

## **Fertilizer why so confusing?**

From my research it appears fertilizer usage took 2 different directions when large reserves were found in the early 1900's and when science reached a level to be able to easily encourage usage. In the early days most of the soil testing labs were established by fertilizer companies and it was easier to sell the notion of " if you increase this nutrient to x amount then you'll lift your production x amount". Another small group of men said look deeper at the problem and include a more balanced approach. One group was driven on volume of sales of one or two products and the other on the efficiency of use of those products created by balancing soil cations. One group celebrates when they sell volumes of fertilizer regardless of other factors like animal health or stock performance or ease of farming; the other celebrates when they get production with more ease and less disease with significantly less fertilizer.

The volume-based group has had no interest in preserving the earth's limited resources. They tend to be short term focused as well.

Scientific trials can be produced supporting both groups with more trial work done by the bigger volume based group. Bigger because they generate more sales of higher margin products yielding more money to sponsor trials. Vs. their poor opposition who often encourage the use of low margin products like Lime and Magnesium.

Over my 10 years specializing in fertilizer consultancy I have seen a common trend. Most people start down the volume road and only consider changing when things start to go wrong - Most often animal performance. When they finally do change over it is more expensive to correct the balance and restore the situation.

It is natural to go with those that are most prevalent in there thinking and marketing, and assume the small voice are the wackos.