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Abstract. The paper describes the systematization process of architectural styles in use during Nazi period in Germany between 1933-45. In the results of the research some regularity about strict concern between function & styling has been observed. Using comparison & case study as well as analytical methods there were pointed out characteristic features of more than 500 objects’ architectural appearance that helped to specify their styling & group them into architectural trends. Ultimately the paper proves that the found trends of architectural styling could be collected by functional detachment key. This observation explains easy to recognize even nowadays traceability – so characteristic to Nazi German architecture. Facing today pluralism in architecture, the findings could be a helpful key in the organization of spatial architectural identification process.

1. Introduction

Today investors often don’t realize that objects they plan to rise would talk to them & the society. Moreover, the same could be told also about many professionals & bigger part of administration officials. Inconsiderate law that entirely can’t achieve the right formula for surrounding pluralism of space creation wouldn’t teach people how the building should look. Due to the pluralism treated today as kind of taboo, the existing criteria to create architectural space consider fake factors that lead to total disintegration of space, because pluralism means magma without specific direction. In the past, when society systems were tightly segregated, only well-to-do people could effort to build a building, so the investment society pressure automatically influenced some established coding of buildings’ appearance provided its function – just opposite today when plural attitude allows to rise entirely deformed architecture. Unfortunately, this shows that pluralism is problematic solution for architectural space creation when there’re no rules or the existing ones are false. New society creation needs new rules & accordingly this concerns rules to create architecture trends compatible with the function. The same problem that we have today with architectural pluralism arose in Weimar Republic period when it gave way to different architectural trends appearance. But Hitler - unfulfilled architect just opposite to today politics - was entirely aware of power that architecture would give him in society control. He knew that cultural program including architecture could tightly bind the society to the State & satisfy its needs much better than uncontrolled consumption rules, common today. Exactly in such terms we must perceive Nazi’s moves towards society control: distinctive spatial policy identifies the society with the State much stronger than pluralism to lead nowhere. Within 6 years of peace between 1933-39 Nazis achieved to consolidate its society using different instruments including architecture & the effect was so strong that German national identity became worldwide famous. This remark shouldn’t be underestimated regardless, how felonious Nazi system appeared to be. Nazis started to dispose architectural matters in their characteristic German consequent manner, detaching
available styling to the objects’ functions. They were entirely aware that wide & opulent scope of architectural trends inherited from Weimar Republic should be selected & reduced to a very few, primarily due to political connotations of some of these trends & secondary, due to the perspicuity requirements. In my research, it was selected six more or less pervasive architectural trends occurring since the rise of Nazis reign in 1933 depending on their function, with tendency to be reduced to three ones. The following paper tries to systemize this process.

2. The course of research
The following describes the course of the research step by step in order to put forward the way that the findings & final conclusions of the paper were obtained.

2.1. Step 01. Historic research on most characteristic objects from Nazi period
In this step some historic research methods have been used in the research of characteristic objects built or designed during Nazi period. These methods have been also implemented to establish the correct architect authors and dating of the objects’ designing process and their completion. More than 500 objects were put under consideration but due to the limited character of this paper the full list couldn’t be attached. Some of most characteristic ones are mentioned in results & discussion – p.4.

2.2. Step 02. Objects main styling features reconnaissance
In this step some comparison methods have been used to recognize main styling trends & features of objects’ taken into consideration, comparing their architecture to the anticipatory objects as patterns of the architectural styling. Established main styling trends are roughly described in p. 3 of his paper.

2.3. Step 03. Objects main functions reconnaissance
Here, the research was focused on establishing the functions mostly assigned to the architectural objects in Nazi period. It is common that during its existence each political system develops some specific functions to be implemented to the buildings raised in the meantime minimizing occurrence of other ones. For example, Nazi State emphasized mass gathering function raising or planned to be raised numerous national memorials, so called Gau-forums, congress halls as well as sport objects. Also train, automobile or aviation transportation function including additional facilities as well as office, health care & social housing was common. Traditionally for Germany, industrial engineering played important role in building programs. Due to the IInd WW outbreak, military engineering for shelter & fortification purposes was naturally extended. On the other hand, building activity about religion function i.e. churches & accompanying facilities was practically ceased.

