

The Nobel Peace Prize - Huge Problems and Small Alternatives

By (Sweden) Jan Oberg, PhD, director, The Transnational Foundation for Peace And Future Research, TFF, Lund, Sweden



Jan Oberg

Not so prestigious or noble

The media often describe the Nobel Peace Prize as the world's most prestigious prize. That is, however, slightly bizarre for at least two reasons: first, there exists no system or set of criteria to rank prizes in various fields in terms of prestige.

Secondly, over decades, this Prize has been awarded to people and organisations that reveal a careless interpretation of Alfred Nobel's short and precise will, if not a direct violation of what he intended his Prize to support.

A more benign interpretation could also be that it is prestigious because it has a focus on what is probably worldwide seen as the most noble or highest value, namely peace. Or, in a banal materialistic sense, that the huge amount of money accompanying the Prize makes it 'prestigious.'

A few introductory considerations

This article discusses what has gone wrong with this prize and how to rectify it to make it a truly prestigious peace prize. However, before we move into issues of substance, let me say this:

Firstly, I'm writing from the West, at a moment in Western history in which the word 'peace' has become a taboo word, a word that you hardly hear anymore in research, politics, and the media. Thus, it is complicated to have a serious discussion about what peace is or could be and to assess in which ways the Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded wrongly or, as I said, in violation of Alfred Nobel's will.

As indicated by statements made

by some Western leaders in relation to the NATO-Russia conflict playing out in the tragic war in Ukraine, peace is now something you reach only by weapons, armament, deterrence and even warfare. And, if so, some past laureates would indeed qualify the Committee, however not Alfred Nobel.

If such an absurd or George Orwell-like definition of the concept of peace is applied and believed, few will see any problems with the Nobel Peace Prize. This argument is not as far-fetched as it may seem because the Nobel Peace Committee operates in a political environment in more than one way. More about that below.

Secondly, a word about my own relationship to the Nobel Peace Prize. The reader should know that I have been nominated for it a number of times without the slightest expectation of ever receiving it. Many peace academics who are much more qualified than I have also been nominated and never received it. The fact is that while other Nobel Prizes have often been given to innovative researchers and other academics, the Nobel Peace Prize has never been awarded to a peace scholar (but to lots of (Western) politicians, diplomats, organisations, etc).

Thirdly, I have been engaged in this issue since 2007. In that year, I served as a visiting professor at Nagoya University in Japan, and my Norwegian friend, TFF associate, peace worker and lawyer, Fredrik Heffermehl, and I began to correspond across the globe why Al Gore, Bill Clinton's Vice President 1993-2001, received that year's Nobel's Peace

Prize for his work for the environment. After all, he had been co-responsible for the US violence wrought upon Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Serbia, Iraq, Sudan, and Afghanistan under the Clinton administration. (<https://www.nobelprize.org/alfred-nobel/full-text-of-alfred-nobels-will-2/>)

Since we both thought that this was a gross violation of the will of Alfred Nobel, we decided to start an investigation and a public education process, seeking to enlighten the world about just how grossly the words in Alfred Nobel's will and the broader intentions were ignored, if not also violated in legal terms too.

Fredrik Heffermehl, who sadly died in late 2023, did 99% of the work from 2007. He did meticulous research and wrote two now classical books about the Prize, the second of which was published right before his passing - *The Real Nobel Peace Prize. A Squandered Opportunity to Abolish War*. All about it here. (<https://realnobelpeace.org/>)

In short, I'm not a newcomer to the field, but I'm also not one who has spent over 15 years doing research, including in the archive of the Nobel Committee in Oslo, as Heffermehl did. But I have supported his work intensely over the years, published his shorter works and written many shorter articles myself. And I remain seized with the matter.

What Alfred Nobel wanted and wrote

In 1895, Alfred Nobel (1833~1896), who was a wealthy Swedish industrialist and the inventor of dynamite, (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_Nobel)

divided his donation into parts, e.g. for literature and medicine, and listed them in his will. Here his words on the part allocated to peace - clear and short: "... and one part to the person who has done the most or best to advance fellowship among nations, the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and the establishment and promotion of peace congresses." He adds that the prize "for champions of peace [shall be awarded] by

a committee of five persons to be selected by the Norwegian Storting." (<https://www.nobelprize.org/alfred-nobel/full-text-of-alfred-nobels-will-2/>)

That's all.

It should be enough to understand what the inventor of dynamite had in mind - regretting perhaps his explosive invention - and taking into account that he was strongly influenced by and a friend of Bertha von Suttner (1843~1924), who was an Austrian-Bohemian noblewoman and famous for her work for peace with her pacifist novel, *Lay Down Your Arms!* She also became his secretary in Paris, where he signed his will. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertha_von_Suttner)

Let's dwell a bit on the main words in his formulation: fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, for holding or promoting peace congresses, and he or she or the organisation must be a champion of peace.

Clearly, what Alfred Nobel wanted with his prize was to contribute to demilitarisation, disarmament, army abolition, global friendship, peace through negotiations, and the like. He wanted to reduce the potentials and resources that go into militarism, war planning and warfare.

The first thing one observes, therefore, is that - within his legal will - his prize can not go to human rights advocates, environmental activists or researchers, or to women's issues, humanitarian work or organisations like the EU that received it in 2012; all EU members uphold standing armies and arms factories, and some have and others host nuclear weapons.

His precise definition should also prevent the widespread thought that the Prize can be awarded as a general Do-Good Prize. But the fact is that very few people who deal with the Nobel Peace Prize, for instance, once a year when it is revealed who the laureate will be, have never read the lines above.

