

Selling the “Boomer Babes”: *more, my generation*, and the “New” Middle Age

By Carolyn Kitch, Temple University

Abstract

This article examines how two recent magazines for Baby Boomers—*more*, targeting women over 40, and the short-lived *my generation*, for the “young old” between 50 and 55, two-thirds of them women—have defined and marketed their audiences. While this study considers editorial content, it primarily examines the rhetoric of the magazines’ media kits, focusing less on how magazines are sold to readers than on how such readers are sold to advertisers. The article suggests that, through editorial and advertising messages promising eternal youth, these publications have replicated for older women the same kinds of unattainable ideals long presented to younger audiences—a profoundly commercial vision based on the fear of aging rather than its celebration.

Introduction

In May of 2002, an article in *Women’s Wear Daily* directed the fashion industry’s attention to “the leading edge of the baby boom,” declaring that “women ages 45 to 56 represent both the most lucrative—and the most underexploited—demographic in the U. S.” [1] A marketing consultant quoted in *American Demographics* calls the current life stage of this group “the 20 new years at the middle of life” and claims that “the coming dominance of women ages 40 to 59 is . . . ‘a fundamental and historic shift’” in population trends. [2]

Marketers have been studying the possible consequences of the aging of female Boomers since the mid-1980s, when the oldest members of that group began to turn 40. An article published in a 1985 issue of the *Journal of Consumer Marketing* proclaimed the arrival of “the new young woman consumer” and reported that, based on surveyed women’s self-perception, “‘middle age’ certainly begins no earlier than 40, and probably even later.” [3] Nevertheless, when several new magazines—*New York Woman*, *Lear’s*, *Mirabella*—were launched explicitly targeting older women, they folded for lack of advertising support. Their demise seemed to confirm the longtime feminist claim that women over the age of 35 remain absent from mass-media representation, an omission implying that advertisers are not interested in reaching them. This invisibility has been a bone of contention in the world of magazines, a medium that is used much more by women than by men and that is a primary forum for public definitions of attractiveness and ideal lifestyle.

Yet as the bulk of the Baby Boom has moved into this age group, the advertising and magazine marketplace is showing signs of a potential shift. One piece of evidence is the success of *more*, a magazine promising “Smart Talk for Smart Women” [4] over the age of 40. Launched as an offshoot of *Ladies’ Home Journal* in 1998, *more*, published ten times a year, now reaches some 700,000 readers. The magazine claims to boldly challenge advertisers, as well as “society,” in its depiction of, and pride in, middle-aged women. Susan Crandell recently wrote on her editor’s page:

While the biggest population bulge—that’s us, the boomers—

has moved into middle age, we continue to see a constant stream of 20-somethings in magazines and on TV, decorating ads for products, from suits to sedans, that are bought by women our age. . . . Boomers are the richest demographic group . . . we should be front-and-center in calls to buy . . . so we asked the people on the scene, five agencies that create some of the most arresting ads in America , to turn the spotlight on their own industry and create a series of ads that would combat ageism in advertising. [5]

The results of that creative challenge appeared in the same issue, under the title “How to Sell 40+.” They ranged from one ad showing laughing women with hands outstretched and the sell line “These Babies Have Boom” to another featuring the face of an attractive, middle-aged woman over this statement: “If you want my money, stop showing me pictures of my daughter in underwear. And stop pretending you think she’s me.” [6] When the magazine was launched, Crandall claimed, “One of the things *more* wants to do is reflect what 40 and 50 looks like.” [7]

This sort of attitude has found expression elsewhere in the magazine world, including, briefly, a new title for the peak of the Baby Boom: *my generation*, an offshoot of the American Association of Retired Persons’ *Modern Maturity* targeting the “young old.” AARP has since recombined the two magazines, but for nearly two years, *my generation* existed as a case study in marketing to one particular population segment, those between the ages of 50 and 55. [8] While the target age group was narrow, the bimonthly magazine’s circulation—given AARP’s mailing list and its use of controlled as well as paid circulation [9]—was a hefty 3.8 million, 2.6 million (two-thirds) of whom were female.

