

(2006) "On the usefulness of concepts "libidinal fixation" and "defense" for the differentiation of discursive manifestations solo", *SPR Meeting*, Edimburgh, 2006

On the usefulness of concepts "libidinal fixation" and "defense" for the differentiation of discursive manifestations

David Maldavsky

I. Problem: are "libidinal fixation" and "defense" useful criteria for the differentiation of discursive manifestations?

II. Sample: 3 groups of speech acts: 1) 10 tattooed adolescents under judiciary surveillance because of their delinquent acts, 2) 30 journalistic texts on different issues, 3) 3 neurotic patients with pathological traits of character.

III. Method

DLA (David Liberman algorithm) is a method designed for the analysis of erotogeneicities and defenses in the discursive manifestations.

Erotogeneicities

- IL Intrasomatic libido
- O1 Primary oral
- O2 Secondary oral sadistic
- A1 Primary anal sadistic
- A2 Secondary anal sadistic
- UPH Urethral phallic
- GPH Genital phallic

Defenses

Main defense	State		
	Successful	Failed	Both
Creativity and sublimation			
Repression			
Disavowal			
Foreclosure of the reality and the ideal			
Foreclosure of the affect			

Levels of analysis

- Words
- Speech acts: phrases and paraverbal components
- Narration

Tools: The grids for analyzing speech acts and narrations allow to detect libidinal fixations and defenses. A computerized dictionary for analyzing words allows to infer erotogeneicities. The application of DLA offers multivariate results. Various erotogeneicities and defenses can be detected. Among them, certain eroticism and its corresponding mechanism prevail.

IV. Analysis

We select the same perspective for the three analyses: the study of speech acts using the corresponding tools.

Main erotogenicities and defenses detected in the samples

Group I: 10 tattooed adolescents

Erotogenicities

Name	IL	O2	A1	GPH	Main
Lorena	X	X	X	X	A1
Gastón	X	X	X	X	O2
Luis	X	X	X		A1
Pablo	X	X	X	X	A1
Ariel	X	X	X	X	A1/O2
Carmen	X	X	X	X	A1
Beto	X	X	X	X	A1
Luis A.	X	X	X	X	O2
Santiago	X	X	X	X	O2
Verónica	X	X	X	X	A1

IL	100%
O2	100%
A1	100%
GPH	90%

Type and state of the main defenses

Type	State	Percentage
Disavowal/Foreclosure of the reality and the ideal	Successful/failed	100%
Foreclosure of the affect	Failed	100%

Group II: 30 journalistic texts

Erotogenicities

Page of opinion Internacional news Local news	A2
Recipes Gourmet Fashion	GPH

Type and state of the defenses

Creativity	Successful	100%
------------	------------	------

Group III: 3 neurotics patients with pathological traits of character

Erotogenicities

	Mrs. C (fourth session, first moment)	Amalie (second session, fourth moment)	Maria (third session, first moment)
O2	-----	-----	Complementary
A2	Central	Complementary	Complementary
UPH	Complementary	Complementary	Complementary
GPH	Complementary	Central	Central

Type and state of the defenses

Repression + secondary disavowal + identification	Successful (Mrs. C ,
---	----------------------

with a deceitful character	Amalie) Failed (María)
----------------------------	---------------------------

Comments

It can be notice a clear difference between the dominant erotogenicities in Group I and in the other two. Group II and III differ especially in the defense, and not in the dominant erotogenicity. In group II, creativity prevails, and in III, the failure repression is combined with complementary defenses (secondary disavowal, identification with a deceitful character). That ensemble corresponds to pathological character traits in neurotic structures.

When studying a discourse, DLA offers multivariate results: more than a unique libidinal fixations can be detected, one of them having major relevance. This fact allows to differentiate between discourses: first, taking into account what is the main libidinal fixation, and second, considering the other erotogenicities expressed in the discourse. But journalistic texts have a great variation on the secondary libidinal manifestations, and just coincide on the main language (A2 or GPH). And those erotogenicities are the same prevailing in the group III (three patients). In those three cases, the same defensive ensemble prevails, but the corresponding mechanisms are combined with different libidinal fixations. When those defenses are combined with A2, the psychic structure corresponds to pathological obsessional traits of character. Hen the same defenses are combined with GPH, the structure corresponds to pathological hysterical traits of character. Besides, in two cases the defense succeeds, and in the third the mechanism fails.

Although the study of libidinal fixations allows to roughly distinguish certain clinical structure, only the research of the defense and its state permits to differentiate among discourses expressing the same erotogenicity but belonging from normal or pathological subjects. But when having the same defense, the specific libidinal fixation to infer some differences. And the study of the state of the defense leads to detect other particularities of each case.

Conclusion

1. When studying libidinal fixations, some differences among the discourses can be detected. Simultaneously, it is possible to gather discourses coming from normal or pathological subjects expressing the same libidinal fixation.
2. When studying defenses, new differentiations can be seen, distinguishing clearly subjects having the same libidinal fixation but not the same structure
3. Only the combination of both analysis (libidinal fixation and defenses) allows to introduce a more sophisticated differentiation among discursive manifestations.
4. New differentiations can be obtained considering the state of the defense.