2.4. Step 04. Case study of the architectural objects & styling assignation to the function
In this step the findings on styling assignation by functional criteria were to be obtained. In result, some interesting remarks could be established about no coincidental functional detachment of the styles to be approved & accommodated for development in totalitarian architecture. The most often developed functions in Nazi period found in step 03 are collated in Table 01 altogether with main styling assignation found in step 04 of the research process.

3. Architectural trends & styles in Germany during Nazi period
According to the famous architect Albert Speer that appeared to be one of the closest collaborators of Adolf Hitler at least in the sphere of architecture, Nazi Germany didn’t create any original style in architectural design [1].We must realize that Nazi State existed twelve years since 1933 till 1945 & only half of this period between 1933 - 1939 could be maintained relatively peaceful excluding aggressive German moves like those towards Austria (twice in 1934 & 1938) & Czechoslovakia (twice in 1938 & 1939) as well as remilitarization of the Rheinland in 1936. On 1st of September 1939 2nd WW broke out, but in spite of that serious architectural planning was continued till its end. Relatively active civil engineering lasted till the end of 1942 being transformed rather towards military purposes due to RAF & USAAF bombardments as well as the necessity of military industry effort. So,
from this point of view it was rather impossible to establish any creative architectural style in such a short time. At most we could mention some architectural trends that were preferred by the regime. These trends based on vast variety of architectural styles developed in Germany at the end of XIXth Century as well as during Weimar Republic period (1919 -1933) due to its cultural & political pluralism. Specialists find three general trends in Nazi architecture. These have been taken following nomenclature: Semi Modern, Rustic – Manufacturing & Neoclassic [2]. Such a nomenclature of the trends has only anticipative & indicatory character basing probably on the derivatives of these trends. But deeper analysis implicates more accurate allotment depending on the objects’ function because exactly their functions cause some considerable differences in the styling. As a result of the research described in the paper, following trends were extracted to exist during Nazi period:

3.1. New Objectivity
This was a movement in different German arts that became popular in the beginning of Weimar Republic in reaction to Expressionism trend. The German name Neue Sachlichkeit for the movement was given in 1925 by director of Mannheim Kunsthalle Gustav Friedrich Hartlaub for a title of art exhibition showing artists in a post-expressionist manner [3]. The architectural semantics was very close to the Sachlichkeit word meaning: “the matter-of-factness” emphasizing objective circumstances of design work, predilection to the functionality, usefulness as well as designer’s consciousness of hard reality professional aspects (constructional, physical, economical, even social & political ones). [3]. The trend was anticipated by Deutscher Werkbund movement & in nearest future it was the base of Bauhaus movement. New Objectivity main recognizable feature was full coherence between technical assumptions used in the design & their honest, not camouflaged visual effects. The architecture was purely unleashed from symbolic meaning showing all objectivity to impact visuality. In this attitude there was not much place for romantic longing or self – involvement which was opposite to the Nazis symbolic requirements. The trend was perceived in terms of engagement, rejection of romantic idealism & social collaboration extended to international scale. Exactly for these features it was associated with international movement treated by Nazi State as bolshevik agenda. Reportedly, the New Objectivity trend was banned by the Nazis & thus rejected from essential appliance, but – as described in the paper research proves – it concerned some functions to represent the State only. It could be told that New Objectivity went underground during Nazi period.

3.2. Quasi Modernity
This trend is congenial with New Objectivity movement. But using untraditional, modern & progressive techniques it accepted some symbolic façade wrapping according to the subjective ideological assumptions, just opposite to the New Objectivity attitude. Just this feature was quite attractive to the Nazi philosophy of architecture application: it was basically predestined to play important role in ideological fight for society approval, temporary social alleviation & perceptual creation complacency. It might be defined as up – to date technical achievements were enclosed in classically framed cult of might deriving from Bismarck – Hohenzollern state power [4]. The main visual intention was monumentality to evoke political state, economical & industrial greatness with use of classical regularity, symmetry & verticality [2]. Quasi Modernity was quite common in Weimar Republic & symptomatically was imported by other totalitarian states like communist USSR being called Proletarian Renaissance as well as by fascist Italy with nickname Al Tedesco [4].

