

Biography of Gideon van Meijeren

Gideon van Meijeren was born on May 27, 1988, in Doetinchem, the Netherlands. After completing secondary education, he finished a propaedeutic year in law. He subsequently entered service with the Royal Netherlands Army and was, at an early stage, admitted to the officer training program at the Royal Military Academy. Upon completion of this program, he continued his military career as an officer, becoming the youngest officer of his cohort.

After three and a half years of military service, he obtained a Master's degree in Law at Radboud University in Nijmegen, specializing in constitutional law. He graduated in 2015 with a thesis on *The Freedom of Expression of Members of Parliament*.

Following graduation, Van Meijeren was admitted to the Academy for Legislation in The Hague and, following successful completion of this program, began working as a legislative lawyer at the Directorate for Constitutional Affairs and Legislation of the Ministry of the Interior. He later continued his career as a legislative lawyer at the Bureau of Legislation of the House of Representatives of the States General.

Entry into Politics

When Forum for Democracy (FVD) was founded in 2016, Van Meijeren joined the party and became actively involved. He served as coordinator for The Hague electoral district during the general election campaign. Shortly thereafter, FVD founder and leader, Thierry Baudet, invited him to work for the party. Initially, Van Meijeren was hesitant to accept the role as he held a strong professional position with promising prospects. He was fully aware of the potential career consequences of joining a party that was controversial due to its critical stance toward the political establishment. Ultimately, in 2018, he made the transition, leaving the civil service to join FVD as a policy advisor and legal counsel.

In the 2019 provincial elections, Van Meijeren was elected as a member of the Provincial Council of South Holland. He quickly distinguished himself not only through his opposition to climate and nitrogen policies, but also through his detailed command of dossiers and his debate style.

In the 2021 general election, Van Meijeren won a seat in the House of Representatives on behalf of FVD.

Political Career

In one of his very first parliamentary debates after taking office, Van Meijeren challenged then-Prime Minister Mark Rutte (since October 2024 Secretary-General of NATO) by exposing a falsehood regarding PM Rutte's contact with Klaus Schwab, founder and then executive chairman of the World Economic Forum (WEF). When

questioned, PM Rutte denied any knowledge of Schwab's book "*COVID-19: The Great Reset*." Van Meijeren subsequently confronted him with a personal letter written by PM Rutte himself, thanking Schwab for the book and praising it as a hopeful analysis for a better future. Reluctantly, the Prime Minister had to admit that he had indeed written the letter, adding that Schwab followed parliamentary debates closely. Footage of this exchange went viral within hours, both domestically and internationally.

As an MP, Van Meijeren holds primary responsibility for the portfolios of Justice & Security and the Interior. He also serves as secondary spokesperson for Asylum & Migration, Public Health, Welfare & Sport, and Agriculture, Nature & Fisheries. In addition, he is a member of the Temporary Committee on Fundamental Rights and Constitutional Review.

He previously served on the Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on COVID-19, established to investigate pandemic policy and its implementation. Shortly after joining, he concluded that the committee offered little scope for genuine truth-finding — members lacked direct access to the millions of requested documents and critical questioning of senior officials was effectively impossible as committee members were not permitted to deviate from questions prepared by the supporting staff. Concluding that he could not fulfill his duties in good faith under these conditions, Van Meijeren resigned from the committee with immediate effect, stating that he refused to serve "as a mere prop in a political theatre."

For citizens critical of government power, Van Meijeren has become a symbol of principled resistance, of exposing uncomfortable truths, and of defending civil liberties against bureaucratic or political arbitrariness.

Van Meijeren also explicitly positions himself as a defender of freedom of expression within parliament. He warns that free parliamentary debate is under increasing pressure due to growing restrictions on what MPs are permitted to say. He argues that precisely within parliament — where laws are made and the government is held to account — all ideas, arguments, and uncomfortable truths must be open to discussion. Referring to the Constitution and parliamentary immunity, he maintains that silencing dissenting views undermines democracy itself.

Van Meijeren is also known for his willingness to address morally sensitive or politically unprofitable subjects. A notable example is his role in the abortion debate. On various occasions, he confronted parliament with the physical reality of the Netherlands' late-term abortion limit of 24 weeks, by bringing a model of a 22-week-old fetus into the chamber. Weeks later, he reiterated this point by wearing a T-shirt depicting the same fetus model. In both instances, the Speaker deprived him of the floor despite the absence of any legal basis for doing so in the parliamentary rules of procedure. Characteristically, such interventions have not deterred Van Meijeren

from continuing to discuss uncomfortable facts. On the contrary, procedural or political resistance confirms for him that he has struck at the core of the issue and it motivates him to develop new, creative ways to present the truth clearly and persuasively.

