

100% Money Back
Guarantee

Vendor:LAST

Exam Code:LSAT-TEST

Exam Name:Law School Admission Test: Logical Reasoning, Reading Comprehension, Analytical Reasoning

Version:Demo

QUESTION 1

This morning, a bakery makes exactly one delivery, consisting of exactly six loaves of bread. Each of the loaves is exactly one of three kinds: oatmeal, rye, or wheat, and each is either sliced or unsliced. The loaves that the bakery delivers this morning must be consistent with the following:

Each of the following could be a complete and accurate list of the unsliced loaves that the bakery delivers EXCEPT:

- A. three oatmeal loaves
- B. three oatmeal loaves, one rye loaf
- C. two oatmeal loaves, two rye loaves
- D. two oatmeal loaves, three rye loaves
- E. one oatmeal loaf, one rye loaf

Correct Answer: A

The reference to unsliced loaves should point you to Rules 3, 4, and 5. Each choice has at least one unsliced oatmeal loaf, and there's no unsliced wheat loaf among the choices, but option [three oatmeal loaves] is a straightforward violation of Rule 5. With more than one unsliced loaf, this option needs to have an unsliced rye loaf as well, but it isn't there.

QUESTION 2

By the year 2030, the Earth's population is expected to increase to 10 billion; ideally, all would enjoy standards of living equivalent to those of present-day industrial democracies. However, if 10 billion people consume critical natural resources such as copper, nickel, and petroleum at the current per capita rates of industrialized countries, and if new resources are not discovered or substitutes developed, such an ideal would last a decade or less. Moreover, projections based on the current rate of waste production in many industrialized countries suggest that 10 billion people would generate enough solid waste every year to bury a large city and its surrounding suburbs 100 meters deep.

These estimates are not meant to predict a grim future. Instead they emphasize the incentives for recycling, conservation, and a switch to alternative materials. They also suggest that the traditional model of industrial activity, in which individual manufacturing processes take in raw materials and generate products to be sold plus waste to be disposed of, should be transformed into a more integrated model: an industrial ecosystem. In such a system the consumption of energy and materials is optimized, wastes and pollution are minimized, and the effluents of one process—whether they are spent catalysts from petroleum refining or discarded plastic containers from consumer products—serve as the raw material for another process.

Materials in an ideal industrial ecosystem would not be depleted any more than are materials in a biological ecosystem, in which plants synthesize nutrients that feed herbivores, some of which in turn feed a chain of carnivores whose waste products and remains eventually feed further generations of plants. A chunk of steel could potentially show up one year in a tin can, the next year in an automobile, and 10 years later in the skeleton of a building. Some manufacturers are already making use of "designed offal" in the manufacture of metals and some plastics: tailoring the production of waste from a manufacturing process so that the waste can be fed directly back into that process or a related one. Such recycling still requires the expenditure of energy and the unavoidable generation of some wastes and harmful by-products, but at much lower levels than are typical today. The ideal industrial ecosystem, in which there is an economically viable role for every product of a manufacturing process, will not be attained soon; current technology is often inadequate to the task. However, if industrialized nations embrace major and minor changes in their current industrial practices and developing nations bypass older, less ecologically sound technologies, it should be possible to

develop a more closed industrial ecosystem that would be more sustainable than current industrial practices, especially in the face of decreasing supplies of raw materials and-increasing problems of waste and pollution.

The author of the passage would most probably agree with which one of the following statements about standards of living?

- A. An increase in the standard of living in developing countries will be accompanied by a decrease in the standard of living in industrialized countries.
- B. It is likely that the standard of living of both industrialized and developing countries will decrease substantially by the year 2030.
- C. The current standard of living of industrialized countries cannot be sustained if the population of the world increases.
- D. All countries could enjoy a high standard of living without depleting natural resources if industrialized and developing countries implemented an ideal industrial ecosystem.
- E. Supplies of critical natural resources will be in serious danger of depletion by the year 2030 unless the current standard of living of both industrialized and developing countries is reduced.

