



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

The village of Vestmannaeyjar, in the far northern country of Iceland, is as bright and clean and up-to-date as any American or Canadian suburb. It is located on the island of Heimaey, just off the mainland. One January night in 1973, however, householders were shocked from their sleep. In some backyards red-hot liquid was spurting from the ground. Flaming "skyrockets" shot up and over the houses. The island's volcano, Helgafell, silent for seven thousand years, was violently erupting! Luckily, the island's fishing fleet was in port, and within twenty-four hours almost everyone was ferried to the mainland. But then the agony of the island began in earnest. As in a nightmare, fountains of burning lava spurting three hundred feet high. Black, baseball-size cinders rained down. An evil-smelling, eye-burning, throat-searing cloud of smoke and gas erupted into the air, and a river of lava flowed down the mountain. The constant shriek of escaping steam was punctuated by ear-splitting explosions. As time went on, the once pleasant village of Vestmannaeyjar took on a weird aspect. Its street lamps still burning against the long Arctic night, the town lay under a thick blanket of cinders. All that could be seen above the ten-foot black drifts were the tips of street signs. Some houses had collapsed under the weight of cinders; others had burst into flames as the heat ignited their oil storage tanks. Lighting the whole lurid scene, fire continued to shoot from the mouth of the looming volcano.

The eruption continued for six months. Scientists and reporters arrived from around the world to observe the awesome natural event. But the town did not die that easily. In July, when the eruption ceased, the people of Heimaey Island returned to assess the chances of rebuilding their homes and lives. They found tons of ash covering the ground. The Icelanders are a tough people, however, accustomed to the strange and violent nature of their Arctic land. They dug out their homes. They even used the cinders to build new roads and airport runways. Now the new homes of Heimaey are warmed from water pipes heated by molten lava.

This liquid was coming from the

- A. mountains
- B. ground
- C. sea
- D. sky
- E. ocean

Correct Answer: B

QUESTION 2

One of the most intriguing stories of the Russian Revolution concerns the identity of Anastasia, the youngest daughter of Czar Nicholas II. During his reign over Russia, the Czar had planned to revoke many of the harsh laws established by previous czars. Some workers and peasants, however, clamored for more rapid social reform. In 1918 a group of these people, known as Bolsheviks, overthrew the government. On July 17 or 18, they murdered the Czar and what was thought to be his entire family. Although witnesses vouched that all the members of the Czar's family had been executed, there were rumors suggesting that Anastasia had survived. Over the years, a number of women claimed to be Grand Duchess Anastasia. Perhaps the best known claimant was Anastasia Tschaikovsky, who was also known as Anna Anderson. In 1920, eighteen months after the Czar's execution, this terrified young woman was rescued from drowning in a Berlin river. She spent two years in a hospital, where she attempted to reclaim her health and shattered mind. The doctors and nurses thought that she resembled Anastasia and questioned her about her background. She disclaimed any connection with the Czar's family. Eight years later, though, she claimed that she was Anastasia. She said that she had been rescued by two Russian soldiers after the Czar and the rest of her family had been killed. Two brothers named Tschaikovsky had carried her into Romania. She had married one of the brothers, who had taken her to Berlin and left her there, penniless and without a vocation. Unable to invoke the aid of her mother's family in Germany,



she had tried to drown herself. During the next few years, scores of the Czar's relatives, ex-servants, and acquaintances interviewed her. Many of these people said that her looks and mannerisms were evocative of the Anastasia that they had known. Her grandmother and other

relatives denied that she was the real Anastasia, however. Tried of being accused of fraud, Anastasia immigrated to the United States in 1928 and took the name Anna Anderson. She still wished to prove that she was Anastasia, though, and returned to Germany in 1933 to bring suit against her mother's family.

There she declaimed to the court, asserting that she was indeed Anastasia and deserved her inheritance.

In 1957, the court decided that it could neither confirm nor deny Anastasia's identity. Although we will probably never know whether this woman was the Grand Duchess Anastasia, her search to establish her identity has been the subject of numerous books, plays, and movies.

In court she _____ maintaining that she was Anastasia and deserved her inheritance.

