

Re: Scope Quality Question

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.techniques.microscopy/2005-04/msg00104.html>

- *From:* "GTO" <gregor_o@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 23 Apr 2005 01:52:27 GMT
-

Thanks. Since when are Swift scopes sold? I wonder if they were better in the past.

Gregor

"Kevin Cunningham" <smskjd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news: 4eae.11012\\$sp3.6911@xx](mailto:news:4eae.11012$sp3.6911@xx)

>

> "GTO" <gregor_o@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

> [news:75%9e.1880\\$zX7.663@xx](mailto:news:75%9e.1880$zX7.663@xx)

>> What scopes are recommended by this group?

>>

>> There are those, who proclaim that everything besides Zeiss, Leitz (now

>> Leica), Nikon or Olympus is junk. And there are those who recommend the

>> "big" names in microscopy without entirely stepping other scopes into the

>> ground.

>>

>> You are asking about the differences between a \$500 and \$5000 scope, one

>> made by Swift and the other one made by, for instance, Olympus.

>>

>> I will now assume that your Swift is as well built as my old PZO from

>> 1975. So, it is not junk and actually useful for microscopy.

>>

>> What would you realize when working with your new \$5000 toy:

>>

>> 1) You have less money left on your bank account.

>> 2) If you are married, your wife will purchase shoes for an additional

>> \$4500 just to compensate for your crazy expenditure.

>> 3) All your microscopy friends don't talk with you anymore since your

>> scope is better (see below).

>> 4) You are too much afraid of really using it since you would never be

>> able to pay for repairs (...just kidding!).

>> 5) You are always cleaning the scope and believe that with extensive

>> cleaning you actually add value until you realize that you actually

>> degrade optical performance through excessive cleaning.

>> 6) Every gear works precise and smooth. It's ergonomical and you just

>> feel the stability and comfort when working with your new \$5000 toy. You

>> just have to look at it and your heart glows.

>> 7) The illumination (including condenser) is far better.

Re: Scope Quality Question

>> 8) The optics has more contrast and, if you purchased more expensive
>> gears, has also more resolution.
>> 9) You can expand the scope (if you have some money left or win in the
>> lottery!).
>> 10) You can mount a heavier camera on the frame and your stage does not
>> start to drift when attaching a phase–slider condenser.
>>
>> Yes, you can see and feel a difference.
>>
>> BTW, stay away from the entry level scopes of the big names. If you want
>> to save a bundle, embrace the used market patiently. Or just stick with
>> your Swift if you are happy with it.
>>
>> Gregor
>>
>> "Charles" <ckraft@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:1ftg61553ntbai7v4i7n6jre5jq15uvgmh@xxxxxxxxxxx
>>> years ago I bought a Swift microscope. It 9is apparently one of the
>>> Chinese brands.
>>>
>>> What am I missing? what difference would I see with one of the scopes
>>> recommended in this group.
>>>
>>> I'm strictly an amateur, no training at all.
>>>
>>>
>>> —
>>> Charles
>>>
>>> Does not play well with others.
>>
> As always a good post! The big problem with Swift is it doesn't
> manufacture a thing. They come up with what they want and they ask
> vendors to bid on it. For some *&^%\$ reason I worked on a bunch of
> Swifts. It was plain as day that one group was made by one company and
> the others by a second company. All of them had the same model
> designation.
>
> Kevin Cunningham
> SMS
>

-
- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ *Re: Scope Quality Question*
 - ◇ *From: Charles*

- **References:**

- ◆ **Scope Quality Question**
◇ From: Charles
- ◆ **Re: Scope Quality Question**
◇ From: GTO
- ◆ **Re: Scope Quality Question**
◇ From: Kevin Cunningham

- Prev by Date: **Re: WTB Long Working Distance Micro/macroscope**
- Next by Date: **Re: Scope Quality Question**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Scope Quality Question**
- Next by thread: **Re: Scope Quality Question**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**