Correct Answer: D

The sentence "Most probably agree" signals Inference, and the Buzzword phrase "standards of living" should send you up top, where the author asserts his "ideal" of everyone, all 10 billion of us, enjoying the same standards. Think Globally does the author think that that can happen? Sure, if the "iie" ever came to pass Remember, he explicitly told us to reject the prediction of a grim future. A quick scan of the choices in search of this kind of optimism must yield option [All countries could enjoy a high standard of living...], it's the idea that underlies the entire plan thereafter outlined.

QUESTION 3

Conflict had existed between Spain and England since the 1570s. England wanted a share of the wealth that Spain had been taking from the lands it had claimed in the Americas. Elizabeth I, Queen of England, encouraged her staunch admiral of the navy, Sir Francis Drake, to raid Spanish ships and towns. Though these raids were on a small scale, Drake achieved dramatic success, adding gold and silver to England's treasury and diminishing Spain's omnipotence. Religious differences also caused conflict between the two countries. Whereas Spain was Roman Catholic, most of England had become Protestant. King Philip II of Spain wanted to claim the throne and make England a Catholic country again. To satisfy his ambition and also to retaliate against England's theft of his gold and silver, King Philip began to build his fleet of warships, the Armada, in January 1586. Philip intended his fleet to be indestructible. In addition to building new warships, he marshaled one hundred and thirty sailing vessels of all types and recruited more than nineteen thousand robust soldiers and eight thousand sailors. Although some of his ships lacked guns and others lacked ammunition, Philip was convinced that his Armada could withstand any battle with England.

The martial Armada set sail from Lisbon, Portugal, on May 9, 1588, but bad weather forced it back to port. The voyage resumed on July 22 after the weather became more stable. The Spanish fleet met the smaller, faster, and more maneuverable English ships in battle off the coast of Plymouth, England, first on July 31 and again on August 2. The two battles left Spain vulnerable, having lost several ships and with its ammunition depleted. On August 7, while the Armada lay at anchor on the French side of the Strait of Dover, England sent eight burning ships into the midst of the Spanish fleet to set it on fire. Blocked on one side, the Spanish ships could only drift away, their crews in panic and disorder. Before the Armada could regroup, the English attacked again on August 8. Although the Spaniards made a valiant effort to fight back, the fleet suffered extensive damage. During the eight hours of battle, the Armada drifted perilously close to the rocky coastline. At the moment when it seemed that the Spanish ships would be driven onto the English shore, the wind shifted, and the Armada drifted out into the North Sea. The Spaniards recognized the superiority of the English fleet and returned home, defeated.

Sir Francis Drake added wealth to the treasury and diminished Spain's _____.

- A. unlimited power
- B. unrestricted growth
- C. territory
- D. treaties
- E. answer not available in article

Correct Answer: A

QUESTION 4

Formal performance evaluations in the professional world are conducted using realistic situations. Physicians are allowed to consult medical texts freely, attorneys may refer to law books and case records, and physicists and engineers have their manuals at hand for ready reference. Students, then, should likewise have access to their textbooks whenever they take examinations.

The reasoning in the argument is questionable because the argument

- A. cites examples that are insufficient to support the generalization that performance evaluations in the professional world are conducted in realistic situations
- B. fails to consider the possibility that adopting its recommendation will not significantly increase most students' test scores
- C. neglects to take into account the fact that professionals were once students who also did not have access to textbooks during examinations
- D. neglects to take into account the fact that, unlike students, professionals have devoted many years of study to one subject
- E. fails to consider the possibility that the purposes of evaluation in the professional world and in school situations are quite dissimilar

Correct Answer: E

This is a Flaw question. For these questions, it's usually possible to form a prephrase of the answer, which should save you time in reviewing answer choices. Put simply, the argument says that students should be allowed to have open book tests. Why? Because in performance evaluations in the professional world, doctors, lawyers, etc. are allowed to refer to their books. This is nothing more than an argument by analogy. The operating assumption in all arguments by analogy is that the two things that are compared are, in fact, comparable. Therefore, the best way to weaken them is to show how the two things are not comparable. Or, in this case, where you must determine why the reasoning is questionable, look for an answer choice that says something along the lines of "the reasoning is flawed because it tries to compare apples and oranges." Option [fails to consider the possibility that the purposes of...] does just that by saying that the author hasn't considered the possibility that the purposes of the two tests mentioned in the stimulus are in fact quite dissimilar.

