

[This is regarding my request sent to the Ames City Council to be doing something about the offensive behavior of young negro men who walked around town with their pants pulled down to the knees, and exposing themselves in a manner unsuitable to public viewing. Amusing, as well as serious, it displays yet again, . . .]

TO: [Ames City Council Members]  
CC: {City Attorney, Chief of Police}

Subject: Offensive clothing behavior and its suppression

Monday, July 21st, 2008

Dear City Council, City Attorney, and Chief of Police:

As the representatives of the people who live in Ames, I ask you to please consider what should be done, using the "police laws" or other methods, regarding the suppression of an offensive behavior that is now being seen particularly here in Ames. This matter has been addressed in other cities in America, particularly in Flint, Michigan, and Lynwood, Illinois.

The behavior has its origins specifically among the negro populations elsewhere, and this behavior is now presenting itself in our city, among the negro men living in, or visiting, Ames. Soon it will be adopted by the young White men, who would, by this aggressive behavior of others unlike themselves, perhaps unwittingly reduce themselves to such a low expression of their own character.

At first, one would think this situation laughable - - something these offensive young men want us to believe; but it is NOT a laughing matter, and the Ames Police Department's "gang unit" will tell you this is true.

The problem is this: several, if not many, young negro men in Ames today, apparently recently transplanted from Chicago South, have been walking around in public areas, exposing themselves in a manner that should be a prosecutable offense. These men are seen with their pants pulled down almost to their knees, with their underwear exposed to anyone looking at them. They make no effort to pull up their pants to the normal and respectable place around the waist. While it is amusing to see these young Negro men walk with such difficulty, it also is more than that: it is an insult upon us all.

Something should be done about this. Otherwise, these negro men will continue to insult us in this manner until we tell them to stop doing it or until the police will arrest them by using ordinance law prohibiting such conduct. And if our young White men follow their miserable example, the problem gets much worse.

Ever since the sudden introduction of negroes from Chicago South, based upon whatever pretenses, there has been plenty of gang related crimes and activities; and now this, their offensive behavior, occurring for two reasons:

First, it is an insult to the general population of White people in Ames. This act of indecent exposure is intentionally offensive, and it is or ought to be an embarrassment to anyone who sees it; and it is a blatant affront to the high morals and the dignity of our women and children. They know this.

Second, this underwear exposure behavior is some kind of open declaration of their "gang status," by displaying their "gang colors." Not only has the manufacturer's brand of underwear been taken as a gang indicator, but each gang has also ultimately decided upon its own color, whether red, blue, etc. To display their gang colors, they have now resorted to offending the non-negro populace in the process.

I myself have seen these negro men walking around near the Walmart on Grand Avenue, and on 24th Street near Grand Ave., and at other places where young negro men are seen walking on the sidewalk, wearing their clothing in this manner. I have not (yet) seen any White men doing this.

These negro men openly insult us by wearing their clothing this way, and it must be presumed they know this is part of their overall intent. Now you know it also. Something should be done to stop this idiotic and offensive behavior, while it is yet in its proverbial infancy.

What these young men do not know is that this behavior would, or should, be considered a violation of the State's "sex crime laws" regarding Indecent Exposure. That means, upon conviction, the man so exposing himself would thereafter be required to register himself with the local police department as a sex offender, no matter where he went in all the States in America. These men obviously don't think much about themselves nor about others in this situation, so why should they think about the long-term effects of their acts? But we in Ames should and we will.

This is not the first time such a proposal to prohibit similar indecent exposure has been considered. Very recently, a small town near Chicago has enacted an ordinance prohibiting such offensive behavior. Their ordinance would levy \$25 fines against anyone showing three inches or more of their underwear in public.

Part of the reason for this law is moral; the other is economic - - something which Ames cannot afford to lose: if we allow these young men to walk around town half-dressed in our city, as they do in other cities and towns, beyond merely drawing our young White men into their lower propensitized negro gangster lifestyles, it will be an inducement to keep major retailers and economic development away from Ames. Perhaps these young negro offenders know this, and plan on that happening, especially when considering the large outpouring of citizen concern as seen in the November 27th, 2007 meeting at the City Council chambers, which resulted in the "Inclusiveness Task Force" being established.

If you are wondering how to eliminate that problem, consider another city's efforts:

Published in various sources, July 21, 2008 by the Associated Press, headlines are varied, i.e., "Be careful if you have saggy pants in the south Chicago suburb of Lynwood"; or, "It's the law: No sagging pants in Chicago suburb".

More than one news source has this basically similar text, as of today.

"Lynwood, Illinois - Be careful if you have saggy pants in the south Chicago suburb of Lynwood.

"Village leaders have passed an ordinance that would levy \$25 fines against anyone showing three inches (7.62cm) or more of their underwear in public.[n.1]

"The mayor of Lynwood, Eugene Williams[n.2], says young men walk around town half-dressed, keeping major retailers and economic development away.

"The American Civil Liberties Union says the ordinance targets young, black men.

"Young adults in the village, . . . , say the new law infringes on their personal style. He said leaders should instead spend money on making the area look nicer." [HINT: they are!]

