



Now, about your collarbones...

Illustration by Emma Walden • Sophomore Adv. Art

Sexism in High Schools

The Duct Tape Dilemma

By Angelia Pulliam

In Evanston, Illinois, school officials banned leggings because they were "too distracting" for male students. In New Jersey, high school girls were prohibited from wearing strapless dresses to prom because they, too, were distracting. In Florida, a new student who unintentionally violated her school's skirt rules was made to wear a so-called "shame suit," consisting of red sweatpants and an oversized neon yellow shirt saying "Dress Code Violation."

Although the severity of punishments have not reached these extremes at Barren County High, allegations of dress code violation corrections being fueled by sexism, have been noted by many students.

Gracey Branham, sophomore, said, "I have been stopped many times for having holes in my jeans, but some boys wear their shorts with holes, way above their knees and suffer no repercussions."

Branham is just one of the many students who feel this way.

Another student, Nick Rigsby, a sophomore, said, "I'll be honest, sometimes my jeans do have holes above the knee, but I have not once been stopped for a dress code violation,

which is weird, because I see girls stopped all the time for the same reason."

The blatant sexism displayed by staff and administrators in high schools across the country is becoming more and more apparent every day, and the students are not blind to it.

To make things more clear, imagine this: You just bought a new pair of jeans. You are absolutely in love, so of course you are going to want to wear them to school, right? As soon as you walk in the doors of the building, you're stopped. A teacher demands you cover the notably small hole in your jeans because it breaks the dress code by being above your knee. She makes you put a large piece of duct tape over the spot, ultimately ruining your outfit, all because of a hole being inches too high.

People may think this is simply just a correction of a dress code violation, but what they may not realize is that you're a female. This is just a fraction of the problems faced by girls at high schools everywhere, daily.

Female students are forced to change, or cover, their outfits because of minuscule dress code violations, and some are even dis-

ciplined, while boys are, a majority of the time, left alone.

Many will notice, you do not see a lot of girls at school wearing shorts. Boys, on the other hand, will wear them all year long. The dress code states that all shorts must reach at least knee-length in order to be worn in school, but boys wear shorts above their knees without discipline every day. If a girl were to do that, they would more than likely be sent home or made to change. Discrepancies like these may seem small to some, but to the students of Barren County, they are an overshadowing reminder of the difference in the treatment of females from males within the school system.

I believe that there needs to be a reform of Barren County High's dress code policy. Females should not be targeted and punished for their choice of attire if males are not.

We are not only advocating for equality between males and females for the dress code, but equality in everything we do. Mary Shelley once said, "I do not wish women to have power over men, but over themselves."

Contact the Times



Front Office:
270•651•6315



507 Trojan Trail
Glasgow, KY



Gmail
bctrojantimes



Online Daily
thetrojantimes.com

The Times Staff

Brennan Crain
Editor-in-Chief

Kaitly Martin
Assistant Editor

Nathan Baines
Copy Editor

Rachel Sergent
Creative Editor

Lillian Barry
Reporter

Madison High
Reporter

Grace Lowe
Columnist

Caroline Kinsman
Reporter

Miranda Peacock
Reporter

Suzie Endicott
Reporter

Angelia Pulliam
Reporter

Kelley Ross
Adviser

Disclosures

Report Error(s)
bctrojantimes@gmail.com

Opinions expressed in this publication do not reflect those of Barren Co. High School or the Barren Co. School Systems' employees and/or administrators.

Printed by Jobe Publishing, Inc.
570 S. Dixie St. • Horse Cave, KY 42749
Printed monthly

The Lowe Down: Bale Out

By Grace Lowe

When Donald Trump was on the campaign trail, he ran on a platform saying he would “drain the swamp” and represent the working class. A large portion of those who were infatuated by those promises were Midwestern and Southern farmers. His supporters said he was a good businessman, and he would help with trade and the economy. Today, two years into the Trump administration, we are in the midst of an all-out trade war with China and those hurt by it are none other than those same farmers who believed he would help them in 2016.

