

Holland's own Kennedy Affair: conspiracy theories on the murder of Pim Fortuyn

Buuren, Jelle van

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Buuren, J. v. (2013). Holland's own Kennedy Affair: conspiracy theories on the murder of Pim Fortuyn. *Historical Social Research*, 38(1), 257-285. <https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.38.2013.1.257-285>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Holland's Own Kennedy Affair. Conspiracy Theories on the Murder of Pim Fortuyn

Jelle van Buuren *

Abstract: »Hollands Kennedy-Affäre. Verschwörungstheorien über den Mord an Pim Fortuyn«. In this article we will analyze the functioning of conspiracy dispositives from the bottom up and the nexus between conspiracy dispositives and security dispositives in the context of the political rise of right-wing populist Pim Fortuyn and the various conspiracy theories that arose after his murder and the effects these conspiracy theories had on Dutch politics and society. These counter-conspiracy theories revolved mainly around the suggestion that the political establishment was responsible for the murder or at least had turned a blind eye to it. The analysis shows that although a small part of the conspiracy constructions can rightfully be understood as counter-conspiracy dispositives raised bottom up, in the majority of the cases a blurring can be noted between counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives. This can be explained by the fact that - parts of - the seemingly counter-conspiracy dispositives were initiated, adopted and instrumentalized by actors from 'above': actors from the Dutch political and cultural establishment. In fact, an intra-elite competition was being battled out.

Keywords: conspiracy, security governance, animal rights activists, intelligence, Pim Fortuyn.

1. Introduction

The rather dull yet friendly image of Dutch politics with its tradition of tolerance, the willingness to reach compromises on potentially divisive societal issues and a lack of serious political violence was turned upside down within no time at the beginning of the 21st century. The stormy entrance of the right-wing populist Pim Fortuyn on the political scene heralded an unprecedented episode of political polarization, culminating in the murder of Pim Fortuyn by a lone activist originating from animal rights activist circles. The murder of Fortuyn gave rise to various conspiracy theories which revolved mainly around the suggestion that the political establishment was responsible for the murder or at

* Jelle van Buuren, Centre for Terrorism and Counter Terrorism, Campus The Hague, Leiden University, Stichtage Koningin Julianaplein 10, 2595 AA Den Haag, Netherlands; g.m.van.buuren@cdh.leidenuniv.nl.

least had turned a blind eye to it. In this article we will define a conspiracy theory as “a narrative that is constructed in order to explain an event or sequence of events as the result of a group of people secretly cooperating with evil intentions” (Birchall 2006, 34). Conspiracy theories should therefore be treated as ‘coded social critiques’ in which not only facts and truth are contested but especially the ethos and legitimacy of society’s main institutions (Miller 2002). The conspiracy theories on the Fortuyn murder will initially be conceptualized as ‘counter-conspiracy dispositives’ (De Graaf and Zwierlein 2013, in this HSR Special Issue) mechanism through which the state’s rule and ruling practices are delegitimized and (violent) resistance against the powers that be is legitimized. Further, it is assumed that a nexus exists between conspiracy dispositives and security dispositives, meaning that invoking the ‘conspiracy’ accusation on the part of the state functions as a legitimizing argument to introduce new modes of security governance or – on the other hand – as an legitimizing argument for counter-securitization moves and resistance to securitizing agencies when invoked by oppositional actors (De Graaf and Zwierlein 2013, in this HSR Special Issue).

In this article we will analyze the functioning of counter-conspiracy dispositives and the nexus between conspiracy dispositives and security dispositives in the context of the political rise of Pim Fortuyn and the various conspiracy theories that arose after his murder and the effects these conspiracy theories had on Dutch politics and society. Further, we will analyze whether and how counter-conspiracy theories on the murder of Pim Fortuyn have influenced the construction of new modes of security governance. The analysis shows that although a small part of the conspiracy constructions can rightfully be understood as counter-conspiracy dispositives, in the majority of cases a blurring can be noted between counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives. This can be explained by the fact that – parts of – the seemingly counter-conspiracy dispositives were initiated, adopted and instrumentalized by actors from ‘above’: actors from the Dutch political and cultural establishment. Political parties and media with a right-wing political affiliation seized the opportunity with both hands to promote their own agendas. These parties and media outlets were in fact definite parts of the Dutch political establishment, but hitched a ride on the suggestion that political and cultural power had been fallen into the hands of leftish elites, resulting in excrescences like silencing political opponents, protecting violent leftish activists, eroding freedom of speech by delegitimizing critics of multiculturalism as ‘racists’ and generally neglecting the protests and desires of ‘the’ people. By siding with ‘the people’ in the gap between the leftish elite and the people successfully created by Pim Fortuyn, these establishment actors succeeded in presenting themselves as allies of the oppressed people and succeeded in instrumentalizing the sentiments set free by Fortuyn in a political agenda aimed at forcing left-wing politics onto the defensive. Behind the successful construction of a political divi-

sion between an unheard people and an arrogant, dangerous state elite, in fact an intra-elite competition was being battled out. The conceptual difference between conspiracy dispositives and counter-dispositives therefore runs the risk of labeling conspiracy dispositives as counter-conspiracy dispositives which in fact are the result of a deliberate construction by closet establishment actors.

2. The Political Rise of Pim Fortuyn

On August 20, 2001, Pim Fortuyn announced his ambition to enter national politics and made it clear from the beginning what his ambition exactly was: he wanted to be the next prime minister of the Netherlands. Pim Fortuyn, a flamboyant personality and former university teacher of Sociology and extraordinary professor of Governmental Labor Relations, had already for several years been seeking the limelight by clear-cut and controversial opinions on Islam, integration, multiculturalism and the leftish political establishment that according to Fortuyn had lost contact with the ordinary people and censured critical stances towards multicultural society by branding them as manifestations of racism. Fortuyn published his ideas and opinions amongst others in a weekly column in the largest Dutch weekly, *Elsevier*, and in a range of books.¹ Fortuyn especially targeted the so-called ‘Purple Cabinets’, in which during the 1994-2002 period the Dutch Labor Party PvdA, the conservative-liberal party VVD and the social-liberal party D66 had formed coalition governments.

Fortuyn’s political ambitions were not taken very seriously by the other political parties, not even when he was chosen as party leader of *Livable Nederland* (Livable Netherlands) on November 25, 2001. This new political party was formed in 1999 and originated from local ‘Livable’ parties, which agitated against too much national political influence on local affairs and argued for more direct democratic participation by introducing plebiscites and democratically elected mayors. *Livable Netherlands* was at first characterized as an “anti-system party with a left-wing populist program” (Van Praag 2003, 101). During the course of 2001, however, and especially since the accession of Fortuyn, *Livable Netherlands* moved to the right side of the political spectrum and turned out to be especially attractive to people who traditionally voted VVD but felt this party had moved too much to the middle of the political spectrum, and to people who hadn’t voted for years (Van Praag 2003, 104). *Livable Netherlands* and Fortuyn forged a ‘monstrous alliance’: Fortuyn needed a political vehicle to gain access to the political system and *Livable Netherlands* needed a charismatic front man (Van Rossum 2003). Soon *Livable Netherlands*

¹ Amongst others *De verweesde samenleving* (1995); *Tegen de Islamisering van onze cultuur* (1997) and *De Puinhopen van Paars* (2002).

scored very well in election polls, which took the other political parties by surprise. Fortuyn's fierce opinions against immigration policies (Galen and Van Holsteyn 2003, 49), combined with his provocative attacks against the 'Red Church' and his mediagenic performances (Koopmans and Muis 2009, 651), laid the foundation for his success. Especially cynical voters with a strong distrust against the government were appealed by the political performances of Fortuyn (Galen and Van Holsteyn 2003, 31). As a result of the convergence in mainstream party positions, Fortuyn became one of the few politicians with distinguishing features. Amongst part of the population, the notion prevailed that there was little left to choose during elections because mainstream parties were too closely connected with the powers that be and therefore turned a deaf ear to the worries of the common people; let alone that these parties would be capable of resolving these problems (Pennings and Keman 2002). Livable Netherlands thus displayed certain elements of an anti-state party (Dorussen 2004, 137).

The political rise of Fortuyn took place within a riotous and heavily polarized climate. Fortuyn made bold statements about Islam, multicultural society, immigration and asylum policies and his political opponents. Statements like "I'm in favour of a Cold War against Islam. Islam forms a serious threat to our society" (*Rotterdams Dagblad* August 28, 2001), "You have to understand mosques as a front organization in which martyrs are being bred" (*Elsevier* September 1, 2001) and "I think Islam is a retarded culture" (*De Volkskrant* February 9, 2002) provoked screaming emotions and various lawsuits. His political opponents, however, kept their end up and disqualified Fortuyn as "dangerous", "a polder Mussolini", "right-wing extremist", "ego-tripper", "a political wild man", "racist", and "narcissist" (Meershoek and Schulte 2002). Fortuyn's spectacular rise involved conspiratorial accusations from the beginning. In February 2002, Fortuyn was brushed aside by Livable Netherlands after he argued in an interview with the daily *De Volkskrant* for the abolition of the constitutionalized prohibition of discrimination. Although Fortuyn had approved the final wording of the interview, he stated that he was the victim of a conspiracy. The chair of Livable Netherlands, Jan Nagel, also pointed in that direction when he stated that the reporters of *De Volkskrant* who did the interview were members of a think tank of the social democratic Labor Party PvdA, together with other journalists. These journalists were accused of conspiring against Livable Netherlands and of using their newspapers to discredit Livable Netherlands. The interview that led to Fortuyn's split with Livable Netherlands was framed as a part of this conspiracy between the PvdA and 'leftish' reporters.² After his forced departure from Livable Netherlands, Fortuyn

² Subsequently a debate was started as to whether reporters should participate in these kinds of organizations. The accusations that the Dutch media were leaning to the left and were prejudiced would surface many times in the years to come on websites and in mainstream

founded a new political party, Lijst Pim Fortuyn (The Pim Fortuyn List) and continued to be very popular in the election polls. However, the LPF also was surrounded from the beginning by scandals and turbulence. It turned out, for instance, that Fortuyn had hired a private investigative agency to screen the candidates for the LPF (*Het Parool* May 13, 2002). The word was that Fortuyn was shocked by the outcomes of the screening procedures, as at least four candidates of the LPF turned out to have serious integrity problems. Earlier one of the candidates, former police officer Martin Kievits, was already forced to step down after accusations of sexual intimidation. Kievits suggested that the top level of the Dutch police had deliberately orchestrated these accusations. “They had to destroy me because as a member of parliament I would have been too dangerous to them” (Cornelisse 2002).

