

This topic can be found at:

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

LionHunter

29 June 2012, 23:39

Terminal Bullet Performance

The IGNORE button is our friend, as sure as ALF is a pain in the ass.

Mike

DSC
DRSS (again)
SCI Life
NRA Life
Sables Life
Mzuri
IPHA

"To be a Marine is enough."

465H&H**30 June 2012, 08:51**

I think you guys are being too hard on ALF. In most cases he has agreed with the advantages of the non-cons and FN solids terminal affects on game. In fact he will be using them in the future at least the FN solids for sure.

In fact you have agreed with the points he was making on the use of artificial media for bullet testing as a predictor of terminal affects on game. There are limitations on what can be predicted. Any artificial media is usually homogenous in makeup while animal tissue is highly variable. Does "wet pack" simulate what to expect when a bullet hits an elephants head? Not likely. Michael has often said that his media is tougher than soft animal tissue and that bullets will penetrate, if I remember correctly, 35% more in animal tissue.

His didn't say that your opinion that CEB bullets cause larger holes in soft tissue than cup and core bullets was false but that since no measurements of wound size or volume were made that there is only observational differences and we know that may be correct but then again it may not. Volumetric comparisons of destroyed tissue between bullet types would settle that issue but wasn't done.

ALF can be very hard to read as his writing is often very technical and sometimes obtuse. One has to work at understanding him. If you notice he never uses personal attacks when someone disagrees with him and seems to maintain a lot of patience in explaining complex theories to us dunderheads.

465H&H

capoward**30 June 2012, 19:37**

H,

I can truly say that the Alf posting today in the SD thread in the Reloading Forum is different that the Alf posting 2yrs ago in the TBP thread in thr BB Forum...same person just a much different written demeanor.

Something that I believe must be understood is that Michael and others who are using the CED, GSC, and NF Monometal FN Solids, NonCons, and Expanding bullets are not going to be using RN bullets on their expensive hunts so there will not be necropsy photographs of RN bullets - solids or softs - alongside necropsy photographs of their monometal results. If someone is waiting for the RN field necropsy results they're going to have to supply them themselves.

I believe everyone knows and understands that Michael's laboratory testing of his 'wetpack', pressure and velocity testing followed by in field necropsy results from use on game doesn't meet the 'scientific' requirements of testing BUT they're the best that any individual not supported by the government or some scientific organization through direct funding or grants has ever compiled and shared with the hunting world.

In that prospective I believe Alf needs to cut Michael some slack and understand this work has been paid for directly from the individual's pocket who is posting the results...no grant monies here.

You are correct that Michael has posted that his 'wetpack' bullet box testing is far more durable that live game...he said as much 2yrs ago in his discussions with Alf on the TBP thread. Michael has always been upfront in the expanding bullets and solids will both give a greater depth of penetration - by a set average percentage for each bullet type - in live game than in his laboratory testing. I believe your stated 35% greater penetration figure relates to expanding bullets with solids being quite a bit more, upwards of 80% - but this is off the top of my head so likely is wrong. But there is a relationship between the two uses that has been established through measurements in the field and in the laboratory. That is more than sufficient for most of the readers and participants in the TBP thread...which may account for our gruffness towards individuals when they discount the work without producing bullet test work and game necropsy of their own efforts to back up their disparaging remarks.

I haven't proofed this post as I haven't had my 1st cup of coffee yet so sorry to all if the post is disjointed or full of typos.

Edit: I'm drinking my 1st ☕ so starting to proof my earlier post.

Jim ☺

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

prof242**30 June 2012, 20:04**

Capo,
Seems very well-said and to the point. Maybe others shouldn't have that first cup of coffee in the morning?

.395 Family Member
DRSS, po' boy member
Political correctness is nothing but liberal enforced censorship

capoward**30 June 2012, 20:12**

quote:

Originally posted by prof242:
Capo,
Seems very well-said and to the point. Maybe others shouldn't have that first cup of coffee in the morning?

Prof,

No no... At least ☺☺ are needed for clarity of mind! LOL

Jim ☺

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

465H&H**30 June 2012, 20:37**

Jim,

I am on my third cup of caffeine so I am a little hyper this am.



I hope no one thought my post was in any way critical of Michael's work. I fully understand the limitations of his work but was trying to point out where I thought ALF was coming from with the hope that we could cut him some slack. I don't want to see us drive him away with personal attacks as has been done in the past. He does provide some valuable understanding to the issue.

465H&H

RIP

30 June 2012, 21:03

Alf has his own personal agenda.

