

This topic can be found at:

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

capoward

18 January 2011, 05:34

Terminal Bullet Performance

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:

quote:

Change this shot to an arse end shot on a shot but rapidly departing buffalo and of the three bullets noted in the foregoing paragraph...ONLY the properly designed FN solid will reliably reach the internal organs from this angle and may take out heavy leg bones on the way.

Quote from capoward:

What data do you have to prove this statement? I guess I am saying prove it!

465H&H

LOL... H as I've previously stated many times in this thread, I've not shot buffalo and I've never been to Africa or to Australia... Yet! But, I'll take your challenge and put my money where my mouth is to prove me correct...or you correct by your allusion that I am incorrect...

I'll have the hunt photographed and even pay a little extra to have a few "Texas heart shot" Asian buffalo dissected to determine just how well they were killed with each bullet and post the results here on this forum in this thread (even if I have to resurrect the thread to do so). I'll even admit I was wrong...if I am wrong. All it will however cost you is few years before I can do so.

Today my wife told me that I can hunt anywhere in the world that I want to hunt as long as I have the money to pay for it. All it will cost me is the identical amount of money placed in her hot little hand to do with whatever she should desire to do with it before I depart on my hunt. So it will definitely take me at least 3 years to accumulate the double cost of an Australian hunt for multiple Asian buffalo.

My 50 MDM rifle will be complete this spring, I just spoke to Steve Button a few days ago and all is going well with it, so I'll have plenty of time to get used to my rifle. And I'll even have some "conventional construction RN solids" manufactured in .500 caliber to go along with my .500 caliber CEB BBW #13 FN solids to use on this hunt.

Does this pass muster for you?

Should you accept...I do have one question, "Just how many "conventional construction RN solids" do I have to shot through the ass end of a single Asian buffalo - if they truly suck on "Texas heart shots" - before I can shot it with my bullet of choice?" Or do I just have to make swiss cheese out of the dam thing until it finally dies a miserable death?

Jim 

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

John Wayne

ALF

18 January 2011, 06:16

capoward

18 January 2011, 06:40

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:

Capoward:

With due respect sir it is a very valid question, in fact it is the quintessential terminal ballistics question !

The answer to this question has been the holy grail of the classic terminal ballistics problem!

Ok...this is a "holy grail" issue.

So regarding, "Forget about getting to the vitals, say our animals are made up of just a huge solid chunk of steak, no bones nothing else. Just a chunk of steak" huge solid chunk of steak?" Is there presently anything alive on earth that would generate this "huge solid chunk of steak"? Or are we talking something that would require a very large dinosaur to carve out this piece of meat?

I'm presuming we're talking very large dinosaur here else someone would have already carved out this huge solid chunk of steak and already produced the solution to the holy grail of the classic terminal ballistics.

Jim 

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

John Wayne

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
Capoward:

With due respect sir it is a very valid question, in fact it is the quintessential terminal ballistics question !

The answer to this question has been the holy grail of the classic terminal ballistics problem!

Alf,

I believe it is postulated in this thread that it is NOT just terminal energy transfer that kills animals but includes the actual trama-both blunt penetrating and cutting shearing- ie how the energy and at what point the energy is transferred that is most important in terminating target animals. Hence in this Capoward is correct in that you have to reach a particular point -not just anywhere in the animal. A tumbling projectile or one that veers too much may indeed transfer energy but if it misses the vitals it does not do its job. It MUST be Directed energy transfer.

We cannot just imagine a giant chunk of meat-- that might be just hip or thigh muscle and simply wound. In military usage a wound is as good as a kill or perhaps better because a wounded soldier requires care. We are attempting quick humane KILLS so must hit vital points within the target animal.

SSR  
SSR

quote:

But a bullet is undoubtedly a rotating object. So can we accurately apply the concept of kinetic energy to bullets at all?  
Makes me wonder.

However, maybe I just don't understand correctly. Won't be the first time!

OK, I'm wondering no more. Since the forward motion of the bullet in a (more or less) straight line, it clearly has translational kinetic energy. If it were sitting still and just rotating, we might talk about its rotational kinetic energy.

Major blond moment, I guess. 🤔

---

Glenn

quote:

Originally posted by Cross L:

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
Capoward:

With due respect sir it is a very valid question, in fact it is the quintessential terminal ballistics question !

The answer to this question has been the holy grail of the classic terminal ballistics problem!

