

# Mailbag

## In Response To Your Column . . .

I just began reading my January issue of *Mustang Times* and I wanted to let you know I agree completely with your Publisher's Corner article. Why is it that those in charge at Ford Motor Company refuse to keep up with the Chevrolet? It has always been my feeling that Ford should have the 5.4 liter engine as an option in the Mustang, just like old times. That way the Mustang could compete with the Z28 and the Cobra could stand up to the Corvette.

*Mustang Times* magazine keeps improving with each issue. Teresa Vickery should receive a pat on the back for the great articles she writes. I am really impressed with the improve-

ments that are being made to the magazine. More color pictures would be nice.

I hope that *Mustang Times* has a special issue this year to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the 1968 California Special. I own one of these cars with a 289 2V, C-4 automatic, Acapulco Blue, with the license plate "OUR PONY". These are very special cars.

I also own a 1993 Cobra with a license plate "MY COBRA" (my wife hates the plate).

My cars wear the MCA badges proudly and I tell people who see the stickers that they need to join this wonderful club.

Keep up the good work.  
Joel Stockseth  
MCA #26143

*Thank you! May we count on*

*receiving photos and information on your California Special in the very near future?*

————— Editor

.....

Ford has been racing for decades. The Ford/Chevy wars have been going on since then. It continues today and hopefully for a long time to come.

I am 48 years old and my first car was a 1965 Mustang 2+2 with 289 HiPo (271 horse). It was a great car and very hard to beat in town or at the track.

What I am trying to get at is there is not any reason why Ford cannot offer more engine choices in the Mustang. I read somewhere else once that most people who owned Mustangs usually owned a couple of other Ford products. For example, I have a 1986 Ford Ranger, a 1996 Ford F250 4+4 super cab plus my 1994 Mustang GT. Business wise I believe that Ford must make the Mustang faster and better handling than anything GM has to offer.

(Wish list-) standard GT 4.6 - 250 horsepower; optional GT 4.6 - 305 horsepower; optional GT 4.6 - 330 horsepower; Cobra 5.4 - 350 horsepower; optional Cobra 5.4 - 370 horsepower; Cobra R 5.4 or 351 - 400 horsepower available for production to general public (5,000 units or so).

Gary J. Potter  
MCA #38744

.....

Hi! Just a reply to your statement regarding the redesign of the 1999 Mustang.

As an MCA member and owner of a restored 1967 390 fastback (you'll be getting a picture as soon as it comes out of winter storage) and one who has a 1998 V6 on order for my wife, I beg to differ on the horsepower issue. We have been debating on buying a new

Agreed value coverage.  
No deductible, ever.  
One liability charge per client.  
Repair shop of your choice.  
The very lowest of rates.  
Fast, friendly service. Really.

**WITH OUR POLICY,  
THAT'S THE FINE PRINT.**

**HAGERTY**  
CLASSIC AUTO INSURANCE

Call 1-800-922-4050

Mustang since the restyling in 1994. The problem is the insurance companies. Ford should realize that this is the '90s. Why not a hot rod V6? Our insurance company (and others from what I gather) consider the Mustang name a sports car and rate it accordingly. Now, make it a GT and it's rated higher, and then make it an SVT Cobra and it gets downright cost prohibitive.

The price of any of the new Mustangs is right in line with any other car in the same market. The price of the insurance is what kills the enthusiasm. I've had Mustangs since high school (we're 40-something) but we also have teenagers in the house. Let the insurance companies know you bought a Mustang and have a teenage driver in the house . . . well you can see the scenario evolve. The GT and Cobra are great, but I don't think we need to subsidize the insurance companies just to pay for (what should be) our right to drive what we want.

Come on Ford, bring back the sporty Mustang, the one that has just enough horses (no pun) to appease the fanatic in all of us, not enough horses that we have to pay for a new insurance building, and looks fast sitting still (nice wheels, spoiler, etc.). Our 1998 is ordered with that thought in mind and we will be adding some things to make it more like that, but we will also be paying the insurance for that idea.

Anyway, thanks for your time and the MCA and *Mustang Times*. Keep up the fantastic work.

Randy and Roberta Graf  
MCA #36749

I wanted to take this opportunity to share with you several thoughts I had upon reading your Publisher's Corner in the January 1998 *Times*.

First, I have to congratulate you and Teresa for the fine job you're doing with the *Times*. I have found Teresa to be very professional in my dealings with her, and I respect her journalism as not appearing to be self-serving. I hope the color works out well and the additional pages will be a plus as well.

I assume the lack of member car features has to do with none or few being submitted. On the local club level, we have a difficult time getting folks to submit either articles or car photos. Writing articles on Mustang experiences or shooting the cars is a much better way to spend time than complaining, like some of our members continue to do.

On the subject of the 1999 Mustang, I wish I could share the optimism of many about the 5.4 being slated to appear in either a GT or a Cobra. Looking back on the long history of the Mustang as compared to the competition, we have always been out-gunned and continue to be. We start with a 289 max, they start with a 396 max. We go to a 429, they go to a 454. As you pointed out, the comparison today isn't even worth making.

Our salvation, however, has always been the styling of the car. My GT fastback isn't close to a street rod with its A-code engine, but she looks fast even when she's sitting still! I would be interested in knowing the ratio of base Mustangs versus optional-engined Mustangs sold through the years. My point being that I'm sure the base cars would outnumber the others by a large ratio, suggesting that folks have bought style more often than horsepower. I will concede that that "style" was often based upon the perception that a Mustang was usually ready to perform as well as it looked.

What concerns me most is that

recently even the perception of the Mustang has taken a beating, as our horsepower has fallen in comparison to the competition. The Cobra served as a temporary stopgap, but it was never enough.

The Cobra R may have been a screaming machine, but what good is that technology if the average enthusiast can't access one through his or her Ford dealer? Let's keep our fingers crossed that Ford will get the message! I know fleet mileage is a major corporate concern, but if Chevy can get around it (and still keep the Corvette in their lineup), Ford should be smart enough to know that horsepower coupled with style will continue to sell Mustangs just like it has for over 32 years! Not Saleens, Steedas, Roushs, or even Cobras, but Mustangs with optional engine choices that folks could order if they wanted to pay the difference.

Enough of my soapbox. Thanks again for the time your MCA commitment has to take. We appreciate your efforts!

Dave Goff, President  
Carolina Regional Mustang Club  
MCA #25511

Just received my January issue; it looks great. Good job with the addition of the color pages. Keep up the good work.

I agree with you that '98 and '99 are going to be banner years for us Mustangers. Perhaps I'll see you in Dearborn or Fairview Heights.

Tom Wilcox  
MCA #33758

*Thank you to all who took the time to respond to Mr. Garcia's January column. We appreciate your opinions, comments, and compliments.*

— Editor