my generation was editorially different from *more*: the former provided a broad blend of lifestyle service articles, while the latter focuses on fashion and inspirational profiles. Yet they are rhetorically and historically related. At its launch, editor Betsy Carter claimed that *my generation* “breaks the mold of existing magazines” and that its audience deserved new respect:

Born into the prosperity of postwar America , the first Baby Boomers grew up with a sense of limitless possibility. And they’re not about to give up their high expectations. Now they’re challenging our idea of what it means to be over 50. Committed to originality and to reinventing their lives, they are actively pursuing their lifelong dreams. Well-informed and media savvy, they are smart, avid consumers of ideas and information. [10]

Neither of these new magazines, of course, served a “new” audience; women over 40 or 50 have been devoted magazine readers for more than a century. They have been reading the “seven sisters”—*Good Housekeeping*, *McCall’s*, *Ladies’ Home Journal*, *Redbook*, *Family Circle*, *Woman’s Day*, and *Better Homes & Gardens*—as well as *Reader’s Digest*, and the fact that these titles have consistently been at the top of industry circulation and advertising-revenue lists is proof of how plentiful and economically powerful middle-aged women are. [11] Nor is this reality changed by the fact that the

Baby Boom has moved into this age group: the above magazines still have huge circulations, the biggest several times the size of their newer competitors' audiences. While the new magazines do speak to certain Boomers in a different voice than middle-aged audiences have been addressed in the past, their content—an editorial mix of beauty, fashion, celebrity, lifestyle, relationship advice—is similar to that of the long-existing women's magazines.

What is new, then, about the newer titles? This article suggests that the answer lies less in editorial content than in the publishers' repackaging of this middle-aged, female audience. That is, the difference lies not in how magazines are sold to readers but in how readers are sold to advertisers. This study considers the magazines' editorial content, looking to a year's worth of recent issues for context and confirmation, but focuses primarily on the business-side transaction—on the publications' media kits and marketing materials defining this “mold-breaking” audience, and on the nature of the advertisers buying space to reach this audience.

In repackaging and selling the middle-aged woman, these magazines have indeed created what seems to be a new ideal not previously represented in the publishing and advertising worlds. Yet in many ways she is a familiar construct, as unrealistically attractive and unattainable as her younger counterpart in magazines for twentysomethings.

Critical Context for the Study

Communication scholars, particularly those who study marketing and advertising, and marketers themselves have paid significant attention to older consumers for two decades, since the Boomers began to enter middle age. Much of this research has focused on the audience itself, and on its spending power and behavior. [12] Some scholarship has considered how age is related to use of various types of media and to perception of media content, [13] while other work has examined media imagery of older people, particularly on television. [14]

A great deal of scholarly attention has been paid to images of women in magazines. [15] Since most of those images are of young women, however, little research has addressed images of older women in magazines. [16] Most scholarship on images of older people in magazines has focused on senior citizens (those 65 and older) more so than middle-aged people.

These studies have produced two types of findings. One is that magazine articles tend to portray older people more often in a negative light (as difficult or senile) than a positive one (as wise or trustworthy). [17] The other conclusion is that magazine advertisements, even in magazines typically read by older audiences, rarely use older models, [18] and that when they do, those older models are more likely to be male than female. [19] These findings have been confirmed in studies done over the past twenty years, despite the fact that other research has revealed that audiences do not react unfavorably to older models and do feel that “advertisers are too obsessed with youth.” [20] Finally, some researchers have argued that the minority of advertising portrayals of vigorous senior citizens are unhelpful because they are *overly* positive: “such active advertising portrayals may contribute to a *less* positive concept of self and unrealistic

expectations about growing old” among media audiences. [21]

Magazines of all kinds tend to represent the reader in idealized form (in articles as well as advertisements), appealing to audiences “who see themselves not as they are, but as they hope to be,” writes anthropologist Maria D. Vesperi. [22] She notes that such “aspirational” images of older people—who have gained the marketing moniker of “woofies,” for “well-off older persons”—can be an inspiring alternative to images of senior citizens who are lonely, afraid, and struggling to make ends meet. “For most elders, however, reality lies somewhere in the middle, and setting the bar so high has unexamined implications for self-esteem and for the range of available and acceptable ‘lifestyle’ options.” [23]

