

The Evolution of Radionics and Psychotronics for Farming and Gardening Part 1

Introduction

This is the first in a planned series of articles to be published in the USPA Newsletter that summarize the history and evolution of radionics/psychotronics as applied to horticulture and the growing of field crops. To those who know and study radionics as a modality for human health and well-being, applications to agriculture may seem ancillary. It's true that society sets a priority on our physical and mental health by supporting a gargantuan and costly medical system and infrastructure. Sadly, however, it often focuses more on treating symptoms than on correcting (or at least admitting to) the underlying causes of disease, which include devitalized and residue-laden food, as well as environments polluted by pesticides and other contaminants from modern farming and other sources. The food we eat; the water we drink; the air we breathe; are keys to health, and the way we farm and garden has so very much to do with the quality of all three...and more. The on-going expansion of organic and local markets indicate a growing proportion of the public recognizes this as well, and they are putting their food-dollars on the line.

Radionics/Psychotronics can contribute to improvements in our food system and the wider environment in numerous ways. Two of these are obvious. First, we can use their analytical methods to assess the purity and vitality of foods in stores, farmers' markets, and on our plates. This application is already a frequent part of basic education in dowsing and radionics.

Secondly, radionics and psychotronics can be used directly in the growing of food, feed, fiber, and energy crops to increase production; suppress weeds, pests, and diseases; cut costs; reduce the pollution and contamination of soil, air, water, and food; and enhance discrimination among crops and crop varieties often developed through misguided breeding programs and objectives. By extension, we can use these radionics and dowsing modalities to assess the quality of foodstuffs arising from different systems of growing, plant breeding, and handling. This feedback can guide advancements in farming and gardening in exceptional ways.

U.K.A.C.O. and the Emergence of the Homeopathic Hypothesis

The story of modern agricultural radionics begins with the commercial enterprise called U.K.A.C.O., and its spin-offs—the Homeotronic Foundation and the Radiurgic Corporation, which operated from the late 1940s through the early 1970s.¹ The name, U.K.A.C.O., derives from the first letters of the last names of Curtis Upton, William Knuth, and Howard Armstrong—the principals of the company. Of these, Upton stands out as the main force behind the enterprise. Edward W. Russell, the author of *Report on Radionics*², which is the primary source of information on U.K.A.C.O., considered Upton the discoverer of agricultural radionics much as he recognized Albert Abrams as discoverer of radionics.

U.K.A.C.O. is best remembered for its numerous successes in radionic pest control—most of which were large-scale—done on crop fields in Pennsylvania and Arizona. They employed remote broadcasting, using aerial photographs as witnesses and botanical pest control substances³ as reagents to rid crops of pest insects. The operators delimited the treated areas by drawing boundaries on the photos and/or cutting away non-target zones. This provided for “check plots,” which could be compared to the treatment to assess the effectiveness of the broadcasts. Most of these treatments appear to have been very successful; numerous field results are summarized in the aforementioned *Report on Radionics*. Also included are the verbatim texts of letters of documentation and support from the Farm Bureau, which observed the field demonstrations. U.K.A.C.O. charged the growers on a per-acre basis only when treatments were successful. The cost was well below that of conventional pesticides and was of significant savings to farmers. There were many growers pleased and supportive of this work.

The re-telling of U.K.A.C.O.'s pest control success stories has created a narrowed perspective and obscured what may be the true nature of radionics broadcasting to field crops and how it might actually work. The mythologized image suggests that

¹ U.K.A.C.O.'s work began in the late 1940s. Precisely how long the entity continued to function is unclear. In 1952, the principals, particularly Upton, were instrumental in creating the Homeotronic Foundation—a non-for-profit organization whose purpose was the pursuit of the science behind agricultural radionics. The Radiurgic Corporation was another commercial venture that, in turn, emerged from the Homeotronic Foundation to again offer radionics services to growers. According to E.W. Russell, the Homeotronic Foundation was still active in 1973 when his book, *Report on Radionics*, was published.

² Russell, Edward W. 1973. *Report on Radionics: Science of the Future*. Neville Spearman (publ.), Suffolk, U.K. 255 p.

³ The botanicals included Pyrethrum, Rotenone, Nicotine, Hemlock, Horsetail, Sumac, and Dark Red Geranium. These materials were found to be at least as effective (if not more so) than arsenic and mercury compounds, which were used as agricultural pesticides at that time. Arsenic- and mercury-based pesticides are now banned for most applications.

pests were attacked or “zapped,” at a distance, using souped-up radionic instruments and methods. This is a seductive image for a world immersed in drones, smart bombs, and violent video games. But while this image *might* be substantially accurate, there is a less-sexy, but more plausible explanation for radionic pest suppression; one that is built on concepts common to Homeopathy, Biodynamic farming, and organic agriculture.

To begin, many Biodynamic and organic farming practitioners consider agricultural insect pests to have a specific role in nature as garbage collectors. They perceive their main function as the removal of plants that are sick, genetically-damaged, or otherwise stressed and weakened. While these growers cannot control all stress factors, they understand many of them to be *agricologenic*—caused by the way we farm. Imbalanced crop nutrition, reaction to herbicides and other pesticides, destruction of soil tilth, and loss of biodiversity are among problems resulting in modern farming and gardening. Traditional Biodynamic and organic growers, therefore, look first at what they are doing in the field which might have encouraged pests to get out of control, and then correct that, if possible.

