

This topic can be found at:

<https://forums accuratereloading.com/eve/forums/a/tpc/f/4711043/m/2861098911>

**jeffosso**

**08 November 2009, 03:06**

### Terminal Bullet Performance

Lots of factors go into penetration .. no SINGLE one is trump .. but weight and speed, construction and shape, to be measured, must remain constant ..

and then be TESTED .. and if you don't test, don't talk .. opinions go on for days

#dumptrump

**opinions vary** band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about

the416AR, 458AR, 470AR, 500AR

What is an AR round? Case Drawings 416-458-470AR and 500AR.

476AR,

<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

**jeffosso**

**08 November 2009, 03:09**

Dwight,

different physics at play .. its like, no IT IS, describing subsonic air flow vs supersonic ... the bow wave (has nothing to do with bubbles) on hypersonic projectiles does amazing things ...

the SMASH of a breaking bar relies on the weight of the bar, not the nose shape, as a rounded one does the same thing as a flat one.. BANG - stop and shatter ..

i've dug a couple ditches, too ... low speed HEAVY tools do lots of damage, while high speed light tools GET damaged

#dumptrump

**opinions vary** band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about

the416AR, 458AR, 470AR, 500AR

What is an AR round? Case Drawings 416-458-470AR and 500AR.

476AR,

<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 06:20**

quote:

Originally posted by jeffosso:

Dwight,

different physics at play .. its like, no IT IS, describing subsonic air flow vs supersonic ... the bow wave (has nothing to do with bubbles) on hypersonic projectiles does amazing things ...

the SMASH of a breaking bar relies on the weight of the bar, not the nose shape, as a rounded one does the same thing as a flat one.. BANG - stop and shatter ..

i've dug a couple ditches, too ... low speed HEAVY tools do lots of damage, while high speed light tools GET damaged

I disagree. I think you miss my point completely.

Of course they do a lot of damage, but a round point will not always do it in a straight line.

I don't know squat about air bubbles, or supersonic flow; unless you mean after a meal of burrito's and beans, but I am a retired building contractor after 36 years of digging holes, punching holes thru things, and working with tools and knowing what they will do.

I do know it works at low and high speed.

The high speed simply creates a hell of a lot more splash outwards that creates the permanet channel thru things. I don't care what you call it.

Again, as for a round point bull prick chisel following as straight a line as a flat point; YOU ARE WRONG!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 06:23**

quote:

Quote by Michael: and I am not trying to find out what is best for punching wet paper,

Michael,

I do not have the time to get into this with you, and that is one reason for the abbreviated exchange on the last thread.

BUT, your quote is off by 180\*. That is the medium you use to "test" and that is the medium from which you draw inferences which you erroneously apply to real hunting and real flesh and bone targets. In truth, your "tests" do nothing more than help you discover which bullets, which nose shapes, which velocities, which...etc, punch wet paper better.

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.

Your inference is false. RN solids do not consistently veer in game. In fact, hemispherical RN's rarely veer in game.

If you seek support for my conclusion of relevant RN performance, then my own experience on real game, both hunting shots and test shots would support my conclusion. Call it 200 RN bullets. If you want more, I'll refer you to 465H&H's thread last winter asking for any experience by any member regarding veering RN's in game. He got not one response.

On the other hand, the one verified case of a veering bullet in my real hunting plus testing on real game came from a FN solid bullet.

Your tests do not reflect results on real game. Inferences you draw from your tests are invalid for real game. At least as far as RN solids are concerned.

When you test in a medium which produces results at least similar to results achieved in real game, you will have found a medium and tests from which accurate inferences can be drawn. But not until then.

JPK

Free 500grains

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 06:35**

quote:

Veral Smith what he say's is that the flat nose forces all the matter it contacts out at right angles, and that matter then act's as a 'sheild' so to speak, and deflect's this matter from contacting the sides if the bullet which would cause it to ver off course, and thus ALLOWS the SD of the bullet to do it's work.

If the bullet is sheilded, that would seem to describe cavitation or super cavitation, as it is popularly understood.

Or perhaps, more kindly, it could be describing shoulder stabilization. That might be a debatable but realistic explanation for bullets at the velocities he is promoting.

Again on RN solids, they not not have a propensity to veer IN GAME. Wet paper, who cares?

JPK

Free 500grains

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 06:43**

Alf,

I suspect your density number for newsprint is for dry newsprint.

Of course, this brings up the issue of saturation levels and variability.

Michael,

Under the best of circumstances, the catalogs, etc, cannot add 200%, 300% to density. They may be stiffer, tougher, harder... but they are not going to change density of you medium so significantly.

JPK

Free 500grains

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 06:52**

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Veral Smith what he say's is that the flat nose forces all the matter it contacts out at right angles, and that matter then act's as a 'sheild' so to speak, and deflect's this matter from contacting the sides if the

bullet which would cause it to veer off course, and thus ALLOWS the SD of the bullet to do it's work.

If the bullet is sheilded, that would seem to describe cavitation or super cavitation, as it is popularly understood.

Or perhaps, more kindly, it could be describing shoulder stabilization. That might be a debatable but realistic explanation for bullets at the velocities he is promoting.

Again on RN solids, they not not have a propensity to veer IN GAME. Wet paper, who cares?

JPK

Ya, maybe, maybe not. Myself, I have very limited experience on really large game; 1,200 lbs max. and nothing really dangerous. Maybe a large Black bear or two. I have however used large bore handguns for the last 30 years on game. I have used RNs. HPs, and for the last 15 years, FPs exclusively. That because HPs would not penetrate thru and thru every time. RNs would in fact change their path too often, and I do use Heavy Large FNs because I consistantly get thru and thru in a straight line. For many years I did culling on a little 80,000 acre ranch to feed the ranch hands. I have only tested them on about 400 head of game however, so I may be wrong. Not sure. I imagine I could change my mind somewhere around 600 head, but since those days are long gone, I doubt it.

