

Most Outlandish Interpretation Fallacy

Lately I've noticed an increase in appeals to a particular fallacy which I'm dubbing the 'most outlandish interpretation fallacy.' It's similar to the 'strawman' with a bit of 'no true scotsman' thrown in for good measure.

Here are a couple examples:

"I don't support capitalism because capitalists support kidnapping children and locking them in sweatshops just because they stole a candy bar."

"I don't support private property because proprietarians support using land mines to kill children who chase their ball into a neighbor's yard."

These scenarios are outlandish interpretations of the concepts linked to them and do not represent what defenders of capitalism and property rights actually advocate or support.

Have you encountered similar nonsense arguments recently? I'm interested to hear your examples.