

## Staff Editorial: Should the United States Intervene In Syria With Military Action?

Intervening in foreign affairs has always been a messy business and the U.S.' proposed military actions in Syria are no exception.

Since 2011, the civilians of Syria have called for greater freedom and democracy from their government, and what could have been peaceful solutions led to horrific conclusions. According to BBC, the speculations over the use of chemical weapons worsened, reportedly killing over 100,000 innocent lives.

As the international community becomes more wary of what is to come, the U.S. leaves many puzzled, as there was a lack of real direction presented by the Obama administration even while renewed presence in the Middle East seems to be unfavorable as troops are being withdrawn from Afghanistan. This in turn leads to the question we need to ask ourselves: Should the U.S. be selfless and help Syria or should the United States be selfish and

stray from other's problems?

The situation in Syria is so complex that no one can explicitly explain all of the aspects of the conflict. Many are concerned that the U.S.' questionable history of involvement will repeat itself, but analysts believe that the differences between Kosovo in 1999, Iraq in 2003 and Libya in 2011 are too large for comparison with Syria's conflict. There are repercussions for any action from sending the Navy Seals to air striking chemical weapon storage facilities that we, as the U.S., will take. Let's not forget that we recently decided to withdraw all military intelligence from Afghanistan back home, and with American "influences" nearby in Iraq, being involved in another Middle East country seems impetuous.

Obama has considered limited military action which can "deter and degrade" the Syrian government's ability to deploy chemical weapons. However, what happens following American military action? We would love to assume that, after the strike, everything will be resolved, but that would not be the case since President

Bashar Al Assad warned the U.S. that he would "defend himself against any aggression." Then we would have to start counting the days until Assad might respond to the attack and considering how many civilians might be killed, which would draw in the allies of both countries along with Syria's neighbors.

The situation would continue to escalate with the worst case scenario being going to war with Russia and Iran, Syria's allies.

What then, can be done? We must ask ourselves: Are we capable of becoming involved in the problems of others and is all this for humanitarian efforts and not for our own self-interests? Though the U.S. has a military budget of approximately \$680 billion- larger than the next 10 highest budgets combined, (China, Russia, the U.K., Japan, France, Saudi Arabia, India, Germany, Italy and Brazil)- we must recognize the fiscal realities of war in this century. In previous wars, it was acceptable to the American people that incurring more debt would be offset by ensuring the world's safety. However, these times are different and the realities of national debt coupled with the cost of military intervention is simply too much of a burden. Coming up with an

alternative to military action is what should be done instead.

On Sept. 14, the United States and Russia reached an agreement to not only have all of Syria's chemical weapons given to international control, but also to destroy all such weapons by 2014.

However, this leaves the regime unpunished for the unparalleled violence enacted against the Syrian people- a crime against humanity. People are not just being killed, they are suffering from the long, drawn out symptoms of using chemical weapons. Whether or not we are concerned with the weakening of this country's status as the "global cop" for not acting upon a humanitarian crisis, it should be the repercussions of military action which causes us to hesitate.

All of our actions must prioritize Americans; we cannot and should not act preemptively, unilaterally and without diligence like we did in the Iraq War.

YES = 5



MOOR graphic by SIMON ZHAO

## Viewpoints:

### Is there a double standard in the dress code for males as opposed to females?

"The guys have more privileges because the dress code is mostly applied to girls, [specifically restricting clothing like] short shorts, crop tops, etc." Amy Boonsun, Freshman



"[No.] The dress code is too harsh [for both sexes.] We can't even wear sports jerseys to support the teams we like [and] we can only wear our school's hat. We should be able to wear anything as long as it's not really inappropriate." Brian Nguyen, Sophomore

"The dress code is biased [against] girls. I [have] honestly never seen guys dress coded. Why are guys allowed to sag their pants/shorts down to their knees but we can't wear some pair of shorts?" Andrea Hong, Sophomore



"There is a certain extent to how baggy and revealing your clothes [should] be. However, the school [s dress code is too strict]. We've had nothing but hot weather and there's no choice for girls but to wear shorts and it's a shame that they get dress coded for trying to [cool down]." Steven Bonus, Senior

"The dress code is not fair because girls have more rules to abide by than guys do. Girls have it harder because girls have [fewer options of attire to wear] that aren't too 'revealing'." Fiona Tang, Senior



"There isn't a double standard; it's not like guys are walking around with our flies open, and the 'trend' of sagging pants is basically over. On the other hand, girls get dress coded for [clothing] which can be sexually objectifying." Allen Chen, Junior

"Yes, there is a double standard. Guys wear inappropriate shirts all the time and don't get caught, but girls who wear shorts to school are always dress coded." Sara Hernandez, Junior



"Guys and girls have equal dress code [standards; the dress code] lets us [equally] express ourselves in a mature modest way." Nick Iniguez, Freshman



## Glendale High School Students' Privacy 'Infringement'

DEREK WU  
Staff Writer

Social media is a very important aspect to adolescents in the 21st century, who update, tweet and post many detail of their lives. Recently, Glendale High School, a member of the third-largest school district in Los Angeles County, hired a company, Geo Listening, to track about 13,000 middle and high school students via social media to search for any online bullying, online posting of graffiti and generally unacceptable behavior.

The company is not "hacking" profiles, controlling student usage of social media and is not asking students for their passwords; it is simply monitoring students' public profiles. The school district has the right to view the profiles of their students to improve the school environment, as it is its responsibility to make its schools safer such as preventing bullying. This newly enforced program is beneficial in persuading students to change their profile settings to private, as the program shows the students how easy it is for a stranger to access a student's personal information. The program will also force students to think twice before posting anything inappropriate that could lead them into trouble.

However, a researcher from UCLA called the program "big brother-ish," comparing it to online monitoring by the government and questioning Glendale High School's stalker-like, abusive methods. While some may consider this program inappropriate, the social media monitoring service only investigates public profiles of students-unlike a big brother program which investigates private information-and leaves private material confidential.

Students interviewed at Glendale High School said that if this policy could prevent suicide or bullying, they would not mind the administrators knowing a few extra details about their lives. Parents also agreed for safety concerns. This program is beneficial to students and parents, by preventing any further crimes and bullying, without causing any legal and privacy issues.