Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson held a high-energy rally Thursday in Las Vegas, where he continued to voice confidence that momentum will propel him to a spot alongside the major party candidates on the prime-time debate stage.

Johnson’s running mate, former Massachusetts Gov. Bill Weld, introduced Johnson at the rally as the “next president of the United States,” to a buzzing crowd chanting, “Gary, Gary!”

Johnson, a two-term Republican governor of New Mexico, has made multiple stops in Las Vegas this summer. In Nevada and beyond, Johnson has noticed a “real uptick in recognition,” he said in an interview with the Review-Journal before the rally.

Johnson contended that many Americans are Libertarians without realizing it, characterizing the ideology as “keep government out of my bedroom and out of my pocketbook.”

Johnson told attendants that Libertarianism is about choice, noting he’s pro-gay marriage and believes abortions should be the decision of the affected women. He called the death penalty “flawed public policy” and favors legalizing marijuana.

In Nevada, “you have the chance to do it and you’re going to do it,” Johnson said of the November referendum that could legalize recreational marijuana for users over the age of 21.

The crowd was lively Thursday night leading up to the rally in The Foundry nightclub, as Johnson and Weld gave one-on-one interviews to media outlets at another venue within the SLS Las Vegas.

Attendants crowded onto the dance floor and milled around upper levels with cocktails, some waving blue and yellow signs that read “Our Best America Yet. You In?”

In order to share the stage with Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton and Republican nominee Donald Trump in the series of debates leading up to the Nov. 8 general election, Johnson must crack the 15 percent threshold in the polls.

Read the rest of the article by clicking here.

By Jamie Munks, © Las Vegas Review-Journal
Things you can do to help grow the Libertarian Party of Nevada

☑️ Sign up for a FREE account at www.LPNevada.org/join

☑️ Become a dues paying member of LPNevada, click here to view membership levels

☑️ Register to Vote Libertarian & get your friends to register to vote as well. Visit: www.lpnevada.org/register_to_vote

☑️ Volunteer because LPNevada needs your help! Visit: www.lpnevada.org/volunteer

☑️ Connect with us on Social Media:
- Facebook Page: www.fb.com/lpnevada
- Facebook Group: www.fb.com/groups/lpnevada
- Twitter Account: www.twitter.com/lpnevada

☑️ Once connected, please “share” and “like” our posts with your friends.

☑️ Our events are awesome! Start attending our events, visit: www.LPNevada.org/events

☑️ Become a contributor to our blog and newsletter by visiting the Volunteer link and selecting “I would like to write for the blog.”

☑️ Get involved with a Caucus and Coalition. See a complete list at www.lpnevada.org/caucuses_coalitions
Letter from the Editor

Ronald Reagan once said those were the scariest 9 words in the English language. But how much damage COULD the government do when they mean well. For instance, the clamoring for the President to visit Louisiana after the floods last week was all over the media. Even Hillary Clinton was derided for not going. Trump went, handed out some packages and got a photo op…and his supporters used it as moral authority. What did Gary Johnson do? Did he get in a boat and save puppies stranded in 7 feet of water? No…he didn’t, but he does support a policy shift that would help everyone address the issue of natural disasters and how we should react to them.

First, some background. “I’m from the government…” And I’m here to help
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Why was flood insurance going up? Looking at the data, the USA recorded 6 major floods in the 2 decades before the 60’s. In the 1960s, there were 9 recorded. More people were being affected by floods…but more importantly, people were migrating to places where the flooding happened. In Louisiana, population in 1930 was about 2 million people, by the 70s it was almost 4 million. For a state that the Federal government lists as “100% Flood Zone”, people sure don’t mind moving there to live. Of course there will be more flood damage and flood insurance will go up. Why would you move to a place that had so much risk of the USA’s #1 ranked natural disaster? Well, GOVERNMENT.

You see, the 1968 National Flood Insurance Act was passed to deal with the rising costs of flood insurance. The markets best and most efficient way of conveying risk to the people. It also set construction standards…many still in use today. One of those standards is the minimum height for a “base flood level” to build on top of. Apparently, the gov’t was off by 14” last week. By 1972 fewer than 100,000 flood policies were in effect in the US. The people were not interested…so the Government went back to work and came up with the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973. Now, if a bank was FDIC or received any federal money, it could not loan to home buyers if they didn’t purchase flood insurance in areas deemed “flood zones”. Well, that worked. 2 million policies sold by 1979. Success?

It depends on who pays the bill. As usual, the scheme with the government is “make everyone pay into it, even if they don’t want it, so we can lower the cost for... continued on page 9
When I joined the Army, I swore a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. My oath was not to maintain the power of any particular political party, or one branch of the government over another. In this election, both the Democratic and the Republican candidates have promised to expand government to the detriment of individual liberty and the U.S. Constitution. Because I swore to uphold our founding document, I believe that my oath would be broken were I to cast my vote for any candidate but Gary Johnson and Bill Weld in 2016.

