Great question — let’s break it down carefully.

The passage’s *hypothetical commodity market in books* (paragraph 2) is not literally about books, but an **analogy** used to make a point about art. In this example, books are treated purely as commodities—traded like pork bellies or coffee beans—where only a few buyers would have access, and most of the public would be excluded from reading them.

The **purpose of this analogy** is to highlight the negative effect of treating art as a commodity: when art is commercialized in this way, it restricts broad access and diminishes its cultural role.

Now let’s look at the answer options:

* **A. we have come to assume that art is prohibitively expensive.**  
  ✗ Too narrow. The analogy isn’t about price assumption, but about access.
* **B. society’s notion of the value of art has changed in the past few decades.**  
  ✗ Too vague and temporal. The example isn’t about changing values over decades, but about what happens when art is commodified.
* **C. New York has become the world center of cultural commercialization.**  
  ✗ Too specific and unrelated. The example doesn’t mention New York.
* **D. the commercialization of art limits the public’s access to culture.**  
  ✓ Correct. The “commodity market in books” example illustrates how turning art into a commodity (like books treated as tradable goods) would **limit access for the public**, which parallels what happens in the art market.

✅ **Answer: D. The commercialization of art limits the public’s access to culture.**

**Justification:** The hypothetical example works as an analogy showing that when cultural goods like books (or art) are treated purely as commodities, access shrinks and society as a whole loses. It clarifies Watt’s position that art’s commercialization restricts cultural participation.

The stem: **If gifts to art museums from wealthy donors increased, this would most weaken the author’s assertion that…**

That means we’re looking for an assertion in the passage that would be **undermined** if private philanthropy went up.

**Step 1: Recall the author’s claims**

From the context of the passage:

* The author argues that U.S. government actions (like tax laws, budget priorities, or reduced support) have harmed museums.
* They also note that a “credit economy” and commercialization reshaped the art world.
* They suggest that decreased buying power of museums leads to reduced public access and appreciation of art.

**Step 2: Test each answer choice**

**A. actions of the U.S. government have harmed museums.**  
✓ If wealthy donors increased their gifts, museums would regain resources. That would offset the harm the author attributes to government policy, thereby weakening the claim that government actions left museums worse off.

**B. a credit economy has transformed the art world.**  
✗ Donor contributions don’t affect whether the art world runs on credit systems (auction houses, collectors, speculation).

**C. the public’s reaction to modern art has been distorted.**  
✗ Nothing about donor gifts alters how the public perceives modern art.

**D. as a museum’s buying power decreases, public appreciation of art also decreases.**  
✗ More donor money might restore buying power, but that doesn’t directly weaken the logical link between museum resources and public appreciation. It just reduces the problem.

**Step 3: Correct answer**

✅ **Answer: A. actions of the U.S. government have harmed museums.**

**Justification:** If wealthy donors stepped in with significant gifts, the impact of reduced government funding would be blunted. This weakens the author’s assertion that government actions harmed museums, since museums would still have access to resources via private support.

**CARS-style justification (use the author’s claims, not outside facts):**

* The passage’s point about **moral instruction in the traditional Akan context** is that **stories and proverbs model consequences** to **shape conduct**—virtue is taught by showing what to imitate/avoid. A tale in which a character is **punished for a vicious act** and the child learns **not to copy it** matches that instructional function exactly.
* Importantly, the author treats virtue as **cultivated through action**, not as a fixed, inborn essence. So instruction aims at **guiding behavior**, not sorting “born good” vs “born bad.”

**Why the other choices are wrong (CARS logic):**

* **A.** “born morally neutral … can never become virtuous”
  + **Red flags:** absolutist **“never”** and an **innate moral status** claim.
  + **Contradiction:** The passage frames virtue as **acquired** through instruction/practice; saying neutrality **precludes** becoming virtuous undercuts the very idea of **moral education**.
* **B.** “only people who are born virtuous can perform virtuous acts”
  + **Red flags:** scope-creep **“only”** and again **innateness**.
  + **Contradiction:** The point of telling tales about **virtuous acts** is to **teach** anyone to act well; the option reverses that—making acts evidence of birth-essence and making **instruction pointless**.
* **C.** “weak sunsum … can never become virtuous”
  + **Red flags:** absolutist **“never.”**
  + **Contradiction:** Even if the passage contrasts **weak vs strong sunsum**, the instructional aim is to **strengthen character**; declaring weak sunsum **incurable** again denies the role of **moral cultivation** the passage emphasizes.
* **D.** “punished for a vicious act … learn not to follow the example”
  + **Direct match:** Consequence-based storytelling used to **deter vice** and **promote virtue**—precisely the function of Akan moral tales described by the author.