Trump has always been vocal about the trade deficit America has with other countries and used this as proof that we have a “bad deal” for trade. He has used tariffs as the main way of trying to negotiate new deals.

However, most economists do not see this trade separation as a bad thing.

Lawrence H. Summers, a Harvard economist, in an interview with the New York Times, said, “The trade deficit is a terrible metric for judging economic policy.” A trade deficit can be argued to be a sign of a good economy because it demonstrates a country’s overall economic stability in that it is wealthy enough to make an abundance of purchases overseas.”

In April, China retaliated to one of the

U.S. tariffs by targeting key exports, such as automobiles and soybeans, and the trade war began to escalate. It has now been seven months since the first tariffs were imposed on China and neither side seems to be loosening up.

There has been a great amount of reporting over this issue, and the most outspoken have been Midwestern farmers. In an effort to decipher whether the most reported stories were common or just anecdotal, I contacted local farmers to get their views.

“25 percent of agricultural receipts are exported,” Brad Bailey, director of Barren County Farm Bureau and dairy farmer, said. “Barren County is in the top five of all agricultural commodity produced in the state. So, yes, we too will feel the effects.”

A common thread I found was that the local farmers believed the tariffs were a necessary means to correct a trade deficit.

“Trump and his administration are truly trying to help,” Mac Newberry, retired BCHS teacher and farmer, commented. “He’s trying to balance the trade out.”

Most of the people I talked to believed that China would begin to loosen up and succumb to the U.S. pressure for them to remove tariffs on U.S. imports. However, China continues in recent weeks to release new tariffs on U.S. imported goods.

Criticism of the Trump trade war tactics consistently stems from the idea that the trade war harms small local businesses and consumers rather than correcting trade imbalance. To try and help this problem \$12.5 billion have been allocated for emergency funds for the farms that are hit the hardest.

Doug Berry, BCHS agriculture teacher and beef cattle farmer, brought up that “insurance farmers,” farmers who take out insurance on their crops, let their crops fail on purpose just to claim the insurance money. He explained this is very hard for the government to find and could get a large portion of those funds rather than farmers who really need it.

“If the money truly goes to emergency funds, then it’s great, but you’re gonna have people who cheat the system,” Berry said.

Every day more information comes out about the trade war. It seems there are more tariffs and retaliation each time the news is on. Since this trade war is ongoing, we will have to wait to see if Trump’s strategy plays out better than it has thus far.

Find more from Grace and her column, “The Lowe Down,” at thetrojantimes.com

Kaepernick and the NFL from a liberal and conservative view

A LIBERAL VIEW

By Rachel Sergent

Nike: the most popular brand for athletic shoes and apparel—the brand that is basically a household name. Nike: politically active sports brand. Recently, Nike released an ad featuring the controversial NFL player Colin Kaepernick, and it has set the world on fire. Although it caused negative feelings in many, it was still a very good idea to run this ad.

I feel that there are many misconceptions on why Kaepernick kneels, so let’s discuss what it does and does not mean. Many believe he is trying to be disrespectful toward America and the veterans who fought for the right to be free. How they got this idea remains a mystery to me. He is peacefully protesting the widespread problem that is police brutality against minorities and the oppression that these minorities experience every day, and Kaepernick has just as much the right to protest this as others have to be angry about it. He is using first amendment, the freedom of speech, that veterans fought so hard to preserve. I would hate to live in a society that censors that right because some people misunderstand the true intentions

of the people protesting.

Many are stuck on the idea that even if he meant no harm, his kneeling during the national anthem was still offensive. It is evident Kaepernick was not trying to be offensive by the fact that he asked veteran Nate Boyer the best way to protest. Boyer gave an answer.

“I suggested kneeling because people kneel to pray; we’ll kneel in front of a fallen brother’s grave,” Boyer said.

