

cc: R. E. Evans
J. J. O'Connor

REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Remington
RIFLE

PETERS
RIFLE

RECEIVED
JUN 5 - 1956
J. D. MITCHELL

Bridgeport, Connecticut
June 5, 1956

TO: P. H. BURDETT
FROM: C. S. CUMMINGS
SUBJECT: MODEL 40-X - ACCURACY
(Letter of S. M. Alvis to P. H. Burdett-
May 23, 1956)

Regardless of the original excellent performance of the 40-X, the evidence strongly indicates that our present 40-X is not optimum for our present cartridge. The reasons for this are, I feel, quite clearly set forth in John O'Connor's letter of March 20, 1956.

Another fact is that the M52 is going to be around for a while. Our cartridge must give performance equal to or better than Mark III in the M52. Compromising the performance of the present cartridge in the M52 would be, I believe, quite ill advised.

Development of a cartridge to optimize the present 40-X would, I fear, be much more than a \$3,000 proposition. Also, manufacturing, warehousing and selling two different match rifle cartridges would present problems and costs that would probably make such a choice most unattractive. I do not believe it is possible, or at least economically feasible, to develop a single cartridge that will give performance in both the present 40-X and the M52 equal to that of our present cartridge in the M52.

It seems that one of the following decisions must be made:

1. Change nothing and accept marginal performance or relatively poorer performance on the average with our gun and cartridge than with M52 and our cartridge.
2. Modify the 40-X to give optimum performance with our present cartridge.
3. Develop a new cartridge to give optimum performance in present 40-X, restricting the present cartridge for use in M52.

Yes! {
no -
cost +
confusion!

P. H. Burdett

-2-


June 5, 1956

Subject: MODEL 40-X - ACCURACY

4. Change the present cartridge to improve performance in the present 40-X, but almost certainly with the sacrifice of performance in the M52.

It appears to me that the choice of alternatives must be based on two considerations:

1. What are Remington's objectives with regard to the match rifle and ammunition field?
2. What are we willing to pay to achieve these objectives?


Supervisor, Fundamental Research

CSC:jbm