 - *Aguadilla 2013 (Puerto Rico):* A hypothesis by analyst *Ruben Lianza* (supported by forum discussions on Metabunk) posits that the infrared video actually shows **two Chinese sky lanterns** drifting together, not a miraculous water-diving craft^{[25][14]}. The “splitting into two” could simply be the two lanterns separating, and their heat signatures (heart-shaped in the IR imagery) were misinterpreted as a single object initially. Advocates of this explanation even identified local wedding venues that often release *pairs of flammable paper lanterns tied together* – a romantic custom that, from a distance, could look like a single odd flying object. The SCU team disputes this, arguing the object was moving too fast and submerging (which a floating lantern could not do)^[15]. Still, the lantern theory remains a plausible, testable alternative – illustrating how mundane activities might explain an ostensibly puzzling video.
 - *USS Nimitz Tic Tac (2004):* While no full debunk exists (this case is still considered unexplained), skeptics like Mick West have suggested pieces of the puzzle: the **“churning water”** might have been caused by a submerged submarine or a weather buoy, unrelated to the white flying object. The Tic Tac’s extreme maneuvers could be an illusion of perspective on the FLIR camera or a glitch – or perhaps an electronic warfare spoof injecting false tracks into the fighter’s radar. One proposed conventional explanation is a **classified drone or aircraft** (for example, some point to rumors of an ultrafast aircraft tested in the area). However, without more data, this remains conjecture. Notably, even the pilots themselves allow that it *could* have been a highly advanced human-made device or an atmospheric anomaly – they simply don’t know^[26].
 - *2019 Navy “Sphere” USO:* Initial UFO community excitement about a craft plunging into the ocean subsided when the context became clear: several Navy destroyers were swarmed by drones launched from an unknown vessel. The spherical UFO in the video likely **sank or flew out of range**, not into an alien undersea base. Indeed, subsequent Navy briefing materials revealed the military’s assessment that these were drones conducting intelligence gathering^[19]. This case demonstrates how thorough investigation can resolve a mystery – turning a “USO” back into an **Identified** Submerged Object (in this case, likely a drone falling into the water). It’s a reminder that we must be careful not to leap to exotic conclusions when faced with limited information.

In light of these counterarguments, a balanced evaluation of USOs means **entertaining terrestrial explanations first**. Many USO cases remain unsolved, but skeptics emphasize that “unsolved” does not mean “unsolvable” – it often means we lack sufficient evidence. As investigative journalist Ben Radford quips, “mystery is not evidence.” The default scientific approach is to seek a conventional reason for each observation (testing hypotheses like misidentification, equipment error, known animals or craft) before considering more extraordinary hypotheses. For some USO incidents, conventional

explanations adequately address the facts (as with the drone swarms). For others (like Shag Harbour or Tic Tac), no fully satisfying conventional explanation has yet been found – but skeptics would say that doesn't prove something alien, only that more data or analysis is needed. This tension between believer and skeptic interpretations keeps the USO debate very much alive.

Influence on Public Perception, Policy, and UFO Discourse

USOs in Public Imagination: While UFOs in the sky have long captured popular imagination (from 1950s flying saucer movies to *The X-Files*), USOs remain a more niche fascination – but one with significant cultural impact. The notion of alien craft lurking in our oceans introduced a new dimension to UFO lore, popularized by writers like Ivan T. Sanderson who speculated in the 1970s about underwater alien bases. This inspired creative works like the film *The Abyss* (1989), where aliens dwelling in the deep sea make contact with humans. USO cases like Shag Harbour and the Tic Tac incident have been featured in TV documentaries and news articles, which has gradually brought the idea of underwater UFOs into mainstream conversation. Public perception has shifted from treating such tales as pure science fiction to at least *entertaining* the possibility that unexplained things might roam the oceans. Still, many in the general public remain skeptical or simply unaware of USOs – they are less famous than Roswell or lights in the sky, partly due to fewer confirmed cases and the inherent difficulty of observing things deep underwater. Nevertheless, surveys show growing interest in all types of UFO/UAP phenomena, especially after credible military USO encounters were reported on programs like *60 Minutes*. This increased exposure has reduced some stigma: Navy personnel like Lt. Cmdr. Dietrich (Nimitz encounter) openly discuss what they saw, emphasizing that reporting such anomalies is important and **should not be mocked**^[27]. As more naval witnesses come forward, the public discourse is slowly “normalizing” discussion of USOs, treating them as a legitimate mystery rather than just tabloid fodder.

