

Re: tak quality SCT?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-05/msg00937.html>

- *From:* "AM" <SCTUSER@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 13 May 2005 21:26:27 -0400
-

"Mark D" <mmd49@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:12007-42854300-321@xx>

>>I looked through an AP Mak Cas once.
>> Maybe it was just me, but I was far more impressed at the AP 1200 mount
>>than the OTA.....
>> Allan

> -----
> Perhaps so, especially, if you were at a star party, and just before
> looking through the AP Mak, you looked through a 20" Dob?
>

No, my C 11 was the biggest aperture there that night :)
(several AP 130's and an AP 5" also)

> If a Celestron C11 had 1/10 wave final wavefront optics, what good would
> it be, if the scope still exhibits focuser slop, and mirror flop? Mark
> D.
>

I agree with what you say, it's just that for visual use
(what I do mostly) the difference in cost is staggering.
Yes the AP gave better views than my C 11, no
question. So did an excellent Tak Mewlon. But they
were better in that the views were more pleasing to look
at, in a 3D kinda way... But the C11 as is now, already
delivers 85 + of the views of the AP, and Tak.
I was seeing most if not all the exact same detail.....
(the contrast on the AP and Tak were NICE tho !!)
If it had better mirrors/mechanics be their equal or be
better.

I would pay extra right now for a C 11 (or whatever)
that had better optics right off. Some mechanical
improvements would be nice, but better corrector and
mirror (s) finishing would be my interest.

Re: tak quality SCT?

And for imaging, to me the mount is the most important part.
(makes life sooooo much easier !)

Allan

• **References:**

◆ **Re: tak quality SCT?**

◇ *From:* Mark D

- Prev by Date: **AP900, Titan or Tak NJP**
- Next by Date: **Re: tak quality SCT?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: tak quality SCT?**
- Next by thread: **Re: tak quality SCT?**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**