Social worker Judith G. Gonyea notes that such unrealistic imagery is even more likely in images of today’s aging Baby Boomer women, who are becoming recognized as a powerful commercial market. She writes:

Although women have always faced pressure to achieve an idealized body image, baby boomer women may face even greater pressure than previous generations have. Whereas for their mothers and grandmothers, aging was regarded as a “normal process,” it is increasingly being perceived as something one can control, delay, and even perhaps stop. As it becomes easier for women to avoid looking middle-aged or old through techniques such as cosmetic surgery, will our society become less forgiving of women who “look old”? [24]

These questions are at the heart of the paradoxical nature of the “new” pictures of female aging in magazines such as *more* and *my generation*. Even before these publications were launched, Betty Friedan—referring to fashion-magazine articles with titles such as “Over 40 and Fabulous”—argued that “what was being sold by these superwomen was the fountain of youth: a career of looking forever young.” [25]

“Smart” and Sexy: A Commercial Redefinition of Middle Age

Celebrities appearing on *my generation*’s cover—recently, for instance, Isabella Rossellini, 50, and Sally Field, 55—spanned the same narrow age range as the intended audience. Although *more* defines its audience as over 40, its editorial focus is on “leading edge” Baby Boomer women, and the average age of its celebrity cover subjects during the year 2002 was 51.

Reader psychographics have been just as important as the demographic of age in publishers’ visions of this audience. Just as *my generation* defined its readers as “well-informed, media-savvy . . . [and] smart,” *more*’s advertising rate card notes “the new attitude of confidence, enthusiasm and excitement with which these women approach their middle years,” calls its readers “a generation which (*sic*) is reveling in and reshaping this vital, rewarding stage of life,” and claims that “*more* speaks to them in a sophisticated voice they understand.” [26]

As does *more*’s editorial tagline, “Smart Talk for Smart Women,” these advertising-media-kit characterizations of the magazines’ audiences have repeatedly

emphasized readers’ “smartness.” They are presented as “savvy” consumers who know what they want. The implication here is that this psychographic definition sets the readers of the newer titles apart from the millions of women reading the traditional women’s magazines. *more*’s competitor list includes none of the traditional titles, but rather the younger women’s fashion and lifestyle magazines—*Cosmopolitan*, *Elle*, *Glamour*, *Harper’s Bazaar*, *In Style*, and *Vogue*—whose average reader age is 34. [27]

Yet demographics do not support these implied differences, nor do they provide quantitative proof that *more* and *my generation* readers are younger or more independent or smarter (though there is a difference in education [28]) than readers of other magazines for middle-aged women. Here is a comparison of key demographics with those of a leading traditional women’s magazine [29] :

	<i>my generation</i>	<i>more</i>	<i>Good Housekeeping</i>
Median age	51	49	47
Married	65%	65%	64%
Homeowners	83%	77%	77%
Attended college	65%	61%	53%
Median household income	\$58K	\$59K	\$49K

It is the last demographic that is the bottom line of publishers’ argument to potential advertisers. The tagline following the *more* logo on its media kit differs from the editorial tagline, instead reading “for the richest years in a woman’s life,” and the word “rich” has two definitions. The demographic of household income—and, given the readers’ age, presumably more of it is disposable than when they were younger—is offered as proof of general spending power, but even more important is the psychographic of self-indulgence. “They always got what they want” was the opening line of *my generation*’s media-kit mission statement; after defining its audience in these terms, the statement described the magazine as “a catalog for living.” *more*’s advertising mission statement simply uses the magazine’s title to declare what its readers want.