Many people do wonderful work in this world, but it doesn't mean they should receive the Nobel Peace Prize, which has a

distinct and well-formulated goal.

A will written in 1895 may have to be adapted over the years to what peace and the challenges to peace are today. It can be argued that it is also essential to work for peace with Nature and peace among cultures or genders. But Alfred Nobel had a specific dimension of peace in mind - not an everything-peace concept.

Hence, in legal and moral terms, the Committee is tasked with respecting his words and can not deviate from the original intention written into his will.

If a person or organisation has done reward-worthy work for human rights, there are several human rights prizes worldwide; the same applies to many other fields. However, only one globally known prize is defined as serving to reduce military violence worldwide, namely Alfred Nobel's.

The Nobel Committee's political, expertise-defying composition and role

You've read Nobel's words above to the effect that the Prize "for champions of peace [shall be awarded] by a committee of five persons to be selected by the Norwegian Storting."

Noteworthy is that the Norwegian Storting (Parliament) shall select five persons to form the decision-making Nobel Peace Prize Committee. Alfred Nobel does not state that the Committee shall be composed of members of the parliament.

Given that all other Nobel Prizes are decided by experts in the respective fields - for instance, the one in Literature by the Swedish Academy - it is indeed conspicuous that the Norwegian parliament from Day One decided that the majority of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee members should be MPs.

Find here the present (2024) composition of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee: (<https://www.nobelpeaceprize.org/nobel-committee/>)

By the way, it is strange that there are photos and names but not even the shortest CV on the official homepage. But here are the basic facts about them elsewhere:

Jørgen Watne Frydnes, the Committee chairman, is Secretary-General of the Norwegian PEN; he has a bachelor's in political science and a master's in international politics, has held various NGO positions related to human rights. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/J%C3%B8rgen_Watne_Frydnes)

Asle Toje, Deputy leader of the Committee, is Cambridge-educated, PhD with a thesis on "American Influence on EU Security Policies." According to Wikipedia, he belongs to the neoclassical realism school, and he is best known for the "transatlantic bargain" thesis: that the US presence through NATO and European integration in the form of the EU constitutes a so-called "integrated complex." (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asle_Toje)

Anne Enger, member, is a former MP, leader of the Centre Party and former Minister of Culture. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anne_Enger)

Kristin Clemet, member, is a former MP for Norway's Conservative Party, Bachelor of Commerce, former political advisor in the Ministry of Industry and Minister of Government Administration and Labour. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kristin_Clemet)

Gry Larsen, member and former Norwegian politician for the Labour Party, now general manager of the Grieg Group's holding company, board member of the World Wildlife Fund and Oppsal Football Club. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gry_Larsen)

Olav Njølstad, secretary, is a Norwegian historian, biographer and novelist, director of the Nobel Institute. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Olav_Nj%C3%B8lstad)

What to make of this?

First, none of the Norwegian Nobel Peace Prize Committee members has any expertise in peace - peace philosophy, peace education, peace research, peace-keeping, peace-making, peace theory, peace culture, peace activism, peace politics - or peace as defined in different cultures.

And as far as we know, none have been on the ground in a conflict zone,

analysed conflicts and contributed to peaceful solutions through peace mediation or other peace-making methods.

Secondly, even if a general expertise in peace were present, there is no evidence - judged from these Wikipedia pages - that the Committee members have any particular, relevant knowledge about or experience in the specific, limited war- and militarism-reducing definition which Alfred Nobel defined so clearly and aimed to reward.

Next, imagine that three ex-MPs and two academics from other fields awarded the prize in physics, literature or medicine?

How prestigious - rather than amateurish - would that be felt by the world? How serious would the respective professions have perceived if that was the case?

The truth is that official Norway, a member of NATO, long ago hijacked the Nobel Peace Prize and let politicians decide who to choose as if peace does not require any expertise, as if peace was not a science with a body of knowledge, and as if peace was something everybody could be an expert in without education or experience.

There is a very interesting introduction to the Committee on the official Nobel Peace Prize homepage: (<https://www.nobelpeaceprize.org/nobel-committee/>)

"According to Alfred Nobel's will, the prize to champions of peace is to be awarded by a committee "of five persons, to be elected by the Norwegian Storting". The rules subsequently adopted by the Storting state that the members of the Nobel Committee are elected for six year terms, and can be re-elected. As far as possible, the composition of the Committee is to reflect the relative strengths of the political parties in the Storting." (My italics).

This last sentence clearly shows how closely - and politically - the Nobel Committee is related to the Norwegian parliament; Nobel never said a word about that relative strength - and we

may also ask why that balance would have any impact on the work to find the best "champion of peace."

Nowhere is there any discussion of the fact that Alfred Nobel never stated that the awarding Committee should consist of MPs. He stated that the Committee's five members should be elected by the Norwegian Storting; he did not write "from or of the Parliament or among MPs.

In that light, the words in the Statutes of the Nobel Foundation speak volumes about the mentioned hijacking of Nobel's Peace Prize away from every peace expertise and placing it, instead, in official Norway's non-expertise parliamentary hands:

"The adjudication needed for the award of the Peace Prize shall be carried out by the committee of the Norwegian Storting referred to in the will, known as the Norwegian Nobel Committee." (My italics).

Those legal terms, of course, are well-considered and deliberate. This secures, as it seems, that the Nobel Peace Prize will never be awarded on the basis of independence from Norwegian (and allies') politics or on the basis of genuine peace expertise. One must also question whether any group of people from a small NATO country could be competent to decide about a prize that, by definition, is global in framework, scope and intentions?

