



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.pass4itsure.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**

Brewer: All children should be given the opportunity to participate in competitive sports; these activities provide an unsurpassed opportunity to engage children's emotions and so stimulate them to put maximum effort into attaining high athletic standards. Polanski: I disagree. Competitive athletics does, over time, produce a handful of highly motivated children with a desire to excel at an activity, but many children have no taste for competition, and to make them participate would only cause them to develop an antipathy toward athletics.

Polanski's response most strongly supports the contention that Polanski misunderstood Brewer to be asserting that

- A. characteristics acquired by playing competitive sports carry over into the rest of one's life
- B. winning at competitive sports is essential to motivation to excel at athletics
- C. children should put more effort into athletic activities than any other form of activity
- D. children should be required to participate in competitive sports regardless of their interests
- E. children cannot be motivated without their emotions being engaged

Correct Answer: D

Polanski argues that kids who don't care for competition could be driven to hate sports if forced to compete. So he must have heard Brewer say [children should be required to...], that a kid should be forced to compete whether s/he like sit or not. Of course Brewer said nothing of the kind; all she said was that all kids should have the chance to compete. But Polanski failed to hear that, and that was his mistake.

QUESTION 2

Figorian Wildlife Commission: The development of wetlands in industrialized nations for residential and commercial uses has endangered many species. To protect wildlife, we must regulate such development in Figoria: future wetland development must be offset by the construction of replacement wetland habitats. Thus, development would cause no net reduction of wetlands and pose no threat to the species that inhabit them. Figorian Development Commission: Other nations have flagrantly developed wetlands at the expense of wildlife. We have conserved. Since Figorian wetland development might not affect wildlife and is necessary for growth, we should allow development. We have as much right to govern our own resources as countries that have already put their natural resources to commercial use.

Which one of the following is an assumption on which the argument advanced by the Figorian Wildlife Commission depends?

- A. More species have been endangered by the development of wetlands than have been endangered by any other type of development.
- B. The species indigenous to natural wetland habitats will survive in specially constructed replacement wetlands.
- C. In nations that are primarily agricultural, wetland development does not need to be regulated.
- D. Figorian regulation of development has in the past protected and preserved wildlife.
- E. The species that inhabit Figorian wetlands are among the most severely threatened of the designated endangered species.

Correct Answer: B



It's the Wildlife vs. the Development Commission in this debate, and first we'll focus on wildlife as the stem mandates, looking for a missing piece of the puzzle. The Wildlife folks maintain that wetland development has endangered many species, and to protect wildlife future wetlands must be offset by the development of replacement habitats. That way, reasons the Commission, there will be no loss of wetlands and no threat to species. But what if the construction of the replacement habitats, or something else about them, does endanger the species that would inhabit them? That would sink the argument, right? So the Wildlife Commission, in making this argument, must be assuming that their placement habitats will be conducive to the survival of species that would otherwise be in natural wetlands. B. speaks to this issue, and the Denial Test is easily applied: If the species can't survive in the new special replacement wetlands, then what's the point?

QUESTION 3

Seven friends, Abe, Bob, Chad, Dolly, Elisa, Frank, and Gregory sit in a VIP enclosure of a stadium to watch a football match. The seats in the enclosure form a 3 x 3 matrix, i.e. 3 rows (front, middle and last) with 3 seats in each row. The following information is known: Chad sits immediately beside Dolly Dolly sits in a row immediately behind the row in which Abe is sitting There is no one sitting on one side of Chad None of Elisa or Gregory sits immediately beside Abe Bob sits in the last row

If Elisa and Gregory do not sit in the same row, which of the following may be true?

- A. Dolly sits in the middle of the middle row
- B. Chad and Dolly do not sit immediately beside one another
- C. Gregory sits in the middle of the first row
- D. Abe sits in the middle of the front row
- E. Frank sits in the middle of the front row

Correct Answer: E

It is known that E and G sit in different rows, i.e. the front and back rows (since only C and D sit in the middle row).

We also know from (v) and (vi):

If A is in the middle of the front row, none of E or G can sit in the front row; thus, they would sit in the last row ... (v)

If A is at either end of the front row, only in that scenario can one of E or G also sit in the front row ... (vi)

Thus, (v) violates the given condition, implying that A sits at either the left or the right end of the front row, allowing one among E and G to sit at the other corner of the front row and the other to sit in the last row.

Thus, we have:



Front row	A		E/G	A is sitting
Middle row	Empty/D	C	D/Empty	Only C and D are sitting
Last row				B is sitting

Or

Front row	E/G		A	A is sitting
Middle row	Empty/D	C	D/Empty	Only C and D are sitting
Last row				B is sitting

Working with the options: Option [Dolly sits in the middle of the middle row]: From the diagram, D can sit at either the right or the left end of the middle row, and not at the middle of the middle row. – False Option [Chad and Dolly do not sit immediately beside one another]: From the diagram, D can sit at either the right or the left end of the middle row and C must be in the center. So, C and D must be immediately beside one another. – False Option [Gregory sits in the middle of the first row]: Since A and G cannot sit together, and A sits at one end of the front row, G cannot take the middle seat of the front row – False Option [Abe sits in the middle of the front row]: We have already established that A sits at one end of the front row – False Option [Frank sits in the middle of the front row]: Since in the front row, A is at one end and E/G is at the other end, F can definitely sit in the middle of the front row. – True

One such possible seating arrangement is shown below:

Front row	E	F	A	A is sitting
Middle row	Empty	C	D	Only C and D are sitting
Last row	B		G	B is sitting

General

Let us name the people Abe, Bob, Chad, Dolly, Elisa, Frank, and Gregory as A, B, C, D, E, F, and G, respectively. We can see that there are $3 \times 3 = 9$ seats, but there are only 7 people. Thus, the only possible way of distributing the 7 people across the 3 rows is that 2 rows would have 2 members each and one row would have 3 members. However, the exact number of people in a particular row is not yet known and further analysis of the statements needs to be done.