What specifically do affluent Baby Boomer women want? The advertisements that ran in *my generation*—which charged a very high open (full-page, four-color) rate of \$154,000 [30] —offered a mix of luxuries (including travel and high-end cars) and health-related products, especially pharmaceuticals. While these ads featured some older men, women were more often used as models or celebrities in advertisements, especially in health ads. [31]

Health is the largest advertising category for *more* (which, given its lower circulation, has an open rate of \$54,000 for a four-color page), followed by beauty. [32] Both themes are closely related in editorial content as well as advertising messages, and the two together account for 63 percent of all advertising in the magazine. Of all the health- and beauty-related advertisements in *more*, 80 percent—four out of every five such ads—have distinct aging-prevention themes. [33] Here are some of the sell lines of

those ads:

“Dryness Defied. Radiance Restored.” (Lancome)

“Retroactive Makes Skin Behave Like It Used To” (Avon Retroactive Cream)

“Now There’s Proof You Can Reduce Wrinkles Just by Washing Your Face”

“Now, a Makeup that Lifts Away Those Little Signs of Aging” (Loreal)

“A Towelette that Tells Your Lines Where to Go” (Ponds)

“Skin Renewal: Advancing the Science of Anti-Aging” (Lubriderm)

“Now, new lift, new life. Overnight.” (Estee Lauder)

“In One Week, Take Years Off Your Eyes” (Neutrogena)

“Stronger. Smarter. Better. And That’s Just the Oatmeal.” (Quaker Instant Oatmeal)

“It’s Not Just about Looking Younger. It’s about Looking Wonderful.” (Olay) [34]

This dominant theme in advertisements is underscored by statistics from a reader poll, provided in *more*’s media kit, that emphasize readers’ fear of growing old and devotion to preventing the aging process. Reader use of hair color, lipstick, mascara, blush, facial moisturizers, and hand and body lotion exceeds 75 percent in all categories, and 88 percent of readers say that they use more beauty products now than they did when they were in their twenties. The study also yielded these statistics:

- * 98 percent agree that the way they look strongly affects the way they feel
- * 97 percent feel pleased when people notice and comment on their appearance
- * 94 percent say it’s important to look their best at all times
- * 90 percent always look for ways to improve their appearance

What is particularly interesting about this study is that it was conducted among a group of readers with “better” demographics than the entire audience, particularly income (median household income \$84,600) and education (83 percent college-educated); i.e., these were the responses of “richer” and “smarter” readers. [35]

In an ironic or at least oddly unselfconscious gesture, the *more* media kit’s “Press” section includes an article, titled “The Fab 40-Plus,” published in the New York *Daily News*. The reporter wrote that “*more* magazine is already redefining middle age.

It's smart! It's fun! And it's downright stunning. All the celebrities and models on its pages were born before 1960. Unfortunately, that just means that all of the rest of us born before 1960 now have a gaggle of gorgeous women to compare ourselves to." [36]

The celebrity images on the covers and in the media kits of both magazines bear out this observation. *my generation* celebrated movie actresses and rock stars. *more* attracted press attention recently for its September 2002 profile of Jamie Lee Curtis, in which the actress was photographed in underwear "as she really is, no lights, no makeup, no retouching," yet the feature closed with a glamorous head shot similar to the issue's cover photograph of Curtis, both certainly with makeup and lighting. [37] Indeed, like Curtis, *more's* cover women and profile subjects—other recent examples include Susan Sarandon, Lauren Hutton, Sela Ward, Cybill Shepherd, Bebe Neuwirth, and Kim Cattrall—not only are famous and successful, but also are among the physically best-preserved middle-aged women in the world.

In the magazine's media kit, such celebrities are also shown as sexual: its cover image shows Patti Hanson in an off-the-shoulder, leopard-print outfit, looking up from under disheveled hair and licking her lips. Inside the media kit, Sela Ward throws her head back, eyes closed and mouth breathlessly open. Even in the magazine—which regularly runs inspirational profiles of accomplished and ordinary-looking middle-aged women—the professional models who appear in the fashion spreads of the editorial well are pencil-thin and beautiful. Like the cover celebrities, they don't *look* 40-plus, even though we're assured that they are.

Discussion

In the end, the mission of magazines such as *more* and *my generation* is to celebrate not middle age itself but the reader's ability to avoid looking or acting middle-aged. Such a goal is built on consumer products that presumably allow the reader to continue to drink from the fountain of youth. This powerful commercial proposition—fueled by a huge Baby Boom audience that, if we believe demographers and social critics, is supremely self-absorbed—is behind the phenomenon that is being credited as "progress" in the mass-media depiction of middle-aged women.

