

請將以下兩段文字譯為中文

(一) 50%

Public Faces in Private Places

It is always a question whether the bourgeois den is worse or better than no private home at all, the norm of the states ancient and modern which consider men as public animals, and homes as army barracks.

But it has remained for our own generation to perfect the worst possible community arrangement, the home of the average American. This home is liberally supplied with furniture and the comforts of private life, but these private things are neither made nor chosen by personal creation or idiosyncratic taste, but are made in a distant factory and distributed by unresisted advertising. At home they exhaust by their presence—a bare cell would give more peace or arouse restlessness. They print private life with a public meaning. But if we turn to read this public meaning, we find that the only moral aim of society is to provide private satisfactions called the Standard of Living. This is remarkable. The private places have public faces, as Auden said, but the public faces are supposed to imitate private faces. What a booby trap!

(二) 50%

Introduction: The Problem of Building Value

One of the less fashionable but crucial issues of the discourse on architectural theory is about what architectural design contributes to the value of buildings, and how this relates to the economic concerns assumed to dominate decision-making in large segments of the building industry. Those concerns seem to be treated with some disdain among architectural theorists; and the profession seems to willingly give up ground in areas it sees as dominated by economic issues, at the same time as it is seen by other players as unable and unwilling to contribute meaningfully to these decisions. The discipline's turning away from the economic aspects of building is fueled by powerful feelings, to some extent shared by the general public — to the effect that there is something palpably 'bad' about decisions made on a predominantly economic basis. The built environment consequences of these decisions seem to lack essential human aesthetic, poetic, spiritual, moral and community values. The irony is that many decisions based on predominantly architectural considerations are seen by the public as equally lacking many of those same values. It is fair to say that there is a problem with regard to the way this issue is being dealt with by both sides. The following speculations attempt to construct a bridge between architectural concerns and those that are equally often decried as merely economic.