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**michael458**

**08 November 2009, 15:08**

JPK

Not only do you not have the time to get into this with me, you do not have the shooting experience to get into this with me. In addition your reading comprehension is not quite up to par, as normal.

This entire discussion, while does include FN vs RN solids, is not entirely concerning that. Since you cannot state that you have done any test work in any other medium other than the field, then you really are not qualified to debunk anything. Since you have experience with but two bullets, Woodleigh RN and I think North Fork flat nose, you really have no qualifications. You have experience in the field with one cartridge, 1 rifle, and 2 bullets. What else?

Are you a shooter JPK, I have asked this many times, what is your experience in test work--Other than shooting 200 bullets into 18 elephant heads?? Tell me please! What different big bore cartridges do you shoot, bullets, loads, lets show our bonafides. Mine are there finally, because I really got tired of your BS, your poor reading comprehension, as I am about to show, and your running off at the mouth thinking you are some sort of EXPERT because you shot 18 or 20 or more elephants. Sorry pal, with some of the conclusions you draw upon it shows you have not learned much at all with your field experience alone. I think you should start doing some test work! I think you should "broaden your shooting experience".

Since this is Big Bore, the cartridges I list here are only big bore, .400 caliber +. These are the ones that I have worked with over the last 20 years. Some not in the field, many are. 416 Taylor--416 Remington-416 Rigby--416 B&M--45/70-458 Winchester--458 B&M--458 Lott--470 Capstick--50 B&M Super Short--50 B&M Alaskan--50 B&M--500 MDM--50 Alaskan--510 Wells. These are cartridges I own and shoot and have shot on a very regular basis, having shot not hundreds, but 1000s of rounds thru many of these cartridges. These do not include cartridges/Rifles owned by others that I have some less experience with. Now this does not make me an expert by any stretch, there are people here at AR that have experience with double, triple or even more than what I have or will ever have! This does not even make me an expert with the cartridges I have extensive experience with, just an avid student of.

First however you really must take the time to read proper, to comprehend what is written. Below is several true quotes that I have made, in shorter form and not so many words so that you can maybe understand better. See Below;

Michaels Post #1

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.

(this one was in particular for you JPK)

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 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!

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

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 trials.

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!

From Post Above to Alf

Now I assume very little, but over many years of putting metal to wet print, and then putting metal to animal flesh, I have come to the conclusion that this is a medium that I can count on to give "reasonable" results so that I might be able to go to the field with confidence, however I do want to point out, that until I put bullet to flesh on the given mission for said particular bullet, until it completes that mission IN FLESH, then I am suspect of it until proven

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!

JPK--JPK--JPK

Can you read the above true quotes that I have actually made??? Do you understand them?

I am going to now go thru your entire post--paragraph by paragraph and respond accordingly.

JPK---BUT, your quote is off by 180\*. That is the medium you use to "test" and that is the medium from which you draw inferences which you erroneously apply to real hunting and real flesh and bone targets. In truth, your "tests" do nothing more than help you discover which bullets, which nose shapes, which velocities, which...etc, punch wet paper better.

Michael--It is obvious that you don't even have the ability to look at photos and be able to compare. I shoot test medium and real honest to god animal flesh---both, and I have shot enough to be able to correlate data between the two. I have hundreds of bullet examples which mostly includes expanding and non conventional bullets, along with solids and comparisons between the two are evident. But read above my statements. To say they are erroneous is stupid. You would not know the truth if it slapped you in the face.

JPK---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.

Michael---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!

I probably do state they veer off course 100% of the time in test medium--but not so in animal tissue. I have personally seen RN solids veer totally off course in animal tissue as many here have done also--but you will not see me say that they do it 100% of the time, that is not a true statement on your part!

Can you see the statement I made above concerning that RN bullets have worked in the field???

Can you read that?

JPK--Your inference is false. RN solids do not consistently veer in game.

Michael--I never said this, never consistently, You have made another FALSE statement.

JPK---If you seek support for my conclusion of relevant RN performance, then my own experience on real game, both hunting shots and test shots would support my conclusion. Call it 200 RN bullets. If you want more, I'll refer you to 465H&H's thread last winter asking for any experience by any member regarding veering RN's in game. He got not one response.

Michael--Sorry, I am not seeking any support from your conclusions--Do you honestly think that I want, or need any support from your conclusions?? You have to be joking? You cannot even read and comprehend what is written in front of you, how in the hell do you think that I could possibly need any conclusions from you? You don't have the shooting experience to be able to comprehend or even understand your own conclusions! Thank you for your offer, but I think I will pass.

JPK--On the other hand, the one verified case of a veering bullet in my real hunting in my real hunting plus testing on real game came my real hunting plus testing on real game came from a FN solid bullet.

Michael--JPK my boy, you are under some sort of delusion of grandeur concerning your stature of real hunting! I am sorry, you may impress someone with little knowledge of these things, you may impress your buddies at the Country Club, you may impress your dinner guests with great hunting stories from charging elephants and buffalo, but you now speak to a group of shooters, many with experiences you will never be able to comprehend. You are in a group of real people, many of which have far more experience than you in areas you won't ever begin to understand. They are not impressed with your "Real World Experience". I am not impressed with your Real World Experience. You do not have a background to back up your "real world Experience". JPK all you have proven is that you have enough money to go to africa, shoot at 18 + elephants, of which as far as I can tell the majority are the smallish tuskless elephants, very small head gear and body size. Anyone with enough money can do that, don't make them a hero, nor does it make them an expert in terminal bullet performance, especially using 2 bullets, 1 gun, 1 cartridge. Now I know you have shot some bulls, not saying you have not. But what you forget is I have been there done that too! I know both sides of the coin! Going to africa and hunting is a great experience, I do not degrade that, but it does not make you one of the great legends of elephant hunting! I have only shot 6 elephants, 2 big body, big headed bulls, 3 medium size bulls, and one tiny little tuskless elephant, this does not make me an expert, just a student. Doing test work on downed elephants is great, but it is extremely difficult to get correct data from, I know this, as I have done this. But again, I make no claims of grandeur concerning the field experience I have. I am just lucky to be able to get some good field experience. The difference between you and I is the fact that

I am a shooter, I shoot and test before going, I have proven the facts before bullet hits flesh, and 100% of the time, my conclusions are 100% correct, every time, time after time! I don't hunt to go hunting! I hunt to shoot! If I did not have something I wanted to test, or try out, or prove to myself, then hunting for the sake of hunting does not interest me at all. I need a new cartridge, bullet, rifle to continue my interests. You on the other hand, do not have the shooting experience or test experience to back your mouth.