In depicting middle-aged women as vibrant and beautiful, both publications have attempted to correct a long-held stereotype and fill a representational void. Yet their focus on the *prevention* of aging—and on congratulating readers as being "smart" and "savvy" for wanting to stay young—falls squarely within familiar marketing techniques that combine fear and flattery. Such an appeal always has been central to the selling of younger-women's magazines and the marketing of those younger audiences to advertisers. Now it has been replicated for older female audiences. At the same time, older women now have unrealistically perfect ideals of beauty that previously were available only within a younger age group. Such outcomes are arguably more cause for concern than celebration. They offer several possible interpretations of how marketers might (as *Women's Wear Daily* put it) "exploit" older as well as young women.

The nature of this idealization and selling process is much more overt, and directly explained, in the materials with which magazines "sell" their audiences to potential advertisers than in the magazines' editorial pages. That is why this study has

focused primarily on those kinds of primary-source materials and on the ads that appear as the result of those campaigns. This article suggests that, when one wants to assess changing definitions of media audiences, such documents may be even more revealing than editorial content.

Today, almost all women in the Baby Boom are 40-plus, and approximately one-third of Boomer women are 50-plus. This part of the American population will continue to be a subject of intense study within the advertising and media industries, and it deserves continuing study from academic researchers as well. These women are indeed a rich topic for research that examines the editorial content of media directed toward them, tracks the group's characterizations in the advertising world, and studies the audience members themselves to learn more about their ideals and realities.

The author would like to thank Temple University doctoral student Rebecca Hains for her research assistance with this article.

Notes

[1] Valerie Seckler, "Boomers: Buried Treasure," *Women's Wear Daily*, 15 May 2002, n.p.

[2] Martha Farnsworth Riche, quoted in Lambeth Hochwald, "Booming Business," *American Demographics* 20, no. 12 (1998): 33.

[3] Benny Barak and Barbara Stern, "Fantastic at Forty! The New Young Woman Consumer," *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1985): 42.

[4] This phrase has been the magazine's tagline from the start, appearing just above the cover logo for its first three years. Though it is no longer on the cover, it remains on the table of contents page.

[5] Susan Crandell, "Editor's Letter: The Aging of Aquarius," *more*, April 2002, 12.

[6] Mary Lou Quinlan, "The *more* Challenge: How to Sell 40+," *more*, April 2002, 53-5.

[7] Quoted in Hochwald, "Booming Business," 34.

[8] "We Are the 50+ Market," sheet in *my generation* media kit, sent to author in March 2002. The magazine was edited for readers' potentially younger spouses as well, so its target age group was actually 45 to 55.

[9] *my generation* was sold on newsstands for \$2.95 per issue and mailed to AARP members ages 50 to 55.

[10] Betsy Carter, editor-in-chief, Mission Statement, *my generation* media kit.

[11] Among the trade publications that annually list magazine circulation and ad revenue figures are *Folio:* and *Advertising Age*.

[12] For instance: Fabian Linden, "The \$800 Billion Market," *American Demographics*, February 1986, 20-2; Adrienne Ward, "Marketers Slow to Catch Age Wave," *Advertising Age*, 22 May 1989, S-1; John J. Burnett, "Examining the Media Habits of the Affluent Elderly," *Journal of Advertising Research* 36, no. 5 (1991): 33-41; and David B. Wolfe, "The Key to Marketing to Older Consumers," *Journal of Business Strategy* 13, no. 6 (1992): 14-8.

[13] For instance: John C. Doolittle, "News Media Use by Older Adults," *Journalism Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (1979): 311-7, 345; Elliot S. Schreiber and Douglas A. Boyd, "How the Elderly Perceive Television Commercials," *Journal of Communication* 30, no. 1 (1980): 61-70; Felipe Korzenny and Kimberly Neuendorf, "Television Viewing and Self-Concept of the Elderly," *Journal of Communication* 30, no. 1 (1980): 71-80; and Norbert Mundorf and Winifred Brownell, "Media Preferences of Older and Younger Adults," *The Gerontologist* 30, no. 5 (1990): 685-91.