Alf,

I believe it is postulated in this thread that it is NOT just terminal energy transfer that kills animals but includes the actual trama-both blunt penetrating and cutting shearing- ie how the energy and at what point the energy is transferred that is most important in terminating target animals. Hence in this Capoward is correct in that you have to reach a particular point -not just anywhere in the animal. A tumbling projectile or one that veers too much may indeed transfer energy but if it misses the vitals it does not do its job. It MUST be Directed energy transfer.

We cannot just imagine a giant chunk of meat-- that might be just hip or thigh muscle and simply wound. In military usage a wound is as good as a kill or perhaps better because a wounded soldier requires care. We are attempting quick humane KILLS so must hit vital points within the target animal.

SSR  
SSR

A kill is made when the nervous system of the animal is destroyed. That can happen two ways, either by directly destroying sufficient critical nervous system tissue or by depriving the critical nervous system tissue of its blood (oxygen) supply.

A knife typically kills by causing such bleeding that the critical nervous system tissue is deprived of its blood supply. A knife can also kill by cutting the nervous system connection between the brain and the heart thereby causing the heart to stop and depriving the brain of its blood supply. A knife can also kill by directly destroying sufficient critical nervous system tissue directly. Very little kinetic energy used.

I find it easier to think in terms destroying the critical nervous system tissue directly or causing lots of bleeding to deprive the critical nervous system of blood supply(or both) than to think in terms of energy when considering shot placement and bullet performance.

I'm not always sure what people mean by trama. Nor am I always sure what people mean by shock. I do know that a physical blow directly to the certain spots on the critical nervous system can cause the critical nervous system to stop functioning and if that stoppage lasts long enough the critical nervous system will be deprived of blood supply and there by cease functioning.

**ALF** 18 January 2011, 09:43

**Cross L** 18 January 2011, 13:17

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:

The intent with the slab of steak analogy was to uncomplicate the question, but if you so wish lets complicate it by going through skin muscle, rib bone, rib cartilage, lets add a lung, large blood vessel , filled with blood ( now thats an interesting medium..... did you know that blood is not like water in terms of behaviour..... blood is a a fluid, but it's compressable. its viscous, it's elastic and very special, it's shear thinning ! instead of it getting " harder" like water when velocity increases when penetration occurs, blood gets "softer) sorry i'm digressing..... and we can add a spot of heart muscle as well!

Now it just occurred to me that in the development of the modern gun and small arms projectiles the following happened.

Early projectiles were Round, they had low velocity, low kinetic energy, they had poor SD they were of large diameter , **they were stable** ( round balls are stable) and above all they were not that lethal.

With time bullets became elongated ( oblong), the caliber got smaller and smaller, velocity increased significantly, Sectional density increased significantly and with the elongation of the bullet came **instability** ( oblong bullets are unstable and need to be stabilized by inducing spin) with this came a very high degree of lethality.

Now I will ask again what is more lethal..... a solid that is stable or a solid that is unstable ie tumble in target.

The one that hits and destroyies vital organs and/or CNS. A round ball in the brain is much more lethal than an unstable solid in the butt,

SSR

**jeffosso** 18 January 2011, 13:48

\$20 bucks says alf deletes/revises-to-next-to-nothing all his recent posts by the end of feb.

he's just trying to stir the pot with previous/conventional/OTHER PEOPLE'S RESEARCH ...

he just can't stand it when persons shot test media and have repeatable results.

each and every animal is a rule unto itself, however, if a bullet can't go 10 inches into wetpack, it is highly unlikely that it will go 30 into muscle.

the rest of alf's frankenstienian "collection" of arguements is exactly that. he's taking UNRELATED events and testing, and trying to stitch together an "Argument" that disproves clear, consistent, and obvious results.

and brother, when testing in any media, results count.

#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>

**buffalo** 18 January 2011, 15:55

quote:

Originally posted by jeffosso:

... each and every animal is a rule unto itself, however, if a bullet can't go 10 inches into wetpack, it is highly unlikely that it will go 30 into muscle.

the rest of alf's frankenstienian "collection" of arguements is exactly that. he's taking UNRELATED events and testing, and trying to stitch together an "Argument" that disproves clear, consistent, and obvious results.

and brother, when testing in any media, results count.