In all fairness, the official Nobel Peace Prize homepage contains one article by Øyvind Tønnesson, "Controversies and criticisms" which focuses on these issues. (<https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/themes/controversies-and-criticisms/>)

What should have been done?

Very simple: The Norwegian parliament should have set up a selection committee and collected data about experts with different backgrounds from around the world and, based on that, select a Nobel Peace Prize Committee that did not consist of Norwegian ex-parliamentarians but of a wide variety of peace experts worldwide.

Instead, what we have today is

the Norwegian Parliament's Whatever Prize misusing Alfred Nobel's name and ignoring his visionary intentions about a disarmament, more peaceful world.

And thus, the world's peace movements have been deprived of the - allegedly - most prestigious prize.

Let us round off this argument by pointing out that the Committee occasionally has found laureates which fully qualify Alfred Nobel's intentions and words. The Committee is not prevented from rewarding anti-militarism and disarmament work; the problem is, instead, that it feels entitled to hand out the prize to persons and organisations who do not qualify but fit Western political correctness even in contravention to Nobel's clear will.

Among the highly relevant laureates one may mention Bertha von Suttner (1905), International Peace Bureau (1910), John Mott (1946), Philip Noel-Baker (1959), Dag Hammarskjöld (1961), Martin Luther King, Jr. (1964), Alva Myrdal (1982), International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, IPPNW (1985), Michael Gorbachev (1990), Jody Williams (1997), International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (2017) and Nihon Hidankyo (2024).

What did the Nobel Peace Prize Committee decide over the years?

First of all, here follow a few of the wrong-to-disastrous decisions that could have been avoided had Nobel's will been respected: ILO (1969), Henry Kissinger (1973), Mother Theresa (1979), Elie Wiesel (1986), Shirin Ebadi (2003), IPCC (2007), Martti Ahtisaari (2008), Barack Obama (2009), Liu Xiaobo (2010), the European Union (2012), Malala Yousafzai (2014), Maria Ressa (2021), Dmitry Muratov (2021), Ales Bialiatski (2022), Memorial (2022), Centre for Civil Liberties (2022) and Narges Mohammadi (2023).

Secondly, of the 112 prizes awarded between 1901 and 2019, 76 went to the US (21) and European recipients. Heffermehl has also identified who ought to have

received the prize. As for the US, Heffermehl concludes that 44 Americans would have qualified according to Nobel's will and could have received it during this period and that only 4 of those who did receive it were in compliance with Alfred Nobel's will.

[Fredrik Heffermehl, *The Real Nobel Peace Prize*, page 350].

Thirdly, it should be clear that the Nobel Peace Prize is basically a Western prize and a prize for - fellow - politicians. While it has been awarded to many "dissidents" in the East, very few Western "dissidents" have received it, e.g. people who have worked intensely against US/NATO wars and interventions. Daniel Ellsberg would be an obvious candidate.

In addition, politicians traditionally tend to believe that their own kin are the true peace-makers. Today, however, the argument is related to the above-mentioned idea that peace goes through armament, offensive deterrence, war planning and, if necessary, war-fighting - not through, e.g. diplomacy, the UN and its Charter as well as other provisions of international law or through research, education, dialogue, mediation, UN peace-keeping, etc.

Peace, understood more deeply as the reduction of all kinds of violence, is considered outdated, at least in the Western world, i.e. among roughly 11% of humankind. And that is where the Nobel Committee operates.

Furthermore, it has - as mentioned - never been awarded to a scholar, peace philosopher, theoretician or peace and conflict researcher who has done the best work for directing the world in a less violent direction.

For instance, Gandhi (1869-1948) did not get it, and it was argued after his death that the Committee did not award the prize posthumously; however, UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld was awarded the prize - very well deserved - after he was killed in 1961.

Among others who would qualify but never got - or will get - the Nobel Peace Prize, I would mention Johan Galtung, Daniel Ellsberg, Elise and Kenneth

Boulding, Richard Falk, Olof Palme, Julian Assange, David Krieger, Gene Sharp, Daisaku Ikeda, numerous local or regional peace movements - to just mention some within the West.

Fourthly, let me round this off by quoting Heffermehl's summary - a good two months before he died - of his monumental analysis, by some considered the most important book ever written about the Nobel Peace Prize:

He writes that, by September 2023, "the Norwegian Nobel Committee continues to develop its own prize "for peace" and ignore Nobel's specific description of his purpose. Norway's Parliament has voted twice, unanimously to (save two votes), not to let its selection of award committee members be governed by Nobel's purpose. The Swedish Nobel Foundation has failed the legal duty of a superior to instruct and control its Norwegian subsidiaries and it never implemented the changes required by the Swedish authorities in 2012.

This cannot continue, it is time to see the world's military as the common enemy of mankind and start discussing how we can liberate ourselves from its occupation of everyone and everything..." (page 346).

It should not continue but it probably will: Why?

Based upon Fredrik Heffermehl's experience and on my own, I would say that it will be rather difficult to change this - failed - prize for the following reasons:

- It is placed very firmly in the hands of official political Norway.
- The Nobel Peace Prize Committee oozes old-fashioned modes of operation - just look at the environment in which its members work and are photographed on its homepage; there is something unchangeable about it all: the vested interests and the old, well-established 'group think.'
- It is thus a political prize - with some flexibility to also do the right thing like in 2024 - but NATO Norway would be hesitant, particularly in these tense, dark Cold War times, to change towards Alfred

Nobel's intentions.

- The overall conceptualisation of peace is mainstream and realist and considers disarmament, the abolition of armies and nonviolent action and politics 'unrealistic.'

