

This topic can be found at:

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

JPK**05 May 2010, 03:13****Terminal Bullet Performance**

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

But mostly, rather than criticize someone for using bullets for what the hell they were designed for - and that isn't shooting wet paper or hardboard - and reporting results, maybe you ought to shut up, pack up and go hunting and find out first hand what happens with solids in real elephants, on real hunts, in the real world.

JPK

I have been there I have done it! I have shot elephants, buffalo, and a damn sight more things than you can even imagine!

So smartass lapdog, you want to direct that comment to me? Real elephants! Real Hunts. Real buffalo! Real Lions and how I got there and was successful is because I shot real paper! So you shut the F%*K up with your inexperienced mouthing off! And while you are at it get off my thread and don't come back.

Michael

By your own admission, in a post to 465H&H just a few pages ago, when he asked about the performance of the Barnes RN's you used to kill your elephants, you replied that you did not dig for bullet, did not record information.

So, you hunted elephants, and lion, and other game, Great for you.

What the hell does that experience have to do with steel jacketed RN solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants? Or FN's for that matter?

BTW, didn't know that you owned this thread.

JPK

AKA: Lapdog

□ Free 500grains

JPK**05 May 2010, 03:16**

Somehow, this one got lost. Wouldn't want you to miss it, Michael458. Pay special attention to the bottom, where I quote an earlier post. Maybe, just maybe you will figure out what solid bullets were intended for. Clue: It isn't shooting wet paper.

And there lies your problem. You cherish irrelevant results in wet paper above real results in real elephants and other game, on real hunts in the real world.

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,

Having a nice hissy fit, eh? Didn't know you owned AR, or at least this thread.

Can't tolerate it when anyone disagrees with you or points out that your so called "tests" just don't reflect reality, real solid bullet performance on real elephants - or other game for that matter - or when someone cites actual, real world, real game experience, eh?

Other than retorting on a handful of recent occasions to your hysterical, ranting and personal attacks in kind I have not attacked you personally.

On the other hand, I have repeatedly pointed out that your so called "tests" of solid bullets, shooting wet paper and other ad hoc media, produces results so far from reality, cannot reproduce real results in real elephant and other game, has zero value for predicting real world results that they are irrelevant to bullet terminal performance in real world hunts for real world elephants and other game.

I have also pointed out that you contradict your own disclaimer about you not extending your wet paper and ad hc media tests to predictions of real solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants and other game so often it is just hypocrisy.

You ought not take disagreement with your opinions, and with the efficacy of your tests as personal attack. If you do, so be it. Your problem, not mine.

Try reading my post below, maybe the whole point of solid bullet making will sink home. Clue: it isn't to shoot wet paper.

JPK
AKA: Lapdog

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:

quote:

Michael, I am not sure you are being fair here. I understand that this thread is about terminal bullet performance but the point is to extrapolate from tests to the field. Shouldn't field experience with actual animals be equally is relevant?

RN bullets kill elephants.
Nobody says they don't.

This thread is to discuss the performance of bullets. If one penetrates better and straighter why would one take it so personal. Kill elephants with whatever you want. If I ever shoot an elephant I will chose the best. Information I have read here makes the decision easy. A closed mind will never grow.

Here lies the whole issue and the whole problem, BoomStick's quote: "Information I have read here makes the decision easy."

The only information on this thread, save one example, shows reliable penetration on elephants by RN steel jacketed solids. One bullet cited on this thread veered, the rest did not.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary, but irrelevant results.

The information on this thread shows TWO examples of FN copper solids veering/deflecting, but otherwise reliable performance.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary (in that it shows no veering or deflection with FN's,) but irrelevant results.

What in the world on this thread shows superior performance by FN solids on elephants? Nothing!

But there is a ream of information that FN's sure do penetrate paper well.

So, were all those damn elephants irrelevant to bullet performance and the wet paper and ad hoc media rellevant?

Are those elephants all F'dU and providing inconvenient results contrary to the media.

Jeezuz, those elephants sure need fixing, so they provide the same results as the wet paper, eh?

Maybe, just maybe, bullet performance ought to measured by performance in the real thing, eh?

JPK

□ Free 500grains

michael458

05 May 2010, 03:31

465HH

Do you believe for one second the comments made by this person are not a personal attack on myself? That is very evident to me, and I think most here, and has even been commented on "by others".

Point two: please go find where any time I state that the woodleigh or other round nose don't work for elephant? It's never been said, never stated, but yet even in your post above, you insinuate this.

You know very well what your comment was about, as does every reasonable person that sees it. I know damn well what it was about, and your boy stated it very well with it's intent. The intent was not to be educated on anything, but to speak down to someone that has not shot elephants, as if that was the end all of experience and knowledge, which it is not. It is but a part of the

equation, but not the sum! Is this enlightening enough?

And who professes to be an expert? Not I of course, as I have stated many many times I am student of terminal ballistics only. Shooting elephants alone, does not make an expert. Testing in dead tissue does not make an expert, especially the body mass of a dead elephant. If you say it is easy to 100% track bullets in dead elephant tissue, then I have not learned how to do that just yet myself! Maybe I could get a lesson.

As stated, animal results are part of the equation, not the sum of. You being a sticker for sample sizes, must surely see value in consistent test medium to test one bullet against another bullet? So please.

I was quick to put your animal results in this thread! I was quick to invite you to bring that here to add to our knowledge.

I also was quick to bring Jack over with his results.

So don't lay that here, that song is not in tune!

