**Sample LD Ballot**

Judge Name: Ollie Rourke

Affirmative Speaker Name: Blake McCracken, Speaker Points: 29

Negative Speaker Name: Ben Sprung Keyser, Speaker Points: 29.5

Name of Person You are Voting For: Negative, Ben Sprung Keyser

**Comments for the Affirmative Speaker:**

Good job standing your ground in CX - it’s hard to answer some of the questions he asked about your framework, i.e. “is it okay to violate one’s freedom for the wellbeing of everyone else?”, so good job staying consistent.

I don’t really think is much of a distinction between your two contentions, so either combine them or try to think of more distinct ideas.

Be careful with your rhetoric - don’t frame all black people as felons, or don’t give your opponent the opportunity to misconstrue your words so it seems like you think that.

Framework debate is circular - need some explanation for why human rights comes before justice other than saying it’s the highest value.

Need to do more work on the empirics debate - even if your study is per capita conviction rates, you still need a warrant for causation.

Final speech really doesn't do it for me. This speech is all defensive - you attack your opponents arguments, but you don’t make enough arguments of your own, or reasons to vote for you. You say the neg is not topical many times, but I don’t really see how his real world examples are irrelevant, and you need a better explanation for this if you’re going to bank on it.

**Comments for the Negative Speaker:**

Good job with persistence in CX, I like your questions that interrogate the assumptions of his framework, such as “is it okay to violate one’s freedom for the wellbeing of everyone else?” - this is especially persuasive for judges who are watching.

The observation that we need to look at real world notions of justice rather than striving for a perfect world is really good and is quite effective against the affirmative case/framework.

I also really like your alternatives argument - that without a compulsory database, we have to rely on eyewitness testimony. The aff tries to rebut this by saying it’s a question of values, but I don’t think that was sufficient.

Good response to his argument about about how racism is a problem with the police and not DNA databases - it’s still important to fight discrimination in the cjs. Persuasive arg

**Reasons for Your Decision:**

I don’t think the affirmative ever has a sufficient response to the negative observation / framework that says that society will never achieve a perfect world so we should focus on fixing real world problems that exist currently.

The aff tries to argue that the neg is “universally harming rights” and makes many abstract claims, but I really like it when the neg says “Look, I got my blood tested when I was a baby and my DNA was stored, and I’m okay, there isn’t a huge violation of everybody’s rights.” He contextualized the affirmatives arguments into the real world, and they just didn’t make sense.

Since we’re looking at the real world through a comparative lens, I buy the negatives arguments that 1.) Non-compulsory DNA databases allow for discrimination and police to target minority communities and 2.) The alternative to a DNA database is eyewitness testimony.

Since the affirmatives goes for the theoretical / rights based arguments in their final speech, they ultimately concede these arguments from the negative.