[14] For instance: Adella J. Harris and Jonathan F. Feinberg, "Television and Aging: Is What You See What You Get?" *The Gerontologist* 17, no. 5 (1977): 464-8; George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli, and Michael Morgan, "Aging with Television Drama and Conceptions of Social Reality," *Journal of Communication* 30, no. 1 (1980): 37-47; Joyce Elliott, "The Daytime Television Drama Portrayal of Older Adults," *The Gerontologist* 24, no. 6 (1984): 628-33; and Barrie Gunter, *Understanding the Older Consumer: The Grey Market* (London and NY: Routledge, 1998). The portrayal of older people in newspapers was examined in Michael Buchholz and Jack E. Bynum, "Newspaper Presentation of America's Aged: A Content Analysis of Image and Role," *The Gerontologist* 22, no. 1 (1982): 83-8.

[15] This body of scholarship includes many journal articles in the literary and communication fields as well as a number of scholarly book-length treatments such as Ellen McCracken, *Decoding Women's Magazines: From Mademoiselle to Ms.* (London: Macmillan, 1993) and Janice Winship, *Inside Women's Magazines* (London and NY: Pandora Press, 1987). The social effects and imagery ideals of women's magazines also have been a frequent subject of media critiques in popular books, from Betty Friedan's 1963 landmark *The Feminine Mystique* (NY: Norton, 1963) to Susan Faludi's *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (NY: Crown, 1991) and Susan Douglas's *Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media* (NY: Times Books, 1994).

[16] One example of scholarship in this area is Andrea Mitnick, "For the Woman Who Wasn't Born Yesterday: Middle Age as a Rite of Passage in *Lear's*," (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1995).

[17] For instance: Jon Nussbaum and James Robinson, "Attitudes toward Aging," *Communication Research Reports* 1, no. 1 (1984): 21-7; and Judith de Luce, "Silence at the Newsstands," *Generations* 25, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 39-43.

[18] Studies that have reported such findings include: Walter Gantz, Howard M. Gartenberg, and Cindy K. Rainbow, "Approaching Invisibility: The Portrayal of the Elderly in Magazine Advertisements," *Journal of Communication* 30, no. 1 (1980): 56-

60; Paula England, Alice Kuhn, and Teresa Gardner, "The Ages of Men and Women in Magazine Advertisements," *Journalism Quarterly* 58 (1981): 468-71; B. Kvasnicka, B. Beymer, and R. Perloff, "Portrayals of the Elderly in Magazine Advertisements," *Journalism Quarterly* 59, no. 4 (1982): 656-8, and Sharon Bramlett-Solomon and Vanessa Wilson, "Images of the Elderly in *Life* and *Ebony*, 1978-1987," *Journalism Quarterly* 66 (1989): 185-8.

[19] Anthony C. Ursic, Michael L. Ursic, and Virginia L. Ursic, "A Longitudinal Study of the Use of the Elderly in Magazine Advertising," *Journal of Consumer Research* 13 (1986): 131-3. It may be important to note, however, that this study examined magazines published between 1950 and 1980—before the Baby Boom became middle-aged and before their parents were elderly. Also, this older study found a much greater gender imbalance in advertising representations (approximately four times as many men as women shown), while Bramlett-Solomon and Wilson ("Images of the Elderly in *Life* and *Ebony*") found a split that, while still slightly favoring men, was more even.

[20] Ronald E. Milliman and Robert C. Erffmeyer, "Improving Advertising Aimed at Seniors," *Journal of Advertising Research* (December 1989/January 1990): 31-6; Herbert J. Rotfeld, Leonard N. Reid, and Gary B. Wilcox, "Effect of Age of Models in Print Ads on Evaluation of Product and Sponsor," *Journalism Quarterly* 59, no. 3 (1982): 374-81; and Adrienne Ward, "Marketers Slow to Catch Age Wave," *Advertising Age*, 22 May 1989, S-1.

[21] This quote is from a literature summary provided in Nussbaum, *et al.*, *Communication and Aging*, 104.