- The media have hardly ever engaged in a serious discussion; for many years, when media asked me to comment on this or that choice, I found out that virtually no one had read Nobel's will; they mostly thought it was a Do-Good prize.

- The peace movement has grossly been uninterested or ignorant of the deception and their being deprived of this prize; it seems that they do not think it is worth fighting for.

- Those who have engaged seriously in criticising the Committee's work have been marginalised, ridiculed and heard their motives questioned. Fredrik Heffermehl's deep multi-year commitment to the issue is - irrespective of its analytical quality - the example above all.

This does not mean that the struggle for a decent, legal and systematic respect for Alfred Nobel's words and intentions should be given up. It only means that the present Nobel Peace Committee's solid anchoring in the Norwegian state-political structures is not easy or quick to change.

For those who receive the Nobel Peace Prize, the prize is an enormous recognition and boost of their future activities, potentials and energies. However, we are unaware of any study that has tried to measure the concrete impact, if any, of the Nobel Peace Prize worldwide.

It seems as if the world is only interested in peace when the prize is announced and when it is awarded on December 10 in Oslo.

Perhaps its importance - its prestigiousness - is quite overestimated?

While it was considered uncontroversial before, we have managed to create a certain amount of debate around it. As with every other struggle for change, one can choose to criticise and be against something; one can also have a vision of something new

and different and work for it.

Fortunately, some new and smaller initiatives point in the latter, more constructive, direction.

The Real Nobel Peace Prize - in two more humble but truthful editions

There are many smaller peace prizes worldwide - smaller in the sense that they offer no or minor sums, are more local, and reach local constituencies, whereas the Nobel Peace Prize is world-renowned, comes across as very "classy" or posh and awards a huge sum.

Wikipedia offers a list of almost 70 prizes, all of which are quite well-known to larger audiences - albeit not as much as the Nobel Peace Prize. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_peace_prizes)

Perhaps hundreds or one thousand smaller peace prizes worldwide will do more good in the real world than that of the Nobel Committee, which hands out US \$ 1 million to one person or organisation once a year - and seems to be forgotten in between?

One such alternative prize has existed for quite some time but is now terminated. That is "The People's Prize for Peace," which was awarded between 2013 and 2020 by the Orust Peace Movement on the island of Orust outside Gothenburg in Sweden. (<https://www.fredsrorelsen-pa-orust.se/fredsprishistorik2020.php>)

The initiative for this prize was taken by the movement's leaders, Ola and Erni Friholt, who were strongly inspired by Fredrik Heffermehl's persistent work for a Real Nobel Peace Prize. They awarded this prize posthumously to Gandhi in 2015, to Johan Galtung in 2017, and to this author in 2013, as well as to Nordic politicians, activists and educators who had devoted their lives to the causes of true peace and nonviolence.

The People's Prize for Peace did not come with any money but with a beautiful artistic trophy and document, a seminar with lectures by the laureate and others, a prize ceremony with poetry reading and

an exquisite three-course dinner prepared by the local members - all interspersed by music and speeches from the audience. It was always held in an old school building in the countryside. It was humble, humorous and genuinely in the spirit of Alfred Nobel's words and intentions.

And November 10, 2024, saw the founding of a new Real Nobel Peace Prize. All about it and about its first laureate, David Swanson, founder and director of World Beyond War in the US here: (<https://transnational.live/2024/10/26/david-swanson-is-first-to-receive-the-real-nobel-peace-prize-for-2024/>)

This new prize includes a one-day Nobel-like ceremony in Oslo and US\$10,000 for the laureate.


The background is that, upon his death, Heffermehl left a fortune and a will that made it possible to establish a new Real Nobel Peace Prize. In this way, Fredrik Heffermehl now receives a kind of posthumous reward for his work, converting it from criticism of the existing fraudulent Norwegian government prize to a constructive alternative in both his own and Alfred Nobel's spirit.

So a sad story has a happy end with a promising new beginning, a new true peace prize.

In summary, peace - and peace prizes - develop both through criticism of what is - and what is wrong - and even more from developing constructive alternatives through 'positive' ideas and actions.

The new prize signifies the latter - and it is not only true to Nobel's and Heffermehl's words and intentions but also to Galtung's Diagnosis, Prognosis and Healing, Martin Luther King's Beloved Community and Gandhi's Constructive Program.

Alfred Nobel's idea - as noble and urgently needed as ever - shall never be monopolised by any government since governments also monopolise military means, militarism, war planning and warfare.

So - let thousands of smaller real peace prizes bloom worldwide so the - not-so-prestigious Norwegian government Nobel Prize will find its place as just one among the many. 

揭开诺贝尔和平奖的迷思

“和平，更深层次的理解是减少各种暴力，但至少在西方世界，即在大约 11% 的人类中，和平被认为是过时的。诺贝尔奖从未授予过在引导世界减少暴力方面做出最佳工作的学者、和平哲学家、理论家或和平与冲突研究者。”

文 | [瑞典] 扬·奥伯格 (Jan Oberg) 瑞典隆德跨国和平与未来研究基金会创始人、主任 翻译 | 胡昊



扬·奥伯格
(Jan Oberg)

没那么高大上

媒体经常称诺贝尔和平奖是世界上最具盛名的奖项。然而，这种说法略显怪异，至少有两个原因：首先，并不存在一个系统或一套标准来对各领域的奖项进行声望排名。

其次，几十年来，该奖项被授予了一些人和组织，这显示出对阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔简短而精确的遗嘱的粗心解读，甚至直接违背了他希望该奖项支持的目标。