**Test-taking tip:** In CARS, watch for **extreme language (“only,” “never”)** and claims that **freeze moral traits at birth** when the author is arguing for **development through instruction**. Those are easy eliminations here.

**Correct answer: C — “the Akans cannot explain how people can make an effort to be virtuous without already being virtuous.”**

**Why C is right (CARS-style):**  
The passage’s critique targets an **explanatory/motivational gap** in Akan moral theory. If virtue is **acquired through practice and instruction**, how does a person who isn’t yet virtuous **get started**—i.e., choose to strive for virtue—without already having the very trait that motivates such striving? The author flags this as a problem the theory does not fully account for. Choice **C** paraphrases that gap exactly.

**Why the other options are wrong**

* **A.** *“makes character too dependent on exposure to ethical proverbs and folktales.”*
  + **Mismatch:** The passage presents proverbs/folktales as the **intended vehicles** of moral instruction, not as a flaw. “Too dependent” is an **unsupported value judgment** introduced by the answer, not the author.
* **B.** *“ignores the fact that if people can receive moral instruction, then they are not morally neutral.”*
  + **Straw man:** The text does not argue that the capacity to receive instruction contradicts initial neutrality. Akan thought can treat people as **initially neutral** and **formed** by instruction; the author’s critique isn’t about neutrality but about **how effort begins**.
* **D.** *“the Akans believe that people can change their character.”*
  + **Opposite of a problem:** That belief is **central** to the system and is presented descriptively/positively. Calling it a “problem” flips the author’s stance.

**CARS tip:** When a question asks for “a problem with X,” look for the **internal tension** the author explicitly highlights. Be wary of choices that add **new criticisms**, use **subjective language** (“too dependent”), or **invert** something the author affirms.

**Correct answer: C — “character is directly related to action.”**

**Why C is right (CARS-style):**  
The question asks what the author **uses** the discussion of the Akan words for “goodness” (para. 2) to show. When an author zooms in on **terminology**, they’re typically revealing the **conceptual linkage** encoded in the language. Here, the word analysis supports the thesis that, in Akan thought, **goodness/character is defined through conduct**—what one **does**. That’s exactly what **C** states: a **direct character–action link**.

**Why the other choices are wrong**

* **A.** *“one cannot perform virtuous acts unless one is already virtuous.”*
  + **Overreach + extreme precondition.** The passage emphasizes **moral cultivation through practice**; the word analysis shows a connection between **acts** and **character**, not a prohibition that you must **already** be virtuous to act virtuously.
* **B.** *“morality is generally concerned with good or bad character.”*
  + **Too vague/generic.** Many moral traditions care about character. The author didn’t cite the words to make this banal point, but to show that **Akan language ties character to action** specifically.
* **D.** *“humans are born morally neutral.”*
  + **Wrong evidence source.** Even if neutrality is mentioned elsewhere, the **word study** in paragraph 2 isn’t used to argue about **birth status**; it’s used to argue about the **action-based** conception of character.

**CARS tip:** Match the **function** of the cited paragraph to the answer. Avoid choices that add **extreme claims** (A), are **overly broad** (B), or **shift to a different point** not supported by the referenced evidence (D).

**Answer: A**

**Why A best resolves the author’s difficulty (CARS-style):**  
The author’s problem (final paragraph) is the **“start-up” gap**: if virtue is **acquired** through effort and instruction, **how can someone not yet virtuous begin to make the needed effort** without already having virtue? Statement **A** says the **capacity to make effort is universally present and independent of prior virtue**. That gives a non-circular starting point: people can initiate effort *before* they are virtuous, so the Akan account no longer faces a bootstrapping problem.

