



Drug Enforcement Committee
Justice Department

16 November 2023

Breach of threshold values to protect rule of law

Dear members of the Drug Enforcement Committee.

In previous correspondence, the Alliance for Rights-Oriented Drug Policy (AROD) has drawn attention on the mandate's problem with the constitution and invited you to report our civil disobedience to clarify a connection between the drug policy and the arbitrary persecution of earlier times. As long as threshold values remain without a principled basis, we will break the proposed limits to promote legal development in an overlooked area, and you thereby receive cannabis. The committee receives cannabis because the political process perpetuates punishment on rejected terms, because the work of the Drug Enforcement Committee threatens to become another travesty for the law, and because court proceedings are needed to protect the rule of law.

Normally, the police can take it for granted that the laws are within the framework of human rights, but not in the drug policy. Not only have Norwegian reports for more than 20 years refuted the premises of punishment, but the political process has been hijacked by extremists and the rule of law is threatened after the government commissioned a study in order to recover police powers which the Director of Public Prosecutions considers to be disproportionate. To that extent the Drug Enforcement Committee fulfils its mandate, Norway will have a problem with human rights, and the government fails not only those persecuted, but also the police.

The Police Act mandates the use of the least possible force, but how can we know if the current use of force is necessary when no less invasive measures have been considered? To the extent that a regulated market is better than a criminal market, the prohibition does not fulfil a legitimate purpose, and there is evidence to suggest that the current use of the police power violates the constitution. For this reason, Germany and other states are moving away from cannabis prohibition, but political will to reconsider the premises of the prohibition does not exist.

Despite a recent report from the Committee for conduct, integrity, and conflict of interest in law enforcement that showed a tension between governance law and rights law, where the latter has been de-prioritised, the political process is too marked by panic to safeguard human rights, and we therefore invite you to activate the legal system. Article 89 of the Norwegian Constitution gives the courts "the right and duty" to control the political process. The right of



judicial review is described by Professor of Law Johs Andenæs as the West's most important contribution to world culture and as a core point in the rule of law, and AROD has for several years used civil disobedience to defend the rule of law. Not only have several hundred grams of cannabis been distributed outside the Director of Public Prosecutions' office, without indictments, but in order to avoid historical and constitutional context, the prosecution has opposed 200 years of legal tradition. As you can see from the documentary [Moving a Nation Forward](#), State Attorney Sturla Henriksbø, who is also a politician in KrF, has set ethical guidelines aside to protect the government's drug policy from constitutional scrutiny, and it falls to more responsible lawyers to promote legal certainty.

It is in this context that AROD contacts the committee. You have a responsibility to protect the rule of law against a government that refuses to deal with rights, and we expect you to file a complaint with the police. The legal system is the only way to illuminate the blind spot that totalitarian forces want to remain obscure, and ethical guidelines are clear on the civil service's responsibility for the rule of law. Your duty can only be done by clarifying the relationship between drug policy and the constitution, and you are not the only ones to receive cannabis. In addition to a police officer and a public prosecutor, the Police Academy and the Minister of Justice have also received cannabis, and all have an interest that law and order is secured. While the Ministry of Justice has overall responsibility for ensuring that the police's use of force is justifiable, the Drug Enforcement Committee is struggling with a mandate that is constitutionally indefensible, and the Police Academy cannot show a professional basis for twisting supply and demand into a victim and aggressor context. The government's resistance to look at the pros and cons of a regulated market as measured against a criminal market puts thousands of employees in the justice sector in a difficult situation, and a police complaint against AROD offers a way forward.

For the state prosecution, not least, this is a gift. As long as the prosecution will spend 14 weeks in court to argue drug cases, it makes no sense to oppose a few days to control the quality of the legislation - as Henriksbø did the last time - and AROD wants five days in court to show the connection between the drug policy and the arbitrary persecution of earlier times. Just a collective denial of responsibility makes it possible to ignore arbitrary persecution in the drug policy, and legal development is required after the failure of the drug reform. If we are to avoid Swedish conditions, it will be up to individuals with integrity to stand up against systemic aversion to rights. We will therefore invite everyone who have received cannabis as witnesses, and we look forward to legal proceedings.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Roar Mikalsen'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Roar Mikalsen
Leader of AROD