Notwithstanding these incidents, Pim Fortuyn and his party remained popular. According to the polls, a mammoth victory was on hand for the LPF as was a disastrous defeat for the PvdA and VVD. Meanwhile Fortuyn complained about the harsh critique his political opponents were articulating and stated that he was being ‘demonized’. Fortuyn received a range of death threats by letter or e-mail, was sometimes called names or molested during public appearances and during the presentation of his latest book, *De puinhopen van Paars* (‘Purple Ruins’), that also formed his election program, activists pushed a pie filled with filth in his face. Fortuyn overtly speculated about possible violent actions against him and connected this fear with the supposed demonization by his political opponents. “If anything were to happen to me, they are responsible,” he stated during a television appearance in March 2002. “Maybe they didn’t pull the trigger, but they fostered the climate. This has to stop. This demonization has to stop.”³

3. The Murder of Pim Fortuyn

On May 6, 2002, just before the national elections of May 15, Pim Fortuyn was shot dead at 18:00 when leaving the media complex in Hilversum. The murderer, Volkert van der Graaf, tried to escape but was arrested within ten minutes

media like *De Telegraaf* and *Elsevier*. Publications would also follow in which it was ‘revealed’ that Dutch civil servants were leaning to the left and misused their power to sabotage cabinets from the right. See for instance: Sjuul Paradijs (2002) ‘Fortuyn: Desnoods door met eigen lijst’, *De Telegraaf*, February 11, 2002; *Trouw* (2002), ‘Helpen journalisten de PvdA?’, February 11, 2002; Willem Breedveld (2002) ‘Schijn des kwaads’, *Trouw*, February 15, 2002; Jos Klaassen (2002) ‘Lezer heeft ook recht om nonsens te horen’, *De Volkskrant*, February 16, 2002; Bart Tromp (2002) ‘Journalistiek en complotten’, *Het Parool*, February 21, 2002; Martijn Koolhoven (2003) ‘NOS Journaal ONDER VUUR’, *De Telegraaf*, November 1, 2003; Eric Vrijzen (2004) ‘Regeren: het ambtenarenverzet’, *Elsevier*, January 10, 2004.

³ Pim Fortuyn in a television show hosted by Robert Jansen; March 2002.

by local police. Van der Graaf turned out to be a political activist connected to environmental and animal rights organizations. After the news of Fortuyn's murder was announced, riots broke loose in various cities in the country. An angry crowd besieged the parliamentary buildings in The Hague, resulting in fights with the riot police. A dozen politicians were moved by police to safe houses out of fear for their security. Especially leftish politicians were the target of anger and aggression. Disturbances, however, faded out during the next few days. The funeral of Pim Fortuyn on May 10, 2002, mobilized tens of thousands of people. Millions of others watched the ceremony on national television. National media framed the funeral of Fortuyn as an event of national mourning and deliberately tried to avoid any controversy or political connotation (Pannti and Wieten 2005).

On May 15, 2002 the LPF achieved a landslide victory in the elections and entered the Dutch Parliament with 26 seats. After a short formation period, led by Mat Herben who was chosen as the new party leader of the LPF, the LPF became part of a new cabinet together with VVD and CDA. However, the cabinet was forced to resign within a couple of months, partly due to quarrels, threats and splits within the LPF party group. After the 2003 elections the LPF still obtained eight seats in parliament, but would disappear from the political stage in 2006 and was formally disbanded as a political party in 2007. During its short-lived existence the LPF was surrounded by all kind of incidents in which conspiracy theories played an important role. Member of Parliament Jim Janssen van Raay, for instance, suggested a conspiracy when LPF parliamentary candidate and former commander of the Royal Military Police André Peperkoorn backed away and stated that he was shocked by information about sexual intimidation within the LPF. According to Janssen van Raay, it was more plausible that Peperkoorn had information at his disposal about a conspiracy that was being plotted against the LPF. "Because of that he could easily get involved in a moral conflict because he is not allowed to share this information with his political colleagues. I think that's a more plausible explanation," Janssen van Raay stated (*NRC Handelsblad* May 23, 2002). Jim Janssen van Raay for that matter articulated his own conspiratorial explanation for the murder of Fortuyn which, however, did not make a lasting impression. According to Janssen van Raay the Catholic Church was involved in the murder conspiracy. "Those people were certainly worried about the risk that a homosexual prime minister could discredit Rome (Trouw 2002a)." Accusations about conspiracies and coups d'état were also recurring themes in the internal fights and splitting that would finally lead to the implosion of the LPF and its disappearance from parliament (Tuil 2002).

The same night that Pim Fortuyn was murdered, speculations and accusations were launched concerning his death. The first building blocks of various conspiracy theories were brought up which would circulate for the next years to come. Accusations and conspiracy constructions first moved into all kinds of

directions but would later on crystallize into four more or less coherent conspiracy constructions. We can distinguish between (1) the demonization thesis, (2) the animal rights activist thesis, (3) the JSF thesis and (4) the diffuse thesis.

4. Demonization Thesis

The night Fortuyn was murdered, his spokesman Mat Herben stated on national television that there was a clear connection between the murder and the ‘political witch hunt’ launched by Fortuyn’s political opponents. “This murder is clearly the result of the hate campaigns launched by the left, with the PvdA in the lead,” Herben stated (Alberts and Kalse 2002). A week later the same accusation was articulated by the chair of the LPF, Peter Langendam: PvdA and the Green Left party GroenLinks were responsible for the climate in which the murder of Fortuyn could take place (Van Lierop 2002). Five days after the murder, Fortuyn’s lawyers announced that they were investigating whether the politicians who had incited hate against Pim Fortuyn could be prosecuted (Weesie 2002). At the same time they announced investigations into probable faults that the government made in protecting Fortuyn. This last accusation would become the prime focus of the following political and societal debates. Especially the ‘pie incident’ of March 14, 2002, came to the forefront: during the presentation of his latest book, Fortuyn was harassed by activists who pushed a pie in his face and were able to escape from the police. According to the lawyers, shortly before being murdered Fortuyn had asked them to launch thorough investigations in case something were to happen to him, with a special emphasis on the ‘demonization’ by prime minister Wim Kok (PvdA) and the political leader of the PvdA, Ad Melkert.⁴

On the night of the murder, the cabinet decided immediately to establish a commission (the Van den Haak commission) that was tasked with investigating the governmental protection of Fortuyn. Resolutions by the LPF calling for the resignation of the ministers responsible for the protection did not get parliamentary approval, pending the investigation (*NRC Handelsblad* June 19, 2002). During the months that the commission was investigating the case, conspiracy theories flourished. Supporters of the LPF organized a demonstration in front of the prison Van der Graaf was locked in as a protest against the time it took the commission to do their job. One of the twenty protesters was Martin Kievits, the former policeman and candidate for the LPF who was discredited with accusations of sexual intimidation. Kievits referred to the flourishing conspiracy theories and stated that the length of the investigation was partly the

⁴ On May 14th 2002 police arrested the activists, but there was no proof whatsoever that they were involved in the Fortuyn murder. See: *NRC Handelsblad* (2002), ‘Justitie houdt taartgooiers Fortuyn aan; Onderzoek naar beveiliging’, May 14, 2002.

reason for this conspiracy booming (*Leeuwarder Courant* September 23, 2002). Conspiracy theories were nourished when media reported in October 2002 that the Dutch security agency BVD had been eavesdropping on Fortuyn (Trouw 2002b). The accusations were dismissed as ‘nonsense’ by former minister Klaas de Vries, in those days responsible for the BVD. At the same time the protection of politicians was the subject of dispute as LPF ministers complained about a lack of protection. According to the political leader of the LPF, Mat Herben, “the state could not be trusted” (Dohmen 2002).

Controversies rose again when the Van den Haak commission published its findings in December 2002 (Commissie Feitenonderzoek 2002). Although many mistakes were made in protecting Fortuyn, the commission concluded that no one could be blamed directly for this. The commission noted that the procedures for deciding whether a politician should be closely protected by governmental agencies did not function properly, nor did the cooperation and information exchange between the different agencies involved. Although information about threats being made against Fortuyn was collected by different agencies, the information was not exchanged or analyzed at a central level. The commission further stated a lack of professionalism in compiling risk analyses. On the basis of 25 incidents and threats made against Fortuyn since March 2002, the commission concluded that Fortuyn should have been closely protected by the government; however, according to the commission, personal protection could not have prevented the May 6 murder from happening. Moreover, the commission concluded that Fortuyn distrusted the idea of personal protection even when it was offered to him. His party LPF also did not take any protective measures.

