

FABRICATING THE DEATH OF ADOLF HITLER

***In identifying
jawbone fragments
and a dental bridge
as belonging to
Adolf and Eva Hitler
respectively,
German dentists
would appear to
have perpetrated a
fraud to fool Stalin.***

Part 2 of 3

by Giordan Smith © 2007

Email: giordansmith@gmail.com

Let the hoax begin: the "official" Hitler corpse

On 5 May 1945, the "badly burnt" corpses of a man and woman were reportedly discovered by the Soviets in a ditch located a mere three metres from the emergency exit from the *Fuehrerbunker*.³¹ It is maintained by most historians today that the corpses discovered this day were those of the *real* Adolf and Eva Hitler. The only mystery, they think, is why Stalin began insisting, as early as 26 May 1945, that Hitler was still alive.

In fact, there is no evidence to corroborate the story of the discovery of the two corpses. Since no photographs apparently were taken of them *in situ*, they could quite literally have come from anywhere. An obvious problem is that they were reportedly discovered in a ditch situated just three metres from the bunker exit.³² Although this is consistent with the statements of alleged eyewitnesses to the burial, who cite distances of between one and three metres, this means that the ditch was located almost directly outside the exit door—a circumstance that would have rendered its use unsafe, to say the least.

What's more, if the ditch really had existed, it is hard to see why the Soviets neither photographed it nor preserved it intact. The earliest photos—those taken in early July 1945, when many foreign reporters and military officials came to view the historic spot—are of a ditch that looks at least 12 metres away from the exit, and possibly more. It is hard to see why, if the ditch mentioned by the eyewitnesses had existed in the first place, two months later it had been covered over and visitors were being shown a different ditch.

A few words are in order concerning the sheer unlikelihood of the presumed Hitler corpse having been authentic. There is something inherently improbable about the idea that Hitler's corpse would have been discarded so near the *Fuehrerbunker*. The narrative of the Third Reich's last days with which we are familiar suggests that measures for dealing with Hitler's death were cobbled together more or less at the last minute as Soviet troops threatened the Reich Chancellery itself. But this view is nonsense. Hitler's fate was the subject of planning that stretched back *at least* until 22 April 1945. That day, Dr Goebbels told General Schoerner: "The least that I can do is ensure that the Fuehrer's corpse does not fall into the hands of the enemy as a trophy."³³ Since the Germans were committed to ensuring that Hitler's body would never be recovered by the enemy, it made no sense at all for them to place it in a location so close to the *Fuehrerbunker* that it could not possibly be overlooked. It also made no sense to inter it in the same grave as a female body that would be able to be identified as Eva Hitler's. Anyone whose mission was to conceal Hitler's corpse would hardly have chosen to inter it with another that provided a blatant clue as to its identity. This is, rather, what someone would do who wanted a decoy body instantly mistaken for Hitler's.

Two further circumstances would seem to prove that we are dealing with a hoax. First, according to the Soviet autopsy report, the corpse was missing its right-side ribs and its left foot.³⁴ While this doesn't prove that the corpse wasn't Hitler's, it does establish that the familiar story of Hitler committing suicide in the bunker and his corpse being carried up to ground level to be cremated and buried immediately afterwards cannot be true. After all, Hitler's right ribs and left foot can hardly have fallen off on the way up the stairs.

Second, the corpses discovered by the Soviets cannot have been cremated in the open air, as eyewitnesses maintained. According to an anonymous British intelligence officer who stated that he had been shown the remains shortly after they had been found: "There were not two complete skeletons and none of the main bones was intact."³⁵ According to W. F. Heimlich, a former intelligence officer who in 1947 was a high official in the

American administration of Berlin, the corpses would probably have had to be burned in a closed crematory to achieve the condition of almost total disintegration in which they were found.³⁶ In *The Murder of Adolf Hitler*, forensic scientist Hugh Thomas provides support for this conclusion. Thomas points out that "the damage described on the skull [in the Soviet autopsy report, parts of which were not published until 1968] could have been produced only in temperatures over 1000°C—far greater than any that could have been produced in the open garden of the Reichskanzlei".³⁷

Creative dentistry

On 8 May 1945, the Soviets set out to identify the corpses they suspected to be those of Adolf and Eva Hitler. That day, two Russians—chief forensic pathologist Dr Faust Sherovsky and anatomical pathologist Major Anna Marantz—autopsied the remains at SMERSH (Soviet military counter-intelligence) headquarters in the Berlin suburb of Buch. According to their report: "The most important anatomical finding for identification of the person are the teeth, with much bridgework, artificial teeth, crowns and fillings."³⁸ Indeed, in the pre-DNA-testing era, the only means of obtaining a secure identification of a heavily damaged corpse was by examining the teeth and comparing them with available dental records.