JPK--Your tests do not reflect results on real game. Inferences you draw from your tests are invalid for real game. At least as far as RN solids are concerned.

When you test in a medium which produces results at least similar to results achieved in real game, you will have found a medium and tests from which accurate inferences can be drawn. But not until then

Michael---Again a reading comprehension issue.

JPK---Michael,  
Under the best of circumstances, the catalogs, etc, cannot add 200%, 300% to density. They may be stiffer, tougher, harder... but they are not going to change density of your medium so significantly

My Quote from the above statement to Alf  
As for the density issue, this is why I insert a mix of catalogs/magazines which makes the medium 35% tougher than wet print alone, which would bring it closer to muscle tissue considered in the study you present.

Michael---And your mathematical conclusions are suspect also. The number for muscle was 1060 and for wet print 690, an increase in strength of the mix by 35% as I have established long before now and stated long before this statement was conceived, would bring the density number of the wet print mix to 1061-pretty close, but yes not exact. 200%? 300%? Mistake, BS, or just a lie? In addition what do these numbers actually mean? But even more important than mathematics, tell me of your actual experience to be able to make that statement? Shooting experience please understand, not your version of "Real game Experience".

JPK

From the first time I posted on AR you have done everything within yourself to degrade, to discredit me from the very start, and it's always the same story. I have done everything possible to not respond back to you in a degrading manner, not to speak down to you, and try to keep the peace with you. Agreeing with many statements you have made, and doing everything possible to overlook the hundreds of either misquotes on your part, or blatant lies on your part. As far as I am concerned you simply must have a horrible reading comprehension issue, or just a sorry liar???

Do not misquote me, do not state blatant lies, either back up your statements or shut your mouth!

You sir are a small man, of very little consequence! Until you are able to comprehend what you read, or get my statements correct do not concern yourself with me any longer. In fact, I really can't see how anyone could be so stupid as to not be able to comprehend what I actually state, therefore the best I can conclude is that you don't even read the posts, and if you do you disregard the posts and tell the lie to further your cause, whatever that cause is.

Unless you can cover new ground, statements that you have not already made for over a year now, do not waste my time any longer. Every single statement you have made for over a year is the same. You have no new information, no valid concepts, it's just more of the same. If you cover the same ground again, I will ignore it, you will accomplish nothing but to show your ignorance not only to me, but many others. Positive, discussion is welcomed, even from you and even now after this. But to cover the same old same from you, I will not do. My statements in this post stand to cover everything you have stated, there is no more. I in fact am pleased to have your observations, and in the past have recorded your very own field data, that you supplied. Your very own data correlates directly with my field gathered data and directly with my test medium data! I actually have your comments in my Terminal Performance Reports! Imagine that? Not only that, but it agrees with MY TEST Data. So you are welcomed, but only if you have new ground to cover. Lies and misquotes are not welcomed and will not be acknowledged any longer. My statements, over and over and over stand for themselves. Just have to read and comprehend them.

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**

**08 November 2009, 15:22**





<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.

**shootaway**

**08 November 2009, 16:30**

Looking at your test results I see that in the Lott,the Barnes Banded solid outpenetrates the Woodleigh fmj but in the 600OK, both 900 gr bullets penetrate about the same.Is this correct?

**michael458**

**08 November 2009, 17:34**

Shootaway

You are pretty close in your conclusions concerning the raw data alone.

On the 600 OK notice that the Woodleigh FMJ started off course at 41 inches. Did not penetrate in a straight line from that point

onward. On the side of the penetration box if found a void in the mix that allowed it to continue to 56 inches.

The 458 Lott data speaks for itself.

Now if what you are getting at is the fact that the Woodleigh FMJ in the 600 OK out penetrates the Woodleigh FMJ in the 458 Lott--then that conclusion is correct also. It did. Do not fail to look at the nose profile on these bullets, as they are vastly different.





458 Caliber

500 Grain

Woodleigh FMJ

4725 Caliber (.474)

500 Grain

Woodleigh FMJ

As is the difference in Nose Profile of the 458 and 470. No two RN bullets of different manufacturer or caliber are created equal-- and the exact same goes for FN designs.

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.

**shootaway**

**08 November 2009, 17:49**

Sorry, I had missed the part about the void in the mix that allowed it to penetrate an extra 14 inches. In that case the results make sense. The RN's and FN's do have different nose profiles amongst themselves, as you say. I would go with a bronze monometal FN but I find them to hard on my rifling and inaccurate in a somewhat smooth bore. They don't feed well in my rifles, too. Wouldn't you get more inches of penetration in animal tissue compared to newspaper?

**michael458**

**08 November 2009, 18:04**

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

<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.

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 19:08**

Michael,

I attack your "test" medium because it produces results entirely different from reality and cannot reproduce real world results. I attack the erroneous inferences you draw from your "tests" because your medium cannot produce results reflective of the real world. Like the false inference you repeat ad nauseum that RN solids tumble consistently in game.

You, on the other hand, have a temper tantrum and make personal ad hominem attacks. That is weak.

I typed a detailed response to your rant, pointing out each and every inconsistency, each and every departure from the rational, and there are many, but I deleted it all and instead will just focus on this quote:

"If I did not have something I wanted to test, or try out, or prove to myself, then hunting for the sake of hunting does not interest me at all."

WOW, is that f---d up!

Your astonishing explanation of your ass backward attitude about hunting, that it isn't the pinnacle, the peak, the climax, the reason, explains your fixation on, worship of a test medium that utterly fails to reproduce results actually achieved in the field.