The United States Constitution is a brilliantly written document which protects the people of the nation against its rulers by separating the powers of government into three branches. This federalist system was created to prevent any one branch of government from subjugating the others and to provide representation from the states to the federal government. Additionally, the federal government is supposed to be constrained by the 10th Amendment which provides that “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

Over the last 100 years, the power of the federal government has grown exponentially. Congress has repeatedly delegated its authority to the executive branch, creating agencies to help manage the increased workload the federal government has created for itself as it takes over political responsibility from the States. We have created a system where there is an agency to exert government control over absolutely everything. What is truly concerning is that these agencies can almost unilaterally create laws that affect and restrict citizens’ activities without the benefit of representation. The federal government has overstepped its authority and now intrudes into almost every aspect of our lives; our checkbooks, our bedrooms, our education, our healthcare, what we eat, and even how to raise our children.

In this election cycle, the Democrats and Republicans have both promised anything and everything to voters. This can only mean one thing… the continued expansion of the federal government and the national debt as well as a further erosion of our freedoms.

The erosion of our federalist system and our individual freedoms is antithesis to the Constitution. Because neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have any respect for the federalist system and seek to expand government irrespective of constitutional limitations, I would be failing the oath I took to support and defend the Constitution by voting for either Trump or Clinton.

Unlike either of the two conventional candidates, Governors Gary Johnson and William Weld have proposed an immediate reduction in the federal government. This includes the Department of Defense and even the elimination of the Department of Education. They want to balance the budget, have repeatedly stated that they understand that the presidency has limits, and want to empower states to act as intended—50 experiments in Democracy.

Fellow veterans, we all know there are many ways we can improve the efficiency of the military without sacrificing readiness or breaking the faith with those who have served or are currently serving. Don’t be fooled by rainbow colored campaign promises. As a group, we need to uphold the oath that we swore to this nation and do the right thing—Vote for Gary Johnson and Bill Weld, the only candidates who will respect the Constitution to which we pledged our lives.

By Ryan Porte, National Coalition Director for Veterans for Gary Johnson.

Bio: Ryan served his country for eight years as an Artillery Officer in the U.S. Army. In 2008, he earned his Ranger tab. In 2010, he deployed to Afghanistan with the 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment to Afghanistan and was awarded a Bronze Star Medal for his service. He is currently enrolled at UC Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco California.

The veterans coalition is always looking for volunteers. If you are interested contact Ryan at ryanporte@johnsonweld.com.
In recent weeks both major parties’ presidential candidates have unveiled their respective tax plans.

For Democrats, Hillary has promised to make the rich pay their “fair share” via increases to income taxes and to the tax rates levied against investment profits (a.k.a. capital gains) for America’s highest earners.

For (what remains of) the Grand Ol’ Party, Trump’s tax proposal mimics much of Reagan’s supply-side, trickle-down theory but includes some atypically generous, left-leaning concessions (e.g., substantial childcare cost deductions).

In other words, both parties have effectively proposed a continuation of the current, decades-old fiscal tug-of-war that has plagued Washington bureaucrats for generations.

However, whereas Clinton and Trump have proposed more of the same failed policies that led us again to this familiar, recurring impasse — truths evidenced by calls for major tax reform every four years like clockwork — Governor Johnson’s tax plan offers a different way of looking at things.

The Libertarian candidate sums-up his proposal as one which aims to “stop special interest loopholes, reward responsibility, and simplify our tax code.”

Towards that stated purpose, Governor Johnson endorses a single federal consumption tax.

A consumption tax, as proposed, would replace the existing system with a far simpler — and cheaper to administer — federal tax structure.

Essentially, the plan calls for a tax to be levied on all goods and services purchased, similar to existing sales and use taxes. Such would replace the thousands of pages that currently spell-out the nation’s convoluted tax code.

The merits of Governor Johnson’s consumption tax proposal were recently praised in a Forbes opinion piece (see “Governor Johnson is Right about a Consumption Tax…”), through which John Tamny illustrates the many upsides of Johnson’s proposal while noting a conspicuous lack of discernible shortcomings.

Tamny writes, “[Johnson’s] proposed form of taxation is far superior to graduated income tax concepts proposed by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. It’s fairly easy to see why,” as outlined by the five notable advantages a consumption tax maintains versus the current tax status quo.

1. **The existing income tax structure penalizes work.**
   Taxes levied against income penalize hard work. A consumption tax entirely removes the existing disincentive attached to one’s employment.

