

## YOU SAID IT

Visitors to STLtoday.com's Talk of the Day blog had these thoughts about recent topics in the news:

**TOBACCO TAXES:**

“If everyone quit smoking, who would they go after next? I would love to hear the outcry if coffee was \$5 a cup. The point is raising money right? Try cutting all the wasteful spending. There is a place to start.”

Greg Feltz | St. Charles

“I am sick of the anti-smoker campaigns and taxes. Pick on another group now. Tax the overeaters who gorge on fast food and run up health care bills the smokers have to be taxed for!”

Rene LaFerla-Stines | Arnold

“I've smoked for 40+ years, it's going to kill me. But, I've had enough. We are going to organize, we are going to fight back, we are going to get our rights back.”

Art Bruening | Bellefontaine Neighbors

“Pricing someone out of a habit won't ever work. ... did any of us stop buying gas just because it was over \$3 a gallon? Of course not, we needed it. And smokers need nicotine.”

Josh Bozzay | Hillsboro

**BUSCH STADIUM MEMORIES:**

“My best memory of Busch was watching the late great Harry Caray (and Jack Buck) snag foul balls in Harry's fish net in the KMOX broadcast booth. After each catch, he'd always “take a bow,” as hundreds of adoring Cardinal fans would applaud his antics.”

Earnie Burton | Barboursville, Ky.

“I hate to see the stadium go but will hang on to the memories. My Cardinal flag hangs in my yard for every Cards game.”

Heidi Knoedler | Gothenburg, Neb.

“Gibby. Shannon. Boyer. Lou. Brock-a-brellas. McGwire. Ozzy. Red. Stan. Whitey. Ray. Jimmy Baseball. Walking around the warning track with my 5 y/o son Tommy this year, and watching him run the bases.”

Al Green | Tebbets, Mo.

“Some of the best times I had at the stadium was when the Shrine Circus would be held there. My father was a Shriner and we would go behind the scenes and be able to see the animals up close.”

Carol Tolentino | Fenton

“I have 21 years of memories that I will hold forever. I'll never forget watching Big Mac, Ozzie, or knowing that Jack Buck's voice will forever remain in those walls. Hate to see it go!”

Traci Arnowitz | St. Louis

STLtoday.com

Watch for this week's topics, and post your comments, online at STLtoday.com/talkoftheday.

## Iraq intelligence



By Philip Dine  
POST-DISPATCH WASHINGTON BUREAU

Sen. Dick Durbin recalls conflicting reports from the CIA and Energy departments:

**‘I was angry. The American people were being misled into believing that the evidence was clear, and it was not.’**

WASHINGTON • Partisan wrangling over how the Senate should investigate the administration's use of prewar intelligence about Iraq is about far more than politics — it reflects major differences over the evidence itself.

As a result, any effort to objectively examine whether the White House misled the country into war faces huge hurdles, even once the political maneuvering is completed.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., says investigators should compare all statements by intelligence agencies with what President George W. Bush said about Iraq's alleged weapons of mass destruction to determine “whether intelligence analysis was manipulated, shaped

or exaggerated.”

“We owe the American people a full and honest accountability of the intelligence that was used to make the case,” said Rockefeller, vice chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee. “This is about the gravest decision any president can ever make — taking the country to war.”

Sen. George Voinovich, R-Ohio, sharply disagrees that there is any evidence that the administration misused intelligence. He calls efforts to examine the matter a “political thing” — because, he says, any mistakes were honest ones made by intelligence agencies, not dishonest ones by government officials.

“It's a waste of time,” Voinovich said. “I was here, we were all here. There wasn't one intelligence

agency that wasn't taken in by this — Israeli, British, all the intelligence agencies. ... Going ahead with an investigation, it's nonsense.”

In making the case for war, the administration cited intelligence that Iraq had large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, was actively pursuing nuclear weapons, and had significant links to al-Qaida — none of which have proven true.

A report by the Senate Intelligence Committee last year acknowledged that the intelligence was wrong. A second phase of the committee's work — on how that intelligence was used by the administration to make the case for war, has been dragged out amid partisan sniping. On Nov. 1, Democrats shut down the Senate to jump-start that investigation, lead-

ing to the appointment of a six-member Senate task force to try to agree on the process for moving ahead.

That task force will report Monday on a proposed timetable and process for the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senate sources said Friday.

Most media attention on the issue over the past couple of weeks has been on the political charges and counter-charges.

But at the heart of the dispute is a basic question — whether senators believe the administration misled the country into war.

Sen. Christopher “Kit” Bond, R-Mo., doesn't think so.

“No, I do not see any major problems,” said Bond, a member of the

PLEASE SEE IRAQ | B5

# The sexual counterrevolution

Maureen Dowd thought feminists would bring about equality — only to find their triumph ‘would last a nanosecond’ ...

