249 El Conejo
Los Alamos, New Mexico
7 June, 1963

Mr. W. E. Leek
Manager - Firearms Design & Development
Ilion Research Division
Remington Arms Company, Incorporated
Ilion, New York

Dear Sir:

Firstly, may I thank you for your letter of 21 May, 1963, received on 25 May, 1963. That receipt date has some significance. I read the letter between trips to the shop of a gunsmith friend. This trip series ended, as related in the accompanying letter, in my possession of Model XP-100 pistol serial number 1411.

I am 43 years old, was torpedoed 21 years ago today and married 16 years ago today, and should know better. However, I could not pass up the beast. I have shown it and talked about it to about a dozen people since the acquisition of the piece. The comment is varied as one would expect. That stock trouble does nothing for the weapon.

Now, Sir, may I take exception to your remark about the velocity one might expect to get out of a .222 Remington case fired in a 10½ inch tube? A rifle load fired from such a tube might actually drop from 3,200 to 2,000 feet per second at the muzzle, something like 89 feet per second per inch * of tube amputated.... study of various reports published in the RIFLEMAN would indicate that something more like 30 to 40 feet per second per inch of tube would be more believeable. However, I had no intention of using rifle loads in a short tube... and so stated. Surely, the ballisticians at Remington could do better than that... have alook at your competitor's .256 cartridge in that "awful" looking revolver-turned-into-a-single-shot.

Incidentally, I found the noise much less than that of the .22 MRF cartridge fired in a Smith & Wesson revolver fitted with an 8-3/8 inch barrel. Recoil was hardly noticeable in the XP-100.

The matter of sight radius is, of course, always open to debate. I can only state that over fifteen people who have discussed the XP-100 with me, not all of them with weapon in hand, have all been disappointed with the "stock" system as presented. (How do you fasten a decent rear sight to the rear receiver ring with only one screw?)

The rear sight on #1411 is definitely cocked as viewed from above. Either its front or rear screw is not properly aligned over the bore... perhaps they are both off. I am not going to disassembl the pistol or use home brewed ammunition in it until I have completed the first of my reports. I had to use almost half of the available left windage adjustment to hit my tin can at a hundred yards from hand rest. (Oh that target shown in the DuPont magazine... you should be ashamed.)

* $\frac{3200 - 2000}{24 - 10.5} \approx 89$

I intend investigating your statement about the studs which project from the barrel to "... support the sights directly...". Could it be that one of these is out of line to cause the misalignment of the rear sight?

I did not mention to the gentleman in charge of the DuPont Magazine the fact that I detect an apparent movement of the nylon rib which makes it look rather sway-backed between support locations. This apparent movement of the rib will be followed, measured, and reported upon at a later date.

If the rib is designed to float, I am wondering how the sights are expected to "stand still". I can see how this could be managed if the sight bases are, indeed, directly supported by the studs, and the rib has been made with enough clearance around the studs to give as the barrel warms... I am also well aware of the fact that the XP-100 will usually not be fired rapidly enough not to get hot... I fired three rounds in about thirty seconds and found relatively little heating of the slender tube.

I now wish to make at least one commendatory statement. That action is a little jewel. The bolt stop is a trifle hard to get to, but should present no problem to the shooter properly equipped to clean and service fine arms. It is a mystery to me how you people get the trigger pulls you do with those stamped-out parts... not exactly like a Hammerli or Browning shotgun. An aside is my question to a gunsmith friend, "Can you see that action fitted with about two feet of stiff barrel, chambered for .222 Remington, and dropped into a bull-pup stock?". Gordon's replay, with his slow grin was, "I wasn't going to say it; but I was thinking about it."

Sir, you asked for it, and you will get it. I propose keeping a careful record on #1411. A weapon to do the job seems to be in demand; but I am not certain the XP-100 is the answer... I have also just started using your .22 Rem-Jet in a Smith & Wesson revolver, so there will be something to compare. What is the trouble with your staff? Couldn't one of the engineers manage the rolling block into something really good? I had a .50 once, and still regret letting it get away from me. You may have seen an article about the conversion of a couple of the rolling block pistols to handguns chambered for the .30 M-1 carbine round.

Enough for this time. Thanking you for your kind attention, may I remain

Very truly yours,

Pierre F. Hartshorne

P. S. You may yet wish to offer twice my money back for #1411; but if you never heard from any of us who pay for your products, you would all be making roller skates.