



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.passapply.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

Professor Beckstein: American Sign Language is the native language of many North Americans. Therefore, it is not a foreign language, and for that reason alone, no student should be permitted to satisfy the university's foreign language requirement by learning it. Professor Sedley: According to your argument, students should not be allowed to satisfy the university's foreign language requirement by learning French or Spanish either, since they too are the native languages of many North Americans. Yet many students currently satisfy the requirement by studying French or Spanish, and it would be ridiculous to begin prohibiting them from doing so.

Their statements commit Professors Beckstein and Sedley to disagreeing about which one of the following?

- A. whether American Sign Language is the native language of a significant number of North Americans
- B. whether any North American whose native language is not English should be allowed to fulfill the university's foreign language requirement by studying his or her own native language
- C. whether the university ought to retain a foreign language requirement
- D. whether any other universities in North America permit their students to fulfill a foreign language requirement by learning American Sign Language
- E. whether the fact that a language is the native language of many North Americans justifies prohibiting its use to fulfill the university's foreign language requirement

Correct Answer: E

Here's a two-question stimulus to chew on. The word "disagreeing" in the first stem signals a Point-At-Issue question. Professor Beckstein argues that because ASL is native to many North Americans, it shouldn't satisfy the university's foreign language requirement. Professor Sedley counters that French and Spanish fit the same definition, but it would be ridiculous to exclude them from satisfying the requirement. Both discuss North American students for whom English is not their native language, and whether or not those other languages should be allowed to satisfy the university's foreign language requirement. This common thread leads us to: Beckstein would answer yes, the fact justifies the prohibition; Sedley would say no, it doesn't.

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.

Which one of the following most likely reflects the author's belief about the current impasse between subjectivists and objectivists?

- A. It cannot be overcome because of the radically different conceptions of evidence favored by each of the two sides.
- B. It is resolvable only if the two sides can find common ground from which to assess their competing conceptions of evidence.
- C. It is unavoidable unless both sides recognize that an accurate understanding of the mind requires both types of evidence.
- D. It is based on an easily correctable misunderstanding between the two sides about the nature of evidence.
- E. It will prevent further progress until alternate ways of gaining knowledge about the mind are discovered.

Correct Answer: D

The "impasse" in this Inference question—the "most likely reflects" signals its nature—begins with 3, which talks about the need for common ground between perspectives before a genuine debate can even take place. A bit later, 5 discusses how to achieve common ground, by questioning the authority of each perspective. Putting these two ideas together yields correct answer choice [It is resolvable only if...], which paraphrases the notion that resolution may occur, should the two sides be able to set the debate on a proper logical footing.

QUESTION 3

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:

There are at least two kinds of loaves.

There are no more than three rye loaves.

There is no unsliced wheat loaf.

There is at least one unsliced oatmeal loaf.

If two or more of the loaves are unsliced, then at least one of the unsliced loaves is rye.

Which one of the following could be a complete and accurate list of the loaves that the bakery delivers?



- A. six unsliced oatmeal loaves
- B. five unsliced oatmeal loaves, one sliced rye loaf
- C. five unsliced oatmeal loaves, one unsliced wheat loaf
- D. four unsliced oatmeal loaves, two unsliced rye loaves
- E. four unsliced oatmeal loaves, two sliced wheat loaves

Correct Answer: D

As it turns out, Rule 5 eliminates all the wrong choices, but if you tackled the rules in order, here's what you would have found: Rule 1 kills option [six unsliced oatmeal loaves], which has only oatmeal loaves. Rule 2 doesn't help, but Rule 3 kills option [five unsliced oatmeal loaves, one unsliced wheat loaf], which has the forbidden unsliced wheat loaf. Rule 4 doesn't help, but Rule 5 knocks off options [five unsliced oatmeal loaves, one sliced rye loaf] and [four unsliced oatmeal loaves, two sliced wheat loaves], which each have two or more unsliced loaves but no unsliced rye loaf.

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

It is well known that many species adapt to their environment, but it is usually assumed that only the most highly evolved species alter their environment in ways that aid their own survival. However, this characteristic is actually quite common. Certain species of plankton, for example, generate a gas that is converted in the atmosphere into particles of sulfate. These particles cause water vapor to condense, thus forming clouds. Indeed, the formation of clouds over the ocean largely depends on the presence of these particles. More cloud cover means more sunlight is reflected, and so the Earth absorbs less heat. Thus plankton cause the surface of the Earth to be cooler and this benefits the plankton.

Of the following, which one most accurately expresses the main point of the argument?

- A. The Earth would be far warmer than it is now if certain species of plankton became extinct,
- B. By altering their environment in ways that improve their chances of survival, certain species of plankton benefit the Earth as a whole.
- C. Improving their own chances of survival by altering the environment is not limited to the most highly evolved species.
- D. The extent of the cloud cover over the oceans is largely determined by the quantity of plankton in those oceans.
- E. Species such as plankton alter the environment in ways that are less detrimental to the well-being of other species than are the alterations to the environment made by more highly evolved species.

Correct Answer: C

Two for the price of one in this double-question stimulus, and the two questions are basic ones: What's the main point, and how does the author make it? It's well-known that species adapt to their environment, but most assume that only highly evolved species actually change their environment to aid in survival. But, we find out, this behavior is actually quite common, as the plankton example is presented to demonstrate. The process that follows is actually relatively unimportant, given that we're looking for general stuff like the main point and the argumentative technique. (See bullet point below.) The Keyword "However" indicates that the example of plankton is meant to show that not only the highly evolved species act in the manner described. Option [Improving their own chances of survival...] captures the main gist of the argument.

[LSAT-TEST PDF Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam
Questions](#)

[LSAT-TEST Brainsdumps](#)