

THE ACCURATERELOADING.COM BIG BORE FORUMS



[Accuratereloading.com](#) [The Accurate Reloading Forums](#) [THE ACCURATE RELOADING.COM FORUMS](#) [Rifles](#) [Big Bores](#) [Terminal Bullet Performance](#)

Page 1 ... [58](#) [59](#) [60](#) **[61](#)** [62](#) [63](#) [64](#) ... [304](#)

Moderators: GeorgeS

[Go](#) [New](#) [Find](#) [Notify](#) [Tools](#) [Reply](#)

Terminal Bullet Performance

[Login/Join](#)



michael458

One of Us



posted 01 May 2010 17:50

[Hide Post](#)

Now for all the 470 owners that would like to take your 470s for deer and such, here just might be an option for you. This test at 2180 seems to be right on the border line of jacket/core separation. Might be a good idea to slow it down to around 2100 fps or certainly can do at less for better performance!



<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>


The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



Air Rifling

You may have accidentally discovered the secret to shooting mono-metal solids in old English doubles, eh?.... Turn the bearing surface exactly the same diameter as the bore...



[/QUOTE]



Michael458,

I think it is a wise decision on your part to restrict your bullet testing to FN solids and soft points. Your results closely resemble the results on elephants and buff. Maybe not in magnitude but in comparisons among different bullet brands. For some unknown reason RN steel jacketed solids behave in a most erratic manner compared to what we see in the same species. That has diverted attention from the more valuable comparisons on SN and FN solids.

465H&H



michael458
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 01:53

Hide Post

quote:

Originally posted by Low Wall:

Air Rifling

You may have accidentally discovered the secret to shooting mono-metal solids in old English doubles, eh?.....



Turn the bearing surface exactly the same diameter as the bore.....

[/QUOTE]

Low Wall



You may very well have a good point! I think they would certainly be double safe!
Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



RIP
one of us

posted 02 May 2010 03:23

Hide Post



Doc M,

When I make it down to Myrtle Beach for a visit, I'll bring your parchment PhD diploma.
As you continue to expand the science of terminal ballistics, we are all reminded that doin' good ain't got no end, it is an end in itself. 😊

Alf, often teased us with the question, is spin necessary for an FN penetrator?
I wonder if he had any study results he was holding back?

Wowzer! Your "Big Five" 470 Capstick barrel from the Winchester Custom Shop is way loose!!!
Just get a lead roundball for 50-cal muzzleloader, and use a 1/2" wooden dowel and a mallet to tap the ball into the muzzle end of the barrel. Then tap it back out with a 3/8" dowel from the breech end.
You can't hurt that barrel.
Measure the slugged roundball with your calipers. That's the groove diameter.

I am guessing you have .474" land/bore and .482" groove. 😊

The twist rate of 1:10" can be read from the engraving on that TBSh.

Like 416Tanzan,
I think I see about a 1:100" twist rate created by the superficial scratching of the bullets that are engraved less than or equal to .0005", skidding along your barrel.

Keep up the good work.
I have not digested it all yet.
Good idea in banning all roundnose solids from testing.



I banned them from the Iron WaterBoard Buffalo Bullet Interrogator too.

Replica of Old Betsy "Presented to David Crockett at Nashville, Tenn. May 5, 1822"

Sorry.

This Image is currently
Unavailable



A 40-caliber/.395 roundball Squirrel&Bear Rifle!!!
JackPhantomHuckleberryHoundDog, RIP



michael458
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 04:07

[Hide Post](#)

Hey RIP

I will be looking very much forward to receiving my diploma, and presented by you would be a great honor for me! Not only that, but would welcome the visit!

As for spin and penetration, well certainly in this case there is zero doubt that a 470 500 gr Barnes Banded is capable of stabilizing itself during terminal penetration, and I suspect strongly that is a function of proper meplat size. I suspect strongly too that this is a good reason that Mike's tests with his Nitro and the North Forks are so successful in a less than optimum twist! With the 70% meplat for caliber, I bet it would also self stabilize! While this is quite a revelation and unexpected, I would still hedge my bets and would prefer a bit of twist and engraving for some spin to keep it stabilized if it should hit something during penetration that might "de-stabilize" it! Without doubt however, a lesson to remember, and furthers the education a good bit. I am getting closer to believing that 65% meplat for caliber is getting there!

Yeah, these barrels need to be slugged for sure. I suspect that your guess is correct on bore/groove. I think Winchester just either ordered the wrong barrels, or sent the wrong barrels and did not know the difference.

We missed you this week, suppose you have been busy, but there is quite a bit to catch up on!

The various round nose solids are just not stable, do too much damage to the facilities, and are way too much of a waste of time trying to get the jug heads to understand what the real deal is. They are so predictable that testing is rather much a futile effort. Time can be far more productive spent elsewhere, not to mention the waste of materials, primers, powder on soon to be obsolete items. I suppose that some will continue to make a few for nostalgic purposes. HEH!

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



JPK
one of us

posted 02 May 2010 08:18

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by ozhunter:

JPK,

The .425 and the two 470s loaded with Woodleigh FMJs worked flawlessly with five brain shots and one heart shot.

This report from OzHunter, who recently returned from a four elephant hunt, ought to be eye opening and insightful for FN and wet paper zealots.

JPK

Free 500grains

Posts: **4900** | Location: **Chevy Chase, Md.** | Registered: **16 November 2004**



capoward
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 08:45

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Originally posted by ozhunter:

JPK,

The .425 and the two 470s loaded with Woodleigh FMJs worked flawlessly with five brain shots and one heart shot.

This report from OzHunter, who recently returned from a four elephant hunt, ought to be eye opening and insightful for FN and wet paper zealots.

JPK

Sorry no...nothing eye opening or insightful at all. I guess either you either ignored or didn't read my post yesterday or you'd have noticed this as it was also posted in red text:

quote:

Originally posted by michael458: [Page 13 (Posted 19 January 2010 15:25)]
Glen


Well, I would not go so far as condemning the RN, I just think overall the FN does better at most things. I normally get into a lot of trouble over this RN/FN discussion. I know myself, that a RN performs better in the field than it does in this test. This is a pretty difficult test for the RN. But as stated, the FN bullets do well in the test, and in the field. I have used a lot of RN bullets, elephant, hippo, and buffalo. All dead! So they were all successful and accomplished the mission at hand. I suppose if one has a rifle that will not feed a good FN one could choose a RN. Personally I would not go to the field with a rifle that would not feed a reasonable FN to begin with. But that is just me.

All proponents of RN FMJ or solids have had success in the field, as far as they can tell. So who am I to say!

Michael

As you can see Michael acknowledged back in January that RN performance in the field is better than their performance in the bullet testing box.

My perception however is that the bullet test box is somewhat tougher on bullets than are live animals...with rare exception.

Jim 
"Life's hard; it's harder if you're stupid"
John Wayne

Posts: **4954** | Location: **Central Texas** | Registered: **15 September 2007**





quote:

As you can see Michael acknowledged back in January that RN performance in the field is better than their performance in the bullet testing box.

Interesting considering the discussions that have been had in this thread and the other one.

Which apart from the odd bullet, seems to back up what those of us who use RN have said about performance in the field.

[QUOTE]

My perception however is that the bullet test box is somewhat tougher on bullets than are live animals...with rare exception.

[QUOTE]

Tougher as in harder or tougher as in penetration / straight line performance ?

I doubt you mean "tougher" as in bone tough / hardness.



michael458
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 15:16

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by 500N:
[QUOTE]As you can see Michael acknowledged back in January that RN performance in the field is better than their performance in the bullet testing box.

Interesting considering the discussions that have been had in this thread and the other one.

