

Judging Judges

The more I read "The Mustang Times" the more negative I get about bringing our car to the nationals.

The recent Editorial (October 1981 Editor's Page) where the editor expresses his views that the purpose of competitive judging is for the restoration of cars, not to benefit its valuation and desirability is in my opinion a lot of wishful thinking and intended to take the pressure off the judges and to ease their responsibility in the judging of a car.

Any way you look at it, any car that consistently wins and has compiled a number of trophies is a matter of fact worth more money. Many cars are sold with statements of the number of wins. Appraisers usually ask for a history of wins to help substantiate a replacement value. Anything restored, be it an antique chair, commode, coffee mill or car — if its restored to its original condition, it's worth more money.

There is simply no logic behind the aforementioned views that competitive judging is only to foster the restoration of a car. It may be a desirable attitude but any car that wins the nationals is going to have an increased value of between \$2,000 and \$5,000 depending on the base value a owner has on a car. This is not my opinion but rather and more important a statement made to me by an officer of the MCA.

Further into the editorial you state "No one has the right to automatically complain about a particular score or judge. Our view is that that right must be earned by acting as a judge."

Is that the view of the editor or the MCA? Other Questions: Is the MCA trying to establish a mandate that gives judges amnesty from criticism and the questionability of their decisions? Or is the editor trying to paint a gray situation white?

Ron Alcott
Groton, Massachusetts

The opinions expressed in the aforementioned editorial are not those of MCA.

To you club paying members I would like to share an experience with you that I had at the Birmingham Meet in 1981. I attended as a Senior Car with a 1966 Mustang Convertible. During the judging at this meet, I noted the judges made some comments about my battery cables. These battery cables are the cables that had been sold to me as correct reproduction cables at the 1981 National Columbia Meet. I put these cables on my car before the meet at Columbia and had no problem taking home a comfortable First Place win. Before the judging sheets were tallied at Birmingham, I went and asked the National Head Judge that I had heard I had been deducted for these battery cables and I suggested he look into this "Before" the judge sheets got added up, as there were only two cars in this class. I also informed the Head Judge that the rule books only said that cables be red and black and both of mine were.

To my dismay I was awarded a Second Place, beaten by one point, because my battery cables were incorrect. I immediately wrote Bob Vickery and George White, I even volunteered to fly down to the next regional meeting to discuss this matter with the National Club. I also asked them in considering this to look at the consistent number of high-point percentages my car has had at the past Nationals meets, I then received word that the ruling at Birmingham would stay and also heard that these battery cables were sanctioned by the club at this same meeting.

There are a lot of beautiful people connected with this club; however, under the present administration, be prepared to protect yourself and investment until such time the club gets and receives the management it needs.

The following is in summary to the above:

1. You would think that battery cables that are listed in the rule book as being red and black would not be judged off points.
2. The judge that judged the car for

incorrect battery cables, his attention was brought to this matter before the votes were in, and he didn't even care or bother to look into this matter.

3. The National Head Judge at this meet was also notified by protest before the votes were in about the cables, and he also didn't look into this matter either.

4. Since there were only two cars in this class and only one point separated them, you would think somebody would at least (if in a responsible position) ask that these cars be rejudged.

5. You would think that after all the letter writing during this time, the cables would be sanctioned as correct and that the responsible party would stand up and right a wrong; at least offer a second First Place trophy; however, this was not done at the time.

I just recently received my October issue of "Mustang Times" and noticed Bob Vickery's article on new lines of reproduced Mustang parts (about time Bob, there is a lot of new stuff out there). I also read with great concern the editor's (Gregory D. Wells) article on judging, especially the part "As an alternative give duplicate awards if the points don't differ by at least five." How right you are Gregory. All good respectable shows have been doing this for years, even back as early as 1935 as you pointed out.

I personally think a lot better judging is needed as Mustangs are getting better and better and more and more expensive; and in speaking of investments, I have over \$11,000.00 worth of restoration receipts in my Mustang. I also bought a new \$5,000.00 enclosed trailer to protect this investment and since my wife's old wagon and my 1981 Olds Regency didn't have enough weight or horsepower to pull this trailer, I went out and spent another \$10,500.00 for a 1979 Lincoln that would do the job to get to these shows. I think I made a commitment to the restoration of my Mustang and the preservation. I was and still am very dedicated in helping others in restoration of these

fine Ponies; however, in view of the above I don't feel the Mustang Club of America is committed to those that are truly dedicated. I only hope the ones responsible for these mistakes can be more responsible for their actions in the future.

