

Bare Facts

Copyright 2008 Lake Edun Foundation, Inc.

Official Publication of the Lake Edun Foundation, Inc.

August 1, 2008

Box 1982; Topeka, KS 66601 • Voice Mail: 785-478-BARN • e-mail: benude@lakeedun.com • Website: www.lakeedun.com
38° 58' 7" North; 95° 47' 56" West

Memo From The Board

Summer seems to be quickly coming to an end! If you have not had time in your busy schedule to come to the lake and enjoy the company of your lake family you really need to do so! It has been many years since the lake looked as good as it does this year. Adequate and sometimes plentiful rain fall has helped keep the area green and the lake full. Our caretakers this year have done an especially good job in getting the trails trimmed and keeping the lawns cut. We have added a few new touches as well. Want to know what they are? Come and see!

We have also enjoyed many new faces at our special place, as well as some of our friends that have not visited for several years. We welcome all who have come to the lake. With all those new to Lake Edun, we have the opportunity to share with our new friends both the philosophy, and naturist etiquette that has developed over the years not only at the lake, but for naturism in general.

One of the principle reasons we formed our foundation and found a place like the lake was to practice the ideals of social naturism. Several naturist groups in the east have adopted a list that outlines these ideals. I will share that list here:

We appreciate all of nature and believe it is an ideal context for nudity.

EveryBODY is beautiful.

We are family-oriented.

We promote nudity in everyday life, not merely recreation. Naturism is more than skin-deep; substantial gymnosophy underlies our nudity.

Nudity is not a pretext for lust.

We revere tradition while welcoming truly wise change.

We deeply respect religion, without promoting any particular creed.

Our nudity is unabashed but not exhibitionist.

We promote nudity via cultural education and not mere law and politics.

This list fits very well with the atmosphere we have tried to create at the lake over the past decades. It embraces several of the reasons we are willing, even anxious to shed the trappings of the everyday world and reveal ourselves as we really are.

From time to time we are made aware of individuals who, perhaps from ignorance of the etiquette or some personal reason, ignore the ideals of the lake and of naturism. When this occurs we may feel uneasy or even upset with the actions of the offending individual. Many times brief discussion is all that is needed to set the course straight. That said, please, please, please if you are aware of questionable actions by a visitor to the lake make your concerns known at the barn so the concern can be addressed. We want our family to expand and our circle of friends to grow.

(Continued to right)

How Much Do Naturist Clubs Charge?

Most Naturist facilities charge a fee for people who wish to visit for a day or camp out for a weekend. Because the Lake Edun Foundation is committed to its educational mission we allow all comers to experience the beneficial impact living clothing-free, for free. We realize some who visit are financially more secure than others. We trust those who are able will make contributions sufficient to help underwrite those who are less fortunate.

Even so, the question is often asked: "What is a reasonable payment?"

Recently, we surveyed ten similar facilities in the midwest. These clubs geographically range from Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Kansas, to Michigan and Indiana. The average charge is \$30.80 for non AANR/TNS members for a one day visit. Some even charge an additional fee for camping.

We much appreciate our visitors and welcome them. We also appreciate and encourage their generosity in donating to the educational mission of the Lake Edun Foundation. It takes all of us pulling together, both with good will and our financial support, to maintain a naturist venue in Topeka. Those of us that treasure Lake Edun know that it fully repays us with the value we receive from a day at the Lake.

Items We Need

See our website at lakeedun.com for more details.

- Non-motorized boats
- Metal Barrels
- Lawn or Lounge Chairs
- Wooden Cable Spools
- Riding lawn mower
- Aluminum cans, etc.
- Working refrigerator

DON'T FORGET

Activities designated HN are sponsored by Heartland Naturists

Aug 2; Sat; 12-3; Open House

Aug 15; Fri; 8-10; HN Swim

Aug 16; Sat; 10-12; Board of Directors

Aug 29-Sept 1; Labor Day Weekend Activities

Sept 1; Mon; Labor Day

Sept 6; Sat; 10-12; Board of Directors

Sept 19; Fri; 8-10; HN Swim

Sept 20; Sat; 8-10; Sauna

Sept 27; Sat; 8-10; Sauna

We live in a society that verges on paranoia about the human body. As individuals come to the lake to explore naturism, they may be carrying this cultural baggage with them. We need to be understanding of their journey of discovery and be ready to welcome, explain, and encourage them as they experience this new world.

