In the last four chapters I have been concerned only with the potential and problems of the work of individual theorists as particular instances of the conflicted relations between psychoanalysis and postcolonial studies. Though I have tried to indicate the ways in which each of their projects attempt to grapple with similar problems and build upon earlier attempts to do so, in this final chapter I want to reflect more broadly on what their efforts mean for the future of psychoanalysis’ place in postcolonial critique. First, I want to briefly review and clarify how Fanon, Nandy and Bhabha’s adaptations of psychoanalysis demonstrate some of the theoretical and political uses of psychoanalytic theory for colonial critique. Following this I want to explain how these particular partial engagements with psychoanalysis fail to resolve certain problems with psychoanalysis as a discourse that produces racial and colonial subjects. Finally, I want to sketch out what kind of relationship between postcolonial studies and psychoanalytic theory might foreground postcolonial concerns about race and colonialism more clearly and productively.

We began with Fanon, not only because he is the most well known proponent of a colonial psychoanalytic, but also because his work has served as the precedent for most subsequent psychoanalytic studies of colonialism. *Black Skins White Masks* did establish certain important considerations for any critique of colonialism that makes use of psychoanalysis. First, Fanon demonstrates in various ways that one can write about the man of colour in terms of psychoanalysis without pathologizing him. Writing in response to a tradition of representing natives, primitives and others as a pathological exemplar, Fanon finds
other ways to use psychoanalytic theory. In *Black Skins White Masks* he presents ‘a psychoanalytic interpretation of the lived experience of the black man’ (157) that attempts to understand through reference to politics and material conditions how the black man experiences his world. Though he sometimes exhibits a rather natural desperation to redeem the black subject from misunderstanding, he is mostly uninterested in explaining why the black man behaves as he does (the mode that colonial ethnopsychiatrists often chose to represent colonized or otherwise marginalized subjects); instead he is interested in explaining in psychoanalytic terms how the black man experiences his life in the wake of racist myths that degrade, devalue and make the black man a fearful object in society. Though I did not examine Fanon’s clinical writings in any detail in the first chapter, it is also worth observing that Fanon repeated this same procedure in his clinical discussion of his Arab patients. In Fanon’s case histories the medical profile of the lazy, dishonest Arab was displaced by a portrait of the Arab patient depersonalized by colonial practice inside and outside the mental health institution.

Though Fanon did not pursue the same kind of colonial analysis of knowledge as Nandy and Said, he recognized that in his speciality, psychiatry, certain forms of colonial power were formed through clinical knowledge and practice. As I discussed in the first chapter, though he was unable to specify or identify the discursive forms through which colonial subjects were produced as psychiatric subjects, he saw only too clearly that the suffering of his patients could not be relieved through objectively applied therapeutic or medical solutions. In other words, although he did not seek to destabilize the discourse of colonial medicine, he did seek to reform the colonial practice of medicine. He was in a position to use his knowledge as a medical specialist to turn the language and practice of psychoanalysis and psychiatry into political instruments, and this is what he managed to do. In his last book, *Wretched of the Earth*, he describes how the specific political situation in Algeria is itself the cause of a range of mental health disorders, distortions and disabilities in the colonizer and colonized as means of arguing against colonialism.

In focusing so strongly on the colonial situation Fanon seeks to remind us that, however much the work of Freud, Adler or Lacan suggests otherwise, the psychoanalysis of the person of colour cannot be attempted from a purely individual angle. This is not because the