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# Article summary:

1. Tim O'Neill is an amateur rage blogger who has been caught lying and making mistakes about basic facts of history.

2. Signs of a crank include being obsessively wordy, lying, having no relevant credentials or publications in history, and responding to criticism with elaborate slanders.

3. O'Neill's response to Richard Carrier's criticism demonstrates his lack of competence and honesty, as he fails to address any substantive facts and instead spews lies and ad hominem speculation.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article by Richard Carrier on Tim O’Neill is highly critical in nature, painting O’Neill as a liar and incompetent hack who is filled with slanderous rage and void of any competence or honesty. The article provides evidence for this claim by citing examples of O’Neill’s behavior such as his obsessively wordy whining, his lack of relevant credentials or publications in history, his tendency to respond to criticism with elaborate slanders rather than addressing the facts, and his admission that he confused which Ananus Josephus was referring to when discussing the James reference in Josephus.

The article does not present both sides equally; it is clear that Carrier has a negative opinion of O’Neill which he expresses throughout the article. Additionally, there are some unsupported claims made throughout the article such as Carrier’s assertion that Ehrman “gullibly thought everything O’Neill told him was correct” without providing evidence for this claim. Furthermore, there are some points of consideration missing from the article such as potential counterarguments to Carrier’s claims against O’Neill or an exploration into why O’Neill may have responded the way he did.

In conclusion, while the article provides evidence for its claims against Tim O'Neill's credibility as a historian, it does not present both sides equally nor explore all possible points of consideration related to the issue at hand. Therefore, readers should take this article with a grain of salt and consider other sources before forming their own opinion on the matter.

# Topics for further research:

* Tim O'Neill credentials
* Tim O'Neill publications
* Criticism of Tim O'Neill
* Counterarguments to Richard Carrier's claims
* Reasons for Tim O'Neill's behavior
* Historical accuracy of Tim O'Neill's work
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