Available online www.worldscientificnews.com

World Scientific News

An International Scientific Journal

WSN 218 (2026) 37-43 EISSN 2392-2192

Electroculture: A Sustainable Approach to Modern Agriculture

Abhay Singh[1], Khulakpam Naseeruddin Shah[1], Deepak Kumar Rana[1], Dharmendra Kumar Ram[2], Ashok Kumar[1] ,Vivek Singh[1*]

[1]Department of Horticulture, School of Agriculture & Allied Science, H.N.B. Garhwal University (A Central University), Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand 246174, India

[2]Department of Agriculture, Sai Nath University, Ranchi, Jharkhand 835219, India

[*]Corresponding author: bibek007singh@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.65770/LNCK5850

ABSTRACT

Electroculture is defined by the use of electromagnetic stimulation (EM) to stimulate seed germination, plant growth, and/or increase yields. The study of EM has existed sporadically over nearly three hundred years. Recently, electroculture has re-emerged into mainstream discussion due to trending social media content pertaining to inexpensive "passive" EM garden devices made with copper-wrapped garden stakes. In this paper, we will provide an overview of past research on electroculture, describe the physiology-based explanations that have been proposed to account for observed effects of EM on plant growth; evaluate the evidence supporting classical studies and modern research efforts; and differentiate scientific "active" electroculture techniques from what appear to be unsupported "passive" approaches based upon limited data.

Keywords: Electroculture, electric field, electromagnetic stimulation, sustainable agriculture, seed germination.

(Received 9 June 2026; Accepted 20 July 2026; Date of Publication 19 August 2026)

1. INTRODUCTION

The idea that electricity can influence plant growth is far older than modern agronomy. As early as the late seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries, researchers noticed differences in how much water was lost by transpiration by electrified plants versus their non-electrified counterparts; these findings demonstrated the possibility that living organisms could respond in measurable ways to application of an electrical charge (Nollet, 1747). By the first half of the 20th Century, scientists had developed a complex theory explaining the link between charged particles found in auroras and the lush vegetation seen near high latitude locations. They proceeded to build large scale arrays of antennas intended to replicate the effects of "atmospheric electricity," which they believed would have positive impacts upon crops grown in agricultural fields (Lemstrom, 1904). In response to research conducted using the USDA's funding during the 1920s (Briggs *et al.,* 1926), plant physiologists explored further into the possible bioelectric interactions within roots and shoots of plants (Scott, 1967).

The collective term "electroculture," that describes this collection of works, was relatively quiet for most of the latter half of the 20th Century due to the advent of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides that provided growers with quicker, easier to scale, and more predictable results than electrically cultured crops. However, in the last decade, there have been two independent developments that have led to renewed interest in the area. The first is a renewed body of scientific literature examining how electric and magnetic fields influence plant physiology at the cellular and molecular levels. This renewed interest was sparked in part by a need for new, low input, climate resilient methods of growing. The second, and largely independent of the first is a viral gardening trend on social media platforms where simple copper coils or wire antennas placed within garden soils are being marketed as a method to increase crop yield using no chemicals. As can be seen, these two types of "electroculture" differ significantly in terms of the physical principles they employ, the amount of empirical data supporting them, and the potential applications of each; therefore, combining them would likely result in an overstatement of the degree to which this technology is ready for use in agriculture and an underestimation of the scientifically supported physiological effects of electric and magnetic stimulation that have been demonstrated through nearly four decades of more rigorous research.

Figure 1. A farmer working in electrocultural field.

This article will investigate the history of Electro Culture (Electro Culture) provide an overview of the hypothesized physiological mechanisms through which electric or electromagnetic stimulation can be applied to alter the rate of plant growth, assess the evidence supporting the distinction between "active" techniques using electrical fields and "passive" approaches employing copper rods; and finally, establish priority areas of study to develop Electro Culture as a science supported by data rather than speculation in order to make it a viable tool for sustainable agriculture.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Early interest in the scientific study of electroculture was first demonstrated by the observation of altered transpiration patterns in electrified plants during the Eighteenth Century. In addition to demonstrating that plant tissue was bioelectrically responsive, this observation also provided evidence of a long history of systematic electroculture studies. The modern use of the term "electroculture" originated from field research conducted at the turn of the Twentieth Century. This research identified high levels of vigorous plant growth in Arctic and Sub-Arctic regions as being caused by naturally occurring electrical currents within the atmosphere generated by the Aurora Borealis. Following Lemström's initial discovery, scientists attempted to artificially recreate these conditions by constructing large-scale electrical networks overhead wires and charging them to thousands of volts.