1st statement: C and D sit beside each other ... (i)

3rd statement: The row in which C and D are sitting, has exactly 2 people sitting in it (since there is no one



sitting on the other side of C) ... (ii)

2nd statement: Since D sits in the row just behind A's row, the row where D (and C) sits must be either the middle or the last row

5th statement: Since B sits in the last row and the row where C and D sits has only 2 people, C and D must be in the middle row ... (iii) Thus, it also follows that A must be in the front row ... (iv)

4th statement: We know that neither E nor G sits beside A. Thus, there are 2 possible scenarios:

If A is in the middle of the front row, none of E or G can sit in the front row; thus, they would sit in the last row ... (v)

If A is at either end of the front row, only in that scenario can one of E or G also sit in the front row ... (vi)

Thus, we have:

Front row				A is sitting
Middle row				Only C and D are sitting
Last row				B is sitting

Also, in the middle row, since C has D on one side and a vacant seat on the other, C must be in the middle position. Thus, we finally have:

Front row				A is sitting
Middle row	Empty/D	C	D/Empty	Only C and D are sitting
Last row				B is sitting

This is all that can be deduced from the main stem.

To answer the questions, we need to use the additional information contained in each question.

QUESTION 4

Some vegetarians have argued that there are two individually sufficient reasons for not eating meat--one based on health considerations, and the other based on the aversion to living at the expense of other conscious creatures. But suppose that eating meat were essential to good health for humans. Then it would be less clear that an aversion to living at the expense of other conscious creatures is enough of a reason to stop eating meat.

Which one of the following most accurately describes the role played in the argument by the supposition that eating meat is essential to good health?



- A. It is used to disprove the vegetarian position that we should not eat meat,
- B. It is used to show that the two types of reasons cited in favor of vegetarianism are independent.
- C. It is used to disprove the claim that a vegetarian diet is healthy.
- D. It is used to weaken the claim that the consciousness of animals is a sufficient reason for not eating meat.
- E. It is used to show that there is no sufficient reason for not eating meat.

Correct Answer: D

Here's a Role of a Statement question, which means that we have to focus on the context of a particular idea; in this case, a supposition. We're given two independent sufficient reasons vegetarians advance for not eating meat: it's not healthy, and it's not good to live at the expense of other creatures. "Sufficient" here is meant to imply that either reason can stand alone as a reason to avoid meat. But suppose eating meat were essential to good health, says the author. "Then..."-- well, how convenient! The author follows the supposition in question with the word "Then," which clearly signals that what's coming up next must be the reason the supposition was included. Then, claims, the author, it wouldn't be as clear that the other reason, the aversion to living at other creatures' expense, would be a sufficient reason to avoid meat. So by casting doubt on one reason, the author tries to weaken the other reason as well.

QUESTION 5

Figorian Wildlife Commission: The development of wetlands in industrialized nations for residential and commercial uses has endangered many species. To protect wildlife we must regulate such development in Figoria: future wetland development must be offset by the construction of replacement wetland habitats. Thus, development would cause no net reduction of wetlands and pose no threat to the species that inhabit them. Figorian Development Commission: Other nations have flagrantly developed wetlands at the expense of wildlife. We have conserved. Since Figorian wetland development might not affect wildlife and is necessary for growth, we should allow development. We have as much right to govern our own resources as countries that have already put their natural resources to commercial use

Which one of the following principles, if accepted, would most strongly support the Figorian Development Commission's position against the Figorian Wildlife Commission's position?

- A. National resources should be regulated by international agreement when wildlife is endangered.
- B. The right of future generations to have wildlife preserved supersedes the economic needs of individual nations.
- C. Only when a reduction of populations of endangered species by commercial development has been found should regulation be implemented to prevent further damage.
- D. Environmental regulation must aim at preventing any further environmental damage and cannot allow for the different degrees to which different nations have already harmed the environment.
- E. It is imprudent to allow further depletion of natural resources.

Correct Answer: C

Now for the Development response: Figoria has conserved and has the right to develop if they wish, considering that wetland development might not, according to them, affect wildlife. We're looking for a principle that supports this position against the Wildlife account of things, and the final sentence itself sounds like a principle, stating that Figoria has as much right as other countries to decide how to use its resources.



VCE & PDF

Pass4itSure.com

<https://www.pass4itsure.com/lSAT-test.html>

2024 Latest pass4itsure LSAT-TEST PDF and VCE dumps Download

[LSAT-TEST VCE Dumps](#)

[LSAT-TEST Exam
Questions](#)

[LSAT-TEST Braindumps](#)