一种更为善意的解释是，该奖项之所以享有盛誉，是因为它关注的是可能被全世界视为最崇高或最高价值的东西，即和平。或者，从平庸的唯物主义意义上讲，该奖项的巨额奖金使其具有“声望”。

几点介绍性思考

这篇文章要讨论这个奖项出了什么问题，以及如何加以纠正，使其成为一个真正有声誉的和平奖。然而，在我们进入实质性问题之前，请允许我这样说：

首先，我是站在西方写这篇文章的，在西方历史上，“和平”一词已成为一个禁忌词，在研究、政治和媒体中几乎听不到这个词了。因此，要认真讨论什么是或可能是和平，以及评估诺贝尔和平奖在哪些方面被错误地授予，或者正如我所说的，在哪些方面违背了阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的意愿，都是非常复杂的。

正如一些西方领导人对乌克兰悲惨

战争中发生的北约—俄罗斯冲突所发表的言论所表明的那样，和平现在只能通过武器、军备、威慑甚至战争来实现。如果是这样的话，过去的一些获奖者确实符合委员会的条件，但阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔不符合条件。

如果对和平概念下这样一个荒谬的或乔治·奥威尔式的定义，并且相信这个定义，那么很少有人会认为诺贝尔和平奖有什么问题。这种说法并不像看起来那么牵强，因为诺贝尔和平奖委员会在政治环境中运作的方式不止一种。下文将对此进行详细介绍。

其次，谈谈我本人与诺贝尔和平奖的关系。读者应该知道，我曾多次被提名为诺贝尔和平奖候选人，但却丝毫没有想过自己会获奖。许多比我更有资格的和平学者也曾被提名，但从未获奖。事实是，其他诺贝尔奖往往颁发给创新研究人员和其他学者，而诺贝尔和平奖却从未颁发给和平学者，而是颁发给许多（西方）政治家、外交官、组织等。

第三，我从 2007 年开始关注这一问题。那一年，我在日本名古屋大学担任客座教授，我和我的挪威朋友、跨国和平与未来研究基金会的同事、和平工作者兼律师弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔 (Fredrik Heffermehl) 开始在全球范围内通信，讨论 1993 ~ 2001 年比尔·克林顿的副总统阿尔·戈尔因其环境工作而获得当年诺贝尔和平奖的原因。毕竟，在克林顿政府执政期间，戈尔对美国在

索马里、海地、波斯尼亚、科索沃、塞爾維亞、伊拉克、苏丹和阿富汗实施的暴力负有共同责任。

由于我们两人都认为这严重违背了阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的遗嘱，因此我们决定展开调查和公众教育工作，试图让世人了解阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔遗嘱中的文字和更广泛的意图是怎么被忽视，甚至在法律上也被违背。

弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔不幸于 2023 年底去世，他从 2007 年开始完成了 99% 的工作。他进行了细致的研究，并撰写了两本关于该奖项的经典著作，其中第二本就在他去世前出版——《真正的诺贝尔和平奖：被浪费的废除战争的机会》。

简而言之，我不是这个领域的新手，但我也像赫弗梅尔那样花了 15 年以上的时间进行研究，包括对奥斯陆诺贝尔委员会的档案进行研究。但我多年来一直大力支持他的工作，出版了他的短篇作品，自己也写了许多短文。我一直在关注此事。

阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的所欲和所写是什么

1895 年，阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔（1833 ~ 1896 年）是瑞典富裕的实业家和炸药的发明者。

他将自己的捐赠分成若干部分，如文学和医学，并在遗嘱中一一列出。在此，他对和平部分的措辞简洁明了：“……还有一部分捐给为促进各国间的友爱、废除或裁减常备军以及建立和促进和平大会做出最大或最多贡献的人”。他还说，“和平卫士奖（应）由挪威议会选出的五人委员会颁发”。

仅此而已。

我们应该足以理解这位炸药发明者的想法——也许他对自己的爆炸发明感到遗憾——并考虑到他深受别尔萨·冯·苏特内（1943 ~ 1924 年）这

位朋友的影响，苏特内是奥地利波希米亚贵妇，因其和平主义小说《放下武器》而闻名于世。她还成为他在巴黎的秘书，在那里他签署了自己的遗嘱。

让我们来谈谈他的表述中的主要词句：国与国之间的友爱，为废除或裁减常备军，为举行或促进和平大会，以及他或她或该组织必须是和平的捍卫者。

显然，阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔希望通过他的奖项为非军事化、裁军、废除军队、全球友谊、通过谈判实现和平等做出贡献。他希望减少用于军国主义、战争计划和战争的潜力和资源。

因此，首先要注意的是——在他的合法遗嘱范围内——他的奖项不能颁给人权倡导者、环保活动家或研究人员，也不能颁给妇女问题、人道主义工作或像欧盟这样在 2012 年获得该奖项的组织；所有欧盟成员国都拥有常备军和军火工厂，有些国家则拥有核武器。

他的精确定义也应防止人们普遍认为该奖项可以作为一般的公益奖项颁发。但事实上，与诺贝尔和平奖打交道的人，比如每年揭晓获奖者时，很少有人读过上面这几句话。

许多人在这个世界上做了出色的工作，但这并不意味着他们应该获得诺贝尔和平奖，因为诺贝尔和平奖有着明确而清晰的目标。

写于 1895 年的遗嘱可能需要经过多年的调整才能适应当今的和平与和平所面临的挑战。可以说，致力于与自然和平相处、不同文化或性别间的和平也是至关重要的。但是，阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔心目中的和平是特定层面的和平，而不是一切概念的和平。