- A. finally appeared
- B. spoke forcefully
- C. testified
- D. gave evidence
- E. answer not stated

Correct Answer: B

QUESTION 3

Thurgood Marshall's litigation of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1952—the landmark case, decided in 1954, that made segregation illegal in United States public schools—was not his first case before the U.S. Supreme Court. Some legal scholars claim that the cases he presented to the court in the sixteen years before his successful argument for desegregation of public schools were necessary forerunners of that case: preliminary tests of legal strategies and early erosions of the foundations of discrimination against African Americans that paved the way for success in *Brown*.

When Marshall joined the legal staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1936, the organization was divided on how to proceed against the legal doctrine that for forty years had promoted "separate but equal" facilities for African Americans in educational institutions, in public transportation, and various other civic amenities. One approach was to emphasize that facilities were not in fact equal and to pursue litigation whose practical goal was the improvement both of opportunity for African Americans and of the facilities themselves. A second, more theoretical, approach was to argue that the concept of separate but equal facilities for the races was by its very nature impossible to fulfill, rendering the doctrine self-contradictory and hence legally unsound. Marshall correctly believed that the latter approach would eventually be the one to bring repeal of the doctrine, but felt it necessary in the short term to argue several cases using the former approach, in order to demonstrate the numerous ways in which segregation prevented real equality and thus to prepare the courts to recognize the validity of the theoretical argument.

While Marshall enjoyed several successes arguing for the equalization of facilities and opportunities in such areas as voting practices and accommodations for graduate students at public universities, it would be twelve years before he evolved a strategy for arguing against pervasive discriminatory practices that enabled him to make the leap from individual instances of inequality to the broader social argument needed to later invalidate "separate but equal." In 1948,



Marshall litigated *Shelley v. Kraemer*, in which he convinced the court to outlaw housing discrimination practiced by private parties. Although the court had previously supported such practices implicitly under a doctrine that excused private dealings from the legal requirement for equal protection of citizens under law, Marshall presented sociological data demonstrating that, in sum and over time, these individual transactions constituted a pattern of insupportable discrimination. Marshall later used this strategy when arguing against individual schools' enrollment restrictions in *Brown*; scholars argue that his successful use of the strategy in *Shelley* prepared the court to accept such data as convincing evidence for finding "separate but equal" insupportable on its face.

It can most reasonably be inferred from the passage that Marshall's legal strategy for attacking the "separate but equal" doctrine

- A. sought to answer critics within the NAACP
- B. suggested Marshall thought the court would never accept the validity of a theoretical argument
- C. satisfied the requirement that cases first be argued in lower court
- D. presumed that the court could only gradually be convinced to overturn the "separate but equal" doctrine
- E. reflected Marshall's preference to seek practical goals

Correct Answer: D

The first five words of the question stem clearly scream "Inference," and we need to remember that an inference may stem from several parts of the passage, or from a careful paraphrase of a single reference. The latter is really the case here. Marshall's legal strategy against the "separate but equal" policy is discussed at the end of 2; he felt that it would be "necessary in the short term" to argue against individual injustices—a clear implication that time would be needed for the argument against "separate but equal" itself to prevail "eventually." This "short term/eventually" contrast supports reference of option [presumed that the court could only gradually...] to the idea of overturning the policy slowly.

QUESTION 4

For some years before the outbreak of World War I, a number of painters in different European countries developed works of art that some have described as prophetic: paintings that by challenging viewers' habitual ways of perceiving the world of the present are thus said to anticipate a future world that would be very different. The artistic styles that they brought into being varied widely, but all these styles had in common a very important break with traditions of representational art that stretched back to the Renaissance.

So fundamental is this break with tradition that it is not surprising to discover that these artists—among them Picasso and Braque in France, Kandinsky in Germany, and Malevich in Russia—are often credited with having anticipated not just subsequent developments in the arts, but also the political and social disruptions and upheavals of the modern world that came into being during and after the war. One art critic even goes so far as to claim that it is the very prophetic power of these artworks, and not their break with traditional artistic techniques, that constitutes their chief interest and value.