Besides the ‘pie incident’ mentioned above, another incident popped up in the report of the commission that would become a permanent part of conspiracy theories on the Fortuyn murder. A police team (‘team Escape’) investigating radical animal rights activists had in the beginning of 2002 intercepted a telephone conversation in which two activists told each other that ‘Fortuyn had to die’. Investigative officers who analyzed the intercepted call decided it was not a serious threat; an opinion that the Van den Haak commission endorsed. The Van den Haak investigation further revealed that Fortuyn had been blackmailed several times before his entrance into national politics.⁵ The commission stated

⁵ A week later it was revealed that the Van den Haak commission, out of fear of financial claims, had withheld certain information from the report indicating that Dutch intelligence knew about ‘risky sexual behavior’ of Fortuyn. The same information would hit the headlines again in 2005, as a prominent crime reporter revealed secret information left by an intelligence officer in a lease car. Supporters of Fortuyn immediately suspected a conspiracy: it was no coincidence that this information was leaked just before the local elections of 2005. See: Marcel Haenen (2002) ‘Details afpersing Fortuyn verzwegen; Commissie vreesde schadeclaims’, *NRC Handelsblad*, December 28, 2002; *AD/Algemeen Dagblad* (2005) ‘Ongeloof en woede na zoveelste fout AIVD - De Vries onthult zondag op tv de inhoud van

explicitly that no proof whatsoever was found of a deliberate governmental conspiracy to murder Fortuyn, nor any proof of deliberately indolent behavior related to the protection of Fortuyn (*NRC Handelsblad* December 17, 2002c; *NRC Handelsblad* December 17, 2002d; *Het Parool* December 17, 2002; Schulte 2002a; Schrooten 2002).

The conclusions of the Van den Haak commission were rejected by the LPF, which dubbed the commission a ‘cover-up commission’ and demanded a new investigation. On the eve of the parliamentary debate in September 2003 on the Van den Haak report, the LPF presented a black book. One of the grievances of the LPF concerned three police and intelligence officers not interrogated by the Van den Haak commission due to sickness; an issue that had been raised earlier by the weekly *Elsevier* (Vrijzen 2003). Further, the Van den Haak commission was accused of explaining away the demonization of Fortuyn. The commission was ‘prejudiced’, history was being ‘twisted’ in the report and the commission was guilty of ‘subjective value judgments’. According to LPF member of parliament Joost Eerdmans, ‘highly placed political civil servants’ inside the department of Home Affairs refused to give Fortuyn personal protection as this would play into Fortuyn’s hands and reinforce his popularity. Although political leader Mat Herben did not refer openly to a conspiracy, his statements came close to it. “What is it the government wants to cover up?”, he asked on the presentation of the black book. Herben believed it was ‘obvious’ that the cabinet feared Fortuyn was threatening their position of power and therefore deliberately decided to throw Fortuyn to the wolves in spite of his requests for personal protection. “Too many questions have not been answered. We want a new investigation in order to get all the answers. Otherwise the Netherlands will have its own Kennedy affair” (*Rotterdams Dagblad* August 1, 2003; Wagendorp 2003).

In their black book the LPF repeated accusations against former Prime Minister Kok and other politicians who had declared Fortuyn ‘a moral outlaw’ by their harsh critique (Schulte 2003). Minister of Justice Donner rejected these accusations fiercely and accused the LPF of unloading only insinuations and suggestions (Schulte 2002b). During the debate a majority of parliament dismissed most of the claims made by the LPF, but decided to launch a new investigation to find out whether Dutch intelligence had been eavesdropping on Fortuyn (*Dagblad van het Noorden* September 10, 2003). This investigation, however, did not reveal any new facts. Dutch weekly *Elsevier*, however, concluded that the follow-up investigation revealed that the Dutch security agency BVD had been messing with internal records in order to disguise their blunders (Vrijzen 2004). Through the years several attempts would be made to prosecute

de gevonden diskettes’, December 9, 2005; *AD/Algemeen Dagblad* (2005) ‘Pim wordt postuum beledigd en kan zich niet verdedigen’, December 9, 2005; *De Telegraaf* (2005) ‘AIVD: Fortuyn bij reeks seksorgieën’, December 12, 2005.

politicians for their responsibility or complicity in the murder of Fortuyn. None of these attempts, however, succeeded (*Het Parool* May 7, 2007; Van den Eerenbeemt 2007; *AD/Algemeen Dagblad* June 28, 2007).

5. Animal Rights Activist Thesis

A second conspiracy theory focused on the network of environmental and animal rights activists that Volkert van der Graaf was part of. On the night of the murder, LPF member Gerlof Jukema stated immediately that a conspiracy existed to murder Fortuyn (Wagendorp 2002). Hans Smolders, Fortuyn's driver, who witnessed the murder and chased Van der Graaf as he was trying to escape, also stated that Van der Graaf must have had help from others. According to Smolders, a car and driver were waiting for Van der Graaf. Fred Teeven, Fortuyn's successor as political leader of Livable Netherlands, also declared that more people were involved in the murder. Based on information made public by the Public Prosecutor and on his own experience as former prosecutor, Teeven stated that it was "almost out of the question that the perpetrator had worked alone" (*Leeuwarder Courant* May 13, 2002).

In January 2003, Dutch Daily *De Telegraaf* launched a theory in which the murder of Fortuyn was attributed to the activist networks in which Van der Graaf participated (Koolhoven 2003). A comprehensive article was dedicated to the network of activists and politicians in the city of Wageningen, where Van der Graaf had lived and worked for a long time. According to *De Telegraaf*, the radical network was subsidized by a range of governmental organizations and public lotteries that supported civil society organizations. It was in these networks that opposition against large-scale farming and biotechnology and gene technology was organized. Especially GroenLinks had to take the rap in the article. In the 1990s, a member of GroenLinks, Jack Borgers, had disclosed that the BVD had tried to infiltrate the network of environmental activists. "If Borgers hadn't disclosed it, this could have been the opportunity for the BVD to obtain at an early stage information on the activities and radical body of thought of the future murderer of Pim Fortuyn," *De Telegraaf* stated. The same Jack Borgers, by then layman and substitute mayor of Wageningen, leaked on the night of the murder the then still confidential information that Van der Graaf was the perpetrator to the organization (*Milieu Offensief*) that Van der Graaf was working for. "That way police never had the chance to be the first to speak with the controversial environmental activists and possibly that same night, incriminating material disappeared from the offices of Milieu Offensief", *De Telegraaf* concluded. "Was this meant to protect environmental friends?"

A few months later the story was elaborated by the weekly *Elsevier*. On June 28, 2003, *Elsevier* published an article which stated that those animal

rights activists were becoming more and more violent. Police, prosecution or intelligence services did nothing to counter the activists or were even stopped from doing so by politicians. “Volkert van der Graaf is not a loner”, *Elsevier* wrote. “He springs from a movement that year after year, day after day, does not take the slightest notice of the law.” According to *Elsevier*, farmers, mink breeders, butchers and even ordinary citizens visiting McDonald’s could become the target of arson attacks or bomb attacks. “The fact that these attacks until now have only killed one man (Pim Fortuyn) is just coincidence,” the weekly concluded. *Elsevier* quoted Peter Siebelt, a self-declared international expert on terrorism and left-wing activism, who warned that actions by animal rights activists would only get worse due to the contacts between Dutch and British activists. “The British squatters and activists are notably harder and more professional than their counterparts on the continent because of their cooperation with the IRA,” Siebelt stated. The weekly further paid much attention to the connections between the ‘upper world’ and the ‘underworld’ of environmental activism. “The Netherlands is a real paradise for terrorists and therefore also for animal rights terrorists,” *Elsevier* concluded. The weekly suggested that the police investigative team Escape was deliberately dismantled because its investigations came too close to ‘upper world’ environmental organizations like *Milieudefensie*. A spokesman of the farming sector stated in the article: “More people will be killed. Fortuyn will not be the last. Dutch politicians then are also to blame. Police and intelligence are powerless thanks to politics. It is their responsibility that the judicial apparatus is incapable of prosecuting and convicting these activists” (Roozendaal 2003a).

In August 2003 Peter Siebelt published his own book, *Eco Nostra*, in which he connected the ‘upper world’ and ‘underworld’ of environmental and animal rights activists. The book was criticized for its suggestion that a world-encompassing, centrally directed activist network existed in which almost every leftist, liberal and humanistic organization was involved. However, the same critics argued that there were enough facts in the book that justified a more serious approach to the activist world by media as well as police and prosecution (Gerritse 2003; Vermaas 2003; Van der Hoorn 2003; Meeus 2003a). The book was used as evidence by representatives of the farming industry to call for a tough approach towards activists (*Dagblad Tubantia/Twentsche Courant* August 14, 2003). The book was also embraced by supporters of Fortuyn, although there was also criticism: Siebelt was working for the ‘old elites’ and was in fact a hired juggler of the Bilderberg organization.

An important element in the reconstructions by *De Telegraaf*, *Elsevier*, *Eco Nostra* and other articles (Meeus 2003b) was the intercepted phone call between environmental activists in which they said ‘Fortuyn had to die’. The police team judged the threat not to be serious and didn’t forward the information to the BVD. Only after the investigation into the security and protection

of Fortuyn by the Van den Haak commission was the existence of the intercepted call revealed. The activists making the call were living in the same part of the Netherlands as Volkert van der Graaf and frequented the same activist circles. The intercepted calls, coupled with the fact that the team Escape was dismantled two months before the murder of Fortuyn, nourished the rumors that police and intelligence were aware of the plans to murder Fortuyn, but deliberately did nothing to prevent the murder (Koolhoven 2002).

