Three cases were selected:
Criterion: amount of words.
N: 452 words
B: 271 words
D: 137 words

Sample:
10 cases of adults with psoriasis illness.
Age: 25/50.
Men: 55%
Women: 45%
No psychotherapeutic attention

PROBLEM:
What are the common aspects and the differences on libidinal fixations and defenses detected in the discourse of various psoriatic persons?

Libidinal fixations and defenses in psoriasis illness
Analysis of the discourse with DLA

Method for analyzing: DLA
It detects libidinal fixations and defenses and its status in the discourse.
Contents 3 levels: Related, Phase, Word.

Erogerenicities
IL Intrusomatic Libido
O1 Primary Oral
O2 Secondary oral sadistic
A1 Primary anal sadistic
A2 Secondary anal sadistic
UPH Uretral phallic
GPH Genital phallic

Defenses
Main defenses | Successful | Failed | Both
--- | --- | --- | ---
Creativity and sublimation
Repression
Disavowal
Foreclosure of the reality and ideal
Foreclosure of affect

Methods for collecting material:
- A speech to introduce him/herself
- Phillipson test reduced
(plates: 2, 6, 7, 13).
Analysis’s levels applied for analyzing erotogenecities:

Words: with a computerized program and Narrations: with a grid.

RESULTS.

In self presentation narrations, IL prevails in B and D, but not in N. Studying the whole group of narrations, some other differences appear. In the case of the three interviewees selected (N, B and D) five languages of the eroticisms are the most relevant: UPH, A1, O2, O1 and IL, having—an euphoric (E) or dysphoric (D) outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>UPH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results on Defenses

#### N: (equilibrated state)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erotogenicity</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Successful/failed</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPH</td>
<td>Repression + secondary disavowal and identification with a deceitful character</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B: (stabilized chronic state)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erotogenicity</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Successful/failed</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Successful/failed</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPH</td>
<td>Repression + secondary disavowal and identification with a deceitful character</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D: (unestabilizable state)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erotogenicity</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Successful/failed</td>
<td>Complementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The three cases have some common aspects and certain differences. Sometimes the avoidance defenses (repression + secondary disavowal and identification with a deceitful character) fail and N is invaded by violent feelings of injustice. In the case also fails foreclosure of the affects and somatic symptoms reappears.

The strong affective dependence to the doctors (O2), combined with successful / failed disavowal (corresponding to narcissistic withdrawal), is the specific trait of B.

The biggest poverty of psychic resources appears in D’s discourse.

Correlations detected:

1) amount of words
2) certain erotogenicities
3) some defenses and their states
4) degree of seriousness of the disease.

In N: 452 words (foreclosure of affect success)
In B: 274 words (foreclosure of affect fails)
In D: 136 words (foreclosure of affect fails)

Common:
IL: Foreclosure of affect.
O1: Disavowal

Differences:
The state of the defenses, especially foreclosure of affect.