QUESTION 5

The six messages on an answering machine were each left by one of Fleure, Greta, Hildy, Liam,

Pasquale, or Theodore, consistent with the following:

At most one person left more than one message.

No person left more than three messages.

If the first message is Hildy's, the last is Pasquale's.

If Greta left any message, Fleure and Pasquale did also.

If Fleure left any message, Pasquale and Theodore did also, all of Pasquale's preceding any of Theodore's.

If Pasquale left any message, Hildy and Liam did also, all of Hildy's preceding any of Liam's.

Which one of the following could be a complete and accurate list of the messages left on the answering machine, from first to last?

A. Fleure's, Pasquale's, Theodore's, Hildy's, Pasquale's, Liam's

B. Greta's, Pasquale's, Theodore's, Theodore's, Hildy's, Liam's

C. Hildy's, Hildy's, Hildy's, Liam's, Pasquale's, Theodore's

D. Pasquale's, Hildy's, Fleure's, Liam's, Theodore's, Theodore's

E. Pasquale's, Hildy's, Theodore's, Hildy's, Liam's, Liam's

Correct Answer: D

This game wasn't easy, but this was the easiest question. Take the rules and use them to eliminate choices. Rule 1 kills E.. Rule 2 doesn't help, but Rule 3 eliminates [Hildy's, Hildy's, Hildy's, Liam's, Pasquale's, Theodore's]. Rule 4 axes [Greta's, Pasquale's, Theodore's, Theodore's, Hildy's, Liam's]., Rule 5 kills [Fleure's, Pasquale's, Theodore's, Hildy's, Pasquale's, Liam's], and we're down to [Pasquale's, Hildy's, Fleure's, Liam's, Theodore's, Theodore's], the correct answer.

QUESTION 6

Five racing drivers, Alan, Bob, Chris, Don, and Eugene, enter into a contest that consists of 6 races. The results of all six races are listed below: Bob always finishes ahead of Chris. Alan finishes either first or last.

Eugene finishes either first or last. There are no ties in any race.

Every driver finishes each race. In each race, two points are awarded for a fifth place finish, four points for fourth, six points for third, eight points for second, and ten points for first.

If Don finishes third in the third race, which of the following must be true of that race?

A. Alan finishes first.

B. Eugene finishes first.

- C. Bob finishes second.
- D. Chris finishes second.
- E. Alan finishes fifth.

Correct Answer: C

If Don finishes third, the order for this race will be: Alan/Eugene, Bob, Don, Chris, Alan/Eugene. Bob will finish second.

QUESTION 7

Only a very small percentage of people from the service professions ever become board members of the 600 largest North American corporations. This shows that people from the service professions are underrepresented in the most important corporate boardrooms in North America.

Which one of the following points out a flaw committed in the argument?

- A. Six hundred is too small a sample on which to base so sweeping a conclusion about the representation of people from the service professions.
- B. The percentage of people from the service professions who serve on the boards of the 600 largest North American corporations reveals little about the percentage of the members of these boards who are from the service professions.
- C. It is a mistake to take the 600 largest North American corporations to be typical of corporate boardrooms generally.
- D. It is irrelevant to smaller corporations whether the largest corporations in North America would agree to have significant numbers of workers from the service professions on the boards of the largest corporations.
- E. The presence of people from the service professions on a corporate board does not necessarily imply that that corporation will be more socially responsible than it has been in the past