+1

**ALF**

**18 January 2011, 19:30**

**DWright**

**18 January 2011, 19:37**

You guys know Alf is correct. . . . Just like since it was written long ago. . . .  
The world is flat!



<http://www.mazamasportinggoods.com>

**465H&H**

**18 January 2011, 20:04**

quote:

Originally posted by capoward:

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:

quote:

Change this shot to an arse end shot on a shot but rapidly departing buffalo and of the three bullets noted in the foregoing paragraph...ONLY the properly designed FN solid will reliably reach the internal organs from this angle and may take out heavy leg bones on the way.

Quote from capoward:

What data do you have to prove this statement? I guess I am saying prove it!

465H&H

LOL... H as I've previously stated many times in this thread, I've not shot buffalo and I've never been to Africa or to Australia... Yet! But, I'll take your challenge and put my money where my mouth is to prove me correct...or you correct by your allusion that I am incorrect...

I'll have the hunt photographed and even pay a little extra to have a few "Texas heart shot" Asian buffalo dissected to determine just how well they were killed with each bullet and post the results here on this forum in this thread (even if I have to resurrect the thread to do so). I'll even admit I was wrong...if I am wrong. All it will however cost you is few years before I can do so.

Today my wife told me that I can hunt anywhere in the world that I want to hunt as long as I have the money to pay for it. All it will cost me is the identical amount of money placed in her hot little hand to do with whatever she should desire to do with it before I depart on my hunt. So it will definitely take me at least 3 years to accumulate the double cost of an Australian hunt for multiple Asian buffalo.

My 50 MDM rifle will be complete this spring, I just spoke to Steve Button a few days ago and all is going well with it, so I'll have plenty of time to get used to my rifle. And I'll even have some "conventional construction RN solids" manufactured in .500 caliber to go along with my .500 caliber CEB BBW #13 FN solids to use on this hunt.

Does this pass muster for you?

Should you accept...I do have one question, "Just how many "conventional construction RN solids" do I have to shot through the ass end of a single Asian buffalo - if they truly suck on "Texas heart shots" - before I can shot it with my bullet of choice?" Or do I just have to make swiss cheese out of the darn thing until it finally dies a miserable death?

capoward,

I wasn't being flippant with my question. We are all trying to find out what bullet will work best for hunting purposes. As Michael458 will attest, I have a fair amount of experience with using both FN and RN bullets on elephant and buffalo.

Your experiment isn't as easy as you have proposed. There are many factors that affect penetration as well as nose shape. Velocity, caliber, bullet design and construction, bullet weight, as well as the type of bullet metal used to name a few all will affect the amount

of penetration. If you "manufacture" a RN bullet then I assume you will make a RN mono-metal bullet. That will probably be similar to the old Barnes hemispherical RN of their early design or the A2 bullet of a similar design. Those bullets were reported to veer off course way back in the late 80's when used on elephant culls in Zimbabwe. I suspect that you will prove your point under this test scenario. If you use a steel jacketed RN solid such as the old Hornady bullet, Winchester 500 grain RN solid for the 458 or Woodleigh RN steel jacketed solid, then I suspect an entirely different outcome may occur. Again, what you propose isn't impossible but the test needs to be carefully designed.

Although, since you have already prejudged the results you may not be the most objective person to do the test.

465H&H

**michael458**

**18 January 2011, 22:09**

quote:

**assumptions** made here by these **so called** tests and observations have been made through the ages and have been disproven !

Alf

Assume? So Called? How offensive. It's a lot of work to do what I have been doing. I don't complain about it, because from PAGE 1, I stated I do it for myself, believe it, trust it or not, makes little difference to me. I have nothing to sell you, if you don't want to buy the bullets, I don't really care, while I am actually putting these bullets in stock, its more of a convenience for the guys here at AR, and my B&M guys as well. Believe me, I spend a lot of money on these bullets each year. In fact I spent more money last year on bullets alone, I could have had a nice double rifle of my choice, not a low priced one either, maybe even two of them come to think of it! I just went at my expense and bought 1200 lbs of news print, loaded it, and brought it to the range and unloaded and stacked it. And You want to make the statement "so called"?

Alf, I must say, that's rather "Ugly" of you!

quote:

What is most amazing to me is that with all the information available today no one here but no one has actually picked up a book, or accessed a set of **valid data** and looked at what has been done in the world of terminal ballistics!

And again, you could not stop could you, Valid Data? Hmmmmm? Another snide little ugly remark!

