

Re: S&T C-6 Review

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2006-06/msg01606.html>

- *From:* "Shelldigger" <lilc01f@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 28 Jun 2006 06:06:48 -0700
-

I agree, reviews in S&T and Astronomy have a generalized feel overall. There is plenty of yapping about this n that but no real down and dirty details. They seem to tapdance around any real issues. Reading these reviews is like having Chinese takeout, good stuff, but I need more.

I guess if I put myself in their shoes, Id not want to bite the hand that feeds me either.

Good thing we have the internet for more information. I would like to see a more organized approach for testing optics, be they scopes or ep's. There has to be a way of doing this that removes objectivity and includes the all of the performance issues we want to hear...

Charles

Doink wrote:

OK, I've brought this up before and it started a flame war. Let's try to stay cool....

I read the reviews of telescopes in S&T and am always disappointed that they don't do more rigorous testing or provide some real. The review of the C-6 is no exception. There's a bunch of "writing" about the mount and the "optically excellent 6x30 finder" and then the write states the OTA has "excellent optics". He determines this because he can see the Cassini Division in Saturn. Neat. Those observations are subject to numerous factors; seeing comes to mind. Why don't they bench test the optics? I'd like the stats, not the impressions of an employee of the company paid to sell the stuff.

Doink