Which apart from the odd bullet, seems to back up what those of us who use RN have said about performance in the field.

quote:

My perception however is that the bullet test box is somewhat tougher on bullets than are live animals...with rare exception.[QUOTE]

Tougher as in harder or tougher as in penetration / straight line performance ?

I doubt you mean "tougher" as in bone tough / hardness.

500N

No not tough like bone or hard material. Tougher than animal tissue because it is a solid aqueous material, providing consistent pressures on the driving end, which is the nose profile on solids during terminal penetration. Animal tissue is not a solid, nor consistent material.

Tanzan brought up again what I have been saying all along a few posts ago. 14 inches in test medium is not 14 inches in animal tissue. Tumbling and veering will and does occur in animal tissue, but for the most part, most of the time (not all) it is after the bullet has reached vitals and done it's job.

One can correlate data back and forth if one has enough experience to do so. But it takes test experience in test medium in addition to taking animals in the field. All indications are from my experience and others with the solids is that one gets at least 35% deeper penetration with a FN solid in animal tissue than what one will get in this test medium. From others data concerning RN solids the percentage of overall penetration would be about the same with them. With conventional expanding bullets the percentage is much higher running from 75-80% to double the amount of penetration in animal tissue than in the test medium. I have enough data on conventional expanding bullets to confirm this many times. Non Conventional expanding bullets I don't have near enough data on at this time to say with authority, but it does look like a good bit above 100% more penetration in animal tissue than this test medium. Non Conventional bullets tend to penetrate far beyond conventional expanding bullets of the same weight.

So for the RN crowd, a typical RN will normally penetrate 25-30 inches straight in this test medium, to a distance of around 40 + inches before stopping or leaving the test medium. As Tanzan pointed out in worst cast the bullet is at lets say 35 inches on average being about 2 inches off course, which would give roughly 45-50 inches of reasonable penetration in animal tissue. Which in many cases is exactly what you guys are reporting.

Now that information is not new, I have said this from the start, from the very beginning. Most RN proponents choose not to read or understand exactly what I have been saying.

Another point to consider is that a good portion of the elephants being shot successfully with the RN crowd are smallish tuskless elephants that certainly present little challenge for any sort of bullet. I know, I shot one and they are quite small compared to a full size large bull, which I have also shot two large big bodied bulls. There is a big difference in the two. In fact some of the posters here, their heads would present far more challenge to a bullet than what a small tuskless elephant would! HEH! Oh, and for the record both the big bulls and the small tuskless I shot were with "Drum Roll" please, the old Round Nose Barnes Solids, 500 gr RN Barnes at 2250 fps in 458 Lott, loaded 82/RL 15 and a Fed 215 primer, in a Winchester M70 of course! The very few other elephants I have shot were medium size bulls, still far larger than a smallish tuskless. Before the great bwans of the world jump my case, yes I am sure there are larger tuskless out there and of course all of you have shot those and not the smaller ones. I shot the smaller one as the hunter that wounded it could not pursue, so I sorted it out. My good old Barnes Round Nose that has now been THANKFULLY discontinued did a fine job of killing the hell out of it too! But that don't mean there is not a better bullet to be used, and today there are many such better bullets, all of them with a Flat Nose profile!

500N, I repeat all of the above for your interest, but should you choose to go and review some in the last 60+ pages on this subject you will see pretty much the same repeated more than a few times.

Please, anyone that might read this, if I have not been clear, or you do not understand, please point it out, OH, someone objective only, obviously I am not sure the message gets across to everyone?

So in answer to your question 500N, harder and tougher for a RN to penetrate straight, not harder and tougher on the bullet construction.

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



500N
One of Us

posted 02 May 2010 15:25

[Hide Post](#)

Michael

Good stuff.

You certainly back up your argument / discussions, unlike some armchair forumites (that is a generalization but often true).

Posts: **3191** | Location: **Victoria, Australia** | Registered: **01 March 2007**



michael458
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 16:09

[Hide Post](#)

500N

Along the same exact lines, during this entire 60+ pages of material there is never once do I say or even indicate that a round nose solid will not take animals because it veers off course in the test medium.

That is a "fabricated LIE" by some to further enhance their personal agenda.

My stance is what it has always been, and will continue to be forever more. A properly stabilized flat nose solid penetrates deeper and straighter in all the test work, it does this in the field also and thus has the most "Potential" to succeed in the field.

Now just because it has a flat nose does not mean it is superior. We have learned a great deal over the last few months, and are continuing to learn, despite setbacks from some more argumentative individuals, who are not involved to learn anything at all. We have learned that Nose Profile is of course #1 but only the beginning. The size of the meplat in relation to the bullets diameter is very important to stabilization. In particular tied directly to twist rate of the barrel. A slower twist rate will require the meplat to be a larger percentage of caliber than what a faster twist rate can stabilize during terminal penetration. In Mikes test with his 1:18.9 twist rate he points this out very clearly. The North Forks with it's 70% meplat for caliber stabilizes during terminal penetration with the less than optimum twist rate. The Hornady DGS is by memory 55-57% meplat of caliber, and it is just not quite getting there, it is trying hard, and does perform better than the RN in the tests, but just not quite stable enough to match the North Fork. Therefore in that caliber the Hornady DGS would be better served and perform better, being more terminally stable with a faster twist rate!

So we see that Nose Profile-meplat size and percentage of caliber-and twist rate are very important factors, and I believe the top three factors required to work together in many cases to give successful straight line penetration. Meplat size % of caliber can override twist rate if that meplat size is large enough, right now I believe at least a 60-65% meplat size of caliber is required to do that. Twist rate can override a less than optimum meplat size, below 60% of caliber, a faster twist rate is required to stabilize during terminal penetration!

To me other important factors that can effect penetration, maybe more depth of penetration than stabilization are velocity, construction and SD.

In this entire thread you will see many times that I state something to the effect of the following concerning the test work done;

My view on this is that if any bullet fails to provide results in the test medium that it is very possible the "Potential" is present for it to also fail to provide results in the field. Not every single time, but the "potential" is there. If a bullet is successful in the test work then there is greater "potential" for it to be successful in the field, when comparing one bullet against the other bullet. This does not mean if a bullet is 100% failure in the tests that it will be 100% failure in the field and just the other way around with success! In the field, there are 1000s of variables that come into play, this is why we test to remove those same variables so that proper comparisons can be made.

There is not one sentence, one phrase, not one time will you find in now 61 pages of material where I state that because a round nose bullet fails, veers off course, tumbles in the test medium that it will do the same 100% of the time in animal tissue too. Not one time in this entire thread will you find that I state because a round nose solid veers off course in the test medium that it also veers off course in animal tissue and will not kill elephants, buffalo, or hippo. It is not there, I have never stated such, and never will. That would be a little stupid would it not, since I have killed the hell out of elephant, buffalo and hippo, and a few other things with round nose solids myself! I am not stupid!

Any statement otherwise made by a very small few is a "fabricated Lie" to enhance their own egos or agendas.

Thanks 500N, I appreciate it!

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



465H&H
One of Us

posted 02 May 2010 19:44

[Hide Post](#)

Michael458,

Thank you for clearly stating your views on RN solids in game in your last two posts. I think there was some misunderstanding on your views in this regard from your posts. That you had good luck with the Barnes Hemispherical RN mono-metal solid on eles possibly the worst solid ever designed (along with the A2 RN mono-metal and RWS solid) is a testament to how even the worst sometimes perform admirably.

465h&H

Posts: **5686** | Location: **Nampa, Idaho** | Registered: **10 February 2005**



michael458
One of Us



posted 02 May 2010 20:52

[Hide Post](#)

My Exact Statements in this thread. What I have said above is nothing new.