We still have several weeks of warm sun and warm water! Come enjoy a few days at the lake. Make some new friends and some really pleasant memories with us.

Encouraging Signs

by John S.

Wow! The weekend was very busy, even though we had some clouds with a rain drop or two. Well okay quite a rain! For the most part it was great.

The book exchange was a little slow, but with it getting in the Bare Facts at the last minute I expected that. Some people had been told prior to the printing so it was well received. Between me and Susan T. there was a good selection to start with. Next time it will be announced well ahead of time. So, if you're a reader and want other books to read, or just pass your own books on to another reader, please keep the book exchange in mind. Once again, any children's books will be passed on to children in local hospitals.

From all the compliments of the grounds and improvements, I would also say we are LOOKING GOOD. My gosh! All the things that have been accomplished would take all day to list, but here are a few: Wider trails and paths, and new sand on both beaches.

We have a few people to thank for all the work. Dan, Wendy, Odell, Bruce, Ernie, and even Carver Dave pitched in some, plus me. Tractor DOUG deserves kudos for all his work. Most of the work was done with muscles, sweat, and blood from nicks and scratches from our labor. Also included is Webb, without whom we could not have the Lake at all.

I don't think Evan was ever thanked for cleaning a rather large pile of junk from the north creek crossing, so we want to thank him now. Riley has tried to keep our equipment functioning. This is no small task for which we appreciate all his help. There is always some work and never enough help, so if you care to help, please let us know.

The floating docks were repaired. There is a boat sandbox now for children to play and dig into. I just hope we have more young folks with children come back out to enjoy the Lake. We again had some new folks, quite a few as a matter of fact, and I want to say WELCOME, please enjoy, and come back when you can.

Just a reminder that we have water and sodas available. We need a new refrigerator to make them more available. For now these items will only be available when there is someone at the barn or a board member is there.

A lot of our equipment is very old and hard used, kinda like my ole body, and starting to have aches and pains of the aging process. Once again, if you donate something please do so only if it is usable. Whoever donated the privacy fence, we want you to know some has been used on the dock and some will make small tables on the beach like the one on South beach that was used this weekend.

The wood, (I believe cottonwood) that was dumped in the Parking lot should have never been dumped on us. We still have a few areas of the parking lot that need to be cleaned up, but it takes time. It would be better if you have something to bring out for us that you call or talk to someone to make arrangements. That way our parking lot will not look like a junk yard from the road, and to new visitors.

This is something I hate to have to even bring up, but it needs restating periodically: We want everyone to enjoy and have

a good experience when they visit. We expect people to conduct themselves accordingly, but we know there are bad apples sometimes. We need to know if there is a problem so we can take appropriate action. If anyone sees or hears of inappropriate activity let us know. Talk to a board member, contact the barn, email, or a note in the mail box at the barn. Be as specific as possible with names, dates, and activity. Some people just don't know how to act in public. If they create problems, we will un-invite them. We as naturists are usually more tolerant of folk's differences and I can't stress this enough, but bad behavior will not be tolerated.

Our new caretakers do not know everyone by name. Please, everyone must go by the barn to let them know who you are and that you're there. As always, **all visitors must sign in**, even if the caretaker is there at the moment.

Nuff Said

A Response

"In a society where only the prettiest of faces makes it onto television, and in a country where billions of dollars are spent on plastic surgery to fix the most minor flaw, Lake Edun stands apart from the rest. Here, at this all-nude lake on the outskirts of south Topeka, men aren't judged by the size of their members and women with breasts that hang from their bodies like tube socks full of sand can feel proud of who they are."

