

Bare Facts

Copyright 2010 Lake Edun Foundation, Inc.

Official Publication of the Lake Edun Foundation, Inc.

May 1, 2010

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

Survey Results Are In

Last month, we posted a new survey question on our website and invited Eduners and others to respond to it. The results of this very unscientific survey are in and are interesting.

With just over 100 responses, we learned that nearly 40% of those who took the survey are naked whenever they can be. They are naked at home, private facilities and anywhere else. Combined with nearly 10% who admit to being naked at approved places such as designated beaches and facilities, we are at just under 50% who enjoy being naked. This is probably not surprising considering it is on the Lake Edun website.

In addition, just over 25% claim they are naked whenever they are alone; in their house or outdoors if they know no one else is around. Our challenge is to convince this group that it is OK and a lot of fun to join others.

We also learned that about 5% of our respondents admit they shower naked and enjoy being naked in their room as long as the door is closed. A larger portion (9%) only shower naked but wear pj's or underwear to bed.

Finally, two respondents admit they don't even shower naked. Life must be tough for them.

We have a new survey on our website now. We hope all Eduners and our supporters will take the time to share their experiences on this month's question.

We thank all who shared in this month's survey. So everyone can feel comfortable, this survey is completely anonymous. We have neither the knowledge nor interest to attempt to track your answers.

Lake Edun Olympics

We are working on finalizing arrangements for our Lake Edun Olympics as best we can. We fully expect this to be an ongoing effort. Final details will appear in the June issue of *Bare Facts*. The final list of events will be chosen by visitors over the Memorial Day weekend

Random Thoughts And Reflections

After a cold winter, our old lock is becoming cantankerous and is wanting to be changed. Members will find the combination to the new lock enclosed.

We are still in need of new wooden cable spools. And, we can also make good use of a few good plastic barrels. If you have access to either of these items, please let us know ... or just bring them out when you visit.

Aluminum is used in many products, most notably drink cans. Most of us don't find it worthwhile to save aluminum for ourselves. However, our combined effort makes a contribution to our annual budget. Please save your aluminum and bring it with you when you visit our special place. Most years, we raise about \$100 through this effort.

Good News

Prices on gas and most of the things we need most to keep our special place really special continue to go up. Most of these costs are borne by our membership. Fortunately, we haven't increased our membership costs in several years. And the board of directors has decided to hold the line on membership costs. However, it has decided to ask visitors to contribute more toward our expenses and make some changes to our sign-in procedures.

This season, we will ask visitors and guests to contribute \$25/single and \$35/couple per day when they visit. A survey of other facilities shows that even at these rates, we are a bargain when compared with other similar facilities. Of course, these amounts are merely suggested contribution levels. To promote the Naturist ideal, we welcome all visitors, even those too poor to afford this modest level of support or who feel they have some kind of entitlement to enjoy recreation at the expense of others.

Plan For An Open House

Our first open house of the season is scheduled for May 22. With only a few weeks to go, it's time to approach some friends and co-workers. We all know others who are curious about Naturism. All we must do is ASK! If they are interested, they will appreciate your thought. If not, they will appreciate that you thought of them.

As in the past, during an Open House, clothing will be required nearly everywhere from noon to 3. That way visitors will not be subjected to unwanted nudity. From 3 to 5, it will be clothing optional so they may elect to join us. After 5 we will be back to normal.

DON'T FORGET

Activities designated HN are sponsored by Heartland Naturists

May 1; Sat; World Naked Gardening Day
May 8; Sat; 12-4; Work Day
May 8; Sat; 8-10; Sauna
May 9; Sun; 12-4; Work Day
May 9; Sun; 1-3; Board of Directors
May 14-16; Weekend; End Of Cabin Fever Days
May 21; Fri; 8-10; HN Swim
May 22; Sat; 12-3; Open House
May 22-23; 6pm-noon; Private party
May 28-31; Memorial Day Weekend
June 5; Sat; Dusk; Evening program
June 15; Mulberry season begins
June 12; Sat; World Naked Bike Ride
June 12; Sat; 12-3; Open House
June 12; Sat; Dusk; Evening program
June 13; Sun; 1-3; Board of Directors
June 18; Fri; 8-10; HN Swim
June 19; Sat; Dusk; Evening program
June 26; Sat; Dusk; Evening program

Naked Family? So What?

It's the return of the time honoured and shop worn debate. Is it ok for parents to be naked around your kids? The website, momsversation.com asks this question. The plus part is a video of several women in a light hearted manner discussing the etiquette for family nudity they have established in their homes.