Beginning with government-backed research in agriculture science in the first half of the twentieth century; U.S. Department of Agriculture released a report of significant length on the results of an extensive series of field trials conducted using electroculture in the 1920's (Briggs *et al.,* 1926). Additionally, in mid-century, several reviews were produced which summarized the fundamental electrical characteristics of plant tissues (Scott, 1967); as well as in latter years, studies investigated whether or not pulsed electromagnetic fields may increase the amount of enzyme expressed when plants are treated with growth regulators, thereby increasing plant mass in culture (Jones *et al.,* 1986). In addition, a comprehensive review that synthesized the physiology of this subject area in the last decade of the 1970's (Pohl, 1977) has been developed in attempts to organize the disparate and methodologically variable body of evidence that had accumulated by then into a consistent group of testable hypotheses related to plant growth mediated through electric fields.

Although there have been over one hundred years of research regarding the use of electricity as an input factor for crops, electroculture has been unable to establish the same degree of institutional presence as the mainstream agronomic disciplines. Recently, a historical study examining how electroculture became part of "non-normal science" during the inter-war period attributed electroculture's failure to gain prominence due to a number of issues related to early experimental design (epistemological) and boundary work at the time by those who wanted to create the new institutions around rapidly developing technology such as chemical fertilizer and synthetic pesticide.

3. PROPOSED PHYSIOLOGICAL MECHANISMS

There are many ways that scientists believe Electric and Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) can affect plants. Examples of these include ion movement through a plant's membrane; enzyme activation, inactivation, inhibition; EMF-induced alterations to uptake of water and nutrients; and genetic changes at the DNA level, all of which may contribute to some degree to what is seen as an effect by the scientist.

3.1. Ion Transport and Membrane Potential

Plant cell membranes create electrical/chemical potential differences, which are responsible for how nutrients enter cells. Applied DC Electric Fields could theoretically be used to control or modify kinetic behaviour of ion channels and other transport proteins located within the plasma membrane. A review of studies examining the use of static electric fields has demonstrated that low intensity applied DC fields can cause shifts in the membrane stability of plant cells. These changes appear to provide possible explanations for a number of unusual biological responses to low-level EMF exposures (Goldsworthy, 2006).

3.2. Soil Electrochemistry and Nutrient Availability.

Low levels of electrical charge that are used on soils appear to affect how ions of nutrients move through soil when an electric field is put into it. The electric field does this by creating a chemical reaction with the soil that increases the amount that ions of nutrients move through the soil. When the roots have better access to minerals as a result of increased ion movement, they take up those minerals at higher rates. More available nutrients support greater photosynthesis indirectly, and therefore, the electrical effect increases plant growth due to changes in soil chemistry vs. affecting the plant itself directly (Lee & Oh, 2023).

3.3. Gene Expression and Growth Regulation.

A number of studies have suggested that both natural and artificial electrical fields can stimulate genes involved in plant growth; these findings provide a molecular mechanism for explaining how electrical fields increase seed germination rates, enhance shoot growth, and improve overall biomass production, as reported in multiple scientific studies. The model developed by Goldsworthy (2006) has influenced many other researchers seeking to determine what causes plants to grow faster when exposed to an electroculture system.

3.4. Electromagnetic and Magnetic Co-Treatments.

Static and dynamic magnetic field studies have also been conducted; these studies showed increased germination rates, increased seedling biomass, and increased seedling photosynthesis when the seeds were subjected to magnetically altered water prior to planting (Shine *et al.,* 2011). Review articles combining the literature on electroculture, magnetoculture, and laser-induced seed stimulation indicated enhanced reproduction and what appears to be resistance to pathogens in multiple taxonomic groups subjected to a variety of different electromagnetic stimuli, while it is probable that the mechanism by which these effects are produced vary with type of stimulus applied to the plants, and further verification in additional species is required (Christianto & Smarandache, 2021).

3.5. Negative Air Ionization.

Electrical generated negative airborne Ions can influence plant growth independent of any direct electrode-to-plant contact by promoting germination and increasing seedling vigour for leafy crops like spinach. This could be an alternative method to deliver the benefits of air ionization with practical relevance.