Your quote explains alot, but WOW, is that f---d up!

JPK

Free 500grains

**michael458**

**08 November 2009, 19:35**

John

There is no rant, just proving you to misquote or lie about nearly everything I said, as you see above.

But pal, you finally got one correct!

This IS A STATEMENT I MADE---100% Correct

"If I did not have something I wanted to test, or try out, or prove to myself, then hunting for the sake of hunting does not interest me at all"

Thank you, you got one correct.

I have never in my life claimed to be a hunter! I shoot! My passion is shooting. I hunt to confirm. I have zero interest in hunting 20 elephants with one rifle, 1 cartridge and one bullet, it holds nothing new for me to discover.

Wow, f---d up! 😊 Absolutely, and what exactly is your point?

Be careful John, a big wad of wet print my get you in one of your attacks!



You have a nice day!

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**

**08 November 2009, 19:41**

John

"Like the false inference you repeat ad nauseum that RN solids tumble consistently in game"

Are you serious? Did you read anything I said? Anything at all? Do you understand english?

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.

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 19:42**

Hmmmmm.

Mr. Bob West; now passed on, was one of my gunsmiths, as well as a good friend. He worked for many years with P.O. Ackley doing testing of all sorts with firearms and cartridges. I'd ask him questions, and listen for hours about his testing and results. He was a very soft spoken man that had forgot more than most will ever know.

He never got into an argument or disagreement with anyone that disagreed with his findings, as he said he was too old and too tired, and it was not worth the energy he had left.

I asked him why he himself never wrote a book about all he had learned. (Some of which goes against what some accept as true today).

He said it was because 😞 you can't prove it to anyone!

He went on to say there will always be some asshole that takes up all your time disputing your test results. They shoot a few animals and think they know it all.

He made a comment once that: there are many things that come to light while testing that can not be learned by shooting an animal.

Those that do the testing and report the results are brave and should be commended for their efforts, as others can learn from those results.

Bob West; a man that spent most his life gaining knowledge by testing and building fine custom rifles was in his mid 90s, and did not have much energy left to argue with the assholes hell bent on arguing his findings from those tests, so unless you asked him about what he learned, he kept it to himself.

Michael, you appear to be a pretty big healthy guy with lot's of energy. I sincerely hope you have enough to ignore the assholes, and continue your testing and reporting so we can all benefit from your efforts.

Cheers!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 19:55**

JPK, I agree with Michael! Can you f#@!\*& read?

You make comments that are untrue regarding Michaels statements.

I think you should get tested for dyslexia.

No disrespect, but I really do.

You are consistantly making comments that do not reflect reality.

I myself am curious as what experience you have with game. You have been asked several times about that, with no response from you.

Michael has backed up his statements sufficiently with reasons why he says what he does. You have nothing!

It amazes me that you continue to make fool of yourself and either do not realize that fact, or simply do not care.

Cheers!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**CCMDoc**

**08 November 2009, 20:14**

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:  
Michael,

I attack your "test" medium because it produces results entirely different from reality and cannot reproduce real world results. I attack the erroneous inferences you draw from your "tests" because your medium cannot produce results reflective of the real world. Like the false inference you repeat ad nauseum that RN solids tumble consistently in game.

You, on the other hand, have a temper tantrum and make personal ad hominem attacks. That is weak.

I typed a detailed response to your rant, pointing out each and every inconsistency, each and every departure from the rational, and there are many, but I deleted it all and instead will just focus on this quote:

"If I did not have something I wanted to test, or try out, or prove to myself, then hunting for the sake of hunting does not interest me at all."

WOW, is that f---d up!

Your astonishing explanation of your ass backward attitude about hunting, that it isn't the pinnacle, the peak, the climax, the reason, explains your fixation on, worship of a test medium that utterly fails to reproduce results actually achieved in the field.

Your quote explains alot, but WOW, is that f---d up!

JPK

Why delete it? I would have read it and perhaps learned something valuable.

I have to add, though at least in my world evidence-based practice takes precedence over experience-based practice. In other words "in my experience" even if it is substantial, is only trusted and valuable if there is some independent test to support it.

"This is the way I have always done it."

"This has always worked for me in the past."

"This is good enough."

-are no longer acceptable in my world. Those individuals who practice the above opinions are the people who keep me in business.

I am not saying you are making that claim, but the variability in anatomy coupled with the variability in shot placement, direction, impact velocity, etc. make tests such as those done by michael458 imperative to better understanding and to better bullet choice. You and I ARE hunters and we both have the same exact goal - quick, humane and respectful taking of our game. Best is to determine what has the best chance of doing so on paper and test media first; before trying it out on one of God's creatures. And if something seemed to work better than another in such tests, we would both choose it.

Wouldn't you agree?

NRA Lifer; DSC Lifer; SCI member; DRSS; AR member since November 9 2003

**STILL waiting for my Taksdale double or a refund**

**Don't Save the best for last, the smile for later or the "Thanks" for tomorrow**

**jeffeosso**

**08 November 2009, 20:14**

quote:

Originally posted by DWright:

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:

the SMASH of a breaking bar relies on the weight of the bar, not the nose shape, as a rounded one does the same thing as a flat one.. BANG - stop and shatter ..

Of course they do a lot of damage, but a round point will not always do it in a straight line.

....

Again, as for a round point bull prick chisel following as straight a line as a flat point; YOU ARE WRONG!

Dwight,

We actually agree -- and you say the same .. I don't say the round point will go in a straight line, I said it will stop and shatter... I didn't say it would go in a straight line, and if i had, i would have been, as you clearly state, wrong

but, busting up the edge of a 3 or 4" driveway slab, both will bust up the concrete ... we don't have naturally occurring rocks in houston .. REALLY (no, really, other than river gravel)

#dumptrump

**opinions vary** band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about

[the416AR](#), [458AR](#), [470AR](#), [500AR](#)

[What is an AR round?](#) Case Drawings [416-458-470AR](#) and [500AR](#).