So begins a recent article in the Daily Kansan written about Lake Edun. While there are some errors in the remainder of the article, they are not all that significant. What is significant is the sentence saying that, "...men aren't judged by the size of their members and women with breasts that hang from their bodies like tube socks full of sand can feel proud of who they are."

I could be wrong, but after a number of readings, it seems that the author in a rather clumsy manner was trying to say that you won't be judged by the appearance of your body at Lake Edun, unlike what happens in the rest of society. In other words, you don't have to be physically perfect to feel good about your body at Lake Edun.

That being said, the imagery used to describe breasts is jarring and offensive. So jarring and potent is this imagery that it negates everything said about Lake Edun's efforts to promote respect and body acceptance. It is also to be noted that at Lake Edun we don't deal in euphemisms for body parts. As adults, we all are aware that men have a penis.

At Lake Edun we understand the trepidation many have about baring their body for all to see. This fear has a lot to do with the relative conformity an individual has with current standards of beauty. The courage it takes to be nude the first time before others is appreciated by all. It is an act that defies conventional society's taboos. This is no small thing.

Each person that goes through this ritual is saying they have realized that the body anxiety and shame promoted by media, advertising, and Hollywood is without merit. Each person that embraces naturism has seen through the materialistic motivations and tissue of lies of those promoting body shame as a way to keep their customers buying products to "fix their defects."

A subliminal message of the tube sock image has to do with the obsessive sexualization of women's breasts in our society. It is an image that patently evaluates/judges women according to the perceived sexual potential of their breasts. Women have been reduced to body parts that are the object of sexual fantasy. We at Lake Edun celebrate the whole person and object to this dehumanization of women in the strongest of terms.

The misery caused by body shaming is all around us. Body shame is a driving force behind much of plastic surgery, anorexia and bulimia, and an untold amount of depression and low self worth. Yet, so pervasive and subtle is this toxic element in our society that not only do most of us unconsciously embrace it, but we consciously spread its corrosive judgments on everyone we meet. Truly, we have met the enemy and it is us.

Those that gather at Lake Edun, and all naturists and naturist venues embody a life philosophy that affirms the essential goodness of the body in all its parts and functions. Naturists also make a political statement by denouncing the demeaning, dehumanizing forces and interest in our society that aggressively mean to oppress us at our very core. That is, to make us feel shame for whom we are in our bodies.

Finally, we invite all to learn more about naturism. Come visit. See for yourself what it means to leave the shaming standards of society behind and feel the freedom of being yourself in nature.

San Onofre Update

A lawsuit has been filed in Orange County superior Court by the Naturist Action Committee and the Friends of San Onofre Beach against the state parks department Thursday. They argue that officials failed to hold public hearings before rescinding a long-standing policy that tolerated skinny-dipping at the beach's southern end.

The suit seeks to delay plans by state parks officials to begin citing nude beachgoers after Labor Day. "We want to bring attention to the public that the Department of Parks and Recreation doesn't care what the public thinks. We think the public is behind us," said R. Allen Baylis, who heads the local activist group. "After being there for more than 30 years, we deserve a piece of the beach."

At stake is continued clothing optional use of a beach that on sunny summer weekends, finds hundreds of nude sunbathers crowding the 1,000-foot strip of sand near Camp Pendleton.

State law doesn't allow for clothing-optional areas in parks. Under the Cahill Policy, named for a former parks director, citations or arrests are made only after a complaint from the public and attempts to "elicit voluntary compliance."

After decades of quietly allowing the Trail 6 beach to remain clothing-optional, officials in May announced they would begin issuing citations because of ongoing public complaints.

In response, a state parks department spokesman said public hearings weren't necessary to rescind the Cahill Policy at San Onofre. There are no plans to rescind the policy at other popular clothing-optional beaches, including Black's Beach in San Diego, he added.

"This is our own internal policy," Stearns said. "We had full authority to establish it, and we have full authority to rescind it."