Most of the moms and those that wrote comments to the video were positive about family nudity – as long as it involved younger children. However, when kids become sexually aware – no way!

These moms suggest that the kids themselves will let you know when it's time to cover up, and this is not uncommon advice. The assumption being that there's some universal feature of kids growing up that causes them to decide that seeing their parents bodies is no longer ok. One mom reported that her son at age 10 suddenly became very modest and demanded privacy when changing clothing.

No doubt reports of children being raised in families that have been relaxed about family nudity suddenly doing a complete about face are real. At the same time, while many parents may be enlightened about benefits of children being comfortable with their bodies, they don't have a naturist perspective.

Clearly, the parents in the video see their children's maturing sexual awareness and family nudity as being no longer acceptable. Sex and nudity have met and in their minds this signals danger – they might be “over stimulated,” and in the extreme, concerns of incest. Obviously they think their children are stupid.

Probably all cultures have incest taboos. However, they don't all assume that clothing is the sure fire guarantee it won't occur. Examples of nearly naked tribal societies are still in evidence in South America, New Guinea, and Africa. It is axiomatic that their children come to sexual awareness seeing their parents and everyone else's parents mostly naked. Despite this, they generally not only avoid incest, but also the other imagined dangers of seeing adult nudity Westerners so greatly fear. They obviously think their children are pretty smart/balanced.

The difference-maker is clothing, it's the cultural context in which children are raised. In clothing compulsive cultures, no matter what happens in the early years, the enormous weight of the rest of culture exerts its powerful shaping influence. Children in a textile culture aren't blind, they know what “everyone else” believes about clothing and how they behave. Beginning in pre adolescence the need to fit in with the peer group becomes a dominant theme in youth as is the tendency to pull away from parents toward the peer group. No one is immune from these pressures.

It is true that in the teen years even children raised as naturists have a tendency to either stop accompanying their parents or wearing swim suits at naturist gatherings. Here again, the most likely reason is the influence of the larger culture and teen reluctance to vary from the norms of their peer group. This is by no means a universal response of

naturist teens and no one suggests it is in response to being over stimulated by what they see.

The following excerpt from the momsversation website is well stated. Naturists would be approving if all families took as positive view of family nudity as this writer does. [Ed.]

Go to: <http://www.embracethechaos.ca/2010/04/are-you-a-naked-family.html>

We live in a naked house, appropriately naked (at least we think it is). We aren't making breakfast with all the bits hanging out, but there are times when I am getting out of the shower and walking to my closet when I am starkers and the kids are walking around. The younger kids still shower with either me or my hubby. And, yes, doors are crashed open while I am standing in the nude or going pee and my husband has been caught with the towel at his ankles while shaving.

I think it is a good idea for kids to see a real body with all its squishy and saggy parts, especially the boys. If boys don't see their mothers naked; the first woman they do see in the nude will probably be some pornified reality star all fake on the Internet. I want them to know that not all women look like they are modeled after Barbie dolls.

I grew up in a house of women with only one bathroom, so seeing family members naked was as common as seeing them dressed. I asked a friend about her thoughts on this subject because she tends to be a bit more shy than I am. She surprised me, saying that she too has a naked house. She never saw her parents in the nude and grew up wondering what was wrong with a naked body. She doesn't want her kids to have a sense of shame like she did.

Good Nudity

It amazes me how perceptive people can be. The following is an example of one of the finest pieces of analysis of the joys of nudity I have come across in a long time. A mom eloquently and almost lyrically describes her young daughter's experience of being nude.

Mom relishes her daughter's comfort in her own skin and laments her own loss of this feeling. She notices the innocence of the simple pleasure of being naked without the “chains” of mandatory clothing imposed by adult society. For this reason, she fiercely defends her daughter having this time in life to be her natural self, her bare skin exposed to the sun, grass and mud. Too soon the child will learn to become embarrassed and ashamed, and fear her body, and want to be covered by clothes to stop these feelings. It is paradise lost!

The sadness expressed by this mom at the prospect of her child losing the joy she now experiences is palpable. In this she is also expressing sadness for her own loss, but she doesn't seem to make the connection her logic seems to be leading her toward. She doesn't question why it must be so not only for her child, but also for adults. It's just the way it is, seems to be the conclusion. She passively surrenders to the inevitability of clothing, yet desires to forestall the onset of that evil day for as long as possible for her daughter.

