

Behind the Façade, in Their Own Words

The ideas of the Dutch far-right milieu described in the AIVD/NCTV report of September 2026: a factual analysis

J. Konstapel, Constable Research, Leiden 23-9-2026.

1. Purpose and method

On 22 September 2026 the Dutch security service AIVD and the counter-terrorism coordinator NCTV published *Achter de façade* ("Behind the façade"). The report describes how right-wing extremists try to normalise their ideas. It names groups but no persons and no parties.

This article does something else. It does not assess the threat. It sets out what the people and groups in and around the report actually say they want. It uses their own statements where they are available. It uses courts, journalists and researchers where they are not.

Every claim below sits on one of three levels:

- **Established:** a court ruling, or the actor's own public statement.
- **Reported:** journalism or research by a named source.
- **Contested:** a claim the actor or others dispute. The dispute is stated.

A note on sources. One of the speeches discussed exists as video: Lidewij de Vos at the Remigration Summit 2026, published by FvD. It could not be transcribed directly. Its content is taken from a detailed written account. Paywalled Dutch newspapers (NRC, Volkskrant, ND) were only available through quotations in other outlets. Primary propaganda of the groups themselves was not collected.

2. The report in five sentences

The report defines right-wing extremism by two features: inequality and white superiority. It describes a strategy of normalisation through "metapolitics", meaning cultural influence before political change. It observes a "façade": a moderate outward presentation of a harder inner position. It names six Dutch groups: White Lives Matter, Geuzenbond, the Groot-Nederlandse Studentenvereniging (GNSV), Active Club Dietsland, Wolvenrad and Voorpost. It also warns that parties on the far right flank are being entered from within, without naming them.

The report adds a caveat of its own. Not every opinion on the political right flank about migration or identity is extremist. That caveat matters for what follows.

3. The shared idea set: five building blocks

3.1 The replacement narrative

The central idea is that Europe's native population is being replaced. In the report's version, this is done deliberately by a "left" or "Jewish" elite. The French writer Renaud Camus gave it its modern name in *Le Grand Remplacement* (2011). In Dutch the word is *omvolking*.

How far the idea reaches was measured in 2024. Kieskompas and ANP surveyed 14,710 adult Dutch respondents. The statement was: "I think part of the political elite is deliberately trying to replace the original Dutch population with non-Western immigrants." About three quarters of FvD voters agreed, against 42 percent of PVV voters and 25 percent of BBB voters. Among NSC and VVD voters the figure was around 9 percent. Overall, about one in six Dutch people agreed. By province, Zeeland scored highest at 26 percent, followed by Friesland and Limburg at around 20 percent.

Party leaders have drawn different lines. Geert Wilders called the theory "abject", while holding that concern about a changing Netherlands is not racist.

3.2 Remigration as a programme

If replacement is the diagnosis, "remigration" is the remedy. The word is the hinge of the whole milieu, because it means different things to different speakers.

The most elaborated version is by the Austrian activist Martin Sellner, *Remigration. Ein Vorschlag* (Antaios, 2024). Sellner divides the target population into three groups: asylum seekers (A), foreigners (B) and "non-assimilated citizens" (C), each with its own package of measures. He spends much effort justifying the proposals within existing national and international law. The publisher states that remigration has nothing to do with expulsion.

A German court read the concept differently. According to a summary of the Federal Administrative Court ruling in the Compact case, the concept aims to preserve an "ethnocultural identity" and links to origin, descent and faith. The court noted that withdrawing citizenship acquired by naturalisation or birth appears as an instrument against "non-assimilated citizens", and that even threatened statelessness is apparently no obstacle. People without a second passport would be moved to leave through "assimilation pressure", a strict de-Islamisation policy and economic measures.

Group C is the decisive element. It concerns citizens, not migrants.

3.3 From race to ethnocultural identity

The report describes a shift around 2015. The identitarian movement moved the vocabulary from biological race to culture and identity. Ethnicities are presented as equal but meant to live separately, each in its own land. The report calls this “ethno-nationalism”. It adds that racial and cultural narratives run together in practice.

The Save Europe Act (§4.3) uses exactly this vocabulary: “ethnocultural continuity”.

3.4 Metapolitics

The strategic idea comes from the French Nouvelle Droite of Alain de Benoist. It borrows from Antonio Gramsci: cultural hegemony precedes political power. The report cites Gramsci. Sellner teaches it explicitly. His own channel lists training sessions on political strategy and metapolitics.

The report makes the point itself: metapolitics is a normal democratic method. The question is what it serves.

