



BY J. C. MUNNELL

Conceived in confusion, born in controversy (some would say it was born prematurely), it has spent its entire existence personifying those twin traits. Its detractors are and al-



The four Ruger .220 Swift rifles in order of manufacture. From left: M 77V, M77 VZ, M 77 Mk II VZ and M 77 Mk II VT. The dates of manufacture run from about 1971 to 1993. Although all are very accurate, the oldest one has been the most consistent. The one on right is still in production.

ways have been legion, its champions few, but yet it soldiers on. Sometimes any given innovation must almost die out before it receives the credit it is due. Some never achieve any real success. Such is the history of the .220 Swift and the jury is still out on its future. The simple fact that it is still with us some 75 years later *ought to be*, but apparently is not, sufficient to establish it as one of the better cartridge designs of modern times. Perhaps eventually, to paraphrase William Faulkner, it, too shall not only endure, but shall prevail.

Announced to the world by Winchester on April 23, 1935, the .220 Swift took the shooting world by storm. It was the first cartridge to break the 4000 fps barrier, and this was at a time when not too many rounds would exceed 3000 fps. Intended by Winchester as a varmint round, its initial loading was a 48 grain bullet at 4110 fps. The first rifles offered in this chambering (the Winchester Model 54) utilized, according to Philip B. Sharpe, a 1-in-16-inch rifling twist, but this was quickly changed (April 15, 1936) to a 1-in-14-inch rate so as to be better able to stabilize 55-60 grain bullets.

Sharpe, in his monumental *Complete Guide To Handloading*, first published in 1937, states that Winchester and noted ballistcian/ex-

perimenter/authority Grosvenor L. Wotkyns, tested over a dozen different cases and shapes before deciding to use the *modified* 6mm Lee Navy case with a very slight rim added (to become the same size as a .30-06 rim for more positive function in the Winchester Model 54 and later Model 70 bolts). The case was thickened, particularly in the head area, to withstand the then unheard of maximum pressure of 55000 psi. Presumably, Winchester felt this case possessed the precise capacity to best utilize the powders available at that time. Also presumably, Winchester felt that by using a modified version of one of their own case designs, this could avoid any conflict with any already-existing design, of which there were many. (This philosophy would have served the same company very well about ten years ago, eh, what!)

It is interesting to note what other case designs Winchester *could have* used rather than to modify an obsolete case. As I detailed in my articles on the .22/6mm, a/k/a .224 TTH, since at least the second decade of the last century, parallel experiments had taken place on high speed .22 caliber cartridges. One school felt that heavier bullets with a fast-rifling twist would create the ultimate long-range big game round, while others favored light bullets and a more open twist,

intending their rounds for long-range varmint hunting. Nearly every serious experimenter of the day had their own ideas on this matter and given the (relatively few) existing “parent” cases, it was to be expected that much of the work of some experimenters essentially duplicated that of others. Thus, according to Charles S. Landis in *Twenty-Two Caliber Varmint Rifles* (1947), Charles Newton (.22 Newton) George Schnerring, Frankford Arsenal’s Proof House Foreman, and R.F. Sedgley (.22/4000 Sedgley-Schnerring), L. E. Wilson and Grosvenor L. Wotkyns (.220 Wilson Arrow) and P. O. Ackley (whose cartridge was later known as the .228 Ackley Magnum), all had their own versions of a necked-down 7 x 57 Mauser/.257 Roberts. Newton and Ackley used fast-twists and heavier bullets of .228" diameter, while the 22/4000 and Wilson Arrow both utilized lighter bullets .224" in diameter and a 14 inch twist rate. Then, too, there was the inimitable .22/250, designed by, oh, perhaps a dozen different people (including the aforesaid Grosvenor L. Wotkyns), as well as the .22 Newton/Krag, the .22 Niedner Magnum and literally dozens of other rounds which *could have* been used by Winchester if all they wanted was an ultra-fast 22 caliber varmint round.