[22] Maria D. Vesperi, "Introduction: Media, Marketing, and Images of the Older Person in the Information Age," *Generations* 25, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 6. She attributes this concept of "aspirational clusters" to British cultural theorist Dick Hebdige, who called psychographic marketing "a social map of desire" ("After the Masses," in *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*, eds. Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994], 232).

[23] Vesperi, "Introduction: Media, Marketing, and Images of the Older Person," 7.

[24] Judith G. Gonyea, "Midlife and Menopause: Uncharted Territories for Baby Boomer Women," *Generations* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 87.

[25] Betty Friedan, *The Fountain of Age* (NY: Touchstone, 1993).

[26] *my generation* media kit; Rate Card 2001, in *more* media kit.

[27] "Competitive Demographic Profile," sheet in *more* media kit.

[28] It is worth noting, however, that, given the difference in their paid circulations (4.5 million versus 700,000), *Good Housekeeping* actually has more than five times the number of college-educated readers that *more* has.

[29] MRI statistics from *my generation* and *more* media kits and *Good Housekeeping*

online media kit (accessed by author on 12 June 2002).

[30] This rate, high for a new magazine with 3.8 million circulation (much of it not exactly paid) may have accounted for the number of house ads for AARP itself and its various services in the magazine.

[31] Based on the author's analysis of advertising content in the six bimonthly issues of *my generation* published between November 2001 and October 2002, as well as the list of launch-issue advertisers in the *my generation* media kit.

[32] "more Advertiser List," sheets in *more* media kit.

[33] Based on the author's analysis of advertising content in the ten issues of *more* (two of them "double issues," December/January and July/August) published between December 2001 and November 2002.

[34] These advertisements appeared in (in order listed in text): *more*, June 2002, 9, 16-17, and third (inside-back) cover; *more* (September 2002), second (inside-front) cover spread; *more* (May 2002), 37; *more* (February 2002), 33; *more* (November 2002), 2-3; *more* (April 2002), 57 and 35; and *my generation* (May/June 2002), 69.

[35] "more Subscriber Study," conducted in 2000, sheet in *more* media kit.

[36] Lenore Skenazy, "The Fab 40-Plus," [New York] *Daily News*, 21 May 2000, n.p.

[37] Amy Wallace, "True Thighs," *more*, September 2002, 90-5.

And, this generation came after The Greatest Generation (or GI Generation) and the Silent Generation. Generation X followed this generation, followed by Millennials. Baby Boomers were born in an era that experienced great U.S. political and social upheaval. Generation X came after the Baby Boomer generation. These individuals were born between 1964 and 1982 (sometimes this is from 1965 through 1979.) No members of this generation served as president. However, this generation is known to have done well. The group collectively learned more than Baby Boomers did when they were the same age. They sought health and wellness in new ways. They were self-actualizing. They wanted and worked hard to earn prosperity. As they enter late middle age, the Boomers still can't grow up. Guys who once dropped acid are now downing Viagra; women who once eschewed lipstick are now getting liposuction. At the risk of feeding their narcissism, I believe it's time someone stated the simple truth: The Baby Boomers are the most self-centered, self-seeking, self-interested, self-absorbed, self-indulgent, self-aggrandizing generation in American history. I hate the Boomers. And so the Boomers careened into the seventies without a thought to picking up where King and the Kennedys left off. Without a war to threaten them, their selfishness came into full bloom. When the team was sold in 1998, Bush made a profit of more than \$14 million. And what does Bush offer us, after this life of wretched Boomer selfishness? More Baby Boomers are using weed and other cannabis products, and they're more likely to also smoke, drink alcohol and abuse drugs, researchers reported Thursday. Nine percent of people aged 50 to 64 said they've used marijuana in the past year, which is double the number in the same age group in 2006. Although current users are more likely to be young adults, the Baby Boomer generation is unique as it has had more experience with marijuana compared to any generation preceding them, NYU's Dr. Benjamin Han and Dr. Joseph Palamar wrote. Related. We're now in a new era of changing attitudes around marijuana, and as stigma declines and access improves, it appears that baby boomers many of whom have prior experience smoking marijuana are increasingly using it.