Of course, it isn't clothing per se that is the evil – the destroyer of all the joy. Rather, it is the clothes compulsive

culture that mandates this loss that is to be feared. Mom has given in to its logic for herself with regret, for she is keenly aware of the price she has had to pay when she sees what her daughter is experiencing so effortlessly. She knows that grown-ups hide their bodies, "...because there is so much about our bodies that cause us fear." How apply put.

There is much to learn from this mom's observations of her daughter when seeking to articulate what it is that makes naturism so appealing. Equally, she captures the restraining and oppressive hand of society on the "natural child" within all of us, that tells us our bodies are to be feared, are shameful, and only acceptable when clothed. [Ed.]

Go to: <http://herbadmother.com/2009/07/a-garden-locked/> for the full article and reader comments.

I like that Emily likes being naked. Her comfort in her own skin – and the joy she experiences when she feels the play of wind, grass, sunlight or dirt upon that skin – is a reminder our bodies are miracles of both function and form and their function and form are sometimes best appreciated in their natural state. This is something I have trouble remembering in my relationship with my own body, as I bind it, cover it and fret over it. I watch Emily, sometimes, as she frolics, naked, with utter abandon, and envy her obliviousness to the cultural baggage grown-ups – most grown-ups – grown-ups like me – attach to bodies.

It's this obliviousness, this innocence that cements my resolve to do as little as possible to discourage her love of her own private state of nature. She's my perfect little noble savage, a creature unencumbered by (better, perhaps, to say, *a creature who does not feel, does not notice the encumbrance of*) the chains of social propriety, the chains that will, inevitably (that do, now), bind her to a social world in which the rules dictate that one must always keep one's bottom covered. Her joy in her experience of freedom is a joy to me, and because it is a freedom that is in so many respects so short-lived, I want her to enjoy it while she can. There is time enough for her to feel the constraints of modesty and shame; this is her time for knowing the joys of shamelessness.

She knows already that there's no such thing as absolute freedom, that freedom inside and freedom outside are two very different things, and that just because one wants to be free, to act freely, in every sphere, does not mean that one *is* free. She understands that although her natural condition is freedom, she is still restricted by chains, whether those be the chains imposed by Mommy and Daddy, or the chains imposed by the world outside. She understands (mostly) that those chains are necessary, even good.

She has not yet learned clothing is, for adults, more than just a uniform to be worn in daily social life, more than decoration applied to the purpose of parading about the public sphere – that it is also (mostly?) a protective barrier shielding us from our own and others' anxieties about our natural state. She has not yet learned we grown-ups hide our bodies because there is so much about our bodies that cause us fear. She has not learned to be afraid or ashamed or anxious about her body. I would love to forestall this lesson for her, to find some way to guarantee she never learns it, but I doubt that I can, and so I simply try to delay it as long as possible.

Fashion and America's Skewed Body Image

What do you know! There seems to be an upsurge in the rush to portray "real" women in the media and the fashion industry. By real, they mean un-retouched photos, and not having to be anorexic thin.

A few celebrities are going out of their way to be photographed without the photo being retouched. Of course, it's women that by nature don't need much retouching to look good according to current beauty standards. But, it seems an idea whose time has arrived may just be arriving – and it's about time.

Perhaps this signifies a real shift in attitudes toward what is deemed as an acceptable body size, or it may be a passing fad. As naturists we can only applaud and lend our voice in support to other forces in the culture that promote greater body acceptance.

Below is a rather unwieldy link to an interesting article that discusses these issues and has links to other articles in the same vein. [Ed.]

<http://www.stylelist.com/2010/04/23/plus-size-americas-skewed-body-image/?icid=main|htmlws-main-n|d13|link6|http%3A%2F%2Fwww.stylelist.com%2F2010%2F04%2F23%2Fplus-size-americas-skewed-body-image%2F>

For example, designer Francisco Costa was celebrated for banning size zero models. Then Kim Kardashian did her part by baring her famous curves in an un-airbrushed photo shoot for Harper's Bazaar. Earlier in the year a plus size model was hailed as a breath of reality when she was photographed nude in a major fashion magazine.

Plus-sized bodies have been front and center over the past several months, and the backlash has been as intense as the adulation. For example, one fashion blogger dismissed plus-sized models as "not really physically healthy and not always flattering to fashion."

Our culture worships the image of a slim, (but curvy where it counts) female. People see models that are thin, but curvy as being naturally fit and gorgeous. It's like when models pick on their "figure flaws" in interviews. It's "real." It's human. It's also part of the fantasy. However, neither size zero nor plus-size models fit in with this emerging ideal, and thus they both get bashed.