6. The JSF Thesis

A third conspiracy theory was also constructed almost on the same night of the murder. A well-known lawyer, Prem Radhakishun, outlined a Dutch conspiracy to murder Fortuyn during the popular talk show 'Barend en Van Dorp'. Radhakishun mostly asked questions and pointed at facts that according to him were at odds with the idea that Van der Graaf acted alone. How was it possible that a lone killer could escape the Hilversum media complex through a back door almost nobody knew of? Why did it take the emergency services so much time before they arrived at the scene of the murder? How was it possible that the murder was executed in such a clearly professional manner? A week later, Theo van Gogh, a popular and controversial movie-maker and opinion-maker and close friend of Fortuyn, also spoke of a conspiracy to murder Fortuyn. Especially the fact that Van der Graaf had left one bullet in the pistol when he was arrested raised his suspicion. 'That is a habit only professional killers are acquainted with [...] No matter how paranoid it may sound, I predict that this is not the work of a lone nutcase, but a conspiracy.'⁶

The connection with the JSF project was made a few days later by opinion-maker Pamela Hemelrijk, who judged the murder to be 'too perfect'. At that time there was a fierce political discussion in the Netherlands about the purchase of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) as a replacement for the outdated F16 fighter. A lot of money and political prestige was at stake, as were Dutch-American relations. Pim Fortuyn was an outspoken opponent of the purchase. A few days before his murder he was visited by the American ambassador to discuss the issue. "What if this American gentleman thought Pim could be a danger for the political stability of this NATO country," Hemelrijk asked. According to Hemelrijk, Van der Graaf perfectly fitted the profile of a "sleep-er", a hit man doing black jobs for intelligence agencies. "But closer to home, our BVD is also a much more scary organization than we realize," Hemelrijk continued. "The powers that be were very nervous about Pim, and him taking office would be not good for their interests [...] I don't think this was just a

⁶ <<http://www.daanspeak.com/Fortuyn10.html>>

leftish conspiracy, I rather think this was of much more significance. Pim simply wasn't allowed."⁷

The JSF conspiracy was then further elaborated by thriller author Tomas Ross in his book *De Zesde Mei* (2003), and later turned into the movie *06/05* by Theo van Gogh. Fundamental in this conspiracy construction is that Van der Graaf was no more than a pawn in a game of chess related to the JSF purchase. The murder of Fortuyn, silently approved by the Dutch political establishment that saw Fortuyn as a danger to their privileged positions, had the function of launching his spokesman Mat Herben, former civil servant at the Ministry of Defence, member of the Freemasonry and visitor of the Bilderberg conferences, into political power. The fact that the LPF, shortly after their entry into parliament, agreed to the JSF purchase counted as the ultimate proof of this conspiracy theory. Further, the JFS thesis was built around all kind of questions regarding 'unexplained' facts that apparently proved that Van der Graaf was indeed no more than a pawn. Various issues which from the beginning surrounded the Fortuyn murder came to the surface again: the alleged presence of a second shooter⁸, the surprisingly fast presence of the police, the intercepted phone conversations between activists, and a cartridge that was found at some distance from the other cartridges.

The book written by Ross sold more than 60,000 copies. The movie by Theo van Gogh, based on the book and shown after the murder of Theo van Gogh⁹, was visited by a large public. In 2010 the same conspiracy scenario hit the television, when the national station BNN broadcast a four-part documentary on the Fortuyn murder. Some 524,000 people watched the documentary. On the occasion of the premiere of the documentary, Ross stated that he believed the Fortuyn murder was a "simple yet brilliant conspiracy [...] I know not everyone believes in it. But hey, there are also still people who believe Lee Harvey Oswald killed Kennedy" (Ross 2010). The JSF thesis was applauded on the internet. "The possibility that the CIA with the help of the BVD recruited Volkert van der Graaf in order to safeguard millions or even billions seems a very plausible option."¹⁰

⁷ <<http://pimfortuyn.com/asp/default.asp?t=show&var=964>>

⁸ Which of course is a reference to the Kennedy murder.

⁹ Theo van Gogh was murdered on November 2nd 2004 by Mohammed Bouyeri, a home-grown Jihadist terrorist. As intelligence agencies again did not correctly analyze the threat emerging from Bouyeri, both murders are frequently named in the same breath and interpreted as comparable conspiracies: again a fierce criticaster of both Islam and the left establishment was murdered with the implicit or explicit approval of the leftish establishment.

¹⁰ <http://pimfortuyn.com/asp/default.asp?t=show&var=964>

7. Diffuse Thesis

Shortly after the murder of Fortuyn, conspiracy theories appeared on the internet in newsgroups such as *nl.politiek* and *nl.actueel.pim-fortuyn*. “Pim didn’t die because of an individual action. I’m convinced that something is rotten”, a writer stated on May 8, 2002, on *nl.politiek*.¹¹ A first conspiracy theory was published on May 15, 2002, on the conspiracy website *Daanspeak*, resulting in a ten-part series of conspiracy stories related to Fortuyn.¹² The rumors published on the internet mainly mirrored questions and suggestions circulated before in mainstream media: the JSF project, the role of Mat Herben, the involvement of internal or foreign intelligence agencies and the involvement or complicity of leftist politicians. The website *Darkisland.nl* grew into a starting point for all kinds of conspiracy theories on the Fortuyn murder. Three main arguments were articulated that claimed to explain the involvement of secret agencies and political actors in the Fortuyn murder: Fortuyn was becoming too important and powerful an actor and thus threatened the privileges of the powers that be; his Republican ideas were thought to be threatening for the monarchy and its advocates; his homosexuality was thought to be dangerous for the international reputation of the Netherlands. Judged by the amount of visitors, the website was a very popular one. Within a few days of its launch, the amount of visitors rose from four thousand per day to tens of thousands per day. According to the creator of the website, the different conspiracy theories were not only supported by followers or admirers of Fortuyn. “I think also a lot of his political opponents have their doubts about this slick liquidation,” he stated in an interview. “Too many coincidences are present in this case. Only when it has been proved beyond the shadow of a doubt who murdered Fortuyn will I terminate this website.”¹³

Just like in mainstream media where much attention was paid to apparently inexplicable issues, the internet too was full of questions. These questions were partly targeted at inexplicable matters, like the question of “how on earth it was possible that a leftist lout was able to shoot that precisely”, the assumed presence of a second shooter and a mysterious gold-colored car, the clumsiness of Van der Graaf’s attempted escape and the quick arrest of Van der Graaf by police officers wearing bulletproof vests and accompanied by tracker dogs (Van der Beek 2002; Van Jole 2002). The common opinion was that Van der Graaf was just a pawn. However, opinions diverged on the question of who was behind the conspiracy and for what reason. The list of possible conspira-

¹¹ Most of the websites mentioned are no longer traceable on the internet. Some of them can partly be retrieved by using the tool ‘The Way Back Machine’.

¹² <http://www.daanspeak.com/Fortuyn10.html>

¹³ Laurens Lammers, De moord en de complotten, <http://www2.internl.net/nieuws/nieuwsbrief/archief/2002/10/4.it>

tors was long; the entire political and societal establishment could be the evil force behind the conspiracy. Among others, the PvdA was mentioned, as was the drugs mafia, the BVD, the leftish political scene, the monarchy, Al Qaeda and the CIA. Some of the conspiracy theories stretched the borders of the at that time more or less accepted assumptions. Some thought the Illuminati were behind the Fortuyn murder, a secret sect that had supposedly been responsible for wars and revolutions since 1776 in order to obtain world power. After the murder of Theo van Gogh in November 2004, new connections were constructed. According to the writer of a letter to the editor of the *Brabants Dagblad*, it was no coincidence that exactly 911 days were between the murder of Fortuyn and the Van Gogh murder, just like between the Twin Towers attack (known as 9/11 in the US) and the Madrid terror attacks of 2005. “The next phase of course will be a microchip in our body and the bankruptcy of America. Before we know it, we will be the slaves of the Bush family with its close connections to the Bin Laden family, and the Rockefeller family who earned a lot of insurance money when the Twin Towers collapsed” (*Brabants Dagblad* December 21, 2004).

On websites characterized by their devotion to Pim Fortuyn and his political body of thought,¹⁴ the focus was initially on the alleged network of environmental activists complicit in the murder of Fortuyn. Later the JSF thesis received more attention, causing fierce discussions and divisions because old sores and quarrels inside the LPF rose again to the surface, especially concerning the role of Mat Herben. Initially the ‘Fortuynistic’ websites did not start any real investigations into the murder as they merely – just like other websites – reacted to news reports, revelations or suggestions published by *De Telegraaf* and *Elsevier*. This changed, however, in November 2002, when the so-called *Mishima-Cyber-Command* (MCC) appeared on the internet.¹⁵ This group, according to themselves consisting of various investigative reporters and former members of intelligence agencies, constructed a conspiracy in which world-encompassing connections were ‘revealed’ between the Fortuyn murder and drug-smuggling operations from Suriname to the Netherlands, the Bilderberg organization, the JSF project, emission rights and the death of former Dutch politician Maarten van Traa.¹⁶ The MCC claimed to know the identity of

¹⁴ See for instance <http://www.pim-fortuyn.nl/pfforum/topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC_ID=6970>.

¹⁵ <<http://mcc-the-truth.wikidot.com/>>; <http://the-biggest-secret.clubs.nl/nieuws/detail/137115_mishima-cyber-command-mission-statement-in-the-fortuyn-murder>; <www.geocities.com/aaactions/index2.html>.