Unfortunately, no documents are available that describe the teeth of the two corpses as they were found on 5 May. The earliest information we have concerning their teeth derives from the autopsy report, which was written three days later. If the report can be believed, the mouth of the presumptive Hitler corpse was completely intact: "There are many small cracks in...the upper jawbones. The tongue is charred, its tip firmly locked between the teeth of the upper and lower jaws."³⁹ The problem was therefore locating Hitler's dental charts.⁴⁰ The Soviets' attempt to find them led them into a mire of intrigue and

deception which remains unravelled even today. As far as it can be reconstructed from extant sources, the investigation proceeded along the following lines.

On 9 May, a Soviet military officer, a female intelligence officer and a male translator went looking for Hitler's dentist, SS General Professor Dr Johann Hugo Blaschke, at his surgery at Kurfuerstendamm 213. When they arrived, they found that Prof. Blaschke was not there and that his practice had been taken over by Dr Fedor Bruck, a Jewish dentist who, in order to evade deportation to the east, had spent two and a half years living underground in Berlin. According to a record Dr Bruck made in 1948, some of Prof. Blaschke's files were still present at the time. But while the visitors were able to take away records for

Himmler, Dr Ley, Goering and Dr Goebbels, all of Hitler's had already been removed.⁴¹ However, the search was not a complete failure, for Dr Bruck told the Soviet officers where they could find Prof. Blaschke's assistant, Kaethe Heusemann, and his dental technician, Fritz Echtmann.

Dr Bruck accompanied the officers to Heusemann's apartment a short distance away in the Pariserstrasse. Heusemann was then taken to the Reich Chancellery, where a fruitless search for Hitler's dental records was conducted. The next day, 10 May,

she was taken to SMERSH headquarters and ordered to examine the remains there. By this stage, the jawbones had been removed from the alleged Hitler corpse, for Heusemann was shown them in a cigar box. This would presumably have been done in order to make them easier to study; however, this raises the problem of the chain of evidence, for we have no means of knowing whether the jawbones Heusemann was shown really came from the corpse autopsied on 8 May.

Nonetheless, Heusemann affirmed that the teeth were Hitler's.⁴² A few days later, she told Dr Bruck that she had been able to identify them immediately. A year later, Dr Bruck told a foreign

reporter that Heusemann had recognised "...an upper crown which was an anchor for a bridge on Hitler's upper jaw. The bridge had been cut because the other anchor had been extracted. The operation left surgical traces which Frau Heusemann [*sic*] recognized at once."⁴³

According to the record of her 19 May interrogation, Heusemann recognised drill marks left behind by Prof. Blaschke in the autumn of 1944 on the fourth tooth in Hitler's left upper jaw when he had extracted two adjacent teeth.⁴⁴ "I was holding a mirror in the mouth and watching the whole procedure with great attention," she declared.⁴⁵

But before we discuss Heusemann's evidence concerning Hitler's teeth, a digression is needed in order to evaluate her evidence in regard to the teeth of the alleged corpse of Eva Hitler. As we shall see, her evidence is rather problematic and casts some doubt on her additional claims to have worked on Eva's teeth.

...the corpses would probably have had to be burned in a closed crematory to achieve the condition of almost total disintegration in which they were found.



