

Conclusion Challenge Explanation 18.4.2

First, translate.

So the city needs to cut spending in a financial crisis, but cutting the zoo budget is false economy. The zoo's budget is less than 1% of the deficit, so cutting it doesn't help the city much. Plus, the zoo has to close if they cut the budget, and it attracts tourists and tax money to the city. The zoo also enhances culture and draws businesses to the city.

Bad situation for the zoo, right? It's not even 1% of the deficit but they still want to cut its budget. The author is arguing the cutting the zoo's budget is a bad call, but I'm wondering what the other options for cutting are. Like would you have to cut school funding? Or other social services? What if cutting anything else is even worse than cutting the zoo? We don't know what we're comparing against here.

LOOPHOLE

What if cutting anything else would be even worse than cutting the zoo?

Now we see it's a Conclusion question, which is awesome since we already know the conclusion as part of designing our CLIR. Here's our translation of the conclusion:

CONCLUSION

Cutting the zoo's budget is false economy.

Now all we have to do is find our conclusion translation in the answer choices!

- A)** *So reducing spending is the only way for the city to respond to the financial crisis. Conclusion? Nope. A's a premise.*
- B)** *So it would false economy to cut the zoo's budget. That's our conclusion translation! B is provable.*
- C)** *So the zoo is only a small portion of the city's budget. C isn't even in the stimulus. The stimulus talked about the zoo budget in relation to the deficit, not the overall budget. Definitely not provable*
- D)** *So the zoo will have to close if they cut the budget. Conclusion? No. D's a premise too.*
- E)** *So if we close the zoo, the city's education and culture will be irreparably damaged. Conclusion? No. E isn't in the stimulus either, so it's definitely not the conclusion. Not provable.*

B is the correct answer. It's a translation of the conclusion.