[476AR](#),

<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

**Whitworth**

**08 November 2009, 20:28**

quote:

Originally posted by DWright:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Veral Smith what he say's is that the flat nose forces all the matter it contacts out at right angles, and that matter then act's as a 'sheild' so to speak, and deflect's this matter from contacting the sides if the bullet which would cause it to ver off course, and thus ALLOWS the SD of the bullet to do it's work.

If the bullet is sheilded, that would seem to describe cavitation or super cavitation, as it is popularly

understood.

Or perhaps, more kindly, it could be describing shoulder stabilization. That might be a debatable but realistic explanation for bullets at the velocities he is promoting.

Again on RN solids, they not not have a propensity to veer IN GAME. Wet paper, who cares?

JPK

Ya, maybe, maybe not. Myself, I have very limited experience on really large game; 1,200 lbs max. and nothing really dangerous. Maybe a large Black bear or two. I have however used large bore handguns for the last 30 years on game. I have used RNs. HPs, and for the last 15 years, FPs exclusively. That because HPs would not penetrate thru and thru every time. RNs would in fact change their path too often, and I do use Heavy Large FNs because I consistently get thru and thru in a straight line.

For many years I did culling on a little 80,000 acre ranch to feed the ranch hands.

I have only tested them on about 400 head of game however, so I may be wrong. Not sure.

I imagine I could change my mind somewhere around 600 head, but since those days are long gone, I doubt it.

LOL! Great post! 🍷

"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"

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 20:30**

Point taken. Sorry for the pun!

I was using the flat point visual on a hand breaking bar to explain the reason that flat points penetrate in a straighter line 'generally'.

Sorry if I took your comment out of context.

Either Alf, or JPK was wondering scientifically why we felt they would penetrate in more of a straight line.

Me; I'm just a common hillbilly cowboy that see's things on a very basic level.

Glad we agree, and sorry, I was possibly too worked up with JPKs dumb ass comments to get it straight.

Cheers Jeffeosso!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 21:00**

quote:

Posted 08 November 2009 19:08 Hide Post

Michael,

I attack your "test" medium because it produces results entirely different from reality and cannot reproduce real world results.

The above comment is from JPK.

I hope everyone and anyone that has any common sense, reads this statement and understands the stupidity of such a statement. I have done a hell of a lot of testing myself in mediums, and can tell you that the results have been very similar to what has resulted in a few HUNDRED head of big game.

Where conditions were in fact so much different from actual game animals, it was understood why and the results with game could be predicted, because of the differences.

But then again, I guess one would have to have the sense God gave a goat to figure that out.

Crap!



<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**Whitworth**

**08 November 2009, 21:15**

quote:

Originally posted by DWright:

quote:

Posted 08 November 2009 19:08 Hide Post  
Michael,

I attack your "test" medium because it produces results entirely different from reality and cannot reproduce real world results.

The above comment is from JPK.

I hope everyone and anyone that has any common sense, reads this statement and understands the stupidity of such a statement.

I have done a hell of a lot of testing myself in mediums, and can tell you that the results have been very similar to what has resulted in a few HUNDRED head of big game.

Where conditions were in fact so much different from actual game animals, it was understood why and the results with game could be predicted, because of the differences.

But then again, I guess one would have to have the sense God gave a goat to figure that out.

Crap!



I too have to scratch my head in bewilderment over this statement. You're reaching, JPK.

"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"

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 21:57**

Well now, just you hold on there Whitworth. I've been think this whole testing thing over, and here's my thought.  
I believe JPK just may have a valid point.

See, I put his logic to work. . . . .

I'm gunna give NASA a call.

Yup NASA!

I figure JPK is correct, and that the only way to know for anything for sure, and just what will happen in any situation, is to 'just do it!

Why NASA you ask. . . Well, it's like this.

I am beginning to see no real need for NASA to spend billions of our tax payers dollars to do mock up testing for their space machines and pilots!

Hell no! I figure the only way to know if them there 'space machines' are gunna work, is to just stick a bunch of untrained men in them there 'space machines', and light the fuse!

As JPK state's, that's the ONLY way to know something for sure. Testing all this stuff is useless. And as far as training the guys to fly them there 'space machines', is with actual on the job experience. Sink or swim.

Yup, ol' JPK just may be on to something.



<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 22:51**

quote:

Why delete it? I would have read it and perhaps learned something valuable.

I have to add, though at leaast in my world evidence-based practice takes precedence over experience-based practice. In other words "in my experience" even if it is substantial, is only trusted and valuable if there is some independent test to support it.

"This is the way I have always done it."

"This has always worked for me in the past."

"This is good enough."

-are no longer acceptable in my world. Those individuals who practice the above opinions are the people who keep me in business.

I am not saying you are making that claim, but the variability in anatomy coupled with the variability in shot placement, direction, impact velocity, etc. make tests such as those done by michael458 imperative to better understanding and

to better bullet choice. You and I ARE hunters and we both have the same exact goal - quick, humane and respectful taking of our game. Best is to determine what has the best chance of doing so on paper and test media first; before trying it out on one of God's creatures. And if something seemed to work better than another in such tests, we would both choose it.

Wouldn't you agree?

Why delete it? Well, mainly because arguing with coolaid drinkers is a waste of time I do not currently have.

But let me give just one example of the many, many ridiculous contortions of reason in Michael's earlier post in response to my post reiterating that the inferences he draws from his tests are invalid because his tests do not reproduce results attained in the real world: Michael actually tries to argue that because catalogs and other print that he inbeds within his newsprint medium is 31% stiffer, tougher - Q: how in the hell would he know that, btw? - that it changes the density of his medium by 31% and so brings his medium from the density cited by Alf for newsprint to quite near the density cited by Alf for flesh! Not only is mixing stiffness, toughness and density mixing apples and oranges, Michael is also inventing facts to match Alf's citation, which I believe is inaccurate for WET newsprint to begin with.

