



I'm not robot



**Continue**

## Pinto station wagon

Ford subcompact car (1971–1980)
Ford PintoFord PintoOverviewManufacturerFordAlso calledMercury BobcatProductionSeptember 1970–1980Model years1971–1980 (Pinto) 1974–1980 (Bobcat)AssemblyUnited States: Edison, New Jersey (Edison Assembly)Milpitas, California (San Jose Assembly)Canada: Southwold, Ontario (St. Thomas Assembly)DesignerRobert Eidschun (1968)[1]Body and chassisClassSubcompact carBody style2-door sedan2-door sedan delivery2-door station wagon 3-door hatchbackLayoutFR layoutRelatedMercury BobcatFord Mustang IIPowertrainEngine1.6 L Kent 142.0 L EA0 142.3 L OHC 142.8 L Cologne V6Transmission4-speed manual3-speed C3>SelectshiftCruise-O-Matic automatic[2]DimensionsWheelbase94.0 in (2,390 mm)[4]Length163 in (4,100 mm)[2]Width69.4 in (1,760 mm)Height50 in (1,300 mm)Curb weight2,015–2,270 lb (914–1,030 kg) (1971)ChronologyPredecessorFord Cortina (captive import)SuccessorFord Escort / Mercury Lynx The Ford Pinto is a subcompact car that was manufactured and marketed by Ford Motor Company in North America. 1980 تم بيعه من عام 1971 إلى عام 1980. The smallest American Ford car since 1907. Pinto was the first subcompact car produced by Ford in North America. Pinto is marketed in three body styles through its production: a fast-door sedan with a trunk, a three-door hatchback, and a two-door station wagon. Mercury has introduced rebadged copies of Pinto as Mercury Bobcat from 1975 to 1980 (1974-1980 in Canada)[5]. More than 3 million pintos were produced over 10 years of production, resulting in aggregates of their local competitors, Chevy Vega and AMC Gremlin. Pinto and Mercury Bobcat were produced at the Edison Society in Edison, New Jersey, the St. Thomas Society in Southwold, Ontario, and the San Jose Society in Milpitas, California. [6] Since the 1970s, the reputation for safety has been born of the Pinto controversy. The design of the fuel tank has attracted both the media and the government to scrutiny after several deadly fires involving tank ruptures occurred in rear-end collisions. A subsequent analysis of the public safety of the pinto suggested that it was similar to other 1970s subcompact cars. Safety issues surrounding Pinto and the subsequent response by Ford have been widely mentioned as business ethics as well as a case study of damage repair. The background of the first generation American subcompacts, from left to right: AMC Gremlin, Ford Pinto, Chevrolet Vega American automaker has first repelled imports such as the Volkswagen Beetle with compact cars including Ford Falcon, Ford Maverick, Chevrolet Corver and Plymouth Valiant, although these cars featured six-cylinder engines and consisted of a larger class car. As the popularity of smaller Japanese imports of Toyota and Datsun increased throughout the 1960s, Ford North America responded by introducing Cortina from Ford Europe as Impor captive. American automakers soon introduced their own subcompacts,[7] led by AMC Gremlin, which arrived six months before Pinto, and Chevrolet Vega, made the day before Pinto. It was named for the Dowing,[8] and Pinto was introduced on September 11, 1970. The platform was completely new, but used the powertrain of european escort specs. Ford President Henry Ford II himself bought a 1971 Runabout (hatchback) to be used as one of his personal cars. [9] The development of the Ford Pinto product design proposal, 1970 initial planning of the Pinto began in the summer of 1967, was recommended by the Ford Product Planning Committee in December 1968, and was approved by the Ford Board of Directors in January 1969. [10] President Ford wanted me iacocca model 1971 that weighs less than 2,000 pounds, and it will cost less than \$2,000. The development of Pinto products, from load to delivery, was completed in 25 months, when the average auto industry was 43 months, the shortest production planning schedule in automotive history at the time. 10. Some development processes, usually conducted in parallel, have taken place. The machine tools overlapped with the development of the product, which froze the basic design. Decisions threatening the timetable have been discouraged; [11] [12] [13] The position of The Ford Administration was discouraged to develop the pinto as soon as possible. [14] Iaioaka ordered a rush project to build the car, and Pinto became known internally as Lee's car. [15] Robert Edshawm erected the chassis in Pinto. [1] Offered with four built-in engine and pinto mechanical design bucket seats was traditionally, with unibody construction, longitudinal composite engine in front rear wheel driving through either manual or automatic transmission and rear end neighborhood axle. The suspension was by asymmetricrims length with front coil springs; The live rear axle is hung on the leaves of the springs. The rack and steering pinion optionally had power assistance, as did the brakes. [16] The date of production on September 11, 1970, ford pinto was presented under the slogan a little carefree car. [17] [18] After structural design on alternative body styles encountered obstacles,[19] Ford offered the Pinto only as a two-door sedan, with entry level models priced at \$1,850, undermining Gm's Chevrolet Vega and targeting imported models directly – which included new competitors such as the Mazda 1200 in 1971, the Subaru DDL in 1972, and the Honda Civic in 1973. [20] Pinto had sold more than 100,000 units in January 1971.