1. **D**: The Jewish monopoly on cheap clothing is a readily shared perception. (The claim of a “complete victory” is somewhat evaluative, but it’s not arguable.)

2. **D** or possibly **D(E)**: Riis’s definition of “sweater” is fact-based from common knowledge. The claim that access to sewing machines is “accidental” appears to be interpretive, but it would be hard to argue that claim.

3. **E** or possibly **E(D) (*)**: The idea that the prevailing social and economic system made the sweater what he is carries some interpretive authority—in fact, this is an echo of Riis’s thesis in the book as a whole. It asserts a complex cause-and-effect that Riis tries to prove by giving ample attention to the evils of the “system.”

4. **E (*)**: The language is strongly evaluative here—“must,” “first and necessary,” “essential, absolutely vital.” Riis is rendering his judgment on the solution to the problem, giving priority to literacy in English as a means of salvation for struggling immigrants. In the absence of his reasons for doing so—his proof—this is only an opinion, but it’s certainly thesis-worthy. (Many people have made this argument.)

5. **D/E** or **D(E)**: The first part of this statement is descriptive, but the last part interprets the significance of the “triple combination.” Riis apparently expects his reader to share his perception that a landlord/liquor dealer/politician is an especially dangerous person, so his statement may be regarded as more descriptive than interpretive.

6. **D(E) or possibly E(D)**: Despite highly charged language such as “miserably inadequate, “murder done in cold blood by the wretches who poison,” and “swill,” Riis’s main claim here is based on common sense and common humanity—hence the claim that the “sanitary authorities [must] know” may be regarded as a readily shared perception. The evaluative language is there, but *is this an argument that begs to be proved?* Probably not.
7. **E(D):** Riis categorically asserts that the tenants of the Tenth Ward have no privacy (because of massive overcrowding), even as he puts quotations around “home” to mock the idea that their living quarters provide any sort of home environment. If this isn’t evaluative enough, he ventures an analogy between ignorant immigrant Jews and ancient barbarian hordes. A colorful interpretation, but not an especially arguable point.

8. **D(E):** Riis ends this chapter of his book with this sentence, which describes a touching and disturbing event that he witnessed in Jewtown. The more evaluative part of the statement is between the dashes, where Riis deftly asserts the tragedy of the toddler’s fate.

9. **E (*):** This is a cause-and-effect claim that’s quite interpretive. Riis gives an explanation for why “Colonization”—in this case, transplanting Jews from the city to the country—has failed to take hold: they’re unfit by nature for an agrarian lifestyle because they’re “too gregarious” and too “commercial.” Elsewhere in his portrait of Jewtown, Riis presents evidence to support his view that Jews are inclined to herd together and do business in the urban marketplace, where they like to haggle. So in effect he argues his claim, which is thesis-worthy even if it’s only a sub-thesis (or minor argument) in his book, and even if it’s racial profiling.

10. **D:** Riis quotes “the lodger” and describes his budget in order to make the point that the good life in Jewtown—according to the wants and needs of the lodger—is on the cheap. Clearly a descriptive claim, with no definite value judgment on Riis’s part.

11. **D(E):** This is a descriptive claim except for “fearfully,” which is evaluative.

12. **D/E:** This complex claim is by turns evaluative and descriptive, starting with “despotism,” a highly charged name for the sweater’s authority. To say that the typical sweater takes advantage of a capitalist economic system as well as the desperation of “immigrant hordes” is mainly descriptive. But identifying Jewish people with “constitutional greed” is an **E** claim of the worst stripe.