**Why the others don’t resolve it**

* **B.** *“By making an effort… one can obey moral rules.”*  
  This is **tautological** (effort → obedience) and **re-describes** the process the author already accepts. It **doesn’t explain how effort begins** in someone not yet virtuous.
* **C.** *“Making an effort requires strengthening of the sunsum.”*  
  This **worsens** the circularity: if effort requires a stronger character (**sunsum**), then one must already have what effort is supposed to produce.
* **D.** *“The ability to make an effort can be instilled only through moral education.”*  
  This creates a **regress**: you need effort to benefit from education, but you only get effort *from* education. It **doesn’t break the circle**; it tightens it.

**CARS tip:** When an author flags a **bootstrapping/motivation gap**, look for an answer that supplies an **independent, preexisting capacity** to initiate the process (A), and reject options that are tautologies (B) or **make the circle tighter** (C, D).

**Correct answer: B — “born morally neutral.”**

**Why B is right (CARS-style):**  
The question asks what the Akans *hold* that allows adults later to be judged moral or immoral. In the passage, the author explains that, for the Akans, **character is acquired through conduct and instruction**, not fixed at birth. That logic presupposes a **neutral starting point**—i.e., people aren’t born already good or bad—so they can become either through their actions. That’s exactly what **B** states.

**Why the others are wrong**

* **A. “born with different degrees of sunsum.”**  
  This **contradicts** the neutrality premise the passage attributes to Akan thought. If people start with unequal built-in moral stuff (sunsum), then later morality is partly predetermined, undercutting the passage’s emphasis on **formation through action**.
* **C. “equally susceptible to moral education.”**  
  The passage does say moral education shapes character, but it **never claims “equal” susceptibility**. “Equally” is an **unsupported quantitative claim**—classic CARS trap.
* **D. “equally capable of making an effort.”**  
  This was mentioned as a **possible resolution** to a problem (the “start-up” gap), not as something the Akans themselves **hold**. The question asks “According to the passage, the Akans hold…,” so importing this proposed fix misreads the author’s stance.

**CARS tip:** Watch for qualifiers like **“only because”** (signals a necessary premise), and beware answers with **unsupported universals** (“equally”) or that **introduce solutions** the author floats but does **not** attribute to the group in question.

**Correct answer: D — “something must cause people to make an effort.”**

**Why D is right (CARS-style):**  
In the final paragraph the author raises the **bootstrapping problem** for the Akan view: if virtue is acquired through **effort** and instruction, how does a non-virtuous person **begin** to make that effort? That critique presupposes that **effort needs an antecedent cause or motivator**. If effort didn’t need a cause, there would be no explanatory gap to point out. Hence the author is operating with the assumption that **something must cause people to make an effort**.

**Why the other choices are wrong**

* **A. “no ethical system is final and unassailable.”**  
  Too broad and not text-based. The author doesn’t make a global claim about all ethical systems; they target a **specific explanatory gap** in the Akan account.
* **B. “Akan ethical thought is superior to Western ethical thought.”**  
  Opposite of the author’s move in the final paragraph, which **criticizes** the Akan position for an unaddressed difficulty. No superiority claim is made.
* **C. “the act of making an effort is self-motivating.”**  
  This **contradicts** the author’s assumption. If effort were self-motivating, there’d be **no problem to explain**; the author wouldn’t press for a cause of effort.

**CARS tip:** When an author poses a “how can X even get started?” challenge, they’re **assuming X requires a prior cause/motive**. Eliminate answers that universalize beyond the text (A), assert unsupported value judgments (B), or directly negate the identified gap (C).

**Correct answer: B — “a person’s *sunsum* can be developed.”**

**Why B is right (CARS-style):**  
The scenario says someone who committed violent crimes **later became gentle and loving *after receiving moral instruction***. That is direct evidence for the Akan claim that **character (*sunsum*) is malleable and can be cultivated through instruction/practice**. The key link is **instruction → change in character**.

