themselves. Architects who radically innovate or experiment with private houses, especially when they are second homes, are acting within a long and fertile design tradition, going back in the western world at least to Palladio's villas if not Hadrian's. But those that take similar liberties with multifamily housing for anonymous users or with wild insertions of single-family houses in residential neighborhoods forget that home and community are about haven and familiarity, not stimulation and striving. When a talented architect such as Rem Koolhaas conducts exciting and creative experiments like the Congrexpo at Euralille, it's a reasonable and exciting proposition. But when he experiments in Fukuoka, Japan, with new architectural types for housing that ends up looking like a nightclub from the street, it's not all right. (It is no wonder that this project went begging in the market.) Residential communities are more socially fragile than business centers—or, for that matter, airports, convention centers, entertainment centers, and sports arenas. Architects must know the right type and time and place to thumb their noses at convention. Not all parts of the city are equally appropriate for experimentation. Most neighborhoods are brittle and need stability more than innovation.

A major contributor to excessive experimentation has been and continues to be schools of architecture. It is important that schools be a progressive and critical force in the discipline and practice of architecture. It is also important that every architecture student be pushed to experiment and speculate. However, it shouldn't be mandatory on, and need not be fundamental to, *every* design exercise and project. Thinking and designing out of the box normally makes more sense in the advanced studios during the later years of the curriculum. To experiment and invent is heady, fun, and positive, but needs to be encouraged at the right time and place. To do it habitually is like eating nothing but dessert—tasty but not very nutritional. Somehow architectural education has come to just that, a hypoglycemic diet of making interesting form. Moreover, the manipulation of form is usually within a predictable "house style" that prevails within the school. Style per se is okay, even beneficial, and ultimately unavoidable. It helps students (or practicing architects) deal with and bring order to the daunting number of variables that they will undoubtedly face. But an architectural style needs to be buildable, adaptable, humane, liberative, and ultimately meaningful. Recent styles, especially those based on fractal and deconstructed geometry, may be dramatic and seductive, but they often are arbitrary and unworkable when they encounter building practice, the human user, and physical context.

Typology can also be an act of efficiency and economy for the designer. It is considerably easier to start with a time-tested architectural type and modify it into a suitable model than to try to invent a new type (or at least an unrecognizable version of an existing type) with every architectural commission. A typological point of departure is quicker in that it draws on types that are finite in number. It does not start out with the near-infinite architectural possibilities that a functional analysis or "bubble diagram" of the building's program permits. The Modernist insistence on starting from scratch is very expensive. It often overtakes the architectural fee and exhausts the design team and client before the design has climbed very high toward perfection on the curve of diminishing returns, where additional design time and effort result in less improvement. Typological designers can climb higher on that quality curve because they waste less time and fee in discovery at the outset. Economy of means and of time encourages architects to embrace typological design.

"Form follows function" was the rallying cry of Modernism. Although it may have achieved this correspondence at the building scale, it often ignored the connection between form and function at the urban scale. Because many Modernist buildings are creative translations of one-of-a-kind programs into unforeseen and never-before-seen forms, materials, and structural systems, they are often unrecognizable as urban elements. Most people would not recognize Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim as a museum, for example. Nor would most people recognize Le Corbusier's Ronchamp Chapel as a church.

On the other extreme, commercial Modernism has recently put complex or mixed programs under one roof, sometimes in a single large volume. These inexpensive sheds, warehouses, pre-engineered metal buildings, tilt-up boxes, and "big boxes" tend to be so large, unarticulated, and generic as to be mute megaboxes in the cityscape. They lack the tectonic quality of traditional market halls and sheds. These warehouses offer the same potential for adaptability for which palazzos and townhouses have been praised, but they are built of much lower quality construction in dumbed-down configurations. Space is not made for particular uses but is simply made available. The huge metal and concrete boxes could house a discount mart, tennis courts, or dairy cows. This reduction in the number of architectural types

TEAM LinG