Photo taken on 6 July 1945 of the ditch in which the Soviets had allegedly found the corpses of Adolf and Eva Hitler. (Source: Corbis Picture Library)

A bridge too far

Dr Bruck also told the foreign reporter that on the same occasion Heusemann had told him that she had been shown "a female bridge from the lower jaw which contained four teeth". "She identified it as Eva Braun's and said, 'We made it for her only six weeks ago,' he related. She told the Russians the bridge was made by a man named Eichmann [*sic*], who was a dental mechanic for Dr Blaschke."⁴⁶

However, the very information that initially seemed to confirm the identity of the female corpse only ended up disconfirming it. On 11 May, the Soviets questioned Prof. Blaschke's dental technician, Fritz Echtmann. He was interrogated about Eva Hitler's teeth on an unspecified number of other occasions in May 1945, and again on 24 July 1947.⁴⁷ On the latter occasion, Echtmann admitted to his interrogator, a Major Vaindorf, that "[a]t the beginning of April 1945" Prof. Blaschke had asked him "to make a small bridge for Eva Braun's right upper jaw".⁴⁸

Echtmann seems to have been talking about the bridge which Heusemann told Dr Bruck that the Soviets had shown her the day before. Dr Bruck told the foreign reporter about this in May 1946. He can probably be believed: there is no obvious reason that he could have known about the existence of the bridge requested by Prof Blaschke in early April—"the 1945 bridge", as I shall subsequently refer to it—if Heusemann had not told him about it.

There are two problems with this information, however. First, the bridge Heusemann described sounds more like the bridge that had been fitted in Eva's mouth by Prof. Blaschke—Heusemann says with her assistance—in the autumn of 1944. (For simplicity's sake, I shall subsequently refer to this as "the 1944 bridge".) The 1945 bridge was for only *one* tooth. The question, therefore, is why Heusemann told the Soviets—and Dr Bruck—that the 1944 bridge was the one that Prof. Blaschke had asked Echtmann to make only six weeks earlier.

Second, why did Heusemann say this if she knew that the 1945 bridge had never been inserted in Eva's mouth?

At some stage—exactly when is not clear—Echtmann told his Soviet interrogators that Heusemann had told him it had never been fitted:

"On 19 April, 1945, I called Professor Blaschke and told him that the small bridge was ready. He told me it would be sent to Berchtesgaden if Eva Braun was there. On the same day, 19 April, I sent the small denture to Professor Blaschke at the Reich Chancellery. Later, in a talk with his assistant Heusemann I learnt that Professor Blaschke had flown to Berchtesgaden on 20 April and had not fitted the small denture in Berlin."⁴⁹

The problems identified here do not damn Heusemann's evidence, but they do undermine her credibility. If she knew that Prof. Blaschke had not fitted the 1945 bridge, why did she lead the Soviets to believe that it *had* been fitted?

The problem is compounded by the information that on 19 April, Prof. Blaschke apparently had not known whether Eva was in Berlin or not. On 19 May 1945, Heusemann told the Soviets

that "a month ago we extracted one tooth [from Eva] in the upper jaw, the 6th one on the left".⁵⁰ Since Eva apparently arrived in Berlin in mid-April—the precise date does not appear to be known—and Prof. Blaschke left the city on 20 April, the extraction must have been performed during the period 15–20 April. In these circumstances, Prof. Blaschke must surely have known that Eva was in Berlin. What's more, since the bridge contained the false tooth to be inserted in the place of the extracted tooth, it made little sense not to have established in advance when and where the bridge was to be fitted. There is something rather slipshod and unlikely about all this.

Then there is the problem that Prof. Blaschke already knew in early April that Eva would need a tooth extracted. It is not clear why he therefore did not remove the tooth then, rather than wait until the denture was ready. Perhaps he wanted to replace the tooth with the denture almost immediately. But if he waited a few weeks until the denture was ready, why was it not fitted the day

Echtmann sent it over to the Reich Chancellery surgery on 19 April? Since Eva was in Berlin, Prof. Blaschke had ample opportunity to insert the fitting, either the same day or the following day (20 April). After all, Prof. Blaschke's flight to Berchtesgaden did not actually take place until the early hours of 21 April.

We therefore do not know what really happened to the 1945 bridge—whether Prof. Blaschke fitted it in Berlin and Heusemann had lied to (or simply misinformed) Echtmann, whether Prof. Blaschke took it on the plane with him to Berchtesgaden or whether he left it behind in Berlin, perhaps for his replacement, Dr Helmut Kunz, to insert in Eva's mouth. The striking fact is that *Hitler's Death*—the recently published collection of documents from Soviet archives allegedly proving that the human remains which the Soviets found on 5 May had been those of Adolf and Eva Hitler—contains neither Heusemann's 10 May interrogation report nor Echtmann's 11 May interrogation report. What's more, although Dr Kunz took Prof. Blaschke's place on 23 April, his interrogation record yields no

information as to whether he worked on Eva Hitler's teeth after that date. Since it is hard to believe that the Soviets would not have asked Dr Kunz whether he had performed any dental work on Adolf or Eva Hitler, it can safely be assumed that the editors of *Hitler's Death* have chosen to suppress this information.