Moreover, Michael makes clear that he shoots game only in an effort to substantiate his so called tests. This is 180\* backward. Testing is supposed to provide predictive results of the real world. If it doesn't it isn't testing, it is playing and pointless. Achieving real world results are the driver for all testing but Michael's. An example here is hemispherical RN solids. They work well in the real world, they provide straight line penetration, they have an historical track record that is duplicable in game on both first shot and subsequent shot testing. They consistently veer in Michael's test medium. Nothing wrong with the game, it is the real world target. Nothing wrong with the bullets, they perform in the real world target. The disconnect is only found in Michael's tests, and that is because Michael's test medium cannot reproduce actual real world results. His medium is faulty, the tests are irrelevant as a result, at least as they relate to hemispherical RN solids, and his inferences which are repeated ad nauseum are inaccurate.

Wouldn't I agree? I am all for testing, but for any test to be useful it must produce results that are predictive of the real world. Michael's tests are not, because his medium is faulty. I do not have the resources to test in ballistic gelatin. The real world results that I seek to predict is solid bullet penetration in elephants and buff bodies and elephant heads on brain shots. And within that larger realm, I am particularly interested in solid bullet penetration from .458" solids driven at speeds attainable from the 458wm case, since that is what I use to hunt elephants. So, without access to ballistic gelatin and knowing of no test medium other than elephant heads, bodies, buff bodies and ballistic gel that produces results predictive of real world results, I do my testing in elephant heads, bodies and buff bodies.

Are their inconsistencies from shot to shot because the test medium is inconsistent? Yes, some for body shots, not so much for frontal brain shots except for required skull penetration due to different elevations of the elephants head, very variation little with side brain shots. With body shots, you have a greater variation, guts, ribs, shoulders, etc... But then, since the medium IS the real world target, the variations, over the long haul, produce a range of real world expectations from the test. Not all shots in the field will hit bone, nor will they all miss. Likewise guts, etc. The range of expectations achieved in live and dead game will EXACTLY predict the first shot real world results on game, if you have done sufficient shooting, and digging. The differentiation between experience based practice and evidence based practice is the bullet digging after the shot. Velocity is controllable. And all elephants - at least the one's I'm shooting - are killed within a pretty tight range, 7 to 35yds, so uncontrolled changes in velocity are minimal. (I test my hunting and test loads for change of velocity due to change in temperature to ensure limited variation on that front as well.)

So, when I was first looking to go buff or elephant hunting, I explored the centuries of experience that previous hunters had, and then narrowed to the personal experience of a few fellows who had wide personal experience and the interest in the topic to do their own testing - in real game - and bullet digging. In the end, for my first hunt, I relied on Dan McCarthy's personal experience and advice, as well as that of Roger Whittall, an outfitter and now retired PH in Zim. From the start, I began to dig bullets and to try different bullets and velocities. I compare results with fellows like Dan or 465H&H who also has much elephant and buff experience.

When someone comes up with an affordable, accessible, useable test medium that is predictive of either body shots on buff and elephants, or elephant heads, I will guarantee that my testing will expand. Until then, I'll use the only accessible testing medium that predicts real world results.

On another front, Michael attacks me for limiting the cartridge, bullets and the game I test on. Well, beyond the fact that they define the limits of my primary interest, another view would be that I limit variables. It does not take much reading of Michael's rants to reveal the huge number of velocity variation, weight variation, calibre variations etc, etc, and the absence of change one variable at a time in his "methodology." It is almost random.

For what its worth, my personal experience and testing reveals that hemispherical, steel jacketed, RN solids travel straight in game. They travel nose first for sufficient penetration for success on buff or elephant body shots from at least a quartering away angle. They have a strong tendency to tumble when they have lost substantial velocity in the game. They penetrate bone extremely well, I have never recovered one with a deformed, dented or mishapened nose, despite penetrating heavy, marrow free elephant bones.

FN solids penetrate muscle and vicera and light bone extremely well, providing on order of 40% greater penetration that the RN's. But they are not as good, or as reliable at penetrating bone as steel jacket RN's. {Others with whom I compare results inform me that truncated cone FN's outperform ogived FN solids by a wide margin for both outright penetration and for straight line penetration. I believe my correspondents, but I have no first hand results and won't for some time since I cannot fire Barnes bullets safely in my 458wm rifle.)

So, for me, load a RN for the first shot at an elephant, it will be a frontal brain shot since that is my ultimate goal. But load a FN for the second shot because you may need all of the penetration you can muster.

Either RN or FN will be more than sufficient for a buff, they just aren't large enough to require the utmost of penetration.

Michael can spout his irrelevant results from his irrelevant tests and repeat his erroneous inferences, but he can't accurately

predict real world results with his tests. Moreover, that isn't his goal, he wants real world results to substantiate his tests, which is backward, and which they do not do, at least as far as RN solids are concerned. Further, he does not understand, and does not have an interest in understanding why his tests produce their results. {Not that I am claiming to have some great understanding, I have done some reading, need to do more: but I do have the desire for greater understanding.} If you want to begin to understand why bullets do what they do, and you want to learn about bullet performance, you would do well to read Alf's and Gerard's previous posts, and to read Alf's cited sources. Not everything about bullet performance is yet understood, and there are differences in theories used to attempt to explain some elements of performance. To ignore the underlying theories to simply say, paraphrasing Michael, "I focus on results" is too simple, too wilfully ignorant, especially when those "results" come from "tests" that cannot predict real world results. And again, the moreso when all is turned backward and hunting performance is not the goal, but only supposed to substantiate "tests" in a medium known to be faulty.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

**JPK**

**08 November 2009, 23:14**

quote:

Originally posted by Whitworth:

I attack your "test" medium because it produces results entirely different from reality and cannot reproduce real world results. I too have to scratch my head in bewilderment over this statement. You're reaching, JPK. Whitworth

[/QUOTE]

RN solids consistently veer in Michael's test medium. They do not often veer in game.

That is but one case where Michael's test cannot reproduce real world results, and cannot predict real world results, which is the entire point of testing to begin with.

