Test 29

Section I

Question 1

QUESTION TYPE: Point at Issue

ARGUMENTS: The politician thinks that it is reasonable that cigarette smokers should fund the new national health campaign. Smoking causes serious health problems; therefore smokers should bear the cost of problems they cause.

The smoker argues that it would be unreasonable to tax those who eat foods high in fat and cholesterol. Yet it is just as well established that those people cause health problems.

ANALYSIS: The smoker makes an argument by analogy. It is a good argument if the politician agrees that it would be unreasonable to tax people who eat fatty foods. Both situations are identical, logically speaking.

You may think the smoker only disagrees with the politician because the plan is to tax *smokers*. That might be true, but it doesn't affect the smoker's reasoning.

The point at issue is whether it is reasonable to tax smokers.

_____

A. CORRECT. The politician thinks it is reasonable. The smoker thinks that it is unreasonable.
B. Neither speakers actually talks about whether people are aware their actions are unhealthy.
C. The smoker thinks the effects are equal. We don't know what the politician thinks since they don't mention fatty foods.
D. Presumably the smokers will benefit from health care funding.
E. Efficient in this case means: effective. The smoker didn't claim that the plan wouldn't work. They just thought it was unreasonable, i.e. not fair.

Question 2

QUESTION TYPE: Method of Reasoning

ARGUMENTS: The politician thinks that it is reasonable that cigarette smokers should fund the new national health campaign. Smoking causes serious health problems therefore smokers should bear the cost of problems they cause.

The smoker argues that it would be unreasonable to tax those who eat foods high in fat and cholesterol. Yet it is just as well established that those people cause health problems.

ANALYSIS: The smoker uses an analogy. If the politician's logic were applied to an identical situation it would produce results the politician would (presumably) disagree with.

A counterexample (answer choice A) can be a type of analogy. It uses a specific situation to disprove a general rule.

_____

A. CORRECT. The politician's reasoning is: people with unhealthy habits should pay. The smoker shows this is absurd if we apply the same reasoning to people who eat fatty food. That's a counterexample: a specific situation that disproves general reasoning.
B. The smoker did not say how funds should be raised.
C. The intended purpose of the tax is to raise money. The smoker did not say that the tax wouldn't raise money.
D. The smoker actually agrees that eating fatty foods "causes as many serious health problems as does smoking." But the smoker also thinks it is unfair to make smokers pay.
E. The smoker didn't say that the tax would make smokers even less healthy or would actually cause lower revenues. They just thought it was unfair to smokers.

Question 3

QUESTION TYPE: Strengthen - Exception

CONCLUSION: There should be a greater use of gasohol.

REASONING: Gasohol has a higher octane rating and fewer carbon monoxide ratings than gasoline. It adds no more CO_2 than plants remove by photosynthesis.

ANALYSIS: On a question like this it's good to think about things you would like in a fuel. We need to eliminate four wrong answers that show gasohol is better. So it's a good bet there will be advantages listed such as: cheaper, cleaner, plentiful, efficient, etc.

The right answer actually weakens the argument, even though it didn't have to.

_____

A. This is another advantage for gasohol: it makes cars run better.
B. Now society doesn't have to worry about energy. Thanks, gasohol!
C. **CORRECT.** This shows that gasohol is slightly less fuel efficient. This actually weakens the argument (a tiny bit.)
D. Cheap fuels are better than expensive fuels. Advantage: gasohol.
E. Gasohol does *not* add more CO_2 than plants can remove. So gasoline upsets the CO_2 balance but gasohol doesn't. One more advantage for gasohol.

Question 4

QUESTION TYPE: Paradox

CONCLUSION: Cats are lazy: they sleep and stretch all day. Yet they are muscular.

ANALYSIS: My cat is like this. Lucky feline.

There isn't much to this question. Just keep in mind that you're trying to explain how sleepy cats can be so strong. The explanation probably has to do with sleeping or stretching since they're the only factors mentioned.

_____

A. This explains why cats are sleepy but not why they are muscular.
B. This tells us cats aren't alone but it doesn't explain anything.
C. This tells us why cats can sleep anywhere but it doesn't explain why they are muscular.
D. **CORRECT. CORRECT.** Apparently a cat just needs to stretch in order to have a muscular body. If only it were that easy…
E. This shows why cats need to be muscular but it doesn't explain how they become muscular.

Question 5

QUESTION TYPE: Necessary Assumption

CONCLUSION: The salaries and duties of the two new employees should be reduced.