因此，在法律和道德方面，委员会的任务是尊重他的意愿，不能偏离他写入遗嘱的初衷。

如果一个人或一个组织在人权方面做出了值得奖励的工作，全世界就会有几个人权奖；这同样适用于许多其他领

域。然而，只有一个全球知名的奖项被定义为有助于减少世界范围内的军事暴力，那就是阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔和平奖。

诺贝尔奖委员会的政治性、违反专业知识的组成和作用

您已经读过诺贝尔的上述文字，大意是“和平捍卫者奖（应）由挪威议会选出的五人委员会颁发”。

值得注意的是，挪威议会将选出五人组成诺贝尔和平奖决策委员会。阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔没有说明委员会应由议会议员组成。

鉴于所有其他诺贝尔奖都是由相关领域的专家决定的，例如文学奖是由瑞典学院决定的，因此挪威议会从一开始就决定诺贝尔和平奖委员会的大多数成员应是国会议员，这一点确实很明显。

顺便说一句，奇怪的是，官方主页上有照片和姓名，却连最简短的简历都没有。以下是他们在其他地方的基本情况：

委员会主席于尔根·瓦特纳·弗里德内斯（Jørgen Watne Frydnes）是挪威笔会秘书长；他拥有政治学学士学位和国际政治学硕士学位，曾在多个非政府组织中担任与人权有关的职务。

委员会副主席阿斯勒·托耶（Asle Toje）毕业于剑桥大学，博士论文题目是“美国对欧盟安全政策的影响”。根据维基百科，他属于新古典主义现实主义学派，其最著名的“跨大西洋交易”理论是：美国通过北约的存在和以欧盟为形式的欧洲一体化构成了所谓的“一体化的综合体”。

安妮·恩格尔（Anne Enger），曾任国会议员、中间党领导人和前文化部长。

克里斯汀·克莱梅特（Kristin Clemet），挪威保守党前议员、商学士、工业部前政治顾问、政府行政和劳动大臣。

格里·拉森（Gry Larsen），挪威工党成员和前政治家，现任格里格集团控股公司总经理、世界自然基金会和奥普萨足球俱乐部董事会成员。

奥拉夫·牛尔斯塔德（Olav Njølstad），秘书，挪威历史学家、传记作家和小说家，诺贝尔研究所所长。

如何看待这个问题？

首先，挪威诺贝尔和平奖委员会成员都不具备和平方面的专业知识——和平哲学、和平教育、和平研究、维持和平、缔造和平、和平理论、和平文化、和平行动主义、和平政治——或不同文化中定义的和平。

而且，据我们所知，没有任何一位诺贝尔和平奖获得者曾在冲突地区实地考察、分析冲突并通过和平调解或其他缔造和平的方法促进和平解决。

其次，即使委员会成员具有和平方面的一般专业知识，但从维基百科的这些页面来看，没有证据表明委员会成员对阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔明确定义并旨在奖励的减少战争和军国主义的具体、有限的定义具有任何特别的、相关的知识或经验。

再设想一下，由三位前国会议员和两位来自其他领域的学者授予物理学、文学或医学奖？

世人会觉得这有多高的声望，而不是业余的？如果是这样的话，各行各业会觉得有多严肃？

事实是，作为北约成员国的挪威官方很久以前就劫持了诺贝尔和平奖，让政治家来决定选择谁，好像和平不需要任何专业知识，好像和平不是一门有知识体系的科学，好像和平不需要教育或

经验，每个人都可以成为和平专家。

“根据阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的遗嘱，和平卫士奖由一个由挪威议会选出的五人组成的委员会颁发。挪威议会随后通过的规则规定，诺贝尔奖委员会成员任期六年，可连选连任。委员会的组



挪威诺贝尔和平奖委员会成员都不具备和平方面的专业知识——和平哲学、和平教育、和平研究、维持和平、缔造和平、和平理论、和平文化、和平行动主义、和平政治——或不同文化中定义的和平

成应尽可能反映各政党在议会中的相对实力”！

最后一句话清楚地表明了诺贝尔奖委员会与挪威议会在政治上的密切关系；诺贝尔对这种相对优势只字未提——我们也可以问，为什么这种平衡会对寻找最佳“和平卫士”的工作产生影响。

阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔从未说过授奖委员会应由国会议员组成，这一点在任何地方都没有得到讨论。他说，委员会的五名成员应由挪威议会选举产生；他没有写“来自议会或由议会或在议员中选举产生”。

有鉴于此，《诺贝尔基金会章程》中的文字充分说明，诺贝尔和平奖已被劫持，从每一位和平专家手中夺走，转而落入挪威官方非专业议员之手：

“颁发和平奖所需的评审工作应由遗嘱中提到的挪威议会委员会，即挪威诺贝尔奖委员会进行”！

当然，这些法律条款是经过深思熟虑的。这似乎确保了诺贝尔和平奖永远不会在独立于挪威（及盟国）政

治或真正的和平专业知识的基础上颁发。我们还必须质疑，来自北约一个小国的任何一群人是否有能力决定一个从定义上看在框架、范围和意图上都是全球性的奖项？

平心而论，诺贝尔和平奖官方主页上

有一篇由聿文德·图内孙（Øyvind Tønnesson）撰写的文章，题为“争议与批评”，其中重点讨论了这些问题。

应该怎么做？

很简单：挪威议会本应成立一个遴选委员会，收集世界各地具有不同背景的专家的资料，并在此基础上选出

一个诺贝尔和平奖委员会，该委员会不应由挪威前议员组成，而应由世界各地的各类和平专家组成。

相反，我们今天看到的是挪威议会滥用阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔名字的所谓和平奖，无视他关于建立一个裁军的、更加和平的世界的远见卓识。

