



THE DIABOLIC LEGAL REDEFINING OF “NATURAL” ACROSS ALL OF EU

Synopsis of The Incredible Disaster and Forensic Analysis Behind How Europe Quietly Reclassified/Renamed Genetic Engineering and Opened the Door to Unlabeled GMOs. The Bottom has Fallen EFSA is now no better than CODEX or USDA Standards.

1. Introduction: The Silent Redefinition of Nature, the Devil is in the Details.

Across Europe, a profound regulatory shift has unfolded with little public awareness and even less public debate. Through a series of political negotiations culminating in December 2025, the European Union quietly altered the meaning of the word “**natural**” in agricultural and food law. This shift centers on a new regulatory framework for **New Genomic Techniques (NGTs)**—a category that includes modern gene-editing tools such as CRISPR/Cas.

Under this new regime, a large class of genetically modified plants—those categorized as **NGT-1**—will no longer be labelled as GMOs. They will not undergo GMO-style risk assessment, will not bear GMO labels on food products, and will enter the European food system under the legal designation “**equivalent to conventional breeding.**” In the language of regulation and, inevitably, in the eyes of consumers, these engineered plants become functionally “**natural.**”

This exposé examines how this shift occurred, how language was used to reshape the political and scientific landscape, and what the consequences will be for transparency, biodiversity, seed sovereignty, and the integrity of Europe’s food system. Though presented as a modernization of outdated rules, this reclassification amounts to a **semantic and political laundering of genetic engineering**, enabling its silent expansion under the guise of natural evolution.

2. The Legal Shock of 2018 and the Seeds of Deregulation

The origin point of the current transformation lies in a decisive 2018 ruling of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). The case—**C-528/16, Confédération paysanne**—held that organisms produced by modern targeted mutagenesis techniques **are GMOs** and must be regulated as such. The court explicitly rejected the argument that gene-edited plants should be exempt from GMO legislation simply because no foreign DNA is inserted into the target (the later reversal constituted a legal shock and a betrayal to all things natural subject to natural unmolested evolution and a direct violation to the will of all EU citizens).

This ruling sent shockwaves through the biotech and agrifood industries. For the first time, CRISPR-edited crops would face the same stringent requirements as classical transgenic GMOs: full environmental risk assessment, traceability, monitoring, and mandatory consumer labelling. For corporations that had invested heavily in gene-editing, the ruling was a severe economic and strategic setback.

From that moment, pressure mounted on the European Commission to devise a regulatory escape hatch—one that would allow gene-edited plants to bypass the GMO framework without overtly dismantling it. The path forward would not be through science, but through **regulatory redefinition**: carving out a category of GM plants that would be legally treated as if they were **conventionally bred**, even though they were generated through direct genomic engineering.

3. The Commission's NGT Proposal: Engineering a New Category of "Natural". Unleashing the Bill Gates of Hell

The European Commission's 2023 proposal to regulate New Genomic Techniques (NGTs) introduced one of the most consequential semantic moves in modern food policy: the creation of the NGT-1 category, legally classifying certain gene-edited plants as "equivalent to conventional breeding." This categorization is not scientific discovery but regulatory invention—an administrative construct designed to relabel genetic engineering as natural.

3.1. How NGT-1 Was Defined

Under the Commission's proposal, NGT-1 plants are defined as those altered by: targeted deletions, small gene insertions, base-pair substitutions, cisgenic edits, or up to twenty

cumulative genomic modifications, so long as the resulting genetic patterns are ones that “could occur naturally or through conventional breeding.”

This definition is a legal fiction. It does not claim the plant arose through natural processes—it simply declares that nature could theoretically produce the same modification, therefore the engineered plant should be treated as if it were conventional.

The Dark Outcome Became evident :

When NGT-1 plants became exempt from GMO risk assessment automatically and overnight ALL NGT-1 foods require no GMO labelling and worst, they can BE LABELED AS EFSA ORGANIC AB so the entire EFSA standard has fallen all the cliff.

This also means that NGT-1 seeds that must be labelled as such, won't have that same label shown on any of the food made from them so NGT-1 crops become invisible to consumers and the general public no matter how hard they try to get the answer.

