

Re: Another OA Reflector

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2004-10/1051.html>

From: Mike Fitterman (*cutshot_at_charter.net*)

Date: 10/08/04

Date: Fri, 08 Oct 2004 22:11:09 GMT

"Ratboy99" <ratboy99@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20041008134004.21100.00001735@mb-m07.aol.com...

> > *If you have a beef with Mike, you should take that up with him in private*
> > *email.*

> >

> > *I'm tired of the violence.*

> >

>

> *Now wait a minute. What violence? Repeatedly Mike has made a ridiculous*
> *and*

> *potentially misleading claim on a public newsgroup. I myself see an*
> *obligation*

> *that he be taken to task for it.*

>

It is not a misleading claim. Dan was there, I believe Steve was. Although you never asked for more details as to why I said what I said.

To be honest, I wouldn't have believed it myself if I hadn't seen it for myself. My belief is that both are somewhat close in their abilities but the focal length is probably the culprit for the differences I saw. Once scope had to have a powermate and eyepiece (namely the 101) and the other only needed one eyepiece. The eyepieces were not the same (I know Dan's scope had one of my ortho's in it) but I don't recall what was in the TV at the time. To get the 2 scopes to the same power took some doing as the 101 is about 1/2 the focal length of the OA.

> *Why, oh why would this be a private email matter to tell him that his*
> *public*

> *statment is still as full of crap as it was last time he made it?*

I think not. I saw it and I believe what I say to be true. You don't have to believe and that's fine by me.

Mike

> *rat*

sci.astro.amateur: Re: Another OA Reflector

> ~();>

>

> *email: remove 'et' from .com(et) in above email address*