Can you please point out any at all valid data, that pertains to what we have done on this thread, that is available in any book or paper? I would like to see it please? Might have saved me a hell of a lot of work, if one could have trusted it? I know of no such work that has gone into as much detail as we have here. Not only testing in the "LAB" per say, but I always promote confirmation from field results--the purpose of the test to begin with. These are real bullets, going to the field after being tested here, and performing in the field as well, much the same as here in the "Lab". So far these "so called" tests, and these "assumptions" are running some damn good percentages of success, I would think that success in the field is "validation" enough? Of course, maybe I am wrong, it's up to you to prove 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.

**Cross L**

**18 January 2011, 22:31**

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
Jeffeosso:

So tell me in what world do you live?

I am not trying to do anything other than point out the very obvious, and that is that much of the assumptions made here by these so called tests and observations have been made through the ages and have been disproven !

What is most amazing to me is that with all the information available today no one here but no one has actually picked up a book, or accessed a set of valid data and looked at what has been done in the world of terminal ballistics!

There is no Frankenstien data, my friend.... frankenstein lives in comics , frankensntein data lives in lay publication.

Everyone here speaks of the words we are here to learn.

You can shoot a million bullets into a wad paper, you can kill a thousand elephants see exactly the same thing, come to the same conclusion about what you thought you saw, but if the conclusion is wrong and it is a fallacy a million times over, erroneous data a million times over !


Alf

Have tried to be polite, but you are proving to be the type of ivory tower idiot that has been getting real world soldiers, explorers and policemen killed for ages.

You just said we could kill a thousand elephants but if the observed data didn't match YOUR conclusion then it is wrong. What a crock of shit!!!

If your mind is so damn small that you invalidate real world results because they weren't PROPER then you need to go back to a cave because real progress always has to have real world results.

Get Saeed to start a Religious thread and go argue about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin-that is what you are trying to do here.



SSR

**buffalo**

**18 January 2011, 22:42**

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
Jefeoosso:

So tell me in what world do you live?

I am not trying to do anything other than point out the very obvious, and that is that much of the assumptions made here by these so called tests and observations have been made through the ages and have been disproven !

What is most amazing to me is that with all the information available today no one here but no one has actually picked up a book, or accessed a set of valid data and looked at what has been done in the world of terminal ballistics!

There is no Frankenstein data, my friend.... frankenstein lives in comics , frankenstein data lives in lay publication.

Everyone here speaks of the words we are here to learn.

You can shoot a million bullets into a wad paper, you can kill a thousand elephants see exactly the same thing, come to the same conclusion about what you thought you saw, but if the conclusion is wrong and it is a fallacy a million times over, erroneous data a million times over !

What is ALF smoking???

**Macifej**

**18 January 2011, 22:45**

quote:

Originally posted by jefeoosso:  
\$20 bucks says alf deletes/revises-to-next-to-nothing all his recent posts by the end of feb.

he's just trying to stir the pot with previous/conventional/OTHER PEOPLE'S RESEARCH ...

he just can't stand it when persons shot test media and have repeatable results.

each and every animal is a rule unto itself, however, if a bullet can't go 10 inches into wetpack, it is highly unlikely that it will go 30 into muscle.

the rest of alf's frankenstienian "collection" of arguments is exactly that. he's taking UNRELATED events and testing, and trying to stitch together an "Argument" that disproves clear, consistent, and obvious results.

and brother, when testing in any media, results count.

Some of the newer guys here are just figuring out he's CRACKERS!!



**Cross L**

**18 January 2011, 23:17**

quote:

Originally posted by Macifej:

quote:

Originally posted by jeffeosso:

\$20 bucks says alf deletes/revises-to-next-to-nothing all his recent posts by the end of feb.

he's just trying to stir the pot with previous/conventional/OTHER PEOPLE'S RESEARCH ...

he just can't stand it when persons shot test media and have repeatable results.

each and every animal is a rule unto itself, however, if a bullet can't go 10 inches into wetpack, it is highly unlikely that it will go 30 into muscle.

the rest of alf's frankensteinian "collection" of arguements is exactly that. he's taking UNRELATED events and testing, and trying to stitch together an "Argument" that disproves clear, consistent, and obvious results.

and brother, when testing in any media, results count.

Some of the newer guys here are just figuring out he's CRACKERS!!