¹⁶ Maarten van Traa was a Labour politician who led in the nineties a sensational enquiry into the use of prohibited investigative methods by Dutch law enforcement. October 21st 1997 Van Traa was killed in a car incident. For a moment there was fear in political circles that the car accident was the result of sabotage but no proof was found. Conspiracy theories on

the second shooter (Abu Fatah, a Syrian hit man), who directly after the hit was transported to Schiphol airport in a dark blue BMW escorted by police. The group also claimed to have video footage in their possession on which the murder was captured. Within Fortuynistic circles a highly secret investigative team was formed that tried to get in touch with the MCC and for several months tried to find proof in support of this conspiracy theory. The investigative team, however, was plagued with internal fights, especially about the trustworthiness of the MCC, which seemed to have gone up in smoke since January 2003. Attention was then redirected to the question of who was behind the MCC: the BVD, the CIA, 'Zionists' or others. Furthermore, the investigators accused each other of treason, infiltration and double dealings. Old conflicts and personal vendettas were fought out in the open and members were banned from internet forums but popped up again under different nicknames. Some of the persons concerned turned to alternative left-wing magazines to get the MCC stories published,¹⁷ which sparked new mutual accusations of treason and defection.

During 2004-2005 the MCC story ebbed away; however, occasionally the story popped up again. The MCC conspiracy theory for instance popped up again in 2007 on the occasion of the publication of a book on the Fortuyn murder by actress and dancer Ine Veen. Former minister for the LPF, Hillebrand Nawijn, was present during the presentation of the book to the public. According to the 70-year-old writer, in her book all the names of the 'real culprits' had been eliminated under pressure from the publisher out of fear of lawsuits and financial claims. The book was ignored or ridiculed by the main media outlet (Van der Beek 2007). The exception to the rule was *De Telegraaf* in which columnist Bob Smalhout wrote a laudatory review. Smalhout was also the author of a laudatory preface in the book *Eco Nostra* written by Pieter Siebelt.¹⁸ The book by Ine Veen was applauded on the internet, but also sparked renewed fierce discussions about the MCC conspiracy.¹⁹ Individuals who were in the days of 2002-2003 involved in the MCC investigation declared the MCC story to be a complete hoax and even declared the MCC topic taboo for Fortuynistic web communities. The only thing these investigators were still interested in was the question of who was behind the MCC, because they interpreted the

the car accident however still circulate on the Internet. See for instance: <<http://www.klokkenuideronline.net/artikel/4307/de-maarten-van-traa-foundation>>.

¹⁷ <<http://www.ravagedigitaal.org/AA-archieff2003/2003archieff/1603a10.htm>>.

¹⁸ Publisher Perry Pierik declared later in a book that he had a 'fine intuition' for books that would be well-received by readers of *De Telegraaf*, especially if columnist Bob Smalhout paid attention to the book in a review. Therefore Pierik published a laudatory book on the life and work of Smalhout. See: Lisa Kuitert (2009) 'Rellen, roddels en complotten; Brieven van Aspekt-uitgever', *Vrij Nederland*, February 14, 2009.

¹⁹ <http://pim-fortuyn.nl/pfforum/topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC_ID=51564&whichpage=4>; <<http://zaprunder.nl/forums/viewthread/8830/P120/>>.

MCC hoax as a deliberate scheme to send the Fortuynistic movement barking up the wrong tree. That way, attention was diverted from the real conspiracy and every suggestion about a connection with the JSF project could be ridiculed in advance.²⁰

The different conspiracy theories, however, kept on appearing on the internet. No new information was added, but any event could give rise to renewed references to the theories. The debate started again, for instance, on the occasion of the documentary broadcast by BNN in 2010 in which the JSF thesis was at the center. It was noted by one of the internet scribes that the documentary could not be found on the internet or looked back at using 'Uitzending Gemist'.²¹ "As if they want to disguise this uncomfortable news, so that people that have missed the broadcast are not able to look back."²² The yearly commemoration of the Fortuyn murder on May 6 also set off conspiracy stories about the "most cowardly Bilderberg murder in history".²³

8. New Modes of Security Governance

The Fortuyn murder, the failing protection and the different conspiracy constructions that circulated led to different countermeasures by the authorities. On the one hand the authorities tried to invalidate the various conspiracy theories by making them a serious part of the investigations into the murder. The Van den Haak commission stated for instance explicitly that they found no evidence whatsoever about a conspiracy or willful neglect by the authorities. The Public Prosecutor also devoted considerable time and energy to investigating whether Volkert van der Graaf had indeed acted alone. For months hundreds of activists from environmental or animal rights organizations were checked out, observed and bugged in order to find out whether Van der Graaf had accomplices. In addressing the court, prosecutor Plooi concluded: "All this shows that nobody used Van der Graaf as a cover and paid him for the murder." However, the hope of the authorities that the investigation into the Fortuyn murder and the

²⁰ <<http://911-complotdenkers.blogspot.nl/2007/05/complot-pim.html>>; <<http://stgvisie.home.xs4all.nl/VISIE/jsf-moord-fortuyn.html>>; <<http://www.sdnl.nl/aivd-fortuyn.htm>>; <http://pim-fortuyn.nl/pfforum/topic.asp?ARCHIVE=true&TOPIC_ID=51564&whichpage=4>. A name mentioned frequently in connection with the MCC is JP Mante. According to the investigators Mante is a flunked former US intelligence officer. Mante still frequents all kinds of Fortuynistic websites and is believed to be using a dozen nicknames in order to create as much confusion and chaos as possible.

²¹ 'Uitzending gemist' is a tool enabling the viewer to look back at previous television broadcasts.

²² <<http://wacholland.org/nieuws/moordcomplot-pim-fortuyn>>.

²³ <<http://www.klokkenuideronline.nl/artikel/12977/pim-fortuyn-en-de-10-leugens#more-12977>>.

conviction of Van der Graaf would make conspiracy theories a thing of the past was not fulfilled (Middelburg 2003; Huisjes and Van 't Klooster 2003). On the contrary, the explicit statement by the Public Prosecutor that the aim of the intensive investigation was also to disprove conspiracy theories strengthened distrust. "This wish to exclude conspiracy theories – by which they are trying to oppress the mistrust of the people – will not work, simply because there are more facts in favor of a conspiracy than against it."²⁴

On the other hand, the Fortuyn murder and the conspiratorial accusations profoundly influenced the security discourse in The Netherlands. Immediately after the murder numerous politicians, mostly from the left, were threatened. The Royal and Diplomatic Protection Department (DKDB) was working overtime in 2002 in order to protect a range of politicians and other public figures. Various politicians were accommodated in safe houses and protected on a permanent basis (*De Volkskrant* May 27, 2002). The political leader of the PvdA, Ad Melkert, received a cocked pistol (*NRC* May 25, 2002). Some politicians decided to leave politics as a result of the persistent threats. During May 2002, political parties and individual politicians were threatened more than a thousand times by letter, e-mail or telephone calls (*ANP* July 4, 2002). Given the huge impact the Fortuyn murder had on Dutch society and democratic order and the subsequent wave of death threats, the level of personal protection of politicians was dramatically strengthened in line with the recommendations of the Van den Haak commission. A new 'System of Guarding and Protecting' (*Stelsel Bewaken en Beveiligen*) was introduced in order to improve both risk analyses and the protection of objects, organizations and especially public figures. The 'Guarding and Protection' Unit of the National Coordinator for counterterrorism (*NCTB* 25 October, 2005) became responsible for the new system (*NCTB* 25 October, 2005; De Wijk 2012). In the next years, often under pressure from incidents, the new system was further strengthened and extended. Whereas the Netherlands had for years been symbolized by Dutch politicians peddling on their bikes through the city of The Hague without any protection, nowadays politicians are transported in armored cars, accompanied by bodyguards, and public events they attend are heavily secured.

A second security consequence consisted of a tougher approach towards political activists or loners threatening politicians. As a result of the above-mentioned media reports on animal rights activism, a political call for a tougher approach was advocated. The Christian Democratic Party CDA stated that these News reports had 'strengthened' their opinion that there was a lack of action by the authorities against animal rights activists. "By now it is clear that we are dealing with a group of people that should be monitored in a specific way," CDA spokesman Wim van Fessem stated (Roosendaal 2003b). In the

²⁴ <<http://pimfortuyn.com/asp/default.asp?t=show&var=964>>.

same article, LPF spokesman Joost Eerdmans stated: “These media reports confirmed my impression that if the team Escape had not been dismantled, Pim Fortuyn would still be alive.” In a review, the weekly *Elsevier* that started the news reports called it “striking” that leftish politicians were not advocating a tougher approach. “This gives the impression that leftish politicians are not willing to condemn violence by leftish activists,” the weekly concluded (Roozendaal 2003b). CDA spokesman Van Fessem added: “In the past everything left or progressive has been declared sacred. In line with this leftish crimes were extenuated.” Joost Eerdmans (LPF): “In the last years there has not been any attention given to the dangers of leftish violence. Even Dutch intelligence is still inclined to look more to the right than to the left.” The call for a tougher approach was converted into a high-priority approach towards activism by law enforcement, prosecution and intelligence, though no spectacular investigative results would be achieved. The political pressure to label and prosecute animal rights activists as ‘terrorists’, however, failed (AIVD 2004, 20; AIVD 2009, 8).

