

LSAT-TEST^{Q&As}

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

Pass LAST LSAT-TEST Exam with 100% Guarantee

Free Download Real Questions & Answers **PDF** and **VCE** file from:

<https://www.leads4pass.com/lSAT-test.html>

100% Passing Guarantee
100% Money Back Assurance

Following Questions and Answers are all new published by LAST
Official Exam Center

- ⚙️ **Instant Download** After Purchase
- ⚙️ **100% Money Back** Guarantee
- ⚙️ **365 Days** Free Update
- ⚙️ **800,000+** Satisfied Customers



QUESTION 1

Chairperson: The board of directors of our corporation should not allow the incentives being offered by two foreign governments to entice us to expand our operations into their countries without further consideration of the issue. Although there is an opportunity to increase our profits by expanding our operations there, neither of these countries is politically stable.

The chairperson's reasoning most closely conforms to which one of the following principles?

- A. A corporation should never expand operations into countries that are politically unstable.
- B. Corporations should expand operations into countries when there is a chance of increasing profits.
- C. Political stability is the most important consideration in deciding whether to expand operations into a country.
- D. Corporations should always be cautious about expanding operations into politically unstable countries.
- E. Boards of directors should always disregard governmental incentives when considering where to expand corporate operations.

Correct Answer: D

This type of Principle question asks to which principle in the choices the argument most closely conforms, which means the right answer will be a general restatement of the argument's gist. The chairperson warns that the company shouldn't hastily gobble up the incentives to expand globally without giving the prospect more thought. Profits may rise, sure, but the countries in question are politically unstable. So the principle we seek will be a straightforward mirror of these elements, and will have to capture the proper tone, as well. Notice that the chairperson is not slamming the door on the opportunity or making any grand pronouncements on what should be done; she's merely, as D. puts it, advocating caution in this matter. The rest of option [Corporations should always be cautious about...] is perfectly in line with the situation; every term matches up. In contrast, all of the wrong choices go to extremes.

QUESTION 2

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.

According to the passage, subjectivists advance which one of the following claims to support their charge that objectivism is faulty?

- A. Objectivism rests on evidence that conflicts with the data of introspection.
- B. Objectivism restricts the kinds of experience from which philosophers may draw knowledge.
- C. Objectivism relies on data that can be described and interpreted only by scientific specialists.
- D. Objectivism provides no context in which to view scientific data as relevant to philosophical questions.
- E. Objectivism concerns itself with questions that have not traditionally been part of philosophical inquiry.

Correct Answer: B

The categorical language and "According to the passage" signal that this is a Detail question, and the detail must come from 2, where the subjectivists' stance is laid out. Their beef is summarized in a rhetorical question that needs some interpreting. "Why," they ask, "should philosophy ally itself with scientists who would reduce the sources of knowledge to only those data that can be discerned objectively?" The scientists they mention are the objectivists, and we're supposed to respond, "Gee, no reason, I guess." In other words, subjectivists think that their opponents unduly restrict ("reduce") the data from which they draw knowledge.

QUESTION 3

"Old woman," grumbled the burly white man who had just heard Sojourner Truth speak, "do you think your talk about slavery does any good? I don't care anymore for your talk than I do for the bite of a flea." The tall, imposing black woman turned her piercing eyes on him. "Perhaps not," she answered, "but I'll keep you scratching." The little incident of the 1840s sums up all that Sojourner Truth was: utterly dedicated to spreading her message, afraid of no one, forceful and witty in speech. Yet forty years earlier, who could have suspected that a spindly slave girl growing up in a damp cellar in upstate New York would become one of the most remarkable women in American history? Her name then was Isabella (many slaves had no last names), and by the time she was fourteen she had seen both parents die of cold and hunger. She herself had been sold several times. By 1827, when New York freed its slaves, she had married and borne five children. The first hint of Isabella's fighting spirit came soon afterwards, when her youngest son was illegally seized and sold. She marched to the courthouse and badgered officials until her son was returned to her. In 1843, inspired by religion, she changed her name to Sojourner (meaning "one who stays briefly") Truth, and, with only pennies in her purse, set out to preach against slavery. From New England to Minnesota she trekked, gaining a reputation for her plain but powerful and moving words. Incredibly, despite being black and female (only white males were expected to be public speakers), she drew thousands to town halls, tents, and churches to hear her powerful, deep-voiced pleas on equality for blacks—and for women. Often she had to face threatening hoodlums. Once she stood before armed bullies and sang a hymn to them. Awed by her courage and her commanding presence, they sheepishly retreated.

During the Civil War she cared for homeless ex-slaves in Washington. President Lincoln invited her to the White House to bestow praise on her. Later, she petitioned Congress to help former slaves get land in the West. Even in her old age,

she forced the city of Washington to integrate its trolley cars so that black and white could ride together. Shortly before her death at eighty-six, she was asked what kept her going. "I think of the great things," replied Sojourner.

