

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING . . .

After reading the August, 1985 issue of the *Mustang Times*, the comments of Michiana Mustangs and Mustang Owner's Club of Southeastern Michigan, and the August, 1985 issue of *Mustang Monthly*, I am compelled to present a rebuttal. A number of you know me personally. I served as National President in 1978 and 1979, Chairman of the Board of Directors in 1980, and have continued to be a current active member of Mustang Club of America Board of Directors.

At the National Board Meeting in September, 1984, I personally moved to add the 1974 and up models of the Mustangs. The reasons given were as follows:

1. 30% of the inquiries to MCA office were from owners of these particular models since there was/is no national club with which they could participate.
2. After talking with my contacts at Ford Motor Company over the past two years and trying to solicit help (monetary, trophies, articles, etc.), I was informed that the National and/or Regional Groups could not expect to receive assistance until these cars were given recognition by our club.
3. That by adding 1974-up models would add a whole new breed of cars and many more active members and also placing us in a more secure financial situation whereby we could increase the size of the *Mustang Times* and do many other things for members and regional groups that we would like to be able to do.

After hearing the proposal it was voted and approved by the National Board to accept.

According to the By Laws of MCA, Article 17, Sections 1 & 2, it's required that we present to the general membership and regional group directors for a vote as the club does belong to the membership. In the November issue of the *Mustang Times*, a statement concerning addition of the late models was made asking for regional group and general memberships' feelings. The response to this was 6 regional groups

and 35 individual members which is a total of 7% of the regional groups and 1/2% of 1% of the general membership.

While reviewing these results at the December, 1984 meeting, the National Board felt that this was in no way a response of the membership. A motion was made and carried to send a post card to the regional groups for their vote along with a letter explaining our reasoning. This letter was also published in the *Mustang Times* for members' responses. The above mentioned items were mailed January 2, 1985. The individual member's response forms were included in the February, 1985 *Mustang Times*.

The March meeting found the response to have been very slow, but no action was taken as the reply deadline was March 31st.

At the April meeting, the responses were as follows:

Individual Members 74 Yes 333 No
Regional Groups . . . 9 Yes 37 No

Members voting in regional group counts totalled 208 Yes, 806 No. This motion was defeated by the overall membership and regional groups. These results were published in June, 1985 (missed the May issue to printing deadline), and again in August, 1985.

According to the By Laws, the National Board can overrule a membership vote is passed by a 2/3's majority of all National Directors voting. A form was sent out to ALL National Directors with the April minutes asking for them to be completed and returned before May 14, 1985. At the May meeting, the votes by national board members in attendance and the mailed responses were counted and the vote was: 25 Yes, 17 No. As this did not meet the 2/3's majority requirement, the motion was defeated and laid to rest.

If the above mentioned regional groups did not understand all of the club's correspondence, perhaps their national director is not reading and/or sharing the minutes (which he receives each month), with his club's general membership, they should have asked

questions rather than "jumping to conclusions". To the Michiana Regional Group who is so concerned with our non-acceptance of the 1974-up models, I ask, "Why are you so quick to criticize and call it a 'so-called vote'?", when you didn't even cast a regional group vote.

To the MOCSEM who did vote, I suggest they recruit more of their regional members into the national club to increase their input club business. 19 of 31 of their national members voted to accept the later model cars. It is understood they have over 100 families affiliated with their club.

To Jim Smart of *Mustang Monthly Magazine*, August, 1985 issue (Hoofbeats article . . .) All I can say here is, I suggest you renew your Mustang Club of America membership and that you, in the future, verify your "facts" with the National President or National Secretary before you join the ranks of "The National Enquirer."

Again, I will add, I made the original motion and am still in favor of accepting the 1974 and Up models even though I don't personally own one.

Lately, all I've heard is, "What has the National Club done for us?" I ask, "What have you done for the National Club?"

Jim Osborn #0376
Lilburn, GA

PUZZLER

In what year were these "specials" offered:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| 1. V-8 Sprint (Fog Lamps) | <u>1968</u> |
| 2. Grabber Sportsroof | <u>1970</u> |
| 3. Indy Pacesetter Special | <u>1967</u> |
| 4. U.S.A. Sprint | <u>1972</u> |
| 5. Mustang "E" | <u>1969</u> |
| 6. Sports Hardtop | <u>1971</u> |
| 7. Sprint 200 | <u>1966</u> |