**Social Contract Neg**

The Value is Morality.

The Criterion is Consistency with State’s Authority and Power.

Arguments about abstract ethical theories ignore the underpinnings of unique state obligations. The state’s power becomes legitimate only through consent because people have agreed to its authority. There is no objective good, so morality can only be concretely defined through these agreements between people and the government. This is the difference between euthanasia and murder—there is limited difference between the acts, but willingness to comply alters the moral dimensions. Consenting to the state is a precondition to state action because otherwise the state’s imposition is tyrannical and unchecked. Even if his framework is good, it doesn’t establish an actor-specific obligation to follow that framework, and it assumes preventing certain impacts is good, but lack of consent to preventing them denies that ethical basis. This means my framework contextualizes what it means to violate his.

Thus I contend that treating juveniles as adults is inconsistent with state authority.

First, juveniles have not consented to the authority because they cannot vote in elections. Even if they have other outlets for political participation, their opinions are disregarded as juvenile, and they have not willed the criminal maxim on the same level because they never agreed to follow it.

Second, juveniles have neither the economic nor legal independence to leave the state. Whereas adults consent by remaining there, juveniles have no power or ability to leave because the state or their parents would drag them back, and they can’t afford to, so their consent is lesser.