[21] and 352,402 for a full 1971 production run; The year 1974 saw the most bentos production in one year, with 544,209 units. [22] Calendar year 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 352,402 480,405 484,488 4.4 5.12 544,209 223,763 290,132 225,097 188,899 199,018 185,054 Total production 3,173,491 1971-1972 Ford Pinto sedan with enclosed trunk 1973 Pinto Runabout,displayed rear slot for sale Ford Pinto on September 11, 1970 in a single body style, a fastback sedan with a closed trunk. The hatchback became available on February 20, 1971, for the first time at the Chicago Motor Show. [19] In 1971, the pinto and head came with paper pieces pinto that one could fold to make a three-dimensional model. [2] Marketed as Runabout, the hatchback went on sale five days later, priced at \$2,062. [19] The slot itself featured exposed chrome hinges for liftgate and five decorative chrome strips, aerodynamic struts to help open the opening, a rear window almost as large as a sedan, and a folding seat down – a feature that simultaneously became an option on the sedan. The hatchback model matched the sedan in all other dimensions and provided 38.1 cubic feet (1.08 m3) of cargo space with folded seat. [19] By 1972, Ford redesigned the slot itself, enlargethe glass part of the aperture to almost the full size of the slot itself, eventually completing it in 1977-1980 with an optional rear slot that was entirely glass. [23] On October 30, 1970, less than two months after an introduction, 26,000 Pentos were recalled to address a potential problem with the accelerator sticking on once operated in more than halfway. [24] [25] [26] On March 29, 1971, Ford recalled every 220,000 PTOS manufactured before March 19, 1971, to deal with a problem with fuel fumes in the engine air filter possibly ignited by a counterproductive through the carburetor. [27] [28] [29] on February 24, 1972,[19] Pinto station coach first with a total length of 172.7 in (4,390 m) and 60.5 cubic feet (1.71 m3) of freight volume. [19] The first 2-door Ford station wagon since the 1965 Falcon, the Pinto wagon is equipped with open quarter-face windows. Along with the front disc brake, the 2.0L engine was standard equipment. The Pinto Square wagon featured fake wooden side panels similar to Squire Country-full size. [30] [31] Also in February 1972, the Spar Décor collection was made available for Pinto for one model year only. The Sprint Decor collection included a white exterior with blue and red paint striped pins, a black grille, color-plated wheels with bright trim rings and pins covers, white frescoframes and double sports mirrors with a colored key. Interiors included red, white and blue cloth, vinyl bucket seats, full carpet and luxury steering wheel. The Sprint Décor collection was presented simultaneously to Maverick and Mtang. [32] For the year 1973 model, offering more appearance options was. There was a new range of Sport Accent displayed in white exterior paint with a choice of paint for an orange accent or two-color avocado, a matching vinyl roof, and a luxurious interior coating with wood trim. There was also a new luxury décor collection with a bright outer dress up Black bumper scrub strips and luxurious interior with wood trim tone. The 1974 Ford Pinto was available with a choice of two engines. In the first five years of production, only four-cylinder built-in engines were introduced. Ford changed power ratings almost every year. [42] In 1974, a 2.3 liter (140 cu in) OHC I4 engine was introduced. This engine has been updated and modified several times, allowing it to remain in production in 1997. Among other Ford cars, the turbo version of this later powered engine is a performance-powered Thunderbird Turbo Coupe, Mustang SV0, and European-made Mercure XR4Ti. [42] [Page need] initial pinto deliveries were used in the early years 1600 cc English (98 cu in) and German 2000 cc (120 cu in) tuned engines for performance (see below). The 2000 cc carburetor was used by Vermelin, where it was only one larger than that used in Maverick. With low weight (not much above 2000 lbs (910 kg)) the SOHC engine accelerated from 0 to 60mph in 10.8 seconds. With the advent of emission control requirements, Ford moved from European source to locally sourced engines, using new or modified designs. New safety legislation has affected fenders and other parts, increasing vehicle weight and reducing performance. SAE standards revised in 1972 reduced the 1.6-liter (98 kin) engine