During the COVID-19 period, Van Meijeren called for the immediate and permanent abolition of all restrictive measures, including the curfew, mask mandates, and the COVID access pass. He consistently argued that the policy did not serve public health, but rather paved the way for a technocratic control state and caused profound social harm. With compelling arguments, he exposed deception surrounding vaccines and the manipulation of research used to justify the QR code, concluding that only large-scale civil disobedience could restore democratic rights.

During this period, Van Meijeren also produced his own undercover documentary on practices at public vaccination sites. Using hidden cameras, he revealed how minors who explicitly stated they lacked parental consent were nevertheless vaccinated and, in some cases, encouraged to conceal this from their parents. The footage demonstrated a stark contrast between official policy and actual practice and illustrated broader trends during the pandemic, in which the public was repeatedly misinformed, fundamental civil rights and legal safeguards were eroded, and bodily integrity became the subject of far-reaching government intervention.

Within the FVD grassroots base, Van Meijeren enjoys strong and loyal support. He is regarded as a principled defender of civil liberties who combines ideological conviction with deep legal expertise. His supporters particularly value his refusal to dilute positions for political expediency and his willingness to address complex and controversial issues in a thorough and substantive manner.

At the same time, Van Meijeren is known to some as one of the most controversial figures in Dutch politics. His outspoken criticism of institutional power structures, the mainstream media, and the prevailing political consensus regularly places him at the centre of public controversy and legal debate — developments that have further increased his international visibility.

Immediately after entering parliament, Van Meijeren immersed himself in the dossier concerning organized sadistic (or even satanic) child abuse in the Netherlands. He has stated that there are indications of involvement by senior civil servants, including within the Ministry of Justice and Security, and argues that the absence of an independent investigation constitutes a serious form of judicial obstruction. A unanimously adopted parliamentary motion to establish a commission to investigate the factual nature and scope of this phenomenon ultimately resulted in a commission operating entirely under the auspices of the Minister of Justice and Security. The chair of the commission, Jan Hendriks, was himself controversial due to earlier public statements suggesting that child pornography should be made available to

paedophiles so they might feel more accepted. Numerous advocacy organizations, whose members — many of them victims — expressed deep concerns about the safety of participating in this commission, have found in Van Meijeren the sole political voice that takes their concerns seriously and represents them in the political arena. Despite significant pressure and opposition, both inside and outside parliament, Van Meijeren remains undeterred and continues to press for a genuinely independent second-opinion investigation, determined to persist until the truth is fully uncovered and justice prevails.

In this context, it is also worth noting another construct exposed by Van Meijeren: the General Intelligence and Security Service (AIVD), tasked by law with identifying threats to the democratic constitutional order, has classified the so-called “malicious elite narrative” as such and stated in official threat assessments that “members of parliament also propagate this narrative.” In a pointed debate, Van Meijeren asked Prime Minister Schoof (former Director-General of the AIVD and former National Coordinator for Counterterrorism and Security) whether this implied that opposition MPs or their parties — and more specifically FVD, as the only party expressing views defined by intelligence services as the “malicious elite narrative” — could be subject to monitoring by the intelligence service. The Prime Minister initially attempted to evade the question, but when pressed, referred to classified directives and stated that “no statements can be made about individual cases.” Van Meijeren described it as deeply alarming that the Prime Minister refused to categorically rule out the possibility that elected representatives could be monitored by intelligence services for fundamental criticism of government policy.

Van Meijeren is also a fierce critic of the proposed Act on Transparency and Countering Subversion by Civil Society Organizations (Wtmo), which has already been adopted by parliament and will enter into force if approved by the Senate. Van Meijeren has described the bill as one of the most dangerous legislative proposals he has encountered in his career, calling it a tool by which the government could suppress critical civil society organizations without any criminal pretense. He warns that under the vague criterion of “undermining the rule of law,” non-criminal activities such as lectures, publications, and journalistic initiatives could be prohibited, while donor privacy would be eroded through extensive scrutiny of financial flows. Drawing on his background as a legislative jurist, Van Meijeren exposed the hidden risks of the bill in parliamentary debates and warned against a trajectory toward far-reaching state control.

In summary, Gideon van Meijeren represents a distinctive figure in contemporary Dutch politics — a highly skilled legal mind, an exceptionally precise and disciplined speaker, and a politician with a strong grassroots following, operating at the intersection of law, democracy, and political resistance.