The political climate regarding political activism was moreover hardened in a more general way, especially when it came to threats against politicians. In June 2004 for instance, a lot of fuss was made when two activists who had besmeared minister of Asylum Policies Verdonk with tomato ketchup were released after a short detention, although they had refused to reveal their identities. The day after the incident, a man threatened minister Verdonk during a radio interview, claiming that he was speaking on behalf of the two activists. “Incomprehensible,” LPF leader Mat Herben described the fast release of the activists. “There were enough facts and reasons to keep them in detention. There should have been an extensive investigation into their connections with activist circles and their history. Nothing has been learned from the Fortuyn murder.” The spokesman of the social liberal party D66, Boris Dittrich, argued that “the prosecutor should give this death threat the highest priority” and that Dutch intelligence agencies should be involved in the investigation. “Freedom of expression is at stake,” Dittrich stated. “We have to learn from the Fortuyn murder.”

The man who had threatened Verdonk was later prosecuted for ‘crimes against national security’, as were the activists responsible for the besmearing of minister Verdonk. The same section of law was launched more often by the Public Prosecution against menacing individuals. This approach was supported by former minister of the Interior Hans Dijkstal, but criticized by lawyers. They feared a too harsh approach. Actions that used to be qualified as frivolous were by now interpreted as the first potential step towards a political murder. The Public Prosecution, however, denied the existence of an orchestrated action to dust off old and hardly used sections of the existing law in order to enable a tough prosecution against activists. However, the Amsterdam-based Public Prosecutor Dop Kruimel pointed at the Fortuyn murder to justify the tough

approach. "We have our feet firmly on the ground. The Fortuyn murder has changed the context in which we assess such threats." The spokesman of the College of Procurator-General also declared that the murder attack by Volkert van der Graaf had consequences for the criminal justice system. "The Fortuyn murder was a turning point. The prosecution is responsive to the spirit of times. The Fortuyn murder was an attack against the democratic order. We have to take that in account" (*Algemeen Dagblad* June 19, 2004; Schreuders 2004; Vogels 2004; Kruijt 2004).

Meanwhile a special police squad, TBP (Threatened Politicians Team), was instituted for the investigation and prosecution of individuals threatening national politicians. During 2004-2011, every year more than two hundred reports of threats against politicians were investigated. By that time politicians of every political affiliation were more or less used to a steady wave of insults and threats. The threateners could be divided into different categories. The category of so-called 'street language threateners' existed of mostly Dutch-Moroccan youngsters who insulted and threatened politicians who spoke negatively about Islam or Muslims via websites, e-mails or rap songs on YouTube. Especially Geert Wilders of the PVV (Freedom Party), which can be considered to be one of the heirs of Pim Fortuyn's political legacy, was the target of this category. Further, there was the category of 'confused threateners' formed by middle-aged native Dutchmen with mental health problems. They bore malice against social welfare workers or doctors who had treated them wrongly and worked off their anger by threatening ministers or members of parliament. Moreover there was the category of 'frustrated' and 'frustrated and confused' threateners: middle-aged native Dutchmen extremely aroused by increasing rents, kilometer taxes or the Islamization of society (Broer and Van Wezel 2010; NCTB 2010). Next to the TBP, a registration center for internet discrimination tried to challenge racism and hate speech on the internet.

The prosecution of menacing individuals sparked fierce reactions from internet communities. Especially on websites devoted to the Pim Fortuyn legacy or websites in support of Geert Wilders, the actions by the authorities were depicted as attacks on freedom of speech and renewed attempts to silence critical voices on multicultural society and leftist politics, just as the authorities tried to silence Pim Fortuyn by murdering him.

As soon as you publish some critical thoughts on the web, the Thought Police will show up at 5.00 AM, but of course only when you are a native Dutchman with a right affiliation who stands up for his opinion and therefore is considered to be a danger for the multicultural Islamic utopia. The past is brought to life in Holland Pravda country.²⁵

²⁵ <<http://www.forum-voor-de-vrijheid.nl/showthread.php?t=2161>>.

The prosecution of Geert Wilders on the suspicion of hate speech was framed in the same way. In addition, a fusion took place with a new conspiracy theory which the supporters of Geert Wilders were embracing: Eurabia. This conspiracy construction states that Europe is the deliberate target of Islamization as the result of secret agreements between European and Arabic elites. As a consequence, freedom of speech is to be restricted in order to prevent any form of criticism against Islam or multiculturalism.

Thus the same two-faced enemy constructed around the Fortuyn murder – Islam and leftish elites – popped up again. The trial against Wilders was interpreted as the ultimate proof of the leftish intention to silence opposition against immigration and multiculturalism – exactly as the Eurabia thesis predicted. As ‘Rudolf’ wrote on the internet: “The prosecution of Wilders fits the Eurabia script, because he constitutes a major obstacle for the emergence of Eurabia.”²⁶ Wilders also referred to Eurabia in his concluding speech in court: “Only fools believe this is an accident. Throughout Europe the multiculturalists are waging a total war against their own populations. Their aim is to continue mass immigration, resulting in an Islamic Europe – a Europe without freedom: Eurabia” (*Nederlands Dagblad* February 8, 2011; Kuypers 2011; De Jong 2011). For that matter, the same writers and media promoting the Pim Fortuyn conspiracy theories turned up in support of the Eurabia conspiracy: columnist Smalhout of *De Telegraaf*, the weekly *Elsevier*, and columnist Pamela Hemelrijk.

9. Conclusion

This article looked into the conspiracy constructions following the Fortuyn murder, starting from the assumption that conspiracy dispositives and security dispositives nourish and influence each other. The Fortuyn conspiracies have been conceptualized as constructions from the bottom up, which we have labeled *counter-conspiracy dispositives*. Their function is to delegitimize the state and the powers that be and to legitimize actions – whether or not with a violent character – against the prevailing order. The Pim Fortuyn murder and the various conspiracy theories have left their marks on Dutch society and political culture, in different ways. The rise of Pim Fortuyn was from the very beginning accompanied by conspiratorial elements. This can be explained by the populist nature of Fortuyn. Populism and conspiracism are closely connected and can be considered to be a match made in heaven as they are both centered on the opposition between a homogeneous, evil elite and a homogeneous pure people as the representation of good virtues, true wisdom and authenticity.

²⁶ <<http://www.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=2236394337487817559&postId=919817164196491900>>.

The inclination to conspiracy theories might be regarded as a logical consequence of the aforementioned perception of the elite as both a homogeneous and a corrupt group (Vossen 2010). Although within populism the ‘elites’ can be represented in different disguises, in the case of the Fortuyn murder the elites were successfully equated with ‘the left’. Furthermore, both populism and conspiracism are characterized by scapegoating. In this case, next to the leftish elite, Islam, Muslim immigrants and multicultural society were scapegoated. The riotous and polarized climate in which the political entrance of Fortuyn occurred, coupled with Fortuyn’s warnings against ‘demonization’ by the ‘Red Church’ and prelude to a possible attack on his life with the moral responsibility attributed beforehand to the left for such an event, formed the perfect breeding ground for the emergence of conspiracy theories after his death. Further, two other elements frequently mentioned in social science literature as of importance for the emergence of conspiracy theories were present: the huge impact of the murder going beyond the imaginable (Räikkä 2009, 197) and a series of ‘unanswered questions’ in the reconstruction of the murder (Keely 1999, 117-8).

However, the analysis also shows that the conceptual difference between conspiracy dispositives (invoked by the state) and counter-conspiracy dispositives (raised from the bottom up by oppositional actors) is in need of further elaboration. Whether a conspiracy dispositive is invoked top down by the state or bottom up by oppositional actors is not so much a question that can be decided on objective grounds or something that can be assumed to exist beyond doubt, but can in itself be the result of strategic discursive interventions by establishment actors estimating that a ‘counter-establishment’ position will further their interests. In fact, the main parts of the different conspiracy theories on the Fortuyn murder were first articulated by mainstream media, politicians and opinion-makers with a right political affiliation or attracted to the body of thought of Fortuyn or by columnists and opinion-makers with easy access to mainstream media and politics. One could state that political parties and media with a right political affiliation seized the opportunity with both hands to promote their own agendas. These parties and media – with the possible exception of the LPF – were in fact definite parts of the Dutch political establishment, but hitched a ride on the suggestion that political and cultural power had fallen into the hands of leftish elites, resulting in excrescences like silencing political opponents, protecting violent leftish activists, eroding freedom of speech by delegitimizing critics of multiculturalism as ‘racists’ and generally neglecting the protests and desires of ‘the’ people. By siding with ‘the people’ in the gap between the leftish elite and the people successfully created by Pim Fortuyn, these establishment actors succeeded in presenting themselves as allies of the oppressed people and succeeded in instrumentalizing the sentiments set free by Fortuyn in a political agenda aimed at forcing left politics onto the defensive. Behind the successful construction of a political division

between an unheard people and an arrogant, dangerous state elite, in fact an intra-elite competition was being battled out.

This blurring between counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives is carried on in both the reception of the different conspiracy theories and the different new modes of security governance that were established after the Fortuyn murder. Both the ‘demonization thesis’ and the ‘activist network thesis’ had the strongest impact. The ‘demonization thesis’ has mainly planted itself into political discourse. Especially Geert Wilders and his supporters on the internet regularly refer to ‘demonization’ whenever political opponents express fierce criticisms. The implicit suggestion is that fierce critique is the forerunner of a political assassination. This constitutes an effective strategy both to underline the underdog position of the PVV vis-à-vis the political establishment and to force opponents to moderate their critique. Evoking the reproach of ‘demonization’ in fact calls to mind the murder of Pim Fortuyn. Sometimes this strategy is used very explicitly. Geert Wilders for instance stated during a 2010 election debate with PvdA leader Job Cohen that for six years now, he had “had to debate while wearing a bulletproof vest”. On the same occasion Wilders referred to the Fortuyn murder when he stated that “people who criticize Islam are being murdered or receive thousands of death threats.”²⁷

The Pim Fortuyn conspiracies thus refer to the future as well as to the past: the alleged conspiracy that resulted in the murder of Fortuyn applies likewise to future critics of Islam and left politicians: assassination. Internet audiences in which a virulent anti-Islam and anti-leftish discourse is articulated interpret the Fortuyn murder as a mark of the malicious power of the left and as proof of the bankruptcy of Dutch democracy. Moreover, the Pim Fortuyn conspiracy has by now been blurred with other conspiracy theories, especially the Eurabia thesis and conspiracy theories targeting the European Union, presented as a left-inspired dictatorial project aimed at destroying national sovereignty and individual freedom. One can speak of a *homeopathic effect* of the Pim Fortuyn conspiracies: without the need to really account for various facts, outstanding questions, futile efforts to prove the conspiracy and speculations that never survived confrontation with the facts, even a strongly watered-down reference to the Fortuyn murder suffices to bring conspiracy connotations to life that point at the malicious role of the left in silencing opponents, if necessary with force.

