Inference Challenge Explanation 18.4.6

First, translate.

> *So when people listen to some music recordings, they are in danger of being influenced by messages that people record backwards and put on the recording.*

First off, this was a real thing. People really did think there were secret backwards messages underneath music and everyone was being brainwashed. That's what makes this question so great. We only have one premise to work with, which makes this Premise Set especially challenging from an Inference standpoint, so let's dive in. What has to be true if people are in danger of being brainwashed by backwards messages? Well, people have to be able to understand backwards recordings in the first place, right? The messages have to be detectable and our brains have to be able to process them

INFERENCE People can understand backwards messages on recordings on some level.

Sometimes, when we have just one premise, we have to look deep inside that premise and try to understand what must underlie it. That's how we designed this Inference. It works almost like a necessary assumption. If that premise is true, what else has to be true?

It's an Inference question, so let's go find our CLIR Inference in the answer choices.

A) *So the backwards messages are louder than the music. This doesn't have to be true. The messages don't have to be louder than the music in order to influence listeners. We can still understand our friends when there's loud music playing, even though they aren't talking as loud as the music.* **A** *just isn't provable.*

B) *So you can add a backwards message to a recording and still preserve all the musical qualities of the performance. We don't know that all the musical qualities on these recordings are preserved! For all we know, the music could be totally messed up. Since we don't know about the quality of the music,* **B** *isn't provable.*

C) *So the recordings are chosen because they're popular or put people in trances. We have no idea why they choose the recordings. Remember, it's dangerous to assume intentions without exact evidence. If we don't have specific information about why the recordings were chosen, then we can't choose an answer about intentions.* **C** *is far from provable.*

D) *So if you have to understand the messages for them to influence, then we have to be able to understand backwards messages. This sounds a lot like our Inference, right? It's a little wordy, but the translation helps us see that it's the same idea we identified in our CLIR. We have to be able to understand the backwards messages for the stimulus to make any sense.* **D** *is provable.*

E) *So when people listen to music, they pay full attention. They don't have to pay full attention to be in danger of being influenced by the recorded messages. We are subconsciously influenced by things we're paying half attention to all the time.* **E** *isn't grounded in the stimulus. It's not provable.*

D is the correct answer. It's the only answer that follows directly from the stimulus.

Inference Challenge Explanation 18.4.10

First, translate.

> *So almost all the books printed in the past 150 years use acidic paper, but this acidity always eventually destroys the paper. The destruction can be slowed if the books are kept cool and dry. There are techniques to de-acid books, but they will probably only be used on historically significant books.*

If the de-acid techniques are probably only going to be used on the historically significant books, what's going to happen to the rest? They're probably going to destroy themselves, right? They're printed on acidic paper and the de-acid techniques probably aren't going to be used on them, so that's fair to surmise. Poor libraries.

INFERENCE The non-historically significant books printed in the past 150 years are probably going to destroy themselves.

It's an Inference question, so our CLIR Inference is here to lead us directly to the correct answer. Let's go find it!

A) *So if a non-historically significant book was published in the past 150 years, it will probably deteriorate. Pretty close to our CLIR Inference, right? Those non-historically significant books probably aren't going to get the de-acid rehab, so their paper is going to destroy them.* **A** *is about as close to a CLIR Inference as we can hope to find. It's a provable choice.*

B) *So almost all the books from the past 150 years will gradually destroy themselves. But wait, the historically significant books might not get destroyed. It's going to be hard to prove that "almost all." We don't know how many historically significant books there are, so we can't know whether "almost all" the books would be destroyed for sure. Since we don't know,* **B** *isn't provable.*

C) *So almost all of the books that deteriorate are made of acidic paper. Books could deteriorate a bunch of ways. There's no reason to believe acidic paper is the only possible cause of book deterioration.* **C** *isn't provable.*

D) *So all the historically significant books from the past 150 years will get the de-acid treatment. We don't know that the de-acid treatment will be applied to* ***all*** *the historically significant books; we just know that books have to be historically significant to get a shot at the treatment. Being historically significant is probably* ***necessary*** *to get the treatment, but it's not* ***sufficient****.* **D** *is not provable.*

E) *So all the books printed on acidic paper in 1900 should be at about the same deterioration state now. The stimulus tells us that the deterioration rate isn't constant. What if some books were kept in hot wet basements and others were kept cool and dry? Even the stimulus tells us those books would likely be at different deterioration states.* **E** *is definitely not provable.*

A is the correct answer. It's provable; it comes at us straight from the stimulus.