The thousands of guys who have gone before us in Africa aren't really any different than us. To varying degrees, like us, they had curiosity, they dug bullets, they wanted to use what was going to work, they didn't want to get gored or squashed.

According to Michael's "tests" in his medium, what they used couldn't have consistently worked. Consistent, successful day in and day out performance on elephant or buff hunting couldn't have begun until the advent of brass, ogived, flat nose solids. But it did, eh?

I'll leave you guys to have your fun, drink your coolaid, shoot trees and mud, and play your "tests" games.

When, if ever, you really want to find out about bullet performance in large DG and at least begin to earn an understanding of what, why, when, do yourself a favor and read up on the topic. You can start hear by reading Alf's previous posts, and Gerard's and 465H&H's and Dan McCarthy's (500Grains.)

You won't get that from Michael, or his irrelevant "tests" in his irrelevant medium.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

**shootaway**

**08 November 2009, 23:36**

I do not own a Winchester big bore but I am curious as to what is it about them that allow them to feed large FN meplat bullets(if that's the case) while other rifles have issues.

**DWright**

**08 November 2009, 23:57**

JPK, you have evidently not read what I wrote earlier. I have in fact had RNs veer off course on cattle and other animals. I am sorry that you have not had enough experience to see this for yourself. Best!

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**JPK**

**09 November 2009, 00:03**

quote:

Originally posted by DWright:

JPK, you have evidently not read what I wrote earlier. I have in fact had RNs veer off course on cattle and other animals.

I am sorry that you have not had enough experience to see this for yourself.

Best!

I read what you posted and gave it the weight it deserved.

From your post, I gather you regard shooting cattle as hunting. Now that is a hoot!

JPK

□ Free 500grains

**Canuck**

**09 November 2009, 00:06**

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

From your post, I gather you regard shooting cattle as hunting. Now that is a hoot!

JPK

Bullets behave differently when "hunting" than when shooting cattle in a field?

[2009 Tanzania Hunt Report](#)

[My 2000 to 2009 "Decade in Review" Slideshow](#)

**DWright**

**09 November 2009, 00:28**

Yes, cattle, bulls, cows, deer, elk, bear, pig, it's all food. I doubt a bullet thru 2,000 lb, Bull acts much different than a 1,500 African Buffalo.

And the subject was bullets, not hunting. I have done both.

<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**capoward**

**09 November 2009, 00:54**

Wow...lots of back and forth since yesterday.

I personally am open to all logical methods of laboratory bullet performance testing if results are verifiable and quantifiable by live animal testing. I mean, the U.S. Army tested various designs and weights of 30 caliber bullets on thousands of pigs and cattle between 1906 and our involvement in WWII to identify the potential "best" bullet design and weight for use against live human targets. Notice they didn't actually "verify" their test results except during wartime conditions against enemy soldiers.

So I guess unless someone on AR has a personal stash of a few thousand elephant and buffalo that they'd generously provide for field testing of laboratory results; then we'll have to make do with those individuals having sufficient interest and resources to both conduct laboratory and field testing...one their own dime...when they are willing to share their methodology and quantifiable results.

JPK and Alf...It's obvious that neither of you agree with Michael458's manner of testing bullet performance. Michael has freely provided examples of both laboratory testing and live animal testing with the same bullets fired from the identical rifle. However I've seen nothing but hyperbole from either one of you which truthfully adds nothing to this discussion but is certainly detracting from it.

I suggest that each of you initiate a thread within the AR Big Bore Forum to discuss your individual laboratory testing and live animal testing methodology replete with photographs of method of testing with bullets, unfired and fired, with the identical rifle used for both, so that all of us can be fully enlightened.

Michael...I personally enjoy your freely given discussions of bullet performance inclusive of both laboratory testing and field testing against live animals. Keep up the good work; it is both informative and enlightening.

Jim 

*"Life's hard; it's harder if you're stupid"*

*John Wayne*

**capoward**

**09 November 2009, 01:21**

Interesting discussions as regarding RN vis-à-vis FN solid performance; obviously both nose variations kill and both nose variations have killed for many years.

Thought I'd throw this picture out into the discussion; all are RN C&C jacket solids:





**Above, some solids aren't "solid."** (Extract from Page 79, Rifle Magazine, November-December 2009)

I can't say whether these bullets killed their respective live animal, the ultimate goal, I can however say that they didn't perform as optimally as desirable.

Jim 🤖

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

**michael458**

**09 November 2009, 01:45**

I will go over everything in the morning, if JPK has anything legitimate I will address at that time. I suppose the address will be very short!

In the meantime the next step we make will be towards looking at Non Conventional bullets.

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**

**09 November 2009, 01:53**

Well no need to wait until the morning to address this. Pretty simple, since there is nothing new on the JPK front even going back a year or more.

JPK

Thank you for your contribution, it is noted, and appropriately filed.

DWright

I think Mr Bob West was a very very wise man!

Hmmmm.

Mr. Bob West; now passed on, was one of my gunsmiths, as well as a good friend. He worked for many years with P.O. Ackley doing testing of all sorts with firearms and cartridges. I'd ask him questions, and listen for hours about his testing and results. He was a very soft spoken man that had forgot more than most will ever know.

He never got into an argument or disagreement with anyone that disagreed with his findings, as he said he was too old and too tired, and it was not worth the energy he had left.

I asked him why he himself never wrote a book about all he had learned. (Some of which goes against what some accept as true today).

He said it was because you can't prove it to anyone!

He went on to say there will always be some asshole that takes up all your time disputing your test results. They shoot a few animals and think they know it all.

He made a comment once that: there are many things that come to light while testing that can not be learned by shooting an animal.

Those that do the testing and report the results are brave and should be commended for their efforts, as others can learn from those results.

Bob West; a man that spent most his life gaining knowledge by testing and building fine custom rifles was in his mid 90s, and did not have much energy left to argue with the assholes hell bent on arguing his findings from those tests, so unless you asked him about what he learned, he kept it to himself.