**Why the others are wrong**

* **A. “human beings are born morally neutral.”**  
  This requires **birth information**. The vignette gives none about the person’s **starting state at birth**, only that they changed later. So it **doesn’t support** neutrality at birth.
* **C. “a person becomes virtuous by performing virtuous acts.”**  
  The scenario highlights **receiving moral instruction**, not the person’s **subsequent acts**. You can’t infer that performing virtuous acts was the causal mechanism; the evidence is about **instruction → character change**, not **acts → virtue**.
* **D. “good or bad character is dependent on a person’s conduct.”**  
  The vignette does not specify conduct after instruction, only that the person **became gentle and loving**. That’s a **trait** report, not a record of **behavior**. Thus it doesn’t isolate **conduct** as the determinant; the most supported claim is simply that **character can be developed** (B).

**CARS tip:** Choose the option **most tightly entailed** by the given evidence. Here, the only guaranteed link is **moral instruction → developed character** (B). The others either add **missing premises** (A, D) or **shift the mechanism** from instruction to **acts** (C).

**Correct answer: A — “have the capacity to change their behavior.”**

**Why A is right (CARS-style):**  
The passage’s core about Akan ethics is that **character is formed by conduct and instruction**; people are **not fixed at birth** and can **make an effort** to cultivate virtue. That framework grounds **moral responsibility**: we can blame poor character **because the person could have acted otherwise**—they **had the capacity to change/try**. Choice **A** states that agency-based rationale directly.

**Why the others are wrong**

* **B. “did not receive traditional moral instruction.”**  
  The passage never says **lack of instruction** is why blame is appropriate. That would actually **mitigate** blame (if anything), not justify it. It’s also an **unsupported assumption**—some wrongdoers may have received instruction and still acted badly.
* **C. “have weak *sunsum*.”**  
  This leans on a quasi-inborn/essentialist explanation. The text emphasizes that traits like *sunsum* are **developable**; blaming someone **because** of a weak essence would **undercut agency** and clash with the passage’s focus on **effort and formation**.
* **D. “have weak *suban*.”**  
  *Suban* means character; saying they’re blameworthy **because they have weak character** is **circular** (we blame them for bad actions because they’re bad?). The passage’s rationale for blame is **capacity to act/effort**, not simply the description of their current state.

**CARS tip:** For questions about **moral blame**, prefer answers that point to **agency/capacity to choose** (supported by the author’s argument) and avoid **unsupported causes** (B) or **essentialist/circular** explanations (C, D).

Thought for 5s

**Correct answer: A — “literature changed in response to a complex combination of social and technological factors.”**

**Why A is right (CARS-style):**  
The author frames the initial boom as **multicausal** and **interactive**—e.g., new technologies (printing, cheaper paper, distribution) **together with** social shifts (rising literacy, urban audiences, markets, patronage/public sphere). The key signal is that the author resists **single-factor** stories and instead emphasizes how **social and technological drivers worked in concert**.

**Why the others are wrong**

* **B.** *“some changes … from social, others from technological factors.”*  
  This slices causes into **separate lanes**, missing the author’s emphasis on their **interdependence** (feedback loops between tech and social demand). The passage favors **interaction**, not mere partition.
* **C.** *“experts disagree, so the issue is open.”*  
  That would be an **agnostic** stance. The author doesn’t throw up their hands; they **synthesize**—arguing for a **both/and** account rather than declaring the matter undecidable.
* **D.** *“focus on social/tech has made us overlook developments within literature.”*  
  This is an **internalist** critique. The passage you’re asked about does **not** pivot to say “look inside the texts instead”; it argues the **external constellation** (social + tech) explains the surge.

**Tip for CARS:** Watch for phrases that signal **synthesis** (e.g., “in tandem,” “mutually reinforcing,” “in concert”)—they almost always point to an answer like **A** over either/or or “still uncertain” choices.

**Correct answer: C — “The expansion of industry and commerce produced a new class with education and leisure.”**  
This **directly supports** Watt’s claim that the rise of the novel tracks **social–economic change** that created a **new reading public** (literate, leisured, with disposable income).

**Why the other choices are wrong (and what *type* of wrong answer they are)**

**A) “The novel explored increasing class conflict.”**

* **Type:** *Theme/content trap* (scope shift).
* **Why wrong:** Speaks to **what novels were about**, not to the **social/economic preconditions** (audience/market) that Watt cites as the cause of the novel’s rise. At best weakly related; it doesn’t **support the causal link** Watt emphasizes.