Yet the old order is still well represented. Just take a look at Victoria's Secret's recent Body for Everybody, Love Your Body campaign, which promoted a line of smooth bras designed for sizes 32A - 40DD. It's a great slogan, yet every single model in their photos is a thin, but curvy supermodel with rock-hard abs.

Public responses tend to fall into two categories: the "real women have curves" camp, and those who point out that it's possible to be naturally skinny without being unhealthy and that women shouldn't be deemed "real" simply because they have curves.

Which brings up an interesting point: Why do we need to pit body types against each other? There does seem to be a bias, but is that because of the curves or because our culture is so

programmed to find slim bodies attractive that we react against anything that doesn't fit into that little box?

Perhaps the answer is, rather than celebrating one body type over another we simply focus on embracing *all* body types, period.

Hopefully these are portents that we are moving toward a more realistic, less black-and-white fashion outlook with regard to acceptable body size.

A Return To Eden

A number of years ago, model Jamie Cotton wrote an intriguing essay entitled "Returning to Eden" for a fine arts magazine, The Sensuous Line. Interestingly, she has a degree in theology from St Mary's College of Notre Dame. At the time she wrote the essay, she had been doing nude modeling work for six years.

Jamie references the Biblical account of Adam and Eve and their now famous fig leaves. From this came, "...a legacy of shame and loathing for the naked body..." which now, "...permeates the delicate social idealism of American civilization." This story has been treated as connecting nakedness and sexual sinfulness resulting in the naked body from then forward being viewed as something shameful.

A consequence has been the exploitation of the nude figure for commercial and pornographic purposes. Unfortunately, too many Americans fail to discern the difference between art and these two enterprises and call for censorship of art as though it was on the same level as pornography. However, Ms Cotton notes that, "...art and exploitation are opponents of one another and only through the acceptance and integration of nude artistic images into our society can we begin to disempower the pornography industry."

Pornography gives the sole implication that the naked body, usually female, exists only as a sexual subject. Yet we know the body is far more than its sexual potential. Indeed, it is through art that we can begin to see the body as beautiful for its own sake. Portraying the nude body in art dilutes the idea of body as sex object and thereby weaken the grip of pornography. She asserts that, "The more we can neutralize the body through art, the more we disempower the sexual objectification of pornography."

Ms Cotton concludes by saying that art treats the body as it would the sky, a landscape, a rock or the ocean. It is a, "... natural object, beautiful in its creation, simple in its existence and completely innocent in its nakedness – an object devoid of judgment." She adds that art is the only contest in which the naked form can be observed without realizing its naked

ness. "Thus, it is only through the exposure of art that we can begin to migrate back to a time of innocence in regard to the naked acceptance of our body. Only through art can we find our way back to Eden."

For the full text and photos from this essay, go to: <http://www.baja.org/sensuousline/sline0799/cotton1.htm>

TNS Goes YouTube

The Naturist Society produced a series of interviews with naturists that are available on YouTube. Go to our links section on this page and check them out or visit our YouTube channel at <http://www.youtube.com/user/thenaturistsociety1> Or go to: <http://www.naturistsociety.com/NEWWebPages/template2008NEWMEMBERSHIPPAGE.htm> where there are two different methods for accessing the videos.

I applaud TNS for getting creative and making use of new applications found on the internet. Many of you may be familiar with YouTube. There are thousands if not millions of user contributed videos posted on YouTube. It's become a standard way to get information out to the public.

Years ago naturists discovered the internet and every club has its own website. Then individuals developed hundreds of their own websites to promote naturism. Naturists then developed Yahoo groups in which members could chat in real time with each other. Each one of these avenues opened up by the internet expanded the opportunities for promoting interest in naturism. People with curiosity about naturism could do their own research and contact naturists to discuss their concerns without the perceived risks of actually going to a naturist club or clothing optional beach.

These websites have been a wonderful source of information and avenue for communication. The interviews conducted at the Eastern Naturist Gathering this summer with naturists are a good first effort. However, I can foresee that the potential for talking directly to the public about naturism through the medium of the internet is unlimited. There is no doubt about it; the internet is the most significant gateway to attracting newcomers to naturism available. [Ed.]

Items We Need

Please see our website at lakeedun.com for more details.

