

Re: General comment

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.techniques.microscopy/2005-11/msg00099.html>

- *From:* David Littlewood <david@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 Nov 2005 15:39:51 +0000
-

In article <ToOdnTTeVJlXLh3enZ2dnUVZ_sWdnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxx>, Nick <nickmirro@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes

GTO,

I would ask that you do not reply to my posts anymore.

Nick, some hints to you on how these things work. And please understand, I'm giving you the benefit of the doubt and trying to be helpful.

FIRST: You have posted your question in a public forum; you simply don't have ANY say in who answers your question, or who chooses to join in any follow-up discussion. Period.

SECOND: Your original question was so vague as to be almost meaningless, and you were lucky anyone took the trouble to try to help you at all. You made no attempt to tell us what you were looking for, or what type of work you were trying to do, or what budget you had available.

THIRD: After you followed up and explained that you were looking for a stereo microscope, Gregor's response was considerably more helpful than you had any right to expect, and (so far as I can judge, I am not familiar with those instruments) pretty accurate.

FOURTH: Even if someone's answers are not quite what you are looking for, have the humility to consider the possibility that it might be because you asked the question in a cack-handed manner, not because the responder is an awkward sod. In fact Gregor is a very long-standing poster here, and is generally very knowledgeable and helpful.

I suggest you start again. Telling us what you are trying to achieve would be a good start.

David

Re: General comment

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 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.

Re: General comment

Please just ignore me if I post anything. Thank you.

Nick

"GTO" <gregor_o@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:XtUff.23153\\$do2.5423@xx](mailto:news:XtUff.23153$do2.5423@xx)

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. 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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:yfidnXsuxc0Jlx3eRVn-tA@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

Re: General comment

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_W0QQitemZ7555582727QQcategoryZ48740QQcmdZViewItem

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:8jrvn190a848iqo4pii5q1cq9jlvbmti3a@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

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 w
resellers and manufacturers don't publish sale or list prices.
completely confused and have a very poor idea of what I can affo

If I see one more Labx link on Google, I think I'm going to brea
omething]: - (

Ok. So what do you want to see? Factual responses are true, but
unfortunatly depressing. Been there done that and have done that.

Re: General comment

Basically, I see your post as seeking a \$15K system for \$1800. This is not going to happen. This is not certainly your fault. The scope field is wide and has many nuances. More info on what you seek to do would help us help you. If you want low quality, it will be low cost. If you want high quality it will cost more. So you need to balance your requirements for image results and overall quality versus cost. And the camera factor is a wild card. Personally, I do not think that an SLR is suited to a microscope system. But of course, others may disagree.

Not easy.

Gary Gaugler, Ph.D.
Microtechnics, Inc.
Granite Bay, CA 95746
916.791.8191
gary@microtechnics dot com

--
David Littlewood
.