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I. Goal:
To detect wishes and defenses in the detonator episodes of the crisis of violence in 7 patients

II. Sample:
Narrations corresponding to 7 patients who described their own violence episodes and their antecedents.

III. Tools:
The David Liberman algorithm (DLA) is a method for discourse analysis. It allows to detect drives and defenses in narrated episodes. Wishes: Intrasomatic libido (IL), Primary oral (O1), secondary oral sadistic (O2), primary anal sadistic (A1), secondary anal sadistic (A2), urethral phallic (UPH) and genital phallic (GPH). Main defenses: Foreclosure of the affect, Foreclosure of reality and the ideal, Disavowal, Repression, In accordance with the goal, Creativity, Sublimation. The state of the defense can be successful, failed or both. The analysis of wishes can be connected with the analysis of defenses. The DLA has a tool for the research of narrations in terms of scenes representing wishes. Defenses can be inferred applying a sequence of steps, once detected the main wishes in the scenes. Each one of these scenes synthesizes different possible anecdotes. It is convenient to explain a bit more some of the traits corresponding to O1. The failure of the cognitive wish may appear when the subject believes in lies that are contradictory to the facts. It may also occur that a
patient feels dependent from a subject that believes in words that don’t match with the facts. In regards the disphoric versions of IL, they involve states of de-vitalization, of economic poverty or of expulsion from a space (locked outside) as much as crisis of somatic terror, vertigo states or terror to the risk of economic or financial collapse.

Regarding the defenses, it is convenient to clarify that the foreclosure of the affect is usually complemented by a mechanism of escape from the reality corresponding to the defense that other authors call “fly”, in the same way as Freud, and that has been usually associated to the PTSD, even though it may also be observed in many other pathologies of severely regressive type.

The DLA instruments allow carrying out qualitative and quantitative research. The method allows investigating fragments of sessions, complete interviews with a wider number of anecdotes, as much as a large cluster of sessions. The qualitative research is solved by a decision referred to the combination between wishes and defenses (and their state), in which some components are dominant and others are subordinated, complementary or in conflict. The quantitative research requires from the application of a table of punctuation in which not only the defenses are valued but also their state, as much as the central and complementary episodes. For this quantitative research it is convenient to focus in the study of complete sessions.

IV. Procedures:

The analysis of narrations with the DLA tools usually requires an initial process that transforms the textual material of a session in a cluster of brief narrative sequences (each one usually composed by two or three successive moments: for example, “1. the patient decided something, 2. he did not try to consummate his wish, 3. then he got anguished”, or “1. the patient believed a false phrase of his older brother, 2. he made a decision without being completely convinced, 3. then he had an insomnia crisis”). The collection of a group of these narrative sequences constitutes the sample over which the DLA instruments will be applied. With the objective of achieving this sample, the researcher has to
comply with a procedure that allows him to select part of the patient’s discourse and reorder it. In this task the researcher complies with several criteria. Among them, three criteria: informative economy (elimination of redundancies and dispersed details), isotopy (maintenance of the topic), chronologic-causal link, allow creating each narrative sequence. It is possible then to apply the DLA instruments to the analysis of an extensive sample (i.e. to the whole cluster of narrative sequences) as much as to a reduction achieved by a collection of similar narrations. The first step consists in the establishment of each narrative sequence to be analyzed. The second one consists in detecting the wishes and the third step, inferring the defenses. It is convenient that in each one of these steps one researcher makes the decisions and then checks it with the other colleagues also trained in DLA.

In this opportunity, the more concrete facts in the application of the DLA consist in: (1) to detect wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in the narrations referred to the violent acts from 7 patients, (2) to compare the corresponding outcomes.

V. Analysis of the narrations of the 7 patients

Patient I
1. he was alone in the town and he missed his family,
2. a girl said he had got her pregnant but it wasn’t true
3. it was his word against the girl’s
Result: suicidal attempt combined with the destruction of the own house.

