

1810 Highridge Dr.
Columbia Mo. 65201
Nov. 23, 1969

Mr. Wayne Leek, Manager
Firearms Research & Design
Remington Arms Co., Inc.
Ilion, N.Y. 13357

Dear Mr. Leek:

A copy of this letter of being sent to Dick Dietz, so we will not inadvertently get afoul of policy. I was grateful for your unusually informative letter, April 8, 1969. My number six doesn't work anymore on this machine, and no craftsman of our great free enterprise system has offered to fix it at less than a tie-up of weeks on end and exorbitant cost.

In the April letter, you suggested after some months passed the subject should be re-opened. I do so with a copy of a letter from Mike Keesee. I have provided an actual copy so ~~you~~ you won't think I made it up. On noting it, please destroy the copy and forget that Mike ever said it. But see the blue-lined part, page 1. Your organization has since made the 700 available in what I take it is a longer version capacity for the six.5 Rem. mag. Well, then, question 1: was that done because your studies displayed an actual better ballistic performance with the bullet seated out?

I take it as given that powder combustion does not appreciably affect the base of the bullet, despite what windy Brownell and Narramore have told us. Is this right? The deep-seated combination would not build up undue pressure so long as one downloaded if from neck-base potential, with proper powders. Is this right?

G. O. ASHLEY
(Col. USAF Ret.)

PRESENTATIONS Ltd.

Ballistic Research : Outdoor Photo-Essays

p. 2, to Leek, Nov. 23, 1969.

Now if I am edging into policy you don't want to discuss, please don't be squeamish about saying so. I simply trust your conclusions more than I do my own inductions.

I take it no whim was involved in making the recent 700 offer. So if it works in that caliber, one may sensibly expect longer actions for the six mm, and others, and a back-handed admission the .257 was not given a full chance, due to its short action presentation. I have better basis for this, for I have 3 .257 Imp. All are on long enough actions to have room to spare to load long bullets out as far as necessary, and all are throated for long bullets. And all shoot like they invented accuracy. So compared, the ~~the~~ stubby .257 Mod 722 I once had, they are almost different rifles - even though from the same case, improved. On them at least, there is a whale of a difference.

Overall question on principle then is have your studies so far developed anything significant you may be disposed to share with me?

As you are no doubt aware, I took the stubby belted brass and did rifles on it in .25, 28, and 32. These were written up in Gunfacts magazine. Each of them had as a basis a chambering and throat cut that would require me to seat the bullet no deeper than the base of the case neck. I elected that not because I was disinclined to "deter from the beaten path." I'll even leap fences where it may be in offing I might learn something. I simply felt it was inappropriate to fill up the capacity of the case I wanted to put powder in with the base of the bullet it was my intention to propel from the case, at its best. Settling that made me disposed to get an action length that would allow me to do what I wanted to do - rather than fitting everything to an action length foreordained just because that was the length it was made to. Actually then it is a dross question of fundamental dominance, isn't it.

I'd be grateful for any tidbits from your research, now, you'd care to let me in on. Best wishes, as usual

Geo.