Ya coulda WARNED a guy



SSR

**CCMDoc**

**19 January 2011, 00:11**

Ahhhhhhhhhhhh. The "Ignore" function makes this so much better. Now if you would please stop quoting him, we could get back to evidence-based and supported discussions.

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**

**someoldguy**

**19 January 2011, 00:17**

quote:

Some of the newer guys here are just figuring out he's CRACKERS!!

Well...I always try to be tactful about such things, but I think Stevie Wonder could've seen that.



Glenn

**michael458**

**19 January 2011, 00:20**

quote:

start a Religious thread

And you know someone mentioned making me a prophet recently as well! I was kinda liking that idea, but got lost on other subjects!



HEH HEH!

M

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

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

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

**Dave Bush**

**19 January 2011, 00:53**

Michael:

Good work, keep it up.

You do need a double!

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).

**michael458**

**19 January 2011, 01:08**

Dave

Thanks my Man--I appreciate it. No need to worry, I do what I do because I enjoy doing it! I think we have undiscovered frontiers in many areas of shooting, and some that are discovered, but not investigated as they should be. Discovery and investigation is an adventure of sorts in and of itself.

I don't need a double, hell Sam has dozens of them! I don't have this experience yet. But like grandparents, the kids bring the children, grandpa can play with them, but soon they go home with mom and dad! Kinda like Sam and the doubles, he brings them, I play with them (sling his brass out on the floor) then he gets to take them home afterwards, and he foots the bill! Man, I got it made like that! HEH.....

Thanks again Dave!

Looks like Sam is making a trip down early Thursday morning right now! Bringing my favorite double, the 500 Nitro! We will sling a few BBW #13s down range! Probably even put a few into some of that "So Called" test medium to see what happens! HEH... Do some barrel strain work, and probably some pressure traces as well.

I have some pressure traces to start tomorrow myself on some of the B&Ms. Figure I will hammer a few of those 400 CEB BBW#13s to see what happens, along with the 370 NonCons in some various 416s.

It would be interesting if my 416 B&M at lower velocity, 2200-2250 fps could stabilize that 400 solid during terminals eh? That 1:14 twist will not stabilize anything else, wonder if the bullet can "Self Stabilize"? Hmmm?? Suppose we must find out!

OH and I have a very very special terminal test lined up for tomorrow--But I cannot let the secret out until it's completed! This is going to be a dandy of a little test! So better stay tuned!

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.

**Cross L**

**19 January 2011, 01:09**

Michael,

so do you want to be a Swami, a Guru, or an Exalted Prophet?





SSR

**srose**

**19 January 2011, 01:26**

Michael or anyone else,

As Michael said I will be down to test more 470 strain gage stuff and if any of you have something you wish tested let me know before Thursday.

Yes Bob I've got your bullets loaded.

Might have time to test a few different fillers.

Michael, What 400 grain bullet wasn't stable in the 416 B&M? I have my 1-12 twist gun ready to try. If I have some of those bullets I can load a few to try.

Sam

**michael458**

**19 January 2011, 02:43**

quote:

Originally posted by Cross L:

Michael,

so do you want to be a Swami, a Guru, or an Exalted Prophet?



SSR

I tell you CrossL, RIP already gave me a pretty good name "Doc M", and that seems to have stuck, and not only that I have been "Honored" with a "Honorary Phd" to boot! And as I understand, TWO new Black Lab Coats to go with! I just don't see how it can get much better than that!

But we will keep "Exalted Prophet" possibly for my next step up in life!



Doc 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**

**19 January 2011, 02:46**

quote:

Originally posted by srose:

Michael or anyone else,

As Michael said I will be down to test more 470 strain gage stuff and if any of you have something you wish tested let me know before Thursday.

Yes Bob I've got your bullets loaded.

Might have time to test a few different fillers.

Michael, What 400 grain bullet wasn't stable in the 416 B&M? I have my 1-12 twist gun ready to try. If I have some of those bullets I can load a few to try.

Sam

Sam

Different fillers that you know of would add to our already completed research--so that would be interesting.

I would have to look but at low velocities 2250 or so, none of the 400s have ever done really good in the 1:14 twists. If I bump that velocity to 2450 fps or so, then they start to do better, the North Fork and Barnes, but still not 100% stable even then.

I think 1:12 will do it, or much better anyway. We can load them up during a break from the 470. Give them a go. Will have medium ready as well.