Any inconvenient truths that confront him are easily ignored by Alf, so he can continue quoting textbooks.

He deletes all his old posts here so the new posts here, though same-old-same-old, appear as some sort of new posting, and he gets to tally up his post count.

."

I have traded textbooks with Alf through the mail.

I mailed to him a copy of Duncan MacPherson's out of print book BULLET PENETRATION in exchange for a pile of papers on internal ballistics.

I thank him for educating me.

I have had college physics and engineering courses, and can follow him, but there comes a time to accept progress.

Proven field results of the quantity and magnitude, i.e., QUALITY, presented by MIB/CEB/B&M related threads:

There is just no reason to theorize "why" it is impossible.

Alf and Terry Wee-wee-land are two peas in that pod.

Alf should be directing his intellect toward theorizing "why" the Non-Con terminal ballistics are so good, not "why" it is impossible.

At least his twaddle would be more interesting then.

Sounds petulantly childish by his current approach.

capoward

30 June 2012, 21:37

H,

I'm working on my 2nd so haven't reached the hyper stage yet...have a BD party with grandkids later today so I definitely have to work on getting their!

I don't believe anyone will take your post as being critical of Michael. Alf...well Alf will be Alf though the current Alf is much easier to understand than the earlier Alf. And contrary to some, I did catch his post 2yrs ago that he does use FN solids so he already understood their benefit.

I believe the major disconnect 2yrs ago was initially that Alf didn't understand that Michael understood his lab testing didn't meet scientific standards but that he (Michael) had 10yrs+ of bullet performance necropsy on game animals that supported the similarity of the bullet performance within his 'wet pack' work once he worked out the best 'wet pack composition'. Michael understood the differences in within-mass performance...the differences being greater penetration within game animals than within his 'wet pack'. And later before Alf's departure from the thread, I don't think that he (Alf) understood that Michael had zero interest in revising his lab work to accommodate acceptable scientific protocol notwithstanding the great expense that would have entailed.

Alf has great scientific interest and is also a hunter. My impression which may be totally wrong is that Alf mentally runs the proverbial 'teeter totter' in his mind between hunting and the science behind hunting at least as it relates to terminal bullet performance.

Michael's interest in terminal bullet performance is that of a hunter not a scientist...more like zero interest in the science behind the terminal bullet performance. And his lab work was/is only an outgrowth of that hunting interest to identify better performing bullets towards eliminating the variable of poor (based upon historical field/game necropsy) or potential poor bullet performance in the field (based upon the bullet's performance within his 'wet pack')...nothing more, nothing less.

If Alf is accepting Michael's bullet performance work will never ever met scientific standards because Michael has no interest in meeting these standards, and that mindset is unlikely to change, then I doubt that Alf and Michael will have any disputes.

Anyway that my reading of the 'tea leaves'...right or wrong. Now it's time for a ☹️ refill... 🍵

Jim ☹️

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

capoward

30 June 2012, 21:47

RIP,

I disagree with this statement:

quote:

Alf and Terry Wee-wee-land are two peas in that pod.

Alf is not an moron.

This statement however, I totally agree with:

quote:

Alf should be directing his intellect toward theorizing "why" the Non-Con terminal ballistics are so good, not "why" it is impossible.

Ah... ☹️ ☹️ ...down and ☹️ underway!

Jim ☹️

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

465H&H

30 June 2012, 22:27

I think the question of why the non-cons cause more tissue destruction than cons is of importance. I will caution though that this improvement is based on visual observation which always leaves some question as to its validity.

Assuming that they do cause more terminal damage, here is a possible theory:

We know that if a second bullet hits an animal in exactly the same hole as the first bullet the total amount of tissue damage will be less than if it had hit another part of the animal. When the petals leave the bullet path, they are encountering fresh tissue that hasn't been traumatized by the main part of the bullet. Ergo, increased amount of tissue damage.

465H&H

capoward

30 June 2012, 22:59

quote:

I think the question of why the non-cons cause more tissue destruction than cons is of importance. I will caution though that this improvement is based on visual observation which always leaves some question as to its validity.

This is true of all visual observations yet validity has to be allocated to photograph necropsy evidence until it can be disproven by other necropsy evidence.

quote:

Assuming that they do cause more terminal damage, here is a possible theory:

We know that if a second bullet hits an animal in exactly the same hole as the first bullet the total amount of tissue damage will be less than if it had hit another part of the animal. When the petals leave the bullet path, they are encountering fresh tissue that hasn't been traumatized by the main part of the bullet. Ergo, increased amount of tissue damage.