3.3. Heimatschutzstil
Heimatschutzstil is a working name for a German national architecture trend originated from peasant handicap tradition. Its roots are dating back to Kaiser Wilhelm IInd reign i.e. much earlier period before Nazis gained the power in 1933. During Weimar Republic it was propagated by conservative groups like Blut&Boden (Blubo) or Kampfbund organization directed by such architects as Paul Schultze-Naumburg or Alexander Senger – the last one formerly bound with racist & nationalistic Swiss group Neues Bauten für kulturelle Ideale, für rassenreinen Stil und Nationalität. [5]. All of them presented nationalistic, racist & anticomunist (antibolschewik) attitudes [6]. The main feature of the trend was consequent use of traditional forms, building techniques & construction, forms & materials as well as architectural composition taken from German handicap experience as if
construction techniques, art & architecture progress had been stopped still. For this reason the trend should be treated as reaction to worldwide modernistic architectural movement. Thus, architecture was given explicit political context positioning the conservative traditional attitude to represent national German values opposite architectural vanguard perceived as bolschewik, communist plot as well as Jewish & cosmopolitan assassination [7]. Visual appearance of this architecture characterized in simple & consistent architectural forms, slopping roofs as well as natural construction & material exposition that helped to blend the object in the background. From this point of view it resembled some Howard’s XIXth Century Garden City ideas.

3.4. Ritual Metaphysic

XXth Century was admittedly characterized by unprecedented expansion of science & technique provided by strictly analytical & systematic way of thinking. But on the other hand such a rational attitude concerned also social & spirit spheres of human life which consequently led to total nihilism & negation of existing religions as well as social order systems. It seems to be symptomatic that most of the communities & countries that experienced extended scientific & technical development suffered from social & ideological crisis. Revolution in science & technique pulled humanity ahead but just like in the recoil phenomenon the same process triggered backwards another kind of revolution - a social one - that led numerous empires to total fall inducing mess & disorder. The results of 1st WW only accelerated fall of German Kaiser’s Empire & remained debris should be put together under some new social order. This is the main reason why NSDAP entered the cards of modern history. New power looked for new religion & social order to be settled. Such a need was wanted very fast – within one generation i.e. in the period of maximum twenty years the new order should be implemented. Nazis searched for the roots of their new society order in racial theories & national greatness past without help of existing Christian religion which they maintained inefficient. This quest was very active also in architectural zone. Its intention was to express intuitional & irrational notion of reality as well as domination of emotional & spiritual strength in some metaphysical way [2]. For its irrational & inaccurate character his trend gathered different architectural forms & probably this is the reason that - due to the shortage of time mentioned above - it didn’t elaborate specific styling features common for all of them. The trend was propagated mainly by Wilhelm Kreis activity in victory mausoleums planned to describe the greatness of German nation anticipated by numerous Bismarcktürme & Bismarcksäulen (Bismarck memorials & towers) [8] as well as military temples & memorials from Bismarck – Hohenzollern period. The same intention was present in sophisticated land objects basing on ancient Greek amphitheatres called Thingsstätte as well as Nazi indoctrination camps, complexes & even castles. Appearance during Nazi period in big amount of objects assigned to carry out different Nazi rituals in manner of new national & spiritual religion justifies pointing out this trend. The main features of this architecture were use of natural local solid & durable material, ancient classical or medieval historicism in form as well as traditional construction.