If Winchester wanted to avoid a conflict with all these noted experimenters who had their own dog in the fight, so to speak, they certainly did not mollify those same people (with the possible notable exception of Wotkyns) by coming out with their own design. Both through pure unadulterated parochialism (“their design is inferior to mine”) and misunderstanding – real or contrived (“the .220 Swift [with its light bullet and slow twist] is a lousy elephant round”) – those same designers, who unfortunately, were also leading gun *writers* of the day, tripped over themselves to condemn the Swift. Particularly prevalent was that age-old contrivance of “condemnation by faint praise”. Thus, Landis states “The cartridge case is strong and heavy *and needs to be*” (emphasis supplied), while also saying “The author’s varmint shooting experiences with the .220 Swift, spread over years, have not been satisfactory” (because of bullet blowup and instability). Yet he also says “It is a clean-killing deer rifle” and goes on to state “but as a reloading proposition, stands almost at the foot of the list among modern high powers” and in what may be the most interesting phraseology on the subject states “In conclusion, the Swift amazes the neophyte and disgusts the real veteran riflemen and reloader.” Can you guess he was an early and strong proponent of the 22/4000 Sedgley-Schnerring?

Contrast Landis’ snide remarks as to the reloadability of the .220 Swift with Sharpe’s comments: “Actually, the case is the strongest for hand loading ever produced -”, and “It is an excellent case for reloading, extremely sturdy and of stiff brass” and will withstand more than 25 reloadings. Yet, he too could not resist the urge to condemn: “Handloading the .220 Swift is a del-

icate operation. The cartridge is by no means perfect-ed.” (He also suggested “some form of grease wad should be used to lengthen barrel life and improve accuracy.”) Likewise, P. O. Ackley states “. . . the barrel life is relatively short”, unless handloaded to speeds 200 to 300 fps under maximum pressures while acknowledging “It is still one of the hottest and still travels in the fastest company no matter how wild a “wildcat” is put against it.”

If these are examples of parochialism, then are Landis’ statements that the .22 Wilson Arrow and .22/4000 were better black bear cartridges (although being ballistically identical) than the Swift ignorance or intentional misrepresentations? Certainly he well realized that by employing 14 and 16 inch twists and by loading 48 grain bullets, Winchester most certainly did *not* intend the Swift for use against bears (although the advertising mores of the day did not require Winchester to *refute* any such statements of use by others)! Upon shoulders such as those of Landis may be heaped the countless failures encountered by various innocents who attempted to shoot large game with the Swift and its factory loads. (Yes, I know even then some custom bullet makers made light-weight, but heavily-jacketed .224" bullets especially for such use, and although I realize that such *would* work on game as large as black bear, I will make no recommendations as to the advisability of using any .22 caliber cartridge for such critters.

In any event, the printed word, for whatever reason, that greeted the .220 Swift in its infancy was less than helpful, to say the least. Nor did this change, at least for 30, 40 or even 50 years. The Swift all but died, with few factories chambering rifles for it and even Winchester ceasing to do so in 1964. (This was when, in a complete about-face, they “created” the .225 Winchester – an almost exact copy of the various “Improved” .219 Zipper rounds.) Sturm, Ruger and Company almost single-handedly revived the Swift when they began chambering the No. 1 and Model 77 rifles for this round in the late 1960’s. They have continued to produce such rifles, and gradually Remington, Sako, Savage and others have made small production runs for the .220 Swift, but not Winchester. Still, it endures.

In the 1960’s and 70’s when I was really getting started into handloading and working with the less-mainstream rifle cartridges, I continued to resist the lure of the Swift. After all, all that I read repeated the same old criticisms: “It ate barrels after a few hundred rounds, it was inaccurate unless loaded to too-high pressures, cases stretched in one or two firings”. Then there was the ultimate criticism: “Besides, it won’t do anything the .22-.250 won’t do.” As I have learned, none of these criticisms are true today, and may never have been true. If any of these were true, today’s slower-burning powders and better barrel steel have largely eliminated many of the old shibboleths.

About 1970, a good friend bought a new Ruger M-77V and found it was very accurate, both with factory loads and with loads concocted by a rather notoriously not-too-competent reloader who owned the store in which he bought the rifle. Then another friend who was a much more capable reloader acquired one in a trade. Even though he didn't really want this rifle, since it came with dies he decided to work up a few loads before trading it off. Finding that it was more accurate than his .22-.250 and killed groundhogs "faster", he wound up keeping it. Both of these rifles were chambered for the .220 Swift. Finally one day, I was loafing in a gunsmith shop when the proprietor turned down a chance to



The four Ruger .220 Swift rifles owned by Munnell in order as described in the text. From left: M 77 V, M 77 Mk II VZ, M 77 VZ and M 77 Mk II VT. The only external difference between the second and fourth rifle is the metal coloring. The third rifle does not exist, according to the Sturm, Ruger & Co. factory records.

buy a similar 77V, complete with a Canjar single-set trigger, from a fellow who claimed it to be very accurate, but needed money to pay the gunsmith. To make a long story very short, I paid the 'smith and kept the Ruger, a decision that, to this day, I'm very happy with.