3.5 Body, brotherhood, masculinity

The fifth block is physical. The Active Clubs network was founded by the American Robert Rundo. Rundo and Denis Kapustin launched it in January 2021 to revive a “spirit of the warrior” through mixed martial arts and the “preservation of European heritage”. After arrests of his earlier group, Rundo shifted to a decentralised white brotherhood he called “white nationalism 3.0”. The decentralised form was chosen to be less visible to law enforcement and less dependent on any single leader. In the United States the network grew from four chapters in 2021 to 31 in 2024.

The Dutch branch is Active Club Dietsland, named in the report.

4. The Dutch carriers, layer by layer

4.1 Street layer: White Lives Matter and Active Club Dietsland

This layer states its aim openly. According to the report, WLM Netherlands wants a country that is at least 99 percent white. The remaining 1 percent would have temporary status and a serving role.

The courts have ruled on its public actions. The Hague court of appeal convicted two men, John A. (27) and Danii S. (37), for projections on the Erasmus Bridge and Eindhoven city hall in 2023, for group insult and discrimination. The court held that “WLM” alone is not punishable, but becomes so in the context of reflections on a white ethnostate. John A. is also a member of Active Club Dietsland.

At this layer there is no façade. The report quotes a WLM handbook that recommends one for public appearances.

4.2 Youth and student layer: Geuzenbond and GNSV

The Geuzenbond was founded in 2018 and is active in the Netherlands, Flanders and French Flanders. The name refers to the Geuzen, the Dutch rebels against Spain in the Eighty Years’ War. The NCTV classifies it as far-right. It is small. Membership was estimated at around 20 in 2024. Its publication is *De Stormlamp*. Its demonstrations rarely draw more than 15 people.

Its ideas:

- **Greater Netherlands.** The goal is political unity of the Dutch-speaking lands. An article in *De Stormlamp* said the GNSV seeks unification of all Dutch-speaking areas of Europe in one nation state.
- **Remigration as main activism.** Its activism focuses mainly on remigration, including demonstrations against asylum centres.
- **Martial training.** The NCTV reads its interest in martial arts as preparation for a possible race struggle.

The report adds the façade: publicly “one people” of Flemings and Dutch; internally, one *white* people.

Its leader has been convicted, though not for his ideas. Geuzenbond leader Thomas D. was sentenced to two years in prison for weapons possession. He had also been a member of the Nijmegen GNSV and was suspended after his arrest.

The GNSV is the student front. It was founded in Leiden in 2021 by Geuzenbond members and forms the “Diets Studentenkartel” with the Flemish NSV!. It presents itself as a conservative-right association operating within the rule of law. Journalist Haro Kraak argued in *de Volkskrant* that it serves as a vehicle that makes the Geuzenbond’s far-right ideas more visible. Its chair in Nijmegen denies that most GNSV members are also active in the Geuzenbond.

The student layer connects to party politics. Nijmegen GNSV chair Daan Meershoek is also active for the local FvD. After the elections, a council majority boycotted him and a colleague.

4.3 Public and political layer: Vlaardingerbroek and De Vos

This is the layer the report leaves unnamed. The information comes from the actors' own statements and from reporting.

The congresses. At the first Remigration Summit near Milan (May 2025), a group from the Netherlands and Belgium attended, with Eva Vlaardingerbroek and Freek Jansen among the speakers. Political analyst Chris Aalberts noted that prominent FvD figures sat in the audience in 2025 without publicising it. In 2026, FvD's parliamentary leader spoke from the stage. The recurring speakers lead far-right movements in Belgium, Italy, Austria and Portugal.

Eva Vlaardingerbroek. She is the milieu's most prominent Dutch voice. Her core claim was reported in an interview: at CPAC Budapest in 2024 she declared that the Great Replacement was no longer a theory but a reality. She co-founded the Save Europe Act with Martin Sellner and has been banned from the United Kingdom since January 2026.

Her programme is the Save Europe Act, a European Citizens' Initiative. Its main demand is a full stop to non-European immigration, legal and illegal alike. It adds a European remigration system, and a reduction of social benefits the initiators see as a pull factor. It passed half a million signatures by July. The European Commission commented that it would constitute discrimination on grounds of race and ethnic origin, contrary to Article 21 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Lidewij de Vos (FvD). Her speech at the 2026 summit is the most detailed Dutch statement of the programme. The account below follows a detailed written report of the video.

She opened with the anti-asylum-centre protests in Loosdrecht, which she presented as a symbol of wider revolt. She acknowledged rioters and said they should be prosecuted, but called the great majority of protesters peaceful. She cited crime statistics and named individual victims. She said the protesters want not just an end to immigration but remigration. FvD, she said, wants four things: enforce borders, deport illegal migrants, denaturalise criminals with dual nationality, and encourage voluntary remigration with financial and practical help, including "remigration coaches". The aim is a negative migration balance that shifts the "demographic and ideological balance". She ended by saying the Netherlands must remain "the only home of the Dutch people".

