**Sample LD Ballot**

Judge Name: Christina Li

Affirmative Speaker Name: M Blake McCracken Speaker Point: N/A (Elims)

Negative Speaker Name: Ben Sprung-Keyser Speaker Points: N/A (Elims)

Name of Person You are Voting For: Ben Sprung-Keyser

Please Verify the Side You Voted For – Underline One – Affirmative or Negative

Comments for the Affirmative Speaker

Especially during the last speech, you did a lot of reiterating your own points, but never sufficiently covered the arguments the neg was making. A lot of the arguments the neg made went cold-conceded. You needed to spent time addressing the flaws in his framework, specifically this idea of comparative worlds vs. human rights. Given that he was winning the framework debate, your offense all goes away. In terms of speaking, you went at a good pace. Time allocation and coverage should be worked on.

Comments for the Negative Speaker

There was sufficient coverage on both the fw and contention level debate. Given that the aff just reiterated his own points without many responses to your offense in the 1AR, the 2NR did a good job hammering in your own claims. There was good time allocation and organization. You did speak a little too fast though.

Reasons for Your Decision

First on the framework debate. The neg talks about comparative worlds, and Lane ‘09 specifically talks about why perfection is regressive. Solving for real world issues, even if it doesn’t necessarily guarantee a perfect world, should be a good thing. This is an indict on the aff’s value of human rights, and it goes completely uncontested. On the value criterion debate, the aff does not make any arguments against the neg framework. Meanwhile, the neg talks about why so much government interference occurs in the real world, and it clearly does not cause any destruction. This goes cold conceded. Thus, neg is winning framework. Given that this is the lens from which we view the round, and the aff has no offense under this contention, we can already vote neg.

On the contention level, the aff, by the 2AR, really only has 2 arguments. He claims that the neg is not being topical and defending compulsory implementation. But given that he has won the comparative worlds argument, and that compulsory DNA samples are better than the status quo, this argument should be evaluated and serve as offense for the neg. The other argument the aff contests is that the neg universally harms rights, and everyone’s property would be violated. But again, the aff’s instance of babies’ blood being drawn clearly counters this. The aff has no offense left standing. Meanwhile, the neg solves for discrimination, increases the public’s trust in government, and talks about why the alternative of eyewitness testimony would be a lot worse. The neg is winning on both the fw and contention level.