to 54 hp (40 kW) – and a 2.0-liter (120 kv) engine to 86 hp (64 kW). [43] Engine name years available horsepower displacement† torque† inline-four engine Ford Kent I4 1971-1973 98 in (1.6 L) 75 hp (56 kW; 76 PS) (1971) 54 hp (40 kW; 55 PS) (1972-1973) 96 lb-ft (130 N·m) (1971) Ford EA0 I4 1971-1974 122 cu in (2.0 L) 100 hp (75 kW; 101 PS) (1971)86 hp (64 kW; 87 PS) (1972-1974) Ford LL23 I4 1974-1980 140 cu in (2.3 liters) 90 hp (67 kW; 91 PS) (1974)83 Horse (62 kW; 84 PS) (1975)92 hp (69 kW; 93 PS) (1976)89 hp (66 kW; 90 PS) (1977)88 hp (66 kW; 89 PS) (1978-1980) 11 lb-ft (150 N·m) (1976)120 lbfull ft (160 Nfull) (1977)118 lbfull ft (160 N full-time) (1978-1979) 119 lbfull ft (161 N m) (161 M) (16 1 N m) 1980) V6 Engine Ford Cologne V6 1975-1979 170 cu in (2.8 L) 97 hp (72 kW; 98 PS) (1975)103 hp (77 kW; 104 PS) (1976)93 hp (69 kW; 94 PS) (1977)90 hp (67 kW; 91 PS) (1978)102 hp (76 kW; 103 PS) (1979) 139 lbmouth amp;1979 ft (188 N·) M) (1975)149 lb Ft (202 Nq) (1976)140 lb-ft (190 N·m) (1977)143 lb ft (194 Nfull m) (1978)138 lb-ft (187 N·m) (1979) † manpower and 1971 are torque classifications are net production after the 1971 model year. Mercury Bobcat (1974-1980) Lincoln-Mercury dealers market the rebadged alternative of Pinto, as Mercury Bobcat, starting in 1974 model in Canada produced in all same body styles. It has been designed with a unique grille egg cage and chrome head light. Featured double modified rear-tail display lamps for sedan and Runabout models. [44] In 1975, Bobcat was added to the American market and initially sold at upgraded levels of pieces such as the Runabout Hatchback and The Village Wagon. Less truncated versions were introduced in later model years. Bobcat has never been introduced as a two-door sedan with a closed trunk for the American market. All Bobcats have been restyled with a vaulted hood and a longer vertical strip-style grille to look like top mercury models. Throughout all years the model Bobcats have been given different appearance options similar to Pinto. [45] In 1979, bobcat received a large hemline with a slanted front façade with rectangular headlamps and a larger vertical bar grille. With the exception of carriages, tail lamps have been revised. The block tool received a new rectangular design base with a modified dashboard. [46] Popcat production ended in 1980 to make way for its replacement, Mercury Lynx. In total, 224,026 bobcats were produced from 1975 to 1980. [47] 1977 Mercury Bobcat Wagon 1977 Mercury Bobcat Village Wagon 1975-1978 Mercury Bobcat Runabout 1979-1980 Mercury Bobcat Run Receptionabout and criticisms upon the release of Bento received with both positive and negative reviews. The road and track error in the suspension and brakes of the standard drum, describing the latter as a serious shortage, but praised the proven Kent 1.6 L engine, adapted from the European Ford. I found Super Stock magazine fit and finished to be superior and impressed with the overall car. [16] The car and driver Pinto, when equipped with a larger 2.0L engine and front disc brakes, were found to be a smart and powerful passenger car with good visibility and feel of a sports car. [48] The 1974 Pinto review with an automatic transmission by the car and the driver was not appropriate with significant reductions in mileage and acceleration. [49] The controversy over Pinto was later led to a negative legacy associated with the car and Ford dealing with the differences. 2004, Forbes included Pinto among the fourteen worst cars of all time, noting that its problems helped create an opening in the American small car market of Japan. [50] Time Pinto magazine included lists of 50 of the worst cars of all time. [51] At the time, popular mechanics and NBC News car have been included in the most important reminder lists. [52] [53] Fuel system fires, recalls, and safety litigation design of the Pinto fuel system led to serious accidents, and later resulted in subpoenas, lawsuits, criminal prosecution, and public controversy. The events surrounding the controversy have been described as a historical novel. [55] Former UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LAW PROFESSOR GARY T. SCHWARTZ DESCRIBES THE ASSOCIATED LEGAL CASE AS LEGENDARY BECAUSE OF MANY IMPORTANT FACTUAL MISCONCEPTIONS AND THEIR IMPACT ON PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING. [56] Ford Pinto has cited and discussed many business ethics[57][58] as well as damage repair[59][60] case studies. The placement of the fuel tank in the car was the result of the practice of the conservation industry at the time as well as the uncertain regulatory environment during the periods of early development and sales of the vehicle. Ford was accused of knowing the car was then placing an unsafe tank under ongoing design changes based on an internal analysis of costs and benefits. 