

Fashion police - flint cracks down on sagging

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



Fashion Police: Flint Cracks Down on Sagging Upon first observation of the photograph, it is clear that the male portrayed in the image has no regard to decency with his appearance and the views of others. The first one, in which the pants are sagging but remain above the butt, can be considered somewhat of a fashion statement, showing just a small amount of the underwear. The second image, in which the pants are below the butt and yet the butt is still covered is simply ridiculous. The purpose of wearing pants is to cover the underwear and the butt, as these are things that the public normally do not see -- nor would they really want to. The pants are not being used for the purpose that they were made for. As for the third picture, in which not only underwear is showing but so is the butt, the image is offensive, which is to say that the male the image is depicting is offensive. Private parts of the body should be covered up and not on display for everyone to see. Furthermore, both the pants and the underwear no longer serve their purpose of keeping those areas covered up.

As for the comments based on each picture, stating that the picture in which the pants sag but still remain above the butt, are correct. At least in this first image the male is merely sagging his pants, showing a little bit of underwear, which is something that can happen to someone who is not even wearing saggy pants. Though I disagree that the second image where the male has his pants below the butt is considered disorderly conduct. He is showing much more of himself than he needs to be, and therefore this should be considered indecent exposure, just as the third image is considered.

After reading the article that accompanies the photograph, the purpose

behind the “criminal offense” system of sagging pants seems almost as ridiculous as the sagging pants themselves. Arresting people simply because their pants sag a little too low seems like a cheap way for a police officer to meet his daily quota; indeed, Officer Dicks seems to think that it is appropriate to arrest people because they are showing underwear. While it is still agreeable that showing part of the butt is indecent exposure, showing underwear, while ridiculous, is still hardly a criminal offense.

There also appears to be a lot of racism behind the concept of going after people wearing sagging pants, as is made evident by the article. Sagging pants are quite common in young men of color, though this does not mean that every young colored male wearing sagging pants is a criminal, or even willing to commit a real crime. The article went into detail, with quotes from others, stating that some people have always worn their pants sagging, and some did not have a choice, having to have worn loose hand-me-down pants that would sag anyway.

While the picture displayed something senseless as someone wanting to wear their pants so low, it pales in comparison to the article, which shows glimmers of racism and racial profiling. Suddenly, the image becomes ridiculous, though not because of what the image is displaying, but what the images now stand for. To the men that wear their pants sagging, it may be a fashion statement, regardless of how ridiculous it looks, but idiocy in regard to clothing is not a crime. Unless a distinguishable part of their butt is showing, then there is no crime to be found by someone who likes to display part of their underwear to the public.