The Legacy of Dynamite: Why Did Alfred Nobel Create the Prize?

March 1, 2026



Paris, 1888. Alfred Nobel opens a newspaper and finds an impossible scene: his own death. It was not a metaphor. It was not a joke. It was a journalistic mistake. His brother Ludvig had died, but a French paper believed Alfred was the one who had passed away and published a brutal obituary: 'The merchant of death is dead.'

Imagine reading, while still alive, the cruelest summary of your existence. Not 'brilliant inventor.' Not 'visionary businessman.' Not 'man of science.' But someone who had become rich by selling a more efficient way to kill. Nobel, who had spent years among tubes, powder, explosions, and formulas, suddenly saw how he might be remembered forever.

And the most uncomfortable part was that the accusation contained some truth.

Alfred Nobel was born in Stockholm in 1833, into a family where business and explosives were part of daily life. His father, Immanuel Nobel, was an engineer and inventor. Alfred grew up among workshops, debt, relocation, and dangerous experiments. He was an unusual industrialist: he wrote poetry, read in several languages, preferred the lab to elegant salons, and carried a quiet loneliness. But he also had an obsession: taming an unpredictable substance called nitroglycerin.

Nitroglycerin was like a wild animal trapped in a bottle. It had enormous power, but it could explode from a blow, a temperature change, or a small mistake. In 1864, that threat became tragedy. An explosion at

the family factory in Heleneborg, Sweden, killed several people, including Alfred's younger brother Emil Nobel. This was not distant news. It was his own world collapsing into rubble.

And yet Nobel did not stop. He kept searching for a way to make that monster useful and controllable. He finally found an answer by mixing nitroglycerin with a porous earth called kieselguhr. The result was dynamite, patented in 1867: more stable, easier to transport, more practical. For mining, tunnels, railways, and canals, it was revolutionary. It was like going from breaking a wall with a spoon to using a precise tool.

- Dynamite helped carve roads, bridges, and mountains.
- It also made destruction faster and easier.
- And it made Alfred Nobel an immensely rich man.

So here is the question that ignites this episode: if his fortune came from an invention that could build and kill, was it guilt, clarity, or both that led Nobel to leave his money to reward those who brought 'the greatest benefit to humankind'?

The question that changed a will

The answer begins, at least in part, with that mistaken obituary of 1888. Sometimes an error works like a merciless mirror. Nobel did not just see an insulting sentence. He saw a warning. He understood that history does not automatically remember our intentions kindly. More often, it remembers the effect of what we leave behind.

To understand why this struck him so deeply, we need to look at the whole man. Alfred Nobel was not a melodramatic villain, nor a pure repentant saint. He was more complicated, more human, and therefore more interesting. He suffered from poor health, frequent pain, emotional disappointments, and a tendency toward isolation. He never married. He worked with almost ferocious intensity and accumulated more than 350 patents. His mind was like a factory running day and night: inventing, correcting, testing, failing, and trying again.

His enormous fortune did not come from one lucky hit, but from an international network of factories, licenses, and laboratories. At a time when Europe was drilling through mountains, building railway tunnels, and expanding industry, dynamite was irresistible. Think of it as the equivalent of a powerful engine in an age of giant construction projects. It sped everything up. What had once taken months of hammer blows and human sweat could be done in days.

But tools are never morally innocent. A knife can prepare dinner or wound someone. The difference lies in the hand, the context, and the scale. Dynamite could open mines and clear land for roads, but it could also feed warfare. Nobel understood that ambiguity. He lived inside it.

The science behind dynamite, without the smoke

What exactly did Nobel do? He did not invent explosions from nothing, and he did not discover nitroglycerin. That substance had been synthesized in 1847 by the Italian chemist Ascanio Sobrero, who also warned that it was far too dangerous for practical use. Sobrero almost hated it. He considered it uncontrollable. He was right.