What is troubling for naturists is why the parks department didn't actively go after the persons causing the problems with their sexual misconduct at the beach. Further, they didn't seek out the Friends of San Onofre beach group to assist in maintaining a beach that would protect clothing-optional use.

Instead, the parks department simply and suddenly announced an end to nude use. Apparently they assume that it is the nude use that causes the problem of inappropriate public sexual behavior. Naturists strongly object to this high handed approach and any linkage between simple nudity and sexual misconduct by some.

It is clear that inaction by the parks department in policing San Onofre in the first place, allowed conditions that they then used to end clothing-optional use. It is obvious that had they targeted the perpetrators of sexual behavior, the location would have quickly gained a reputation as being unsafe for this activity and they would have moved their cruising elsewhere.

The parks department asserts that they can rescind the Cahill Policy at will, but that this change won't affect other beaches. This is cold comfort for naturist beach goers. This has all the makings of a stealth approach to close down all nude beach use simply by saying, "We have had just too many complaints," and another nude use beach bites the dust – slam bam, thank you ma'am.

We are led to wonder if the policy change stands and only folks in swim suits are there, will the parks department then start arresting the sexual trouble makers? Or will they take the next logical step and close the beach to textile users if there is continued sexual misconduct? Nah!

The outcome of the NAC lawsuit is very serious for future nude beach use in California. It further illustrates just how precarious nude use on public lands is if changing administrators can overturn decades of traditional nude use at a whim. We sincerely hope that Bob Morton and company at NAC prevail. [Ed.]

A Simple Photo

The following story isn't directly about naturism, but it does have implications for naturism and art. Naturists believe that parents and children belong at our parks and gatherings. Wholesome family nudity is believed to promote a number of positive values, and parents and their children often are depicted in the pages of *N*.

Unfortunately, those with sinister motives have taken advantage of children, making them objects of pornography. This has caused an international backlash that raises questions of its own. The report below is an illustration of this backlash at its worst.

A well intentioned father thought it would be nice to take pictures of his *clothed* sons having fun on a slide. But his innocent snaps caused a furious row with staff and another parent – who called him a pervert.

First, a woman running the fairground slide tried to stop him from taking photos of his two youngest children ages seven, and five. Then, other families waiting in the queue also demanded he stop.

Mr. Crutchley, who claimed he had only taken photos of his own children, said: "A woman said I could be taking pictures of any child to put on the internet and called me a pervert. It was sheer madness."

"We left. Two police officers confirmed that I had been perfectly within my rights to take photographs of my own children in the park." He added: "What is the world coming to? This parental paranoia is getting out of hand."

Mr. Crutchley's wife who was with him, said: "I was annoyed, upset and embarrassed." The park owner, whose daughter was running the attraction, said: "Our policy is to ask people taking photos whether they have children on the slide. If they do, then that is fine. But another customer took exception and an argument developed."

The last thirty years or so has seen a rising tide of concern about child porn. The advent of the internet has only served to make all forms of pornography readily available to just about anyone. This includes professionally produced porn and amateurs posting pictures of wives and girlfriends on websites. Every advance in technology has its dark side.

At the same time, everyone with a camera isn't a pornographer. Every picture of a child, regardless of state of dress, is not pornography, nor is it destined to be used as such on the internet. Two recent cases in Australia, (for more see: <http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/story.html?id=675321&p=1>) in which artists photographed nude children amply illustrate this tension. However, Mr. Crutchley is correct in observing, "This parental paranoia is getting out of hand."

At the same time, we must ask when are we as a society going to develop some judgment about real danger? We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded like sheep by every alarmist who shouts, "The sky is falling!" The unintended consequence of exaggerated alarm harms the innocent and does nothing to protect children.

It would do us all some good to recognize that politicians and media thrive on the perception of crisis. It doesn't matter the issue, or how worthy of serious consideration it may be. They nearly always couch their cause in the most alarmist of terms. The public is then endlessly bombarded by advocates of an agenda vying for our attention, and frequently our money.

