

## **E-mails respond to column about global warming fuss**

by Randy Bright <http://www.tulsabeacon.com/?p=3327#more-3327>

I receive a daily online architectural newsletter, the Architect Newswire, that I enjoy reading. Each day, Monday through Friday, they give highlights of news that architects would be interested in.

To my surprise, they had picked up on my December 3 article regarding global warming in which I discussed the hacker who exposed the manipulation of data to prove global warming.

I'm not kidding myself that this was printed in the Newswire as a compliment. The intro to my article in part read, "He praises whoever hacked into the files of the Climate Research Unit recently to find supposed evidence of climate-data manipulation toward attempts (to) prove warming is caused by humans."

By the way, I never used the word "supposed" in my article, but to their credit, Newswire linked my article in the Tulsa Beacon so it could be read in its entirety, and unedited.

In that article I had cited a survey done by Architect magazine in which almost half of 970 architect-participants expressed disbelief or skepticism in man-made global warming.

My initial thought when I saw the article in Newswire was that I was going to get bombarded with e-mails chastising me for my strongly held view that global warming is a hoax, but as it turned out, the response far exceeded the survey results; that is to say, eight out of the eleven e-mails I received agreed with me.

I first learned of the Newswire article when I received an e-mail telling me I had gone national with my article. He congratulated me and said that he agreed with me about global warming but felt that the green movement was political. He had received his LEED certification and thought that we should make our buildings as energy efficient as possible, but we shouldn't go overboard.

Another e-mailer wrote to ask if I had more information on global warming, said that it had bothering her for a long time, and expressed hope that it was finally coming to an end. I pointed her to the Senate Minority Report that included testimonies from than 700 scientists disputing the theory of man-made global warming.

Another thanked me for writing the article and for bucking the trend. He felt that the statistics I had quoted from the Architect magazine article were encouraging, but felt that the architects who believed in global warming were the loudest and most likely to perpetuate the myth.

The next one wrote to let me know that my article was being noticed by the architectural community, and thanked me for writing it.

Another wrote to offer his support to me and to others who had not jumped on the global warming bandwagon. He felt that the basis of global warming was spiritual, not scientific, and was a liberal philosophy intended to reduce mankind's position to something less than God had intended.

Another e-mailer, a newly licensed architect, wrote to compliment me on the article and said that he had confronted a number of myths in our profession, but that the one that troubled him the most was that the sustainability movement was the solution to all of the problems of the world.

Another architect wrote to let me know that he agreed with me and that he used to think that we were in the minority. My article changed his mind.

Finally, another architect simply wrote to thank me for writing the article.

I won't share the negative e-mails. Let's just say that they weren't very polite. Or constructive. Or professional.

Obviously eight positive responses out of the eleven I received is not a scientific survey, but what it does indicate to me is that this is far from being a settled issue among architects.

It is my belief that there are many more who, like me, want our practices to be based on solid, honest science, not science that is influenced by politics. It would be a mistake to assume that just because I and other architects don't believe in man-caused global warming; it doesn't mean that we are anti-environment. Far from it. We are just as concerned as our counterparts, but only to the degree we feel is appropriate.

Architects should be intellectually honest and should not accept such a politically-charged theory just because it is popular. We should welcome objective scrutiny of both sides of the issue. In the interest of honesty and integrity, I encourage them to demand the truth, wherever it leads them, and not let pride stand in the way of good, solid science. We as architects owe that to our profession, our clients, and the public.

©2009 Randy W. Bright

Randy W. Bright, AIA, NCARB, is an architect who specializes in church and church-related projects. You may contact him at 918-664-7957, [rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net](mailto:rwbrightchurcharch@sbcglobal.net) or [www.churcharchitect.net](http://www.churcharchitect.net).

This entry was posted on Thursday, December 17th, 2009 and is filed under [Columns](#).