This particular Ruger M-77V is not so old as to be one of the earliest "flat bolt" variations but wasn't made too long after that era. When I got the gun, I took it apart and noted that it had been very carefully glass-bedded around the recoil lug and for the first 1½" of the chamber area. I guessed that no more work was needed and uncharacteristically left well enough alone. The rest of the barrel was free-floated. As I have opined before, I firmly believe Ruger used a better grade of barrel on their varmint rifles than on their hunting-weight rifles. In any event, this barrel seemed very smooth inside and showed no signs of throat erosion. I guessed, considering the Swift's reputation as a barrel burner, that it hadn't been shot more than a few dozen times. (I was to later learn that this reputation, like most of the other reported Swift flaws, was largely nonsense.) What was intended as a long-range groundhog rifle deserved a long-range scope and I just happened to have a 16x Redfield 3200 "barrel rider" scope lying around. Since the early Ruger varmint rifles were drilled and tapped for barrel rider bases (in addition to having the usual integral dovetails), and since I had such suitable bases, I was in business.

At the time, I already owned a Browning M-78 in .22-.250, which was extremely accurate with the 52 grain Speer Silver Match. Therefore, since the Swift is a bit faster, I decided to see how it would shoot with some 60 grain Sierra hollow points, guessing that anything heavier might be a bit too heavy for the gun's 14" twist. With this bullet I got accuracy that I felt was entirely satisfactory. In fact, only one load went over one inch, while three (out

of 19) went under one-half inch. Powders used were Accurate MR-223, Hodgdon H-380 and IMR 4064 and 4350. Primers were CCI BR-2, W-W brass was employed and Bonanza Bench Rest dies were used, all with complete satisfaction. Velocities approached 3750 fps. Being happy didn't mean I was ready to quit experimenting and I'm quite glad I didn't, since the good accuracy was merely a harbinger of better things to come. By the way, you will note, I'm sure, that I am giving no *specific* powder charges. This is not a new policy of either Editor Dave or me, but the reason will be better demonstrated a bit later.

The next bullet used was even more impressive. With the 52 grain Speer h.p., I did not fire even a single group over one inch. Occasional 5/16" four-shot groups appeared at the 100-yard target with many groups being under one-half inch. The same was true for the Speer 52 grain Silver Match. H-380 proved the most accurate powder with both 52 grain bullets, with most accurate loads producing around 3900 fps.

Still, uncertain of the voracity of the old saw that Swifts ate barrels before lunch, I was hesitant to "ruin" the Ruger by any further experimenting. Although the gun served well (and continues to do so) in the groundhog fields, no more attempts at working up loads were made with this rifle.

A few years later I found two more Ruger/Swifts in rapid succession. The first I actually sought out – the Varmint version of the then new Model 77 MKII; the second turned up at a gun show and was interesting enough to buy. It was an original M77V, but one of the last made and was in the "Z" stock – multi-colored laminate. Since this model in this chambering was not catalogued, I thought I might be buying a future collectable. According to the Ruger factory, however, this rifle does not exist. The serial number left the factory as a barreled-action (only) with a .22-.250

barrel on it. While I certainly cannot prove that the present configuration is original, all parts are pure Ruger and all barrel markings are correct for a Swift. Who knows!

I started working with the Mark II before I found the other rifle, so decided to make it a project for one summer and hold the “Z-gun” off until the next summer. With this early M77 Mark II, I refined what has become my (almost) standard testing protocol for varmint rifles: I tested one bullet quite extensively (in this case, the 52 grain Speer h.p. which had shot so well in the earlier Ruger), re-tested any particularly promising loads, then I took those five loads that produced the best *average* accuracy and tried the same five loads in several (in this case nine) other match grade varmint-type bullets, eventually settling on the “best of the best”. Again, W-W brass, CCI BR-2 primers and the Bonanza dies were used.