No need to worry, I have plenty of energy, plenty of data, and more then enough to ignore ignorance, the issue is that some are so stupid, they are not even aware they are ignorant!

As stated we will start our discussions this week on Non Conventional bullets.

Michael

<http://www.b-riflesandcartridges.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.

**capoward**

**09 November 2009, 02:15**

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
The tumbling behaviour of oblong, ogived projectiles in dense visco-elastic targets is a physical fact, not opinion!...  
Cows, buffalo, deer, mice and man is not simply a single solid homogenous slab of steak...  
Does stacked paper, wet or dry, wood, clay, soap, gelatine have the same effect as say pure muscle covered with skin on a bullet's behaviour when the bullet is shot into the media, under the same impact conditions? ...  
The answer is self evident and does not really require much debate...  
We will not even try and go into the effects that the bullet has on the target because that is where impossible enters the mind 😊

Few extracts remind me of a college professor I had...couldn't get a straight answer out of him either.

I have a very simple question, the answer of which should not require more than 50 words fully excluding the verbal mumbo-jumbo; aka: bs, so here it is.

Alf, using your personal knowledge and experience, what test medium or combination test medium produces "reproducible bullet results" in both the test medium and the hunted live animal? And to be even more specific hoping for a succinct answer, please limit the response solely to your approved test medium to successfully replicate hunt results against live cape buffalo.

If there is none, please limit the response to "there is none".

Thanks,

Jim 🤖

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

**RIP**

**09 November 2009, 03:41**

capoward,  
Thanks for the contributions here.  
But please don't lump Alf in with JPK.

Compare their contributions.

Dr. Alf : Good critiques, lot's of good science, he is merely helping us stay on the road to truth.  
His initial caution about not making overzealous statements about nose shape was merely proper caution.  
I am squarely in Michael's camp regarding the value of testing in artificial media.  
Alf is too.  
He will tell you that the medium closest to muscle is 10% ordnance gelatin at 40F but only if it passes the BB calibration before testing commences.  
And you might drape clothing and a fresh-killed pigskin over it if simulating human flesh for handgun bullet testing.  
It only gets more complicated and expensive from that starting point of approximation.  
Close, but no cigar!

JPK:  
What a load of crap from that hole!  
I salute the time and effort of michael458, in giving any response to JPK.  
However, that is surely wasted on JPK, if not the rest of us.

DRG says: "Kiss my liberal grits!" 🤖

**RIP**

**09 November 2009, 04:19**

Alf,  
Is there any research on the gas pressure within the temporary cavity of the wound in muscle or ordnance gelatin?  
How does it compare to air density?

Does the cancelous, spongy, air/fluid-filled bone of an elephant skull cavitate much more than the permanent wound track as the bullet passes?

If the bone does not get much flung aside, the lateral forces on the sides of a roundnose "solid" passing through the skull of an elephant would be greater than in soft tissue.

Any fishtailing would be confined to lesser amplitude.

Much like shooting a stack of plywood only, roundnoses do fairly well there, with the lesser nose resistance possibly favoring them over an FN for depth of penetration.

Is that what keeps a roundnose solid on course in an elephant skull?

Bone restraining the tail of the bullet to keep the nose pointed forward?

At least long enough to find the brain?

Sometimes that is not long enough, maybe, and poor marksmanship is not all to blame for a failed brain shot on elephant.

Why not use an FN if you can, eh?

DRG says: "Kiss my liberal grits!" 🤖

capoward

09 November 2009, 04:23

quote:

You are correct, for a full thickness penetration of an animal body there is no valid simulant at this time:

Other than a live animals shot under lab conditions and under scrutiny using very expensive and difficult to set up conditions such as the use of high speed flash radiography.

Alf, thank you for your response.

I'm aware of some treatise relating to wound ballistics and trauma; I was given access to much of my former agencies' armory conducted research followed by firearms and ballistic testing prior to moving from .357 magnum wheel guns to the selected .40 S&W in semi-auto replacement handguns. In our case the base requirement was a semi-auto cartridge with appropriate bullet that would kill both a human as well as an automotive engine (old case iron style not current aluminum engine).

Rip...I'm not putting Alf in the same box as JPT. Alf has stated much scientific information stating why something perceived truly isn't. In fact, I'd love to view photographs of Alf's laboratory testing area and read the hunt reports comparing his results drawn from both.

My only issue with Alf is that some of his information is presented in such a manner perceivable as to disparage the individuals and their methodology who have taken the time to conduct bullet and cartridge testing in both the laboratory and the field against the appropriate living game without backing up his statements by producing his personal laboratory and field test results, for all on AR to read that, that disproves or discounts the presented results.

Michael has stated that his laboratory testing is not an absolute match to field testing, that it was only a good approximation...that said he also identified that no bullet that passed his laboratory testing failed to perform equally as well in the field. Michael has also stated that RN solids have demonstrated the tendency to turn rather than run straight and true within his test medium.

Heck, I have multiple books relating to cartridges and Africa and everyone of them includes photographs of RN solids extracted from African DG that have not driven straight and true and often were bent in shape.

Everyone has personal conviction no matter how fervent it is; here are a few of mine:

I personally believe that had Otto Bock known there'd be two world wars within the next 40 years and that Germany would lose both that'd he'd have designed the 9.3x62mm as a 9.5x62mm to assure that the British couldn't try and outlaw the single cartridge of greatest competition to their revered .375 H&H Magnum!

I also personally believe that had the British possessed the quality of smokeless gunpowder that Germany possessed between 1900 and 1920 that the .375 H&H Magnum would never have been a long slender belted cartridge (designed that way to accommodate the British long strand smokeless gunpowder)!

Anyway, those are just a couple of my personal prejudice...just as I personally believe that Vladimir Lenin and Mao Zedong are laughing their respective asses off in hell as a result of the current machinations of the US congress.

Again, I'm not disparaging Alf...but I will also not disparage Michael and his test results either.

Jim 🤖

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

John Wayne