465HH, we have had few disagreements this is true, and certainly nothing of import anyway. Sample size, in some terms you are correct, in others, being short of experience with this test medium you are not correct, so I suffice to say we can both be correct, and wrong, so little to disagree about on sample size. When something is in question, then I do in fact want a larger sample size to hopefully answer that question. I know for a fact that I discounted something because of too small a sample size, and I will tell you all exactly what it was. 480 gr 458 caliber Hornady DGS. I tested it, lousy stability and performance, and in my mind condemned ALL HORNADY DGS from that one sample test. I was very very wrong, and I am not correcting that. Now I find the 500 gr Hornady DGS is excellent, the 470 caliber DGS is trying, and with a proper twist rate I bet it gets there too, the .510 caliber DGS did excellent in 500 Nitro last week, and I was supposed to test the .510s 570s in my 510 Wells at higher velocity this week. So far, results are very good and promising for the DGS in faster twist rates, and even the .510 did great in Sams double with 1;18! SO I WAS VERY VERY VERY WRONG ON THAT COUNT. So yes, there are times and I agree.

I hate personal attacks, but I am tired of ignore, and tired of the insults, not personally from you, but in your corner! Maybe it's just hanging around with the wrong crowd! I find you sometimes are judged by those in which you keep company! Rather misconceived I agree, but I don't make the rules! But your boy, goes too far with his insults! And his comments are meant to insult, of that there is no doubt. Now, I will be more than willing to stand in judgement on this matter, if they are not insulting, then by all means please take a vote, I would abide by the rules and the vote of my peers of course. I see them as insulting and a personal attack, if I am wrong then please say so.

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

05 May 2010, 03:31

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:
JPK has stated several times that RN SJ solids penetrate better than FN solids on elephant heads. I haven't weighed in on that statement because I have only used about a dozen on elephants. From that very limited experience, I found the opposite to be true but hope to increase the number during the next year. In this regard if you read Dan McCarthy's article on bullet performance in elephants which even you have referred to then you will see that his results showed Woodleigh RN solids penetrated deeper on elephant heads than NF, Bridger or GS Custom combined. It was only when the abysmal failure, the Barnes RN mono-metal bullet was averaged in did FN penetrate deeper on elephant heads.
465h&H

465H&H,

My results show FN's penetrate elephant heads deeper than RN's. Actually, on frontals and on side brain shots they all exit the skull, except when on a side brain shot they strike the offside zygomatic arch, or where the green dot was. But the FN NF's continue into the neck further on frontals, not infrequently exiting between the shoulder blades. But my results also show that the copper FN's are not so reliable as the steel jacketed Woodleighs.

I have never had a Woodleigh veer or deflect, not so with the NF's. That is why I now load a Woodleigh in the right barrel for the first shot, likely a brain shot, and NF's in the left, in case of missing the brain shot.

And I believe that the NF FN's are superior for any additional shots required as well, because of their tremendous penetration.

As we discussed, I am not as concerned about over penetration on elephants as you are, especially if they are fleeing a missed brain shot.

JPK

AKA: Your ever faithful Lapdog 🐶 😊 😊 😊 😊

o Free 500grains

michael458

05 May 2010, 03:47

Some people, no please let me correct that, one person, I won't say who. Does not have enough sense nor reason to be able to understand that in fact the test work does correlate directly back to animal tissue. In fact by their own results, that are the same. But explaining some effects is a waste of time on some that do not have the capability to comprehend, beyond the abilities to do so. Rather sad I think.

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.

michael458

05 May 2010, 03:51

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

So, you hunted elephants, and lion, and other game, Great for you.

What the hell does that experience have to do with steel jacketed RN solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants? Or FN's for that matter?

JPK
AKA: Lapdog

So you have shot a few elephants, great for you!

What the hell does that have to do with the rest of this thread concerning expanding and NonCon bullets, both tested in REAL test medium and REAL animals?

You know something, please don't answer, I really don't have the time for you, I find it rather.....boring, since you have nothing new to offer.

So no response needed or desired!

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.

MikeBurke

05 May 2010, 04:08

quote:

That is why I now load a Woodleigh in the right barrel for the first shot, likely a brain shot, and NF's in the left, in case of missing the brain shot.

And I believe that the NF FN's are superior for any additional shots required as well, because of their tremendous penetration.

If you shot the elephant with your left barrel first maybe you would not miss the brain. 🍌

465H&H

05 May 2010, 04:14

Michael458,

I think when anyone takes a stand such as macfej did to the point of turning it into a personal attack it is only fair to ask on what experience he is basing his opinion. The fact that he has no experience with any type of bullet on elephant definitely affects the credibility of his opinion. That does not mean that he isn't entitled to an opinion or that his opinion has no value. I certainly didn't mean it as a slight and don't know why anyone would take it that way. I have no idea what his experience is. I think you know me

well enough by now to know that is not my style.

I have completely stayed out of your pissing match with JPK. I am not going to take sides on any pissing match. Maybe I missed something but from what I can remember JPK has criticized your techniques, media and opinions of what your results mean. I don't see that as a personal attack. If we are willing to give an opinion based on whatever then we should be able to take criticism. Maybe I missed a personal attack he has made at you personally if so let me know. I don't approve of personal attacks whether by you, JPK or Macfej. I told you I was anal in this regard.

465H&H

JPK

05 May 2010, 04:16

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

Point two: please go find where any time I state that the woodleigh or other round nose don't work for elephant? It's never been said, never stated, but yet even in your post above, you insinuate this.

And who professes to be an expert? Not I of course, as I have stated many many times I am student of terminal ballistics only.

As stated, animal results are part of the equation, not the sum of.

So don't lay that here, that song is not in tune!

I hate personal attacks, but I am tired of ignore, and tired of the insults, not personally from you, but in your corner! Maybe it's just hanging around with the wrong crowd! I find you sometimes are judged by those in which you keep company! Rather misconceived I agree, but I don't make the rules! But your boy, goes too far with his insults! And his comments are meant to insult, of that there is no doubt. Now, I will be more than willing to stand in judgement on this matter, if they are not insulting, then by all means please take a vote, I would abide by the rules and the vote of my peers of course. I see them as insulting and a personal attack, if I am wrong then please say so.

Michael

Boy, what a bunch of hog wash!

