

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.pass2lead.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

Logician: I have studied and thoroughly mastered the laws of logic. So to argue that I sometimes violate the laws of logic in ordinary conversation would be like arguing that some physicist circumvents the laws of physics in everyday life.

The reasoning in the logician's argument is questionable because this argument

- A. ignores the fact that our conception of physical laws undergoes constant change
- B. presents no evidence that physics is as difficult to master as logic
- C. fails to rule out the possibility that some physicist could circumvent the laws of physics in everyday life
- D. treats two kinds of things that differ in important respects as if they do not differ
- E. has a conclusion that contradicts what is asserted in its premise

Correct Answer: D

When we see "the logician's argument is questionable because" in the question stem, we think "find the logical flaw." And we have to admit the test makers are not without a sense of irony, beginning a Logical Flaw question with the phrase "Having mastered the laws of logic. . ." Hmm...evidently not. So, because he has supposedly mastered logic, the logician claims that for him to commit a logical flaw in conversation would be like a physicist violating the everyday laws of physics. This seems fairly silly on its face. Does the logician mean that because no physicist can simply float off into space, for example, he, a master logician, cannot make a logical mistake? We can see immediately that the two situations are not the same. Violating the laws of physics is by definition impossible, whereas the logician can easily violate the laws of logic by misspeaking. The laws of physics and the laws of logic differ in important respects. The laws of physics apply universally and cannot be violated; the so-called "laws" of logic are learned and therefore can be violated.

QUESTION 2

All too many weaklings are also cowards, and few cowards fail to be fools. Thus there must be at least one person who is both a weakling and a fool.

The flawed pattern of reasoning in the argument above is most similar to that in which one of the following?

- A. All weasels are carnivores and no carnivores fail to be non-herbivores, so some weasels are non-herbivores.
- B. Few moralists have the courage to act according to the principles they profess, and few saints have the ability to articulate the principles by which they live, so it follows that few people can both act like saints and speak like moralists.
- C. Some painters are dancers, since some painters are musicians, and some musicians are dancers.
- D. If an act is virtuous, then it is autonomous, for acts are not virtuous unless they are free, and acts are not free unless they are autonomous.
- E. A majority of the voting population favors a total ban, but no one who favors a total ban is opposed to stiffer tariffs, so at least one voter is not opposed to stiffer tariffs.

Correct Answer: C

The "All too many" is just literary, not logical, in nature. The first clause simply means Many or Some weaklings are

cowards. The second clause can be read as Many or Most or Some cowards are fools. (Why are we seemingly being so loose in our translations? Because the choices are. Because whichever one of these turns out to be correct, it represents a significant verbal variation on the original. None of the choices reads "All too many X," or "few Y are not Z." So we have to stay a little flexible here.) With that in mind, a loose translation of the first clause would be: Some (or Most) of A are B, and the second as Some (or Most) B are C. When we turn to the conclusion, however, we can feel confident that it can be solidly translated. We know from our formal logic training that the phrase "At least one" means precisely one thing: SOME. So the conclusion is: Some weaklings are fools. Now, given that conclusion, we ought probably to be drawn first to options [All weasels are carnivores and no...], [Some painters are dancers, since...] and [A majority of the...], each of whose conclusions uses the word "Some" or the phrase "At least one." Let's start with those three.

QUESTION 3

By refusing to ban smoking in restaurants, the city council has put the financial wellbeing of restaurant owners above the health of the citizens of this city. No doubt, the council would support the restaurants if they decided to use asbestos tablecloths and to barbecue using radioactivity. These devices would be no more risky.

The author of this paragraph makes her case by arguing A. from experience

B. from example

C. by authority

D. from observation

E. from analogy

Correct Answer: E

The passage makes its point by analogy, comparing the dangers of smoking to the dangers of asbestos and radioactivity.