She also rejected the charge of extremism. In a parliamentary debate days earlier on political violence and terms such as “omvolking” and “remigration”, she refused to distance herself from those terms and groups, while condemning violence at demonstrations.

5. One word, four programmes

Set side by side, the positions differ on the questions that matter most.

	Who is meant to leave	Means	Stated end state
WLM (report)	Everyone non-white, except a 1% serving minority	Not specified publicly	Netherlands ≥99% white
Sellner (book, court reading)	Asylum seekers, foreigners, and “non-assimilated citizens”	Incentives, assimilation pressure, withdrawal of acquired citizenship	Preserved “ethnocultural identity”
Save Europe Act	Illegal migrants and offenders; plus a wider EU framework for non-integrated non-Europeans	Full stop to non-European immigration; EU remigration system; benefit cuts	“Ethnocultural continuity” of European peoples
De Vos / FvD (speech)	Illegal migrants; criminal dual nationals; voluntary returnees	Border enforcement, deportation, denaturalisation, paid voluntary return	Negative migration balance; shifted “demographic and ideological balance”

Four factual observations follow from the table.

1. **The word is shared, the scope is not.** De Vos's four points are framed as voluntary and legal, except for denaturalisation of criminal dual nationals. Sellner's group C and WLM's 99 percent reach citizens as such.
2. **The end state converges.** All four describe the goal in demographic or ethnic terms, not only in terms of legal status. De Vos's "demographic balance" and the Save Europe Act's "ethnocultural continuity" point to the same kind of goal as Sellner's "ethnocultural identity". The difference lies in the means.
3. **The persons overlap.** The same speakers recur on the same stages. Vlaardingerbroek co-founded an initiative with Sellner. A Nijmegen GNSV chair is active in local FvD.
4. **The overlap is exactly what the report calls normalisation.** De Vos argues the opposite reading: that the word is being smeared to silence ordinary migration criticism. Both readings describe the same fact, a term that spans a wide range.

6. What is contested

- **Naming.** Critics of the report point out that FvD and the PVV are nowhere named in it, while small fringe groups are. They call this collective suspicion without evidence. The report indeed names no party. The link between the unnamed parties and FvD is drawn by others, not by the report.
- **Government reading.** Justice minister David van Weel called the normalisation worrying, and according to the *Reformatisch Dagblad* sees no direct link between politics and the far-right riots.
- **"Façade".** The concept assumes a gap between public and private positions. For WLM and the Geuzenbond that gap is documented by courts and journalists. For public political figures the report gives no evidence, because it names none. What they say publicly is set out in §4.3 and can be judged on its own terms.

7. The human layer

Behind the categories there are people.

- **Young men** in clubs of fifteen or twenty. They train together and read *De Stormlamp*. The Active Club model offers them brotherhood, a body and a cause.
- **Village residents** in places like Loosdrecht and Opheusden. They were confronted with an asylum centre at short notice. Most of them protest peacefully. Their fear is real to them. Politicians on both sides claim to speak for them.
- **Crime victims and their families.** Their names are now used in political speeches.

- **Dutch citizens with a migration background.** Programmes that reach “non-assimilated citizens” are about them. They have lived here for generations in many cases.
- **Local council members and journalists.** According to the report, some withdraw after threats.
- **Students** on campus, who meet a “conservative-national” association at an introduction market.

The report’s own closing identifies the common ground. Receptivity grows with insecurity about livelihood, wellbeing and belonging. The report cites CBS data on low trust in politics. That insecurity is shared across all these groups. The disagreement is about what it demands.

8. Findings

1. The Dutch milieu shares one idea set: replacement, remigration, ethnocultural identity, metapolitics, and the body.
2. Its carriers form three layers: street (WLM, ACD), youth/student (Geuzenbond, GNSV) and public/political (Vlaardingerbroek, FvD speakers).
3. The street and youth layers are small: tens of people, not thousands. The replacement idea reaches about one in six adults.
4. “Remigration” spans programmes from paid voluntary return to withdrawal of citizenship and a 99 percent white state. The shared word joins them.
5. The layers are connected through persons and stages: the Remigration Summits, the Save Europe Act, and a GNSV chair in local FvD.
6. The report names the small groups and not the connecting layer. That choice is itself contested.

Annotated references

Primary document

1. AIVD & NCTV, *Achter de façade. Strategische normalisering vanuit de rechts-extremistische beweging*, September 2026. aivd.nl *Why read?* It is the occasion for this article and the official definition of the problem. *Reading advice:* read ch. 4 first, then the endnotes. They form a ready-made bibliography.

Own statements of actors

2. Forum voor Democratie, “We leven niet langer in angst om ‘racist’ te worden genoemd”, 10 June 2026. fvd.nl/nieuws. Video of De Vos’s full summit speech. *Why read?* It is the only complete Dutch political statement of the remigration programme. *Reading advice:* watch the video in full. Written accounts select.