Correct Answer: B

As soon as you see percentages being discussed, you should pay close attention. And since the question stem tells you that there is a flaw in the argument, it's a good bet that the author is going to confuse the numbers in some way. The author concludes that people from the service professions are underrepresented in boardrooms because only a very small percentage of people from the service professions ever become board members of the largest corporations. Well, that doesn't make much sense. There are probably millions of people in any industry you can think of, including the service industry; but there are only a few people (relatively speaking) that are board members of the largest corporations. So by the author's reasoning, virtually every industry would be underrepresented. Therefore, the author's conclusion doesn't logically follow from the evidence. Option [The percentage of people from the service professions] correctly identifies this flaw; it points out that the way you tell whether a group is Underrepresented is to look at the percentage of board members who come from a particular group -- not by looking at what percentage of the group become board members. Once you have identified this fundamental flaw, none of the other answer choices should have distracted you. Note that options [It is a mistake to take the 600 largest...], [It is irrelevant to smaller corporations whether...], and [The presence of people from the service professions on...] have outside the scope elements, namely, corporate boardrooms generally, smaller corporations, and social responsibility.

QUESTION 8

Some philosophers find the traditional, subjective approach to studying the mind outdated and ineffectual. For them, the attempt to describe the sensation of pain or anger, for example, or the awareness that one is aware, has been

surpassed by advances in fields such as psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive science. Scientists, they claim, do not concern themselves with how a phenomenon feels from the inside; instead of investigating private evidence perceivable only to a particular individual, scientists pursue hard data—such as the study of how nerves transmit impulses to the brain—which is externally observable and can be described without reference to any particular point of view. With respect to features of the universe such as those investigated by chemistry, biology, and physics, this objective approach has been remarkably successful in yielding knowledge. Why, these philosophers ask, should we suppose the mind to be any different?

But philosophers loyal to subjectivity are not persuaded by appeals to science when such appeals conflict with the data gathered by introspection. Knowledge, they argue, relies on the data of experience, which includes subjective experience. Why should philosophy ally itself with scientists who would reduce the sources of knowledge to only those data that can be discerned objectively?

On the face of it, it seems unlikely that these two approaches to studying the mind could be reconciled. Because philosophy, unlike science, does not progress inexorably toward a single truth, disputes concerning the nature of the mind are bound to continue. But what is particularly distressing about the present debate is that genuine communication between the two sides is virtually impossible. For reasoned discourse to occur, there must be shared assumptions or beliefs. Starting from radically divergent perspectives, subjectivists and objectivists lack a common context in which to consider evidence presented from each other's perspectives. The situation may be likened to a debate between adherents of different religions about the creation of the universe. While each religion may be confident that its cosmology is firmly grounded in its respective sacred text, there is little hope that conflicts between their competing cosmologies could be resolved by recourse to the texts alone. Only further investigation into the authority of the texts themselves would be sufficient.

What would be required to resolve the debate between the philosophers of mind, then, is an investigation into the authority of their differing perspectives. How rational is it to take scientific description as the ideal way to understand the nature of consciousness? Conversely, how useful is it to rely solely on introspection for one's knowledge about the workings of the mind? Are there alternative ways of gaining such knowledge? In this debate, epistemology—the study of knowledge—may itself lead to the discovery of new forms of knowledge about how the mind works.

The author's primary purpose in writing the passage is to

- A. suggest that there might be valid aspects to both the subjective and the objective approaches to studying the mind
- B. advocate a possible solution to the impasse undermining debate between subjectivists and objectivists
- C. criticize subjectivist philosophers for failing to adopt a more scientific methodology
- D. defend the subjective approach to studying the mind against the charges leveled against it by objectivists
- E. evaluate the legitimacy of differing conceptions of evidence advocated by subjectivists and objectivists

Correct Answer: B

This primary purpose Global question shouldn't be tough because of our Roadmap. We saw that the passage picks up in interest in 3 and beyond, when the author gets past sheer definitions to an idea for resolving a philosophical debate. That purpose, illustrated by 4 and fully described in 5, is pretty clearly reflected in option [advocate a possible solution to the impasse...].

QUESTION 9

On the popular children's television show, there are four little animals that make up the "Creature Buddies" are digitally animate. Since that means that they can't make a live stage performance, while the Creature Buddies are on tour, each is represented by a puppet that is operated by a chief and an assistant puppeteer.