1. You infer from your wet paper shooting that RN steel jacketed solid veer in game. They do not. Your very heavy inference is there, and it is drivel to continue to pretend that you are not drawing false conclusions from your wet paper shooting.
2. You profess to not being be an expert! Just read your own words, you make the claim at every turn! You profess here to be a "student of terminal ballistic only." Your own words repeatedly belie that, moreover, your repeated efforts to ignore or real world solid bullet performance (except when it supports your contention) renders you a student of wet paper and ad hoc media terminal bullet performance. You consider the real results presented to you ONLY when they support your wet paper shooting results, you try your damndest to ignore them, or discount them, or downplay them, or to attack them by attacking the provider EVERYTIME they are contrary to your wet paper results.
3. The only thing out of tune, is your flip flopping, your hypocrisy regarding using real in game results and not, about extending your wet paper results to the prediction of in game performance.
4. You make much of 465H&H's relationship with me or vice versa. We exchange results, theories, pleasantries. He isn't creating results, nor am I. If I dropped dead this moment, he would not change his views, since they are based on his real results. And vice versa. Divide and conquer cannot work, we each have drawn our own conclusions from our own real world, real hunt, real game experiences.
5. As I have written, I have resorted to personal attack only in response to your prior personal attack. And light going at that. The remainder has been mere refutation of your irrelevant results as they apply to real solid bullet performance in real elepahnts and other game, to your irrelevant wet paper so called "tests" and to your hypocritical denial of and following extension of your wet paper shooting results to performance of solids in game, especially steel jacketed RN solids.

As for a vote, the jury is rigged. And to what avail anyway.

Really, you see as insulting ANY disagreement with you. Your intentional misreading of 465H&H's post, your utter mistreatment of him - noted in post twice in the last several days by Dave - is sufficient evidence of this. You may find me thorny or prickly, even ornery, and maybe you think you are responding to me in kind, but it is damned hard to find 465H&H anything but contemplative and thoughtful.

Quit whining. Quit crying oh poor, poor Michael. Respond to disagreement with fact based argument.

The world does not end when someone disagrees with you or thinks your wet paper shooting is irrelevant and leads to false predictions with regard to solid bullet terminal performance.

JPK
AKA: Lapdaog

□ Free 500grains

michael458

05 May 2010, 04:26

OK, it is important to take into account field experience. As stated for sure, it is very much a part of the "Equation" but it is not the

"Sum". Many other factors must come into play to come to real conclusions. One reason that field experience CANNOT be the SUM and the end all of results and conclusions is right in front of us, for all to see.

I have not near enough experience in this particular matter, elephants and elephant heads. But for sure I have taken that into account, to add to test work done before hand. Still it is not the sum of all conclusions.

I find myself that the few flat nose solids I have shot in elephant heads they for sure penetrate far deeper than any round nose I have used. However, this is only two types of bullets, 500 gr 458 caliber old Barnes round nose solids and my current .500 caliber 510 gr flat nose design, most all of you have seen. Without doubt, I never had the old round nose barnes exit, the .500 caliber did exit. So limited experience tells me this only--those two elephants my .500 caliber .510 gr bullet penetrated that head of that elephant better than the 500 gr barnes round nose penetrated the other elephant that day.

So my vote for penetrating elephant heads goes to the flat nose.

Now the "so called" expert elephant head shooter says that FN out penetrates elephant heads too. But has stated many times the RN penetrates elephant heads better, and that is why he choses the Woodleigh? OK, little lost on that? But regardless one says this, the other says that! ANother says FN penetrates deeper (I think that is what is said) for elephant heads, but limited experience and wants more of a sample size. Yet another says that the Woodleigh penetrates deeper than all the rest.

So there is one or two for FN and one or two for RN, all from real world experience. Part of the equation most certainly, but to get to the sum one must have more objectivity and experience doing tests in "consistent" medium, to come up with direct and consistent "conclusions" or the real sum of the total!

This is exactly why real experience is not the end all of the matter. There is no consistency with even conclusions from one experience to the next, one hunter to the next, one bullet, velocity, twist rate, cartridge, rifle, an so on, far too many variables and too many opinions, and all different. Even my own! To test in the field only, with no experience in other areas of consistency, is an act of futility. To say otherwise, is an act of foolishness! All things must be considered.

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.

Dave Bush

05 May 2010, 04:27

Michael:

I had been thinking about getting some .458 Hawks with the .065 jacket. However, I might just buy a box of the .416 bullets with the .050 jacket. That would be a good test too if you could test them. I sent Andy and e-mail to see if I could talk him out of a few of the .458 .065 jacket bullets for the test but I haven't heard from him. I will try and remember to call him tomorrow.

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).

JPK

05 May 2010, 04:30

Michael458,

You have edited my post again, with out noting it. You removed this portion:

"By your own admission, in a post to 465H&H just a few pages ago, when he asked about the performance of the Barnes RN's you used to kill your elephants, you replied that you did not dig for bullet, did not record information."

Nothing I have shared on this thread, not one post, not one papagraph, not one sentence, not one word has had anything to do with soft bullets.

You know that. Why ask?

And I haven't shot a few elephants, hell, even you have shot more than a few elephants, if six is the number.

JPK
AKA: Lapdog

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

So, you hunted elephants, and lion, and other game, Great for you.

What the hell does that experience have to do with steel jacketed RN solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants? Or FN's for that matter?

JPK
AKA: Lapdog

So you have shot a few elephants, great for you!

What the hell does that have to do with the rest of this thread concerning expanding and NonCon bullets, both testeed in REAL test medium and REAL animals?

You know something, please don't answer, I really don't have the time for you, I find it rather.....boring, since you have nothing new to offer.

So no response needed or desired!

