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# Article summary:

1. Attorney General Bill Lockyer has announced a proposed $2.6 million settlement with Diebold Election Systems, Inc. to resolve a lawsuit alleging false claims about its electronic voting equipment.

2. The settlement includes payments to the state and Alameda County, as well as funding for research on training poll workers in electronic voting technology.

3. Diebold will also be required to strengthen the security of its touchscreen voting machines and vote tabulation servers, and provide documents and information to the California Secretary of State for further analysis.

# 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 titled "Attorney General Lockyer Announces $2.6 Million Settlement with Diebold in Electronic Voting Lawsuit" provides information about a settlement between the State of California and Diebold Election Systems, Inc. The settlement resolves a lawsuit that alleged Diebold provided false information to obtain payments for its electronic voting equipment.

One potential bias in the article is the use of language that portrays Diebold's actions as cavalier and irresponsible. The article states that Diebold treated the right to vote and taxpayers who bought its machines cavalierly, implying negligence on the part of the company. This language may be intended to paint Diebold in a negative light and support the Attorney General's position.

The article also highlights the importance of the right to vote and emphasizes that this settlement holds Diebold accountable. While it is important to ensure the integrity of voting systems, this emphasis on accountability may suggest a bias towards punishing the company rather than exploring potential solutions or improvements to electronic voting technology.

Additionally, there are unsupported claims in the article regarding false claims made by Diebold about the security and certification of its machines. The article does not provide specific evidence or examples of these false claims, leaving readers without sufficient information to evaluate their validity.

The article also lacks exploration of counterarguments or alternative perspectives. It does not mention any potential benefits or successes of Diebold's electronic voting equipment, nor does it address any arguments made by Diebold in defense of its actions. This one-sided reporting limits readers' ability to form a balanced opinion on the issue.

Furthermore, there is promotional content within the article regarding funding for research aimed at training poll workers in electronic voting technology. While this may be a positive outcome of the settlement, its inclusion without critical analysis or discussion raises questions about whether it is relevant to the main issue at hand.

Overall, this article presents a biased perspective by portraying Diebold negatively without providing sufficient evidence for its claims and failing to explore alternative viewpoints. It also includes promotional content that may not be directly related to the main issue.

# Topics for further research:

* Diebold electronic voting machine security claims
* Benefits of Diebold electronic voting equipment
* Diebold's defense in the electronic voting lawsuit
* Alternative perspectives on the settlement with Diebold
* Improvements in electronic voting technology
* Criticisms of the settlement with Diebold
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