Powders tried included IMR 3031, Norma 201, Hi-Vel No. 2, Accurate 2460, Hodgdon’s 4895, IMR 4064, Accurate 2520, Hodgdon’s H-380 and H-414 and IMR 4350. As you can see from these choices, the .220 Swift, like the .22-.250, will digest any but the fastest-burning and slowest-burning rifle powders. Bullets tested, in addition to the 52 grain Speer h.p. were Sierra Match h.p.s in both 52 and 53 grain weights, the Speer 52 grain *B.T.* Match, the Nosler 52 grain h.p. b.t. Match, the Hornady 52 and 53 grain Match h.p.’s, the 52 grain Cook h.p. and the 52 grain Berger Match h.p. Velocities in the gun were as high as the mid-4100 fps range but best accuracy – thereby giving the lie to another of the old shibboleths – was generally in the 3800 to 3900 fps range. Although all bullets could be coaxed into giving the occasional standout group, the three consistently best shooters were the 52 grain Sierra hollow point boattail, the 52 grain Cook hollow point and the 52 grain Berger Match. In all three instances ve-

locity was around 3900 fps. The most accurate powder turned out to be H-414. All the good groups were made despite the gun having a truly terrible trigger, which situation I did not rectify – for the sake of consistency – until testing was over.

This rifle taught me much; not only about it, but about the previous Ruger/Swift as well. First, cartridge over-all length was not consistent between the two guns; the second Ruger could handle cartridges as much as .050" longer than the earlier gun, but more importantly this gun would not accept nearly as much of any given powder as did the former rifle. Finally, after putting better than 1200 purely experimental (read: occasionally excessively hot) loads and not seeing any appreciable throat erosion at all, I began to realize that the reputation of the .220 Swift as a barrel burner was not necessarily deserved. I give much of the credit for good barrel life *in any rifle* to my firm practice of firing no more than four shots without allowing the barrel to cool to ambient temperatures before any additional firing. Heat, both that caused by the friction of the bullet passing through the bore and that from the burning powder, is the true culprit in reducing barrel life.

For those unfamiliar with the early Mark II Ruger varmint rifles, they were very similar to those made today and known as the M77 MKII VT, but with three differences. First, the receiver is blued on the early guns. Second, the barrel, although stainless, does not have the “target gray” color of today’s guns, and finally the triggers are totally non-adjustable ones like those used on the hunting-weight rifles of the time. Later VT’s used the very excellent two-stage trigger originally designed for the Palma rifles Ruger made some years back.

The third Ruger varmint rifle, another M77 but with the “VZ” stock was tested in the same manner the following summer. Again, the 52 grain Speer hollow point (*not*

the “Match” bullet) was used as the guinea pig. This time, however, AA-2460 was dropped and IMR 4320 and 4831 were added. “Only” six additional bullets were tried; the Nosler (discontinued) and the 52 grain Hornady (I ran out) were dropped. Velocities ran a bit lower with this gun than with the MK II but were higher than the original M77 and accuracy was not quite as consistently good as either of the two previous guns. Still, superb results were obtained with the 52 grain Cook, in particular at around 3900 fps. The most consistently accurate powder was H-4895, although the best *combination* was 3031 with the Cook bullet. The same components and equipment were used as in the previous two guns, and cartridge O.A.L.’s were similar to the M77 MK II. (I should herein mention that I turned necks with these second and third guns, as well as with the next one, but had not with the original .220 Swift, chamber necks being just tight enough on the latter guns to make turning necessary.) Are you starting to see a pattern emerging from these three guns yet? Me neither.

When Ruger announced the VT version of the Mark II, complete with the two-stage trigger, I simply had to buy one “to complete the set.” Again, basically the same protocol was followed with this fourth Swift and again – to be as consistent as possible – the 52 grain Speer was used as the guinea pig. This rifle did not present any great surprises. Accuracy was very acceptable (although still the most consistent gun in the accuracy department has been the original M77V) and most similar to the M77VZ. Here, however, the 52 grain Berger Match h.p. was the most accurate bullet and IMR 4350 the most accurate powder. (Again, a load with the most accurate bullet and the most accurate powder was not the best overall tested.) Velocities were just slightly lower than in the last two rifles, but still a bit faster than in the first one. Components used were

the same and over-all lengths were the same as the previous two guns. Again, necks required turning.