NGT-1 traits may still be patented, linking “natural-equivalent” plants to corporate ownership which fully explains the intense and voracious lobbying the big BioAg has been doing in that field.

3.2. The Global Messaging That Made NGT-1 Possible: Gene Editing as “Natural Evolution”

The regulatory design of NGT-1 aligns closely with a messaging strategy that has been promoted for over a decade by major biotech advocates, including Bill Gates, whose philanthropic, investment, and public communication efforts have significantly shaped the global perception of gene editing.

Across numerous public appearances, interviews, and conference discussions, Gates and Cohorts across UN agencies have repeatedly described gene editing, especially CRISPR, as: “the natural progression of biology”, “An acceleration of natural evolutionary processes”, “something nature would do on its own but slower” and as “A way to help evolution adapt”.

This Nihilistic rhetorical framing can only serve several purposes of the following agenda:

1. It collapses the distinction between natural mutation and engineered modification. 2. It encourages regulators to treat engineered edits as benign.
3. It creates a psychological bridge that turns CRISPR from a dangerous and experimental Frankensteinian laboratory intervention into a “tool of nature.”
4. It softens public resistance by embedding gene editing within familiar, evolutionary metaphors.

5. It legitimizes deregulation and reduces oversight by eliminating consumer rights.

Critics argue that this messaging, repeated consistently across Gates-backed agricultural initiatives, TED-style platforms, and global policy forums, laid the conceptual groundwork for regulatory bodies—including the EU—to treat engineered organisms as merely “conventional variants.”

3.3. Gates’ Institutional Influence on Gene-Editing Policy

Bill Gates’ involvement extends beyond rhetoric. His foundations, investment arms, and affiliated research partnerships have funded major gene-editing research in staple crops by financially supported international agricultural investment pushing biotech abominations. They have also invested billions in agritech firms deploying NGT technologies while collaborating with institutions advocating for “innovation-friendly” regulation that green washed gene editing as a cornerstone of climate-resilient agriculture.

Observers note that the NGT-1 = “equivalent to conventional” logic closely mirrors the language used by Gates and affiliated organizations across interviews, white papers, and agricultural innovation summits.

The alignment is unmistakable: a narrative crafted around the idea that gene editing is “nature accelerated” dovetails perfectly with a regulation asserting that engineered traits are “equivalent to natural.”

3.4. How This Narrative Was Codified Into EU Law

The EU’s adoption of the NGT-1 category did not merely take inspiration from this messaging—it institutionalized it. By placing gene-edited organisms into a legal class defined explicitly as “equivalent to conventional breeding,” the European Commission transformed a philosophical argument into juridical fact. The consequences are sweeping and a far-cry from 2018. Currently, Engineered organisms are now legally “non-GMO.” Which was only a dream Gates and Company only dreamed of a few short years back. We have witnessed all EU regulatory barriers vanish overnight as scientific oversight has evaporated and now is coupled by a set of nasty corporate control and backed biotech seed protection laws across the EU and worldwide.

This shift represents a synthesis of political pressure, industry interest, and global advocacy narratives—especially those suggesting that gene editing is simply “evolution with human guidance.”

Through the NGT-1 designation, this narrative has been embedded into the backbone of European agricultural law..

4. The December 2025 Ominous Trilogues: What Was Agreed and Why It Matters

In December 2025, the European Parliament, Council, and Commission reached a **provisional trilogue agreement** that solidified the NGT proposal and set the stage for its adoption by 2026.

The agreement confirmed that:

- **NGT-1 plants will not be labelled as GMOs on food products**
- **NGT-1 plants will be legally classified as equivalent to conventional plants**
- **NGT-1 seeds must carry an NGT label, but food derived from them will not**
- **NGT-2 plants remain under GMO rules**
- **Patents remain allowed on NGT plant traits**, a point heavily criticized by farmer and organic associations
- **Monitoring and traceability requirements for NGT-1 are minimal**, further limiting detection and oversight

The outcome is a regulatory structure where **genetic engineering becomes invisible at the consumer level**, while corporations retain full intellectual-property rights over engineered traits.

In effect, Europe has legalized the expansion of unlabeled gene-edited crops while simultaneously enabling large agrifood corporations to deepen their control over plant genetics through patents.