Without any more information to go on, it is not possible to say what the real significance of the 1945 bridge was. What can be said is that if, during his first interrogation on 11 May 1945, Echtmann revealed to the Soviets that the small bridge had never been fitted, this would explain why, on or about 15 May, apparently without any advance warning, the Soviets took Heusemann into custody.⁵¹

The fact that Heusemann was repeatedly interrogated by Soviet intelligence agents suggests that information was continually coming to light that rendered her evidence problematic. On 19 May, Lt-General Vadis interrogated her for nearly five hours.⁵² A partial record of *this* interrogation does appear in *Hitler's Death*.⁵³

The problems identified here do not damn Heusemann's evidence, but they do undermine her credibility.

If she knew that Prof. Blaschke had not fitted the 1945 bridge, why did she lead the Soviets to believe that it *had* been fitted?

According to this document, Heusemann said that she had been able to verify that the teeth were Eva's because she recognised a "gold and resin bridge" that, with her assistance, Prof. Blaschke had inserted in the right part of Eva's lower jaw in the "summer of 1944".⁵⁴ At a later date—no earlier than 23 July 1947—Heusemann was still being pressed for a full description of Eva Hitler's teeth.⁵⁵ In this statement, she implied that Eva had a false tooth in her upper right jaw—which she can only have done if the 1945 bridge had been fitted after all!⁵⁶

Such prolonged and intensive questioning is inconsistent with the idea that the information Heusemann provided had been sufficient to establish that the teeth were Eva's. If so, why ask her to go over the subject again and again? There are therefore plenty of *hints* of intrigue, but thanks to the fact that only very brief selections from her interrogations are included in *Hitler's Death*, it is not possible to chronicle the development of her story. The same goes for Echtmann's evidence: *Hitler's Death* only contains statements he gave on 24 July 1947, not those he gave in May 1945 during what appear to have been at least four or five interrogations.

Heusemann's and Echtmann's fate supports the conclusion that the Soviets found something fishy about their evidence. Within two days of each other in August 1951, Heusemann and Echtmann were arrested by Soviet MGB (Ministry of State Security) officials. Heusemann was charged with "having treated Hitler, Himmler and other Nazi leaders until April 1945", while Echtmann was charged with "assisting Hitler and his circle". Each was sentenced to 10 years in a Soviet labour camp.⁵⁷ Neither person appears ever to have been repatriated and it is a fair guess that both vanished in Stalin's vast, impenetrable gulag. It seems hard to credit the idea that their crimes really consisted of having provided Hitler and other top Nazis with dental treatment; more likely, both paid the ultimate price for trying to deceive Stalin.

X-ray deception

In the above discussion of the forensic issues concerning Eva Hitler's teeth, it became obvious that Heusemann's evidence was problematic to say the least. She told the Soviets and Dr Bruck that the bridge that was shown to her had been made recently, yet it more closely resembles the bridge she claimed to have helped Prof. Blaschke insert in the summer of 1944 than the 1945 bridge. In view of the issues raised in relation to Eva's teeth that undermine her credibility, it is important to ask whether Heusemann was actually *competent* to assess the evidence concerning the teeth of the presumptive Hitler corpse discovered on 5 May.

By 10 May, the jawbones had been removed from the "Hitler" corpse and placed, if we can believe it, in a cigar box and shown to Heusemann. For our purposes it is unimportant whether the cigar box was ferried to Heusemann, as Soviet military reconnaissance interpreter Elena Rzhetskaya claimed,⁵⁸ or whether Heusemann was taken to SMERSH headquarters to

identify them there, which is what Dr Bruck in his 1948 memoir indicated happened.⁵⁹ What is important is that in the record of her 19 May interrogation, Heusemann stated, as established previously, that she had recognised drill marks left behind by Prof. Blaschke on the fourth tooth in Hitler's left upper jaw the time he extracted two adjacent teeth.⁶⁰

