



Analysis/Synthesis Paper

An analysis paper asks students to examine a work critically, identify the author's main and secondary points, and reflect on these points carefully. Below are parts of an analysis of an article by Donald Huddle entitled "A Growing Burden," which originally appeared in *The New York Times* (September 3, 1993).

1. In your introduction, identify the author's main point, or **thesis**.

Donald Huddle uses statistics to show that unlimited immigration to the United States puts a tremendous burden on taxpayers and reduces jobs available to native-born Americans.

2. Identify how the author **supports** this thesis. What reasons or examples are given in support?

Huddle cites studies that project that the costs for supporting the immigrant population and the native-born workers displaced in jobs by these immigrants will be \$915 billion over the next ten years, while the taxes paid by the immigrant population will be only \$283 billion.

3. Your paragraphs should explain each of these main points, **incorporating quotations** or **paraphrases** to explain how the author supports his or her claims.

Huddle acknowledges that cutting the funding for programs for legal immigrants is not the answer. He proposes that the U.S. "reduce immigration and select entrants more carefully" (472). He suggests that if the U.S. only allowed in immigrants who were skilled or professionals that the country would save nearly \$200 billion in public assistance, though he does not explain how he arrived at this figure.

4. Include **your own reflections** on the points you have explained — elaborate the ideas further, agree or disagree, point out strengths or weaknesses in the argument.

Though Huddle does appeal to the exasperated American taxpayer with his statistics about the money spent on people who are not citizens and who do not pay taxes themselves, he neglects to elaborate on his proposal. It is unclear how he suggests we "select" the right immigrants and he seems to contradict himself. Why is it discriminatory to revoke funding from current immigrants but not to choose only upper-class would-be immigrants? Huddle's proposal appears to make arbitrary distinctions between the "native" citizens he wishes to protect and the legal immigrants he wants to exclude. Does the newborn baby of a woman who has lived legally in this country really have more of a "right" to public assistance than his mother does? America is a land of immigrants, composed primarily of those who left their own countries for reasons of economic hardship or some other form of oppression. Ironically, it seems that Huddle has forgotten his own family's history; he seeks restrictions that, if they were in place at the time, would have kept his own family out of the country.