In the meantime, real child pornographers continue to ply their trade and the innocent are subjected to harassment in a McCarthyesque atmosphere of hysteria. The genuine desire to protect children from predators deserves our best thinking. However, we have to be able to distinguish real danger from what is not. Otherwise, in our zeal we carelessly damn the innocent and diminish our liberty in the process.

Inordinate fear of how someone might potentially use a photo of a child can become the lowest common denominator for evaluating and censoring any picture or work of art. The logical end for such irrational fear is to ban all depictions of children; make them wear burkas; or lock them all behind walls. Is that the brave new world we want to live in? [Ed.]

Put Yer Shirt On

There are men who take off their shirts wherever possible, and there are men who prefer to keep their shirts on, even at the beach. Each group finds the other faintly ridiculous. And each has taken sides in a contest as timeless as fourth-grade dodgeball.

That's right, fellas: It's Shirts against Skins.

You rarely hear much from either squad, but a few of the Skins were fuming recently when they attended a Nationals game and were told by ballpark employees that they needed to put on their shirts. Men without a shirt on have been deemed a type of "indecent exposure" by Nationals management.

Shirts have also heard from girlfriends and spouses who look at Skins and think: That's just unfair. A woman can't strip to her waist, not without breaking the law anyway. And even if a woman is willing to break the law, nobody would consider her shirtless. She'd be considered topless. There is no such thing as a shirtless woman, just like there's no such thing as a topless man.

Really Put Yer Shirt On!

For only the third time in five years, police in a small Maryland town have ticketed someone for going topless in public. An 18 year old male was cited June 4 when police say he was spotted without a shirt on South Street near Hanson Street. He was also cited for failing to obey a lawful order to stop for police.

A town ordinance adopted in 1974 forbids anyone from going topless in public buildings or on public streets and sidewalks. Possible penalties are a fine of up to \$100 and up to 10 days in jail.

The police said people without shirts are considered a public nuisance. Three citations have been issued since 2003.

Interesting. Should this catch on around the country, there goes the constitutional complaint by the topfreedom for women advocates. Should this silliness spread, how are men going to react?

It has all the potential for creating the proverbial "horns of the dilemma" situation. Will males meekly submit to this nonsense, or will they vote the pinheads that pass such laws out of office? What can be predicted is whether these circumstances will benefit the female topfreedom cause. [Ed.]

Actual call to Fire Department: "Send someone over quickly!" the old woman screamed into the phone. "Two naked bikers are climbing up toward my bedroom window!" "This is the Fire Department, lady," the voice replied. "I'll have to transfer you to the Police Department." "No, it's YOU I want!" she yelled. "They need a longer ladder!"

Support The Naturist Society They Support Us!

The Furor Over San Onofre, Part II

By: Dave Bitters

This is the final installment of this article. See the July issue of Bare Facts for Part I.

Thus the clothing-optionals and the clothing-compulsives have coexisted more or less peacefully for decades. Articles in the Naturist Society's quarterly suggest that clothing-optional use may have extended back to the early days of the free beach movement. Occasionally there would be reports of a few gay men who would cross from the park onto the dunes on the Camp Pendleton property to do whatever they do that outrages public sensibilities.

Camp Pendleton officials take a dim view of people trespassing on their property – for a variety of reasons, (some having to do with the practical matter of public safety). Apparently, park rangers would just as soon not have to deal with this. Thus controversy, (which may have been manufactured) erupted this spring. A news alert from the Naturist Action Committee, (NAC) offered that, “Recent retirements among those in the CA Parks management team responsible for San Onofre have brought replacements that are intolerant of clothing-optional recreation.”

Instead of encouraging and allowing the cooperation of naturists in policing illicit activity, Rich Haydon, the new manager who took over at the beginning of May has featured the nearby sexual activity in his reports, using it as an excuse to request permission to put an end to recreational nudity at the beach. Haydon has reportedly represented to his superiors that a majority of those who come to enjoy the clothing-optional beach are participants in illicit “sex there.”

