

Re: Last Question...Please

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2006-04/msg01710.html>

- *From:* "Doink" <skyman102a@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 25 Apr 2006 18:18:30 -0700
-

That's why I was considering other models...you bag the others I mentioned for a LOT less. I'm struggling with "do I need a \$700-800 camera to do what I want?"

Doink

"Stephen Paul" <smarshallpaul@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:vNidnf3eUP5mX9PZnZ2dnUVZ_uudnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Doink wrote:

Why the 300D? I see a lot of quality DSLRs being advertised now---Olympus \$349 Canon S31S \$499 Sony 6MP Cybershot \$399

So what does the 300D have over these?

Other than being a known quantity, I haven't a clue.

The 300D seems well regarded as low noise for astro, but there are those working with other cameras as well.

I haven't researched the models you've listed, but it's important to keep in mind that an SLR (digital or otherwise) historically has a removable lens. Undoubtedly there's no law that says that the marketing geniuses can't decide all of a sudden that DSLR can have a fixed lens as well. ;-)

I think you should stop spinning your wheels and go ahead and jump. There is little to complain about with the 300D. I suppose you could consider the amplifier glow a problem if you want to do 10 minute+ exposures at ISO 200. I believe the 350XT has less of a problem with this.

However, IMO, the image quality you can attain with the 300D stacking 5 minute ISO 400 frames is unlikely to be bested enough to justify twice the price for the 350XT. Also, problems like amplifier glow can be removed using a gradient tool plug-in to PhotoShop CS2.

But most importantly, I think you should keep in mind your original claim that you aren't looking for Hubble class images. :-)

Re: Last Question...Please

-Stephen