2. **A consumption tax does not discriminate.**
   A consumption tax is blind to wealth — the amount one pays through a consumption tax has absolutely nothing to do with the amount of money one earns. Indeed, it is quite the opposite.

3. **A consumption tax permits taxpayers to control and/or limit the amount of taxes they pay.**
   As it stands currently, taxpayers have virtually no ability to limit the money it pays to the Internal Revenue Service. A consumption tax permits taxpayers to manage and predict, with perfect accuracy, the amount of taxes they will owe.
   “Precisely because it’s to some degree voluntary,” writes Tamny, “this means we have some control over the amount of our income that the political class gets to spend.”

4. **The process for filing taxes will be simplified and streamlined.**
   Each year, Americans agonize over the proper and legal filing of their taxes. The process is so overwhelming that many opt to spend their own hard-earned dollars towards third-party tax services — think H&R Block, among others.
   A consumption tax would significantly reduce the confusion and opaqueness... continued on page 8
Much talk has been made of the Clinton e-mail scandal over the past several months, but with the investigations finally closed and FBI Director James Comey’s report given to congress, it’s time for a more thorough analysis of what happened, and whether a double standard was applied.

Director Comey’s decision not to recommend prosecution hinges on one thing: intent. He notes that although the law permits him to recommend prosecution based on “gross negligence,” a prosecutor would be the first to do so in about 100 years. Director Comey argues that “no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case”. Because of this, he would have to prove that Hillary Clinton intended, beyond a reasonable doubt, to mishandle classified material, and he doubted his ability to do so due to Sec Clinton’s apparent lack of “technical sophistication”. In layman’s terms, she was too technologically challenged to understand that classified material belongs on a separate network, or that material marked as classified is classified, or that networks need professional protection to be secure. Let’s look more in depth at these aspects.

First we will talk about network separation. The US government maintains several different networks for processing material at different classification levels. Most commonly, unclassified material is processed on NIPRnet. This network probably resembles the network you use at work. You have access to most of the internet, but not all, and can e-mail your coworkers easily though an outdated version of outlook. The second network, SIPRnet, has no access to the internet. This network is for secret level processing only. One of the highest networks is JWICS, which can process up to top secret//SCI material. SCI means intelligence material which must be protected at a level even higher than top secret. Now, you can’t accidentally end up on the wrong network. You have to log in to each network on a different computer, and when you do, the desktop background proudly proclaims the level of classification you’re cleared to. To get information off of JWICS, and onto NIPR so that you can send it to Sec Clinton’s personal e-mail server, you have to pull the information up on one computer, and then manually type it into the lower system. This cannot be done accidentally, only with intent. So what would any reasonable person do if they received this kind of information on their unclassified e-mail?

Well according to the training every person who handles classified information is required to complete, you physically disconnect the computer from the network and report it to your security manager immediately. Obviously, this didn’t happen.

What about markings? Well it’s fair to say that if classified material isn’t marked, it can be difficult to know it’s classified, especially if it comes from outside your organization. But some e-mails in the Clinton server were marked. Now, I understand that most people won’t know what this looks like, so allow me to demonstrate. (U) Dolphins live in the ocean

... continued on page 9
EVENTS

SEPTEMBER 2016

06 FIRST TUESDAY LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL
@ Jalisco Mexican Cantina, from 6-9 PM.

11 CARSON CITY SOCIAL
@ the Firkin & Fox, from 3-5 PM.

13 OUT FOR LIBERTY (LGBTQI CAUCUS)
MEETING
@ the Phoenix Bar & Lounge from 7 - 9 PM.

14 WOMEN IN NEVADA CAUCUS
@ Applebee’s Boulevard Mall from 6 - 8 PM.

17 CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE INTERVIEWS (SOUTHERN NV)
@ Satay Thai Bistro from TBD.

18 CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE INTERVIEWS (SOUTHERN NV)
@ Satay Thai Bistro from TBD.

20 THIRD TUESDAY LIBERTARIAN SOCIAL
@ Siena Italian Trattoria from 5:30-8:30 PM

24 CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE INTERVIEWS (NORTHERN NV)
@ TBD from TBD.

25 CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE INTERVIEWS (NORTHERN NV)
@ TBD from TBD.

PLEASE SUPPORT JALISCO MEXICAN CANTINA
Jalisco Mexican Cantina has been supporting us. please support them.
www.jaliscocantina.com | 702.436.5200
What an exciting year to be a Libertarian! We have the perfect storm with Hurricane Hillary and Typhoon Trump, two candidates with the highest unfavorable ratings seen in a very long time. Americans are seeking an alternative and flocking to Gary Johnson and the Libertarian Party. With all of this, new donations to the National Libertarian Party have soared every month this year, and the Libertarian Party of Nevada has seen new donors every month. The party has received more contributions in the third quarter of 2016 than all of last year. The Libertarian National Convention had record-breaking attendance of around one thousand delegates and alternates, a fundraiser banquet that raised $105,961, and the Johnson-Weld campaign had a money bomb in August that raised over $1,750,000.

