Why not 1 stone
Posted by BillSutherland - 07 Feb 2013 21:45

Please excuse my dumb question but I'm wondering why two stones are needed to sharpen on the WE. Since there are more stones becoming available and the expense is doubled by having to have two stones, why not just use one and purchase additional grits with the money you'd spend on two? Since I'm so new at all this please excuse the question but I'm just not seeing the need for two.

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by nicholas6225 - 07 Feb 2013 22:39

---

having two stones makes sharpening quicker, makes it easier to keep an edge apexed, and when you get up to the whetstones it makes lapping and creating a slurry a lot easier. The biggest benefit of the wicked edge is being able to sharpen both sides of the blade at "once" which makes it unique from other sharpeners:)

p.s there are never stupid questions, there are only stupid answers

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by BillSutherland - 07 Feb 2013 23:06

OK, I'll buy that it is quicker and easier but not a "necessity". If you wanted to have more stones you COULD go 1 stone at a time and not have to use 2?

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by nicholas6225 - 08 Feb 2013 00:04

Clay does a pretty great job explaining it

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by cbwx34 - 08 Feb 2013 08:10

It would be like taking 1 pedal off a bicycle, you COULD still ride it, but it wouldn't be very efficient.

Using two stones is one of the principal concepts of the Wicked Edge... it's what makes it a great sharpener. Not to mention the other benefits Nicholas mentioned. You would also double the use on one stone, so replacement time would be sooner, on some stones anyway.

OTOH, I do see your point. On some of the very fine stones, especially the aftermarket waterstones, you probably could get away with one stone. I'm not sure WE or any of the aftermarket sellers would want to sell them that way, so you'd probably have to make arrangements with someone to split an order? I wouldn't bother with the majority of the stones though... don't think the savings would outweigh the loss of benefits you get from using two.

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone

Posted by BillSutherland - 08 Feb 2013 08:41

HHMMMM....I guess maybe since I'm new I don't have enough experience, but I'm not convinced that other than saving a little time, there's really any distint advantage in having two. Slurry will be developed whether you're using one or two so I don't see any advantage there. I think what makes it such a great sharpener is the stability and being able to sharpen two sides without having to move the knife. I do see one disadvantage for two, other than the expense, is that the two seperate stones are very unlikely to be at the same size (ie thickness) so the angle on one side with stone A may not be the same as the angle with stone B. Especially after a lot of use, stone A will wear more or less than stone B. Unless you take out your micrometer and make sure they're the same, you're going to be using a different angle for each side. I guess the only way to make sure is to use the angle cube to check your angle and forget relying on the angle marks on the arms.

This probably isn't a big deal and it really isn't going to alter how anyone uses the machine but in my research I often heard that one negative of the machine was that you had to purchase two stones so the initial outlay was expensive. Long term you'd have more stone life because you're using two and that would be a serious consideration for someone sharpening often.

One way or the other there's no doubt it's one of the very best sharpeners.

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone

Posted by Sauce - 08 Feb 2013 09:22

Unless you are sharpening many many knives with uneven bevels, two stones should wear quite evenly. The angle cube is invaluable in my opinion. No matter whether you are using 1 or 2 stones, the angle can be verified. I use in between each progression of stones, and find I make minor adjustments about 25-50% of the time. No question your stone is hitting at the proper angle each stroke. Overboard maybe, just my .02 on that. Also, it's nice to go from one side of the blade to the other without having to reposition the stone each time. Speeds sharpenings up a bit. I spend enough time on them already, although I do enjoy it.

Sauce

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by cbwx34 - 08 Feb 2013 11:34

BillSutherland wrote:

HHMMMM....I guess maybe since I'm new I don't have enough experience, but I'm not convinced that other than saving a little time, there's really any distint advantage in having two...

Do what I would do... test your theory. Pack 1/2 your stones away and try it. I'd be interested in seeing what you find out. I think you'd then see what the advantages are, but you never know until you try. In the end, like most things in sharpening... there's no right or wrong, just find what works for you to get that.

Warning: Spoiler!wicked edge!.

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by wickededge - 08 Feb 2013 14:17

Interesting question. Another factor that gets overlooked is that, while you can just move one stone from side to side, you most likely won't do it every single stroke. When you start doing multiple strokes per side, you immediately begin to form a burr.

==========

Re: Why not 1 stone
Posted by BillSutherland - 08 Feb 2013 19:25

"When you start doing multiple strokes per side, you immediately begin to form a burr

Is it better to do it that way or by alternating strokes per side? For some reason I tend to be not alternate the strokes but as I said before, I'm just beginning.

==========