

There seems to be widespread doubt about whether Obama deserved his prize. Ideally, the conclusion should be:

$$NPP \text{ Recipient} = \operatorname{argmax}_p f(p)$$

That is, the p that maximizes $f(p)$, where $p \in \text{People} \cup \{\text{Nobody}\}$ and $f(p) = E[\text{p's lifetime contribution to peace}]$ for some measure of contribution, say a weighted average of lives saved, poverty eliminated, or something of that sort, as determined by the Norwegian committee. ($f(\text{Nobody}) = 0$ is the baseline case)

If you disagree with the award, you must believe that there is some person p such that $f(p) > f(\text{Obama})$ (There's someone who has contributed more to peace), OR $f(p) < 0$ (everyone adversely affected peace) for every person p .

Let's examine this by cases:

1. $f(p) > f(\text{Obama})$. Who is this person, and what makes him more deserving than Obama?
2. $f(p) < 0 \forall p \in \text{People}$. So everyone has detrimentally impacted peace?

So, which case is it, and what is your response?