By Maureen Dowd  
NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE

When I entered college in 1969, women were bursting out of their '50s chrysalis, shedding girdles, padded bras and conventions. The Jazz Age spirit flared in the Age of Aquarius. Women were once again imitating men and acting all independent: smoking, drinking, wanting to earn money and thinking they had the right to be sexual, this time protected by the pill.

I didn't fit in with the brazen new world of hard-charging feminists. I was more of a fun-loving (if chaste) type who would decades later come to life in Sarah Jessica Parker's Carrie Bradshaw. I hated the grubby, unisex jeans and no-makeup look and drugs that zoned you out, and I couldn't understand the appeal of dances that didn't involve touching your partner. In the universe of Eros, I longed for style and wit. I loved the Art Deco glamour of '30s movies.

I took the idealism and passion of the '60s for granted, simply assuming we were sailing toward perfect equality with men, a utopian world at home and at work.

I figured there was plenty of time for me to get serious later, that America would always be full of passionate and full-throated debate about the big stuff — social issues, sexual equality, civil rights. Little did I realize that the feminist revolution would have the unexpected consequence of intensifying the confusion between the sexes, leaving women in a tangle of dependence and independence as they entered the 21st century.

Maybe we should have known that the story of women's progress would be more of a zigzag than a superhighway, that the triumph of feminism would last a nanosecond while the backlash lasted 40 years.

Despite the best efforts of philosophers, politicians, historians, novelists, screenwriters, linguists, therapists, anthropologists and facilitators, men and women are still in a muddle in the boardroom, the bedroom and the Situation Room.

**Courtship**

My mom gave me three essential books on the subject of men.

The first, when I was 13, was “On Becoming a Woman.” The second, when I was 21, was “365 Ways to Cook Hamburger.” The third, when I was 25, was “How to Catch and Hold a Man,” by Yvonne Antelle. (“Keep thinking of yourself as a soft, mysterious cat. ... Men are fascinated by bright, shiny objects, by lots of curls, lots of hair on the head ... by bows, ribbons, ruffles and bright colors. ... Sarcasm is dangerous. Avoid it altogether.”)

I put it aside as an anachronism. After all, sometime in the 1960s flirting went out of fashion, as did ironing boards, makeup and the idea that men needed to be “trapped” or “landed.” The way to approach men, we reasoned, was forthrightly and without games, artifice or frills.

PLEASE SEE DOWD | B6

Men do not reject achieving women. Quite the opposite.

Everything women were doing to advance themselves in the boardroom could be sabotaging their chances in the bedroom

... But a journalism professor and a women's studies scientist say Dowd's observations are based on flawed and outdated studies.

By Caryl Rivers and Rosalind C. Barnett  
WOMEN'S ENEWS

A growing media narrative over the past year says men do not like high-achieving women.

It's been fueled by stories in, among others, The New York Times, the Chicago Sun-Times, Toronto Star, “60 Minutes” and the Atlantic magazine.

This drumbeat reached its zenith last Sunday in Maureen Dowd's New York Times Magazine piece, “What's A Modern Girl to Do?”

The piece became the most e-mailed article from the Times' Web site and has left Dowd fielding readers' mail on the past and future of feminism.

What a waste of such a powerful platform. If only Dowd — capable of such wit, charm and political insight — had bothered to check her social science data.

Decades after the feminist movement promised equality with men, Dowd laments, “it was becoming increasingly apparent that many women would have to brush up on the venerable tricks of the trade: an absurdly charming little laugh, a pert toss of the head, an air of saucy triumph, dewy eyes and a full knowledge of music, drawing, elegant note writing and geography. It would once more be considered captivating to lie on a chaise lounge, pass a lacy handkerchief across the eyelids and complain of a case of springtime giddiness.”

For this surreal description of contemporary men and women, Dowd draws on data that shows her running with the media pack, yes, but sadly out of touch with serious social science.

**An alleged trend**

In particular, Dowd hypes an alleged trend of men rejecting ambitious women based on a 2004 study by psychology researchers. Those findings, by psychologists Stephanie Brown of the University of Michigan and Brian Lewis of the University of California at Los Angeles were wildly overblown.

The study was done on a small sample of 120 male and 208 female undergraduates, mainly freshmen.

The males rated the desirability as a dating or marriage partner of a fictitious female, described as either an immediate supervisor, a peer or an assistant.

Surprise, surprise! The freshman males preferred the subordinate over the peer and over the supervisor when it came to dating and mating.

The study, however, was no barometer of adult male preferences. Rather, it reflected teen boys' ambivalence about strong women.

Men, by contrast, do not reject achieving women. Quite the opposite. Sociologist Valerie Oppenheimer of the University of California at Berkeley reports that today men are choosing as mates women who have completed their education. The more education a woman has, the more likely she is to marry. Unlike the single University of California at

PLEASE SEE TREND | B6