3.5. Stripped Classicism

This trend might be perceived as homologous to the styling described in p. 3.6 of the paper. The main visual feature to differ it from Monumental Neo Classicism was decreased doze of classical detail implementation, probably due to the costs & personal penchants of the objects’ architects influenced by modern architecture. The trend occurred in the buildings being not under direct influence of Nazi administration which gave some opportunity not to quote literally classical elements. But the composition rules as well as considerable oversizing, regularity, form consistency, multiplicity & use of durable materials were reliable features to indicate coherency with main stream of Nazi State ideological assumptions. The buildings’ forms stripped from superfluous classical detailing had even more convincing appearance in terms of psychical influence to the society due to better contrast of severely juxtaposed huge planes & recesses. This architecture was set out to submit the audience to Nazis ideas for space creation even better than literally used Neo Classicism. In Quasi Modernity manner described above, the coherence between commonly used modern construction & façade played secondary role.
3.6. Monumental Neo Classicism
According to Adolf Hitler cit.: “(…) humanity has been never so close to antiquity like today”, [9]. This brief statement of mighty dictator with ambitions of unfulfilled architect explains almost everything about Nazi’s relation to Neo Classicism & its position in Nazi world. If dictator once said so, any other architectural interpretation of the totalitarian State in architecture was impossible because it would mean that dictator was wrong. In totalitarian system it was impossible as the dictators were always infallible otherwise they wouldn’t be dictators. Having proven Neo Classicism to represent Nazi State in this way, it remains to explain why exactly this trend was chosen for such a role. Many sources show that it was Hitler’s personal point of view due to the impression of power he perceived from German Classicism of the 1840ties developed mostly in Berlin & Munich as well as his connotations with the cities of his youth i.e. Munich & Vien [2]. In Hitler’s opinion Classical architecture resembled unquestionable greatness of antic Empires of Greece & Rome which he wanted to match & even surpass. Following statement leaves no doubt about that, cit.: “(…) If we are asked about our predecessors, we should always point Greece!” [10]. Hitler’s attention to Classicism is vastly described by numerous authors [11]. According to S. Owens Zalampas cit.: “To Hitler, Greek architecture represented the supreme combination of beauty & function”, [12]. Even ancient Greek & Roman building ruins were important factor to choose Classicism for Nazi State representation for these were impressive evidence of greatness of the Empires that had created them. Such a perception of this architecture was explicitly coherent to ideological assumptions of IIIrd Reich rulers which intended to create objects of which ruins would be witnesses of Nazi movement 1000 years later. According to this intention, Nazis perceived IIIrd Reich to be kind of cultural trampoline between antiquity & future. The idea was invented by Albert Speer & accepted by Hitler in form of Ruinenwert theory [1]. This was the reason for consequent use of durable materials like stones or concrete & aversion to glass surfacing. Hitler explained the matter in his predictable manner cit.: “Our buildings – if the sea won’t flood German soil – would exist unchanged thousands years (…) & nonetheless would subdue anyone to enter inside”, [13].

4. Results of the research & discussion
The results of the research on the functional detachment of the trends occurring during Nazi period basing on most characteristic 500 objects were shown in Table 02. Due to the shortage of this paper photo digest of case study has been shown here accompanied by brief discussion describing functional connections with implemented styling. Each trend has been illustrated by min. 9 examples.

Figure: 1a-b-c. New Objectivity trend examples. Rough & simple geometry was generally addicted to the function without sophisticated form or ornament; a) Flaktürme (AA defense towers) made of cast reinforced concrete (1941-43, Hamburg, Berlin, Vien); b) KdF Prora designed by Klemens Klotz seaside resort extended over the length of 4,5 km (1935-36, Rugien Island). c) Functionality in 360° panoramic control of AVUS racetrack Beobachtungsturm (Observation tower) by Walter Bettenstaedt & Fritz Wilms (1934-35, Berlin).
Figure: 2a-b-c. *New Objectivity* trend examples; a) Telefunken Hauptverwaltung. The main reason of the *New Objectivity* architecture implementation was the personal continuity of architectural team: the object’s designer Hans Hertlein had been former chief architect of Siemens Corporation during Weimar Republic period (1937-40, Berlin); b) Müllverladestation by Paul Baumgarten. Garbage utilization was a function good enough to use *New Objectivity* styling (1936-37, Berlin); c) Deutschland Halle by Franz Ortmann & Fritz Wimmer was allowed in *New Objectivity* styling due to the shortage of time before Olympic Games in 1936, as punctual ending of the main Olympia Stadium was doubted. (1935, Berlin);

Figure: 3a-b-c-d. *New Objectivity* for military purposes; Objects showed the same pragmatic features of *New Objectivity* styling: form simplicity & full addition to function & construction. These weren’t supposed to bear concrete ideological context containing transcendent ideas of everlasting IIIrd Reich but probably their form & construction made them materialize that idea. a) Cone shaped concrete bunker entrance (1941-42, Bordeaux); b & d) AA cast concrete military objects accordingly Esterehazy Leitsand V & Ausgarten Flaktürm VII in Vien. (1942-44, Vien); c) U-boot base cast concrete shelters (1940-43, Lorient & Bordeaux);