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.


**ALF** 19 January 2011, 04:22

**Low Wall** 19 January 2011, 04:54

quote:

Wow and all I asked was what is more lethal, a tumbling solid or a solid that remains straight and true.....

The answer is, "that would depend"...

It's really quite simple and easy to grasp when you have a simple mind.. 

Next question?

**Macifej** 19 January 2011, 07:36

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:  
Wow ! what a shitstorm !

Ban the man! Herecy! burn him at the stake! put him on ignore, he is crackers, he must be smoking something !.. no wait he must be an agent for PETA and perhaps he is even a democrat, liberal... what else Oh he lives in an ivory tower!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Wow and all I asked was what is more lethal, a tumbling solid or a solid that remains straight and true..... Damn cant he see here we have it 120 pages of big big holes punched through stacks of wet paper.

Geez whats wrong with this guy he actually reads books, he dares look at what others who study, design and make policy about what is used in guns around the world state and do. For that we should run him right off AR, how dare he question anything !

yep it's an intersting world we live in. If you do not agree with us we will banish you from the circle !

**" Fallacious research by those with little grasp of the fundamentals has been perpetuated by editors, reviewers, and other investigators with no better grasp of the subject "**

from:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE WOUND BALLISTICS LITERATURE, AND WHY  
ML Fackler  
Letterman Army Institute of Research  
Division of Military Trauma Research  
Presidio of San Francisco, California 94219  
Institute Report No. 239  
July 1987

**" Probably no scientific field contains more misinformation than wound ballistics. In a 1980 Journal of Trauma editorial entitled "The Idolatry of Velocity, or Lies, Damn Lies, and Ballistics," Lindsey identified many of the misconceptions and half-truths distorting the literature (1). Despite his cogent revelations, the errors he attempted to rectify are still being repeated in the literature (2-7), often embellished with unproven assumption and uninformed speculation."**

"The Idolatry of Velocity, or Lies, Damn Lies, and Ballistics,"  
Lindsey D J Trauma. 1980 Dec;20(12):1068-9

All "science" aside .... your reputation (and the reputations of several other self proclaimed experts posting here) proceeds you (and them). The shitstorm as you so aptly put it, is of your own making. Most of the gentlemen posting regularly in this forum are quite

capable of critical thought (despite your condescension to the contrary) and thereby posses highly refined bullshit detection skills. References to the work of others carries little weight here.



**ALF**

**19 January 2011, 09:13**

**Macifej**

**19 January 2011, 09:39**

quote:

Originally posted by ALF:

Macifej:

I can live that thank you:

But I must say this statement takes the cake for critical thought!

"References to the work of others carries little weight here." Yah so if the work of Michael is not your work but his work how come you give weight to it?

Anyway one day all will be revealed for what it is!

I haven't commented critically or endorsed Michael's work nor is his mutually exclusive of mine. The point most here would like to make, and I've taken the liberty of making, is ... do your own work Alf, spend the money, take the time, go out and make some parts, and DO IT! Any of us can read the literature and many of us have. As you know it's mostly very old and doesn't cover some of what is explored here. If you have the need to persevere with philosophical bent, perhaps you should test your skill in the PF or maybe you should send a request to Admin for a new Philosophy and Literature forum? Your current tack is a distraction.

**capoward**

**19 January 2011, 09:59**

quote:

Originally posted by 465H&H:

capoward,

I wasn't being flippant with my question. We are all trying to find out what bullet will work best for hunting purposes. As Michael458 will attest, I have a fair amount of experience with using both FN and RN bullets on elephant and buffalo.

Your experiment isn't as easy as you have proposed. There are many factors that affect penetration as well as nose shape. Velocity, caliber, bullet design and construction, bullet weight, as well as the type of bullet metal used to name a few all will affect the amount of penetration. If you "manufacture" a RN bullet then I assume you will make a RN mono-metal bullet. That will probably be similar to the old Barnes hemispherical RN of their early design or the A2 bullet of a similar design. Those bullets were reported to veer off course way back in the late 80's when used on elephant culls in Zimbabwe. I suspect that you will prove your point under this test scenario. If you use a steel jacketed RN solid such as the old Hornady bullet, Winchester 500 grain RN solid for the 458 or Woodleigh RN steel jacketed solid, then I suspect an entirely different outcome may occur. Again, what you propose isn't impossible but the test needs to be carefully designed.