Much the same as the supposition drawn from Michael's lab work with the NonCons and supported by the necropsy photographs posted over the past few months from various African hunts.

Now that we have evidence to support the theory, can someone produce the mathematics to support the theory and evidence?

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

capoward 30 June 2012, 23:01

Well... 3rd 🤔 down and it's time to spend a couple of hours on the road to face the grandkids in a day of softball and BD celebrations!

Edit Added: Oops...wife decided she needed to bake some more deserts so will be around another hour or so

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

michael458 01 July 2012, 15:43

quote:

Now that we have evidence to support the theory, can someone produce the mathematics to support the theory and evidence?

Cappy, I was never really good at Math, but by damn I think I can handle this one!

OK OK, bear with me now.

1 NonCon + 1 Animal = 1 Dead Animal!

Now that is $1 + 1 = 1$

OK, now where did I put that calculator? Something just does not seem to "Add" up?

Hmmmmmm? OK OK, I think I have a theory why this is not adding up right, maybe it's because it is a NonCon bullet--You know, Non Conventional, they don't always adhere to basic rules! So maybe it works like that with the Math too?



HEH HEH
😊

<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.

416Tanzan 01 July 2012, 15:50

quote:

Now that is $1 + 1 = 1$

Your 'x' is rolling over. It is

1 Non-con x 1 Animal=1 Dead Animal

+ + + + +

"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.

michael458 01 July 2012, 16:08

quote:

Originally posted by 416Tanzan:

quote:

Now that is $1 + 1 = 1$

Your 'x' is rolling over. It is

1 Non-con x 1 Animal=1 Dead Animal

I told you from the beginning I was never too good at math!

I think you have it!



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

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

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

capoward

01 July 2012, 20:08

OK..
NC = NonCon
LA = Live Animal
DA = Dead Animal

And the mathematical computation is:

1NC x 1LA = 1DA. 🤔

So does that mean...

2NC x 1A = Oops. ☐

Jim 🤔

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

John Wayne

prof242

02 July 2012, 20:29

OR..

1NC x not aware behind 1LA = 2DA + Oops + \$ 😞

.395 Family Member

DRSS, po' boy member

Political correctness is nothing but liberal enforced censorship

capoward

02 July 2012, 23:41



Who'd have thought there'd be so many applicable mathematical computations.



Jim 🤔

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

John Wayne

michael458

03 July 2012, 01:08

A good mathematician can make anything possible! Sometimes, it don't even have to add up!

How about a couple of "Terminal Tests"? Do we still do that here? Hmmmmm? I suppose we do, when we have something new to test!





500 MDM
7/2/2012
1:12 Twist Rate
300 BBW#13 W25
With W Talon Tip
Muzzle Velocity 2991 fps
Impact Velocity 2824 fps
48 Yd Impact
42 yd Between Chrono
Massive Trauma 3-8 Inches
X2--18 Inches Total Penetration





Michael

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

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

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

416Tanzan

03 July 2012, 01:22

I ran a BC on the second test velocities 2896/2759 over 42 yards:

.283

It's a great bullet, so I'm thinking that a better BC is doable.

+ + + + +

"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.

capoward

03 July 2012, 01:27

quote:

Originally posted by michael458:
How about a couple of "Terminal Tests"? Do we still do that here? Hmmm I suppose we do, when we have something new to test!





Michael

Michael,

Very nice. If you have time, "what are the weights of the bullet shanks sans their nose?"

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

michael458

03 July 2012, 02:59

quote:

Very nice. If you have time, "what are the weights of the bullet shanks sans their nose?"

Jim coffee

Jim

For the 300s they average 202 grs and the 335 averaged 230.

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.

RIP

03 July 2012, 05:03

quote:

Originally posted by 416Tanzan:
I ran a BC on the second test velocities 2896/2759 over 42 yards:
.283
It's a great bullet, so I'm thinking that a better BC is doable.

Above refers to .500-caliber/335-grain NonCon plus tip fired from the 500 MDM, right?
So with tip is that a 345-grain bullet?

That is excellent velocity for 345-grainer from the 500 MDM with 21" barrel.
Almost as speedy as the 500 BUM with 360-grainer from a 24" barrel (W350+tip).

BC of .283 is great to 300 yards with that kind of velocity ... as long as the cross wind is not too great. 🇺🇸

capoward

03 July 2012, 06:44

Thanks Michael.