In combination, all of the above mechanisms suggest that “electroculture” is not one single physical intervention or phenomenon; it encompasses a number of physically distinct interventions (including DC supplied by buried electrodes, AMF, and ionized air), which can have their own unique mechanisms of action as well as varying degrees of supporting scientific data.

4. ACTIVE VERSUS PASSIVE ELECTROCULTURE: AN EVIDENTIARY DIVIDE

Active ElectroCulture (AEC) is defined as the use of a direct, applied external electrical power supply to intentionally control a specific amount of voltage, current, or magnetic field through either the soil itself or directly through plant tissue. It can be contrasted with Passive ElectroCulture (PEC), which has recently gained popularity via social media posts by inserting a bare or copper-coated wooden dowel into garden soil without application of any external power; it is assumed the naturally occurring electrochemical/galvanic reactions within the soil will produce sufficient current for desired physiological effects.

Most published studies on active electroculture and the effect of applied voltage on plant yields and growth are based on experiments that yielded results where the voltage was greater than that generated by passive copper rods. Studies have shown many trials where there were significant improvements due to applied voltage which were reported at levels of 6-1000+ V; The majority of these trial reports had the applied voltage greater than 200V. This is important because, in natural environments, a galvanic cell will produce less than 1/2 V.

This experimental concern was assessed directly in an experiment using a controlled design where Chier *et al.* (2025) demonstrated how leafy greens (mustard greens, kale), as well as root vegetables (beets, turnips), were grown in pots containing either a buried, exposed, or absent copper-wrapped dowel. These dowels were specifically created so that, if there was an electrical effect produced by the dowels, it would be separated from a simple copper fertilizer effect. No consistent evidence for improvements to plant biomass, photosynthesis rates, or yields of the tested crops due to passive electroculture was demonstrated. However, a statistically significant increase in turnip biomass was reported by the authors under one treatment condition however this is likely unrelated to both electrical stimulation and copper fertilization, as plants treated with exposed copper rods did not have the same response (Chier *et al.,* 2025). Similarly, the same authors also stated that although actively applied electric fields could potentially improve crop productivity under suitable conditions, the voltage levels required are greater than what a passively buried copper rod can produce, and therefore suggested that home growers should treat commercially available "passive electroculture" products with skepticism until additional research supports their use (Chier *et al.,* 2025).

There is a common thread among research conducted on truly active electrically and/or magnetically charged apparatus (DC electrodes, AE fields, MP chambers & NI generators) that have demonstrated positive physiologic responses; conversely, while there are many studies of the commercially promoted "copper stake" apparatus, there is only one study that employed rigorous controls to compare this device's efficacy to other treatments. That study found no statistically significant difference in response compared to those receiving placebo treatment.

5. CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF THE EVIDENCE BASE

Several methodological issues limit confidence in the results of studies claiming that "active" electroculture has a beneficial effect on plants. The most significant issue is that many of the classic works on the subject done during the nineteenth and early twentieth century were not replicated with sufficient randomness or statistical controls, so we cannot consider them as evidence of efficacy. Additionally, there is a wide variation among contemporary studies in terms of the type of plant used, the developmental stage of the plant when it was exposed to an electric field, the intensity of the electric field used, how long the plant was exposed to the field, and the environment in which the study was conducted. This makes it very difficult to synthesize across studies and limits the generality of any individual study that shows a benefit due to electric culture.

Another problem is that studies that report an influence of an electric field on biological organisms tend to cite each other's work and thus create a false sense of agreement based upon a limited number of often-cited historical papers. A systematic review of both static electric fields' effects on animals and plants noted that, in addition to the variability in the results of these studies, some of the methodology of previous research has been weak and thus called for development of more standard experimental procedures prior to drawing strong practical conclusions about whether electric culture can provide benefits to agricultural crops (Schmiedchen *et al.,* 2018).