Government and Military Response: Possibly the most significant impact of USO reports has been on government policy and defense priorities in recent years. Once considered fringe, these incidents – especially the Navy's – prompted lawmakers to act. By 2020, the U.S. Congress demanded more thorough investigation of “*unidentified aerial phenomena*” (UAP), explicitly expanding the definition to include **submerged and transmedium objects** in 2022^{[28][1]}. This led to the establishment of the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office (AARO) to collect and analyze reports of unknown objects **in the air, sea, or space**. High-level officials have acknowledged that protecting national security means understanding *all* incursions, whether by advanced drones, natural events, or other causes. The Pentagon's language shifted to reflect this: Under Secretary of Defense Ronald Moultrie noted that **UAP now encompasses “unidentified phenomena in all domains...air, ground, sea or space” that may pose threats and require urgent attention**^[1]. In practice, this means Navy and Air Force personnel are

now *encouraged* (and trained) to report unusual sightings, including USOs, through official channels without fear of career harm. The creation of reporting guidelines in 2019 was a direct outcome of the rash of UAP encounters naval aviators had^[29]. The Navy even updated its incident databases to log “Unidentified Submersible Objects.” This institutional response is partly driven by security (e.g. concerns that foreign adversaries could have breakthrough underwater vehicles) and partly by recognition that some things observed remain genuinely unexplained. Other countries have also taken note: for example, the Chilean Navy and French GEIPAN have investigated a few cases of UFOs over water, and the **Russian Navy’s declassified records** in 2009 drew attention to the prevalence of sightings near water^[5]. In short, USOs have gone from a quietly discussed subtopic to an official area of interest. While there’s no confirmation of alien craft, the *possibility* that something unconventional is operating undersea has prompted governments to **allocate resources, collect data, and increase transparency** about these phenomena.

UFO Research Community: Within ufology, USOs have significantly influenced theories and debates. Researchers point to the frequency of UFOs reported around oceans (as the Russian officer’s statement highlighted) and speculate that if extraterrestrials are here, the oceans would be ideal hiding places (given 70% of our planet is ocean and relatively unexplored). This has led to hypotheses of undersea UFO bases – oft-discussed locations include the Puerto Rico trench (connected to the 1970s Caribbean USO reports) and areas like Catalina Island in California, where many modern Navy UAP sightings cluster. Such ideas remain speculative, but they have driven enthusiasts to focus on coastal “hotspots” for skywatching and to re-examine old naval logs for clues. USOs have also broadened the scope of UFO discourse to **“transmedium” capabilities**, meaning any truly advanced craft might not be limited to aerospace – an idea that challenges engineers and scientists to imagine technology that works in multiple mediums (air and water). Some aerospace experts, prompted by these accounts, have discussed how an object could overcome the massive drag of water at high speed (proposals include force fields or supercavitating designs). Even if alien craft aren’t behind USOs, *the reports are influencing human technology research* – for instance, the U.S. Navy has experimented with supercavitating underwater bullets and drones that can briefly fly and then dive, mirroring the concept of transmedium travel. In the skeptic vs believer dynamic, USOs have sometimes been a point for believers to emphasize: unlike lights in the sky, here are cases where something physical *interacts with water*, implying mass and advanced engineering. Skeptics counter that this just ups the ante for proof. Nonetheless, the UFO community now routinely includes USOs in conferences and studies. Groups like the SCU call for deploying more sensors in ocean environments to catch USOs in the act. The discussion has even reached academia in a limited way – e.g. oceanographers like **Rear Admiral Tim Gallaudet** (retired) have advocated for scientific inquiry into USOs, noting the need to catalog unusual underwater observations just as we do in the sky^[30].

In sum, USOs have evolved from a little-known aspect of UFO lore to a subject of serious consideration by militaries and a fascinating element of the wider debate on unexplained

phenomena. They've nudged public perception a bit closer to accepting that "UFOs" aren't just saucers zipping through space – they might also be submersibles lurking in our seas. This widening of perspective is influencing how we prepare policy (e.g. archiving UAP records for public release) and how we approach the enduring question: *What truly lies behind these unexplained sightings?*

Key Sources and Avenues for Further Research

To further clarify the unresolved aspects of USOs, interested readers and researchers can consult a variety of **primary documents, official reports, and expert analyses**. Below is a curated list of sources and follow-up research materials that shed light on USO cases and may help close the knowledge gaps:

- **National Archives UAP Collection (Record Group 615)** – Under the 2024 NDAA, U.S. federal agencies are transferring all UAP-related records (including USO incidents) to the National Archives^{[31][32]}. These records, once released, will be a treasure trove of official documents (military reports, sonar logs, intelligence estimates) for researchers. Checking the National Archives' online catalog for declassified Navy encounters or Project Blue Book case files involving water (e.g., Project Blue Book files include a 1960s case of a USO sighting by a ship's crew) could provide new insights from primary evidence.
- **Shag Harbour Official Reports & Research** – The incident generated numerous RCMP reports, Navy dive records, and press clippings. The **Canadian National Archives** and Library and Archives Canada hold some of these documents, which were uncovered by researchers Chris Styles and Don Ledger. Their book *"Dark Object: The World's Only Government-Documented UFO Crash"* (1998) details the case and reproduces official correspondence^[10]. Styles' later work *"Impact to Contact"* (2017) adds new interviews and analysis. These sources offer a comprehensive look at what is arguably the best-documented USO event, and they highlight remaining questions (e.g., analysis of mysterious yellow foam on the water that was reported, or the alleged tracking of the object to another location).
- **Ghost Rockets Archives and Analysis** – For the 1946 wave, researchers can refer to Swedish military archives (some are summarized in the book *"Ghost Rockets: Mystery Missiles of World War II"* by Clas Svahn). Additionally, the **Skeptoid Podcast episode "The Swedish Ghost Rockets" (2018)** by Brian Dunning critically examines original newspaper reports and military memos, providing references to Swedish Air Force investigations and concluding that meteors likely explained many sightings^[23]. These resources reveal how governments at the time distinguished between possible natural phenomena and potential foreign weapons – a useful historical parallel to today's UAP investigations.
- **Russian Navy USO Files** – Although many Soviet-era documents remain classified, a notable disclosure came via the Russian Navy in 2009. Outlets like *Russia Today* (RT)

and **Wired** magazine reported on a cache of Navy “Underwater UFO” case files. The Wired article “*Russian Navy Declassifies Cold War Close Encounters*” by David Axe (2009) cites intriguing details: sonar readings of 400 kph submersible objects and the Lake Baikal diver account^{[6][7]}. For deeper study, the book “*Russia’s USO Secrets*” (2016) by Paul Stonehill and Philip Mantle compiles various Russian and international USO cases, drawing on interviews with former Soviet naval officers. These sources can be explored to understand the breadth of USO incidents in that part of the world and to evaluate their credibility (keeping in mind some may be embellished). Researchers might also follow up with the Russian Navy’s oceanographic institute publications to see if any anomalous acoustic events have been logged scientifically.

- **U.S. Navy UAP Reporting & FOIA Releases** – Recent U.S. Navy encounters have generated official reports that can be requested via the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). For example, the **2019 drone swarm investigation** produced briefing slides and ship log excerpts, obtained by journalists at *The War Zone*^[19]. Their articles (e.g., “Drone Swarms That Harassed Navy Ships...Demystified in New Documents”, 2022) include photographs and timelines from the Navy’s perspective. Studying these documents can clarify how the Navy differentiates between unknown drones versus truly unexplained craft. Additionally, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) has published unclassified **UAP reports to Congress** (in June 2021 and an update in 2022) that mention efforts to capture data on transmedium incidents. While these reports are high-level, they identify how many incidents were undersea or multi-domain and outline plans for improved sensor tracking. They serve as a roadmap for what the government is (and isn’t) finding in terms of USOs.
- **Scientific Coalition for UAP Studies (SCU) Reports** – The SCU’s **Aguadilla UAP report** (2015, updated 2018) is available on their website^{[33][34]}. It provides a case study in applying scientific methodology to UFO/UAP data. Reading the full report (and the rebuttal to the “lantern hypothesis”) offers insight into how measurements and physics are used to argue for an unknown object. This can be a template for analyzing future USO videos. SCU members have also given presentations on USOs; for instance, marine scientist Marc D’Antonio (who has worked with the U.S. Navy) speaks about USO detection in sonar data and has speculated about submarine tracking of fast movers. His perspectives (available in interviews and YouTube lectures) straddle the line between open-minded inquiry and technical skepticism, making them valuable for a nuanced understanding.
- **Expert Commentary and Books:** A number of researchers and former officials have spoken publicly about USOs. Retired U.S. Navy Admiral **Tim Gallaudet, PhD** – an oceanographer – authored a 2021 white paper on the **potential maritime security threats of USOs**^[30]. He advocates for deploying advanced sensors to monitor underwater approaches to Navy vessels. His work (see The SOL Foundation’s publications) and interviews can guide those interested in the defense implications of USOs. In the broader UFO literature, **Leslie Kean’s book “UFOs: Generals, Pilots and Government Officials Go on the Record”** (2010) includes a chapter on naval

encounters and the need for serious official study, which gives a policymaker's viewpoint. For a skeptical take, **Carl Sagan's "The Demon-Haunted World"** (1995) doesn't discuss USOs specifically but provides a framework for scientifically analyzing outrageous claims that is very applicable to USOs. Cross-referencing believer and skeptic authored books will help identify the **key gaps in evidence** – places where both sides agree more information or research is required.