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

416Tanzan

03 July 2012, 09:21

quote:

BC of .283 is great to 300 yards with that kind of velocity ... as long as the cross wind is not too great. 🇺🇸

You are right. The -8" drop is relatively easy to deal with, especially with rangefinders these days. But the 12" sideways slide in a 10 mph wind starts to push things into the marginal zone.
It would be good to cut that down to 8", too.

+ + + + +

"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.

michael458

04 July 2012, 15:28

quote:

Above refers to .500-caliber/335-grain NonCon plus tip fired from the 500 MDM, right?
So with tip is that a 345-grain bullet?

RIP

Correct, any and all times in this scenario with BBW#13 NonCons, I always refer to the bullet weight, WITHOUT the tip.

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

04 July 2012, 15:47

Sam came down for a visit yesterday, and as normal we managed to get a lot of work done. Just so happened that the new North Fork FPS (NEW NOSE PROFILE) prototypes arrived the day before. These were sent for my approval, as RIP and I have an order in, .500 caliber. These were the first in .500 caliber done with the New Nose Profile that North Fork has changed to in ALL CALIBERS, not just .500.

Specific to .500 caliber only, in comparison to the BBW#13, the North Forks have a slightly longer Nose Projection than what we designed for the .500s in the BBW#13. As we know, Nose Projection, has become a factor in depth of penetration. The Nose Projection on the North Forks is around .680 on the 375 NF FPS, and around .700 on the 450 NF FPS--As best I can measure that here, give or take a bit, John could give you exact numbers if wanted. I also suppose that this nose projection carries out in other calibers, which is a good thing.

The New Nose Profile, very similar to the BBW#13 as you can plainly see, but is not an exact 13 degree angle, is a superior solid to the older version nose profile in every way. I will have to say that it is the absolute equal of the BBW#13 without a doubt. If compared directly, there is a 375 BBW#13 and the 375 North Fork, because of the slightly longer nose projection the North Fork will penetrate deeper. In the case of lets say the 500 BBW#13 compared to the 450 North Fork, because of Nose Projection, and velocity in this case, the 450 North Fork is the dead equal to the 500 BBW#13. This falls true in the 50 B&M where the 500 BBW#13 can be run to 2150 fps and the 450 North Fork yesterday at 2235 fps. In the case of the 500 MDM the 450 North Fork fell just short of the 500 BBW#13 slightly. All intensive purposes, and not counting an inch here or there, very equal.

We now have two Solids for our choosing that really cannot be equaled in Performance anywhere in the world as far as I am concerned. What you choose is up to you, I will be working exclusively with the BBW#13s and North Fork only in the future, there is no need to look elsewhere. No bullet company out there supports you like these two companies do, and both are Performance dedicated. North Fork by changing the meplat size down to 68% of caliber has now joined the ranks of proper performance, but also feed and function in our bolt guns. I tested three different rifles yesterday, Of course all Winchester M70s, and worked them hard, slinging brass against the wall on the other side of the range, feed and function was 100%, slick as can be, did not even feel a bump in 50 B&M Super Short, 50 B&M, and 500 MDM. ZERO issues on that front, of course with a proper rifle. I cannot speak for that \$2 POS!

Let's get started, and show you what we have.



North Fork .500 450 FPS

New Design FPS

Old FPS



If one does crimp, and in the case of the 500 MDM I do crimp, the new North Fork FPS has an excellent crimp groove compared to the old version.

Michael

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

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

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

michael458

04 July 2012, 16:05

Starting with the 375 North Fork FPS tested in the 50 B&M Super Short, for which it was originally designed for, lets look at the older Nose Profile first. While the old nose profile did well, and there were no issues with it, the New Nose Profile out performs the old by a significant margin.

This first bullet was the prototype test sent, meplat size was 71% of caliber, it did cause issues in feed and function, with the nose clipping the bottom of the feed ramp, total stoppage.



The final version of the old nose profile was changed to 68% of caliber, feed and function was 100%, with zero issues, and depth of penetration was increased by a measurable and consistent margin. This was the bullet adopted at that time, I still have many of those as well.



Now we enter into the 375 North Fork FPS New Nose Profile. It maintains it's 68% meplat of caliber, and by virtue of it's superior nose profile feed and function, and performance has increased by a very significant margin. In addition the North Fork also penetrates deeper than it's cousin the 375 BBW#13 because of the shorter nose projection of the #13. In either case, both are more than enough to accomplish rather big duties, and I will be using both (**If North Fork can deliver before 7/24/12-HINT HINT**) on buffalo in Australia.