**B) “Decline of patronage gave writers more freedom.”**

* **Type:** *Producer-centered / insufficient support* (proximate but incomplete cause).
* **Why wrong:** Concerns **authors’ autonomy**, not the **demand side** (a new class of readers). Greater freedom doesn’t establish that a **new market** emerged—the key mechanism in Watt’s argument.

**D) “Arts flourished seemingly independent of social changes.”**

* **Type:** *Contradiction / negation of premise*.
* **Why wrong:** Explicitly **undercuts** Watt’s position by denying the tie between artistic development and **social–economic transformation**.

**CARS tip**

When an author advances an **externalist causal claim** (social/economic shifts → literary form), prefer answers that **instantiate that causal chain** (new educated, leisured audience). Down-rank:

* **Theme/content** answers (scope shift),
* **Creator-freedom** answers (producer-side only, no audience/market),
* **Negations** that reject the passage’s core linkage.

**CARS-style core of the passage**

The author pushes **against technological determinism** (tech → social/cultural change) and instead favors **demand-pull / coevolution**: expanding **social demand** (a new reading public, urban wealth, literacy) and **literary production** interact with technology (printing), rather than technology unilaterally driving society.

**Evaluate each statement**

**I.** *“The public appetite for fiction motivated mechanical engineers as well as writers to apply their skills to the mass production of reading material.”*

* **Consistent.** This is **demand-pull**: **public appetite** (social demand) spurs both writers and engineers. That matches the passage’s emphasis on social/economic forces **shaping** technological application.

**II.** *“The development of high-speed printing presses encouraged both the educational reforms that increased literacy and the writing of books intended for a general readership.”*

* **Inconsistent.** This is **technological determinism**: **press technology causes** social reform (education/literacy) and cultural output. The author argues **against** tech-→-society causation as the primary driver.

**III.** *“The wealth concentrated in urban centers fueled an unprecedented demand for new forms of literature and more efficient printing methods.”*

* **Consistent.** Urban **wealth/demand** → both **new literature** and **improved printing**. Again **social/economic forces** driving both cultural and technical developments—exactly the author’s line.

**Why the answer choices**

* **A (II only):** Correct—only **II** contradicts the passage’s anti-determinist stance.
* **B (III only):** Wrong—III aligns with demand-pull.
* **C (I and II only):** Wrong—**I** is consistent, not inconsistent.
* **D (I and III only):** Wrong—both I and III are consistent; **II** is the outlier.

**CARS tip:** When the passage critiques **tech-drives-society** stories, eliminate options that make **technology the prime mover** and keep those where **social/economic demand** drives both literary and technological change.

**Correct answer: D — “The access of the public to new technologies determines the direction of social change.”**

**Why D is right (CARS-style):**  
From the context in paragraphs 4–5, the author uses *technological determinism* to mean a **tech-drives-society** model: once people have access to a new technology, that access **sets or steers** social outcomes (institutions, literacy, cultural forms). That aligns with D’s “access → direction of social change.”

**Why the others are wrong**

* **A. “Technological sophistication … determines their reception of revolutionary inventions.”**  
  *Type of wrong:* scope shift to **reception/attitudes**.  
  *Why wrong:* The author’s term concerns **technology causing social change**, not how sophisticated audiences **receive** inventions.
* **B. “Social structure … determines the technological advances …”**  
  *Type of wrong:* **Reverse causality** (society → tech).  
  *Why wrong:* That’s the opposite of technological determinism; it’s a **social determinist** or demand-pull view the author contrasts with tech-first accounts.
* **C. “Demand for technological innovations determines the type of research …”**  
  *Type of wrong:* **Market/demand-pull** account.  
  *Why wrong:* Again flips the arrow to **social demand shaping tech**, not tech shaping society.

**CARS tip:** When a passage labels something “technological determinism,” translate it to **technology → social change**. Eliminate options that (i) talk about **reception** rather than **direction of change**, or (ii) reverse the arrow to **society → technology**.