Page 1

quote:

As stated there is no test medium that will exactly duplicate animal flesh. This is true, and rather "common" knowledge. Most hunters never test a bullet or load except by shooting game in the field. Shooting animals in the field is never a satisfactory way to conduct true and proper test work, no two shots can be alike, one may hit bone, another soft tissue, one straight on, one at an angle. This does not mean one cannot learn from field tests, quite the contrary, but this is not the arena in which to begin test work! I do not wish to go to the field "ignorant" of how any of my equipment may or may not perform, I would much prefer to have some prior knowledge of how a bullet may or may not work long before possible costly, and unethical "failures" occur in the field.

quote:

Again, for those who cannot comprehend the written word---No Test Medium Exactly Duplicates Animal Tissue! However, proper test medium will give one reasonable comparisons not only between different bullets, but will give us some insight into how a bullet may or may not perform in the field. There are many test mediums that can and have been used, Ductseal, Clay, Wooden Boards, Gelatin, wet news print, water, sand, dirt, and probably other materials I can't think of right now. Many years ago I tried some different mediums but settled on wet news print as it was readily available, reasonably easy to work with, and I believe a reasonable medium in which to put reasonable stress on a bullet for test purposes. I also decided that this would be the only medium that I would test with as I could record and keep data concerning performance, I could see wound channels, measure penetration, retain fired bullets for study. By gathering this data one could later correlate this back to findings in the field on animal tissue. Now one can do this with nearly any reasonable medium, but one has to stay with that medium and collect quite a bit of data over the years to be able to correlate the two. By "reasonable medium" I mean a test medium that will have some relevance to what you intend to accomplish in the field on targets you intend to destroy! For instance, if you are a hunter, then why would you want to test on cold rolled steel test medium??? If

your intentions are to test armor piercing ammo, then by all means you need to test on a steel medium.

quote:

There are no absolutes in our shooting world. There are far more variables to consider in the field with animal tissue and one would be a fool to say that each and every bullet will perform exactly in the field as it does in the test medium. The test medium gives us consistent medium in which to work with, it does not have bones (although this can be injected into the mix) it does not have many of the various issues that you will run into in the field. There are no absolutes! But, if one is persistent with collecting proper data, then one is able to "predict" how most bullets may or may not perform in the field, if using a reasonable medium that is pertinent to the field tests.

quote:

Field work and tests on animal tissue is the number one priority, and is without doubt the most important and the one that counts the most. This is where the metal hits the meat, this is the one that can either give you success or failure. But I can tell you this, I would not go to the field to test or shoot animal tissue with zero knowledge of how a bullet may or may not perform. It is pure ignorant and stupid to do so in my opinion.

quote:

There are some people, that believe that no valuable information can be "learned" from doing prior test work in any medium. Those people are "correct"---Those people with that attitude cannot learn anything! In the meantime the rest of us common folks can usually learn a great deal from test work done prior to field trails.

quote:

I have over the years of doing the test work been fortunate enough to be able to put bullet to animal tissue, and be able to create some "rules of Thumb" to correlate back to the terminal performance tests done with my wet print mix, which for the last 5-6 yrs has consisted of a mix of 65-70% wet news print and 30-35% catalogs/magazine mix. This just happens to coincide with an increase of 30-35% tougher than wet news print alone. The paper of the catalogs/magazines being thicker, glossy, and tougher overall. The following is a "rule of thumb" only, but from bullets recovered from animal tissue I find that one can expect from 80% to 100% more penetration in animal tissue than this wet print mix I use, for expanding bullets. For solid bullets one can expect 30-35% deeper penetration in animal tissue than that of the wet print mix. This data base is continuing to grow each year, as stated I consider it a "rule of thumb" and NOT an absolute! For expanding bullets I have found that a bullet tested in wet print mix expands and reacts very close, very similar, and sometimes indistinguishable from those found in animal tissue. How it expands and performs in the wet print mix is almost identical in every case to what a bullet will look like when recovered from animal tissue. Exceptions being bullets hit by bone.

quote:

I have also stressed some solids with a piece of fiberboard up front (after initial positive tests in wet print mix alone) which is extremely dense, more so than bone, just to see if I could stress the bullet to the point of failure to penetrate properly. If it failed this test--THEN IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE--MIND YOU "POSSIBLE" it could fail in the field. A bullet that could pass all the stress tests, would be very very likely to be successful in the field. However, as stated, there are no absolutes!

quote:

Could 36 inches of ALMOST straight line penetration be enough? Of course, it has been adequate for a 100 yrs--I stated so in a post above. More than enough? Never more than enough with this type. Yes it has worked and will continue to work, but there will always be issues with the POSSIBILITY of the design going off course on the real thing in the real world.

All Of that is on page one, and goes right along with what I just said, nothing new with what I have said today. It has been my stance since 2006, before then I was just as ignorant as most concerning nose profile of solids and straight line penetration, it worked, why bother? Because of all the reasons stated.

PAGE 3

Everything that is posted above on PAGE 1 was reposted and repeated on PAGE 3 Again. In addition to the ones listed below.

quote:

In addition to this point, you do not consider that any animal is not solid, thru and thru muscle? You have some skin, you have some bone, some muscle, some liquid, some air within the cavity, then back out again--no such creature I know of is made of solid muscle thru and thru, solid bone thru and thru. Or even solid liquid thru and thru. Therefore this explains another point the fact that In ALL cases, I get less solid penetration in my wet print/catalog medium than I do with the same bullet in animal tissue. Stated before in this thread, Rule of Thumb only--80-100% more penetration with expanding bullets in animal tissue and 35% more penetration with given solids in animal tissue, than in the mixed medium I use. Again, enough bullets in both to have some correlation between the two. Again, just a Rule of Thumb, there can be exceptions, and there are zero absolutes.

quote:

Now do keep in mind, yes the FN bullets tend to win big time in the lab, if my rifles work with them (and they do--they are Winchesters) then that is what I am going to be shooting in the field--no ifs ands or buts!! That does not mean the RN versions will not work in the field. They have for a century done the job, they can continue to do so. Just means the FN versions are superior, That does not mean the RN versions will not work in the field. They have for a century done the job, they can continue to do so. Just means the FN versions are superior, no questions about that, and that is what I use, and will continue to use. You will continue to get good reports from the field with the RN versions. But if you can shoot the FN solids, then you can be close to certain your bullet will do what is asked of it--They do for me, so I suspect they will for you too!

THIS IS FROM AN IDIOT POSTER

quote:

An example of an erroneous inference you draw from your "tests" in an unrealistic medium is: because RN solid bullets veer consistently in wet newsprint they veer consistently in game.

MY STATEMENT TO THE ONE ABOVE

This is nothing but a blatant lie! I challenge you to find where I state anywhere that "RN solids consistently veer in game" as you say? Find that please, and point it out!

So you see, this is not new!

quote:

michael458
one of us

Posted Nov 8, 9:04 AM Hide Post
Shootaway

Yes, animal tissue from all the data I can gather with solids of all sorts, gives an additional 30-35% penetration than the test medium I use. This is why most RN designs have worked and will continue to work for heavy jobs, elephant, hippo, buffalo. Consider even the 458 Woodleigh FMJ at 31 inches of straight line penetration before going off course, in animal tissue that would give us something along the lines of 44-47 inches penetration in animal tissue. Remember, this is but a correlation between gathered data, there are many considerations in the field that must be taken into account. Rule Of Thumb, and there are no absolutes. But I would have some confidence that one could achieve this with some RN designs.