The Creature Buddies are a: Dragon, Gorilla, Kangaroo, and Tiger. The Creature's Names are: Audrey, Hamish, Melville, Rex

The Chief Puppeteers are: Ben, Jill, Paul and Sue

The Assistant Puppeteers are: Dave, Gale, Pam and Tom

Melville isn't the puppet who is operated by Sue and her assistant Pam.

Hamish's chief puppeteer (who is not Jill) is assisted by Tom.

Ben is in charge of the dragon, but Jill doesn't have anything to do with the kangaroo.

Dave is the assistant puppeteer for the tiger.

Rex, whose chief is Paul, isn't the gorilla (who's name is not Melville).

Which chief puppeteer works with Tom?

- A. Ben
- B. Jill
- C. Paul
- D. Sue
- E. Rex

Correct Answer: A

QUESTION 10

By the time Bentham turned his interest to the subject, late in the eighteenth century, most components of modern evidence law had been assembled. Among common-law doctrines regarding evidence there were, however, principles that today are regarded as bizarre; thus, a well-established (but now abandoned) rule forbade the parties to a case from testifying. Well into the nineteenth century, even defendants in criminal cases were denied the right to testify to facts that would prove their innocence.

Although extreme in its irrationality, this proscription was in other respects quite typical of the law of evidence. Much of that law consisted of rules excluding relevant evidence, usually on some rational grounds. Hearsay evidence was generally excluded because absent persons could not be cross-examined. Yet such evidence was mechanically excluded even where out-of-court statements were both relevant and reliable, but the absent persons could not appear in court (for example, because they were dead).

The morass of evidentiary technicalities often made it unlikely that the truth would emerge in a judicial contest, no matter how expensive and protracted. Reform was frustrated both by the vested interests of lawyers and by the profession's reverence for tradition and precedent. Bentham's prescription was revolutionary: virtually all evidence tending to prove or disprove the issue in dispute should be admissible. Narrow exceptions were envisioned: instances in which the trouble or expense of presenting or considering proof outweighed its value, confessions to a Catholic priest, and a few other instances.

One difficulty with Bentham's nonexclusion principle is that some kinds of evidence are inherently unreliable or misleading. Such was the argument underlying the exclusions of interested-party testimony and hearsay evidence. Bentham argued that the character of evidence should be weighed by the jury: the alternative was to prefer ignorance to

knowledge. Yet some evidence, although relevant, is actually more likely to produce a false jury verdict than a true one. To use a modern example, evidence of a defendant's past bank robberies is excluded, since the prejudicial character of the evidence substantially outweighs its value in helping the jury decide correctly. Further, in granting exclusions such as sacramental confessions, Bentham conceded that competing social interests or values might override the desire for relevant evidence. But then, why not protect conversations between social workers and their clients, or parents and children?

Despite concerns such as these, the approach underlying modern evidence law began to prevail soon after Bentham's death: relevant evidence should be admitted unless there are clear grounds of policy for excluding it. This clear-grounds proviso allows more exclusions than Bentham would have liked, but the main thrust of the current outlook is Bentham's own nonexclusion principle, demoted from a rule to a presumption.

The author mentions "conversations between social workers and their clients" most probably in order to

- A. suggest a situation in which application of the nonexclusion principle may be questionable
- B. cite an example of objections that were raised to Bentham's proposed reform
- C. illustrate the conflict between competing social interests
- D. demonstrate the difference between social interests and social values
- E. emphasize that Bentham's exceptions to the nonexclusion principle covered a wide range of situations

Correct Answer: A

The line reference appears in the context of the previous sentence which begins with "Further," indicating that it's continuing the previous thought which was the idea of the entire fourth, that there were difficulties with Bentham's nonexclusionary principle.

QUESTION 11

Some philosophers find the traditional, subjective approach to studying the mind outdated and ineffectual. For them, the attempt to describe the sensation of pain or anger, for example, or the awareness that one is aware, has been surpassed by advances in fields such as psychology, neuroscience, and cognitive science. Scientists, they claim, do not concern themselves with how a phenomenon feels from the inside; instead of investigating private evidence perceivable only to a particular individual, scientists pursue hard data such as the study of how nerves transmit impulses to the brain which is externally observable and can be described without reference to any particular point of view. With respect to features of the universe such as those investigated by chemistry, biology, and physics, this objective approach has been remarkably successful in yielding knowledge. Why, these philosophers ask, should we suppose the mind to be any different?

