**Sample Affirmative Case**

“Every human being, of whatever origin, of whatever station, deserves respect. We must respect others even as we respect ourselves.” This was said by U Thant, former Secretary-General of the United Nations. In an increasingly globalized society, respect for cultural sensitivity is important for any business wishing to succeed. Cultural sensitivity is also important for anyone wishing to communicate with someone from another culture. Therefore, I support the resolution. Resolved: When they conflict, respect for cultural sensitivity ought to be valued above commercial use of free speech.

I will now define some key terms in the debate. According to *The Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, “respect” means “high or special regard.” “Commercial” means “having to do with commerce.” “Free” means “enjoying political independence.” “Speech” means “the power of speaking.” Cultural sensitivity, as defined by a project on the website of the University of Vermont, is “being aware that cultural differences and similarities exist and have an effect on values, learning, and behavior.”

My value is respect. As Jane Addams, one of the country’s first social workers, said in a speech in Honolulu in 1933, “Civilization is a method of living, an attitude of equal respect for all men.” This means that we can only have civilization as long as we have respect, because, without it, anarchy would rein, societal institutions would crumble, and our entire civilization would fall apart, just because of disrespect. Respect is especially important when we work with people who are different from us, so that no one feels slighted or misunderstood. For companies wishing to serve and do business with diverse customers, there must be respect for cultural sensitivity, or else unintentional miscommunications and misrepresentations will occur. With respect comes the additional value of knowledge, because, if you respect something, you are more likely to learn about it. Knowledge is important because we must know about each other’s cultures in order to communicate effectively. Without respect and knowledge, miscommunications will occur and commercial transactions will not go as planned.

My first contention is that it is in everyone’s best interests to have respect for cultural sensitivity. As Kofi Annan, former Secretary-General of the United Nations, once said, “Tolerance, inter-cultural dialogue, and respect for diversity are more essential than ever in a world where people are becoming more and more closely inter-connected.” Unless we have inter-cultural dialogue and respect for diversity and other cultures, miscommunications and social gaffes in foreign environments will undermine business endeavors. One example of this is when Chevrolet tried to market its Chevy NOVA in Venezuela. “Nova” is Portuguese for “new,” but it is also Spanish for “no go,” and Spanish is the official language of Venezuela. Very few Venezuelans bought the Chevy NOVA, which lost Chevrolet many sales that it could have gained if it had remembered to have respect for and knowledge of the Spanish language and Venezuelan culture that would inevitably be present in the Venezuelan consumer market.

My second contention is that the Constitution does not protect the commercial use of free speech. As Supreme Court Justice John Roberts wrote in the majority opinion for the 1942 case Valentine v. Chrestensen, “The Constitution imposes no such restraint on government as respects purely commercial advertising.” Since “purely commercial advertising” is basically the same thing as the commercial use of free speech, this means that the commercial use of free speech is not really a form of free speech and is not entirely immune to regulation, for good reason. In order to ensure that advertisements are appropriate and respectful, commercial speech must sometimes be regulated and restricted by the government. Otherwise, advertisements could easily become disrespectful and insensitive, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to their audiences. For instance, Coca-Cola made an ad several years ago that included an old lady in a wheelchair who became annoyed and rude when she found out there was no Coke at a family reunion. Coca-Cola had to take back the ad because customers protested so severely. Ads such as this one are degrading to the potential customers and are also bad for the company’s business, because offended customers are less likely to buy from a company than customers who felt respected.

My third contention is that we have a moral obligation to be respectful of other people’s cultures. As Frank Barron, Professor of Psychology at the University of California at Santa Cruz, once put it, “Never take a person’s dignity: it is worth everything to them, and nothing to you.” He is absolutely right. Companies can function perfectly well without being disrespectful, so they should have respect for cultural sensitivity, since, as I have proven, it does the company no harm and often is an asset in the business world, as well as being the right thing to do.

In conclusion, respect for cultural sensitivity ought to be valued more than the commercial use of free speech. Respect for cultural sensitivity is important if companies are to sell their products, and it is also important for everyone who lives in our current globalized society. It is essential that commercial speech is used in a respectful and culturally sensitive way, or else customers will be offended and demoralized, companies will not be able to sell their products, and everyone will lose. Thus, respect for cultural sensitivity ought to be valued more than the commercial value of free speech.