**Scope**

What motivates the pursuit of knowledge in these areas of knowledge?

In the human sciences, the pursuit of knowledge is motivated by a desire to understand human behavior and why things happen the way they do. Another part of this motivation is having the ability to predict behaviors, often to prevent negative events from happening. For example, the study of economics within the human sciences is focused on determining the causes for changes in an economy. The causes of depression, inflationary and recessionary gaps, and welfare loss have been studied extensively. Possible responses to these situations were also studied so the government knows which actions to take to correct the economy during a recession.

In the language arts, the pursuit of knowledge is motivated by a desire to express oneself and to make commentaries on society. Similar to the human sciences, language arts is partially motivated by human life and behavior, since many literary works make commentary on societal norms in unique ways. For example, Kate Chopin’s *The Awakening* is a commentary on the roles of women in society in the late 1800s. Chopin pursued to express her ideas and criticisms of society through the novel. However, unlike the human sciences, a greater emphasis is placed on creative expression instead of analysis of past events or data. The study of economics will look to past recessions and the responses made by the government in an attempt to determine which methods were most effective. These methods are then repeated in similar events or expanded upon, since they have been proven to be effective. The language arts, although also influenced by the past, does not look towards the past for an accurate form of knowledge. An artist is able to look within themselves, identifying knowledge in their own perspectives and experiences, then using language to express this knowledge.

**Perspectives**

Are some types of knowledge less open to interpretation than others?

When comparing the human sciences and the language arts, it appears there is less room for interpretation in the human sciences than language arts. In the study of economics, there is significant evidence that government intervention speeds up economic recovery during a recession. President Roosevelt’s New Deal policies during the Great Depression and the US government increasing interest rates during the Great Recession are both examples of this. Looking at the language arts, there seems to be much more room for interpretation. For example, in Shakespeare’s play *Hamlet*, there are parallels between Hamlet and Ophelia. Hamlet pretends to go crazy, while Ophelia does go crazy. Hamlet contemplates killing himself, while Ophelia does kill herself. There are multiple interpretations of these parallels, often contradicting each other. Some say it is conveying frailty of women and how they can’t hold them together, while others claim that it is to show Hamlet’s weakness, where even a woman can do what he does not.

Despite this, interpretations still exist within the human sciences. On the issue of government intervention, the new classical perspective believes the economy will recover on its own without the government. They point to the boom and bust cycle of the economy that has been present for many decades in history as evidence of the automatic recovery of the economy. With conflicting evidence on this issue, the truth about government intervention for correcting the economy is up to interpretation.