REASONING: The two new employees have complex duties and high salaries. Inexperienced workers usually don't have such things.

ANALYSIS: Barnes only evidence is that these workers have more pay and more complex duties than inexperienced workers usually get. He concludes this is wrong. But an equally likely conclusion is that the workers are actually experienced.

A. This double negative can be confusing. This can be read as "no other employees have duties as complex as these two." There could be other people with more complex duties (the CEO?)…as long as the two workers have duties more complex than new hires.
B. The argument might actually be stronger if this weren't true (i.e. if the real reason were that the hiring manager was drunk.)
C. **CORRECT.** If the two newest employees are experienced then Barnes has no evidence.
D. This has nothing to do with Barnes. He's just the one making the argument. Besides, Barnes wasn't claiming that absolutely no one has a higher than average salary starting out.
E. Other companies aren't really relevant since Barnes is discussing his own company's normal practices. But Barnes is likely assuming that the salaries actually are much higher than the industry average. That's why he thinks the salaries ought to be lowered.

Question 6

QUESTION TYPE: Must be True

FACTS:

1. More cholesterol in the blood leads to a higher risk of heart attack.
2. Heart disease is the biggest killer in North America.
3. At least three factors (smoking, drinking and exercise) can influence blood cholesterol.

ANALYSIS: This is a great question that shows how tricky the LSAT can be.

Two of the wrong answer choices talk about smoking increasing the risk of heart disease. Many people will nod their heads at those answer choices even if they don't pick them.

But the stimulus didn't say *what* smoking did. It may even *lower* cholesterol. We assume smoking is bad, but the stimulus did *not* tell us whether smoking is actually bad.

This is important because this is one of the big tricks on the LSAT. Subtle language causes you to think of outside knowledge and make incorrect assumptions.

A. We don't know this. Risk may be *lower*. But it isn't necessarily "low."
B. Technically this stimulus doesn't say what smoking does to cholesterol. Maybe it lowers it. This answer choice is trying to trick you by playing on outside assumptions.
C. This is tempting but doesn't have to be true. We only know that cholesterol is a risk factor. There could be other risk factors that are much more harmful and cause more death.
D. The stimulus did not say that smoking was bad. If you think it did, read it again. This is a classic example of how the LSAT can trick you.
E. **CORRECT.** If you change one of the three factors you'll change your cholesterol. That in turn changes your risk of heart disease. Those three factors are part of our lifestyle.

Question 7

QUESTION TYPE: Flawed Reasoning

CONCLUSION: The skeptic concluded that Debbie used none of the three methods he tested.

REASONING: The skeptic tested each method individually and didn't catch Debbie using them.

ANALYSIS: Did you ever play a game as a kid where someone had to guess which hand you were holding a ball in? You would keep both hands behind your back. You could trick the other kids by switching the ball depending on which hand they picked.

That could be what Debbie did. If the skeptic was videotaping her for slight of hand she could have used a trick deck. If the skeptic gave her the deck then Debbie could have used sleight of hand.

The skeptic should have tested everything at once.

A. **CORRECT.** Debbie could be very clever and switch her methods.
B. I'm sure there are many methods to catch sleight of hand. But as long as videotaping works well then it doesn't matter how many others there are.
C. The skeptic would have caught Debbie if this had been the case. When he tested for the trick deck Debbie still succeeded. So she can't have needed sleight of hand *and* a trick deck.
D. The skeptic didn't say Debbie must be a magician. He just said she didn't use one of the three techniques he tested. There could be other techniques.
E. The skeptic didn't reach a conclusion about whether Debbie really used magic or if she had a method. He just concluded she never used the three techniques he tested.

Question 8

QUESTION TYPE: Most Strongly Supported

FACTS:

1. Many people claim that people on a low-fat diet should eat simple carbohydrates.
2. Yet we now know that eating lots of carbs produces insulin.
3. Insulin lets us make energy from sugars or starches.
4. If energy isn't required then insulin produces fat instead.

ANALYSIS: A low fat diet can make you fat is what this is saying. More specifically, simple carbs can make you fat.

A. This is tempting but actually a low fat diet produces energy. Lots of energy. So much that you don't need it all and insulin produces fat as well.
B. We actually have no idea what the advantages of a low-fat diet are. The stimulus doesn't say who should eat one.
C. Same as B. We don't know who should limit fat or why. It's more strongly supported that we should limit simple carbohydrates.
D. **CORRECT.** It looks like simple carbohydrates cause weight gain. So don't eat too many unless you want to gain weight.
E. This says that if you don't produce much insulin you'll have a hard time losing weight by getting rid of carbohydrates. Maybe? All we know is that insulin can cause weight gain. There's no reason to think that lack of insulin prevents weight loss.

