Don't forget bromoxynil as 2,4-D substitute

In a recent Government Update column you failed to mention that bromoxynil (Brominal ME4) is a good substitute for 2,4-D in turf. Brominal ME4 is a product of Union Carbide. The turf industry sees and hears about 2,4-D and dicamba (Banvel) but apparently rarely do they receive information about bromoxynil and its use.

Union Carbide should advertise in WT&T about bromoxynil for use in turf for broadleaf weed control. The product is available to the custom applicator and chemical distributors for turf maintenance.

Rupert D. Palmer
Extension Weed Specialist
Texas Agricultural Extension Service
Texas A&M University System
College Station, TX.

Kudos for Guide

Your October copy of Weeds Trees & Turf, contained an article on fertilizer by Roger Funk and Richard Rathjens.

I am urged to say this article is the most instructive and enlightening reader on fertilizer ever to come into my hands.

I was delighted that I have been connected with the up-keep, and even design, of golf courses for many years.

However, I must say I learned more on the subject of fertilizers in Part I than I did in prior short courses in agronomy from two universities.

In my view, your magazine has advanced much in content and display in the past two years.

George J. Pulver
Life member of PGA and GCSAA

Proposition is "scary"

Since most of my peers in the 2,4D herbicide business are long ago retired or deceased, I feel compelled to suggest to you that the proposition to "sacrifice" 2,4D (pg. 16, Oct., 1983, Weeds Trees & Turf) to gain regulatory advantage is not only scary, but outright contradictory to the past history. Those of us who were there when the current mess with political control evolved, can attest that sacrificing DDT accomplished nothing and certainly gained no advantage for the industry.

Scientists have long ago agreed, for the most part, that banning DDT has only prohibited the American public from enjoying the advantages of its use. Oh yes, it has filled the pockets of the pseudo-environmentalists who have profiteered substantially with their activities at public expense. Oh, how we could use another Senator Everett Dirksen, for he understood the phonies and the foolish, misled public segments.

No, if you cannot defend 2,4D, then, in fact, you cannot reasonably defend any pesticide on today's market. Jerry Faulring has good intentions, I'm sure, but he apparently doesn't know much about the history of the on-going battle with lawyers and antagonists over pesticides. The "self-vested" interested parties have misled and prevailed entirely too much up to now and conceding further ground is ill-advised. 2,4D has as good and justified use record as any...
material used today and we have no substitute after some 35 years of experience.

James O. King
Regal Chemical Co.
Alpharetta, GA

Rationale questioned
I have read with great interest (Drs. B. Rao and T. Mog, authors of "Problem Solvers") your response to the question from Missouri regarding “tree injections” in the September 1983 issue.

C.S.I. is a major supplier to the tree care industry (of systemic implants), and, as you are undoubtedly aware, a supplier to the Davey Tree Expert Co. As such, I am more sensitive to the inconsistencies and lack of rationale that is often used in discussing systemic injections and implants.

Several statements in your response that deserve attention are: 1) “Wounds of any origin are harmful to the tree and should be avoided”; 2) “The smaller the wound, the smaller the chances are of doing permanent damage to or killing the tree”; 3) “Injections/implants should be used only when established treatments fail”; and 4) “My major reservations lie with the materials being injected and the benefits attributed to the injections”.

Specifically, I would like to comment on each of the above points: 1) What is your attitude toward pruning cuts and “cosmetic tree surgery”? Certainly such practices involve “wounding the tree” and the apparent benefit of such wounds would seem obvious.

2) The emphasis of “smaller wounds” often “used out of context” by commercial companies promoting devices alleging to utilize “smaller physical wounds”. Also, it has been demonstrated over the past 20 years that “smaller is not always safer”...i.e. theoretically you might utilize a hypodermic needle to inject a minute quantity of a “damaging compound” that could cause extensive cambial dieback or demise of the tree. I think instead we should be examining the chemicals being introduced into the tree (and their potential risks); and equally the tolerance of different tree species to withstand such treatments rather than “imply” that 3/16 inch diameter holes are “acceptable”, but 3/8 inch are “not acceptable” (note: examples only!)

3) The use of systemic treatments “only when established treatments fail” does not satisfy the applicator utilizing IPM (Integrated Pest Management); nor does it satisfy the “needs” where conventional applications are (a) not environmentally acceptable, or (b) not physically possible.

4) I am in agreement with your “major reservation” regarding chemicals being injected (or implanted). Also, in considering this aspect, we must be able to differentiate between discolored wood and deadwood! Contrary to the opinion of some plant pathologists, certain chemicals can cause discoloration without contributing to cambial dieback.

In summary, injections and implants have been available to (and utilized by) the industry for over 20 years and I believe there is a basis for a more positive response than that which was expressed in your column.

Warren D. Wolfe,
President, Creative Sales, Inc.
Fremont, NE
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