M

o Free 500grains

michael458

05 May 2010, 04:37

quote:

Originally posted by Dave Bush:
Michael:

I had been thinking about getting some .458 Hawks with the .065 jacket. However, I might just buy a box of the .416 bullets with the .050 jacket. That would be a good test too if you could test them. I sent Andy and e-mail to see if I could talk him out of a few of the .458 .065 jacket bullets for the test but I haven't heard from him. I will try and remember to call him tomorrow.

Dave

416s with the .050 would be good too. Just let me know what velocity you would like to see and any specs you would like to put on the test. Be happy to do so. It's been a long time since I spoke to Andy, but many years ago we had some good conversations. The last Hawks I bought were .500 calibers. None of the thicker jackets.

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.

jeffosso

05 May 2010, 04:45

how many elephant heads can dance on a woody RN solid?

#dumptrump

opinions vary band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about
the [416AR](#), [458AR](#), [470AR](#), [500AR](#)
[What is an AR round?](#) Case Drawings [416-458-470AR](#) and [500AR](#),
[476AR](#),
<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,
You have edited my post again,

So what, johnny? you do the same all the time

#dumptrump

opinions vary band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about
the [416AR](#), [458AR](#), [470AR](#), [500AR](#)
[What is an AR round?](#) Case Drawings [416-458-470AR](#) and [500AR](#).
[476AR](#),
<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

michael458

05 May 2010, 04:52

Edited. Not edited, left out because it was not pertaining to my reply. FYI this thread is not solely created for steel jacketed RN solid terminal performance.

Stated that you have never mentioned anything about a soft expanding bullet is EXACTLY THE POINT. This thread is not steel FMJ solids only, in fact more expanding bullets are tested than solids of all types here.

That is the point of that response, thank you for assisting me to make that point, by your own words! Do you understand that?

<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.

jwp475

05 May 2010, 04:52

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,

Having a nice hissy fit, eh? Didn't know you owned AR, or at least this thread.

Can't tolerate it when anyone disagrees with you or points out that your so called "tests" just don't reflect reality, real solid bullet performance on real elephants - or other game for that matter - or when someone cites actual, real world, real game experience, eh?

Other than retorting on a handful of recent occasions to your hysterical, ranting and personal attacks in kind I have not attacked you personally.

On the other hand, I have repeatedly pointed out that your so called "tests" of solid bullets, shooting wet paper and other ad hoc media, produces results so far from reality, cannot reproduce real results in real elephant and other game, has zero value for predicting real world results that they are irrelevant to bullet terminal performance in real world hunts for real world elephants and other game.

I have also pointed out that you contradict your own disclaimer about you not extending your wet paper and ad hc media tests to predictions of real solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants and other game so often it is just hypocrisy.

You ought not take disagreement with your opinions, and with the efficacy of your tests as personal attack. If you do, so be it. Your problem, not mine.

Try reading my post below, maybe the whole point of solid bullet making will sink home. Clue: it isn't to shoot wet paper.

JPK
AKA: Lapdog

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:

quote:

Michael, I am not sure you are being fair here. I understand that this thread is about terminal bullet performance but the point is to extrapolate from tests to the field. Shouldn't field experience with actual animals be equally is relevant?

RN bullets kill elephants.

Nobody says they don't.

This thread is to discuss the performance of bullets. If one penetrates better and straighter why would one take it so personal. Kill elephants with whatever you want. If I ever shoot an elephant I will chose the best. Information I have read here makes the decision easy. A closed mind will never grow.

Here lies the whole issue and the whole problem, BoomStick's quote: "Information I have read here makes the decision easy."

The only information on this thread, save one example, shows reliable penetration on elephants by RN steel jacketed solids. One bullet cited on this thread veered, the rest did not.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary, but irrelevant results.

The information on this thread shows TWO examples of FN copper solids veering/deflecting, but otherwise reliable performance.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary (in that it shows no veering or deflection with FN's,) but irrelevant results.

What in the world on this thread shows superior performance by FN solids on elephants? Nothing!

But there is a ream of information that FN's sure do penetrate paper well.

So, were all those damn elephants irrelevant to bullet performance and the wet paper and ad hoc media relevant?

Are those elephants all F'dU and providing inconvenient results contrary to the media.

Jeezuz, those elephants sure need fixing, so they provide the same results as the wet paper, eh?

Maybe, just maybe, bullet performance ought to be measured by performance in the real thing, eh?

JPK

I'd say that by your own words the flat point is superior and confirms Micheal458's tests as well

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
465H&H,

FYI, about 50% of my Woodleighs exit on broadside shots on cow elephants. 100% of the NF's. On bulls, the Woodleighs don't exit, and the NF's exit most of the time.

Right now, if I had to pick only one solid, it would have to be the Woodleigh .458", 500gr.

Also, on Quartering away shots, the NF's reliably penetrate into, maybe exiting, the off side shoulder or are found under the skin or to have exited from the front. The Woodleighs do not penetrate to that extent, and so do less damage to the lungs and heart.

The beautiful thing here is that I do not have to select just one bullet, I can select two, and use the one most suitable for the circumstances. A useful feature of double rifles.

JPK

A 9mm may expand to a larger diameter, but a 45 ain't going to shrink

Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing had happened.
- Winston Churchill

JPK

05 May 2010, 04:57

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

OK, it is important to take into account field experience. As stated for sure, it is very much a part of the "Equation" but it is not the "Sum". Many other factors must come into play to come to real conclusions. One reason that field experience CANNOT be the SUM and the end all of results and conclusions is right in front of us, for all to see.

I have not near enough experience in this particular matter, elephants and elephant heads. But for sure I have taken that into account, to add to test work done before hand. Still it is not the sum of all conclusions.

I find myself that the few flat nose solids I have shot in elephant heads they for sure penetrate far deeper than any round nose I have used. However, this is only two types of bullets, 500 gr 458 caliber old Barnes round nose solids and my current .500 caliber 510 gr flat nose design, most all of you have seen. Without doubt, I never had the old round nose Barnes exit, the .500 caliber did exit. So limited experience tells me this only--those two elephants my .500 caliber .510 gr bullet penetrated that head of that elephant better than the 500 gr Barnes round nose penetrated the other elephant that day.