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

04 July 2012, 16:44

Now lets take a look at the 450 North Fork in the 50 B&M.

Again, with the 1st prototype .500s, with the 71% meplat. Feed and function, even in the Winchester, at 71% was troublesome. Penetration and performance, good.



Dropping the meplat size down to 68% was a success, in both 100% feed and function, and a marginal increase in depth of penetration. All as it should have been, and expected.



Now enter the 450 North Fork FPS, New Nose Profile, and yet again an increase in performance, and feed and function 100% perfect.



Last time I tested the 500 gr BBW#13 it drove to 63 inches in the 50 B&M. For all basic purposes the New North Fork FPS is it's equal.

Michael

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

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

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

michael458

04 July 2012, 17:00

While I can find the test work done with the first prototype 450 North Fork at 71%, I come up short on the test at 68% meplat. Evidently I missed that for whatever reason.



We did not see as dramatic a difference as we do at the lower velocities of the other smaller cartridges, and it might be possible we are reaching the upper end of performance with these type bullets at these velocities. There is massive trauma inflicted up front because of this velocity as well, it MAY very well be much of that transfer of trauma up front, might shorten depth of penetration by some margin. I do not know this as fact, only theory. But, all along the way here in these three tests we see the margins tighten as velocity increases, so it's possible. In all honesty, I really don't care one way or the other, performance is incredible and far beyond adequate for anything one would embark upon. I can also say that I believe very strongly in the hitting ability of this bullet, and the BBW#13, at higher velocity, and trauma inflicted up front. Without any doubt, I have seen this in buffalo and elephant at higher velocity impacts.



North Forks new Nose Profile, in my opinion, is a tremendous leap forward for North Fork. These bullets prove a significant gain in terminal performance, and feed and function across the board in calibers. It is my understanding that the 68% meplat is now standard across the board, this will make a big difference in all bolt guns, new nose profile also feeds and functions better as well. Performance, no doubt about it, the terminals are there, performance has increased significantly in both depth of penetration and straight line penetration as well. Many times at the end of penetration with the old nose profile it would start to lose stability, not much, the last couple of inches and only sometimes, not all the time. In the case of the 50 B&M and the 50 B&M Super Short, everything was 100% dead straight. In the case of the 500 MDM maybe it started to get loose in the very last 1 inch of penetration, which is common in most all solid bullets, and even the BBW#13. But of absolutely no consequence.

North Fork, You have been extremely successful in this endeavor, I lift my hat to you!

Michael

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

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

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

capoward

04 July 2012, 19:02

Very nice results Michael. Fantastic new generation nose profile design for NF!

And a Happy and Safe 4th of July to everyone!!!

Jim 🤔

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

RIP

05 July 2012, 10:30



boom stick

05 July 2012, 13:17

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...youtube_gdata_player

A video is worth a thousand posts.

[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)

Esskay

05 July 2012, 21:16

And now the bulging eyeballs 😊

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?f...n&NR=1&v=6S56o2spCw0>

All DocM's fault..really! 😊

michael458

08 July 2012, 20:05

I heard this morning that in Precision Shooting Magazine (I think that is what it is called) there is a big article in it about the ESP Raptors? I have not seen it, nor do I subscribe to that, so maybe someone that does can review it for us?

I should have the article here in hard copy sometime this week.

Michael

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

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

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

RIP

09 July 2012, 04:15

That should be a pretty good piece in that magazine.

Any idea on the overall drift?
I used to get it. Had to cut back somewhere. 😊

RIP

09 July 2012, 08:42

Found some more recycled drollery from Terry Wee-wee-land in the Summer 2012 issue of **AFRICAN HUNTING GAZETTE**:

PP 128-129:

Expanding Bullet Update

... "In it's least exact form, terminal performance is measured by whether you got the animal.
If you did, the bullet performed admirably;
if you didn't, it didn't. This presupposes the animal was properly hit, of course." ...

Such a clever wordsmith, that Terry! 🗨️

... "As the premium-bullet market has matured, we predictably find marketing people trying to turn vice into virtue.
For example, the argument that a bullet will expand, the claws will fly off, and behave like shrapnel,
penetrating at different angles into the vitals of the animal."

"Anyone who has examined a wound, or even the penetration channel of a medium such as soaked, compressed newsprint (which is the closest we can come to duplicating the characteristics of animal tissue)

Yes, Terry actually wrote that.

knows that claws, when they have broken off, merely litter the wound channel."