John F. Hall
Salem, Illinois

Back to Basics

I would like to comment on Mr. Jim Stainer's letter in the Mail Bag section of the September *Mustang Times*, entitled, "Amazing Attitudes."

Mr. Stainer states that, "(MCA members) don't seem to mind when people make Rancheros or station wagons or cut (Mustangs) in half to make trailers out of them."

Well, I don't know about anyone else, but I do mind when someone cuts up a Mustang, because it seems like the waste of a good old car. But I also admire the time, work and ingenuity that goes into cutting up all that sheet metal and making it into something new and different.

In his letter, Mr. Stainer goes on to suggest that we take a closer look at the word "radical." Webster's dictionary defines "radical" as: a) of or from the root or roots; going to the foundation of something; fundamental; basic. b) extreme, thorough; favoring fundamental or extreme change," and the word "radically" as: a) as regards root or origin, b) fundamentally, basically, completely."

Thus, we may assume that the MCA's Radically Modified Class was created to allow competition for cars whose "root or foundation" has been "fundamentally" or "completely" changed.

By putting a power antenna, power windows, stripes and paint on his 2+2, no matter what brand names his extra equipment came under, it was not a change that went to the "roots" of the car. Mr. Stainer's car has not been "radically modified"; if his additions are to come under the heading of mod-

ification at all, they would certainly be called surface modifications.

Mr. Stainer's comment that "I have never heard any of the modified car owners scorn and ridicule (pure stock people's) cars for being stock! We put just as much time and effort into making our cars show quality as you do."

I am sure that modified car owners do put a lot of time and effort into their cars (just think how much it takes to slice up a Mustang and make it into a trailer!) But if the facts are faced, it is, by far, easier to modify a car than to make it pure stock.

I'll give a classic (you'll pardon the pun) example. Suppose someone buys a Mustang and would like to have an 8-track tape player in it. Now anyone can go to a local car stereo store, buy a fine 8-track and have it installed, as a modified car owner might do. But what of the person who wants his car pure stock? He either goes without or spends months or even years, searching, writing letters, etc., trying to find a genuine Ford 8-track player for his Mustang. Another example is GT lights. The modifier can go to any auto supply store and buy them for a fairly nominal price. But the genuine item costs a great deal more. Certainly even Mr. Stainer must agree that all this is more difficult than buying after market, easily and abundantly available parts for his car.

But I agree heartily with Mr. Stainer's last sentence: "Look at it this way: the more modified cars there are, the more valuable your pure stock cars will be and the less competition they will have."

Mr. Stainer is perfectly correct on this point. The more Mopar-Chevy-Ranchero Mustangs there are, the more valuable our plain ol' Ford Mustangs will become.

Laura Foster
Cincinnati, Ohio

Since You Asked

Glad to see someone has really taken charge of the *Mustang Times*. I thought since you asked for suggestions I would give you a few thoughts

on matters in general. I have been involved in car clubs for almost 15 years, and I am the Secretary-Treasurer and Newsletter editor for the Southern PA, Region of the Shelby Club, so I can sympathize with your problems.

However I do feel the members paying \$20 a year have a right to a first class publication. I know the problems with volunteer services but maybe this should not be. Volunteers are fine for small regional clubs but it seems that a club this large should have some payed staff. The National meets are great but a good percentage of the members' only contact with the club is through the newsletter. So maybe you should consider paying for articles. I believe it's impractical to expect Mustang fans with a lot of expertise to take a lot of time to put together an article for free when other publications will pay them. After all time is very valuable these days.

This brings me to another financial matter. I know it costs a lot to mail the *Mustang Times*, etc., but with the increased dues I don't recall seeing a Treasurer's report for quite some time. Maybe the members would be more understanding if they knew where the money goes.

Also the National Meets are nice but it would be nicer if the Eastern Regional were a little farther East. A lot of people have mentioned to me that everything seems to be all in one area.

Mike Hufnagle
New Oxford, Pennsylvania

Paint Problems

I was impressed with the article "Corral Full Of Mustangs" covering Telstar Motor's use of Centari Acrylic Enamel Paint. I have used this paint with less than satisfactory results. Would you please run a how to article by Dan Lang, Telstar's painter, explaining step by step how he achieved his best results? I have painted several cars with this paint and still have

some trouble with orange peel.

What kind of primer is he using?

What ratio of paint, hardner, and reducer is he using?

Is he using regular or fast drying reducer, set for what temperature?