The problem is, rather, that all of Heusemann's claims to have worked on Hitler's teeth—claims which are iterated on several occasions in *Hitler's Death*—appear to be false. In early 1948, while still in American captivity, Prof. Blaschke gave an interview in which he stated that Heusemann "cannot give a positive identification because she knows only some X-rays of Hitler's teeth".⁶¹ Thus, Heusemann's knowledge of Hitler's teeth derived solely from the X-rays and not from personal experience. She can therefore *never* have helped Prof. Blaschke work on Hitler's teeth six times between 1944 and 1945, as she told her Soviet interrogators, and can only have recognised the "drill marks" she told Dr Bruck about from the X-rays she had studied. She therefore had no means of knowing whether the X-rays accurately represented the condition of Hitler's mouth or that of someone else.

Once I realised that Heusemann had lied about having worked on Hitler's teeth, I also began to doubt Heusemann's claim to have worked also on the teeth of Eva Hitler and many leading Nazis. According to the testimony she gave the Soviets, she had worked at the Reich Chancellery dental surgery from December 1944 until 20 April 1945. She specifically claimed to have helped Prof. Blaschke extract a tooth from Eva Hitler in April 1945. However, despite the relatively long period involved—around four months—I have found no account that corroborates her presence in the Reich Chancellery surgery, aside from the aforementioned contact between Heusemann and Echtmann that does

not prove that she really worked there. (Since Echtmann could have been a participant in the same intrigues as Heusemann, his evidence is far from decisive.)

During the period from 20 April to 2 May 1945, Heusemann is also supposed to have remained in the Chancellery. Dr Bruck told reporters that for safety reasons she had remained in the Chancellery "in the last days of Berlin".⁶² It is odd, then, that she was not mentioned by Dr Kunz, who took over from Prof. Blaschke at the Chancellery surgery on 23 April. (Dr Kunz apparently had no assistant at all.) My conclusion is that Heusemann was probably nothing more than an opportunist, someone who sought to profit from knowledge of the dental charts she had gained in 1944(–45?) while working for Prof. Blaschke. To this end, Heusemann appears to have recruited Dr Bruck.

According to Dr Bruck himself, he renewed his acquaintanceship with Heusemann on 4 May, when he located her in the Pariserstrasse. It seems likely that this day she drew him into her confidence and explained how she had enjoyed access to Hitler's dental records. It is clear why Dr Bruck, despite being Jewish, was a willing participant in the dental intrigues surrounding the alleged corpses of Adolf and Eva Hitler.

Thus, Heusemann's knowledge of Hitler's teeth derived solely from the X-rays and not from personal experience.

She can therefore never have helped Prof. Blaschke work on Hitler's teeth six times between 1944 and 1945, as she told her Soviet interrogators...

Although he had been living underground in Berlin since October 1942—and was reportedly destitute by the time the Soviets entered Steglitz (the quarter of the city in which he had been hiding) on 26 April 1945—Dr Bruck was placed in a position by Heusemann to take over Prof. Blaschke's surgery less than a week after they had renewed their association. This was quite a coup, for the surgery was located in Berlin's most fashionable street.

Dr Bruck's prior relationship with Heusemann offers the only plausible explanation for this cosy arrangement. Heusemann had worked for Dr Bruck when he was a school dentist in her home town of Liegnitz (Silesia) in the mid-1930s. She moved to Berlin in April 1937 to work for Prof. Blaschke. It is possible that, knowing he would probably never return, Prof. Blaschke gave Heusemann the rights to the surgery after he left Berlin on 20 April; if so, she might have considered it a good idea to secure her right to the practice in the new post-Nazi era by placing it in the care of a Jewish dentist she knew and trusted.

What strengthens the likelihood that this scenario accords with the facts is evidence that Dr Bruck was consciously playing a role in a hoax to authenticate the alleged remains of the *Fuehrer* and his wife. First, it was Dr Bruck who told Soviet investigators about Heusemann and Echtmann.

Having established on 4 May where she lived, he was in a position to lead them straight to her when they arrived at the Kurfuerstendamm surgery on 9 May. For by that date, Dr Bruck had already taken over the surgery and moved into the apartment connected to it.⁶³ It was obviously extremely convenient for them that Dr Bruck was on hand to meet them when they arrived. If the surgery had been abandoned altogether, the Soviets would have had to go to a good deal more trouble to track down anyone who apparently possessed the

necessary competence to evaluate the alleged Hitler dental evidence. Things couldn't have been made any easier for them.