因此，世界和平运动被剥夺了这个据称是最负盛名的奖项。

让我们指出，委员会偶尔也会发现一些完全符合阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的意图和言辞的获奖者。委员会并不是不能奖励反军国主义和裁军工作，问题是它认为有权把奖颁给不符合条件但符合西方政治正确的个人和组织，甚至违背诺贝尔的明确意愿。

在与此相关的获奖者中，我们可以提到别尔萨·冯·苏特内（Bertha von Suttner）（1905年），国际和平局（International Peace Bureau）（1910年），约翰·莫特（John Mott）（1946年），菲利普·诺埃尔-贝克（Philip Noel-Baker）（1959年），达格·哈马舍尔

德 (Dag Hammarskjöld) (1961 年), 马丁·路德·金 (Martin Luther King, Jr.) (1964 年)、阿尔瓦·米达尔 (1982 年)、国际防止核战争医生组织 (IPPNW) (1985 年)、米哈伊尔·戈尔巴乔夫 (1990 年)、乔迪·威廉姆斯 (1997 年)、国际废除核武器运动 (2017 年) 和日本原子弹氢弹受害者协会 (2024 年)。

诺贝尔和平奖委员会多年来做出了哪些决定？

首先，以下是一些错误到灾难性的决定，如果诺贝尔的意愿得到尊重，这些决定本来是可以避免的：国际劳工组织 (1969 年)、亨利·基辛格 (1973 年)、特蕾莎修女 (1979 年)、埃利·维塞尔 (1986 年)、希林·艾巴迪 (2003 年)、政府间气候变化专门委员会 (2007 年)、马尔蒂·阿赫蒂萨里 (2008 年)、巴拉克·奥巴马 (2009 年)、刘晓波 (2010 年)、欧盟 (2012 年)、马拉拉·优素福扎伊 (2014 年)、玛丽亚·雷萨 (2021 年)、德米特里·穆拉托夫 (2021 年)、阿莱士·比亚利斯基 (2022 年)、纪念 (2022 年)、公民自由中心 (2022 年) 和纳尔格斯·穆罕默迪 (2023 年)。

其次，在 1901 年至 2019 年期间颁发的 112 个奖项中，有 76 个颁给了美国 (21 个) 和欧洲获奖者。赫弗梅尔还指出了哪些人应该获奖。至于美国，赫弗梅尔得出的结论是，在这个时期，本来有 44 名美国人被证明符合诺贝尔的遗愿并可以获得该奖。然而，在上述获奖的这些人中，只有 4 人符合阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的遗嘱。

第三，应该明确的是，诺贝尔和平奖基本上是一个西方奖项，是给政治家的奖项。虽然东方的许多“持不同政见者”都曾获此殊荣，但西方的“持不同政见者”却很少获此殊荣，比如那些极力反对美国 / 北约战争和干预的

人。丹尼尔·埃尔斯伯格就是一个明显的候选人。

此外，政治家们历来倾向于认为自己的亲属才是真正的和平缔造者。然而，今天的争论与上述观点有关，即和平是通过军备、进攻性威慑、战争计划以及必要时的战争来实现的，而不是通过外交、联合国及其《宪章》以及国际法规定的其他规定或通过研究、教育、对话、调解、联合国维和行动等来实现的。

和平，更深层次的理解是减少各种暴力，至少在西方世界，即在大约 11% 的人类中，和平被认为是过时的。而这正是诺贝尔奖委员会的工作范围。

此外，如前所述，诺贝尔奖从未授予过在引导世界减少暴力方面做出最佳工作的学者、和平哲学家、理论家或和平与冲突研究者。

例如，甘地 (1869 ~ 1948 年) 没有获得诺贝尔和平奖，而且在他死后，有人认为委员会没有追授该奖；但是，联合国秘书长达格·哈马舍尔德在 1961 年遇害后获得了诺贝尔和平奖——这是当之无愧的。

在其他有资格但从未获得或将要获得诺贝尔和平奖的人中，我想提及约翰·加尔通、丹尼尔·埃尔斯伯格、伊莉斯和肯尼斯·博尔丁、理查德·福尔克、奥洛夫·帕尔梅、朱利安·阿桑奇、戴维·克里格、吉恩·夏普、池田大作和众多地方或地区和平运动——仅提及西方的一些人。

第四，让我引用赫弗梅尔在去世前两个月对他的不朽的分析所作的总结来结束这篇文章，有些人认为这是对诺贝尔和平奖有史以来最重要的著作：

他写道，到 2023 年 9 月，“挪威诺贝尔委员会继续制定自己的‘和平’奖，而无视诺贝尔对其目的的具体描述。挪威议会曾两次投票，一致同意（除两票外）不按照诺贝尔的宗旨来选择评奖委员会成员。瑞典诺贝尔基金会没有履行

上级指示和控制其挪威子公司的法律义务，也从未按照瑞典当局的要求在 2012 年进行改革。

这种情况不能再继续下去了，是时候将世界军事视为人类的共同敌人，并开始讨论如何将我们从它对每个人和每件事的占领中解放出来了……”（第 346 页）。

这种情况不应该继续下去，但很可能继续下去：为什么？

根据弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔和我自己的经验，我认为要改变这一失败的奖项是相当困难的，原因如下：