The press picks up on such things because they yield splashy headlines. As is usually the case, press coverage for the naturist viewpoint generally is anything but fair and balanced. In turn, this can generate a good deal of secondary chatter from on-line news letters, bloggers, etc.

For instance, on June 3rd a conservative Catholic on-line newsletter called the California Catholic Daily ran an article titled, “They’re Trying to Make Nudity at San Onofre Illegal,” a headline that apparently quoted another source out of context. The secondary headline read, “California parks chief pressured to allow people to go naked at state beach.”

If you’ve read this far you’ll understand that this is transparently disingenuous. [See <http://www.calcatholic.com/news/newsArticle.aspx?id=95b722d7-88ea-4360-9533-a5e7db8a07d1>]

What made this article interesting were the seventeen pages of reader comments that followed. Those taking the two sides of the issue were about evenly divided, though in general the opponents of the proposed change appeared better informed. It’s easy to speculate that the posts represent a fair sampling of the views of those who have a real interest in the issue.

NAC board member Judy Williams tried to remind readers that some in high positions in the Catholic Church have taken a more benign position on human nudity than traditional hard-liners have understood. She wrote, “To Eillen, and Anne who believes, ‘...no decent woman wants to see a

bunch of exposed male bodies,’ and to Kenneth M. Fisher who calls upon God to, ‘...have mercy on us!’ May you take comfort in the following words of a very wise man. I rest my case for living in harmony with nature, as nature intended and raising our children to show respect for themselves, for others and for the environment! ‘Because God created it, the human body can remain nude and uncovered and preserve its splendor and its beauty...Sexual modesty cannot in any simple way be identified with the use of clothing, nor shamelessness with the absence of clothing and total or partial nakedness...Nakedness, as such, is not to be equated with physical shamelessness. Immodesty is present only when nakedness plays a negative role with regard to the value of the person. The human body is not in itself shameful...Shamelessness, (just like shame and modesty) is a function of the interior of the person.” Author: Pope John Paul II.

A person named John L. Sillasen offered this response: “Judy Williams, read my post immediately above yours. You fall exactly into the category of manipulating and distorting words. Nowhere in the quote from the late Pope, assuming you’ve at least done that correctly, is there any reference to public...public...public nudity. The late Pope is explicating Church tradition; he is not saying ‘if it feels good do it.’ All you are doing is attempting to justify your sin and hiding your shame...neither of which is Catholic. You could quote anything and come up with your same conclusion, because it is not based on what you quoted.”

The post to which Sillasen referred said, “Like the devil tempting Jesus with partial truths, it is nothing less than people making believe that there is nothing wrong with public nudity. When quoting or paraphrasing Holy Scripture, the first thing necessary is to respect it, and not try to manipulate it for one’s own short sighted or blind aims.”

This writer felt obliged to jump into the fray. I offered this in support of Williams’ post. “Judy Williams’s posting merits extension. The Gospel of Thomas, (saying 37) offers this: ‘His disciples said, ‘When will you appear to us, and when will we see you?’ ‘Jesus said, ‘When you strip without being ashamed, and you take your clothes and put them under your feet like little children and trample them, then (you) will see the son of the living one and you will not be afraid.’ ”

Naturists, (including users of the San Onofre nude beach) will understand that the meaning of this passage is transparent. Columnist Burr Snider captured the sense of it some years ago in the San Francisco Examiner, “...the real nude beach wonders aren’t the young, hubris-ridden gods and goddesses with the flawless hardbodies and the cocoa-butter ultratans. As terrific as it is watching beautiful naked people flipping Frisbees or frolicking in the waves, it’s those less-than-perfect folks whose egos transcend fleshly matters and who can bare themselves unself-consciously, warts and wattles, sags and cellulite and all, who make nude beaches such a joy. Like the old people you sometimes see naked on the beach, wrinkles-be-damned – those great, wonderful free

birds who fly their own route and gulp deeply of the fount of life and who will probably never end up pushing a walker to the Safeway for an afternoon's torturous exercise."