So my vote for penetrating elephant heads goes to the flat nose.

Now the "so called" expert elephant head shooter says that FN out penetrates elephant heads too. But has stated many times the RN penetrates elephant heads better, and that is why he choses the Woodleigh? OK, little lost on that? But regardless one says this, the other says that! ANother says FN penetrates deeper (I think that is what is said) for elephant heads, but limited experience and wants more of a sample size. Yet another says that the Woodleigh penetrates deeper than all the rest.

So there is one or two for FN and one or two for RN, all from real world experience. Part of the equation most certainly, but to get to the sum one must have more objectivity and experience doing tests in "consistent" medium, to come up with direct and consistent "conclusions" or the real sum of the total!

This is exactly why real experience is not the end all of the matter. There is no consistency with even conclusions from one experience to the next, one hunter to the next, one bullet, velocity, twist rate, cartridge, rifle, an so on, far too many variables and too many opinions, and all different. Even my own! To test in the field only, with no experience in other areas of consistency, is an act of futility. To say otherwise, is an act of foolishness! All things must be considered.

Michael

Michael,

No amount of wet paper and ad hoc media shooting will ever provide results that repeat real world results, that predict real world results. The media is the problem, it provides irrelevant results that do not duplicate real world results, cannot predict real world results. This fact regarding the media's defficiency has been known for decades.

Performance in game IS the reason for solid bullets.

Sample size runs to the hundred plus for me, more for 465H&H. Your sample size, in wet paper runs a tiny, all but immaterial fraction.

No amount of testing in something other than elephant heads will ever equal testing in elephant head, even with samples much smaller than those I have, 500Grains has, 465H&H has.

Since you seem to have so much difficulty understanding why Woodleigh RN's are the preferred bullet for brain shots on elephants, despite the FN's penetration advantage, something I have repeated ad nauseum on this thread and the 470 penetration thread, let me spell it out one more time:

1. Penetration required to reach the brain on frontal or side brain shots is known and is well within the capability of both NF FN's and Woodleigh RN's.
2. NF FN's rivet, divot and otherwise deform when they strike bone, especially heavy bone. Riveting frequency is 100% when even light bone is encountered, but not all riveting is harmful to performance, it can even add to in game stability. However, when they divot or deform non-uniformly, they have exhibited a tendency to veer or to deflect. (Gerard argues that his softer FN bullets will not deflect so readily, I don't know.)
3. Woodleighs do not deform (often?) when they strike bone, even heavy bone, nose first. (I have never recovered a Woodleigh with nose deformation. Every deformed Woodleigh that I have recovered has exhibitted signs of tumbling. Tumbling "only" occurs when the RN has expended the great proportion of its velocity, well after it has done its job.)
4. Since heavy bone may be encountered on brain shots, especially side brain shots, the Woodleighs are preferred, because their noses do not deform.
5. Since FN's out penetrate RN's in soft material, and on second and subsequent shots, as much penetration as can be mustered may be required, use FN's for the second and subsequent shot.

6. Bone encountered on a second or subsequent shot need not be penetrated, only broken - or 465H&H reports merely severely damaged. Bone likely to be encountered or targeted on second and subsequent shots are the hip bone, leg bones, spine, shoulder. An elephant cannot walk on three legs.

Caveat: Neither the copper FN's or the steel jacketed RN's will penetrate ivory reliably. And it is reported the same for the elephants molars as well, but I have no first hand experience on the issue.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

JPK

05 May 2010, 05:02

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,

You have edited my post again,

So what, johnny? you do the same all the time

No, I indicate, or at least try to, when I have edited a post, like "..." to signify the abbreviation of the post or noting that the post is edited. And even at that I rarely edit posts.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

JPK

05 May 2010, 05:04

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

Edited. Not edited, left out because it was not pertaining to my reply. FYI this thread is not solely created for steel jacketed RN solid terminal performance.

Stated that you have never mentioned anything about a soft expanding bullet is EXACTLY THE POINT. This thread is not steel FMJ solids only, in fact more expanding bullets are tested than solids of all types here.

That is the point of that response, thank you for assisting me to make that point, by your own words! Do you understand that?

Yes, I understand that a portion of this thread is about soft points.

I also understand that a larger portion, and growing, is about solid performance in game vs in your wet paper and ad hoc media.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

JPK

05 May 2010, 05:06

Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK

quote:

Originally posted by jwp475:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,

Having a nice hissy fit, eh? Didn't know you owned AR, or at least this thread.

Can't tolerate it when anyone disagrees with you or points out that your so called "tests" just don't reflect reality, real solid bullet performance on real elephants - or other game for that matter - or when someone cites actual, real world, real game experience, eh?

Other than retorting on a handful of recent occasions to your hysterical, ranting and personal attacks in kind I have not attacked you personally.

On the other hand, I have repeatedly pointed out that your so called "tests" of solid bullets, shooting wet paper and other ad hoc media, produces results so far from reality, cannot reproduce real results in real elephant and other game, has zero value for predicting real world results that they are irrelevant to bullet terminal performance in real world hunts for real world elephants and other game.

I have also pointed out that you contradict your own disclaimer about you not extending your wet paper and ad hoc media tests to predictions of real solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants and other game so often it is just hypocrisy.

You ought not take disagreement with your opinions, and with the efficacy of your tests as personal attack. If you do, so be it. Your problem, not mine.

Try reading my post below, maybe the whole point of solid bullet making will sink home. Clue: it isn't to shoot wet paper.

JPK

AKA: Lapdog

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:

quote:

Michael, I am not sure you are being fair here. I understand that this thread is about terminal bullet performance but the point is to extrapolate from tests to the field. Shouldn't field experience with actual animals be equally relevant?