Even with all of that, we still have more to do as a nation to regain our lost liberties. You can help the Party and our candidates by getting the word out and getting Libertarians elected to the Nevada legislature. You can donate to the State Party, State Legislature Candidates, and the Presidential campaign by using the links below.

Libertarian Party of Nevada: [www.LPnevada.org/donate](http://www.LPnevada.org/donate)

By Tim Hagen, Libertarian Party of Nevada Treasurer, Treasurer of the Libertarian National Committee, and Candidate for State Senate District 5

Friends and Family who don’t know they’re Libertarian? Share this site!

Many people are thinking through all the issues this year and taking the online quiz at [www.isidewith.com](http://www.isidewith.com) - a website that will take each person’s answers and show which candidate or candidates are the best match on the issues.
Here to Help (continued from page 3)

those who can’t afford it.” Very “social”ist. There are 5.6 million policies today, with over 500,000 flood policies in Louisiana. This means there are plenty of people paying into the system so that many of those poorer people can live in areas they otherwise would not move to due to risk. What is the catch? It still isn’t working. 2014 we had the Flood Insurance Affordability Act…because after Sandy, people’s policies went through the roof…and deductibles made it so difficult to qualify for payment. The NFIP is now $24 BILLION in debt. Tax payer debt. Bail out needing debt. Weight on your children’s back debt. Why? Because telling people that living in a flood zone is risky and they must pay for that risk is somehow mean…and our government is not mean, it is nice, and it “Is here to help.” And they want to fix our health care now. And our schools. And our retirement. And our food. Wonder why we are 20 trillion dollars in debt? I don’t.

By Jason Smith, Vice Chairman, Libertarian Party of Nevada

Can’t Punish Stupid (continued from page 6)

(S) The ocean is very deep

(C) The ocean is wet

(TS//SCI) Dolphins live in the deep, wet ocean and eat fish.

Now, you’ve probably never had any training on the subject, but answer me this. Which of the above statements is marked unclassified? Which one is confidential? Which one is top secret/SCI? I’ll bet you can figure it out. So are you more “technically sophisticated” than the Secretary of State? But that’s not even the end of it! You’ve only passed the test to be a “derivative classifier”. That is the categorization for government worker bees who are expected to be able to determine the classification of a statement or document based on guides and other materials from the same program. Sec Clinton was an “original classifier”. That means she is trusted to such an extent that she writes those guidelines. She must be able to recognize the harm that leaking a piece of information would do to the country, and classify the information accordingly, on sight. But somehow she can’t recognize marked content on sight? Okay, director.

Last is server protection. Now, I believe that Sec Clinton has no idea how to protect a server, but apparently she also doesn’t know how to hire experts. The server was administrated by at least seven administrators, according to Dir Comey’s testimony, but they collectively failed to implement basic security measures. The server wasn’t running up to date software, and didn’t have intrusion detection or prevention systems. For something this important, you can’t just run a simple anti-virus software, you have to constantly monitor traffic going in and out of the server to notice malicious or abnormal behavior. When Director Comey said he had no evidence of foreign hackers entering the server, it’s not because they didn’t do it, it’s because there was no system in place to produce the evidence. It would be tantamount to saying “we don’t know if they looked in the safe deposit box because there are no locks or security cameras in this bank”. Truly, if foreign intelligence didn’t access the server, they’re just as technically incompetent as Sec Clinton claims to be.

Now that you understand the basics of how classified networks are separated, how material is marked, and how incompetent the protection was, do you believe Secretary Clinton didn’t intend to mishandle the material?
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that currently characterizes tax filing season.

5. The consumption tax promotes growth while limiting government's ability to spend irresponsibly during economic downturns. The consumption tax is as pro-growth as tax plans come. It provides business with complete transparency in spending and costs while limiting the government's access to tax revenues during recessionary periods due to decreased consumer spending. Consumption taxes, in this respect, hedge against potential government waste and fiscal irresponsibility.

Thus “recessions under a consumption tax scenario will be shorter simply because alongside government having less of our money to consume, businesses and entrepreneurs will have more to access,” espouses Tamny.

Worth noting, some have questioned the viability of Johnson’s promise to keep the proposed system revenue-neutral.

Doing so means maintaining the existing balance of taxation and spending between the government and its taxpayers.

Notwithstanding some discourse pertaining to the finer minutia of Johnson’s proposal, however, the consumption tax presents a favorable alternative to the current, failing status quo.

By Daniel Honchariw, Nevada Policy Research Institute