No one will deny that an artist may, just as much as a writer or a politician, speculate about the future and then try to express a vision of that future through making use of a particular style or choice of imagery; speculation about the possibility of war in Europe was certainly widespread during the early years of the twentieth century. But the forward-looking quality attributed to these artists should instead be credited to their exceptional aesthetic innovations rather than to any power to make clever guesses about political or social trends. For example, the clear impression we get of Picasso and Braque, the joint founders of cubism, from their contemporaries as well as from later statements made by the artists themselves, is that they were primarily concerned with problems of representation and form and with efforts to create a far more "real" reality than the one that was accessible only to the eye. The reformation of society was of no interest to them as artists.



It is also important to remember that not all decisive changes in art are quickly followed by dramatic events in the world outside art. The case of Delacroix, the nineteenth-century French painter, is revealing. His stylistic innovations startled his contemporaries and still retain that power over modern viewers, but most art historians have decided that Delacroix adjusted himself to new social conditions that were already coming into being as a result of political upheavals that had occurred in 1830, as opposed to other artists who supposedly told of changes still to come.

The author presents the example of Delacroix in order to illustrate which one of the following claims?

- A. Social or political changes usually lead to important artistic innovations.
- B. Artistic innovations do not necessarily anticipate social or political upheavals.
- C. Some European painters have used art to predict social or political changes.
- D. Important stylistic innovations are best achieved by abandoning past traditions.
- E. Innovative artists can adapt themselves to social or political changes.

Correct Answer: B

The case of Delacroix... is revealing" (paragraph 5). Of what? Must be the claim made just before: Dramatic artistic changes aren't always followed by dramatic social changes.

QUESTION 5

Many political economists believe that the soundest indicator of the economic health of a nation is the nation's gross-national product (GNP) per capita—a figure reached by dividing the total value of the goods produced yearly in a nation by its population and taken to be a measure of the welfare of the nation's residents. But there are many factors affecting residents' welfare that are not captured by per capita GNP; human indicators, while sometimes more difficult to calculate or document, provide sounder measures of a nation's progress than does the indicator championed by these economists. These human indicators include nutrition and life expectancy; birth weight and level of infant mortality; ratio of population level to availability of resources; employment opportunities; and the ability of governments to provide services such as education, clean water, medicine, public transportation, and mass communication for their residents.

The economists defend their use of per capita GNP as the sole measure of a nation's economic health by claiming that improvements in per capita GNP eventually stimulate improvements in human indicators. But, in actuality, this often fails to occur. Even in nations where economic stimulation has brought about substantial improvements in per capita GNP, economic health as measured by human indicators does not always reach a level commensurate with the per capita GNP. Nations that have achieved a relatively high per capita GNP, for example, sometimes experience levels of infant survival, literacy, nutrition, and life expectancy no greater than levels in nations where per capita GNP is relatively low. In addition, because per capita GNP is an averaged figure, it often presents a distorted picture of the wealth of a nation; for example, in a relatively sparsely populated nation where a small percentage of residents receives most of the economic benefits of production while the majority receives very little benefit, per capita GNP may nevertheless be high. The welfare of a nation's residents is a matter not merely of total economic benefit, but also of the distribution of economic benefits across the entire society. Measuring a nation's economic health only by total wealth frequently obscures a lack of distribution of wealth across the society as a whole.

In light of the potential for such imbalances in distribution of economic benefits, some nations have begun to realize that their domestic economic efforts are better directed away from attempting to raise per capita GNP and instead toward ensuring that the conditions measured by human indicators are salutary. They recognize that unless a shift in focus away from using material wealth as the sole indicator of economic success is effected, the well-being of the nation may be endangered, and that nations that do well according to human indicators may thrive even if their per capita GNP remains stable or lags behind that of other nations.



The term "welfare" is used in the first paragraph to refer most specifically to which one of the following?

- A. the overall quality of life for individuals in a nation
- B. the services provided to individuals by a government
- C. the material wealth owned by individuals in a nation
- D. the extent to which the distribution of wealth among individuals in a nation is balanced
- E. government efforts to redistribute wealth across society as a whole

Correct Answer: A

The categorical language ("is used," "refer most specifically") suggests that we can go right to the passage reference to pick up the meaning of "welfare," first introduced in 1st paragraph. The thrust of it has to do with the topic, that of measuring economic health.

[Latest LSAT-TEST Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST PDF Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam
Questions](#)