



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 18, 2023

## Dress 'em Down: Democrats Once Again Oppose Equality

Just as hope is not a strategy, outrage is not an argument. This could come to mind with the Tuesday CBS News headline “Outrage after Missouri lawmakers’ new dress code for women in the state House.” The issue?

Female legislators will now be held to standards *approximating* those of their male colleagues.

And this relative equality is driving Democratic feminists nuts.

In fact, from some of the comments on the matter, you’d think the Taliban had arrived with full-length burkas.

CBS reports on the [story](#):



Petar Chernaeve/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Missouri lawmakers on Wednesday adopted a new dress code for women in the state House, requiring them to cover their shoulders. The stricter dress code was part of a larger new rules package, and passed with a vote of 105-51.

The dress code immediately drew criticism from local Missouri politicians, who took to Twitter to express their frustrations. The new dress code even has its own hashtag: #Sweatergate.

“I never thought my first national interview would be about what I can and cannot wear as a female lawmaker,” said Democratic Missouri Representative Ashley Aune.

Perhaps Aune would’ve been more accurate if she’d ended her statement after her first three words. Or maybe Aune did think. This would be even worse because it means she decided to propagandize after perhaps recognizing the simple truth: Unless you’d let representatives enter their chamber San Francisco-style (*au naturel*), you believe in a dress code just as anyone else does. It’s just a matter of where you draw the line.

And women being held to the same standards men are won’t bother you unless you have a problem with “equality,” which is a leftist rallying cry whenever the matter is obtaining privileges the feminists want.

As an example, a Nantucket bylaw allowing women to go topless on all town beaches was approved last year in “order to promote equality for all persons,” the [rationale went](#).

But again proving that equality appeals are ploy and not principle, CBS didn’t even point out that the Missouri House dress code revision would merely hold female legislators to a standard closer to that restricting the men.

ABC, to its credit, did do this. After [pointing out](#) that the “new rules require female legislators and staff members to wear a jacket such as a cardigan or blazer,” the site informs that “Republican Rep. Ann Kelley, who introduced the amendment, said it cleans up language in current House rules so that the



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 18, 2023

---

dress code for women will mirror the dress code for men.”

“It is essential to always maintain a formal and professional atmosphere on House floor and to ensure this happens, I have felt compelled to offer this amendment,’ she said during Wednesday’s floor debate,” ABC continued.

The kicker is that the women will still have more sartorial latitude than the men; in fact, this benefit was never in doubt. As ABC also informs, Kelley’s “initial amendment said women would be required to wear business attire — specifically a ‘jacket [no tie requirement],’ which would include ‘blazers and knit blazers.’ After spirited debate, a revised amendment was adopted to clarify that a cardigan could also be worn.”

“Men in the Missouri House of Representatives were already required to wear a jacket, shirt and a tie,” ABC added.

Returning to Representative Aune, she “gave an impassioned statement against the bill on the House floor,” CBS also tells us, “asking her fellow lawmakers, ‘Do you know what it feels like to have a bunch of men in this room looking at your top, trying to decide whether it’s appropriate or not?’”

Of course, if (Western) people are scrutinizing her top and thus wondering, it’s a clue: It’s not appropriate. Don’t dress questionably, walking the line of propriety, and it won’t be an issue.

Echoing this was Kelley. Responding to Aune, she [stated](#), “You would think that all you would have to do is say, ‘dress professionally’ and women could handle it.”

As is said, however, there’s one in every bunch (and, today, more than one). Illustrating why appropriate dress codes are necessary is the deranged Canadian male “teacher” who [parades around](#) with huge prosthetic breasts in front of kids. Give ‘em an inch — they’ll take a K-cup.

Aune does have a point, though: Men in the Missouri House certainly needn’t worry about people scrutinizing their tops’ propriety (and not just because most of the pols can’t be mistaken for Adonis). The monkey suits they must wear preclude that.

This raises a point: Were the roles reversed, with women required to don the jackets and ties and men enjoying the greater latitude, imagine the attitude. Why, the situation might be likened to the dystopian film *The Handmaid’s Tale*.

Actually, that’s already happened: CBS mentions that a Facebook user made this comparison while remarking on the new Missouri dress code. A different obviously deep thinker, [commenting](#) on the CBS piece, asked “[I]s this Sharia in my state??” Another opined, referencing the female legislators “Next, they’ll have to hide their faces.”

Actually, I’d want to hide my face if I ever mounted such puerile arguments.

In reality, the imperative here isn’t “equality”; that was only mentioned in the Alinsky-esque spirit of making the “other side” live up to their own alleged principles. The issue is *modesty*.

Modesty can dictate different rules for the sexes, too, because they are different. All this said, perhaps the first question for leftists railing against holding women to standards approximating those of men is:

What is a woman?



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

**Subscribe**