Michael

PAGE 4

AND ONCE AGAIN MUCH OF PAGE 1 IS REPEATED ON PAGE 4

PAGE 5

quote:

Now the reason I do this is consistency between different bullets. Stated many times no medium can or does represent exact duplicates of animal tissue. However, if we try to be as consistent as possible then over a long period of time, as data collects, it is more possible to compare differences in two different bullets. Also over time as one collects bullets fired into animal tissue, one can begin to "correlate" data, between animal tissue and the test medium. This is exactly what I have been doing over a period of several years. As any reasonable individual can readily see from the many photos I have provided, this data correlates between the two mediums in a fairly consistent basis! No absolutes, by any stretch, but not a bad predictor of future "possibilities"!

It is always good especially concerning solids, to stress a bullet to the extremes at times. For instance if you take two bullets, say two RN designs for example. If one nose design penetrates deeper, and straighter than the other design in the same medium, one might then want to put an adder in the mix to find out at what point the more successful design might be stressed enough to fail, or at least penetrate in a less desirable manner. Now an insert of "steel" is not a reasonable test, as we are not testing armor penetration, however as you mention waxed cardboard, posterboard thin plastic screens would serve a purpose. I tend to go at times a little further, using a 2x4 or even a 4x4 if handy! This really puts some stress on some designs. In even more extreme, put the 2x4 in at angles! More extreme than that, fiberboard, extremely dense material, put in at angles!!!! The only bullet I have put to that extreme fiberboard test was the 510 gr .500 caliber solid I use in the 50 B&M and the 500 MDM. Each time it burned straight thru them and proceeded to penetrate in a straight line to 62 inches of total penetration! It seemed to not even notice the fiberboard inserted at an extreme angle! Now in my conclusions of this, I decided that if this bullet could be stressed to that extreme, and still accomplish the mission, then this bullet had a very very good chance of being successful and accomplishing my mission in the field on animal tissue.

quote:

The jest of the matter is this--while no test medium is equal to animal tissue one can still learn from and use data from doing test work before taking a bullet to the field. What I learned in my test work on this particular bullet was validated in the field on elephant and buffalo. Recently shooting 20 of my own buffalo, and seven others belonging to my hunting partner in Australia I once again validated test work which began on the range in test medium, my test medium. Not only with that same 510 gr .500 caliber solid, but several other bullets in both 500 caliber and 458 caliber. What was successful in the lab, was successful in the field on animal tissue.

NOw all this stated by myself on pages 1 through 5 alone.

This statement Jim found on page 13

quote:

Originally posted by michael458: [Page 13 (Posted 19 January 2010 15:25)]
Glen

Well, I would not go so far as condemning the RN, I just think overall the FN does better at most things. I normally get into a lot of trouble over this RN/FN discussion. I know myself, that a RN performs better in the field than it does in this test. This is a pretty difficult test for the RN. But as stated, the FN bullets do well in the test, and in the field. I have used a lot of RN bullets, elephant, hippo, and buffalo. All dead! So they were all successful and accomplished the mission at hand. I suppose if one has a rifle that will not feed a good FN one could choose a RN. Personally I would not go to the field with a rifle that would not feed a reasonable FN to begin with. But that is just me.

All proponents of RN FMJ or solids have had success in the field, as far as they can tell. So who am I to say!

Michael

MY statement today page 61

quote:

Tanzan brought up again what I have been saying all along a few posts ago. 14 inches in test medium is not 14

inches in animal tissue. Tumbling and veering will and does occur in animal tissue, but for the most part, most of the time (not all) it is after the bullet has reached vitals and done it's job.

One can correlate data back and forth if one has enough experience to do so. But it takes test experience in test medium in addition to taking animals in the field. All indications are from my experience and others with the solids is that one gets at least 35% deeper penetration with a FN solid in animal tissue than what one will get in this test medium. From others data concerning RN solids the percentage of overall penetration would be about the same with them. With conventional expanding bullets the percentage is much higher running from 75-80% to double the amount of penetration in animal tissue than in the test medium. I have enough data on conventional expanding bullets to confirm this many times. Non Conventional expanding bullets I don't have near enough data on at this time to say with authority, but it does look like a good bit above 100% more penetration in animal tissue than this test medium. Non Conventional bullets tend to penetrate far beyond conventional expanding bullets of the same weight.

So for the RN crowd, a typical RN will normally penetrate 25-30 inches straight in this test medium, to a distance of around 40 + inches before stopping or leaving the test medium. As Tanzan pointed out in worst cast the bullet is at lets say 35 inches on average being about 2 inches off course, which would give roughly 45-50 inches of reasonable penetration in animal tissue. Which in many cases is exactly what you guys are reporting.

Now that information is not new, I have said this from the start, from the very beginning. Most RN proponents choose not to read or understand exactly what I have been saying

I am only up to page 7 right now, and was afraid I might loose all that I have here. So I am posting it.

Point being, everything was stated right up front from page 1 and I have to continue to do the exact same statements to those who wish to fabricate something else, that I have never said. Misquotes and fabrications, and flat out blatant lies to further a personal agenda! Go back and read page 1 through 5, it's all right there!

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**





quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:
Michael458,

Thank you for clearly stating your views on RN solids in game in your last two posts. I think there was some misunderstanding on your views in this regard from your posts. That you had good luck with the Barnes Hemispherical RN mono-metal solid on eles possibly the worst solid ever designed (along with the A2 RN mono-metal and RWS solid) is a testement to how even the worst sometimes perform admirably.

465h&H

465HH

You know something, I went back to the very first thread that you and I had a conversation on this exact same subject, nothing every changes does it?

I posted this in a conversation with you 2 yrs ago.

quote:

Boys I think there has to be some sort of misunderstanding here. From the start I stated that the test medium was good for testing one bullet compared to another, that is all. I related the penetration of any said bullet tested in the medium to what I was getting in animal flesh--roughly 30%-35% more in animal flesh and bone than in the test medium. I don't think that I ever said that what will happen in the test medium is what you get on animal flesh. If so it was misspoken and not intentional, and I am not going back to read the book I have written in this thread.

My stand on the issue is this "If a bullet fails on a regular basis in any Test Medium--it is just POSSIBLE that a bullet can fail in the Field" I am not saying it will every single time--Just that the POSSIBILITY is out there! Is that simple enough? If a bullet performs perfectly, or as you desire, on a very regular basis--Then it is just POSSIBLE that it will perform well in the field! Not that there are DIRECT relationships between test medium and real live flesh and bone--there are not.

Test medium gives us a consistent--or fairly consistent way to test one bullet against another. If you recall to have comparisons to real world events I used both Barnes Solid FN bullets as a base line in which to base other conclusions upon--I know what these bullets will do in the field--if other bullets perform close to this, well I figure it is a success. If not, then try something else.

In this same first thread with you and your lapdog I also stated this; this is over two years ago!

quote:

I never said that because it would not work in my tests that it would not work in the world, and further more I said several times that my first 4 elephants were in fact shot with round nose bullets and they are deader than Abe Lincoln is right now! I have the ivory hanging over my fireplace as I write this--shot with round nose bullets

These comments go back to 2008 on this very same subject. SAME OLD SAME. And you can actually sit there and tell me that you are happy that I finally made my statements clear and that there was a misunderstanding?

To some it may seem that I am upset, I am not, I really can't understand how in 2 yrs time, my comments listed above that anyone cannot understand my stand on the issue that has been questioned for 1000s of typed words? Frustrated? Oh Yes without doubt. Maybe I am not clear, but you would think if you repeat something enough that somewhere along the line it would sink in.

Well, for any future reference I have it above where you now state that you do understand now anyway! I am quite sure your lapdog does not, and who cares anyway. I know I don't. But to be honest I really expected a little more from you. I have to say I am a bit disappointed.