Reckon Terry is just imagineering his bullet tests in wetpack?

"They don't penetrate like shrapnel. How could they? They are oddly shaped bits that weigh a few grains.
Meanwhile the bullet has less weight with which to maintain its momentum."

"The shrapnel argument is purest hogwash, invented by marketing people to sugar-coat poor performance." ...

Skip to last sentence of the article.

... **"And avoid any bullet that claims a "shrapnel effect," or which emphasizes long-range accuracy rather than terminal performance."**

There is no way for Terry to have his cake and eat it too. Poor Terry.

Cross L

09 July 2012, 09:10

ALF
one of us
Posted 03 July 2012 16:15 Hide Post
Trax:

yes !

The "mistakes" made in the interpretation of the tests are numerous but most probably the greatest error derives from the fact that behaviours are reported that are not tested for.

As I have tried to show over and over it is a two way street.

Only the bullet behaviour is tested for in the simulation, not the target behaviour and even then only certain behaviours not all.

So if there is comment bullet expanding or fragmenting etc etc then that part is ok, the minute there is reference to the amount of trauma done to the paper stack or gelatine or reference to this likely being a better killer than that, as observed by the amount of damage to the target then the test is invalid, no matter how many times over you repeat the test !

It is a systematic error in the methodology employed.

Yes I agree that the amount of damage to the target material would constitute a measure of lethality in living tissue but sadly simulation testing does not test for this..... this is the problem and people do not seem to get this.

The hole you see in gelatine and the hole in paper after shooting is not representative of the amount of damage done in various tissues. This is why basic science in ballistics is so important.

Just to illustrate here is a picture posted from the terminal thread

This is the "trauma" done to the paper.

Simple questions:

1. What caused this damage ? By that I mean by what mode of action did this occur?
2. Do you see this behaviour in living muscle , or bone or organ tissues? In other words if you shoot your animal do you see this destruction and mass of devitalized tissue ejected from the target ?

This whole thing to me is amazing because this thread on terminals is so important it has been made a permanent fixture on AR.

So anyone wishing to find out about ballistics who googles Terminal behaviour is going to get this popping up on their screen. They may actually believe that what they see there is how things happen ?

I cannot wait to see some kid at school presenting this for fact when asked to write a term paper on ballistics !

Posts: 61

Alf is at it again



SSr

boom stick

09 July 2012, 10:18

Say what you want about "Wetpack" a #%@\$ing 130 grain ESP Raptor can take down all sorts of African PG better than most bullets out there.

[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)

416Tanzan

09 July 2012, 15:22

quote:

Originally posted by RIP:
Found some more recycled drollery from Terry Wee-wee-land in the Summer 2012 issue of **AFRICAN HUNTING GAZETTE**:

PP 128-129:

Expanding Bullet Update

... "In it's least exact form, terminal performance is measured by whether you got the animal.
If you did, the bullet performed admirably;
if you didn't, it didn't. This presupposes the animal was properly hit, of course." ...

Such a clever wordsmith, that Terry! 🤖

... "As the premium-bullet market has matured, we predictably find marketing people trying to turn vice into virtue.
For example, the argument that a bullet will expand, the claws will fly off, and behave like shrapnel,
penetrating at different angles into the vitals of the animal."

**"Anyone who has examined a wound, or even the penetration channel of a medium such as soaked, compressed newsprint
(which is the closest we can come to duplicating the characteristics of animal tissue)**

Yes, Terry actually wrote that.

knows that claws, when they have broken off, merely litter the wound channel."

Reckon Terry is just imagineering his bullet tests in wetpack?

"They don't penetrate like shrapnel. How could they? They are oddly shaped bits that weigh a few grains.
Meanwhile the bullet has less weight with which to maintain its momentum."

"The shrapnel argument is purest hogwash, invented by marketing people to to sugar-coat poor performance." ...

Skip to last sentence of the article.

... **"And avoid any bullet that claims a "shrapnel effect," or which emphasizes long-range accuracy rather than terminal performance."**

There is no way for Terry to have his cake and eat it too. Poor Terry.

He really is a wee-wee. Now in the good old days, he would just eat his hat like Mike Fink , King of the River.

BTW someone who subscribes to one of these mags needs to write a 'letter to the editor' and complain of poorly disguised slander. Those mags border on liably irresponsible. Keep it short and suggest that Terry hasn't tested and doesn't know what he's bad-mouthing about. A senior editor with some brass ones would ask Terry to do a study in retraction or fire his ass.

+ + + + +

"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.