RN bullets kill elephants.

Nobody says they don't.

This thread is to discuss the performance of bullets. If one penetrates better and straighter why would one take it so personal. Kill elephants with whatever you want. If I ever shoot an elephant I will chose the best. Information I have read here makes the decision easy. A closed mind will never grow.

Here lies the whole issue and the whole problem, BoomStick's quote: "Information I have read here makes the decision easy."

The only information on this thread, save one example, shows reliable penetration on elephants by RN steel jacketed solids. One bullet cited on this thread veered, the rest did not.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary, but irrelevant results.

The information on this thread shows TWO examples of FN copper solids veering/deflecting, but otherwise reliable performance.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary (in that it shows no veering or deflection with FN's,) but irrelevant results.

What in the world on this thread shows superior performance by FN solids on elephants? Nothing!

But there is a ream of information that FN's sure do penetrate paper well.

So, were all those damn elephants irrelevant to bullet performance and the wet paper and ad hoc media relevant?

Are those elephants all F'dU and providing inconvenient results contrary to the media.

Jeezuz, those elephants sure need fixing, so they provide the same results as the wet paper, eh?

Maybe, just maybe, bullet performance ought to be measured by performance in the real thing, eh?

JPK

I'd say that by your own words the flat point is superior and confirms Micheal458's tests as well

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
465H&H,

FYI, about 50% of my Woodleighs exit on broadside shots on cow elephants. 100% of the NF's. On bulls, the Woodleighs don't exit, and the NF's exit most of the time.

Right now, if I had to pick only one solid, it would have to be the Woodleigh .458", 500gr.

Also, on Quartering away shots, the NF's reliably penetrate into, maybe exiting, the off side shoulder or are found under the skin or to have exited from the front. The Woodleighs do not penetrate to that extent, and so do less damage to the lungs and heart.

The beautiful thing here is that I do not have to select just one bullet, I can select two, and use the one most suitable for the circumstances. A useful feature of double rifles.

JPK

□ Free 500grains

CowboyCS

05 May 2010, 05:13

I think I'll just stick with my big balls, they've been working for me for years.... 🇹🇼

Colin

Macifej

05 May 2010, 05:16

quote:

JPK

So to prove your point(s) I offer you the same opportunity as 465 you devise the test and I'll supply the bullets. Since the two of you are self-annoyed geniuses (having shot a herd of ele between you) in the realm of material science, external ballistics, hydrodynamics, etc. we should see something with well modelled statistical controls. All repeatable of course.



michael458

05 May 2010, 05:20

quote:

Originally posted by CowboyCS:

I think I'll just stick with my big balls, they've been working for me for years.... 🇹🇼

Colin



Yes, I saw those big balls earlier! I think anything I could say about that might lead to misconceptions at the least, and how does one top that anyway!

LOL

Welcome by the way! I think there is some discussion about those round balls that you might be able to add to. I promise I have ZERO experience with "balls". Not really looking for any experience in that direction either!

LOL

Well, it's getting dark here, and I see there is nothing new added that has not been heard many times before. So I think I am off for the evening! By all means carry on!

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

05 May 2010, 05:25

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

OK, it is important to take into account field experience. As stated for sure, it is very much a part of the "Equation" but it is not the "Sum". Many other factors must come into play to come to real conclusions. One reason that field experience CANNOT be the SUM and the end all of results and conclusions is right in front of us, for all to see.

I have not near enough experience in this particular matter, elephants and elephant heads. But for sure I have taken that into account, to add to test work done before hand. Still it is not the sum of all conclusions.

I find myself that the few flat nose solids I have shot in elephant heads they for sure penetrate far deeper than any round nose I have used. However, this is only two types of bullets, 500 gr 458 caliber old Barnes round nose solids and my current .500 caliber 510 gr flat nose design, most all of you have seen. Without doubt, I never had the old round nose barnes exit, the .500 caliber did exit. So limited experience tells me this only--those two elephants my .500 caliber .510 gr bullet penetrated that head of that elephant better than the 500 gr barnes round nose penetrated the other elephant that day.

So my vote for penetrating elephant heads goes to the flat nose.

Now the "so called" expert elephant head shooter says that FN out penetrates elephant heads too. But has stated many times the RN penetrates elephant heads better, and that is why he choses the Woodleigh? OK, little lost on that? But regardless one says this, the other says that! ANother says FN penetrates deeper (I think that is what is said) for elephant heads, but limited experience and wants more of a sample size. Yet another says that the Woodleigh penetrates deeper than all the rest.

So there is one or two for FN and one or two for RN, all from real world experience. Part of the equation most certainly, but to get to the sum one must have more objectivity and experience doing tests in "consistent" medium, to come up with direct and consistent "conclusions" or the real sum of the total!

This is exactly why real experience is not the end all of the matter. There is no consistency with even conclusions from one experience to the next, one hunter to the next, one bullet, velocity, twist rate, cartridge, rifle, an so on, far too many variables and too many opinions, and all different. Even my own! To test in the field only, with no experience in other areas of consistency, is an act of futility. To say otherwise, is an act of foolishness! All things must be considered.

Michael

Michael,

No amount of wet paper and ad hoc media shooting will ever provide results that repeat real world results, that predict real world results. The media is the problem, it provides irrelevant results that do not duplicate real world results, cannot predict real world results. This fact regarding the media's deficiency has been known for decades.

Performance in game IS the reason for solid bullets.

Sample size runs to the hundred plus for me, more for 465H&H. Your sample size, in wet paper runs a tiny, all but immaterial fraction.

No amount of testing in something other than elephant heads will ever equal testing in elephant head, even with samples much smaller than those I have, 500Grains has, 465H&H has.

Since you seem to have so much difficulty understanding why Woodleigh RN's are the preferred bullet for brain shots on elephants, despite the FN's penetration advantage, something I have repeated ad nauseum on this thread and the 470 penetration thread, let me spell it out one more time:

1. Penetration required to reach the brain on frontal or side brain shots is known and is well within the capability of both NF FN's and Woodleigh RN's.