- 它被牢牢地掌握在挪威官方政治机构的手中。

- 诺贝尔和平奖委员会散发着老式运作模式的气息——看看其成员的工作环境和主页上的照片就知道了；这一切都有一些不可改变的东西：既得利益和老式的、根深蒂固的“群体思维”。

- 因此，这是一个政治奖项——或者可以具有一定的灵活性，比如在 2024 年做正确的事情——但挪威北约会犹豫不决，特别是在这个紧张、黑暗的冷战时期，是否要向阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的意图转变。

- 和平的总体概念是主流和现实主义的，认为裁军、废除军队以及非暴力行动和政治是“不现实的”。

- 媒体几乎没有进行过认真的讨论；多年来，当媒体要求我对这个或那个选择发表评论时，我发现几乎没有人读过诺贝尔的遗嘱；他们大多认为这是一个公益奖。

- 和平运动对这一欺骗和他们被剥夺这一奖项的情况极不关心或一无所知；他们似乎认为这不值得为之奋斗。

- 那些认真参与批评委员会工作的人被边缘化，遭到嘲笑，他们的动机也受到质疑。弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔多年来对这一问题的深入研究——无论其分

析质量如何——都是最重要的榜样。

这并不意味着应该放弃为体面、合法和系统地尊重阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的言论和意图而进行的斗争。这并不意味着，目前诺贝尔和平奖委员会在挪威国家政治结构中的稳固地位不容易改变，也不可能迅速改变。

对于那些获得诺贝尔和平奖的人来说，该奖项是对他们未来活动、潜力和精力的巨大认可和推动。然而，我们并不知道有任何研究试图衡量诺贝尔和平奖在世界范围内的具体影响（如果有的话）。

似乎只有在诺贝尔和平奖宣布和12月10日在奥斯陆颁奖时，世界才会对和平感兴趣。

也许它的重要性——它的声望——被高估了？

虽然以前人们认为它没有争议，但我们还是设法围绕它展开了一定程度的辩论。就像其他所有争取变革的斗争一样，人们可以选择批评和反对某些东西；也可以对新的和不同的东西有一种憧憬，并为之努力。

幸运的是，一些新的、规模较小的倡议指向了后一个更具建设性的方向。

真正的诺贝尔和平奖——两个更简陋但更真实的版本

世界上有许多规模较小的和平奖——规模较小是因为它们不提供奖金或奖金较少，更具有地方性，影响的也是地方选区，而诺贝尔和平奖则举世闻名，显得非常“高雅”或豪华，并颁发巨额奖金。

维基百科提供了一份近70个奖项的清单，所有这些奖项都为更多的受众

所熟知——尽管不如诺贝尔和平奖。

诺贝尔奖委员会每年向一个人或一个组织颁发100万美元的奖金——似乎在此之外就被遗忘了——相比之下，也许全世界数百或一千个小型和平奖在现实世界中会发挥更大的作用？

有一个这样的替代奖项已经存在了相当长的一段时间，但现在已经终止。



就像其他所有争取变革的斗争一样，人们可以选择批评和反对某些东西；也可以对新的和不同的东西有一种憧憬，并为之努力

这就是“人民和平奖”，由瑞典哥德堡郊外奥鲁斯特岛的奥鲁斯特和平运动在2013年至2020年期间颁发。

该运动的领导人奥拉（Ola）和埃尼·弗里霍尔特（Erni Friholt）受到弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔为设立真正的诺贝尔和平奖所做的不懈努力的强烈激励，提出了设立该奖项的倡议。他们于2015年将此奖追授给甘地，2017年追授给约翰·加尔通，2013年追授给本文作者，并将此奖追授给毕生致力于真正和平与非暴力事业的北欧政治家、活动家和教育家。

人民和平奖不附带任何奖金，但提供制作精美的艺术奖杯和文件、由获奖者和其他人士主讲的研讨会、包含诗歌朗诵的颁奖仪式以及由当地成员准备的精致的三道菜晚餐——所有这些都穿插在音乐和观众致辞中。活动总是在乡间的一所旧校舍里举行。它谦逊、幽默，真正体现了阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的精神和意图。

2024年11月10日，一个新的真

正的诺贝尔和平奖成立了。该奖的首位获奖者是——美国“超越战争的世界”组织的创始人兼主任大卫·斯旺森。

这一新奖项包括在奥斯陆举行为期一天的类似诺贝尔奖的仪式，并向获奖者颁发10000美元奖金。

其背景是，赫弗梅尔在去世后留下了一笔财产和一份遗嘱，使设立一个新的

真正的诺贝尔和平奖成为可能。这样，弗雷德里克·赫弗梅尔现在因他的工作而获得了一种死后奖励，从批评挪威政府现有的虚假奖项转变成了一种具有建设性的替代方案，既体现了

他本人的精神，也体现了阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的精神。

因此，一个悲伤的故事有了一个圆满的结局，一个充满希望的新开端，一个新的真正的和平奖。

总之，和平——以及和平奖——既是通过现状和错误的批判发展起来的，更是通过“积极”的思想和行动发展起来的。

新的奖项代表了后者——它不仅忠实于诺贝尔和赫弗梅尔的言辞和意图，也忠实于加尔通的“诊断、预测和治疗”、马丁·路德·金的“亲爱的社区”和甘地的“建设性计划”。

阿尔弗雷德·诺贝尔的思想——一如既往的崇高和迫切需要——永远不会被垄断了军事手段、军国主义、战争计划和战争的任何政府所垄断。

因此，让数以千计的小型真正的和平奖在全世界绽放吧，这样，挪威政府的诺贝尔奖——这个并不那么受人尊敬的奖项——就会发现它只是众多奖项中的一个。[12](#)