Question 9

QUESTION TYPE: Point at Issue

ARGUMENTS: Jean argues that a low cost model would allow increased sales and continued domination of the high-end. She notes that their low-end competitors sell more units.

Tracy disagrees. She thinks that a low-cost model would hurt the reputation of the high cost model, hurting overall sales.

ANALYSIS: Jean thinks this is a good idea all around. Tracy is worried about the high cost market. She thinks competitors will gain the upper hand and the company will no longer dominate that market.

_____

A. Neither of them mentions which market has more profit. Jean might think that high-cost has more profit.
B. Tracy doesn't think that consumers will buy the company's low cost model instead of the high cost model. She thinks other high cost competitors will steal customers instead.
C. Very tempting. But technically Jean didn't say that the company could dominate the low cost market. And Tracy didn't say how she thought the low cost product would sell.
D. CORRECT. Jean clearly says that the company will continue to dominate high cost. Tracy thinks competitors will gain an advantage in high cost and sales will drop.
E. Tracy doesn't say how she thinks low cost sales will be.

Question 10

QUESTION TYPE: Paradox

FACTS: The vaccine against hepatitis is 100% effective. Yet some people in the group who received the vaccine nonetheless exhibited symptoms of hepatitis A.

The symptoms always take at least 60 days to appear.

ANALYSIS: One possible answer would be that other diseases also cause the same symptoms that hepatitis A causes.

Instead the question requires you to know something about vaccines: they prevent disease but they do not cure it. If you are already infected a vaccine can't help you. So it could be that the people who exhibited symptoms were already infected. The symptoms take a while to show up.

_____

A. The placebo group isn't puzzling. The strange thing is that people who actually received the real vaccine still got sick.
B. This shows that the vaccine group received some benefit but it doesn't explain why there were still some sick people.
C. This shouldn't matter: the vaccine is supposed to work *every time*. Yet some people got sick.
D. CORRECT. The vaccine can't help you once you have the disease.
E. This shows the vaccine might have helped. But it's supposed to prevent the disease entirely. This doesn't explain why it didn't.

Question 11

QUESTION TYPE: Main Point

CONCLUSION: This characteristic [altering the environment in ways that help a species to survive] is actually quite common. It is not just the most highly evolved species that do this.

REASONING: Plankton is given as an example. Plankton release a gas that causes clouds. The clouds reflect heat and cool the earth. A cool earth benefits the plankton.

ANALYSIS: The main point is that many species adapt the environment to benefit themselves. It is not only highly evolved species.

Plankton were only mentioned to illustrate this phenomenon. The stimulus is about many species and not just plankton.

A. **A.** This is true but it isn't the main point. Plankton were just an example.
B. **B.** This plays on outside assumptions that a cooler earth is better. But the main point is that the species benefit *themselves*. Also, the stimulus is about many species: plankton are just an example.
C. **CORRECT.** Many species can do this (such as Plankton.)
D. **D.** We know plankton influence cloud cover but they might not be the most important factor. Besides, the stimulus is making a broader point about species changing their environment.
E. **E.** The plankton benefited themselves. That's *all* we know. We don't know if they benefited other species, the earth, etc.

Question 12

QUESTION TYPE: Method of Reasoning

CONCLUSION: This characteristic [altering the environment in ways that help a species to survive] is actually quite common. It is not just the most highly evolved species that do this.

REASONING: Plankton is given as an example. Plankton release a gas that causes clouds. The clouds reflect heat and cool the earth. A cool earth benefits the plankton.

ANALYSIS: The argument uses a detailed example to prove that their opponent's claim is wrong.

A. There is a general principle and a particular case. But it is the particular case (plankton) that is used to justify the general principle (many species alter their environment.)
B. An example: If I explain how I got $1,000,000 dollars without robbing a bank (a controversial phenomenon) then maybe you'll believe that I really did get $1,000,000 without robbing a bank (and therefore I will have supported the claim that the phenomenon did occur.)

This is totally different. The argument wasn't explaining why species alter their environment.
C. This is tempting. But the stimulus didn't try to describe the conditions under which species can alter their environment. It just said they could.
D. CORRECT. Some people say that only highly evolved species can change their environment. But look! An itty-bitty plankton can do it! That's a counterexample. It shows that the claim made by some people is wrong.
E. There is a detailed example. But the stimulus didn't say if the strategy was good or bad. There's no value judgment being made.