Second, there is a puzzling instance of foreknowledge. When the Soviet investigators arrived at the surgery, Dr Bruck seemed to know why they had come. He asked them if they were seeking to identify some "fragments" they had found.⁶⁴ While it would not have taken much by way of brains to guess they were seeking to identify a corpse, Bruck's use of the word *Fragmente*—which has the exact same meaning in German as it does in English (i.e., fragments)—seems quite a slip. What is sometimes referred to as Hitler's jawbone (i.e., in the singular) is actually a collection of four fragments.⁶⁵ Dr Bruck must have known in advance that it was not a question of identifying an intact set of teeth. It was a slip that implies participation in a conspiracy to deceive the Soviets.

Third is the striking fact that Dr Bruck was the first person to reveal to Western reporters that the Soviets had called on Heusemann to identify teeth they presumed to be Hitler's. After Heusemann and Echtmann vanished into Soviet prisons in mid-May 1945, Dr Bruck never gave up trying to pass on information to the West that confirmed Western suspicions that the Soviets had found Hitler's body. On 5 July 1945, two days after the Western Allies were allowed to enter Berlin, Dr Bruck began scouting out foreign reporters to ask if they knew anything about Heusemann's fate. Although there is no reason to doubt that he felt genuine concern for her safety, Dr Bruck had the opportunity from such contacts with foreign reporters to ensure that the

information which the Soviets had gleaned from Heusemann, but had been withholding, reached the West at last. On 9 July, an article by William Forrest was published in the British *News Chronicle* that incorporated information Dr Bruck had given Forrest on 7 July.⁶⁶ Dr Bruck obviously wanted to ensure that Heusemann's information entered circulation, whether the Soviets liked it or not.

Fourth, in 1947 Dr Bruck was very nearly arrested by the Soviets. At that time, the Americans warned him that the Soviets had decided to arrest him. Had he not been warned in time, they would surely have succeeded and Dr Bruck would have joined Heusemann and Echtmann in Soviet captivity. Instead, Dr Bruck emigrated to the United States and in 1952 acquired American citizenship. (He spent the last 30 years of his life living in New York under the Anglicised name of Theodor Brooke.)

The thesis that best accounts for events, therefore, is that on 4 May Dr Bruck struck a deal with Heusemann to ensure that the Soviets would believe that they had found the remains of Adolf and Eva Hitler. In return for services such as ensuring that the Soviets were able to locate Heusemann and Echtmann without difficulty, Dr Bruck appears to have been rewarded with Prof.

Blaschke's Kurfuerstendamm surgery.

When the Soviets sought to arrest him in 1947—the same year Heusemann and Echtmann were apparently re-interrogated about their claims—the Americans intervened and gave him refuge in the United States.

Where the plan went awry, I would suggest, is that it was based on knowledge that Heusemann had only derived from studying Adolf and Eva Hitler's dental charts (or, more likely, charts she had *assumed* to be those of Adolf and Eva Hitler). It is easy to see how Heusemann could have been

encouraged to examine them. All Prof. Blaschke had to do was leave the charts and X-rays of a man who had been selected to die in Hitler's place lying around in his surgery for Heusemann and Echtmann to inspect. They would have had no idea that he had done so with a view to misleading them. At any point between the date that the X-rays were made—apparently they date from September 1944—and April 1945, the man would have been murdered and his body stored for use when Berlin fell. The charts and X-rays would then have been destroyed—an act that would have reinforced the belief that the charts had been authentic. All this could have been done without Heusemann and Echtmann realising that they were being used.

However the intrigue unfolded, there is one fact that cannot be denied: so far as anyone knows, the only person to survive the war who genuinely possessed the expertise to identify Hitler's teeth was Prof. Blaschke himself.