- Non-motorized boats
- Wooden Cable Spools
- Lawn or Lounge Chairs
- Aluminum cans, etc
- Flat screen monitor
- Plastic Barrels

Men are even lazier than they are timorous, and what they fear most is the troubles with which any unconditional honesty and nudity would burden them. – Friedrich Nietzsche

Nude Or Exhibitionist?

The following is opinion from Tom Pine, editor of The Naked Truth Naturist, May 2010 issue.

Some interesting thoughts occurred to me when I saw the *One & Other Art Project* and a discussion I had about it. It seems a sculptor named Anthony Gormley (you know, the

guy who set up 3 km of 100 nude statues in Britain) set up the fourth plinth (placed in 1841, but never occupied by a permanent work of art) in Trafalgar Square with a safety net and requested volunteers to occupy it for one hour to do whatever they thought of for that hour.

Needless to say, a number of naturists took the opportunity to stand, or sit, or perform, in the nude—their contribution to living art. *Going Natural*, the Canadian naturist magazine of the Federation of Canadian Naturists (FCN), did an article on the project in their latest issue, featuring a young woman named Kiran Mahay. I went to the link and viewed the videos of a few of the “plinthers” and considered what they had been trying to say with their appearances.

To some people, if a person (on a plinth in the instance above) strips off and stands before a crowd of clothed people, he or she is an exhibitionist. This brings up a cogent point and raises *a lot* of questions. Is it exhibitionism to appear nude before clothed people? Should nudity be restricted to nudist parks, beaches and other sanctioned nude areas *only*? This raises its own set of questions. Why is it okay to be nude before others in *sanctioned* areas? Is it because there are other nude, or mostly nude, people there too? Because somebody said it’s okay? Why is it okay because somebody *said so*?

Here’s the biggest question. When did the unclothed human body become something illegal in and of itself? I mean, we all look pretty much the same, man or a woman, as other men and women. I’m not referring to *doing* something considered lewd, or obscene, or provocative, or threatening; I’m just referring to being simply nude.

Many argue that complete nudity is offensive to some. One of my nudist friends made the unconscious statement that “we don’t want to offend people.” Oh, is that so? Have you ever seen a law where it’s a crime to *offend* someone? People are offended all the time. There are laws that cover illegal reactions to said offense: a punch in the nose; a knife; a bullet. People are offended all the time, for many reasons, yet I’ve never heard of John Law arresting someone just for being offensive. That’s why authorities try to *attach* something to a person’s nakedness all the time: Public lewdness, sexual display, indecency, injuring the morals of a minor.

Note that all the terms are very *suggestive*. How do you codify *intent*? The law is supposed to govern *actions*. You have to *violate*, to do something to *break* the law. Even that phrase “break the law” indicates *action*. A person’s nudity is *a state of being*, not an action at all. I suppose the police could arrest someone for the action of *removing* his or her clothes, but what if that person *left the house in the nude*? (Incidentally, during some sanctioned nude events, such as the World Naked Bike Ride and “Bare” to the Breakers, it’s okay to be nude in public – you just can’t undress on the street – interesting approach to the law there).

Ironically, you can’t even find a condemnation of nudity in the Bible, a book Christians use all the time to *define* morality. The only time I find a proscription against nudity there is when a person *does something wrong*. Otherwise, nudity is just is what it is – a state of being.

Even after the Fall, when Eve, then Adam, broke fellowship with God, he never condemns their nudity. In fact, he asks them a very pointed question. “Who told you that you were naked?” They made *aprons* of fig leaves, to cover their genitals, which they saw as defiled because of their rebellion. But God made them *coats* of skins, not because he thought

their nakedness was wrong, per se, but to protect them from the environment they would face outside the Garden. They made *aprons* to cover their shame, God made *coats* for their protection.

At the risk of asking too many questions, here’s another one. When a *clothed* man or woman climbed up on that plinth, to pose, sing, read poetry, or just speak extemporaneously, why didn’t people consider *that* exhibitionism? It is, isn’t it, whether folks think so or not? After all, they’re bringing attention to themselves.

Isn’t that at the root of exhibitionism? Yet, let a person walk calmly down Main Street in the buff, not speaking or accosting anyone – just strolling along – those same people would raise the cry, “He/she’s being an exhibitionist!” The same thing would occur if someone sat calmly at the train station, reading a book or newspaper. Why is that? They weren’t trying to bring attention to themselves, were they? Or did the *very fact that they were nude* make the difference?