Question 13

QUESTION TYPE: Parallel Reasoning - Exception

CONCLUSION: Student attendance should be the top priority of the administration.

REASONING: Teachers, textbooks and facilities aren't worth anything if no students show up.

ANALYSIS: The structure is: without one factor all other factors are worthless. It's a bit of an exaggeration because it's highly unlikely that *no* students will show up.

It's also true that if you have no teachers then it doesn't matter how many students show up.

It may be that losing any one of the factors means the school won't work.

A. Nothing else matters if the customer isn't comfortable. This matches the structure.
B. Everything else is meaningless if you don't have food. This matches the structure.
C. All of the fancy science stuff doesn't work if there are no clues to analyze. Same structure.
D. Without books a library is nothing. Same structure.
E. CORRECT. This hasn't made a comparison to any other factors. It does say "top priority" but the similarities end there.

Question 14

QUESTION TYPE: Flawed Reasoning

CONCLUSION: There was enough light for Klein to make a reliable identification.

REASONING: The moon set at 1:45 AM. The robbery occurred between 1:15 and 1:30 AM. Dr. Yuge acknowledged that the moon was full enough to provide considerable light before it set.

ANALYSIS: This sounds very damning, but the prosecutor hasn't established that there actually was light at the time. Is "considerable light" enough to make a reliable identification? Is Klein nearsighted?

The right answer shows that the moon's light could have been blocked by clouds. Surely you've been out on a moonlit night. Sometimes you can see and sometimes things interfere with the light.

A. The prosecutor claims to have conclusively shown that the robbery happened between 1:15 and 1:30. We'll believe him.
B. Apparently the perpetrator wasn't identified. At least, Klein claims that he didn't ID the perp. So it doesn't matter what they look like.
C. This is tempting but the conclusion is specifically about the amount of light. The prosecutor claims there was enough.
D. Dr. Yuge sounds like an expert. An expert could testify as to how bright the moon would have been even if they weren't there.
E. CORRECT. The prosecutor ignores the possibility that something got in the way of the moon. **(Correct)**

Question 15

QUESTION TYPE: Necessary Assumption

CONCLUSION: Cerebral edema is especially dangerous at high altitudes.

REASONING: Cerebral edema has symptoms that resemble those of ordinary mountain sickness. Cerebral edema can be fatal unless correctly treated from the start.

ANALYSIS: The argument is that it is hard to tell mountain sickness apart from cerebral edemas. So if cerebral enema occurs on a mountain we might misdiagnose it as mountain sickness. The patient could receive the wrong treatment and die.

The argument is assuming that the treatments are different. Otherwise a patient might receive the correct treatment even if people thought they had mountain sickness.

A. CORRECT. If the treatments are the same then there is no problem if an edema is misdiagnosed as mountain sickness. The patient will get the right treatment anyway. **(Correct)**
B. Even if a patient doesn't slip into a coma they could still die if they aren't treated correctly from the onset.
C. This shows that mountain sickness is less dangerous. But it doesn't change the fact that the outward symptoms of the diseases are similar.
D. Even if this weren't true it would still be easy to confuse the two diseases.
E. Even if people with mountain sickness are always given treatment it could still be the wrong treatment for edema.

Question 16

QUESTION TYPE: Weaken

CONCLUSION: It is likely that the people who spoke Proto-Indo-European lived in a cold climate and were isolated from ocean or sea.

REASONING: We can learn about the living conditions of a vanished culture by examining their language. The Indo-Europeans had no word for sea but had words for winter, snow and wolf.

ANALYSIS: Languages sometimes lack words for important concepts. English doesn't have a word for "Schadenfreude." We had to borrow it from the Germans. But everyone recognizes the feeling when the word is explained.

A. This is tempting but it could just mean that they lived near a lake or river but not a sea or ocean.
B. CORRECT. They could have lived by the sea but simply lacked a word for it even though it was prominent. **(Correct)**
C. We're talking about an ancient language and not modern languages. Also, if no languages lack a word for sea then it's even more unusual that the indo-Europeans didn't have one.
D. This could just mean that they knew how to make fires. It doesn't mean they didn't live in a cold climate.
E. Nomads can move around entirely within the same region. If the nomads occasionally lived by the sea they would probably have a word for it.

