

Oslo, January 31, 2019

The Norwegian Nobel Committee
postmaster@nobel.no

Oslo

I would like to repeat professor Alf Petter Högberg's earlier nominations of IALANA, Peter Weiss and the German branch of IALANA, see <http://www.nobelwill.org/index.html?tab=7#weiss>.

The lawyers have played a seminal and crucial role in the various efforts to outlaw nuclear weapons for almost three decades. A prize for the lawyers in 2019 could be used to encourage more nations to sign on to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, open for signatures since September 2017. According to ICAN there are now 70 signatory nations and 20 state parties. Another 30 signatories are needed for the treaty to enter into force.

Sincerely yours,

Kristian Andenæs
Professor emeritus. Law Faculty,
University of Oslo

Attachment 1:

The Norwegian management of Nobel's peace prize must respect Alfred Nobel's own intention. In a profoundly surprising vote last fall Norway's Parliament with 169 against 2 MPs rejected the following proposal:

"The members of the Nobel Committee should be chosen on the basis of professional qualifications and ... must be assessed on the basis of knowledge about, and dedication to, peace work and disarmament as defined by Alfred Nobel."

The obligation of loyalty to Nobel's idea is so evident, basic and central element of the Parliament's mandate that it should have been superfluous to express it formally. The decision is unacceptable and must entail consequences.

It is also clear that the Norwegian Nobel Committee and Secretariat have promoted "a wide concept of peace" and a so-called "dynamic interpretation" of the will. This practice was defended by former Nobel secretary Geir Lundestad and confirmed by the newest Nobel Committee member, Asle Toje, in an article in *Morgenbladet* in March 2018. Asle Toje was asked by Fredrik S. Heffermehl to clarify whether practising a "dynamic interpretation" would serve the original purpose of Nobel.

In *Dagsavisen* 24.9 2018 Heffermehl noted that Toje's idea of "dynamic interpretation", was expressed after 9 years as research director at the Nobel Institute and led to the inevitable conclusion that those who serve Nobel Committee are not familiar with Nobel's intention and supply misleading information. This is unavoidable considering how Parliament for generations has not shown any interest in its mandate and Nobel's intention. ("Siden Toje har vært forskningssjef og utreder ved Nobelinstituttet siden 2009 viser hans utsagn at de som arbeider med fredsprisen ikke har kjennskap til Nobels vilje, Nobelkomiteen blir villedet av sitt sekretariat. Slik må det gå når Stortinget i flere generasjoner ikke har vist interesse for sitt mandat og Nobels intensjon.")

The discussion ended with a challenge, Heffermehl asking Toje to clarify two questions, first whether the committee's understanding would not be a free interpretation as long as it fails to ascertain what Nobel himself intended the prize to do, second where and how Toje had shown any interest in what Nobel's own idea must have been? ("Jeg har to spørsmål til Toje. Først: Blir det ikke en fri tolkning så lenge man ikke vil sette seg inn i hva Nobel selv ville med prisen? Derrest: Når, hvor og hvordan har Toje vist noen interesse for hva som var Nobels egen idé med fredsprisen?"). So far Toje has not responded to the two questions.

Reference to these articles:

<https://morgenbladet.no/ideer/2018/03/stormogulen> (published March 2, 2018)

<https://morgenbladet.no/ideer/2018/03/nobels-formal-og-de-utro-tjenere>

<https://www.dagsavisen.no/nyemeninger/hvem-kan-stortinget-velge-1.1205892>

<https://www.dagsavisen.no/nyemeninger/vet-toje-noe-om-nobels-vilje-1.1218916>

In 2012 the Swedish authority supervising Foundations (Länsstyrelsen i Stockholm) asked the Nobel Foundation to examine the purpose Nobel had in mind. Without this as a basis for selecting those best qualified to win in our world today it seems obvious that the award is no longer Nobel's prize for peace. As stated by Heffermehl in his first book in 2008 all interpretations must start with Nobel's original purpose and then one must ask who come closest today. It is high time for the Norwegian awarders to consider what this implies.