# Article information:

Eastern Orthodoxy and "Oriental Orthodoxy"
<http://orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/east_orth.aspx>

# Article summary:

1. The term "Oriental Orthodox" is a euphemism used to obfuscate essential theological differences with the Eastern Orthodox Church.

2. The Non-Chalcedonian heresies held by the three main groups of Non-Chalcedonians make it difficult for them to be considered Orthodox.

3. Ecumenical dialogue between the "official" Orthodox and the Monophysites has caused harm to immortal souls and suffering for the Church, and traditionalists challenge the Monophysites to accept the standard of True Orthodox Christianity.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article presents a strong and clear argument against the idea of ecumenical dialogue with the "Oriental Orthodox" churches, which are described as holding intransigent heresies. The author argues that the designation "Oriental Orthodox" is a euphemism used to obfuscate essential theological differences between these churches and Eastern Orthodoxy. The article also criticizes New Calendarist jurisdictions in America for their eagerness to engage in such dialogues.

The article's bias is evident in its use of language, which is often pejorative towards the "Oriental Orthodox" churches and those who engage in ecumenical dialogue with them. For example, the term "Monophysite heretics" is used repeatedly throughout the article, despite being considered offensive by many members of these churches. The author also refers to the Moloch of Monophysitism, implying that those who engage in dialogue with these churches are sacrificing their fellow man to a pagan deity.

The article makes several unsupported claims, such as the assertion that the Non-Chalcedonian heresies held by these churches make it difficult to consider them Orthodox. While it is true that there are significant theological differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and these churches, it is not accurate to say that they cannot be considered Orthodox at all.

The article also fails to explore counterarguments or present evidence for its claims. For example, while it asserts that there is no real distinction between Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy, it does not provide any evidence to support this claim or address potential counterarguments.

Overall, while the article raises some valid points about theological differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy, its biased language and lack of evidence weaken its argument. It would have been more effective if it had presented a more balanced view of the issue and engaged with potential counterarguments.

# Topics for further research:

* Differences between Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy
* Non-Chalcedonian heresies
* Ecumenical dialogue with Oriental Orthodox churches
* New Calendarist jurisdictions in America
* Monophysite heresy and its history
* Offensive language in religious discourse
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