**Simran LD Ballot**

Judge Name: Simran Gandhi

Affirmative Speaker Name: M Blake McCracken Speaker Points: 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

* Very clear speaking and good ethos.
* You rely too much on defensive arguments. You need to provide clear reasons to vote for you specifically, not just reasons why the neg is bad.
* You don’t respond to a lot of his claims about how even if your arguments are all true, the real world alternative solutions to those technologies would be even worse.
* The “neg isn’t topical argument” made sense, but it needed to be impacted out more - explain why it is bad to stray from the topic, what that means for the ballot and how exactly the neg violated this.

Comments for the Negative Speaker

* Very clear speaking and ethos.
* The burdens and observations were very good - they clearly dictated the roles of the affirmative and negative, and were also strategic since they excluded a lot of aff offense.
* The justice framing card (London Times) was very good - the warrants were well explained and very intuitive, and helped set up the offensive structure when you moved on to the aff.
* The line by line responses to the aff were very good and specific.
* 2NR was good but a bit repetitive, more of it could have been spent closing all of the doors left open for the 2AR.
* Respond more to the “neg isn’t topical” argument.

Reasons for Your Decision

The negative is sufficiently winning the framework question about what justice means (Alan Lane, London Times). It means that we shouldn't aim for perfection, but just try to maximise justice in the real world, which emphasises looking towards practical solutions. However, the aff attempts to derive conclusions based on a perfect world, which is inherently flawed and thus their arguments are null.

Secondly, the neg wins that in the real world, the use of DNA testing is inevitable. This means that this debate is question about whether DNA testing should be used universally or to a specific group of people. The neg proves that the latter would be discriminatory and thus unjust. This argument is solidified by the analysis that shows that the only alternative to DNA testing would be DNA dragnets, which are worse than DNA testing.

3 args that the 2AR goes for:

1. The neg isn’t topical - I don’t see why this is relevant or true, the neg is just saying that even if DNA testing is bad, the alt is worse so we should stick with DNA testing. This claim is supported by the real world justice framing.
2. Human rights VC - the neg wins that discrimination means that human rights aren't applied equally, so neg fwk is a prerequisite.
3. Neg has guaranteed harms - 2AR doesn’t extend enough offense so I don’t buy that the aff resolves any of these harms, even if they do exist.