

Call for Contributions: *Intersections* 9.2

“History and Fascism”

History is central to fascism. As Jason Stanley explains in *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them* (2018): “the function of the education system is to glorify the mythic past, elevating the achievements of members of the nation and obscuring the perspectives and histories of those who do not belong... The dominant perspective is often misrepresented as the truth, the ‘real history’” (43 and 47). Such “invented histories,” he insists, “also diminish or entirely extinguish the nation’s past sins” and legitimate “the vision of an ethnically pure, virtuous past nation” (15). The discipline, as a result, becomes a battleground.

How can history as a research field, a practice, and a form of education respond to these challenges? How has the discipline responded in the past? We are particularly interested in articles that explore the current context in both Canadian and transnational settings and/or engage in historical comparisons.

Topics may include, but are not limited to:

- The role of historical study/practice/education in fascist ideology/practice
- Evidence denialism and the construction of national myths
- Exclusion of marginalized groups and voices in historical study/practice/education
- Challenging “invented histories”
- Presenting the truth

The submitted work should include a short text (600-1,000 words) and a two-line biography; a bibliography of 4-5 references and/or a copyright free image are optional. Submissions should not have footnotes. Light copyediting may be done by the editors, but all *Intersections* submissions are expected to arrive in print-ready condition. The deadline for submissions is **August 1, 2026**. Please send your text to cha-shc@cha-shc.ca. Questions and comments can be directed to either Andrew Nurse (anurse@mta.ca) or Roberta Lexier (rlexier@mtroyal.ca), the Guest Editors of this issue.

We are also seeking a small sub-set of 4-5 articles (200-300 words) for a forum on the CHA’s 2026 Annual Meeting. Despite the suspension of Congress’s umbrella meeting, Canadian historians unambiguously expressed a desire to continue meeting in person, even outside that framework, and the result was a vibrant, well-attended event. Rather than merely celebrate it, the Editors propose applying our tools as historians to analyze it. What were some of the primary foci and themes expressed – and what of the criticisms to these themes? What to make of the passionate engagement with historical study during a time of continued cutbacks in higher education? Ideas for future meetings?