But philosophers loyal to subjectivity are not persuaded by appeals to science when such appeals conflict with the data gathered by introspection. Knowledge, they argue, relies on the data of experience, which includes subjective experience. Why should philosophy ally itself with scientists who would reduce the sources of knowledge to only those data that can be discerned objectively?

On the face of it, it seems unlikely that these two approaches to studying the mind could be reconciled. Because philosophy, unlike science, does not progress inexorably toward a single truth, disputes concerning the nature of the mind are bound to continue. But what is particularly distressing about the present debate is that genuine communication between the two sides is virtually impossible. For reasoned discourse to occur, there must be shared assumptions or beliefs. Starting from radically divergent perspectives, subjectivists and objectivists lack a common context in which to consider evidence presented from each other's perspectives. The situation may be likened to a debate between

adherents of different religions about the creation of the universe. While each religion may be confident that its cosmology is firmly grounded in its respective sacred text, there is little hope that conflicts between their competing cosmologies could be resolved by recourse to the texts alone. Only further investigation into the authority of the texts themselves would be sufficient. What would be required to resolve the debate between the philosophers of mind, then, is an investigation into the authority of their differing perspectives. How rational is it to take scientific description as the ideal way to understand the nature of consciousness? Conversely, how useful is it to rely solely on introspection for one's knowledge about the workings of the mind? Are there alternative ways of gaining such knowledge? In this debate, epistemology—the study of knowledge—may itself lead to the discovery of new forms of knowledge about how the mind works.

Which one of the following is most closely analogous to the debate described in the hypothetical example given by the author in the fourth paragraph?

- A. a debate among investigators attempting to determine a criminal's identity when conflicting physical evidence is found at the crime scene
- B. a debate among jurors attempting to determine which of two conflicting eyewitness accounts of an event is to be believed
- C. a debate between two archaeologists about the meaning of certain written symbols when no evidence exists to verify either's claim
- D. a debate between two museum curators about the value of a painting that shows clear signs of both genuineness and forgery
- E. a debate between two historians who draw conflicting conclusions about the same event based on different types of historical data

Correct Answer: E

One last analogy, one last Parallel Logic-type question, this one stemming from 4. Remember, in that the author uses an analogous example (people of different religions debating the creation of the universe, but at an impasse because of each group's sense of rightness) in order to illuminate the issue at hand. Now, we need to find an analogy to the analogy! Remember the key point: A debate is at an impasse because each side is certain of its own separate evidence, and that evidence conflicts.

QUESTION 12

Human intelligence is not possible without human emotions. A computer is something that can never have emotions, so for that reason alone a computer will never be able to display intelligence.

Which one of the following is an assumption on which the argument depends?

- A. A computer could have emotions only if it could display intelligence.
- B. Computer technology will not greatly advance beyond its current state.
- C. Someone or something is intelligent only if it can identify its emotions.
- D. The greater the capacity to feel emotions, the more intelligence there is.
- E. Being intelligent requires the capacity to have emotions.

Correct Answer: E

Did you pick up on the scope shift in this Assumption question? Did you notice the mismatched terms? If not, take another look before reading on. Hint: look closely. Okay: Human intelligence requires human emotions. A computer can't have human emotions. Therefore, a computer can't display human intelligence. What's wrong with that? Nothing -- but that's not what the author says. She concludes that computers can't display intelligence period; she leaves out the word "human," and therein lays the shift. What if there are other kinds of intelligence that don't require emotions? Then the author couldn't argue that computers can never display intelligence based solely on the fact that they don't have emotions. If the author wants to make a case about intelligence in general based on the evidence given, then she needs the connection cited in option [Being intelligent requires the capacity to...]. (Note: If you missed the distinction between human intelligence and intelligence in general, option [Being intelligent requires the capacity to...] probably looked to you like a restatement of the first sentence.)