The ‘activist network thesis’ converted itself mainly into efforts to legitimize though security approaches against environmental and animal rights activists. Mainstream media like *Elsevier* and *De Telegraaf* took the lead, supported on the political level by LPF, CDA and VVD. These activists had

²⁷ <<http://www.elsevier.nl/web/Nieuws/Politiek/267615/Wilders-lk-debatteer-al-zes-jaar-met-kogelvrijvest-aan.htm>>.

already for some time been a thorn in their flesh and the connection with Volkert van der Graaf presented a window of opportunity to criminalize activists, force moderate environmental organizations onto the defensive and introduce tough security policies. Without saying out loud that environmental and animal rights networks conspired to murder Fortuyn, the suggestion was consequently spread that Fortuyn would never have been murdered if only law enforcement and intelligence had taken a tougher stance. By suggesting moreover that leftist activists were being protected by leftist political parties, left politics was more generally forced onto the defensive.

The JSF thesis, on the other hand, while being by far the best worked-out conspiracy construction of the Fortuyn murder, never became a serious topic of investigation by mainstream media or the authorities or used as a political tool. Although environmental activists do not come off unscathed in this script, the main culprits are situated inside Dutch and American intelligence agencies, the leftist media, monarchy and the interested business partners involved in the JSF purchase. Further, due to the fact that Mat Herben, the successor of Fortuyn as political leader of the LPF, was depicted as a Bilderberg mole, the JSF conspiracy theory was controversial inside the Fortuynistic movements. A further complication was the fact that the left political parties were fierce opponents of the JSF purchase. Thus the JSF conspiracy theory didn't fit easily into the favored 'leftist evil elite contra the good people' scheme. The JSF thesis resonates more strongly within conspiracy audiences not affiliated with the Fortuyn movements, probably because of the connections with Bilderberg, the USA and the monarchy.

The same can be said of the reception of the diffuse conspiracy theories. Besides some persistent internet investigators, hardly anyone supported or acted upon these conspiracy constructions. They were ignored in mainstream media or just presented as examples of nutcases who were chasing shadows – which, however, was interpreted by some Fortuynistic websites as proof of another conspiracy: by deliberately carrying conspiracy theories on the Fortuyn murder into the extreme, every conspiracy theory would effectively be delegitimized. This case shows that conspiracy constructions are hardly effective outside directly involved conspiracy audiences as long as they are not being picked up one way or the other by mainstream media, opinion-makers or politicians because it fits their agenda. These diffuse conspiracy theories seem to fit most closely the conceptualization of counter-conspiracy dispositives.

When looking at the new modes of security governance established in the post-Fortuyn era, comparable differences can be noted due to the blurring of counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives. Enhanced security measures targeting political activists and menacing individuals were at first dominated by the post-Fortuyn agenda: an offensive against left activist and left politics. The alleged conspiracy of activist networks was deployed in a classical vein by establishment actors to mobilize popular support for a tough

security approach. Activists acknowledge that the involvement of Volkert van der Graaf in the Fortuyn murder and the subsequent offensive against activists and moderate organizations alike has damaged their movements and forced them onto the defensive.²⁸ Again, the mere suggestion of a possible conspiracy seems sufficient to have the desired effect. However, efforts to prosecute animal rights activists as ‘terrorists’ failed and in spite of enhanced efforts by police and intelligence to dismantle the activist networks, the theme of the animal rights activists’ threat has disappeared from the center of public and political debate. It would be an over-exaggeration to characterize this as a new and lasting mode of security governance.

Further, a complicating factor was that in due course new modes of security governance in the context of activists, death threats against politicians and hate speech not only hit left-wing activists but also right-wing populist internet audiences who were not averse to threatening leftish politicians or discriminating against Muslims. Right-wing populists tried to frame these actions by the police as proof that democratic order in the Netherlands had been abolished and that the institutions of the state were held firmly by the left and were being used to silence political opponents – just as happened with Fortuyn. However, mainstream media and politicians from the right side of the political spectrum did not want their fingers burnt by digital big-mouths prosecuted for hate speech, racism or death threats. These examples suggest that the linkage between conspiracy dispositives and security dispositives is more complicated and messy and should not be understood as an almost linear or mechanistic process. Conspiracy dispositives can be used to establish new modes of governance, but these attempts can fail, only partly succeed or transcend the original political intention. However, within these right-wing populist internet audiences, dynamics can be discerned to the full extent in which government is consequently depicted as an undemocratic and hostile entity oppressing the people and is therefore a legitimate target for resistance, and every security measure is interpreted as a deliberate strategy to consolidate the power of the left and to silence the people. Again it is in these circles that the working of counter-conspiracy dispositives and its relationship with ‘counter’ security dispositives can be detected at its optimum.

Comparable comments can be made regarding the personal protection of politicians which was drastically enhanced in reaction to the Fortuyn murder. The accusation that the authorities had been deliberately neglectful in protecting Fortuyn was surely one of the causes of this. However, even if these accusations had never been articulated, the enhanced protection regime would have been enforced. The shock of the assassination and the subsequent societal and political polarization were simply too large to ignore. The Fortuyn murder and

²⁸ See for instance <<http://www.animalfreedom.org/paginas/opinie/effectief.html>>.

the following murder of Theo van Gogh, the threat emerging from Jihadist terrorism and a general feeling of insecurity propelled security to the highest priority of government, supported by all political parties. The enhanced protection regime has by now become standardized and normalized and is hardly the subject of fierce debate. This shows that conspiracy dispositives are not imperative for the emergence of new modes of security governance.

Conspiracy theories surrounding the murder of Pim Fortuyn have left their marks in Dutch political culture. Interacting with the emerging right-wing populism, which has a conspiratorial nucleus, conspiracism has established itself more than before in the discourse and perception of parts of Dutch population which have a fundamental distrust and aversion towards politics, convinced that the Netherlands labors under a politically correct left-wing dictatorship. The Pim Fortuyn murder played an important role in this and has by now been mixed with other conspiracy constructions on Eurabia, the European Union, the New World Order, Bilderberg and the Illuminati. The lasting suggestion is that the powers that be – to be precise: the leftish powers that be – show no mercy when it comes to defending their privileges and power positions. Although since 2002 no new facts or interpretations have surfaced, the various conspiracy theories can pop up again on any occasion. The October 2012 rumor that Volkert van der Graaf was granted probationary release, for instance, started the conspiracy carousel all over again.²⁹ In reproducing ‘old’ conspiracy theories the internet of course plays an important role, as old stories can easily be republished and linked to other sites, by which a large audience can get acquainted with the main conspiratorial themes. Thus one can speak of lasting effects of the conspiracy theories on Dutch politics and society. However, the fact that main proponents of the ‘counter-conspiracy dispositives’ were in fact closet establishment actors calls into question the conceptual strength and clarity of differentiating between counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives. New modes of security governance resulting from the Fortuyn conspiracies reflect this hybridization of counter-conspiracy dispositives and conspiracy dispositives and have been proven to be only loosely related to the dynamics of conspiracism.

References

- Algemeen Dagblad*. 2004. Woede om vrijlaten activistes; Politici en justitie des duivels: Niets geleerd van belagen Fortuyn. June 19.
- Algemeen Dagblad*. 2007. OM kan minister niet vervolgen na dood Fortuyn. June 28.

²⁹ <<http://boinnk.nl/blog/43635/gerucht-volkert-van-der-graaf-is-vrij/>>; <<http://www.stormfront.org/forum/t916609/>>.