Although, since you have already prejudged the results you may not be the most objective person to do the test.

465H&H

H,  
I do apologize if my response seemed to demean or denigrate your question, it was not intended to.

I do agree that I likely would not be the most objective person to conduct this test against live buffalo for multiple reasons...foremost being that I dislike the thought of firing one or more shots up the arse end of a hunted animal – especially the 1st or 2nd shot fired at the animal unless I am pretty darn sure that the animal will typically die quickly from the shot(s) – and I do detest the thought of doing so solely as a test project – But I also am aware that the only way to validate my statement is to do exactly this.

I do freely admit that I am prejudiced in my thinking. Prejudiced in the sense that off and on over the past 44 years I have many articles about African DG hunting, and in these articles of the inopportune failure of the RN FMJ bullet to complete a quick kill of a DG animal and of the occasions that this failure caused the maiming or death of the hunter or one of the hunting party. Granted these inopportune failures were in many occasions atypical of the bullet performance but it still leaves a cloud of uncertainty hanging over the bullet. I do acknowledge that not all RN FMJ bullets are equal in either construction or typical bullet performance. Much has changed over the years and RN FMJ bullet are much more reliable 10 years into the 21st century than they were 10 years into the 20th century. And if these were the only style of DG solids available then one would be taking my chance with one on my first African DG hunt. But today that is not the case.

Your statement, "There are many factors that affect penetration as well as nose shape. Velocity, caliber, bullet design and construction, bullet weight, as well as the type of bullet metal used to name a few all will affect the amount of penetration." is very cogent and I believe aptly covers the range of much of Michael's testing work leading up to his and Sam's efforts in designing the BBW #13 bullet nose shape.

My DG solid bullet of choice for my 1st African hunt will not be a RN FMJ bullet, it will be a CEB BBW #13 Brass FN solid...unless Michael and Sam develop an ever better and more reliable bullet prior to my hunt, then I'll be taking it.

Jim 🤖

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

Warrior

19 January 2011, 13:44

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:



What is there to say about this. Great performance!

Michael

Michael,

63 inches of straight penetration at a low velocity of 2207 fps is sterling performance for a big bore @ .458 caliber. The nose profile seems to give more penetration than the truncated design as it moves the COG point farther forward. Also the meplat of 67% makes for great shoulder stabilization.

I am happy with the front end of the bullet, but I am still concerned about the back end of the bullet. Would it give a complete gas seal with only one drive band at the back and is there a proper 'neck tension' of the bullet to hold it straight and true with only 3 drive bands in front of a wide open space? This is not to criticize, but simply a question that I think we need to ask, as it affects internal ballistics rather than external ballistics, but both have to do with how the bullet performs.

Perhaps a last observation ... if 63" of penetration can be achieved at 2207 fps, then any more velocity is moot and only adds to more recoil and discomfort at unneeded high peak pressures in a hot tropical Africa. So the 458 Lott people do not have to chase that elusive and magical 2300 fps. Obviously this is just a generalization as 63" might not be the cut-off point for what is acceptable and what not, it might even be much lower at say 55" or 50" for all I know. But the regular elephant hunters may give us a better clue as to what they regard as the minimum they seek.

Warrior

someoldguy

19 January 2011, 13:56

quote:

The point most here would like to make, and I've taken the liberty of making, is ... do your own work Alf, spend the

money, take the time, go out and make some parts, and DO IT!

He can't, Mac. Besides that would make him at most an equal. And ALF doesn't want to feel equal, as "one of the guys", he wants to feel superior. This is called being grandiose, and I don't have to mention it's not a healthy state of mind. I know because I have a close relative who had that same symptom. You can't carry on a rational discussion with someone like that, you can only either ignore them or humor them. (And, if you live with them, make sure they stay on their meds because there's nothing you can do about it.)

So argue with him all you want, it's not going to do any good. Quoting him before he replaces his posts with dots might do some good, but he could always come back and say that your quote was a fabrication done to discredit him, or something similar. So I think Michael had the correct tactic at the very beginning. He said, "Your comment is duly noted" and nothing else.

---

Glenn

**416Tanzan**

**19 January 2011, 14:50**

quote:

Perhaps a last observation ... if 63" of penetration can be achieved at 2207 fps, then any more velocity is moot and only add to more recoil and discomfort at unneeded high peak pressures in a hot tropical Africa. So the 458 Lott people do not have to chase that elusive and magical 2300 fps.