QUESTION 4

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:

If the bakery delivers exactly four wheat loaves, then the bakery could also deliver

A. one sliced rye loaf and one unsliced rye loaf

B. one sliced oatmeal loaf and one unsliced oatmeal loaf

C. two unsliced rye loaves

D. two unsliced oatmeal loaves

E. two sliced oatmeal loaves

Correct Answer: B

If four wheat loaves are delivered, then those wheat loaves are sliced (Rule 3). One unsliced oatmeal loaf is always

included, and that kills options [one sliced rye loaf and one unsliced rye loaf]., [two unsliced rye loaves], and [two sliced oatmeal loaves]. So what could the sixth loaf be? It can't be an unsliced oatmeal, since that would violate Rule 5. That kills option [two unsliced oatmeal loaves].

QUESTION 5

Donna Haraway's *Primate Visions* is the most ambitious book on the history of science yet written from a feminist perspective, embracing not only the scientific construction of gender but also the interplay of race, class, and colonial and postcolonial culture with the "Western" construction of the very concept of nature itself. Primatology is a particularly apt vehicle for such themes because primates seem so much like ourselves that they provide ready material for scientists' conscious and unconscious projections of their beliefs about nature and culture.

Haraway's most radical departure is to challenge the traditional disjunction between the active knower (scientist/historian) and the passive object (nature/history). In Haraway's view, the desire to understand nature, whether in order to tame it or to preserve it as a place of wild innocence, is based on a troublingly masculinist and colonialist view of nature as an entity distinct from us and subject to our control. She argues that it is a view that is no longer politically, ecologically, or even scientifically viable. She proposes an approach that not only recognizes diverse human actors (scientists, government officials, laborers, science fiction writers) as contributing to our knowledge of nature, but that also recognizes the creatures usually subsumed under nature (such as primates) as active participants in creating that knowledge as well. Finally, she insists that the perspectives afforded by these different agents cannot be reduced to a single, coherent reality?there are necessarily only multiple, interlinked, partial realities.

This iconoclastic view is reflected in Haraway's unorthodox writing style. Haraway does not weave the many different elements of her work into one unified, overarching Story of Primatology; they remain distinct voices that will not succumb to a master narrative. This fragmented approach to historiography is familiar enough in historiographical theorizing but has rarely been put into practice by historians of science. It presents a complex alternative to traditional history, whether strictly narrative or narrative with emphasis on a causal argument. Haraway is equally innovative in the way she incorporates broad cultural issues into her analysis. Despite decades of rhetoric from historians of science about the need to unite issues deemed "internal" to science (scientific theory and practice) and those considered "external" to it (social issues, structures, and beliefs), that dichotomy has proven difficult to set aside. Haraway simply ignores it. The many readers in whom this separation is deeply ingrained may find her discussions of such popular sources as science fiction, movies, and television distracting, and her statements concerning such issues as nuclear war bewildering and digressive. To accept her approach one must shed a great many assumptions about what properly belongs to the study of science.

The passage suggests that Haraway would most probably agree with which one of the following statements about scientists observing animal behavior in the field?

- A. Those scientists who have been properly trained in field techniques will all record similar observations about the animals they are studying.
- B. Primatologists are more likely to record accurate and sensitive observations about the animals they are studying than are other animal behaviorists.
- C. Scientists studying primate behavior will probably record more accurate and sensitive observations than will scientists studying animals that are less like ourselves.
- D. Scientists who study primates will probably be more likely than will scientists studying other animals to interpret an animal's behavior in terms of the scientists' own beliefs.
- E. Scientists who take a passive role in interactions with the animals they study will probably record observations similar to those recorded by scientists taking a more active role.

Correct Answer: D

The passage suggests" again ?it\\'s another Inference question. A search reveals no explicit reference to field observations of animal behavior, but it\\'s a concept that seems to relate to 1 and/or 2, where the relationship of science to nature is topic [Those scientists who have been properly...].

[LSAT-TEST VCE Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Practice Test](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam Questions](#)