Reconstructing the truth

Having run into a brick wall with Heusemann and Echtmann, the Soviets must have been overjoyed when in July 1945 Prof. Blaschke turned up in an American camp for prominent POWs. They promptly sent him a bag containing all the necessary equipment and ordered him to reconstruct, as perfectly as his memory enabled him, the appearance of Hitler's jawbone. The result, we are told, perfectly matched the jawbone Heusemann had identified as Hitler's.⁶⁷

**Dr Bruck must have known
in advance that it was not
a question of identifying
an intact set of teeth.
It was a slip that implies
participation in a conspiracy
to deceive the Soviets.**

But if Prof. Blaschke's evidence corroborated Heusemann's identification, the proof itself has never been published. Although the Americans had Prof. Blaschke in their hands from May 1945, when he was captured, until late 1948, they never made public any of the information he shared with them about Hitler's teeth. On 5 February 1946, for example, he was interrogated by US military intelligence on precisely this subject. However, the report based on the 1946 interview was never released and *remains classified by the US Department of Defense even today*.⁶⁸ Given that by 1946 the Americans were extremely keen to publicise any information which suggested that the Soviets really had discovered Hitler's corpse, it must be the case that, wittingly or otherwise, Prof. Blaschke had given them information that contradicted this position.

It is also hard to draw any firm conclusions from an interview Prof. Blaschke gave on the subject of Hitler's teeth while still in American captivity in early 1948. Although on this occasion Prof. Blaschke expressed confidence that the Soviets really did have Hitler's jawbone, he made two remarks that only undermined this view. First, as we saw above, he stated that Heusemann had not been qualified to give a "positive identification". Second, Prof. Blaschke challenged the Soviets to show him the jaw in question: "Why don't the Russians show this jaw to me? I only need one look and can definitely state this is or is not Hitler's jaw."⁶⁹ The only obvious answer to this question is that the Soviets knew that it was not really Hitler's.⁷⁰

Prof. Blaschke may even have been punished for these indiscretions. Towards the end of 1948, just as the Americans were about to release him, Prof. Blaschke was tried by a German "denazification" court and sentenced to a further three years in

prison.⁷¹ It looks suspiciously like he was being punished for more than just having been Hitler's dentist.

Prof. Blaschke was released from prison and practised dentistry in Nuremberg until he died in 1959. He never said anything further about Hitler's teeth. His silence on the subject seems almost inexplicable. Information derived from Prof. Blaschke is also conspicuously absent from *Hitler's Death*. If it was Prof. Blaschke's reconstruction of Hitler's jawbone that helped clinch the identification of the alleged Hitler remains, there can be no reason for omitting it from the *Hitler's Death* volume. In these circumstances it seems highly likely that Prof. Blaschke's evidence had only confirmed what the Soviets had already

suspected—that they had been led down the garden path.

Finally, there is an obvious problem with the idea of thinking that Prof. Blaschke could be relied upon to tell the truth: if a dental hoax was perpetrated to mask Hitler's mysterious departure from history, as I allege, then Prof. Blaschke himself, who had been Hitler's dentist since 1932, would have been involved. He would have only needed to reproduce his own work in the mouth of someone who had been selected to die in Hitler's place to pull this off.

Continued next edition...

However, the report based on the 1946 interview was never released and remains classified by the US Department of Defense even today.

About the Author:

Giordan Smith is an independent academic from Sydney, Australia, with a special interest in modern German history. He can be contacted by email at giordansmith@gmail.com.

The complete text of this article will be available at the NEXUS website, <http://www.nexusmagazine.com> at the time of publication of part three in NEXUS vol. 15, no. 2.

Endnotes

31. V. K. Vinogradov et al. (eds), *Hitler's Death: Russia's Last Great Secret from the Files of the KGB*, Chaucer Press, London, 2005, pp. 53-54
32. *Hitler's Death*, p. 54
33. *Hitler's Death*, p. 245
34. D. Marchetti et al., "The death of Adolf Hitler – forensic aspects", *Journal of Forensic Sciences* 2005 Sept; 50(5), Abstract, p. 1148, <http://journalsip.astm.org/JOURNALS/FORENSIC/PAGES/5060.htm>
35. "Did Hitler And Eva Die One Year Ago?", *Winnipeg Free Press*, 3 May 1946
36. "Yank Intelligence Officer Says He Doesn't Believe Hitler Dead", *Charleston Gazette*, 9 February 1947
37. Cited in D. Marchetti et al., p. 1150
38. Cited in D. Marchetti et al., p. 1148
39. Cited in D. Marchetti et al., p. 1148
40. Neither Adolf Hitler's nor Eva Hitler's dental charts have ever been found. According to Paul Manning, in