Of course, it must be remembered that some of these solids will be used on the south end of a north-fleeing buffalo and may need to be shot at ranges of 100 yards, and even 200 yards outside the forest proper. At those ranges the velocity will drop considerably, e.g. about 1960fps at 200 yards even when starting out at 2400fps. I for one like all the velocity that I can get. (E.g., 2800 fps in 416 Rigby with 350 grainers.) I don't see any reason for dropping below 2300 or even 2400+ fps muzzle velocity in a rifle that can handle it, say a 450 Rigby (something I would be happy to own, but must confess that I haven't found the means yet).

+ + + + +

"A well-rounded hunting battery might include:

500 AccRel Nyati, 416 Rigby or 416 Ruger, 375Ruger or 338WM, 308 or 270, 243, 223" --  
Conserving creation, hunting the harvest.

**Warrior**

**19 January 2011, 15:02**

quote:

Of course, it must be remembered that some of these solids will be used on the south end of a north-fleeing buffalo and may need to be shot at ranges of 100 yards, and even 200 yards outside the forest proper.

416Tazan,

Sir, if you do this then it makes you a Maverick in my books. Seen another way, it is perhaps the lack of confidence I have to do just that. 😊

Buffalo hunting is better done at hunting them close range rather than shooting at them at 200 meters. I would envisage a lot of failures and wounding at that range, and it will be expensive - in fact that mistake can cost the same as buying the 450 Rigby you want, and then shoot them prudently at a more practical range where you have the odds in your favour.

The thrill is that much greater if you can see the flies on them ears.

Warrior

**michael458**

**19 January 2011, 16:27**

Warrior

I was very pleased with the 480 BBW #13. Also pleased since it really is designed for 450 Nitro, and is .457 as I am told most 450 bores are .457. Of course in the 458 B&M which is 458, at 50 yds it was a 1 hole deal if I did my part.

I will discuss this with Sam and Dan, but honestly I really don't see a reason to do a 500 gr bullet for the larger capacity cartridges like the 458 Lott and more. I think if I do a bullet for those, will take that same 480 #13 and move the bands closer together, and make it 458 and call it a day! It will do most anything a 500 will do, maybe an inch or two less, but at 60 + it makes little difference in the field. And if there is a gain in velocity in the larger cartridges, any loss of weight will be made up for very easy, as this nose likes velocity.

For 458 Win and my 458 B&M I still like the 450 gr bullet better in those cartridges. Dropping to an 18 inch barrel in the 458 B&M I can still get a tad over 2200 fps with the 450 and that is enough!

Matched with the NonCons, these make a great combo.

BTW, I think you might have misunderstood Tanzan. I don't think he was talking about "Starting" the dance at 100 or even 200 yds,

but one MIGHT have to do that as a hail mary on a wounded fleeing buffalo. I think that is what he meant. Of course if one starts out with the NonCon, that would not be needed--HEH,if your placement is correct!

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**

**19 January 2011, 16:39**

For all those that would like to reference exactly what Alf is hinting at you can go here, everything is right on this that he refers to, and I don't see one thing on this entire BS about lions, buffalo, elephant, hippos, nothing. None of which is relevant to what we have been and continue to study here.

<http://www.firearmstactical.com/wound.htm>

Of course I may have missed something within some of these, because I have little or no interest in this data, all of which I have studied in my youth during my "Tactical" days, I have yet to see any relevance to what we are doing, but it could be there somewhere. I do not intend to waste my time looking for it however. There is a difference in thin skinned soft "human" tissue and buffalo and elephant tissue. What will work on a relatively soft Human--will not work on elephant quite as well.

End Of Story

Doc M to You Alf!

<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.

**someoldguy**

**19 January 2011, 17:15**

quote:

For all those that would like to reference exactly what Alf is hinting at you can go here, everything is right on this that he refers to, and I don't see one thing on this entire BS about lions, buffalo, elephant, hippos, nothing. None of which is relevant to what we have been and continue to study here.

That's what I was thinking. The main ones that Fackler himself is criticizing are Marshall and Sanow, authors of the popularized "One Shot Stop" notion that has circulated amongst the law enforcement/self-defense crowd for a number of years. Self-defense/law enforcement ammo has practically nothing at all in common with the type of ammo that you focus on in these tests.

---

Glenn