5. Semantic Manipulation: How Language Became a Regulatory Weapon

The redefinition of NGT-1 plants as “equivalent to conventional” is not a scientific classification but a **linguistic and political strategy**. By substituting the term “GMO” with “NGT,” and further dividing NGTs into categories, the regulatory narrative reframes engineered genetic changes as benign and unremarkable.

Key phrases—“conventional-like,” “equivalent to natural,” “could have occurred naturally”—serve to obscure the engineered origin of these plants and to reassure the public

through rhetorical familiarity. This mirrors a broader international trend in which regulators and industry actors avoid the politically charged acronym “GMO” and instead adopt softer, more technocratic language that downplays intervention.

This reframing has consequences:

- It recasts engineered changes as natural variations, erasing the technological intervention.
- It transforms a high-tech biotechnology product into a familiar, everyday agricultural input.
- It conditions public perception to accept gene editing as part of nature, not technology.

Once this linguistic shift is institutionalized, the category “natural” loses functional meaning.

6. Patents, Seed Laws, and Corporate Consolidation

The reclassification of NGT-1 plants as “natural” contrasts sharply with how they are treated under **intellectual property law**. Corporations retain the right to patent gene-edited traits even as these traits are legally treated as conventional.

This creates a paradoxical situation:

- **Biologically engineered traits are publicly naturalized but privately owned. • Farmers unknowingly growing NGT-1 crops could still face patent claims or restrictions.**
- **Seed laws requiring official variety registration favor patented, uniform varieties over heterogeneous, traditional seeds.**

Farmer organizations warn that this framework threatens:

- The right to save, exchange, and reuse seeds
- The viability of traditional plant breeding
- The future of organic and biodynamic agriculture, which rely on GMO-free seed lines • The resilience of Europe’s agricultural biodiversity

Contamination from NGT-1 crops—undetectable without specialized testing—could further entangle farmers in patent disputes or erode non-NGT seed purity without their knowledge.

The combination of **semantic naturalization** and **legal proprietary control** represents a consolidation of corporate power unprecedented in the European seed system.

7. Global Comparison: A Worldwide Strategy of Deregulation by Redefinition. A Dark Age Redox.

Europe's shift aligns it with a global trend where nations redefine genetic engineering categories to ease market entry and avoid public resistance.

United States

The USDA exempts many gene-edited plants from GMO oversight if the resulting traits could occur through conventional breeding. Gene-edited crops enter the food system without mandatory labelling.

Canada

Health Canada exempts gene-edited products from pre-market assessment unless they introduce novel traits. Many edited foods are effectively unregulated and unlabelled.

Japan

Japan allows gene-edited foods (e.g., CRISPR tomatoes, edited fish) onto the market without mandatory labelling as long as no foreign DNA is inserted.

Argentina and Brazil

These countries pioneered product-based regulations where gene-edited plants often fall outside GMO categorization, accelerating commercialization.

The shared feature across all these jurisdictions is the **redefinition of engineered edits as "conventional-like"** when certain criteria are met, enabling rapid deployment of gene-edited crops while minimizing public scrutiny.

8. Practical Consequences: The Disappearance of Transparency as Lying becomes the New Normal

The EU's NGT framework produces several immediate consequences:

- **Consumers lose the ability to distinguish between engineered and non engineered foods.**
- **Organic and GMO-free supply chains face new contamination risks from unlabelled NGT-1 crops.**
- **Farmers encounter legal uncertainty in a system where engineered traits are invisible but still patented.**
- **Regulators lose oversight capabilities without mandatory traceability.**
- **Corporations gain unprecedented leverage over seed genetics through patents and licensing.**

Transparency is replaced by opacity: gene editing becomes ubiquitous yet undetectable at the point of purchase.

9. Impact on Heirloom Varieties, Biodiversity, and Seed Sovereignty. The New Doctrine of Biological Nihilism

The NGT-1 category poses structural threats to heirloom seeds, landrace varieties, and region-specific plant genetics. Because NGT-1 seeds will be marketed as “conventional equivalent,” seed companies can create:

- “Heritage-style” gene-edited varieties
- Patented versions of old cultivars with engineered disease resistance
- “Traditional” varieties that are in fact heavily modified

This allows corporate NGT seeds to infiltrate markets traditionally dominated by heirloom or farmer-saved seeds, eroding the distinct identity and genetic purity of those lines.