- Martin Bormann, Nazi in Exile* (Lyle Stuart, Secaucus, NJ, 1981, p. 182): "Bormann had removed them from the chancellery files."
41. Kay Lutze, "Von Liegnitz nach New York: Die Lebensgeschichte des jüdischen Zahnarztes Fedor Bruck (1895–1982)" ("From Liegnitz to New York: The Life of the Jewish Dentist Fedor Bruck..."), *Zahnaertztliche Mitteilungen* 96(10):124-27, 16 May 2006, http://www.zm-online.de/m5a.htm?/zm/10_06/pages2/hist1.htm (NB: Lutze is Bruck's grandchild.)
42. *Hitler's Death*, p. 95
43. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 3 May 1946, p. 7
44. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 97-99
45. *Hitler's Death*, p. 97
46. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 3 May 1946, p. 7
47. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 102-7
48. *Hitler's Death*, p. 106
49. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 106-7
50. *Hitler's Death*, p. 99. Amazingly,

this tooth was in the exact same location as the tooth that Heusemann told the Soviets (*Hitler's Death*, p. 97) she had helped extract from Hitler's mouth in 1944 (not the fourth, as Dr Bruck told the Western reporter). What are the odds of that?

51. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 3 May 1946, p. 7. Dr Bruck stated: "Two days after she told me the story, a Russian officer and a Russian woman drove up and asked her to prepare a bag for a visit of some days. I have not seen or heard of her nor Eichmann [sic] since."

52. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 95-100

53. The record of this five-hour-long interrogation is only a few pages long and can account for no more than 10 minutes of the interrogation at best, leaving one to wonder what other matters took up the rest of the time. Another curious fact is that the interrogation record actually combines

Continued on page 80

Continued from page 44

evidence given on two occasions more than two years apart—on 19 May 1945 and 24 July 1947. No indication is given as to which sections derived from which interrogation. It is therefore impossible to state whether Heusemann gave the evidence I cite in 1945 or in 1947.

54. *Hitler's Death*, p. 99

55. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 101-2

56. *Hitler's Death*, p. 101: "In the upper jaw all natural teeth, except for the 6th." This implies that the sixth was a false tooth, not that there was no tooth in that location at all.

57. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 96, 102

58. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Observer/international/story/0,6903,1479109,00.html>

59. Lutze, 2006

60. *Hitler's Death*, pp. 97-99

61. "Dentist Says Russ Have Hitler's Jaw", *Oakland Tribune*, 6 May 1948

62. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 3 May 1946, p. 7

63. Lutze, 2006

64. Bruck recalled: "When I asked

whether the documents they were looking for were for the purpose of identifying some sort of fragments that had been discovered, the first lieutenant made a very annoyed official face and put his index finger over his mouth, from which I gathered that my guess had been on the right track." (Lutze, 2006)

65. See photograph, *Hitler's Death*, p. 97.

66. Lutze, 2006

67. For example: <http://www.welt.de/data/2006/10/25/1085392.html>

68. "United States Forces in the European Theater", Military Intelligence Service Center, Final Interrogation Report no. 31 (O1-FIR No. 31), "Hitler's Teeth" (7 pages and annexes), 5 February 1946. A copy of this document is held in the William Russell Philp Collection, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Ronald Bulatoff, archival specialist at the Hoover Institution Archives, recently wrote to an Australian researcher with whom I am in contact confirming that the document remains

classified. Oddly enough, Mark Benecke, a German forensic biologist, writes on his website (<http://www.benecke.com/airhihe.html>): "The reports of Hitler's dentist, Blaschke (who had formerly studied in the U.S.), and other witnesses clearly show that the teeth in that little cigar box must indeed be the Fuehrer's (see Figure 5)."

If Benecke has had access to a report that remains classified, this suggests that he is working in tandem with the US military to keep the hoax alive. It is hard to see any other reason why he should be granted access to a document that members of the general public are not allowed to examine.

69. *Oakland Tribune*, 6 May 1948

70. The Associated Press (AP) version of the same report evaded the problem of raising this response in the reader's mind by omitting Prof. Blaschke's challenge to the Russians. See "Russians Have Hitler's Jaw, Says Der Fuehrer's Dentist", *Indiana Evening Gazette*, 5 May 1948

71. *Valley Morning Star*, 17 September 1948, section 2, p. 5