The preparation of asking a veteran shows how much Kaepernick cared about what he was doing. It also shows that he thought that some might find it offensive, so he went out of his way to try to make it as respectful as possible.

In response to this ad, many have taken to the internet to post videos: some burning their shoes (one video featured a man burning his shoes while he was wearing them!)—or some cutting the Nike Swoosh off of their socks. It’s absolutely insane to burn a perfectly good pair of shoes, especially when the burning of said shoes does not negatively impact them. This controversy has actually caused Nike’s stock to

rise. After experiencing a small drop the day after the ad released, the stock rose from \$79.60 to \$85.26 a share, making it the highest it has been in six months. For Nike, the risk of running the ad has paid off.

While I understand that burning or cutting the brand on Nike apparel is a form of protest and all should have the right to do so, there are so many better ways to protest. Why not try writing to your local newspaper on why you disagree with this, or, if you must get rid of already bought shoes, why not donate them or give them to someone who needs them? There are many other ways to protest the inclusion of the ad without being destructive.

Overall, the anger over this ad, while valid, is too much in my opinion. Kaepernick never meant to offend, only to draw attention to an important issue in a nonviolent way. The ad only supports him and his cause and in no way disrespects veterans.

A CONSERVATIVE VIEW

By Kalei Staples

Editorial Submission

“Oh, say does that Star-Spangled Banner yet wave, O’er the land of the free and the home of the brave?” These are the famous words from “The Star-Spangled Banner,” our national anthem.

Over the past 200 years, the song has played before sporting events, national events and generally anywhere in America. It is a symbol and writing that shows the strength and resilience of our great country in times of war and in times of peace.

Since the beginning of the 2016 NFL Football season, Colin Kaepernick has knelt or sat during the singing of the national anthem, prompting many other athletes to follow. This has caused a nationwide debate: should this be allowed, should those players be fired or should they be praised for their courage to protest a social injustice?

The right to peaceful assembly or protest is a right covered in the First Amendment of the Constitution. People are allowed to protest almost anything, but I believe that protests should make a difference, protests should help people and draw awareness to a problem in our country.

Kaepernick’s protest was of social injustice and racial profiling. I don’t believe that Kaepernick achieved a successful protest because noth-

ing more has been done to stop racial profiling or social injustice. Kaepernick brought awareness to topics that were already across the media. While both of these are major issues in America, how is causing a huge controversy helping the cause?

Are victims of police brutality benefiting from Kaepernick’s kneeling or is this just a way a backup quarterback for a struggling NFL team to gain publicity for something other than football?

What is being accomplished?

Has the world changed for the better?

Has there been more division among our citizens or has this brought us together?

In most cases, this protest has not helped people but has caused more tension and division among our nation.

In September, Nike signed Kaepernick on their new “Just Do It” campaign, sparking new controversy among Americans. Many people began defacing their expensive Nike products, cutting the Nike symbols from their socks, burning their Nike shoes and boycotting Nike altogether.

If Kaepernick has the right to kneel for our national anthem as a protest, then Americans have the right to deface Nike products as a protest. Americans’ right to protest is the same

right that allows Kaepernick to protest.

Yes, people should have taken a less destructive approach, like the people who made the comments about Kaepernick no longer supporting Nike because of a political motive. I think people should have taken a more diplomatic approach and expressed their feelings with words rather than using action to deface Nike products.

Nike has been a household name for many years, but they lost several customers when they signed Kaepernick. Protests should accomplish something and if the only goal is to receive an acknowledgment, then they shouldn’t be treated equally to protests that actually help people.

Whether people continue to support Kaepernick or deface their clothing, they should at least do one thing—change something. At the end of the day, Nike products will continue to be burned, ripped and torn apart in the name of one NFL player who accomplished little with his protests.

Kalei Staples is a senior at Barren Co. High School. This argument was originally written for WKU Dual Credit English 100. The class examines writing and the usage of rhetoric to communicate an effective message.