See: Chicago Channel 2 TV,

<<http://cbs2chicago.com/watercooler/chicago.sagging.pants.2.775405.html>>

See: News-Courier, Athens, Alabama,

<[http://www.ewescourier.com/statenews/local\\_story\\_203103729.html](http://www.ewescourier.com/statenews/local_story_203103729.html)>

(N.1: Even that much display of personal clothing is too much, The commonly understood, yet unwritten, social rules of decency among the majority of Ames citizens requires proper wearing of clothing in a manner not indecent).

(N.2: It should be noted that the Mayor of Lynwood is a negro; and two of the six "trustees" (council members) are negro; and yet, they passed this ordinance to stop negro men from practicing this offensive behavior. Ought these Negro Council Members not to be a Good Example for Ames City Council, as well?).

The ordinance also might be found at the Village of Lynwood's website, at

<http://www.lynwoodil.us/> at "Village Ordinance Book"; or at

<http://www.municode.com/Resources/gateway.asp?pid=14383&sid=13>,

but this site was updated only as of April, 2008.

I hope this City Council has enough foresight to see the problem before it becomes one, and acts against this offensive behavior.

It will be pleasing to consider all of your response to this request, whether as Council Members or Police Chief or City Attorney, et al.

Thanks for reading, and acting upon, this email.

R.J. Gardner

-----

COUNCIL REPLIES:

Re: Offensive clothing behavior and its suppression  
From: Jim Popken  
Sent Wed 7/23/08 11:13 AM  
CC: [Other City Council Members, City Attorney, Chief of Police]

Dear R.J. Gardner

I was just in campustown and downtown yesterday. I witnessed several hundred people of all ages in very tight biking shorts and tops. From my understanding these bicyclist are generally not wearing underwear under their shorts (it causes to much friction with the bike seat). I may find these sights distasteful, however they do not harm me and should remain legal. I do believe in regulating health and safety. This does not appear to fall within the purview of health and safety concerns. There are instances where society does regulate in areas beyond health and safety, such as indecent exposure. And I do believe the city's current ordinances do addresses indecent exposure at this time.

Thank you for communicating your concerns.

Jim Popken  
Ames City Council At Large

On Mon, Jul 21, 2008 at 10:14 PM, RJ Gardner wrote:

Monday, July 21 st, 2008

-----

PARTIAL RESPONSE TEXT. . . :

From: **Matthew Goodman**  
Sent: Thu 8/07/08 3:57 PM  
To: RJ Gardner  
Cc: [Mayor, other City Council Members, City Attorney, Chief of Police]

. . . I just thought the idea of legislating waistlines was a bit silly, so I let someone else respond. Since you seem to want a response from us all, there is mine. Take care.

-----

OTHER NEWS SOURCES RELIED UPON:

[http://wdbo.com/includes/news/indepth/05399 Judge gets fed up with sagging pants in court 082945.html](http://wdbo.com/includes/news/indepth/05399_Judge_gets_fed_up_with_sagging_pants_in_court_082945.html)

[Central Florida]

### **Judge gets fed up with sagging pants in court**

Dave Wahl 09/11/2008 08:30:35

A Florida judge tired of seeing inmates' underwear because of sagging orange pants decided to take action this week.

Circuit Judge Daniel Perry delayed court for an hour and a half Wednesday, as he ordered the 61 inmates on his docket back to jail so that a handful of them could change into better-fitting, if not as fashionable, bottoms.

According to a court transcript, Perry said he did not want to see people ``with their rear ends hanging out of their pants." He added: ``We're done."

The Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office reminded deputies of proper sizing methods for inmates and some spare pants were also delivered to the courthouse.

--==--

April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009

<http://www.timesfreepress.com/news/2009/apr/19/some-tennessee-laws-price-not-right/>

Chattanooga Times Free Press

[‘Outlawing baggy pants would cost state. . .’](#) April 19th, 2009 under [Crime](#), [Economy](#), [Events](#), [Politics](#), [Shera Crossan](#)



Outlawing baggy pants would cost state government \$438,400, while selling wine in grocery stores would boost Tennessee wine consumption by 50 percent and produce \$16 million in new tax collections.

Allowing holders of handgun carry permits to pack pistols in state parks has a \$38,200 taxpayer price tag, while making carry permit holder records confidential could cost state government \$45 million in federal funding.

And there's a new way of calculating the state's cost of locking up criminals. Lesser criminals cost more than before; the really bad guys cost less.

Such is a sample of the daily decisions made by the 12-member staff of the Tennessee Legislature's Fiscal Review Committee, which must produce a written estimate on the cost to Tennessee taxpayers of each of the thousands of bills introduced in the General Assembly.

The decisions, officially deemed "fiscal notes," can make, break or reshape a bill and thus are often a matter of great controversy within the Legislature, though perhaps little noticed by the general public. . . .

Fashion restrictions, gun permissions

The bill to prohibit droopy drawers, which has touched off great controversy on the merits of the proposition in general, declares that violators will be subject to a fine only — not jail time, which would normally mean an incarceration cost to the state or local governments.

But the fiscal note looks beyond the surface, finding that there are currently 2,512 juveniles on probation in the state who would, if convicted of any misdemeanor, see their probation revoked and be returned to state custody if caught with their pants down.

The note assumes that 1.5 percent of those juveniles, or 38, would be caught and thus go back into state custody for an average of 180 days at an incarceration cost of \$180 per day — borne by the taxpayers.

The resulting fiscal note has doubtless caused prospects of passage to sag. . . .

-----