**Correct answer: B — “Social changes established a need for TV, and its development has contributed to further changes.”**

**Why B is right (CARS-style)**

The author pushes back on **technological determinism** (tech → social change) and favors a **reciprocal/demand-pull** model: **social/economic changes create the need for a technology**, which—once adopted—**feeds back** and contributes to further social change. Choice **B** mirrors that two-way story exactly: *society → TV (need), then TV → society (contributes to change).*

**Why the others are wrong (and what *type* of wrong they are)**

* **A. “Changes in society’s values led to technical refinement of TV and ensured its rapid acceptance.”**
  + **Type:** *Half-story / one-way demand-pull.*
  + **Why wrong:** It has the first half (society → tech) but **omits the feedback** (tech → further social change) that the author also stresses.
* **C. “TV created a demand for information and for new technologies that have accelerated social changes.”**
  + **Type:** *Technological determinism.*
  + **Why wrong:** Makes TV the **prime mover** causing social change, the stance the author argues **against**.
* **D. “Later advances … reduced the relative social significance of TV.”**
  + **Type:** *Irrelevant drift / historical aside.*
  + **Why wrong:** Doesn’t address **how culture arises** relative to TV; it just ranks TV’s later importance, which isn’t the author’s argumentative point.

**CARS tip:** When a passage argues against “tech causes society,” look for answers that show **society shaping tech needs** **and** acknowledge **feedback effects** from tech back to society. Avoid pure tech-drives-society claims (determinism) and one-sided or off-scope statements.

**Correct answer: B — “It supports the idea that technology does not determine the form taken by literature.”**

**Why B is right (CARS-style):**  
The scenario says that once recording/printing became possible for Native American languages, **new written stories still kept the style of the traditional oral tales**. If technology determined literary form, you’d expect the *form* to shift toward the technology’s norms (e.g., Western print conventions). It didn’t. That directly **supports the passage’s anti–technological determinism**: **tech enables transmission but does not dictate form**.

**Why the others are wrong (and what *type* of wrong they are)**

* **A. “Economic factors are irrelevant to technological developments.”**
  + **Type:** Off-scope generalization.
  + **Why wrong:** The scenario speaks to **literary form vs technology**, not whether **economic forces matter** for tech development. No evidence provided about economics.
* **C. “It weakens the idea that literacy is necessary for a market for literature.”**
  + **Type:** Scope shift to market/literacy.
  + **Why wrong:** The example is about **style persistence** after transcription, not whether a **market** exists or if **literacy** is required. It says nothing about demand or sales.
* **D. “It weakens the idea that new technologies are responses to public demands.”**
  + **Type:** Causal-direction red herring.
  + **Why wrong:** The vignette doesn’t address **why** the technology arose (public demand vs other causes). It only shows that **form didn’t change** once the tech was used.

**CARS tip:** When you see a passage arguing against **technological determinism**, favor answers showing **cultural/literary forms persisting despite new tech**; reject options that drag in **economics, markets, or causation of tech development** unless the scenario actually speaks to those.

**Correct answer: D — “No; the results mentioned have no clear correspondence to specific historical events.”**

**Why D is right (CARS-style):**  
The question asks whether Eisenstein’s conclusion about printing (para. 6) is supported by **verifiable evidence** *in the passage*. The author summarizes broad claims (e.g., printing’s far-reaching social/occupational/intellectual effects) but **does not tie those outcomes to dated, specific historical events or datasets** in the text. Without concrete correspondences—names, places, dates, traceable causal chains—the evidence isn’t **verifiable** as presented. Hence **D**.

**Why the others are wrong (and what type of wrong they are)**

* **A. “Yes; printing presses were clearly catalysts for further technological and literary developments.”**
  + **Type:** **Assertion echo / overread.**
  + **Why wrong:** Repeats the *claim* but doesn’t identify **verifiable** support *in the passage* (no concrete events or data). Saying “clearly” doesn’t supply evidence.
* **B. “Yes; the advent of the novel was clearly a direct result of the capabilities of printing.”**
  + **Type:** **Causal exaggeration / determinism trap.**
  + **Why wrong:** The passage resists **technological determinism** and, in any case, does not supply **specific, verifiable** proof that printing **directly caused** the novel’s rise.
* **C. “No; the output of printing shops clearly did not have major occupational and intellectual effects.”**
  + **Type:** **Contradiction of the text.**
  + **Why wrong:** The passage does not assert “clearly did not”; it questions **evidentiary grounding**, not the possibility of effects. This option rejects the effects outright, which the author does not do.

