

Re: KRS – artificial weathering

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2004–09/2103.html>

From: Eric Stevens (*eric.stevens_at_sum.co.nz*)

Date: 09/17/04

Date: Fri, 17 Sep 2004 21:54:49 +1200

On Fri, 17 Sep 2004 08:51:43 GMT, "zolota" <zolota3@REMOVEshaw.ca> wrote:

>
> "I E Johansson" <ingerxjohanssonx@telia.com> wrote in message
> news:Lhx2d.103519\$dP1.373252@newsc.telia.net...
>>
>> "zolota" <zolota3@REMOVEshaw.ca> skrev i meddelandet
>> news:%_v2d.31317\$dS.13731@pd7tw2no...
>>>
>>> "I E Johansson" <ingerxjohanssonx@telia.com> wrote in message
>>> news:Hqv2d.3441\$d5.26437@newsb.telia.net...
>>> > zolota,
>>> > the suggested method of yours is one of the easiest to detect of all
>>> > according to scientists here.
>>> >
>>> >
>>> Everything snipped so top posting is correct.
>>>
>>> How to detect please, that's why I posted it, to find the detection
>> method.
>>> You claim to know how to do it, tell me.
>>
>> That's only to use one of the modern electron–microscope. We could do it
>> back in 1976 –79 when I worked with salt on ice using the best microscope
>> then. Actually we had to do it because there was an accusation from some
>> we
>> today should call 'Green' propagandist that the salt on ice had this and
>> that effect on stone, asphalt and concrete. Of course it had and of course
>> it
>> was detectable. For the effect of combination salt, sea–wind resp acid
>> rain
>> on stone, graywake and other, as well as soil, ground, growth and fauna my
>> own father worked in the so called 'blue' (water–related weatering,
>> erosion
>> and polution) field from 1954 till he retired – I helped him with tests
>> from
>> 1957. The laboratarium they used could detect all non–normal ageing in

>> 1960's. *It didn't look the same.*
>> *It still doesn't according to the geochemist I met with, as so many times*
>> *each year, last week.*
>>
>> *Inger E*
>>>
>
>*I would agree in the sense that an electronic instrument is the most likely*
>*device to find a tampered surface. But you have said nothing about what the*
>*scientist would be looking for with this instrument. Your 1976 EM could only*
>*scan physical appearances. While it may prove some frauds it cannot confirm*
>*that other surfaces are frauds, or ancient, and it cannot put a date on*
>*them. "It didn't look the same" is not a scientific observation, differences*
>*must be quantified. I repeat my question "what method"? (Not, what*
>*instrument)". What quantifiable chemical or physical marker would prove the*
>*age or fraudulence of an apparently old mineral surface, what minerals would*
>*you look at?*
>
>*As I noted to Eric, do you think that anyone would ever allow a cut through*
>*a letter of the KRS so that a cross section of the surface can be studied?*

They already have allowed a sample to be cut from it. In any case, the fact that it might not be permissible to take a piece from the KRS does not mean that nothing would be found if a piece was taken.

Eric Stevens