Europeans Examine
U.S. Implant System

By WARREN WOLFE, Creative Sales, Inc.

REVIEWING the history of tree implantation or tree trunk injection, we readily admit that we are not the “pioneers of the system”. Leonardo da Vinci is given credit for introducing chemicals into trees (via an auger) as early as the 15th century. Was his idea really that “undesirable”? It appears his only shortcoming was to develop an easy-to-use, economical, commercial technique to place the chemical into the tree’s system.

With the advent of the first commercially offered trunk injection applicators in the late 1950’s, it’s easy to think of one or another of the popular injection techniques as being the answer to nearly all tree problems or pests. In reality, however, systemic injection is still in its infancy. We could list many reasons why tree service companies, commercial growers, landscape pest control operators, and homeowners are still spraying the tree foliage or introducing chemicals into the soil. It is increasingly evident that new improved injection techniques have in fact increased the total awareness, interest and use of direct trunk injection. While we don’t hear the term “ecology” used quite as much today, the public is still very concerned about our environment. And the preservation and care of our valuable shade trees is gaining enthusiasm.

In early 1973 one of Italy’s leading chemical marketers became interested in Iron MEDICAPS for testing on peaches, pears, grapes, and citrus. The calcareous soils abundant in the Mediterranean often (continued on page 40)

European fruit growers are expressing quick and positive interest in encapsulated iron for chlorosis control. Above: Dr. Alberto Giaccherò (left), MONTESHELL managing director, Warren Wolfe, and Dr. Flavio Lucchi, managing director (MONTESHELL) discuss 1975 test market plans for Italy. Below: The tree on the left is a Clark Avocado with severe chlorosis. This picture was taken the day of treatment as part of a 1974 University of Southern California implant test. The picture on the right shows the same tree two months later. Researchers claimed the treatment is economical for fruit trees in arid calcareous soils where lime-induced chlorosis may be expensive to control using chelates.
John Brugeman (left) and Fred Gleason, maintenance supervisors at Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Michigan, look over implant demonstration site in preparation for the 1975 International Shade Tree Conference Convention, August 10-14, in Detroit. Visitors will have an opportunity to examine actual comparisons of treated and untreated trees at the I.S.T.C. field demonstrations on the 14th.

EUROPEANS (from page 14)
render conventional applications of iron chelates virtually ineffective.

The increasing grower cost of chelates has made conventional applications very expensive, particularly at high rates and repeat sprays as required to correct the "lime-induced chlorosis." In 1975 Creative Sales, Inc. (basic manufacturer and owner of the MEDICAP® patent) and MONTESHELL (Milan, Italy) have teamed up to introduce MEDICAP FE to the Italian fruit grower on a commercial basis. According to Peter G. Hirst, Manager of Third Party Products for MONTESHELL, more than 7500 peach and pear trees and grape vines will be injected this year using MEDICAP FE. Hirst claims their 1975 test market has been received with very high interest. Growers are attracted by the adaptability of implants for "spot — treatment" of problem trees or vines in their groves. They soon learn that this new product is initially more effective, but as well more economical than chelate sprays, since control lasts more than one season using the capsules.

An expanded program has now been implemented to test the implants on fruit trees in Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, West Germany, France, South Africa, Israel, Greece, Syria, Turkey and Lebanon.

Early tests in southern California have also resulted in some rather remarkable comparisons when Avocado trees were injected with Iron MEDICAP. Again, further testing is underway to determine the commercial interest from fruit growers in the arid alkaline soil zones of the southwestern United States.

EDITORIAL (from page 36)
lowered from OSHA's 90 to 85; estimated cost $31.6 billion.
ITEM: It costs $4 billion a year to support federal regulation agencies.
ITEM: An engine plant in Wisconsin was forced by the government to stop using coal. They now use 1 million gallons of oil every 26 days.
ITEM: Auto Industry forced to use Catalytic Mufflers. Now even the government wonders if it was right; yet General Motors spent over $100 million developing it.
ITEM: Western paper plant forced from coal to oil, then back to coal. Transition ran into millions of dollars.
ITEM: Ford Motor Co., president, Iacocca, predicts 1978 auto standards will cost consumers $9 billion a year.

Unfortunately this list goes on and on. And the consumer, you and I had better realize that all these costs are passed on to us — "There ain't no free lunch" the saying goes. It sounds like a cliché, but have you written your Congressman lately? If you don't squawk, we all may wake up to absurd cost-increasing standards.