I had now owned four .220 Swift rifles, all Rugers, all of which had a 26" barrel and all of which were of varmint (heavy barrel) configuration. All four rifles were very accurate and had been tested with various target scopes ranging in power from 16 to 20x. Yet, they each displayed definite individual traits, preferences and perhaps even personalities. In what was largely a huge exercise in futility, I decided to *try* to quantify these preferences and peccadilloes. I made all manners of charts and graphs, largely to no avail. (Don't worry Dave, I'm not going to ask you to publish any of them.) (Editor: Good!)

Fourteen powders were tested all together and each gun preferred a different one. Burning-rates of the preferred powders ran from H4895 on the fast side to IMR 4350 on the slow end. Even so, 3031 ran second in one rifle and IMR 4831 was second in another, these two representing the fastest and slowest tested respectively. IMR 4064, perhaps the "classic" .220 Swift powder, while not preferred in any of the four guns, was always in the running. As far as bullets were concerned, the original Ruger Model 77V was only tested with three different ones, but preferred the 52 grain Speer (non-Match) hollow point, the M77VZ preferred the 52 grain Cook hollow point, the M77 Mark II V liked the 52 grain Sierra boattail hollow best and the M7 MK II VT doted on the 52 grain Berger Match. However, the biggest surprise came in the form of the amount of the various powders each gun would "digest" without showing signs of too-high pressure. With 3031, 34.5 grains was maximum in the Mark II V, while 37.5 was OK in the M77 VZ. With H4895, 35.5 was maximum in one rifle, whereas 38.5 was maximum in another. 4064 safe loads ran between 36.5 and 40.5 grains, MR-2520 varied from 35.5 to 39.0 grains and H-380 went from 38.0 to 44.0!! And so on. In several instances, maximum loads gave similar velocities in different guns despite being several grains different. Let this be a lesson: the "generic" reloading caution about safe loads in one gun being possibly unsafe in another is a very real and sensible word to the wise. Had I blindly used the maximum loads from the Mark II VT in the Mark II V, for instance, there could have been some spectacular fireworks.

A few years ago, I had the opportunity to purchase a fairly rare Sako variant – an L-579 chambered for the .220 Swift. Knowing the reputation for accuracy of Sako rifles (and having personally verified this reputation in several instances), and by this time being completely sold on this cartridge, I snapped up the rifle in what probably was record time. This gun had a shorter 24" heavy barrel with a 1-in-12-inch rifling twist.

Although again beginning with the Speer 52 grain h.p., I used a total of 14 different powders in this rifle, adding such as H-335, R1-21 and AA-2700, I also put

the new-to-me but no longer made 52 grain flat-based h.p. made by Jef and Ed Fowler through its paces with 13 powders. What a great bullet! In addition, a few new custom bullets were tried such as the Bruno 52 grain h.p., the Hart 52 grain h.p., the Starke Red Prairie 52 grain h.p. and the Hornady A-Max 52 grain. All proved very accurate. The best accuracy came with the 52 grain Fowler and IMR 4064 powder. Although the rifle was very accurate and very consistent, the "best" groups could not compete with a couple of the Rugers, especially the original M77V. Then, too, possibly due to the two inch shorter barrel (or the tighter twist rate?) velocity was somewhat lower, but not by much. Since this rifle was scarce enough to command a fairly hefty dollar, it was sent packing.

My most recent foray into the world of the .220 Swift was a Remington M-40XR. When I saw it for sale, I said to myself "Aha! Now I'll find out just how darned accurate a Swift really can be." Also, since I had no prior experience with the repeater version of the Model 40X, but have long been a fan of nearly *any* 40X, I was doubly anxious to try it out. Then, too, it had that wonderful 27¹/₄" barrel, "guaranteed" to squeeze the final fps. Wrong and wrong!

This time around I followed pretty much the same protocol as I had with the Sako; I extensively tested both the 52 Speer h.p. and the 52 Fowler h.p., using 11 powders. A trio of new powders, Hodgdon's Benchmark and Varget and VihtaVuori N-160 were thrown into the mix and all were suitable. Of the two bullets, the 52 grain Fowler was by far the more accurate. Using the five best loads from testing the Fowler, I also tried six other bullets, but none proved more accurate.

This rifle was the least accurate of all the .220 Swifts I have owned. Having said that, it still was pretty darn accurate – *with loads it liked*. Sub-1/2" groups were common – again with loads it liked. 1¹/₂" groups also were fairly common, however, demonstrating the extremes in its preferences. Incidentally, velocity, even with the longest barrel in the "gang of six" was lower than even the slowest Ruger.

