

**THREE HOURS**

**QUESTION 1 is COMPULSORY. You answer that and ANY TWO other questions**

1. Answer ANY TWO of the following:
  - a) 'For all its range, Morel's 1857 treatise is weak at the very point it has to be strong, namely in its account of how degenerations were inherited'. Discuss.
  - b) What were the premises upon which Max Nordau built his case for the truth of degeneration in his book of that name?
  - c) What were the full implications of the arguments in E. R. Lankester's lecture on 'Degeneration, a chapter in Darwinism'?
  - d) Why did Alfred Fournier entitle his book 'Syphilis and Marriage'?
2. Does Darwinism and the eugenics that accompany it actually have - or indeed need - a place for a theory of degeneration?
3. 'Far more interesting, more humane and - crucially - more comprehensible than the various forces, including the psychiatric ones, which condemned them'. Discuss this claim, with regard to ANY or ALL of the following:  
D-P Schreber, V. Nijinsky and King Ludwig 2<sup>nd</sup> of Bavaria.
4. Outline the political and historical context for Le Bon's writings on the psychology of the crowd.
5. What were the roots of modern 'decadence' for Nietzsche and how did he think they might be overcome?

**CONTINUED**

6. How did spiritualists undermine nineteenth-century ideas on psychiatry and degeneration?
7. 'No longer criminals, but still imprisoned in a new but equally rigid system of medicalised illness and pathology'. Is this an overly pessimistic view of the lives and activities of those deemed 'perverts' after the work of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and others from the 1880s onwards?
8. Debate the claim that Lombrosian criminal anthropology was both defined by and also restricted by its emphasis on physical stigmata, this emphasis itself being explained by its Northern Italian origins.
9. Give an account of studies in hysteria from Charcot to Freud. Do you think that this was one way of medicalising women's protest in the *fin-de-siecle* and if so why?

**END OF PAPER**