

Re: General comment

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.techniques.microscopy/2005-11/msg00069.html>

- *From:* "GTO" <gregor_o@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 20 Nov 2005 21:29:56 GMT
-

nickmirro:

I am terribly sorry but I will not get brushed aside by you who seems to refuse to do your homework before you start posting in this group. – Wake up, read books and get realistic with your requirements at your 1,800 budget. Remember, microscopy is not just an attachment to a hobby photographer's equipment!

But of course, you do not know where to get free information about what you are looking for. Right? My mistake. So, read some of these pages first <http://micro.magnet.fsu.edu/primer/index.html>

BTW, welcome to this newsgroup where everybody has a voice! It is up to every individual to decide when one wants to stop participating in a thread. Statements like " I would ask that you do not reply to my posts anymore" and then start writing tons of silly statements isn't going to sound convincing. Don't you think so?

Please feel free to continue this discussion ;-)

Gregor

PS: Do you also have a real e-mail address?

"Nick" <nickmirro@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:ToOdnTTeVJ1XLh3enZ2dnUVZ_sWdnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> GTO,
>
> I would ask that you do not reply to my posts anymore.
>
>
> FIRST: You come across as very bright but for some reason are not getting
> the jist of any of my posts.
>
> (What I was hoping for)
>
> Feedback and friendly comments (+ or -) regarding the inexpensive units
> that

Re: General comment

> I posted.
>
> (What you posted)
>
> 1. A response that wrongly suggests and focuses on the idea that – I am
> under the impression – I can get a complete Nikon setup for \$1800. My
> estimation is that you are in the business of bashing and have found this
> specific issue a potential vulnerability.
>
> 2. Suggestion that I am not considering macro photography as an
> alternate.
> Currently, I use Canon L lenses and have a variety of extension tubes,
> teleconverters and multielement diopters. This macro photography setup,
> which is its primary use, cost over 10k. I am quite experienced in this
> area and cannot see it as a cost effective or practical alternative. It
> is
> not a good platform to observe from and isn't a less expensive way to get
> high quality optics.
>
>
> SECOND: I find that your comments are condescending:
>
> "get realistic"
>
> "Most stereozooms are designed for an observer using both eyes and not for
> a
> camera stuck onto one
> eyepiece only."
>
>
> Regarding your follow-up post, I admit that I posted a similar question on
> the Yahoo hobby group. You caught me. I've learned my lesson. If it
> doesn't go through you, it is of limited or questionable value.
>
> Please just ignore me if I post anything. Thank you.
>
> Nick
>
>
>
> "GTO" <gregor_o@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> [news:XtUff.23153\\$dO2.5423@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:XtUff.23153$dO2.5423@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>> That's the wrong question. The SMZ-1000 is a stereoscopic zoom microscope
>> that is part of an entire system. Like the SMZ-800, it consists of a
>> zooming body (from US pricelist 2002, just the SMZ-800 zooming body was
>> \$1,314) and your choice of oculars, illuminators, stand, viewing body
>> and,
>> last but not least, objective. You can put a combination together that
>> costs more than 10k or less. But for \$1,800 you will not even come close
>> to the new price of this scope. Get realistic. If you want to use an SLR
>> to do some photomacrography, get a decent macro lens with focusing rail.

Re: General comment

Re: General comment

>> If you need more magnification, buy a second hand scope on eBay (e.g. a
>> good old B&L) and live with its limitations. It will do ok. The SMZ-1000
>> is an expensive scope for professionals working for the industry (deep
>> pockets!). You may get a good one used. But I doubt that you get it for
>> less than 5k if it's a working system.

>>
>> Gregor

>> "Nick" <nickmirro@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:yfidnXsuxc0Jlx3eRVn-tA@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>>> Well this is eye opening. \$15k? Well actually thats depressing. Maybe
>>> I should clarify that I could do without the imaging ability initially.
>>> It just needs to be an upgrade possibility. I am now also will to fork
>>> over up to \$2500 and take something used. Here are some inexpensive
>>> zooms that I found tonight but I am unsure as to quality and usefulness.
>>> Any comments?

>>>
>>>

>>> Wild M5A Stereo
>>> <http://www.sherwooddallas.com/usedmicroscopes.html>

>>>
>>> Meiji EMZ-5TR
>>> http://www.professionalmicroscopes.com/EM_series_Meiji.html

>>>
>>> Carton NSZT-70SBF-SL
>>> <http://www.optekusa.com/nsz70family.htm>

>>>
>>> Olympus SZ III-TR Trinocular
>>> http://www.mcbinst.com/A_Stereomicroscopes.htm

>>>
>>> ULTIMATE (brand?) 3.35X-90X ZOOM

>>>
>>> http://cgi.ebay.com/ULTIMATE-3-35X-90X-ZOOM-MICROSCOPE-W-USB-PC-CAMERA_W0QQitemZ7555

>>>
>>> Just to satisfy my curiosity, does anyone know what a Nikon SMZ 1000
>>> lists for?

>>>
>>> Nick

>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>

>>> "Gary G" <see.signature@bottom> wrote in message
>>> news:8jrvn190a848iqo4pii5q1cg9jlvbmti3a@xxxxxxxxxxx

>>>> On Sat, 19 Nov 2005 21:11:34 -0600, "Nick" <nickmirro@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
>>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>>Its really, really hard for a beginner to pick out a new scope when
>>>>>resellers and manufacturers don't publish sale or list prices. I am
>>>>>completely confused and have a very poor idea of what I can afford.

>>>>>

Re: General comment

◇ *From:* Nick

- Prev by Date: ***Re: General comment***
- Next by Date: ***Re: General comment***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: General comment***
- Next by thread: ***Re: General comment***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***