



REPLY

Rejoinder to: Pilkey, O.H.; Thieler, E.R.; Young, R.S., and Bush, D.M., 1999. Reply to Houston, J.R., 1998. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 14 (3), 1170–1173, Summer 1998. Rejoinder to: Pilkey, O.H.; Young, R.S.; Thieler, E.R.; Jacobs, B.S.; Katuna, M.P.; Lennon, G., and Moeller, M.E., 1996. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 12 (4), 1044–1050, Fall 1996. Reply to: Houston, J.R., 1996, Discussion of Young, R.S.; Pilkey, O.H.; Bush, D.M., and Thieler, E.R., A Discussion of the Generalized Model for Simulation Shoreline Change (GENESIS). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 12 (4), 1038–1043, Fall 1996. *This Volume*.

James R. Houston, PhD

Director
Coastal and Hydraulics Laboratory
Department of the Army
Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers
3909 Halls Ferry Road
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-6199

INTRODUCTION

HOUSTON (1996) noted that YOUNG *et al.* (1995) cited the Folly Beach beach-nourishment project, South Carolina, as an example supporting their claim that the shoreline-response model GENESIS failed in a practical application. HOUSTON (1996) said, “. . . the GENESIS developers can do a much better job than I debating the efficacy of GENESIS,” but pointed out that statements by YOUNG *et al.* (1995) concerning the performance of the Folly Beach project were “simply not true” and provided measurements and extensive photographs showing this to be the case. The photographs presented by HOUSTON (1996) looked down the beach’s length at a landmark and covered the entire project so the reader could obtain a complete view of the project (there are over 120 photographs). PILKEY and DIXON (1997) presented only two photographs that showed erosion on short stretches of beach that HOUSTON (1996) had already pointed out as having erosion problems, and they then concluded, “Both their photos and ours are useless as evidence of the overall success of the Folly Beach project.” PILKEY *et al.* (1996) presented measurements they made at the Folly Beach project and repeated their claims that the project performed poorly and GENESIS predictions were inaccurate. However, HOUSTON (1998) showed, these measurements agreed with measurements and photographs in HOUSTON (1996), and all directly contradicted statements in YOUNG *et al.* (1995) and PILKEY

et al. (1996) concerning the project’s performance and GENESIS predictions.

DIALOGUE IS NOT POSSIBLE WHEN FACTS ARE IGNORED

Unfortunately, PILKEY *et al.* (1999) did not submit a timely reply to HOUSTON (1998), so their reply was not published in the same edition (HOUSTON, 1998, was submitted to the *Journal of Coastal Research* in March, 1997). Had their reply been published with HOUSTON (1998), the reader would have clearly seen their reply was completely unresponsive to the discussion of HOUSTON (1998). The key sentence in HOUSTON (1998) was, “It would be difficult to debate the subtleties of models such as GENESIS when agreement cannot even be reached on simple facts relating to the Folly Beach Project—the only application of GENESIS that YOUNG *et al.* (1996) criticize.” PILKEY *et al.* (1999) ignore the discussion of HOUSTON (1998) except for part of one sentence and never address the central topic of the discussion, the performance of the Folly Beach project and predictions made by GENESIS relating to the project. PILKEY *et al.* (1999) have chosen a clever but transparent debate tactic—ignore facts raised by your debate opponent and strike out in directions unrelated to the debate. I have presented extensive measurements and photographs of the Folly Beach project and shown they are supported by measurements presented by PILKEY *et al.* (1996).

The measurements (including those of PILKEY *et al.*, 1996) and photographs all contradict key statements made by YOUNG *et al.* (1995) and PILKEY *et al.* (1996) concerning the performance of the Folly Beach project and the GENESIS model. Rather than simply admit their statements were incorrect, PILKEY *et al.* (1996) obfuscated, and PILKEY *et al.* (1999) change the subject. These may be winning debate tactics, but dialogue and the truth are the victim.

Dr. Pilkey and his colleagues have published several papers criticizing coastal models. They have lamented that modelers have not engaged in dialogue with them, and PILKEY *et al.* (1999) call for "dialogue between model proponents and critics." Is dialogue really possible when Dr. Pilkey and his colleagues will not accept measurements by made by others, their own measurements, and eyewitness reports in the form of photographs of the condition of the Folly Beach project? If we cannot agree on simple facts supported by overwhelming data, the debate is simply not about trying to determine scientific truth.

CONCLUSION

HOUSTON (1996) and HOUSTON (1998) presented measurements and extensive photographs of the Folly Beach project and showed this information was supported by measurements presented by PILKEY *et al.* (1996), and all evidence and analysis contradicted statements made by YOUNG *et al.* (1995) and PILKEY (1996) relating to the condition of the Folly Beach project and performance of the GENESIS model. Rather than admit they were wrong, PILKEY *et al.* (1999) ignore the discussion of HOUSTON (1998). Repeating the key conclusion of HOUSTON (1998), "It would be difficult to debate subtleties of models such as GENESIS when agreement can-

not even be reached on simple facts relating to the Folly Beach Project—the only application of GENESIS that YOUNG *et al.* (1996) criticize."

LITERATURE CITED

- HOUSTON, J.R., 1996. Discussion of: YOUNG, R.S., PILKEY, O.H., BUSH, D.M., and THIELER, E.R. A Discussion of the Generalized Model for Simulation Shoreline Change (GENESIS). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 11 (3), 875–886. *Journal of Coastal Research* 12 (4) 1038–1043, Fall 1996.
- HOUSTON, J.R., 1998. Rejoinder to: PILKEY, O.H., YOUNG, R.S., THIELER, E.R., JACOBS, B.S., KATUNA, M.P., LENNON, G., and MOELLER, M.E., 1996. Reply to HOUSTON, J.R., A Discussion of the Generalized Model for Simulating Shoreline Change (GENESIS). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 11 (3), 875–886. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 14 (3), 1170–1173, Summer 1998.
- PILKEY, O.H., YOUNG, R.S., THIELER, E.R., JACOBS, B.S., KATUNA, M.P., LENNON, G., and MOELLER, M.E., 1996. Reply to: HOUSTON, J.R., 1996. Discussion of: YOUNG, R.S., PILKEY, O.H., BUSH, D.M., and THIELER, E.R., 1995. A Discussion of the Generalized Model for Simulating Shoreline Change (GENESIS). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 11 (3), 875–886. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 12 (4), 1044–1050, Fall 1996.
- PILKEY, O.H. and DIXON, K.L., 1997. Review or Rebuttal? A Response to "Review of the Book *the Corps and the Shore* by O. PILKEY and K. DIXON by JAMES R. HOUSTON and ROBERT DEAN." *Shore and Beach*, 65 (1).
- PILKEY, O.H., THIELER, E.R., YOUNG, R.S., and BUSH, D.M., 1999. Reply to: HOUSTON, J.R., 1996. Rejoinder to: PILKEY, O.H., YOUNG, R.S., THIELER, E.R., JACOBS, B.S., KATUNA, M.P., LENNON, G., and MOELLER, M.E., 1996. Reply to HOUSTON, J.R. A Discussion of the Generalized Model of Simulating Shoreline Change (GENESIS). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 12 (4), 1044–1050. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 14 (3), 1170–1173." *Journal of Coastal Research*, this volume.
- YOUNG, R.S., PILKEY, O.H., BUSH, D.M., and THIELER, E.R., 1995. A Discussion of the Generalized Model for Simulating Shoreline Change (GENESIS), *Journal of Coastal Research*, 11 (3), 875–886.