Nitroglycerin stores a huge amount of energy in a small space. It is like a spring compressed to the limit inside a fragile box. If that spring is released all at once, the energy bursts out violently. The problem was that this spring could be triggered too easily. Transporting it was like carrying a crate full of delicate glasses, except that every stumble might turn into an explosion.

Nobel did not change the deep chemistry of nitroglycerin itself. He did something equally important: he made it manageable. By absorbing it into a porous material called kieselguhr, he created a paste that was less sensitive to shocks and motion. Then he shaped it into cylinders that were easier to use. He also improved detonation systems, meaning ways to make it explode only when people actually wanted it to. In everyday terms, he did not just build a powerful car; he added brakes, a steering wheel, and an ignition key.

That combination of power and control was the secret of his industrial success.

A life surrounded by loss and contradiction

The 1864 accident, in which his younger brother Emil Nobel was killed, left a deep scar. Although Alfred kept working, it would be naive to think he did not carry guilt and grief. Every inventor lives with a shadow: the possibility that what he creates may harm others or return to harm him. In his case, that shadow had names and faces.

As the years passed, Nobel also watched the political climate in Europe grow more tense. States armed themselves, rivalries sharpened, and technology made more efficient destruction possible. There is a bitter irony here: many nineteenth-century inventors believed that more terrible weapons might actually

prevent war. The logic was something like this: if fighting becomes too horrible, no one will want to fight. Nobel himself expressed ideas close to that in some letters. History would show that humanity does not always become wiser when given more frightening tools.

Into this story steps another important figure: Bertha von Suttner. Her name deserves to be better known. She was a writer and peace activist, author of the antiwar novel 'Lay Down Your Arms!' published in 1889. Bertha briefly worked as Nobel's secretary in Paris in 1876. The job did not last long, but they continued corresponding for years. She argued passionately for international peace and criticized European militarism. Nobel listened. He did not always fully agree, but he clearly respected her.

Many historians believe Bertha influenced the inclusion of the Nobel Peace Prize in his will. She was not the only reason, but her voice was there: insistent, humane, uncomfortable, like the people in our lives who refuse to let us escape difficult questions. And there is a beautiful detail: in 1905, Bertha von Suttner herself won the Nobel Peace Prize. It is as if a private exchange of letters ended up written into world history.

The will that stunned everyone

On November 27, 1895, at the Swedish-Norwegian Club in Paris, Alfred Nobel signed his final will. There he made a startling decision in the best sense of the word: he ordered that most of his fortune be placed in a fund, and that the interest from that capital be awarded each year to those who had conferred 'the greatest benefit to humankind.'

This was not a token donation. It was most of his wealth. Roughly 94 percent of his estate, about 31 million Swedish kronor at the time, an enormous sum. To imagine it, think of someone who, instead of leaving almost everything to family, turns his fortune into a machine designed to reward talent, knowledge, and peace for generations.

The prizes were to be divided into five fields:

- Physics
- Chemistry
- Physiology or Medicine
- Literature
- Peace

Economics was not part of the original will. It was added much later, in 1968, by Sweden's central bank.

The choice of categories says a lot about Nobel. He did not want to reward only pure science. He included literature, because words also change the world. He included peace, because he understood that technical progress without moral restraint can become a nightmare. And in physiology or medicine he left a wide door open to those who decode the human body and relieve suffering.

What does 'the greatest benefit to humankind' mean?

That phrase is the moral heart of the Nobel system. It is also its greatest challenge. Because it sounds simple, but it is not. How do you measure benefit? By immediate impact? By the number of lives touched? By an idea that seems abstract at first and only decades later transforms hospitals, cities, or entire countries?

It is like planting a tree. Some trees give shade in a year, while others take decades and then hold up a whole landscape. Science often works that way. A discovery may seem small in the moment and later become the basis for vaccines, antibiotics, scans, or treatments that save millions.