1. a girlfriend abandoned him
2. to his request, she agreed to meet him as friends,
3. then he supposed she had another boyfriend
Result: destruction of the own house.

Table I: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while O1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.

**Patient II**

1. the patient requested his wife to give him money to maintain a fictitious financial reliability of his own father,
2. after an initial petition to which his wife said yes, then she refused to continue maintaining the patient’s father
3. the patient’s father announced his son that he had finally ruined his own family

Result: violence directed to his wife.

**Table II: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while O1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.

**Patient III**

1. the patient’s father used to tell him he was the favorite
2. the patient noticed that his father gave the goods to his younger brothers without taking him into account.

Result: complicity (to clear a bank’s door) in an armed robbery.
1. On his father’s birthday, when the patient was driving the taxi through an avenue, a bus passed him transgressing the law.
Result: kick to the public transport’s door.

Table III: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while O1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.

Patient IV
1. a friend was attacked by a gang,
2. his friend was at a disadvantage
Result: fight

1. a gang attacked his family’s house,
2. his family was at a disadvantage
Result: fight

1. two hooligans attacked his brother,
2. his brother was at a disadvantage.
Result: fight

Table IV: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while A1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.
**Patient V**

1. his mother was very sick,
2. he didn’t have money to buy her the medication.

Result: he steals with a gun and confronts the police shooting

**Table V: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: IL and successful-failed Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time while IL and failed Foreclosure of the affect were the specific factor determining the violence outburst.

**Patient VI**

1. the patient spoke to her mother,
2. she seemed a deaf person and did not answer to the patient,

Result: she unsuccessfully cried in high voice.

1. she phoned her former fiancé,
2. he did not answer her,

Result: she hit his head with a piece of steel.

Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while O1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.

**Table VI: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patient VII

1. L’s mother had her in order to stop her husband from leaving with another woman.
2. his parents separated.
Result: L. begins with her violent crisis.

1. L demands her mother a gift that she had promised her,
2. his mother responds that she promised to give her a present if she carried out her domestic obligations (studying, keeping his bedroom tidy).
Result: L. has new violent crisis.

Table VII: Wishes and defenses (as well as their state) in detonator episodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Foreclosure of the affect</td>
<td>Successful-failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Disavowal</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: IL and Foreclosure of the affect lasted over the time, while O1 and disavowal were the most specific factor determining the violence outburst.

VI. Discussion

The detonator of the violence episodes contains two components. One of them is the combination IL and successful-failed Foreclosure of the affect. This combination consisted in episodes of lack of energy and somnolence, and/or feelings of poverty and of being expelled from the family space.
This component lasted over the time. The other component is usually the combination O1 and unsuccessful state of disavowal (71 %). This combination consisted in episodes of being dependent from an unreliable subject. This
component is the most specific detonator of the violence episodes. As a complementary component, A1 and failed disavowal had relevance. Nevertheless, in some cases (15.5%), O1 and failed disavowal were replaced by A1 and failed disavowal occupying the role of the most specific detonator of violence episodes. This combination consisted in episodes of suffering from powerful persons’ unfair attitudes.

In other cases (15.5%), neither O1 and disavowal nor A1 and the same defense were detected, but only two states of Foreclosure of the affect combined with IL. While IL and successful-failed Foreclosure of the affect corresponded to a lasting situation, the combination between IL and the failure of the same defense was the specific detonator of the violence episodes. In that case, the patient’s somnolence state (successful-failed state of the defense) was replaced by a crisis of anxiety (failure of the defense).

VII. Conclusions

IL and successful-failed Foreclosure of the affect seemed to be the most usual combination wish-defense-state in the detonator episodes of the violence outburst. This combination corresponds to a lasting state of the patient, which is a necessary condition, but a second combination wish-defense-state is required to conduct from this lasting state to the violence episodes. This second combination is usually composed by O1 (main) and A1 (complementary), both accompanied by failed Disavowal (71%), but in the same cases it is composed by A1 and failed Disavowal (15.5%) or by IL and failed Foreclosure of the affect (15.5%).