3. M. Nubé, “FVD-leider De Vos verdedigt remigratie”, NieuwRechts, 11 June 2026. nieuwrechts.nl *Why read?* It is the most detailed written account of the speech, from a sympathetic outlet. *Reading advice:* compare it with the video. The value lies in the four-point programme.

4. M. Sellner, Remigration. Ein Vorschlag, Antaios, 2024. *Why read?* It is the blueprint behind the congresses. *Reading advice:* read it through the German court summary (ref. 5) for the parts on citizens.

Courts and official bodies

5. Faktenfackel, “Remigration: Was der Begriff meint”, September 2026. faktenfackel.de *Why read?* It summarises the Federal Administrative Court’s reading of Sellner’s concept, including denaturalisation. *Reading advice:* follow the paragraph numbers to the ruling itself.

6. Rijnmond, “Celstraffen voor racistische projecties op Erasmusbrug”, 10 December 2025. rijnmond.nl *Why read?* It records where Dutch law draws the line: WLM alone versus WLM plus the ethnostate. *Reading advice:* also read the OM press releases of December 2024 and October 2025.

7. European Commission response to the Save Europe Act, via Wikipedia “Martin Sellner”. *Why read?* It is the EU’s legal qualification (Art. 21 Charter). *Reading advice:* look up the Commission’s registration decision itself.

Journalism and research

8. H. Kraak, “Gezellig bij de studentenvereniging, extreemrechts bij de jongerenbeweging”, de Volkskrant, 28 August 2024. *Why read?* It is the basic investigation of the GNSV–Geuzenbond link. *Reading advice:* paywalled. Read alongside the GNSV’s denial.

9. Vox (Radboud University), reports on GNSV, 2023–2026. voxweb.nl *Why read?* It covers campus-level detail, including the FvD link and the conviction of the Geuzenbond leader. *Reading advice:* start with “Hoe extreem is de GNSV?” (2023).

10. De Wereld Morgen, “Wat is de extreemrechtse Geuzenbond?”, August 2025.

dewereldmorgen.be *Why read?* It is the Flemish view of the Greater-Netherlands dimension, with following counts. *Reading advice:* note the actual scale: demonstrations of around fifteen people.

11. C. Aalberts, “Remigratie-conferentie toont aan...”, 1 June 2026. chrisaalberts.nl *Why read?* It is a sharp comparison of 2025 and 2026 FvD presence at the summits. *Reading advice:* it is an opinion piece; check the speaker lists.

12. Illiberalism Studies Program, “Remigration, or the Rebranding of Extremism”, November 2025. illiberalism.org *Why read?* It is the best scholarly reconstruction of the Gallarate summit and the term’s genealogy. *Reading advice:* read the section on *dédiabolisation*.

13. Kafka, “Remigration Summit” and WLM dossiers. kafka.nl *Why read?* It is the long-running Dutch archive on these groups. *Reading advice:* antifascist in orientation. Use it for facts and check it against courts.

14. Kieskompas/ANP, belief in the replacement theory, August 2024, via TPO and RD. *Why read?* It is the only large Dutch measurement of the idea’s reach. *Reading advice:* note the exact statement wording and the party breakdown.

15. ADL, “Active Club Network”; SPLC, Hatewatch (2025); Middlebury CTEC (2023). *Why read?* Together they give the origin and design logic of the Active Clubs. *Reading advice:* start with CTEC for the “why decentralised” argument.

16. Voxeuropa Herald, interview with Eva Vlaardingerbroek, June 2026. *Why read?* It is her own account of the Save Europe Act. *Reading advice:* read it together with ref. 7.

17. Dagelijkse Standaard, “Zware verdenkingen, géén namen”, 22 September 2026. *Why read?* It is the strongest critique of the report from the right. *Reading advice:* read it for the naming argument, which is factually correct.

Background

18. R. Camus, *Le Grand Remplacement*, 2011. *Why read?* It is the source text of the replacement idea. *Reading advice:* short. Read it for its rhetoric of loss.

19. A. de Benoist, *Vu de droite*, 1977. *Why read?* It is the origin of right-wing metapolitics. *Reading advice:* read the introduction on cultural power.

20. C. Miller-Idriss, *Hate in the Homeland*, 2022; C. Mudde, *The Far Right Today*, 2019. *Why read?* These are the two standard academic frames the report itself relies on. *Reading advice:* Mudde for categories, Miller-Idriss for the spaces where youth are reached.

21. E. Leidig, *The Women of the Far Right*, 2023. *Why read?* It covers the role of women influencers, directly relevant to the Dutch public layer. *Reading advice:* read the chapters on online influencers.