When New York freed its slaves, Isabella had

- A. problems
- B. no children
- C. five children
- D. an education
- E. three children

Correct Answer: C

QUESTION 4

Tragic dramas written in Greece during the fifth century B.C. engender considerable scholarly debate over the relative influence of individual autonomy and the power of the gods on the drama's action. One early scholar, B. Snell, argues that Aeschylus, for example, develops in his tragedies a concept of the autonomy of the individual. In these dramas, the protagonists invariably confront a situation that paralyzes them, so that their prior notions about how to behave or think are dissolved. Faced with a decision on which their fate depends, they must reexamine their deepest motives, and then act with determination. They are given only two alternatives, each with grave consequences, and they make their decision only after a tortured internal debate. According to Snell, this decision is "free" and "personal" and such personal autonomy constitutes the central theme in Aeschylean drama, as if the plays were devised to isolate an abstract model of human action. Drawing psychological conclusions from this interpretation, another scholar, Z. Barbu, suggests that "[Aeschylean] drama is proof of the emergence within ancient Greek civilization of the individual as a free agent." To A. Rivier, Snell's emphasis on the decision made by the protagonist, with its implicit notions of autonomy and responsibility, misrepresents the role of the superhuman forces at work, forces that give the dramas their truly tragic dimension. These forces are not only external to the protagonist; they are also experienced by the protagonist as an internal compulsion, subjecting him or her to constraint, even in what are claimed to be his or her "choices." Hence all that the deliberation does is to make the protagonist aware of the impasse, rather than motivating one choice over another. It is finally a necessity imposed by the deities that generates the decision, so that at a particular moment in the drama necessity dictates a path. Thus, the protagonist does not so much "choose" between two possibilities as "recognize" that there is only one real option. Lesky, in his discussion of Aeschylus' play Agamemnon, disputes both views. Agamemnon, ruler of Argos, must decide whether to brutally sacrifice his own daughter. A message from the deity Artemis has told him that only the sacrifice will bring a wind to blow his ships to an important battle. Agamemnon is indeed constrained by a divine necessity. But he also deeply desires a victorious battle: "If this sacrifice will lose the winds, it is permitted to desire it fervently," he says. The violence of his passion suggests that Agamemnon chooses a path chosen by the gods for their own reasons on the basis of desires that must be condemned by us, because they are his own. In Lesky's view, tragic action is bound by the constant tension between a self and superhuman forces. The quotation "[Aeschylean] drama is proof of the emergence within ancient Greek civilization of the individual as a free agent."

Suggests that Barbu assumes which one of the following about Aeschylean drama?

- A. Aeschylean drama helped to initiate a new understanding of the person in ancient Greek society.
- B. Aeschylean drama introduced new ways of understanding the role of the individual in ancient Greek society.
- C. Aeschylean drama is the original source of the understanding of human motivation most familiar to the modern Western world.

- D. Aeschylean drama accurately reflects the way personal autonomy was perceived in ancient Greek society.
- E. Aeschylean drama embodies the notion of freedom most familiar to the modern Western world.

Correct Answer: C

Barbu, Snell's cheering section, is trotted out in the passage to ascribe the Snell idea of human autonomy in decisions to Greek civilization generally. He says that the plays of Aeschylus are "proof of" — in other words, evidence for — how the idea of the autonomous human had begun to take hold in Greece. Well, that can only be true (and you might well have pre-phrased this) if Aeschylus's plays had some relevance to, or reflected, the texture of Greek society. It's a connection Barbu doesn't explicitly mention in his brief little quote, but it's a connection he must assume is there. Use the Training Denial Test: If the plays didn't at all reflect the broader ideas underlying Greek life and society, if they were somehow anomalous or renegade, then the plays wouldn't be "proof of" any generalization about Greek civilization whatsoever. If option [Aeschylean drama is the original source of...] is false, Barbu's little argument falls apart.

QUESTION 5

Columnist: It is impossible for there to be real evidence that lax radiation standards that were once in effect at nuclear reactors actually contributed to the increase in cancer rates near such sites. The point is a familiar one: who can say if a particular case of cancer is due to radiation, exposure to environmental toxins, smoking, poor diet, or genetic factors.

The argument's reasoning is most vulnerable to criticism on which one of the following grounds?

- A. The argument fails to recognize that there may be convincing statistical evidence even if individual causes cannot be known.
- B. The argument inappropriately presupposes that what follows a certain phenomenon was caused by that phenomenon.
- C. The argument inappropriately draws a conclusion about causes of cancer in general from evidence drawn from a particular case of cancer.
- D. The argument ignores other possible causes of the increase in cancer rates near the nuclear reactor complexes.
- E. The argument concludes that a claim about a causal connection is false on the basis of a lack of evidence for the claim.

Correct Answer: A

Once again, an argument author is using faulty logic; no big surprise there. The columnist concludes that it is "impossible" for there to be evidence that lax radiation standards at nuclear reactors actually contributed to the increase in cancer rates near those sites. And the columnist's evidence that it is impossible for there to be such evidence? Simply the fact that no one can say if a particular case of cancer is due to radiation, smoking, or other factors. Did you notice the scope shift there? Many flawed arguments turn on such subtle scope shifts. In this instance the columnist takes evidence about what may have caused a single case of cancer and uses it to support a conclusion about whether there is evidence that radiation contributed to an increase in cancer rates. Therefore, you should have been looking for an answer choice that addresses this scope shift. Option [The argument fails to recognize that there...] does the job. If, for instance, there were statistical evidence that cancer rates had increased by 80 percent during the relevant time period, that would be evidence that the standards had made a contribution, even if you couldn't prove conclusively that any one of the individual cases was due to radiation.