Figure: 4a-b-c. *Ouasi Modernity* on office examples; The construction of the buildings was truly modern as it consisted of steel frames faced with limestone slabs. Modernistic simplicity without historical pretentions, detailing & ornamentation are main features. a) Offices of Nordstern Insurance Company at Fehbelliner Platz in Berlin by Otto Firle (1936, Berlin); b) Moabit Rathaus located at Mathilde - Jacobs Platz by Richard Ermisch (1935-37, Berlin); c) Reich Bank building by Heinrich Wolff (1934-38, Berlin);

Figure: 5a-b-c. *Ouasi Modernity* on office examples; a) Tempelhof Airfield by Ernst Sagebiel complex consisted of simply horizontally formed spaces deprived ornamentation with explicid axis assumption. The construction was also modernistic pattern: steel cantilever framing with stone facing. (1935-41, Berlin); b)
Reichsministerium für Vorklarung & Propaganda by Karl Reichle offers a good impression of Nazi state architecture: conservative modernism and monumental austerity reflected in the shell limestone facade with its uniform serial pattern (1934-38, Berlin); c) The monumental Reichluftfahtministerium constructed in reinforced concrete & steel framing in modernistic mood by Ernst Sagebiel. Structure of uniform sharp-edged window rows stand out against the smooth shell limestone façades. (1935-36, Berlin);

Figure: 6a-b-c. Ouaqi Modernity on industrial examples; Main determinants were economy, functionality & construction simplicity. The buildings were designed to wrap their necessary function inside only. For many known Weimar Republic architects industrial designing was professional asylum as they weren’t allowed to propagate modernism officially for international, bolschevik associations; So in industrial design they could smuggle some newest modernistic features. a) Extention of VW Werke by Emil Mewes, Karl Kohbecker-Fritz Schupp & Martin Kremmer (1937-38, Wolfsburg - Westfalen); b) Opel Werke headquarters by Heinrich Bärsh (1935-36, Brandenburg an der Havel); c) Mannesmann Werke headquarters by Hans Väth (1935-36, Huckingen);

Figure: 7a-b-c. Heimatschutzstil trend on countryside housing examples); Nationalistic Blut & Boden (Blubo) ideas dominated here to resemble pure values of German countryside architecture like: gable roofs often truncated by sides as headstalls, plastered walls, grating Prussian Walls, rustic ornamentation, use of simple construction systems & country materials like stones, bricks & wood; a) In Heimatschutzstil also military facilities like Heeresbauverwaltung by Ludwig Marx (1937, Westfalen) were built; b) For youth indoctrination Heimatschutzstil was used in numerous Hitler Jugend (HJ) hostels – here Hermann – Göring – Heim – for HJ by Hanns Dustmann (1938, Melle); c) Bauernhof by Willi Erdmann (Göttnitz – Rügen, 1937);

Figure: 8a-b-c. Heimatschutzstil on indoctrination objects examples. It was obligatory trend in all NSDAP training camps for its Blubo propagated features; a) Main pavilion of Ordensburg Sonthofen training camp by Hermann Giesler (since 1931, Allgäu) with Heimat ornamentation; b) Campfire shed & barracks in Ordensburg Crössinsee by Klemens Klotz with gable roofs & truncated headstalls (1934-36, Falkenburg); c). Barracks made of natural stones & wood in Ordensburg Vogelsang by Klemens Klotz (since 1933, Eifel);
Figure: 9a-b-c. Heimatschutzstil on residential examples. Consequently ideological indoctrination of Blubo occurred in residential housing of Nazi VIPs; a) The luxury complex of Hermann Göring by Werner March (1933-36, Schorfheide near Berlin); b) Adolf Hitler residence by Alois Degano basing on Hitler’s own sketches (1934-36; Berghof/Obersalzberg); c) Atelier Albert Speer designed by himself (1936, Obersalzberg);