Now, I'm sure there are several readers who are saying something like "Munnell is no benchrest shooter (true enough) and he probably did not bother adjusting seating depth, prepping cases and all those things absolutely necessary to wring the best accuracy out of any rifle. If he had done so, he would have made that 40XR shoot much better." Not so! With the *partial* exception of my very first Ruger .220 Swift (which was tested and loaded long, long ago in a galaxy far, far away), *all* cases were fully prepped, necks were turned and seating depth (of the best load in each gun) was varied. This last procedure, in particular, almost always produced *some* positive results.

Bedding was checked and, when necessary, corrected. Triggers, except in the instance of the second Ruger as already stated, were worked over so as to have a trig-

ger pull between two and three pounds. Scopes were kept as consistent as possible; the ones of higher than 16x were all set to 16x for all testing. I did not vary primers or brass manufacturer, preferring to be able to compare “apples to apples”. Nor did I try different reloading dies during the testing. (As a point of interest, I did try neck sizing, both with a standard neck sizing die



Early Ruger Model 77 V .220 Swift, with 16x Redfield M-3200 “barrel rider” scope. Many varmint rifles made when this one was manufactured (1971) were factory-drilled and tapped for bases for this type of target scope. The optics are still excellent, even by today’s standards. This gun also wears a Canjar single-set trigger, which no doubt partly accounts for the superb and consistent accuracy this rifle has always produced. Over 2000 rounds have gone through its bore, without any sign of erosion or decreased accuracy. So much for the main criticism of the Swift!

and with a bushing-type die, but this was done *after* a final load was settled upon and is not reflected in the results.)

So, what does this mean? Does it mean that Remington 40X’s and Sakos are less accurate than Rugers? Of course not. Does it mean that long barrels are “slower” than short ones? Ditto. Does it mean - -? No, the only conclusion I can draw from testing these six different .220 Swift rifles are as follows:

1. The .220 Swift is one damn fine cartridge.
2. The only one of the “time-honored” criticisms of the Swift which has any validity is that Swift



Model 77 MK II VZ. This was the first variation of the varmint configuration in the Mark II model. Note blued receiver and bottom metal, as well as “silver” (as opposed to the later “target grey”) color of the barrel. Scope is an old (El Paso) Weaver T-16.

cases will stretch a bit more than some less-tapered ones. I usually trimmed cases after three or four loadings and then did not have to trim them again. I was able to get at least 12 loadings out of all cases without problems.

2(a) All of my Swift rifles *would* shoot well with maximum loads; *however*, they all shot best with ve-



Although this rifle was made in 1992, it is still in production. It is an M 77 Mk II VT (Varmint-Target) and incorporates the excellent two-stage trigger originally developed for the Palma matches. The scope is a Redfield M-6400 RM (“Receiver Mounted”) in 16x and also has excellent optics. The author misses the old Redfield company and at least their target scopes. Note “target grey” metal coloration – a very practical concept.

locities a bit below 4000 fps. This is as it should be – if you want a rifle that will shoot 52 grain bullets at 3600 fps, buy a .22-250; if you want to “run with the big dogs”, load ‘em up!

2(b) Today’s barrel steels and powder availability may have a lot to do with making the Swift (like any other chambering) a more well-balanced and perfectly acceptable round.

3. In any given rifle *with a good barrel* the .220 Swift will be very accurate and very fast.

3(a) Ruger *varmint* barrels are very accurate.

3(a) (1) The rumor that even in the original Model 77’s, Ruger used a better barrel in their varmint-weight rifles is *probably* valid.

4. Each rifle is a law unto itself. (We already knew that, didn’t we?)

5. Heed the generic reloading warning – start low, work up slowly, use caution.

6. Don’t use a Swift with varmint bullets for deer, bear, hogs or elephants.

I will also herewith postulate (definitely *without* answering) the following: Considering the fact that my first Swift remains the most accurate, and considering that when I did my testing with it (1) I did not fully know what I was doing, (2) no “case prep” was done, (3) components, particularly bullets, were not of the quality and consistency we have today, and (4) my testing was very limited as to both bullets and powder, does this mean that either (A) such things are not important, or (B) ignorance truly is bliss? Probably all it means is that I was damn lucky in finding that particular gun *and* in having the uncommonly good sense to not sell it.

May the Swift not only endure, but may it prevail!