Without labelling, farmers may unknowingly plant engineered variants of historically significant varieties. Over time, this risks:

- The dilution or disappearance of true heirloom genetics
- Reduced agricultural resilience due to genetic homogenization
- Loss of cultural and regional food heritage
- A shift from farmer-managed seeds to corporate-controlled genetics

The NGT framework thus accelerates a transition toward a food system where the appearance of tradition masks the reality of engineered uniformity.



10. Conclusion: A New World Seed Era of Invisible Gene Engineering — The Forces of Darkness have Prevailed

Europe’s decision to classify gene-edited plants as “natural-equivalent” marks the beginning of a new era in food governance. Through redefinition and linguistic strategy, genetic engineering has been woven into the fabric of conventional agriculture, bypassing public debate, avoiding consumer scrutiny, and consolidating corporate control over plant genetics.

The term “**natural**”—once a boundary separating human intervention from biological evolution—has been dissolved by regulatory decree. In its place is a system where engineered traits become invisible to consumers, yet enforceable through patents; where biodiversity is threatened by corporate consolidation; and where seed sovereignty becomes increasingly precarious.

This exposé documents a phenomenon that has been hiding in plain sight. The challenge now is to restore transparency, preserve genetic heritage, and safeguard the meaning of “natural” before it is lost completely.

REFERENCES (CHICAGO STYLE)

1. Court of Justice of the European Union. “Judgment in Case C-528/16, *Confédération paysanne and Others*.” 25 July 2018.
2. European Commission. “Commission welcomes provisional agreement on new genomic techniques.” Press release, 4 December 2025.
3. Council of the European Union. “New genomic techniques: Council and Parliament strike deal to boost the competitiveness and sustainability of our food systems.” Press release, 4 December 2025.
4. European Parliament. “Plants produced by certain new genomic techniques – Legislative Train Schedule.” Updated 2024–2025.
5. Kahrman, J., and G. Leggewie. “European Commission’s Plans for a Special Regulation of Plants Created by New Genomic Techniques.” *European Papers*, 2024.
6. Mundorf, J. “Simplifying GMO Law by Redefining Equivalence: The European Commission’s Proposal on New Genomic Techniques.” *Environmental Sciences Europe*, 2025.
7. Save Our Seeds. “New Genomic Techniques – Factsheets and Legal Analyses.” 2024–2025.
8. Inf’OGM. “Civil Society Organisations Concerned about Outcome of the NGT Trilogues.” 2025.
9. IFOAM Organics Europe. “Agreement of NGT Trilogues Poses a Big Risk to European Food Sovereignty.” 4 December 2025.
10. ECVC (European Coordination Via Campesina). “Patents on New Genomic Techniques: Implications for Farmers’ Rights.” 2024–2025.
11. Demeter International. “Council Mandate on NGTs Threatens Farmers’ and Breeders’ Freedom of Choice.” March 2025.

12. Foodwatch. “New GMOs: Freedom of Choice Only Possible Through Mandatory Labelling.” Joint NGO Statement, May 2025.
13. ARC2020. “Draft New GMO Regulation: Key Elements and First Reactions.” June 2023.
14. USDA. “Statement on Plant Breeding Innovation.” 2018.
15. Health Canada. “Guidance on the Safety Assessment of Gene-Edited Plants.” 2022–2024.
16. Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. “Policy on Genome-Edited Foods.” 2019–2024.
17. National authorities of Argentina and Brazil. Regulatory summaries on gene-editing frameworks, 2015–2024.
18. *Financial Times*. “Brussels Backs Softer Regime for Gene-Edited Plants.” 4 December 2025.
19. *Science|Business*. “Council, Parliament Agree on Long-Awaited Regulation for New Genomic Techniques.” 4 December 2025.
20. *FoodIngredientsFirst*. “EU Council and Parliament Agree on New Rules for NGT Plants.” 5 December 2025.
21. EUnews. “Green Light for the EU Framework on NGTs: A Mix of GMOs and Conventional Plants.” 4 December 2025.