Someone may ask, “Do you think that a person being nude *wouldn’t* bring attention to him or her?” Let me answer with this scenario. If an extremely attractive man or woman, dressed modestly by society’s definition, walked down a street, do you think they’d attract attention? I think so. Would it be exhibitionism? Is the fact he or she is attractive the culprit of exhibitionism?

To take it to the other extreme, if someone who looked like the Elephant Man walked down the street, wouldn’t *he* attract attention? Couldn’t people accuse him of being an exhibitionist? Let’s take it one step further. Suppose that attractive person dressed in minimal clothing. Would that constitute exhibitionism, or did he or she simply wish to be comfortable on a hot day? This implies intent, does it not?

Let’s say, for the sake of argument, that said actions constituted exhibitionism. Is it necessarily *wrong*? Is the act of bringing attention to oneself wrong, in and of itself? At the core of this argument, and all the (mostly rhetorical) questions, is the unclothed/nude/naked/bare human form.

People, society, and the law, have criminalized nudity – not wrong acts, or improper behavior – simple, self-evident, unassuming nudity, nothing else. They argue that a nude person will cause people to *act* improperly. On its face, it sounds logical, but what if someone robs you of the money and credit cards in your wallet? Should we make it against the law to carry our money and credit cards with us when we go out?

One thing that particularly annoys me is when any person or group that speaks out against nudity raises the “they do it in front of the children!” issue. I’m sick to death of this one. Can you think of ANY group of people to which nudity has less impact? To a child, a naked adult is just that – naked. To him or her, it’s simply another way to “*be*.” What must go through the fevered brains of the strident detractors, who imagine such dire and deleterious things will happen to a child when they see nudity? I think, like the rest of society, THEY can’t disassociate nudity from sex. Shame on us? Shame on *them*!

I’m thankful for those people who go nude – in the face of

public opinion, and suffer the wrath of the law – to make a point. What *is* that point? I think it's this: there is *absolutely nothing wrong* with seeing the human body without clothes. Though we all possess varying degrees of physical beauty (and what constitutes beauty, anyway – it varies, doesn't it?), and come in all shapes, sizes and ages, we all have basically the same bodies as everyone else does.

If we are doing nothing more than *existing*, why is appearing completely nude some sort of problem? *This* is the message of the Vincent Bethells, the Stephen Goughs – and every other person who dares to defy what the greater society around them considers social convention – are trying to bring.

We are *all* humans, with or *without* clothing, and self-evident in and of ourselves. We don't need to defend, or explain, who we are, or our reason for existing – we just *are*. God, or nature, or whatever you want to call it, made us as we are, just as surely as the other mammals, or fishes, or bugs, and we have every right to exist, *and have others see us*, as we are. We don't have to aspire to great things. We don't have to make the world a better place.

We don't have to rock the pillars of society. We are who we are *just because we exist*. Sometimes, we find wisdom and

profound thought in the most unlikely of places. The following is a DaySpring message, printed on the throwaway piece of cardboard that came with one of its calendars. It's a message from co-founder, Roy Lessin. "Just think, you're not here by chance, but by God's choosing. His hand formed you and made you the person you are. He compares you to no one else – you're one of a kind. You lack nothing that His grace can't give you [Even naked! – Ed.]. He has allowed you to be here at this time in history to fulfill His special purpose for this generation" (emphasis mine).

Here's my scenario for a near-perfect world, though I don't believe we'll see it this side of heaven. **Street Scene; Warm, Sunny Day; Anytown, the World:** People congregate in a park, a bazaar, at a library, at various shops, a mall, a restaurant, a religious institution, and at an amusement park. There is a mix of people, of all races, religious persuasions and ages, clothed and naked, walking, sitting, talking, laughing, and enjoying life on a nice day, unconcerned with anyone's state of dress, or undress. An "exhibitionist" stands in the town square, reading a pamphlet to a small group of interested people, some clothed, some nude. No one cares beyond the fact that everyone is law-abiding and happy. Their state of dress is irrelevant and not at all an issue.

Seem good to you? It sure does to me!

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	_____
Recession Discount – if you need help	(50.00)	(75.00)	_____
Working Membership (Discount)	(50.00)	(50.00)	_____
Separate Mailing Address for members		12.00	_____
<i>No Sex, No Violence ... Only Nudity</i> First Naked Plays – DVD		25.00	_____
<i>Lake Edun Exposed</i> – Video		25.00	_____
<i>Lake Edun Exposed</i> – DVD		50.00	_____
Naturist Society Membership		55.00	_____
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 _____

Charge my Visa; MasterCard Discover # _____ Exp. ____ / ____ \$ _____

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