Michael

Michael458,

I think you are being too rough on me. I have understood your position for a long time and our phone conversations will confirm that we have pretty much agreed on almost all aspects of the problem. When I said what I did I was stating that it should now be abundantly clear to those that **don't understand** your position. If they don't now understand then they are a lost cause. Try not to be so testy and take a compliment when it is honestly given!

465H&H



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 00:49

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Michael458,

I think you are being too rough on me. I have understood your position for a long time and our phone conversations will confirm that we have pretty much agreed on almost all aspects of the problem. When I said what I did I was stating that it should now be abundantly clear to those that don't understand your position. If they don't now understand then they are a lost cause. Try not to be so testy and take a compliment when it is honestly given!

465H&H

465HH

Very well then, I might have been too rough on you, and it seems it is I who may have misunderstood that you ACTUALLY MEANT OTHERS and not yourself. With that being the case, then my apology by all rights!

And I am actually pleased that I misunderstood the post, this way I do not have to reevaluate my opinion of you, and no longer need to be as disappointed.

My position has changed little since 2006 and has remained constant, as has yours. What has changed a good bit is some of the things that have been added to the knowledge we have gained here. I certainly feel like I have a better understanding of several factors concerning these matters over the last few months!

With that said, thank you.

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



Karl
one
of
us

posted 03 May 2010 03:37

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:
Everyone on the DR board should see this.
These pic are worth a 1,000 words x 1,000





Boomy

It's a waste of time with the majority, this is why I do not post there and some other places here. Big Bores is mostly shooters that understand the concept without emotional and nostalgic attachments to bullets.

Michael of all the posters here you are at least as emotional as anyone-I think you spent about 2000 words on my 30 word posts and assumed I am doing this, and not reading that, and highlighted this is read etc etc 😊

Let me clarify a few points.

I am not part of any terrible roundnose brigade and personally don't give a fuck what penetrates best. you tell me its flat nose, fine. My current personal crusade is pointy bullets on Taliban, so you guys have the liberty to enjoy your hobbies. 500grains has already drummed FN into us anyway over the last 10 years or so.

I logged on to one page and saw a particular bullet test I thought was shit, and still do. If the 45-70 marlin with FN beats the 577 nitro with RN regularly, this needs explaining.

I'd also like to see how the old bore guns (12, 10, 8, 4 bore etc) do with hard roundballs by comparison in your box.... Since the whole reason the nitro expresses came about was to replace the poor and unreliable penetration of the bore guns.

As to the guy above who mentioned how many times Sullivan was charged... he stopped all the charges.

Anyway the good news for me is the 'little' 577 cape gun I am thinking of building with 650gn solids is going to do okay with flatpoint bullets apparently.

Regards,
Karl.



srose
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 06:23

[Hide Post](#)

I don't think anyone ever said the 45-70 with a flatnose beats a 577 regulary. I am a great lover of the 45-70 and have used it alot for over 30 years but I know the 577 surely has more thump. As for Woodleigh roundnose solids I have had good success with them on buffalo and one elephant. As a matter of fact I posted that I had better luck with them than the new Trophy bonded sledgehammer solid. I had one of these turn sideways on a buffalo and failed to penetrate on a broadside shot at 20 yards. My Woodleighs kicked up dirt on the far side. However I have had the pleasure of meeting Michael and doing some testing with him and I am very impressed with all of his work. It sure opened my eyes to the difference between a roundnose and flatnose solid. I have had only two Woodleigh solids stay in an animal and those were insurance shots into the chest of my elephant and were found in the back at the top of the hips. Plenty of penetration but after seeing how RN solids act in the testing compared to the flatnose I will not shoot RN again. After thinking about it I know that those two bullets should not have ended up in the back at the angle I was shooting into the elephant. Not all bullets will react the same way and I think Michael has proven that nose profile make a lot of difference. No one really knows what a bullet will do when it enters an animal. There are way too many variables involved. I think Michaels tests just help us all know what certain bullets are likely to do. I think everyone that reads these posts are lucky to have people like Michael that are willing to do such extensive testing not for profit or reconition but for the benefit of others. I have been very impressed with all of the data that has been collected and posted. There has been a wealth of information posted and again we are all lucky to be able to make our own judgment on what we have read. Everyone has there own opinions and should not be upset at what other people think but that is human nature.

As for Sullivan stopping all the charges, I never said he didn't have guts to stand and face them. I was just making a comment that he seems to be charged a lot and was wondering why.

Sam

Posts: 2823 | Location: NC | Registered: 08 July 2006



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 15:57

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Michael of all the posters here you are at least as emotional as anyone-I think you spent about 2000 words on my 30 word posts and assumed I am doing this, and not reading that, and highlighted this is read etc etc 😊

Let me clarify a few points.

I am not part of any terrible roundnose brigade and personally don't give a fuck what penetrates best. you tell me its flat nose, fine. My current personal crusade is pointy bullets on Taliban, so you guys have the liberty to enjoy your hobbies. 500grains has already drummed FN into us anyway over the last 10 years or so.

I logged on to one page and saw a particular bullet test I thought was shit, and still do. If the 45-70 marlin with FN beats the 577 nitro with RN regularly, this needs explaining.

I'd also like to see how the old bore guns (12, 10, 8, 4 bore etc) do with hard roundballs by comparison in your box.... Since the whole reason the nitro expresses came about was to replace the poor and unreliable penetration of the bore guns.

As to the guy above who mentioned how many times Sullivan was charged... he stopped all the charges.

Anyway the good news for me is the 'little' 577 cape gun I am thinking of building with 650gn solids is going to do okay with flatpoint bullets apparently.

Regards,
Karl.[/QUOTE]

Karl

I am quite sure your comment about 2000 words vs 30 words was off the cuff, but looking a bit more carefully at that comment, my direct comments to you were 631 words, yours 178. Oh, no I did not count them actually, just used a word count program is all, about 1 second of effort. Indirectly not to you but all concerning the subject another 735 words. 😊

I can't attest to what 45/70 test you are speaking of, but there have been many bullets tested in 45/70. None of which have been comparisons to 577 Nitro. Emotional no, a little testy and impatient absolutely YES! WHY? Because all the answers for your demands are here, you must just read some more and not demand that I explain things many times over. I don't operate well with demands! Requests are done with pleasure, demanding something needs explaining when the answers are here, nahhhh, you could do a little more reading on your own, or make a proper request!

I would be happy to test old bore guns with roundballs (I think) but I have neither of those available and since this is really not anything in use today I am not sure what the point of the exercise be to justify the effort. Not a bad suggestion by any means, but a little more justification needed for the effort is all.

Yes it would appear that your 577 would do very well is some 650 Flat Nose solids.

Again Karl, Thank you very much for your participation!

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: 8426 | Location: South Carolina | Registered: 23 June 2008



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 17:01

[Hide Post](#)

Since Karl is the first one to bring up anything about comparisons to 45/70 to anything else, I would like to address that issue with personal experience and my "official" position on the matter, since it seems there is a question, although I can't figure where it might have come from.

I like 45/70, always have. During the early part of this decade I was doing quite a bit of shooting and work with bullets available at the time, and they were far short of today's bullets available. In 2002 I found myself in Zim with a trusted 458 Lott and a Marlin Guide gun in 45/70. One of the quick come over sorta deals and had two bull elephant on quota and some buffalo. I had no intentions of shooting buffalo or elephant with 45/70. I was playing with a few different bullets in 45/70, one of them a Cast Performance 420 gr bullet at or around 1850-1900 fps as I recall. Previously I had shot quite a few lesser critters with 45/70, and while all of them are deadlier than Ceaser, I was not always impressed with the "trauma transfer", very rarely did 45/70 ever just knock'em off their feet! I was urged by the PH to try the little gun on buffalo. While I knew from previous test work it would certainly do the job with the right shot, I was not all that keen on it. But did anyway, and as I thought it was rather unimpressive and nearly got us in some trouble. Later in the hunt I had a perfect opportunity for a second large bull, PH again urged the use of the 45/70, but this time I declined, I honestly felt like the bullet was not up to the job for 100%, and there was only a slim chance for side brain that it would work, as we had already tested a side brain with the bullet on an big bull that had been downed with the 458 Lott.