It's too early for a dismissal of electroculture in its entirety. A convergence of independent lines of evidence (ion transport physiology, soil electrochemistry, gene expression, magnetically treated seeds, and negative air ions) supports the conclusion that plants have a genuine response to electrical and electromagnetic stimuli; and, under carefully controlled conditions, some types of electrical stimuli could produce tangible physiological responses. The primary science objective for future research will no longer be establishing that plants react to electricity in general, but rather what specific parameters of electrical stimulation applied by means of specific delivery systems for plant-specific developmental stages will result in agronomic and economic benefits.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

The interest in electroculture is largely based on its theoretical potential as a low-chemical-input agricultural technology consistent with the principles of sustainable and regenerative agriculture. If active electroculture techniques can be miniaturized; if they are powered at an efficient level (e.g., using small scale solar panels); and if their efficacy is demonstrated through trials with major food crops, then in theory these approaches may be able to replace or complement some of the use of synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, especially where resource-constrained or small holder farms are involved. Reviews of analog electronic devices used in agriculture provide a greater context for understanding the history of electroculture as part of the larger family of electrically-mediated farming technologies (e.g., soil moisture sensors and irrigation controllers). These reviews suggest that recent advances in inexpensive and high performance sensing and actuating technologies could support more precise and reproducible experimentation than was previously possible for electroculture researchers in the past.

The economic and practical basis for using electroculture remains unsubstantiated, especially for commercially available, passive electroculture products marketed directly to home gardeners. Unquestioning marketing of untested passive products also threatens consumers financially and tarnishes the reputation of those pursuing scientifically-based research into electroculture.

7. CONCLUSION

Electroculture has an unusually fascinating yet scientifically unbalanced history in the realm of agriculture. For nearly three hundred years on-and-off, electroculture studies have generated substantial scientific evidence demonstrating that controlled and sufficient electrical power, as well as electromagnetically stimulated plants can produce positive effects for germination, development, and physiological responses in specific plant species using bio-electrochemical and biochemical mechanisms, including ion transport; electrochemical processes in soils; altered gene expressions; and biophysical interactions from the presence of air ions. On the other hand, most of the recent interest in electroculture is largely being driven by unpowered, non-scientifically supported, copper rod based passive "devices," used in most cases by enthusiasts of electroculture.

The only experiment designed to test the efficacy of such a device demonstrated that there were no consistent advantages to yield or growth of crops grown under these conditions compared to those not subjected to this treatment.

References

[1] Briggs, L. J., Heald, R. H., & Flint, L. H. (1926). *Electroculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. (USDA Report No. 1379).

[2] Chier, M., Oakey, A., Budny, M. L., & Lemoine, N. P. (2025). Passive electroculture using copper rods does not improve yield in home container vegetable gardening. *PLOS ONE, 20*(8), e0329615. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0329615

[3] Christianto, V., & Smarandache, F. (2021). A review on electroculture, magneticulture and laserculture to boost plant growth. *Bulletin of Pure and Applied Sciences – Botany, 40*(1), 65-69.

[4] Goldsworthy, A. (2006). Effects of electrical and electromagnetic fields on plants and related topics. In A. G. Volkov (Ed.), *Plant electrophysiology: Theory and methods* (pp. 247-267). Springer.

[5] Jones, D. B., Bolwell, G. P., & Gilliatt, G. J. (1986). Amplification, by pulsed electromagnetic fields, of plant growth regulator induced phenylalanine ammonia-lyase during differentiation in suspension cultured plant cells. *Journal of Bioelectricity, 5*(1), 1-12.

[6] Lee, J., & Oh, M. (2023). Electric field: A new environmental factor for controlling plant growth and development in agriculture. *Horticulture, Environment, and Biotechnology, 64*, 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13580-023-00525-y

[7] Lemström, S. (1904). *Electricity in agriculture and horticulture*. George Tucker.

[8] Nollet, J. A. (1747). *Recherches sur les causes particulieres des phenomenes electriques et sur les effets nuisibles ou avantageux qu'on peut en attendre*. H. L. Guérin & L. F. Delatour. Pohl, H. A. (1977). Electroculture. *Journal of Biological Physics, 5*(1), 1-33.

[9] Schmiedchen, K., Petri, A. K., Driessen, S., & Bailey, W. H. (2018). Systematic review of biological effects of exposure to static electric fields. Part II: Invertebrates and plants. *Environmental Research, 160*, 60-76.

[10] Scott, B. I. H. (1967). Electric fields in plants. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology, 18*, 409-418.

[11] Shine, M. B., Guruprasad, K. N., & Anand, A. (2011). Enhancement of germination, growth, and photosynthesis in soybean by pre-treatment of seeds with magnetic field. *Bioelectromagnetics, 32*(6), 474-484.