- AIVD. 2004. *Dierenrechtenactivisme in Nederland grenzen tussen vreedzaam en vlammend protest*. Den Haag: BZK.
- AIVD. 2009. *Dierenrechtenextremisme in Nederland. Gefragmenteerd maar groeiende*. Den Haag: BZK.
- Alberts, J., and E. Kalse. 2002. Pantser, pizza's en parkeerplaatsen; De benauwde dagen in de Haagse politiek tussen de moord op Fortuyn en de verkiezingen. *NRC Handelsblad*, June 15.
- ANP. 2002. Politiek in mei bijna 1000 keer bedreigd of beledigd. July 4.
- Birchall, C. 2001. Conspiracy Theories and Academic Discourses: The necessary possibility of popular (over)interpretation. *Continuum* 15 (1): 67-76.
- Brabants Dagblad* 2004. 2005 of 1984? December 21.
- Broer, T. and M. van Weezel. 2010. De hatemail regeert; Politici onder vuur. *Vrij Nederland*, September 25.
- Commissie feitenonderzoek veiligheid en beveiliging pim fortuyn. 2002. *De veiligheid en de beveiliging van Pim Fortuyn. Feiten en verantwoordelijkheden*. Den Haag: SDU.
- Cornelisse, L. 2002. De politie brengt ineens onbeduidende zaken naar buiten. *Trouw*, May 31.
- Dagblad Tubantia/Twentsche Courant*. 2003. Vleessector: vuist tegen activisten. August 14.
- Dagblad van het Noorden*. 2003. Toch nader onderzoek naar afluisteren Fortuyn. September 10.
- De Graaf, Beatrice, and Cornel Zwierlein. 2013. Historicizing Security – Entering the Conspiracy Dispositive. *Historical Social Research* 38 (1): 46-64.
- De Jong, P. H. 2011. Wilders' oorlogstaal en het nazisme. *Nederlands Dagblad*, February 12.
- De Volkskrant* 2002a. De islam is een achterlijke cultuur. February 9.
- De Volkskrant* 2002b. Vriendin Van der G. beveiligd; Justitietop bezorgd over golf bedreigingen van politici en journalisten. May 27.
- Dohmen, J. 2002. Mat Herben: Staat is niet te vertrouwen; 'Nawijn onvoldoende beveiligd'. *Algemeen Dagblad*, 7 December.
- Dorussen, H. 2004. Pim Fortuyn and the 'new' far right in the Netherlands. *Representation*, 40 (2): 131-45.
- Elsevier*. 2001. Pim Fortuyn. September 1.
- Galen A. I., and J. J. M. van Holsteyn. 2003. A new kid on the block: Pim Fortuyn and the Dutch parliamentary election of May 2002. *British Elections & Parties Review* 13 (1): 29-46.
- Gerritse, T. 2003. De horzel voor links Nederland; Peter Siebelt: 'Ik ben niet zo'n papagaai'. *Algemeen Dagblad*, May 24.
- Het Parool*. 2002a. Fortuyn zette detective op zijn mensen. May 13.
- Het Parool*. 2002b. Groot alarm na e-mail LPF'er. December 17.
- Het Parool*. 2007. Voormalige lijfwacht eist heropening onderzoek. May 7.
- Holsteyn, J. J. M. van, and A. I. Galen. 2003. Never a dull moment: Pim Fortuyn and the Dutch parliamentary election of 2002. *West European Politics* 26 (2): 41-66.
- Huisjes, B., and B. van't Klooster. 2003. Het wapen; wie leverde het? *Algemeen Dagblad*, March 22.

- Keeley, B. L. 1999. Of conspiracy theories. *The Journal of Philosophy* 96 (3): 109-126.
- Koolhoven, M. 2002. Afgetapte gesprekken te laat doorgegeven. *De Telegraaf*, December 18.
- Koolhoven, M. 2003. Het broeinest van Volkert. *De Telegraaf*, January 18.
- Koopmans, R., and J. Muis. 2009. The rise of right-wing populist Pim Fortuyn in the Netherlands: A discursive opportunity approach. *European Journal of Political Research* 48: 642-64.
- Kruijt, M. 2004. Aanpak OM van bedreigingen niet geregisseerd. *De Volkskrant*, July 8.
- Kuypers, H. 2011. Wilders: strijd tegen islam is mijn plicht. *ANP*, February 7.
- Leeuwarder Courant*. 2002a. Opkomst demonstratie voor Fortuyn valt tegen. *Leeuwarder Courant*, September 23.
- Leeuwarder Courant*. 2002b. Verdachte had hulp van buiten. *Leeuwarder Courant*, May 13.
- Meershoek, P., and A. Schulte. 2002. Minister kan nog altijd op de fiets naar het werk; Zes keer bedreigd in achtduizend e-mails. *Het Parool*, December 18.
- Meeus, T.-J. 2003a. Overall linkse complotten. *NRC Handelsblad*, July 18.
- Meeus, T.-J. 2003b. Let op, morgen worden jullie opgepakt, zegt een stem; Politie en justitie werden gedwarsboomd bij onderzoek van radicale dierenactivisten. *NRC Handelsblad*, December 10.
- Pantti, M., and Jan Wieten. 2005. Mourning Becomes the Nation: television coverage of the murder of Pim Fortuyn. *Journalism Studies* 6 (3): 301-13.
- Middelburg, B. 2003. Waar is het complot gebleven? *Het Parool*, April 3.
- Miller, S. 2002. Conspiracy theories: public arguments as coded social critiques: a rhetorical analysis of the TWA flight 800 conspiracy theories. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 39 (1): 40-56.
- NCTB. 2005. *Evaluatie stelsel bewaken en beveiligen*, 10 October 2005, kenmerk 5377683/05, Den Haag: NCTb.
- NCTB. 2010. *Individuele bedreigers van publieke personen in Nederland. Fenomeenanalyse en een beleidsverkenning*. Den Haag: NCTB.
- Nederlands Dagblad. 2011. Zaak-Wilders en Het Diner. February 8.
- NRC Handelsblad*. 2002a. LPF, CDA beginnen met lege stoelen. May 23.
- NRC Handelsblad*. 2002b. LPF eist hoofd De Vries. June 19.
- NRC Handelsblad*. 2002c. Wie deed wat fout rond de beveiliging van Fortuyn? December 17.
- NRC Handelsblad*. 2002d. Belangrijkste conclusies en aanbevelingen. December 17.
- NRC Handelsblad*. 2002e. Beveiliging politici nu verminderd; Dreigementen ebben weg. May 25.
- Pennings, P., and H. Keman. 2002. The Dutch Parliamentary Elections of 2002: *Fortuyn versus the Establishment*. Working Papers Political Science No. 01/2002, Amsterdam.
- Räikkä, J. 2009. On Political Conspiracy Theories. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 17 (2): 185-201.
- Rozenendaal, S. 2003a. Beesten van mensen; Volkert en zijn vrienden. *Elsevier*, June 28.
- Rozenendaal, S. 2003b. Beesten van mensen. *Elsevier*, July 5.

- Ross, T. 2010. Geen reden tot suizebollen bij een geniaal complot. *Het Parool*, May 17.
- Rossum, M. van. 2010. *Waarom is de burger boos? Over hedendaags populisme*. Amsterdam: Nieuw Amsterdam.
- Rotterdams Dagblad*. 2001. 'Ik zie de Islam als een buitengewone bedreiging'. Interview met Pim Fortuyn. August 2001.
- Rotterdams Dagblad*. 2003. Wiegel moet zich buigen over moordzaak Fortuyn'. August 1.
- Schreuders, G. 2004. Analyse: Justitie zet zwaar kanon op bedreiger Verdonk, *Eindhovens Dagblad*. June 28.
- Schrooten, F. 2002. Reconstructie: van haatmail tot moord. *Provinciale Zeeuwse Courant*, December 18.
- Schulte, A. 2002a. Bijna iedereen deed wel iets fout- *Het Parool*, December 17.
- Schulte, A. 2002b. Donner heeft genoeg van insinuaties LPF. *Het Parool*, September 4.
- Schulte, A. 2002. LPF komt met slordige en onbewezen verwijten. *Het Parool*, September 2.
- Trouw*. 2002a. Katholieke kerk in complot tegen Pi. *Trouw*, November 9.
- Trouw*. 2002b. De Vries noemt geruchten over afluisteren 'lariekoek'. *Trouw*, October 19.
- Tuil, E. 2002. Eberhard vermoedt complot Wijnschenk. LPF-fractie stelt Kamerlid op non-actief. *BN/DeStem*, August 27.
- Van der Beek, H. 2002. Internet wijt dood Pim aan complot. *Het Parool*, June 8.
- Van der Beek, H. 2007. De moord op Pim: complot! 'in mijn eerste versie noemde ik alle namen...'. *Het Parool*, April 28.
- Van den Eerenbeemt, M. 2007. Oud-ministers moeten cel in van Marten Fortuyn; Accent Dood door schuld. *De Volkskrant*, June 8.
- Van der Hoorn, E.. 2003. De wereld van het milieuactivisme. *Leeuwarder Courant*, August 29.
- Van Jole, F. 2002. De CIA heeft Pim vermoord. *De Volkskrant*, May 18.
- Van Lierop, H. 2002. Kok: Langendam overschrijdt een grens. *ANP*, May 13.
- Van Praag, Ph. 2003. De LPF-Kiezer: Rechts, Cynisch of modaal? In *Jaarboek DNPP 2001*, ed. G. Voerman, 96-116. RUG: Groningen.
- Vermaas, P. 2003. Vegetarisme als kiem van misdaad; Peter Siebelt, *Eco Nostra. De Groene Amsterdammer*, August 23.
- Vogels, P. 2004. Goed dat bedreigen van politici wordt aangepakt. *Dagblad van het Noorden*, July 7.
- Vossen, K. 2010. Populism in the Netherlands after Fortuyn: Rita Verdonk and Geert Wilders Compared. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 11 (1): 22-38.
- Vrijnsen, E. 2003. Pim Fortuyn: de blinde vlek. *Elsevier* January 4.
- Vrijnsen, E. 2004. AIVD Gerommel: Ongerijmdheden in nieuw rapport laten zien dat autoriteiten inzake Fortuyn nog iets verbergen. *Elsevier*, February 7.
- Wagendorp, B. 2002. Net als Diana offerde Pim zijn leven. *De Volkskrant*, May 11.
- Wagendorp, B. 2003. LPF eist onderzoek-Fortuyn. *De Volkskrant*, September 2.
- Weesie, D. 2002. Pim Fortuyn klaagt postuum politici aan. *De Telegraaf*, May 11.
- Wijk, R. de. 2012. *Het stelsel Bewaken en Beveiligen na Pim Fortuyn* Hague Center for Strategic Studies, October 2012.