- **Future Research Technologies:** As a forward-looking note, those interested in solving the USO puzzle might follow developments in ocean exploration technology. Projects like autonomous underwater drones, high-resolution sonar arrays, and even crowdsourced efforts (e.g., sailboat-mounted sensors) could soon make it easier to detect and track unusual underwater objects. The **Galileo Project** (led by Harvard astronomer Avi Loeb) primarily focuses on sky phenomena, but its principles could be extended to water – Loeb has already led an expedition to retrieve meteoritic fragments from the ocean floor, showcasing techniques that could, in theory, be used to hunt for USO evidence. Engaging with the oceanographic research community and even organizations like NOAA could open up collaborative avenues (for instance, analyzing unexplained sonar contacts in existing ocean data archives).

By exploring these sources and continuing a rigorous, open-minded investigation, we can chip away at the mysteries surrounding USOs. Whether the ultimate explanations turn out to be advanced human technology, rare natural events, or something truly extraordinary, a deeper understanding of Unidentified Submerged Objects will emerge from **careful analysis of quality evidence**. The cases that remain unsolved present an opportunity for the next generation of researchers – perhaps with better data and tools – to finally identify those strange objects beneath the waves.

Footnotes

1. [The U.S. Government Is Taking Underwater UFO Sightings Seriously](#)
2. [The Swedish Ghost Rockets](#)
3. [Ghost rockets - Wikipedia](#)
4. [Ghost rockets - Wikipedia](#)
5. [Russian Navy Declassifies Cold War Close Encounters | WIRED](#)
6. [Russian Navy Declassifies Cold War Close Encounters | WIRED](#)
7. [Russian Navy Declassifies Cold War Close Encounters | WIRED](#)
8. [Canada's best-documented UFO sighting still intrigues, 50 years on | Globalnews.ca](#)
9. [Canada's best-documented UFO sighting still intrigues, 50 years on | Globalnews.ca](#)
10. [Canada's best-documented UFO sighting still intrigues, 50 years on | Globalnews.ca](#)

11. ['Normalizing' UFOs - retired U.S. Navy pilot recalls Tic Tac encounter | Reuters](#)
12. ['Normalizing' UFOs - retired U.S. Navy pilot recalls Tic Tac encounter | Reuters](#)
13. [Aguadilla Infrared Footage of 'UFOs' - Probably Hot Air Wedding Lanterns | Metabunk](#)
14. [Aguadilla Infrared Footage of 'UFOs' - Probably Hot Air Wedding Lanterns | Metabunk](#)
15. [2013 Aguadilla Puerto Rico UAP Incident: A Detailed Analysis](#)
16. [Leaked video appears to show UFO plunging under water off California - National | Globalnews.ca](#)
17. [Leaked video appears to show UFO plunging under water off California - National | Globalnews.ca](#)
18. [Leaked video appears to show UFO plunging under water off California - National | Globalnews.ca](#)
19. [Drone Swarms That Harassed Navy Ships Off California Demystified In New Documents](#)
20. [Drone Swarms That Harassed Navy Ships Off California Demystified In New Documents](#)
21. [Ghost rockets - Wikipedia](#)
22. [The U.S. Government Is Taking Underwater UFO Sightings Seriously](#)
23. [The Swedish Ghost Rockets](#)
24. [Drone Swarms That Harassed Navy Ships Off California Demystified In New Documents](#)
25. [Aguadilla Infrared Footage of 'UFOs' - Probably Hot Air Wedding Lanterns | Metabunk](#)
26. ['Normalizing' UFOs - retired U.S. Navy pilot recalls Tic Tac encounter | Reuters](#)
27. ['Normalizing' UFOs - retired U.S. Navy pilot recalls Tic Tac encounter | Reuters](#)
28. [The U.S. Government Is Taking Underwater UFO Sightings Seriously](#)
29. [USOs Not UFOs Have Been the Greatest Threat to the Navy | Naval History Magazine - August 2022, Volume 36, Number 4](#)
30. [The U.S. Government Is Taking Underwater UFO Sightings Seriously](#)
31. [Records Related to Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena \(UAPs\) at the National Archives | National Archives](#)
32. [Records Related to Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena \(UAPs\) at the National Archives | National Archives](#)
33. [2013 Aguadilla Puerto Rico UAP Incident: A Detailed Analysis](#)
34. [2013 Aguadilla Puerto Rico UAP Incident: A Detailed Analysis](#)