Question 17

QUESTION TYPE: Weaken

CONCLUSION: It is impossible for there to be real evidence that lax radiation standards at nuclear reactors caused cancer.

REASONING: Who can say what causes a particular case of cancer?

ANALYSIS: This argument makes a common error. It's very hard to say what causes an *individual* case of cancer. But if I see very high rates of cancer in the *population* around a nuclear power plant then maybe I could find some evidence that radiation was the cause.

We can have evidence that radiation increases the likelihood of cancer in a population even if it's impossible to pinpoint causes in an individual.

A. CORRECT. Statistical evidence refers to cancer rates in the whole population. That could let us blame radiation standards. **(Correct)**
B. Actually the argument is assuming that what follows (cancer) was not caused by what came before (radiation). Or at least it's assuming we can never find evidence.
C. The argument hasn't specified what caused a particular case. It actually said we can never specify a particular case.
D. This would be a criticism of someone who thought that the radiation did cause cancer. This columnist says he has no clue what causes it.
E. The columnist did *not* say that radiation did not cause cancer. He said we could never have real evidence to prove it.

Question 18

QUESTION TYPE: Must be True

FACTS:

1. Some planning committee members have a significant financial interest in the committee's decisions. They are those that represent the construction industry.
2. No one on the planning committee lives in the suburbs
3. Many members work in the suburbs.

ANALYSIS: We can combine the second statement with the other two and say that some people with a financial interest in the committee don't live in the suburbs and some people who work in the suburbs don't live in the suburbs.

A. There could be people with a financial interest in the committee's decisions who aren't on the committee and who don't work in the construction industry.
B. This is only true for people who are on the committee. There could be people not on the committee with a financial interest and who live in the suburbs.
C. This is possible but doesn't have to be true.
D. Same as C. We only know "many" people work in the suburbs. But they may not be the same people as the people who represent the construction industry.
E. CORRECT. The people who represent the construction industry have a significant financial interest *and* they don't live in the suburbs. **(Correct)**

Question 19

QUESTION TYPE: Principle

CONCLUSION: The shipping manager is also to blame for the delay.

REASONING: He knew the contractor is usually late and he should have planned for it.

ANALYSIS: This is a good argument. It was foreseeable that the contractor would be late so the shipping manager was negligent for not planning for it.

A. CORRECT. If you don't consider foreseeable risks then you'll have a lot of problems. **(Correct)**
B. The manager would argue this principle. The stimulus argues that managers should know that contractors can be late.
C. Maybe. But the main point of the argument is that the manager is to blame in this case because the problem was foreseeable.
D. Does a manager directly supervise a contractor? Usually not.
E. The arbitrator says that the contractor is also to blame.

Question 20

QUESTION TYPE: Sufficient Assumption

CONCLUSION: On average people pay less in constant dollars for a coach ticket than they used to.

REASONING: A year ago half of the tickets were discount tickets and half were full fare. Now 90% are discount tickets and only 10% were full fare. The full far ticket costs the same.

ANALYSIS: This sounds like a good argument. But we don't know how big the discount is. If it was a lot bigger a year ago then people might be paying more even though more discounts are being sold.

E.g. If discount tickets used to cost $1 and now they cost $1000…people are probably paying more even if more tickets are "discounted."

A. The conclusion is about price. This answer choice is about service and is therefore useless.
B. CORRECT. Now each type of ticket costs the same as it did a year ago. Since more people are buying discounts people must be paying less on average. **(Correct)**
C. This doesn't add anything to our discussion of the prices of *Toronto-to-Dallas* tickets.
D. We're talking about the average price each passenger pays. It doesn't matter how many total passengers there are.
E. This could explain why more discounts are sold but it doesn't tell us how much the discounted tickets cost.

Question 21

QUESTION TYPE: Must be True

CONCLUSION: There is a risk of accident and the public is correct to be worried.

REASONING: The government claims that the nuclear industry poses no risk of accident.
Yet the government is limiting the nuclear industry's liability *in case of accident*.

ANALYSIS: The editor's argument is not quite good. It could be that there is no risk and so unlimited liability won't affect anything. Governments sometimes have useless programs.

So the editor could be right but it could also be the case that there is no risk and the liability insurance is useless.

A. This could be true but doesn't have to be true. It could be the plants are safe and the liability waiver is worthless.
B. CORRECT. Either the plants are safe or they aren't. The government says they are safe but is acting as if they aren't (by limiting liability.) **(Correct)**
C. It could be that the government is not lying about its reasons (protecting the industry.) That would just mean that the government is lying about *safety* instead.
D. This would only be true if there is no risk of accident. But if there is a risk of accident then unlimited liability *does* threaten the nuclear industry.
E. Heck no. An accident would only threaten the nuclear industry's finances if it also injured people. People are at risk too.