With some of the bullets available today that far surpasses some available 10 yrs or so ago, I might would have had more confidence to take the opportunity. But even so, that don't make the 45/70 cartridge an elephant stomper by any means. Can it do the job with proper bullets? Of course it can, but no matter it cannot and is not an equal to 458 Lott, and certainly not an equal to 577 Nitro.

Now in total I have passed up the opportunity for 5 additional elephants because I knew for a fact that the bullet I had at the time, for two trips across the pond, while might have done the job, were totally unsuitable for the job with an reasonable reliability. This time with the 45/70, another time with a 50 B&M and terrible round nose designs that for sure would not track straight in animal tissue.

Concerning the penetration comparisons of 577 Nitro Woodleigh FMJ and 45/70 FN. Yep, I promise in this test medium that a good 45/70 FN solid will out penetrate a 577, 510, 500, 470, 458, 416 FMJ or RN solid each and every single time. For that matter I have a Win M94 in 45 Colt that with most any good cast bullet at 1200 fps will out penetrate all of them in the test medium. Well this demands an explanation! Easy, the RN cannot stabilize in a solid, aqueous material, while a properly stabilized FN can do so. Once again, no test medium is equal to animal tissue. RN Designs do better in animal tissue than in test medium. Along the lines of 35% or so better, which certainly explains why they have been successful in killing several "million" buffalo and elephant. Adequate!

Why test these in this medium? To compare one bullet with another bullet, or one design against another design, in a reasonable test medium for the mission at hand.

If one bullet falls behind in the test medium and is consistently that way, then it could mean that there is the mere "possibility" that it could have the "potential" to do the same under other circumstances. Not that it is likely, or that it will fail every time or even behave every time the same.

If one bullet is consistently successful in the test work, then the "potential" for success in the field is very favorable. And this is what I have found in every single case with expanding, NonCon, and FN solids that have been successful in the tests, they have also proven themselves in the field on animal tissue.

If I had a choice between hunting elephant with a 45/70 and hunting elephant with a 577 Nitro and FMJ bullet, I would choose the 577 and the FMJ if that was my ONLY choice. However, I am quite positive it would not be my choice with any work before hand. If I had a choice between 45/70, and 577 Nitro with EITHER a FMJ RN or a Flat Nose design such as we tested last week, then that is a very easy, hands down choice, I would choose the 577 Nitro and Sams FN design bullet! I have zero doubts as to what that will do!

FYI--895 words! HEH!

M

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



JPK
one of us



posted 03 May 2010 18:08

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:
Michael458,

Thank you for clearly stating your views on RN solids in game in your last two posts. I think there was some misunderstanding on your views in this regard from your posts. That you had good luck with the Barnes Hemispherical RN mono-metal solid on eles possibly the worst solid ever designed (along with the A2 RN mono-metal and RWS solid) is a testament to how even the worst sometimes perform admirably.

465h&H

465HH

You know something, I went back to the very first thread that you and I had a conversation on this exact same subject, nothing every changes does it?

I posted this in a conversation with you 2 yrs ago.

quote:

Boys I think there has to be some sort of misunderstanding here. From the start I stated that the test medium was good for testing one bullet compared to another, that is all. I related the penetration of any said bullet tested in the medium to what I was getting in animal flesh--roughly 30%-35% more in animal flesh and bone than in the test medium. I don't think that I ever said that what will happen in the test medium is what you get on animal flesh. If so it was misspoken and not intentional, and I am not going back to read the book I have written in this thread.

My stand on the issue is this "If a bullet fails on a regular basis in any Test Medium--it is

just POSSIBLE that a bullet can fail in the Field" I am not saying it will every single time-Just that the POSSIBILITY is out there! Is that simple enough? If a bullet performs perfectly, or as you desire, on a very regular basis--Then it is just POSSIBLE that it will perform well in the field! Not that there are DIRECT relationships between test medium and real live flesh and bone-there are not.

Test medium gives us a consistent-or fairly consistent way to test one bullet against another. If you recall to have comparisons to real world events I used both Barnes Solid FN bullets as a base line in which to base other conclusions upon-I know what these bullets will do in the field-if other bullets perform close to this, well I figure it is a success. If not, then try something else.

In this same first thread with you and your lapdog I also stated this; this is over two years ago!

quote:

I never said that because it would not work in my tests that it would not work in the world, and further more I said several times that my first 4 elephants were in fact shot with round nose bullets and they are deader than Abe Lincoln is right now! I have the ivory hanging over my fireplace as I write this--shot with round nose bullets

These comments go back to 2008 on this very same subject. SAME OLD SAME. And you can actually sit there and tell me that you are happy that I finally made my statements clear and that there was a misunderstanding?

To some it may seem that I am upset, I am not, I really can't understand how in 2 yrs time, my comments listed above that anyone cannot understand my stand on the issue that has been questioned for 1000s of typed words? Frustrated? Oh Yes without doubt. Maybe I am not clear, but you would think if you repeat something enough that somewhere along the line it would sink in.

Well, for any future reference I have it above where you now state that you do understand now anyway! I am quite sure your lapdog does not, and who cares anyway. I know I don't. But to be honest I really expected a little more from you. I have to say I am a bit disappointed.

Michael

Michael458,

I think you are being too rough on me. I have understood your position for a long time and our phone conversations will confirm that we have pretty much agreed on almost all aspects of the problem. When I said what I did I was stating that it should now be abundantly clear to those that **don't understand** your position. If they don't now understand then they are a lost cause. Try not to be so testy and take a compliment when it is honestly given!

465H&H

I wonder if this might be directed toward me.

Yes, from early on Michael458 has on occasion written that his so called tests do not, or at least may not, predict real life, in game performance of bullets. But his disclaimers are chock full of yea buts, like "Exactly Duplicates," "may or may not" and many others.

And then, to top it off, within the same post, or the same paragraph, or even within the same sentence, he will contradict himself and make (false) predictions of real life, in game performance based on his wet paper and other ad hoc media shooting.

The contradiction is frequent, and it is hypocritical.

WRT tuskless vs bull elephants, Michael458, you have it exactly backward. The copper FN solids work remarkably well in the smaller elephants' heads, like most tuskless (and most tuskless are smaller than a similar age tusked elephant because elephants use their tusks for feeding. Without tusks, the tuskless are at a disadvantage and so cannot feed at the same pace, and end up generally smaller.) They work well on tusked cows as well, since they are not that much different than tuskless, though bigger, generally.

The bulls' larger heads and generally harder and tougher bone in their heads, even the honey comb bone, is where the RN shines and provides more reliable performance than the malleable FN's.

Moreover, the vast, vast majority of elephants killed by professional ivory hunters or sport hunters since the advent of smokeless powder have been bull elephants, and the vast majority of those have been killed by RN solids. Facts, 100% contradictory to you assertions.

JPK

Free 500grains

Posts: 4900 | Location: Chevy Chase, Md. | Registered: 16 November 2004



peterdk
One of Us

posted 03 May 2010 18:51

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:
I would be happy to test old bore guns with roundballs (I think) but I have neither of those available and since this is really not anything in use today I am not sure what the point of the exercise be to justify the effort. Not a bad suggestion by any means, but a little more justification needed for the effort is all.