2. NF FN's rivet, divot and otherwise deform when they strike bone, especially heavy bone. Riveting frequency is 100% when even light bone is encountered, but not all riveting is harmful to performance, it can even add to in game stability. However, when they divot or deform non-uniformly, they have exhibited a tendency to veer or to deflect.

(Gerard argues that his softer FN bullets will not deflect so readily, I don't know.)

3. Woodleighs do not deform (often?) when they strike bone, even heavy bone, nose first. (I have never recovered a Woodleigh with nose deformation. Every deformed Woodleigh that I have recovered has exhibited signs of tumbling. Tumbling "only" occurs when the RN has expended the great proportion of its velocity, well after it has done its job.)


4. Since heavy bone may be encountered on brain shots, especially side brain shots, the Woodleighs are preferred, because their noses do not deform.

5. Since FN's out penetrate RN's in soft material, and on second and subsequent shots, as much penetration as can be mustered may be required, use FN's for the second and subsequent shot.

6. Bone encountered on a second or subsequent shot need not be penetrated, only broken - or 465H&H reports merely severely damaged. Bone likely to be encountered or targeted on second and subsequent shots are the hip bone, leg bones, spine, shoulder. An elephant cannot walk on three legs.

Caveat: Neither the copper FN's or the steel jacketed RN's will penetrate ivory reliably. And it is reported the same for the elephants molars as well, but I have no first hand experience on the issue.

JPK



<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

05 May 2010, 05:26

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:

quote:


Originally posted by JPK:
Michael458,

You have edited my post again,

So what, johnny? you do the same all the time

No, I indicate, or at least try to, when I have edited a post, like "..." to signify the abbreviation of the post or noting that the post is edited. And even at that I rarely edit posts.

JPK



<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

05 May 2010, 05:26

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:

Edited. Not edited, left out because it was not pertaining to my reply. FYI this thread is not solely created for steel jacketed RN solid terminal performance.


Stated that you have never mentioned anything about a soft expanding bullet is EXACTLY THE POINT. This thread is not steel FMJ solids only, in fact more expanding bullets are tested than solids of all types here.

That is the point of that response, thank you for assisting me to make that point, by your own words! Do you understand that?

Yes, I understand that a portion of this thread is about soft points.

I also understand that a larger portion, and growing, is about solid performance in game vs in your wet paper and ad hoc media.

JPK



<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

05 May 2010, 05:27

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK

quote:

Originally posted by jwp475:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

Michael458,

Having a nice hissy fit, eh? Didn't know you owned AR, or at least this thread.

Can't tolerate it when anyone disagrees with you or points out that your so called "tests" just

don't reflect reality, real solid bullet performance on real elephants - or other game for that matter - or when someone cites actual, real world, real game experience, eh?

Other than retorting on a handful of recent occasions to your hysterical, ranting and personal attacks in kind I have not attacked you personally.

On the other hand, I have repeatedly pointed out that your so called "tests" of solid bullets, shooting wet paper and other ad hoc media, produces results so far from reality, cannot reproduce real results in real elephant and other game, has zero value for predicting real world results that they are irrelevant to bullet terminal performance in real world hunts for real world elephants and other game.

I have also pointed out that you contradict your own disclaimer about you not extending your wet paper and ad hoc media tests to predictions of real solid terminal bullet performance in real elephants and other game so often it is just hypocrisy.

You ought not take disagreement with your opinions, and with the efficacy of your tests as personal attack. If you do, so be it. Your problem, not mine.

Try reading my post below, maybe the whole point of solid bullet making will sink home. Clue: it isn't to shoot wet paper.

JPK

AKA: Lapdog

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:

quote:

Michael, I am not sure you are being fair here. I understand that this thread is about terminal bullet performance but the point is to extrapolate from tests to the field. Shouldn't field experience with actual animals be equally relevant?

RN bullets kill elephants.

Nobody says they don't.

This thread is to discuss the performance of bullets. If one penetrates better and straighter why would one take it so personal. Kill elephants with whatever you want. If I ever shoot an elephant I will chose the best. Information I have read here makes the decision easy. A closed mind will never grow.

Here lies the whole issue and the whole problem, BoomStick's quote: "Information I have read here makes the decision easy."

The only information on this thread, save one example, shows reliable penetration on elephants by RN steel jacketed solids. One bullet cited on this thread veered, the rest did not.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary, but irrelevant results.

The information on this thread shows TWO examples of FN copper solids veering/deflecting, but otherwise reliable performance.

The wet paper and ad hoc media tests provide consistent contrary (in that it shows no veering or deflection with FN's,) but irrelevant results.

What in the world on this thread shows superior performance by FN solids on elephants? Nothing!

But there is a ream of information that FN's sure do penetrate paper well.

So, were all those damn elephants irrelevant to bullet performance and the wet paper and ad hoc media irrelevant?

Are those elephants all F'dU and providing inconvenient results contrary to the media.

Jeezuz, those elephants sure need fixing, so they provide the same results as the wet paper, eh?

Maybe, just maybe, bullet performance ought to be measured by performance in the real thing, eh?

JPK

I'd say that by your own words the flat point is superior and confirms Micheal458's tests as well

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
465H&H,

FYI, about 50% of my Woodleighs exit on broadside shots on cow elephants. 100% of the NF's. On bulls, the Woodleighs don't exit, and the NF's exit most of the time.

Right now, if I had to pick only one solid, it would have to be the Woodleigh .458", 500gr.

Also, on Quartering away shots, the NF's reliably penetrate into, maybe exiting, the off side shoulder or are found under the skin or to have exited from the front. The Woodleighs do not penetrate to that extent, and so do less damage to the lungs and heart.

