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Since 2014, Stance has partnered with the Steven Humphrey Student Philosophy Colloquium at the University of Louisville. Stance staff attend the conference and select one or two papers to consider for publication. We are grateful to the University of Louisville Philosophy Department for their support of our partnership and especially to Steven Humphrey for his gracious hospitality. We look forward to the enduring exchange of ideas fostered by this partnership between Stance and the Humphrey Colloquium.
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When I was in only my second year of philosophical study, Stance was beginning its eighth year of publication. That year, I was asked to join the staff. I was told the journal took in submissions by some of the best undergraduates from around the world, and these were then reviewed, edited, and chosen by fellow undergraduates with a passion for philosophy. Because this whole "philosophy" thing was new to me, I was certain I would have little to contribute.

Fast forward to my fourth year of philosophical study, and second as the Editor-in-chief of Stance. Only now do I realize how lucky I was as a member of the journal. Early in the experience, I found I had an opportunity that many other undergraduates did not. With so few outlets for undergraduate philosophy research out there, I had a responsibility to give the journal all I could. I began to feel a part of a larger community, one where young, open-minded adults across the world looked for any and all places they could share their hard work. Still to my amazement, I was one of the people chosen as curator.

Undergraduates have important things to say, too. At times when I would advertise the journal and how we operated, I would be met with hints of condescension. Stance is not a novelty. Stance is not something else, something less, solely because it has "undergraduate" in the description. Certainly, we may have not have logged as many hours as these professionals, but should we not be heard? Should we not be read? Should we not be able to share our well-thought opinions?

That, to me, is the purpose of this journal. This is an outlet for undergraduates to share the results of their hard work in their chosen field. Our global reach is constantly spreading. In the past ten years, we have worked with philosophers from Bangladesh, Japan, Poland, Argentina, Australia, Cameroon, and many more. Certainly an impressive feat for what started as a small group from Indiana. Perhaps the greatest part of the journal is that it is a consistent source of contribution and innovation. Despite losing and gaining different members, the staff always picks up where the last left off. The same can be said about the authors and reviewers. There will always be a surplus of undergraduates waiting to show their skill, and Stance will always try to find the best.

The authors, reviewers, editors, and production staff have all put great work and long hours into this journal.

We hope you enjoy.

Cameron McNeely
Editor-in-Chief
Every year when I receive the new issue of Stance, I think about what a windfall the whole thing has been for me. Having merely gotten the ball rolling, I now get to sit back and enjoy the fruits of all the talent and ingenuity that have been invested in it since. Stance has changed so much since its humble beginnings that it seems disingenuous to regard myself as its founding editor. But I’ll take the honor, with gratitude to all those whose hard work makes it such an honor.

In its very earliest days, Stance was in real danger of being called something far less dignified: The Original Position. The idea wasn’t that we would specialize in Rawls scholarship—I knew we needed to cast a far wider net than that—but that we would publish original work defending substantive philosophical views: not just any positions; we would publish original positions! The connection with Rawls’s original position contracting device wasn’t meant to be deep; it was just a cute little tribute.

Going into our first meeting, I had such courage of conviction! I knew some of my teammates had a different idea about what the journal should be called, but they would see reason. My case was meticulously prepared, and I looked forward to the challenge—and the satisfaction—of winning them over. Now for the anti-climax: ultimately, it was me who was won over. I remember well the experience of realizing they were right. Starting Stance was my thesis project, and yet theirs was the better idea. Imagine that.

There’s plenty to value about collaboration: it can legitimize the ultimate decision, secure buy-in for its implementation, and make people feel invested. Thick-headed go-getter that I am, I too often discount a different kind of value: collaboration helps us learn, and it helps us do better work. It certainly isn’t costless. It’s often slow and messy. It can make us feel irritated and insecure. And, plausibly, we would sometimes do better to work alone. Stance made me think about collaboration more carefully than I had before: how do I weigh the uncertain gains of collaboration against its probable costs of time, messiness, and frustration? My experience suggests that I am far likelier to go wrong by avoiding collaboration than by embracing it. Beginning with Ball State philosophy and Stance, I’ve enjoyed a wealth of opportunities to see how others’ contributions make my work better. It’s easy to forget, given the popular image of the solitary philosopher, that this project we’re involved in is a thoroughly collaborative one. We think about our own writing and our own thinking and our own teaching and learning, but what makes all of these worthwhile is the role they play in the conversation we’re having together. We participate by reading and studying others’ ideas, and by talking together—in classrooms and at conferences and in journals—about what we can learn from those ideas, where they fall short, and how they might be made better. We share our own ideas, and others return in kind. And very slowly, we make progress together.

With a lot of luck and a lot of hard work, some of us get to make a job out of participating in this conversation. But there’s plenty to take away and plenty to contribute, even if we’re involved only for a little while. Stance would have been The Original Position had my teammates not been there to think with me. Congratulations to all of us, past and present Stance team members and contributors, for building something that’s equipped so many of us to learn and think together. Of all the things about Stance that make me feel proud, this one stands out: you’ve built Stance into a bit of evidence that kind, careful, and constructive collaboration can make philosophy better.

Dr. Gina Schouten
Stance Founder
Assistant Professor of Philosophy,
Harvard University