Figure: 10a-b-c-d-e. Ritual - metaphysic architecture on indoctrination examples. Every element of these was created in sophisticated way using mystic, rituals & metaphysics to point up Nazi omnipotence & to emerge new NSDAP religion. a) Ordensburg Sonthofen training camp by Hermann Giesler (since 1931, Allgäu); b; d) Watchtowers of Ordensburg Vogelsang (since 1933, Eifel) & pair of watchtowers of Ordensburg Crössinsee (1934-36, Falkenberg), both by Klemens Klotz. These resembled the trainees that anything they had done would be under might of some metaphysical power. c) Ordensburg Vogelsang training camp by Klemens Klotz (since 1933, Eifel); e) Castle of Wevelsburg – the mystic residence of Nazi Grail & its new priest – Heinrich Himmler. Object’s modernization & extension to big City SS was carried under Hermann Bartels supervision (1123, 1603-09, extension since 1934, Wewelsburg);

Figure: 11a-b-c. Ritual - metaphysic architecture on memorial examples. These were anticipated by monumental patterns from Kaiser times recalling metaphysical & irrational notions like fate, destiny or providence filled with mysticism & evoked by historical Romanesque or Classical detailing & using local form associations. Most of the designs were made by Wilhelm Kreiss.; a) Project of soldiers Mausoleum in Russia patterned by Russian Kurhan i.e. tumulus (1941; Dniepr river,); b) Project of soldiers Mausoleum patterned by triumphal arch (1940, Netherlands); c) Project of Africa Korps Mausoleum shaped as triumphal arch (1942, Thunisia);

Figure: 12a-b-c. Ritual - metaphysic architecture on cultural performance examples. The regime worked out sophisticated land objects basing on Greek amphitheatres, called Thingsstätte. Nationalistic rituals were kept to encourage Nazi reign & recall Aryan provenience. a) Thingsplatz in Nußberg by Ernst Zinnser & Fritz Schaller (1934-35, Braunschweig); b) Thingsplatz Annaberg by Franz Böhmer & Georg Petrich (1934-36, Silesia); b) Thingsplatz Waldbühne,, Dietrich-Eckart-Freilichtbühne” by Werner March (1934-36, Berlin);
Figure: 13a-b-c. Stripped Classic trend on representative examples. This trend was intermediate phase between Quasi Modern architecture & pure Classicism. The most important factor to choose Neo Classic architecture as Nazi regime representative were ideological assumptions to associate IIIrd Reich with the cradle of Classicism i.e. ancient Greek & Roman Empires. a) Messe main entrance hall to Berliner Fair by Richard Ermisch (1936-37, Berlin); b) Regierungsgeschäfte edifice by Felix Bräuler (1939-45, Wrocław); c) Japan Embassy in Germany by Ludwig Moshammer (1938-42, Berlin);

Figure: 14a-b-c. Stripped Classic trend on office examples. These materialized Nazi power over society thus were obliged to represent its ideology. Due to high expenses of pure classic detailing as well as actual modernistic trends among German architects, Stripped Classicism was a temporary solution; a) Dortberghaus Verwaltung by Emil Rudolf Mewes façade was a kind of compromise showing minimalized ornamentation & quadrate windows proportions of upper levels in modernistic manner (1937-38, Dortmund); b) LufGauKommando LGK IV by Wilhelm Kreis (1935-38, Dresden); c) Friedenau Verwaltungsgebäude der Beton & Monierbau AG offices by Fritz Fuss & Cornelius van der Hoeven (1939, Berlin);

Figure: 15a-b-c-d. Stripped Classic trend examples. Stripping of the Classicism is used here to point out classical main composition however being deprived ornamentation. a) Oberpost by Hermann Billing (1938, Karlsruhe); Luftkriegsschule LKS I by Ernst Sagebiel acquired classical portico but still without ornament (1935, Dresden); c) Olympia Stadium by Werner March based on Roman Coliseum composing rules but with reduced ornamentation (1934-36, Berlin);d) LuftGauKommando LGK III by German Bestelmeyer (1935-36, München);