20. Two high-profile legal cases are Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Company and Indiana V. Ford Motor Company, resulting from fatal accidents involving Pintos. [61] The scientific work published in the decades following Pinto's release examined the cases and provided summaries of pinto's general understanding and controversy over vehicle safety performance and fire risk. These actions also reviewed misunderstandings regarding the actual number of fire-related deaths related to fuel system design, land and unsupported claims confirmed in The Madness of Pinto and elsewhere,[62] facts of related legal issues, Grimshaw vs. Ford Motor Company, safety standards in place at the time of design, and the nature of the NHTSA investigations and subsequent vehicles. [63] The design of the fuel system was complicated by the design of the Pinto fuel system due to the uncertain regulatory environment during the development period. The first federal standard for the safety of the automobile fuel system, passed in 1967, known as section 301 in the Federal Auto Safety Standards, initially considered only the front effects. In January 1969, 18 months after the Pinto development cycle, NHTSA proposed expanding the standard for coverage of rear collisions. The proposed standard was based on a 20 mph mobile rear collision test. Ford has publicly announced that it supports this standard. In August 1970, in the month in which Pinto went into production, the NHTSA changed the proposal to a stricter 20 mph fixed barrier standard which the car He was scheduled to meet in 18 months. The automotive industry considered the fixed barrier standard to significantly increase the intensity of testing. At the same time, the National Displacement Authority announced a long-term goal of establishing a fixed 30-mile-per-hour barrier standard. [64] Due to the confusion associated with the various proposed criteria and expectations that NHTSA would not select the most strict 30 mil barrier barrier standard, Ford chose to voluntarily meet the 20-bay movement barrier standard for all cars by 1973. [66] Ford and other automakers objected to the stricter fuel system safety standard and filed objections during the suspension periods required for the proposed regulations. [68] Pinto's fuel tank design was placed between the steel-rear axle and the rear bumper, a common practice in American sub-vehicles at the time. [69] Fuel exposure to fuel leakage and fire in rear collision was exacerbated by low rear crushing space. lack of structural reinforcement in the rear, and mainly rear bumper decorations (although similar to other manufacturers). [70] Crash tests, conducted in 1970 with modified Ford Mavericks, as part of the response to proposed NHTSA regulations, showed weaknesses in the relatively low crash speeds. Design changes were made, but post-launch tests showed similar results. [71] These tests were conducted to develop fault testing standards rather than specifically investigating the safety of the fuel system. Although Ford engineers were not happy with the car's performance, there are no time reports of particular concern. [72] Ford has also tested several different vehicle modifications that can improve rear collision performance. [73] However, the engineer's professional caution and aversion to unproven solutions, as well as the view that the crash test results were inconclusive, led to the use and development of the traditional fuel tank design. [74] The use of a tank site above the axis was considered safer by some, but not all, in Ford. This placement was not a viable option for Hatchback and station wagon body styles. [76] Beginning in 1973, field reports were received from ford Pintos, which was consumed by fire after low-speed rear collisions by the Ford Recall Coordinator's Office. [77] Based on the standard procedures used to evaluate field reports, Ford's internal recall assessment group reviewed field data twice and found no actionable problem. [78] Cost and Benefit analysis, Pinto's 1973 memorandum, developed ford's Division of Environmental Engineering and Safety cost-benefit analysis entitled Deaths Associated with Crash and Fire-Related Fuel Leakage to be submitted to NHTSA to support Ford's objection to the proposed stronger fuel system. [79] The document became known as the Grouch/Sondi Report, which was named after its authors.[80] and the Pinto Memorandum. [81] The cost-benefit analysis was Used in evaluating safety design decisions accepted by industry and NHTSA. [82] The analysis compared the cost of repairing community costs of fire-related injuries and deaths in vehicle overturning cases for all vehicles sold in the United States by all manufacturers. The values attributed to serious burns and loss of life were based on values calculated by the National Displacement Authority in 1972. [83] In the memo, Ford estimated the cost of fuel modifications system to reduce fire risk in extension events to be \$11 per vehicle across 12.5 million cars and light trucks (all manufacturers), a total of \$137 million.