Michael

Michael

i will take you up on that at a later date, there is actually quite a few people that uses the bore guns, or a modern version of them.

the usual load is 3-5 drams(82,5-137,5 grains) of black powder and a hardned roundball in a shotgun hull with a device to center the ball going down the bore, they get some quite remarkble accuracy and results that are as true today as they were 120 years ago.

with round ball you actually dont need that much rifling if any at all, the major concern is matching the ball to the bore.

best regards

peter

□

<http://www.facebook.com/pages/...ife/146722612017963>

Posts: **1336** | Location: **denmark** | Registered: **01 September 2007**



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 18:59

[Hide Post](#)

Peter

Very well! I could probably, Maybe, manage that with some expert guidance I think!.

With that said, looks like my 470 Capsticks would be a perfect solution since I would need little rifling, eh?

HEH.

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



Whitworth
Moderator



posted 03 May 2010 19:35

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:
Peter

Very well! I could probably, Maybe, manage that with some expert guidance I think!.

With that said, looks like my 470 Capsticks would be a perfect solution since I would need little rifling, eh?

HEH.

Michael

Michael, your word count is a bit low here.....

"Ignorance you can correct, you can't fix stupid." JWP

If stupidity hurt, a lot of people would be walking around screaming.

Semper Fidelis

"Building Carpal Tunnel one round at a time"

Posts: **13440** | Location: **Virginia** | Registered: **10 July 2003**



DWright
One of Us

posted 03 May 2010 19:43

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by 500N:
Michael

Good stuff.

You certainly back up your argument / discussions, unlike some armchair forumites (that is a generalization but often true).

This comment pretty much sum's it all up! Good job!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

Posts: **1324** | Location: **Oregon rain forests** | Registered: **30 December 2007**



Dave Bush
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 19:45

[Hide Post](#)

Michael:

If you could boil your bullet testing down to a number of simple rules, what would they be?

For example, with respect to expanding bullets, it seems that the premium bullets like Swift, North Fork, Barnes, and Woodleighs all seem to perform pretty well.

With respect to solids, the flat nose solids from North Fork, Barnes, GSC, seem to give better straight line penetration than the found nose solides like the old Barnes or the present Woodleighs.

Could you give us a summary of what conclusions you have reached from your testing?

Dave
DRSS
Chapuis 9.3X74
Chapuis "Jungle" .375 FL
Krieghoff 500/.416 NE
Krieghoff 500 NE

"Git as close as y can laddie an then git ten yards closer"

"If the biggest, baddest animals on the planet are on the menu, and you'd rather pay a taxidermist than a mortician, consider the 500 NE as the last word in life insurance." Hornady Handbook of Cartridge Reloading (8th Edition).

Posts: **3728** | Location: **Midwest** | Registered: **26 November 2006**



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 20:36

[Hide Post](#)

Whitworth

Hey, I can always make it longer?

Dave

Along those same lines, am I limited in the number of words in my summary?



HEH

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



Dave Bush
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 20:42

[Hide Post](#)

No limitation on words. I just wanted to now what your tests have demonstrated to you and what conclusions you have reached.

Dave
DRSS
Chapuis 9.3X74
Chapuis "Jungle" .375 FL
Krieghoff 500/.416 NE
Krieghoff 500 NE

"Git as close as y can laddie an then git ten yards closer"

"If the biggest, baddest animals on the planet are on the menu, and you'd rather pay a taxidermist than a mortician, consider the 500 NE as the last word in life insurance." Hornady Handbook of Cartridge Reloading (8th Edition).

Posts: **3728** | Location: **Midwest** | Registered: **26 November 2006**



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 20:42

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by Dave Bush:
Michael:

#1--If you could boil your bullet testing down to a number of simple rules, what would they be?

#2--For example, with respect to expanding bullets, it seems that the premium bullets like Swift, North Fork, Barnes, and Woodleighs all seem to perform pretty well.

#3--With respect to solids, the flat nose solids from North Fork, Barnes, GSC, seem to give better straight line penetration than the found nose solids like the old Barnes or the present Woodleighs.

#4--Could you give us a summary of what conclusions you have reached from your testing?

Dave

OK Short Summary.

#1--Rule--Shoot more and do what Michael says do, and not as Michael Does!

#2--Yes

#3--Yes

#4--Yes

OK Yes I know this is a smart ass post, I have to apologize to you Dave, I could not help myself, it's not directed at anyone, and all in jest! But I am laughing my tail off at it!

That's absolutely as short as I can get it!!!!



M

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 20:44

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by Dave Bush:
No limitation on words. I just wanted to now what your tests have demonstrated to you and what conclusions you have reached.

I will try and do just that, a little bit later when I have a few minutes.

It might be long!

LOL

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



MikeBurke
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 21:33

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by peterdk:

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

I would be happy to test old bore guns with roundballs (I think) but I have neither of those available and since this is really not anything in use today I am not sure what the point of the exercise be to justify the effort. Not a bad suggestion by any means, but a little more justification needed for the effort is all.

Michael

Michael

i will take you up on that at a later date, there is actually quite a few people that uses the bore guns, or a modern version of them.

the usual load is 3-5 drams(82,5-137,5 grains) of black powder and a hardned roundball in a shotgun hull with a device to center the ball going down the bore, they get some quite remarkble accuracy and results that are as true today as they were 120 years ago.

with round ball you actually dont need that much rifling if any at all, the major concern is matching the ball to the bore.

best regards

peter

Michael458

How would you know if roundball tumbled? 😊

I bet they are a blast to shoot.

Posts: **2939** | Registered: **26 March 2008**





quote:

Michael:

#1--If you could boil your bullet testing down to a number of simple rules, what would they be?

#2--For example, with respect to expanding bullets, it seems that the premium bullets like Swift, North Fork, Barnes, and Woodleighs all seem to perform pretty well.

#3--With respect to solids, the flat nose solids from North Fork, Barnes, GSC, seem to give better straight line penetration than the found nose solid like the old Barnes or the present Woodleighs.

Could you give us a summary of what conclusions you have reached from your testing?

Dave

Dave

I will try and give you a reasonable summary, answer to the best of my abilities. What you receive is worth what you paid for it, all just my opinion and it seems that is not worth that much anyway! At least to some, and that is fine, I could care less sometimes, and this is one of those. But if it's worth something to you, here it is.

Simple Rules

#1--Know your bullet! Understand it's limitations, whether that is velocity and it's working range, or understand the mission in which you use it for. Match the proper bullet for the mission in which you intend to embark upon. There is a difference between a "deer" bullet and a "buffalo" bullet.

#2--Don't get Cheap! So many times hunters spend many thousands of dollars on a very expensive hunt, and get cheap on the bullet used? The bullet is what can make or break your hunt. Cartridge don't matter, rifle don't matter, it all comes down to the "Bullet" and it does the work.

Expanding Bullets

Yes, the premium bullets are better than ever. We as shooters and hunters live in a wonderful time, where bullet tech has reached out and become better than ever in our entire history. Today's common bullets are excellent in the same light, sometimes far better than premiums of yesteryear. But also keep in mind one can take a premium and do lighter work with good results, but sometimes you cannot take a standard bullet to do heavy work!

