

That's Not a Duck

I've said it before and I'll say it again: if something doesn't fit the minimum definition, then it isn't the thing being discussed; no matter how much someone might invoke the "No true Scotsman" fallacy to try to make you ashamed of noticing.

Ducks are not mammals, even if one type of mammal has a bill and lays eggs.

A knife is not a dill pickle, even though I can imagine ways to make a knife out of a dill pickle.

And people who don't *at least* reject the initiation of force (more generally: archaism) are **not** libertarians.

This includes those initiations of force and property rights violations they really like and support. Things like "taxes", "tax farm borders", and other property violations; arrests, imprisonment, and other forms of aggression.

They might be *really close* to being a libertarian in most ways, but just like an ichthyosaur was *really close* to being a dolphin in a lot of ways, the differences blow the comparison to pieces. The differences break the definition.

Yes, I know recognizing this is intolerant of me. I'm not saying I can't work with them where we agree, even while pointing out why they aren't what they claim to be.