The beautiful thing here is that I do not have to select just one bullet, I can select two, and use the one most suitable for the circumstances. A useful feature of double rifles.

JPK



<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

05 May 2010, 05:28

STANDARD REPLY-jpk, lapdog

Says everything I need to say to you. Good evening to the rest of you.



<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.

jwp475

05 May 2010, 05:40

quote:

Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

There are flat point solids that supply that type of integrity. Flat point solid leave larger wound channels and out penetrate round nose solids. Flat point solids provide the best of both worlds. This has been know since the 1800's why people are denying it is a mystery

Of course the fact that flat points out penetrate round nose solids, does speak highly for the flat points integrity

A 9mm may expand to a larger diameter, but a 45 ain't going to shrink

Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing had happened.
- Winston Churchill

jeffosso

05 May 2010, 06:03

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK

and this may be the 17th dumbest comment ever made on AR.

RN's integrity, like your own, is questionable.

□

#dumptrump

opinions vary band of bubbas and STC hunting Club

Information on **Ammoguide** about
the [416AR](#), [458AR](#), [470AR](#), [500AR](#)
[What is an AR round?](#) Case Drawings [416-458-470AR](#) and [500AR](#).
[476AR](#),
<http://www.weaponsmith.com>

jwp475

05 May 2010, 06:20

quote:

Armor Piercing: Jacketed designs where the core material is a very hard, high-density metal such as tungsten, tungsten carbide, depleted uranium, or steel. A pointed tip is often used, but a flat tip on the penetrator portion is generally more effective.[1]

The supiriority of a flat point for penetration has been well documentes for a very long time, yet there are still those that like to argue with the facts

A 9mm may expand to a larger diameter, but a 45 ain't going to shrink

Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing had happened.
- Winston Churchill

boom stick

05 May 2010, 08:11

quote:

Originally posted by CowboyCS:
I think I'll just stick with my big balls, they've been working for me for years.... 🍀

Colin



577 BME 3"500 KILL ALL 358 GREMLIN 404-375

we band of 45-70ers (Founder)
Single Shot Shooters Society S.S.S.S. (Founder)

boom stick

05 May 2010, 08:13

These were shot at high velocity in some mean medium if I remember correctly. This was a bullet punishment test and it looks like the Macifej solids won.

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK

and this may be the 17th dumbest comment ever made on AR.

RN's integrity, like your own, is questionable.

577 BME 3"500 KILL ALL 358 GREMLIN 404-375

we band of 45-70ers (Founder)
Single Shot Shooters Society S.S.S.S. (Founder)

Macifej

05 May 2010, 08:34

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:

Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK


Huh ...??

You're lost man!! Careful when you're out plinking ele ... they might outthink you ...!!



boom stick

05 May 2010, 09:01



If Alf would come back and play this thread would get real interesting

577 BME 3"500 KILL ALL 358 GREMLIN 404-375

we band of 45-70ers (Founder)
Single Shot Shooters Society S.S.S.S. (Founder)

Whitworth

05 May 2010, 16:04

quote:

Originally posted by Macifej:

quote:

Originally posted by JPK:
Penetration isn't everything. The bullet needs the integrity to get to the brain for elephants. The steel jacketed RN's provide that integrity. The FN's? not so much.

JPK

Huh ...??

You're lost man!! Careful when you're out plinking ele ... they might outthink you ...!!



LOL! I just spit coffee on my keyboard!

"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"

Dave Bush

05 May 2010, 17:02

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:
Dave,
results will be simple on the hawk bullets.. pancakes if soft, misshapen if solids .. but they deliver the goods on thinskin game

Jeff:

I was wondering.... have you ever tried any Hawks with the heavier .050 or .065 jackets in any of your hunting.

I have to admit that Andy has me intrigued with his "dead soft" concept. I have a friend who always shoots his bison with a 45-70 or perhaps it's a 45-90 but he always uses lead. He has gotten some spectacular results just like they did in days gone by. That's kinda how I see the Hawks.... lots of expansion, big holes, and plenty of punch if you use a bullet of appropriate weight...

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).

Whitworth

05 May 2010, 17:50

Dave, I have used the Deadsofts (.035 jacket?) in my .416 Remmie and my .458 Lott on some hogs and while they do expand impressively, they also tend to come apart. I have experienced complete core separation in the .458 especially even though we ran really subdued velocities (2,100 fps). I wasn't too impressed to say the least.

"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"

CowboyCS

05 May 2010, 17:54

quote:

Originally posted by boom stick:

quote:

Originally posted by CowboyCS:

I think I'll just stick with my big balls, they've been working for me for years.... 🇺🇸

Colin



It's good to inject a little humor into these kinds of topics every once in a while and besides I couldn't pass up the opportunity to talk about my balls. I figure AC/DC wrote that song just for me "I like big balls, she likes big balls, dirty big balls" 🇺🇸

quote:

Welcome by the way! I think there is some discussion about those round balls that you might be able to add to. I promise I have ZERO experience with "balls". Not really looking for any experience in that direction either!

Micheal458,

There really probably isn't much I could add concerning roundball performance, the subject has been covered very well by men with more knowledge and experience than me. And nothing about roundballs has really changed in the last couple hundred years. There are really only a few factors involved with round balls, Velocity, diameter, mass, and hardness of the material.

Most of my experience is obviously with muzzleloaders, since that is what I primarily build. The only real change in roundballs in the last couple hundred years is the materials(alloys) available today and the ability to heat treat or harden them. As for Cartridge roundball guns, I've had an idea rolling around in the back of my head for a few years to build an 11 Bore(.751") using 10 gauge brass necked down and shoot 3/4"(.750") 260 alloy formable brass bearings in it. Lighter than lead roundballs, so the velocity could be increased for equivalent loads, and the hardness is Rockwell B75-B87 as compared to lead alloys at around B20. No real point to it, but it would make for a fun round ball gun with more thump than it's lead equal.

Colin