All expanding bullets, even within the same manufacturer are not created equal! See Rule #1! Know Thy Bullet! A good example of this is Woodleigh! I love Woodleigh bullets, but you have to know what the limitations of that particular bullet in that particular caliber is. Woodleigh does a pretty good job by the label on the box, pay attention to it! Even then, a Woodleigh in 416 caliber is not the same as .510 caliber, they will not perform the same. I know what you are thinking, but you may be wrong! For example I find the 400 gr SN Woodleigh in 416 about as good a buffalo bullet as one can get in 416 caliber, expands back to about 1/3 of the shank, leaves lot's of shank and weight to continue to penetrate, at velocities from 2300 to 2400 fps. A 600 gr Woodleigh SN in .510 caliber nearly doubles on itself at 2250 fps, flat as pancakes if it don't wrap around itself, limiting it's penetration, and it's velocity simply must be lower, probably working well at 2000 fps impacts, or certainly better! The 500 gr Woodleigh SN in 458 caliber are excellent bullets run at velocities of 2150-2200 fps max, and do well under that velocity. So every Woodleigh is not equal, Know Thy Bullet!

And rule #2 Know thy Mission. I have picked Woodleighs on many hunts for thin skinned animals where I wanted trauma transfer and massive expansion, and did not need a deep diver. So this means while a particular bullet may not make the best buffalo bullet, that same bullet just might be the ticket for lion or bear, and be a far better choice.

Barnes, Swift, and North Fork are pretty predictable and more consistent from caliber to caliber above 416. About the only difference from one Swift to another Swift within caliber is velocity at impact. Same with the Barnes and North Forks that I have worked with. All excellent bullets.

Non Premiums can achieve great things for you if used properly. I have tested most everything I can get my hands on in .458 caliber. I had left one out recently and asked by Dean to test the 350 Speer at 2300+. I got a great surprise with the fantastic performance of that bullet, I did not expect it to hold together, but it did, and gave great penetration and is a great bullet in it's class. As are many standard non premium bullets from Hornady (I am a big Hornady Non Prem Fan) and others.

All of them match the bullet to what game you are after, and refer to Rule #1--Know thy bullet!

Everyone knows, or should by now, that I prefer a good Flat Nose solid above any and all round nose solids or FMJ. While I don't discredit the round nose, I think the flat nose solids are a leap in progress and perform all tasks asked of it better than any round nose can do. My opinion. Like it or not. I can't think of any mission at all with anything where a properly designed and stabilized flat nose cannot succeed at in the hunting world. As with any bullet one needs to know their limitations too. We are only beginning to scratch the surface of many of the major factors involved with terminal stability of these bullets, but we are getting there. We are learning that it's just not enough to have a flat meplat, it must be a certain size for caliber, right now I like anything above 60% meplat for caliber, optimum being 65-70%, my current opinion. Twist rates become very important with less than 60% meplat of caliber, and less important with bullets of 65% meplat of caliber and up. Is there a limit on the size of meplat concerning penetration? I am of the opinion today that there is, I suspect that 75%-80% would start showing a decrease in penetration, but that is NOT SUBSTANTIATED, that is pure theory at this time! Velocity is a factor, in most all cases more velocity giving more penetration with these designs as an overall rule. Construction is a factor when hitting bone or other tough obstructions. SD has actually become less important with these bullet designs and only comes into play with bullets with the exact same nose profile, meplat, twist rate, velocity, and construction, with only SD being the difference, point in fact 458 caliber 450 Barnes Banded vs 500 gr Barnes Banded, everything the same, weight being the only difference.

This very second in time, that's about as good as I can do, and I am sure I am leaving out many things of import, but you asked for short and that's the quick short version cooking around in my head right now.

Not bad, 1067 words, not including this sentence of course!

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 21:57

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Michael458

How would you know if roundball tumbled?

I bet they are a blast to shoot.

Mike
DRSS

I must put my sooper dooper brain organizer on to answer that question?????

I bet they would be fun too!

Penetration????? Hmmmmm, straight? Strange to think about that?

I bet they don't tumble however!



M

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.

Posts: **8426** | Location: **South Carolina** | Registered: **23 June 2008**



Whitworth
Moderator



posted 03 May 2010 22:45

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

I bet they don't tumble however!



M

And if they did, you'd never know it.....

"Ignorance you can correct, you can't fix stupid." JWP

If stupidity hurt, a lot of people would be walking around screaming.

Semper Fidelis

"Building Carpal Tunnel one round at a time"

Posts: **13440** | Location: **Virginia** | Registered: **10 July 2003**



Dave Bush
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 23:03

[Hide Post](#)

Michael:

I was wondering have you ever tested any .458 Hawk bullets with the .050 or .065 jackets? If not, and I can get a few, would you test them for us?

Dave
DRSS
Chapuis 9.3X74
Chapuis "Jungle" .375 FL
Krieghoff 500/.416 NE
Krieghoff 500 NE

"Git as close as y can laddie an then git ten yards closer"

"If the biggest, baddest animals on the planet are on the menu, and you'd rather pay a taxidermist than a mortician, consider the 500 NE as the last word in life insurance." Hornady Handbook of Cartridge Reloading (8th Edition).

Posts: **3728** | Location: **Midwest** | Registered: **26 November 2006**



peterdk
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 23:05

[Hide Post](#)

michael

just to put the things into perspective.

□ the round next to it is a 450 3,25" black powder round, looks a bit small dont it

best

peter

□

<http://www.facebook.com/pages/...ifile/146722612017963>

Posts: **1336** | Location: **denmark** | Registered: **01 September 2007**





quote:

Originally posted by Dave Bush:
Michael:

I was wondering have you ever tested any .458 Hawk bullets with the .050 or .065 jackets? If not, and I can get a few, would you test them for us?

Dave

I have tested and have some hawk bullets, I think 350s and 400s in 458. I believe the jackets are light at .035???? I would have to check on that. I have some Hawks in other calibers too. I don't think or recall that I have any with .050 or .065 jackets? I will look shortly and see for sure.

Those that I have tested in years past are very soft and give tremendous expansion.

I looked around my photobucket and happened to have a photo loaded



I think I have some from years ago that are .025 and .035 jackets.

I would be happy to test some if you wish. If you want to send some that would be great.

Michael

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 23:35

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by peterdk:
michael

just to put the things into perspective.

the round next to it is a 450 3,25" black powder round, looks a bit small dont it 😊

best

peter

Peter

Nice Photo of the cartridges and Balls! That looks interesting. The lead balls, how fast do you run them? Soft lead? Hardened? I am sure that can be duplicated with smokeless?

M

<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



Macifej
One of Us

posted 03 May 2010 23:37

[Hide Post](#)

quote:

Originally posted by peterdk:
michael

just to put the things into perspective.

the round next to it is a 450 3,25" black powder round, looks a bit small dont it 😊

best

peter

From Colin's thread ...

<http://stolzerqunsmithing.webs.../2borejonespage5.htm>



michael458
One of Us



posted 03 May 2010 23:53

[Hide Post](#)

J

Well all I got to say about that is "Colin's got some big Balls"



<http://www.b-mriflesandcartridges.com/default.html>

The New Word is "Non-Conventional", add "Conventional" to the Endangered Species List!
Live Outside The Box of "Conventional Wisdom"

I do Not Own Any Part of Any Bullet Company, I am not in the Employ Of Any Bullet Company. I do not represent, own stock, nor do I receive any proceeds, or monies from ANY BULLET COMPANY. I am not in the bullet business, and have no Bullets to sell to you, nor anyone else.



Reply

[Accuratereloading.com](#) [The Accurate Reloading Forums](#) [THE ACCURATE RELOADING.COM FORUMS](#) [Rifles](#) [Big Bores](#) [Terminal Bullet Performance](#)

[Contact Us](#) | [Accuratereloading.com](#) | [Terms of Service](#)

Copyright December 1997-2023 [Accuratereloading.com](#)

Community Statistics

Statistics for the last 30 days

New Posts	5275
New Members	24
Page Views	2743857
Visits	504208
Newest Member	RedRaider4400



[Visit our on-line store for AR Memorabilia](#)