**CARS tip:** When asked about **verifiable evidence**, scan for **specific, checkable links** (dates, cases, events). If the passage only offers **broad generalizations** without such anchors, favor “not supported with verifiable evidence” over options that **restate conclusions** or **inflate causality**.

**Correct answer: D — genetic changes**

**Why D is right (CARS-style):**  
Allen’s and Bergmann’s rules describe **systematic differences in body shape/size across climates** (shorter limbs and larger bodies in colder climates; longer limbs and smaller bodies in warmer ones). In the passage’s terms, those **climatic adaptations** are framed as **evolved, heritable patterns across populations**—i.e., **genetic adaptations** shaped by natural selection over generations, not moment-to-moment or within-lifetime adjustments.

**Why the others are wrong**

* **A. Behavioral changes**  
  These are **actions** an individual chooses (seek shade, add clothing, migration). Allen/Bergmann concern **morphology**, not behavior.
* **B. Physiological changes**  
  These are **short-term/reversible** acclimations within an individual (vasodilation, sweating rate, acute metabolic shifts). The rules address **population-level body form**, not temporary physiology.
* **C. Growth changes**  
  Ontogenetic/developmental plasticity (e.g., stature differences from nutrition) happens **within a lifetime**. The rules, as used in the passage, point to **consistent clines across generations**, best explained as **heritable (genetic) adaptations**, not just developmental variation.

**Bottom line:** The passage treats Allen’s/Bergmann’s patterns as **evolutionary, heritable differences** among populations—hence **genetic changes**.

**Correct answer: D — generationally transmitted behavior patterns.**  
The passage’s main claim is that humans can live almost anywhere **primarily because culture (learned, transmitted behaviors)**—clothing, shelter, fire, tools, agriculture—lets us adapt quickly without waiting for biology to change.

**Why the other choices are wrong (with *type* of wrong answer)**

* **A) Intergenerational genetic changes**
  + **Type:** *Time-scale mismatch / biological determinism trap*
  + **Why wrong:** Genetic evolution is **slow** and real, but the passage says it is **not the primary** reason for rapid human spread across environments; culture does that job.
* **B) Reversible physiological changes**
  + **Type:** *Insufficient cause / level-of-analysis error*
  + **Why wrong:** Acclimatizations (sweating, vasodilation, shivering) are **short-term and limited**. They help tolerate conditions but don’t, by themselves, enable **stable, long-term habitation** of extreme environments.
* **C) Ontogenetic growth changes**
  + **Type:** *Within-lifetime plasticity distractor*
  + **Why wrong:** Developmental adjustments (e.g., stature/shape from early life conditions) exist, but the passage does **not** present them as the **primary** driver of broad human environmental range; they’re **secondary** to culturally transmitted solutions.

**CARS tip:** When you see “**primarily**,” pick the author’s **main mechanism** (here, culture/behavior), and down-rank answers that are **too slow** (A), **too short-term/insufficient** (B), or **secondary within-lifetime** (C).

**Correct answer: A — “Allen’s rule does not hold true uniformly.”**

**Why A is right (CARS-style):**  
Allen’s rule predicts that **warmer-climate** populations tend to have **longer extremities** (to increase surface area for heat loss). The evidence given is **mixed**—**long upper** but **short lower** extremities in the **same warm-climate population**. That doesn’t nuke the rule; it shows the pattern is **not uniform** and can be **modulated** by other factors (e.g., locomotion, ecology, culture). So the best inference is **limited/general-not-universal applicability**, i.e., **A**.

**Why the others are wrong (and what *type* of wrong they are)**

* **B) “Bergmann’s rule is correct.”**
  + **Type:** *Irrelevant rule / scope error.*
  + **Why wrong:** Bergmann’s rule concerns **overall body size/mass vs. climate**, not **relative limb segment lengths**. The data are about **upper vs lower extremities**, so this choice doesn’t address the evidence.
* **C) “Allen’s rule is incorrect.”**
  + **Type:** *Overgeneralization / absolutist trap.*
  + **Why wrong:** A **single counterpattern** in one population doesn’t **invalidate** the rule everywhere; it supports a **non-uniform** application (A), not outright falsity.
* **D) “Bergmann’s rule requires modification.”**
  + **Type:** *Scope shift.*
  + **Why wrong:** The observation is about **limb proportions** (Allen), not **body mass/size** (Bergmann). There’s no basis here to modify Bergmann’s rule.

