

Re: MEMO to Meade: How to write an honest news release

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-02/0348.html>

AFM_at_andersonsoftware.ca

Date: 02/02/05

Date: 1 Feb 2005 21:46:33 -0800

So long as the surgeon fixes the problem then he can say he did as many bypasses as he wants :)

"Nomenclature is trivial" you are right I should have been clearer in this statement. I made this statement in direct reference to telescope nomenclature and how it would become overly complex if every single modification to a design received a new name, as it stands you can determine something about a telescope's design and behavior from its name.

I agree words have meaning and what Meade did was probably an act of marketing. I also agree that the RCX is not a true Ritchey Chretien. But if it is a Ritchey with a Schmidt corrector then it could be called a Schmidt Ritchey Chretien the same way a Richey with a Baker corrector is a Baker Richey Chretien. Can Takahashi call their BRC250 a Richey?

If, on the other hand, Meade did not use two hyperbolic mirrors then I totally agree with you: calling the RCX a ritchey is fraudulent and the name should be changed.

You, on the other hand, decided to attack my products in a way that has nothing to do with the issue and I do not appreciate it. I especially do not appreciate your spreading false information about my products you were entirely out of line and now I need to correct the remarks you made.

For "P" to be identical to "Q" they must share all properties. If they do not share all properties then they are not the same thing. So which is it, do words only mean one thing or don't they. You said a mak cass can have a spherical mirror or it can have an aspherical mirror. You gave two things the same name. If the conical constant of the primary mirror is irrelevant then there is no reason why Takahashi cannot call their mewlons Ritcheys. You just blurred the term mak cass.

"I suppose as long as people realize the limited size of the fully illuminated FOV, it is fine."
The fully illuminated field is considerably larger in my telescope than

a newtonian of equal obstruction. I designed the field to be equal to a typical Newtonian.

I wont dignify the rest of the paragraph with a response. Read the site again.

"I did have some questions though. You wrote, "You can understand my reluctance to simply quote a specific number. The optics in my telescopes are hand made by Barry Arnold to be atmosphere limited. This means the optics will not be the weak link of your equipment.""
When you quote me quote all of what I say. I wont give a number because there are an infinite number of ways to rate a telescope.

" "Atmosphere limited" I like that. But what exactly does "atmosphere limited" mean? If nomenclature is trivial, what is the surface accuracy in nontrivial terms? Saying, "the optics will not be the weak link" really doesn't say anything."

Interesting, I thought that did mean something. I already told you why I refuse to give a number. "atmosphere limited" means the optical system is limited only by the quality of atmospheric seeing. "the optics will not be the weak link" means the quality of my optics will not be the limiting factor in what you can see.

"What is "qualitatively perfect"?"
When the telescope is in focus you will not notice an improvement from higher optical quality. For those who have not read my site yet I should mention I said this about ALL hand made telescopes. Qualitatively means "in someone's opinion." In this context it means "in your opinion". In other words the statement I made on my website could also be phrased as "when you look through any hand made telescope you will not be able to discern the in focus image from that of a perfect telescope."

"With that tiny illuminated FOV, it is not going to keep up with other scopes at "low power [wide field] deep sky viewing." That is fine if people understand that."
I suppose you think that about all Newtonians and cassegrains. My telescopes have the same field drop off. If you want a truly wide field of view I can do that too. The problem is the obstruction will be equal to a standard Newtonian. That is why my company is named custom optical systems. I will make a telescope to order. Given equal obstruction my telescopes will always have the advantage over other reflectors.

You didn't need to attack me to get your point across. Have you ever used one of my telescopes?
Ian Anderson

sci.astro.amateur: Re: MEMO to Meade: How to write an honest news release

www.customopticalsystems.com