Question 22

QUESTION TYPE: Strengthen

FACTS:

1. The government claims that the nuclear industry poses no risk of accident.
2. Yet the government is limiting the nuclear industry's liability in case of accident.
3. Therefore there is a risk of accident and the public is correct to be worried.

ANALYSIS: The editor's argument is not quite good. It could be that there is no risk and so unlimited liability won't affect anything. Governments sometimes have useless programs.

So the editor could be right but it could also be the case that there is no risk and the liability insurance is useless.

A. The government claimed that the power plants were *safe*, not unsafe.
B. No one controls the event of an accident and no one stands to benefit financially. The nuclear industry only stands to lose financially.
C. This would show that the limited liability might harm the public *if we already knew the reactor was unsafe*. But we don't. The reactors might well be safe whether or not the nuclear industry has a financial interest in them staying safe.
D. CORRECT. The government doesn't act unless there is a danger. They acted to protect the industry from liability if there were an accident. Therefore there is a danger of an accident. Plus the government sometimes lies. **(Correct)**
E. This doesn't tell us if a danger actually does exist.

Question 23

QUESTION TYPE: Flawed Parallel Reasoning

CONCLUSION: At least some people who appreciate poetry are illogical.

REASONING: Most scientists are logical and Linda says no scientists appreciate poetry.

ANALYSIS: Linda is a very illogical scientist. She notes that logical scientists don't like poetry. That doesn't mean that at least some people who do like poetry are illogical.

It's like saying that because children are not ten feet tall then at least some people who are not children are ten feet tall.

Another element is that Linda *claims* no scientist likes poetry. But that's a very strong claim and Linda provides no evidence apart from being a scientist. Being a scientist doesn't make her an expert on who likes poetry.

A relevant expert is someone who has studied a particular area and can be expected to speak about it competently.

A. This is a good argument. Ralph is a relevant expert and can be expected to know if marsupials lay eggs.
B. CORRECT. This argument sounds so good…but it's wrong. First, Franz can't speak for all fathers: he isn't an expert on what all fathers think. Maybe some want their kids to eat candy at bedtime. And Franz also hasn't given us any evidence that children are demanding candy. **(Correct)**
C. This is a good argument. Yuri is a relevant expert.
D. Xi is a relevant expert and makes a good argument.
E. This is very close. Betty can't speak for all corporate executives. But the conclusion is different. The stimulus went from logical to illogical. Betty goes from honest to honest.

Question 24

QUESTION TYPE: Weaken

CONCLUSION: Emissions standards *testing* is effective.

REASONING: Cars are tested while idling. Pollutants exiting the tailpipe are measured.

ANALYSIS: People don't just sit idle in their cars all day. They generally drive them around. Exhaust pollutants might change when the car moves.

A. This shows that emissions control becomes expensive but it doesn't really have anything to do with emissions *testing*.
B. As long as the devices *are* recalibrated frequently then the testing should go smoothly.
C. CORRECT. Yikes. So by making a car clean while idling we are actually causing more pollution when the car moves. **(Correct)**
D. This doesn't tell us whether the emissions standards are effective.
E. This shows the standards are strong because they don't make exceptions for old cars. But…are the emissions tests effective? That's the question.

Question 25

QUESTION TYPE: Paradox - Exception

FACTS: The indigenous people of Tasmania and Australia are related. Yet there were major differences between the cultures and technology of the two peoples 2,000 years after the land bridge disappeared.

The Tasmanians had no domesticated dogs, fishing nets, polished stone tools or hunting implements.

ANALYSIS: The four wrong answers will help explain why only the Australians have all the cool innovations. We're looking for something that does not solve the mystery.

A. This helps explain things. The Tasmanians knew how to do all that stuff but just decided to stop.
B. CORRECT. If the *Tasmanians* developed those tools then why don't then have them now? This adds to the mystery. **(Correct)**
C. This explains it. The Australians only got the tools *after* they were separated from the Tasmanians.
D. Same as C. Australians only figured it out *after* they lost contact with the Tasmanians.
E. This explains things. The Tasmanians had no contact with the sub-group of Australians who developed the innovations.

This has been a sample of the LR explanations written by Graeme Blake, and available at:

http://www.lsatprep180.com/lsat-explanations/