This line of thinking is well-supported by the overlapping theories of Predisposition⁴ and Trophobiosis⁵. In a most compelling example, it was discovered that stressed plants stop building proteins and begin reducing them, instead. This results in the proliferation of excess free nitrogen and amino acids in plant cells and sap. These compounds are the preferred foods of herbaceous insect pests, like aphids, which lack the enzymes to break down whole proteins into their amino acid constituents.^{6,7} Assuming this to be true, insect pests on healthy plants—being denied the digestible food that sick or stressed plants provide—need not be directly attacked either with pesticides or radionics; they will either starve in place or seek nourishment elsewhere.

⁴ Coleman, Eliot W., and Richard L. Ridgeway. 1983. Role of Stress Tolerance in Integrated Pest Management. p. 126. In: Knorr, Dietrich (ed.). 1983. Sustainable Food Systems. AVI Publishing Company, Inc., Westport, Connecticut. 416 p.

⁵ “The theory of trophobiosis has to do with how plant nutrition affects plant health, with what makes a plant susceptible or resistant to disease and to pest attack.” From Lutzenberger, J.A., p 2. In: Chaboussou, Francis. 2007. Healthy Crops: A New Agricultural Revolution. Jon Carpenter Publishing, Charlbury, UK. 234 p.

⁶ Eliot Coleman, as quoted by Stoner, Kim, and Tracy LaProvidenza. 1998. A history of the idea that healthy plants are resistant to pests. p.4. In: Stoner, K. 1998. Alternatives to Insecticides for Managing Vegetable Insects: Proceedings of a Farmer/Scientist Conference (NRAES – 138). NRAES, Ithaca, New York. December 6–7.

⁷ Anon. 1999. Pests starve on healthy plants. Ecology Action Newsletter, Willits, California. May. p. 3–4.

This might help explain the observations by radionics pioneer Peter Kelly, as expressed in an interview from the early 1980s.⁸ In response to a question about the corporeal remains of insect pests controlled by radionic broadcasting, Peter notes that simple organisms, such as corn borers, essentially dissolve into "native materials like water and basic energy;" more complex organisms, on the other hand, "would have some remnants." This almost certainly reflects what one would likely observe under circumstances where a crop suddenly becomes unpalatable to pest insects. The larval or caterpillar (primitive) stage of moth, butterfly, beetle, and fly pests—being soft-bodied and unable to migrate to other feeding grounds, are likely to die of starvation in-place and decompose rapidly. Adult forms and those insect pests that do not pass a larval stage (e.g. true bugs), have an exoskeleton that would resist immediate degradation and leave some remains. However, such insects are also more mobile and better-equipped to move on!

Peter Tompkins and Christopher Bird hint at an alternative to the "zapping" hypothesis in their 1973 book *The Secret Life of Plants*.⁹ They suggest that U.K.A.C.O.'s radionic broadcasts may have acted homeopathically—directly affecting the plants (as opposed to the pests)—stimulating natural resistance. If true, we might argue that this resistance may have assumed a plant-nutritional form to counter insect-feeding as suggested by Predisposition and Trophobiosis theories.

This notion takes on more weight when one carefully reads Russell, and Tompkins and Bird. Both sources indicate that U.K.A.C.O. sought, not simply to eliminate pests, but to vitalize crops to increase yield and quality! If we assume that successful vitalization equates to stress-reduction, that further leads to pest starvation, it is logical that most observers might measure success in terms of pest suppression. They might simply note any improvement of crop performance as resulting only from reduced pest damage. It would be quite possible to overlook the underlying causal factors associated with healthier plants.

It is not clear from Russell, Tompkins and Bird, and other published sources, just what protocols U.K.A.C.O. principals and cooperators followed, and whether the alternative "homeopathic/predisposition/trophobiotic" explanation truly holds water. However, we might take a hint from another radionics pioneer, T. Galen

⁸ Aickin, Leslie. Circa 1983. Interview: Psychotronic Farming, p. 8-13. In: Kelly, Peter. 1986. Psychotronics Book 1. Interdimensional Sciences, Lakemont, Georgia. 107 p.

⁹ Tompkins, Peter, and Christopher Bird. 1973. *The Secret Life of Plants*. Harper and Row, New York. p. 323

Hieronymus, who worked with U.K.A.C.O.'s not-profit research arm, the Homeotronic Foundation. In the "*credimus*"¹⁰ or introduction to his *Cosmiculture* manual, Galen outlines his philosophy and approach to using radionics/psychotronics for agriculture. He states:

Disease, unwanted insects, undesirable plants are simply indications of conditions, in that environment, conducive to their existence at a particular time and place. Change those conditions by enhancing the environment for the desirable, and the reason for the undesirable ceases to exist.

*Reagents are incorporated within the Cosmiculture system that will, at once, enhance the vitality of the desirable and reduce the vitality of the undesirable.*¹¹

This statement of belief mirrors the ideas common to Predisposition, Trophobiosis, and the traditions of Biodynamics, Homeopathy, and organic farming. They might also have been those of Upton, Knuth, and Armstrong. Whether they are or not, the concept continues through the contemporary evolution of agricultural radionics, the story of which will continue in Part 2 of this series.

¹⁰ Roughly translated from the Latin, *credimus* means "what we believe."

¹¹ Hieronymus, Thomas Galen. No date. *Cosmiculture*. A.S.R.&D., Lakemont, Georgia. p. 1.