In medicine, for example, the prize does not simply honor the smartest researcher. It points toward the finding that truly changes the human experience of pain, disease, or survival. That idea of deep usefulness, of real service, comes directly from Nobel.

The battle after his death

Alfred Nobel died on December 10, 1896, in San Remo, Italy. He was 63. What followed was not a smooth ceremony or a grateful consensus. It was chaos.

His family was surprised and, in some cases, upset. The institutions named in the will were not prepared. There were legal doubts, political resistance, administrative problems, and very practical questions: how would this money be managed, who would choose the winners, and how could a solitary inventor's written wish be turned into a global institution?

The key figure in solving that maze was Ragnar Sohlman, one of Nobel's executors, along with Rudolf Lilljequist. Sohlman worked with a mix of patience, strategy, and stubbornness. He gathered assets scattered across several countries, negotiated with relatives, dealt with bureaucracy, and defended Nobel's intention as if he were protecting a flame that might go out.

Thanks to that effort, the Nobel Foundation was formally established in 1900. In 1901, the first prizes were awarded. It was the beginning of a tradition that turned a private gesture into one of the world's most prestigious institutions.

The first echoes of the legacy

The first Nobel Prizes already reflected the spirit of the will. In Physics, Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen was honored in 1901 for the discovery of X-rays, the images that for the first time allowed doctors to see inside the body without opening it. Imagine the shock of that era: it was almost like gaining superhero vision, except made real by science.

In Physiology or Medicine, Emil Adolf von Behring received the prize that same year for his work on serum therapy against diphtheria. Diphtheria was a feared disease, especially in children. His treatment with antitoxin serum was a major step forward. Again, Nobel's idea is visible in action: reward something that does not merely impress, but saves.

In Literature, Sully Prudhomme won. And for Peace, the prize was shared by Henry Dunant, founder of the Red Cross, and Frédéric Passy, a peace activist. It is hard not to see a message in that opening lineup: Nobel's legacy would celebrate not just brilliance, but brilliance placed in the service of human life.

Guilt, redemption, and something more

So did he create the prize out of guilt? Yes, guilt was probably part of the story. But reducing everything to guilt would be too simple. Guilt alone rarely builds a durable institution. What seems to be present in Nobel is a more complicated mixture:

- Awareness of how he might be remembered
- Personal pain from accidents and nearby losses
- Genuine pride in science and invention
- Admiration for people who improved human life
- A desire to turn industrial wealth into a moral legacy

In other words, he was not just a man trying to wash his name clean. He was also someone who understood the double-edged power of technology and wanted, even after death, to tilt the balance toward the common good.

That gesture feels deeply modern. We still live among inventions with two edges: artificial intelligence, gene editing, nuclear energy, digital surveillance. Almost every major advance brings promise and danger. Nobel left us with a question that has not aged: it is not enough to ask whether something can be done; we must also ask for whom, with what consequences, and for whose benefit.

The prize as an imperfect compass

Of course, the Nobel is not perfect. It has had omissions, injustices, and controversies. Some brilliant people never received it. Some decisions are still debated. But even with those flaws, the prize acts as a cultural compass. Year after year, it reminds us that there are discoveries and works that expand what is possible for humanity.

And that matters. Because in the noise of the world, where violence, scandal, or money often seem to dominate the stage, the Nobel insists on reserving a spotlight for a different kind of hero: people who look at a disease, a particle, a poem, or a conflict and decide to spend their lives understanding it better and trying to transform it.

It all began with a living contradiction: a man who made his fortune from explosives and ended up funding a global celebration of knowledge, compassion, and peace.

Maybe that is why Alfred Nobel's story still fascinates us. It is not the story of a pure man. It is the story of a human being confronted with the most uncomfortable version of himself. And instead of looking away, he did something extraordinary: he wrote a different ending.

That may be the truest legacy of dynamite. Not only the force to break open mountains, but the possibility that a life full of contradictions can still leave a door open toward something better for everyone.