**CARS tip:** Prefer the answer that **matches the scope of the evidence** and avoids **absolute claims**. A mixed anatomical pattern in one group weakens **uniformity**, not the entire principle.

**Correct answer: B — “cannot be applied in all cases.”**

**Why B is right (CARS-style):**  
The passage explicitly notes that Allen’s and Bergmann’s rules are **general clines with exceptions**; they’re useful tendencies, **not universal laws**. The author flags the drawback as **limited applicability**—they **don’t fit every population or body proportion**.

**Why the others are wrong (and what *type* of wrong answer they are)**

* **A) “were formulated in the nineteenth century.”**
  + **Type:** *Irrelevant historical fact.*
  + **Why wrong:** Age isn’t cited as a drawback; the critique is about **scope/coverage**, not when they were proposed.
* **C) “were little known before 1950.”**
  + **Type:** *Popularity/awareness distractor.*
  + **Why wrong:** The passage doesn’t tie their **drawback** to how widely known they were. Fame ≠ validity/applicability.
* **D) “have little explanatory power.”**
  + **Type:** *Overstatement/absolutist trap.*
  + **Why wrong:** The author treats them as **informative generalizations** that explain broad patterns; the issue is that they **don’t cover all cases**, not that they explain **little**.

**CARS tip:** When a passage calls something a “rule of thumb,” expect the correct answer to emphasize **useful but non-universal**—avoid answers that pivot to **history, popularity,** or **blanket dismissal**.

**Correct answer: C — a physiological response.**  
Perspiration is a **short-term, reversible, autonomic adjustment** to heat stress—classic **physiological acclimatization**.

**Why the others are wrong (with *type* of wrong answer)**

* **A) Genetic response**
  + **Type:** *Time-scale mismatch (evolutionary vs acute).*
  + **Why wrong:** Genetic adaptations occur **across generations** (heritable population changes like Allen’s/Bergmann’s rules). Sweating happens **within minutes** in an individual.
* **B) Growth response**
  + **Type:** *Ontogeny distractor (development vs acute).*
  + **Why wrong:** Growth/ontogenetic changes unfold **over years** during development (e.g., stature, limb proportions). Perspiration is **immediate and reversible**, not a developmental trajectory.
* **D) Behavioral response**
  + **Type:** *Category error (volitional behavior vs autonomic physiology).*
  + **Why wrong:** Behavioral responses involve **choices** (seek shade, change clothing). Sweating is **autonomic**, not a deliberate action.

**CARS tip:** Match the **time scale** and **mechanism** in the stem to the category:

* Seconds–hours & automatic → **physiological**
* Years in one lifetime → **growth/ontogenetic**
* Across generations → **genetic**
* Volitional actions → **behavioral**.

**Correct answer: C — inconsistencies in the viewpoint presented.**  
The passage explicitly ties Manet’s late physical frailty to **formal perspective/viewpoint contradictions** in the painting (e.g., mismatched sightlines/reflections). That’s the stated vehicle for conveying bodily weakness.

**Why the others are wrong (with *type* of wrong answer)**

* **A) “his failure to carry the project to completion.”**
  + **Type:** *Completion-status trap*
  + **Why wrong:** The author doesn’t ground meaning in whether the work was finished; the causal link is to **viewpoint inconsistencies**, not completion.
* **B) “his adoption of a loose painting technique.”**
  + **Type:** *Technique distractor*
  + **Why wrong:** Brushwork looseness isn’t cited as the sign of weakness in the passage. The argument centers on **pictorial viewpoint**, not handling/impasto.
* **D) “the representation of a squalid bar scene.”**
  + **Type:** *Content/setting distractor + value-judgment insertion*
  + **Why wrong:** The passage doesn’t hinge the effect on a “squalid” subject; it emphasizes **formal inconsistencies** rather than the **depicted scene** or mood.

**CARS tip:** When an author highlights a **specific formal device** (here, viewpoint/perspective) as the vehicle of meaning, down-rank answers that swap in **completion status**, **brushwork**, or **subject matter**.