

Re: Zhumell vs. Celestron vs. Meade

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2005-06/msg01902.html>

- *From:* james <george@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 24 Jun 2005 21:22:16 GMT
-

Orko

First off none of these scopes on their present mount will be adequate for astrophotography. Low cost scopes tend to save costs by spending less on the mount. For astrophotography one needs a rock solid mount.

Most manufacturers of low tier scopes use half decent optics. From my own experience owning a 144mm and a 150 mm reflector, the 150 mm will reveal better views of the planets and deep space objects. Some of the closer galaxies will look like a dim grey area in the 114 mm scope. Globular clusters the same. In the 150 mm you can start to resolve stars in globular clusters and galaxies look a bit more than a grey patch in the sky.

Two of the scopes that you have chosen appears to be short tube reflectors that may or maynot have a secondary lens to lengthen the focal length. The Zhumell seems to be a full length. Short tube with correctors to lengthen focal length are less desirable than the full length reflector. Simply do to the fact that the primary mirror will be spherical and all imperfections are attempted to be corrected in a lens just inside the focuser. This arrangement may yield poor astrophotography in these scopes.

IF this is your intention to buy one of these then the Zhumell seems the best of the three. I am unfamiliar with the mount or the optics of this brand so it becomes buyer beware.

I have also found that equatorial mounts are more difficult to setup for the beginner than the dobsonian mounts reflectors. They may not lead to photography but they are easier to use and that helps reduce frustrations and promotes better learning of the sky. Learning the skies and what you can and cannot see is a huge task for a beginner. Simplifying the setup goes a long way to relieving frustration and enhancing enjoyment of observing.

james

Re: Zhumell vs. Celestron vs. Meade

On 23 Jun 2005 16:29:41 -0700, "OrkoPolo" <orko.polo@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

>Hello,
>
>Being new to the astronomy community, I am just purchasing a telescope
>and have about \$200 USD to spare.
>
>The models I have narrowed down are:
>
>Celestron FirstScope 114 EQ Short Newtonian Reflector
>http://www.celestron.com/prod_pgs/tel/fs114eqs.htm
>
>Zhumell Eclipse 114 with Motor Drive
><http://zhumell.com/html/detail.asp?PID=21576>
>
>Meade 114EQ-AST Short Tube EQ Reflector
>http://www.meade.com/starterscopes/eq_series.html
>
>I picked these out of several dozen because of their specs and claims
>of good quality viewing of clusters, nebulae, lunar, and planetary
>bodies. The Zhumell model seems packed with features, and comes with
>the motor, but I have no idea on the quality and durability of their
>products. Meade and Celestron have been around for a long time, but
>I'm foggy on the pros and cons of each of these.
>
>As a side note, I will be learning the stars with my 6 year old
>daughter, and would like the ability to photograph in the near future
>as well so we can document our journey ;-)
>
>Could I please get a few opinions on these manufacturers, their
>durability and optic quality, and most importantly... the overall
>customer service experience? I'm looking to buy this in a couple of
>weeks, and have prices of \$149 (Meade), \$159 (Celestron), and \$199
>(Zhumell).
>
>Thanks in advance!

• **References:**

◆ **Zhumell vs. Celestron vs. Meade**

◇ *From:* OrkoPolo

- Prev by Date: **Re: Mosquitoes and Observatories**
- Next by Date: **Re: Space waste won't be completed**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Zhumell vs. Celestron vs. Meade**
- Next by thread: **NASA job to keep certain firms in business?**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**

◆ *Thread*