What air pressure is he using?

What model of spray gun and tip?

How many coats?

How long for drying time between coats at what temperature, say 70 degrees?

I have found the recommended reducing of 50/50 shown on the can to be unsatisfactory. 30% paint 70% reducer has worked better for me, however it seems too thin. Am I going to destroy the quality of the paint by thinning it too much? Please HELP.

Keith Blanchard
Garden Grove, California

Letter forwarded to Telstar Motors.

Tri Power?

Do you people know if the 390's for the Mach 1's ever came with a tri power? If yes, how can one tell by the codes? Does anyone in the club have this set-up?

Fran Golden
Camarillo, California

No, and it is not available from the factory.

Two For Jon

I have been a member of the Mustang Club of America for three years. I have two Mustangs, both '66 coupes. I am driving one now which was my first car. I got it along with my membership to the MCA. I am partially restoring one which I will sell and make quite a large profit on. This car is the one I drive. It has 125,000 miles on it and has never left me stranded. I've had it for two years.

The other Mustang is one my Dad found for me for \$300. We have completely restored it mechanically, including the engine, brakes, suspension and transmission. The body and interior leave much to be desired. Due to the purchase of 25 acres of land, the Mus-

tang has been sitting for over a year. I hope to continue restoring it myself. That car I will keep.

About a year ago, before we brought it to our land, the door was stolen, along with the identification plate. We put another door on, but I will never know what place my car has on the "In Search of Mustangs" list.

Anyway, I am sending the plate off of it and the one off the other one. Would you please decipher them for me? One is 6F07T274835, body 65A color M, trim 25, date O1C, DSO 64, axle 2, trans. 6. The other is 6F07C739056, body 65A, color K, trim 22A, date O5V, DSO 64, axle 6, trans. 1.

Thanks.

Pat Mount
Lafayette, Louisiana

The first car is a Wimbledon white hardtop produced on March 1, 1966 at the Dearborn assembly plant. The standard interior is dark red with red appointments and has bucket seats. It has a 200 cubic inch IV engine, a 2.83:1 rear axle ratio code and a C-4 automatic transmission. It was shipped to the New Orleans district for sale.

The second car is also a 1966 hardtop, produced in Dearborn on August 5. It has a nightmist blue exterior; the standard interior is blue with blue appointments and bucket seats. It has a 289 cubic inch 2V engine, a 2.80:1 rear axle ratio code and a three speed manual transmission. This car also was shipped to the New Orleans district.

I own a '67 Mustang coupe on which I am having trouble deciphering my VID plate. It reads as follows: warranty 7T01C286331, body 65A, color M, trim 2A, date 19V, DSO16, axle O, trans W. I would greatly appreciate any help. In the September 1981 issue, you also gave Randy Webber the assembly plant and district data. Please do the same for me.

When looking over my car, I found it seems to have parts that don't belong. I am wondering if they are original or if

they've been replaced. These "parts" are as follows:

Exterior decor hood scoops with blinkers, but no chrome trim around the wheel wells and rear. Also no F-O-R-D on hood . . . Imitation vinyl "T" handle transmission lever, but no brushed aluminum panels as in the interior decor group . . . 1965-66 jacking instructions decal inside the trunk; this looks original.

The car also has the "Sports Sprint" option. Could you tell me what this was and what it consisted of? Nobody I have talked to seems to know.

Thank you for your time and help.

Tom Black
Pennington, New Jersey 08534

Your car is a 1967 hardtop with standard interior and bucket seats. It has a Wimbledon white exterior and a black interior. It was built on July 19, 1967, at the Metuchen, New Jersey plant. It is equipped with a 289-2V engine and a C-4 automatic transmission. It was originally destined for the Philadelphia district.

The hood should have the letters F-O-R-D. However, it seems the louvers and turn signal indicators should not be on the hood, as you do not have the exterior decor group.

The shift lever should be chrome rather than vinyl. If your car had the interior decor group, the body code would be 65B rather than 65A.

The jacking instruction sheet is incorrect.

For information on the Sports Sprint option, try contacting the owner of SPRINT 6; see "Pony Plates" of this issue.

Everyone interested in deciphering VID plates, note the first of a series of articles on this subject by Jon Whittington in this issue.

Mulby Plaudits

. . . The article on (Bob Vickery's) Mulby was terrific. It looks like you did a terrific job. I can't wait to judge it!!

Frederick R. Glazier, Jr.
Souderton, Pennsylvania