Bless him, Mr. Sillasen apparently couldn't let any statement of a theological nature, (particularly if it conflicted with his views) go unchallenged. In response to my comments he wrote, "The word 'modest' is, at root, a word for 'mode.' It means something that defies legal definition. An example is when a US Supreme Court justice said of pornography, "You know it when you see it." The spurious gospel of thomas [sic] even in the above quote does not legitimate nudism...it is a way of saying that He is never going to appear to those people. To get to an even more profound level of Scripture, consider that the Second Coming of Jesus will be when there is a whole lot of imitation of goodness, such as anti-christ [sic], beast, whore of babylon [sic], false prophet, and more exciting characters. Nudism is beyond question immodest and associated with deception...just as the gnostic [sic] post reveals."

I don't profess to be a Biblical scholar, (of the Canon, much less of the Gnostic writings). But anyone who pays the least attention to the variety of religious experiences that inform the contemporary scene understands that the scriptures proclaimed from the pulpits of America have a variety of interpretations. It's unclear to whom Sillasen refers when he claims that, "...it is a way of saying that He is never going to

appear to those people." Who are *those people*? Does he include himself? I speculate he would be unwilling to, "...strip without being ashamed, and...take [his] clothes and put them under [his] feet like little children and trample them." Or does he refer to naturists, (me included) who *are* capable of stripping and trampling? Is he suggesting that *we* are the ones who will never see, "...the son of the living one?" I can't speak to the nature of his religious experience, any more than he can speak to the nature of mine. But, looking back on it after twenty years maybe, *just maybe*, I *did* experience the son of the living one when I left my shorts behind on that sunny day on the San Gregorio beach.

Free beaches that proliferated along the California coast (and elsewhere) achieved traction during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Tim Miller, a professor of religion at the University of Kansas, has written extensively on the counterculture movement of this era. He asserts it was essentially a religious movement, albeit one that eventually succumbed to excess. Sometimes there's a fine line between idealism and license.

So it is also with the nude beaches, even today. This is the conundrum that naturists face. Still, may I suggest, (albeit timidly) that maybe, *just maybe*, the religious conservatives have it all wrong. Maybe, *just maybe*, in their attempts to close down clothing-optional venues such as the one at San Onofre, they might be denying others safe havens where some day *they too* might see the son of the living one.

Lake Edun Foundation, Inc.

P.O. Box 1982
Topeka, KS 66601-1982
(785) 478-BARN

**Membership Application
Change of Address Form**
Please Print

Name: First _____ MI ____ Last _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone: _____ DOB _____ E-mail Address _____

All information provided is strictly confidential. If you are joining as a couple, include names for both people. If you are a couple not living together, make a copy of this form for the other individual. (NB: To promote gender diversity, a couple is defined as one male and one female.) Those willing to assist with upkeep a minimum of 10 hours

per year may deduct \$50. One subscription to our newsletter *Bare Facts* is included with membership. A subscription only to *Bare Facts* is available for \$20.00. New members will receive a Waiver and Release which must be completed before membership is finalized. Visitation restrictions apply to Associate Membership.

Membership Fees:

	Single	Couple	Amount
Lake Edun Foundation Membership	275.00	350.00	_____
Associate Member (Over 125 miles away)	175.00	250.00	_____
Working Membership (Discount)	(50.00)	(50.00)	_____
Separate Mailing Address for members		12.00	_____
<i>No Sex, No Violence ... Only Nudity</i> Naked Plays – DVD		25.00	_____
<i>Lake Edun Exposed</i> – Video		35.00	_____
<i>Lake Edun Exposed</i> – DVD		50.00	_____
Naturist Society Membership		53.00	_____
Subscription to <i>Bare Facts</i> only		20.00	_____
Tax Deductible Donation - Improve our Educational Program			_____
Tax Deductible Donation - Legal Defense Fund			_____
Total Enclosed - Check, Money Order, or Credit Card			_____

Please charge my Visa; MasterCard # _____ Exp. ____ / ____ \$ _____

Note: There is a \$30 charge for any checks returned unpaid for any reason.