Figure: 16a-b-c. Monumental Neo Classical trend on mass gathering & exposition examples. This trend was culmination of Nazi architecture development. Oversized proportions & intensity in full range materialized representation of Nazi State ideology. a) Uncompleted Deutsches Stadion by Albert Speer (1937-42, Nürnberg); b) German Pavilion for “International Exposition of Art &Technology” by Albert Speer won first prize (1936-37, Paris); c) Partially completed Kongress Halle by Franz & Ludwig Ruff (since 1935, Nürnberg);
Figure: 17a-b-c. Monumental Neo Classical trend on cultural, memorial & gathering examples. These functions were most representative to the Nazi State, thus full range of officially approved Neo Classic style features was consequently present, just like ornamentation & detailing strictly quoted from ancient Roman & Greek architecture, oversized proportions to match & even exceed the splendor of Nazi architecture anticipations, multiplied composition to point up Nazis omnipotence, massive & durable materials like limestone, marble, travertine etc in big slabs. a) Haus der Deutschen Kunst by Paul Troost (1933-37, München); b) Two Ehrentempeln at Königs Platz by Paul Troost (1933-35, München); c) Zeppelin Tribune by Albert Speer where Lichtdom shows were carried (1935-36, Nürnberg);

Table 1. Functional detachment of trends/styles occurring in architecture during Nazi period 1933-45

| Functions | New Objectivity | Quasi Modernity | Heimat schutzstil | Ritual Metaphysic | Stripped Classicism | Neo Classicism |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| A Military field headquarters function | + | - | + | - | - | - |
| B Military fortifications engineering | + | + | - | - | - | + |
| C Concentration camp function | + | - | + | - | - | - |
| D Roads & bridges engineering | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| E Industrial function | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| F Sport gathering function | + | + | - | - | + | - |
| G Multi – family housing function | - | + | - | - | - | - |
| H Transportation function (airfields, train stations) | - | + | - | - | + | - |
| I Office & administration function | - | + | - | - | + | + |
| J Exposition function | - | + | - | - | + | + |
| K Residential & family housing function | - | - | + | - | + | - |
| L Schools of primary education (Volksschule) | - | - | + | - | - | - |
| M NSDAP education function | - | - | + | - | - | - |
| N Military headquarters & barrack function | - | - | + | - | - | - |
| O Memorial function | - | - | - | + | - | + |
| P Mass gathering political function | - | - | - | + | - | + |
| R Cultural function (theatres, operas, cinemas) | - | - | - | - | + | + |
| S Representative political function | - | - | - | - | + | + |

Figure: 18a-b-c. Monumental Neo Classical trend on representative & office examples. Monumentality, splendor & submissive perception of Neo Classic architecture was consciously used by Hitler & his regime for political actions to impact & intimidate his enemies. This is why this styling was implemented for representative function. a) Neue Reichs Kanzlei by Albert Speer (1938-39, Berlin); b) Volks Halle at Der Grosse Platz by
Albert Speer (1938-39, Berlin); c) Triumphal Arch on N-S Axis by Albert Speer & Adolf Hitler (1925-39, Berlin); d) Führerbau edifice of first Hitler’s headquarters by Paul Troost & Leonhard Gall (1931-39, München);

5. Conclusions
As could be concluded from this brief record, architecture styling in Nazi Germany wasn’t homogenous phenomenon due to short time of 12 years to develop. In many cases use of concrete trend depended on functional background to be implemented. But the following regularity - the more representative function, the more Classicism - could be observed. Hitler & his regime was pragmatic enough to reject immediately trends associated with internationalism, communism or cosmopolitanism i.e. New Objectivity & Quasi Modernity. In a fit of sincerity Hitler admitted cit.: “My actions are always based on a political way of thinking” which explains his cynical acquiescence for use of modern styling in some cases [14]. By chronology, Classical trends permanently & consequently eliminated Modernity trends from German architecture. Just like the main reasons of modern styles rejection from Nazi environment were political connotations, the same political reasons for denazification led to reject classical architecture from German post-war architectural space, as if architecture was guilty for unimaginable war horrors. This action probably was the most creative factor for post-war modernism career altogether with a need for quick building substance reconstruction due to modern trend simplicity. But consequently other negative features of modernism like anonymity & lack of spatial identity became so common that today we stay again in front of total spatial disintegration & lack of genius loci justified by plurality.
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