Bizarre interaction with a sage-conduct committee member on sage-devel

10 messages

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Fri, May 10, 2024 at 6:28 PM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>

Hi committee,
I am still waiting for the committee to fix its harmful public
mischaracterization and mishandling of clear misconduct and abuse as
"disputes" and "controversies", and to make an effort to repair the
damage already done by it.

Instead I am reading posts like the ones below. What am I supposed to
do with this? https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/dEa3i2Fn3ZY/m/0pmvhNyRAwAJ

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: julian...@fsfe.org <Unknown>
Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at 6:20:52 AM UTC-7
Subject: Re: Governance proposal: Maintainer/code-owner model for .ci,
.devcontainer, .github/workflows, tox.ini
To: sage-devel <Unknown>

Hi Matthias,

It was a bit unclear to me how your v2 proposal is different from the
initial proposal on this sage-devel thread. Maybe it's helpful to
clarify that build/bin/write-dockerfile.sh was removed from the
proposal and src/doc/en/developer/portability_platform_table.rst was
added. Otherwise, it's in essentially unchanged.

julian

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: julian...@fsfe.org <Unknown>
Date: Friday, May 10, 2024 at 4:19:14 PM UTC-7
Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: Governance proposal:
Maintainer/code-owner model for .ci, .devcontainer, .github/workflows,
tox.ini
To: sage-devel <Unknown>

Dear Matthias,

If I read your proposal correctly, it is about removing review from
changes made by "maintainers" and merging things directly into develop
without waiting for the Release Manager.

Mostly, I am opposed to this because changes to the files you list are
not automatically uncontroversial, see the disputed
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37740,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37387,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37351,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36726,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36697,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36694,
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36678, (there's probably more.)

In general, I am not sure about changing the review requirements. I

know that having to do several rounds of review can be frustrating. At the same time, I like the idea of having somebody double check things. (I consider waiting for the first round of review a necessary annoyance. What can be really frustrating is waiting for the second round of review. Maybe, there are other ways to improve this, e.g., by encouraging people to set things to "feel free to set to positive review yourself once you addressed these tiny things I brought up in my review.")

I also think it's fairly confusing to have different rules for different parts of the repository. I would not mind at all to use different rules for different repositories within the sagemath organization though. And breaking the sage repository into smaller bits sounds like a good idea to me anyway. (As long as all the src/sage and src/doc stays in one place…) There are some means to reuse workflows in GitHub (I have not checked if they are feasible for us) and one could certainly try to extract some things into shared actions that live elsewhere. Maybe that's an approach that is worth exploring?

julian
====

--
Dr. Matthias Koeppe . . . . http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe
Professor of Mathematics

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>   Fri, May 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>

Dear Matthias,
As a committee, we have rejected your characterization of your conflict with other Sage developers. Yes, others have behaved inappropriately. So have you. We stand by our characterization of these interactions essentially as disputes and controversies which at times have devolved into misconduct.

We are working to repair the damage done to the community by you and others. We would be happy to consider specific suggestions for helpful public actions that we can take.

As for the interactions with Julian, his messages in response to your governance proposal were sent as an individual developer. There is certainly no code-of-conduct violation in the posts you are quoting.
The Code of Conduct Committee

> [Quoted text hidden]
>> [Quoted text hidden]
>> --

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Fri, May 17, 2024 at 4:42 PM
To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>

On Fri, May 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> wrote:
> As a committee, we have rejected your characterization of your conflict with other Sage developers. Yes, others have behaved inappropriately. So have you.

No, David, this stops right here.

Someone else please communicate with me.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Fri, May 17, 2024 at 9:35 PM
To: John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com>

Hi John
FYI I'll consider further messages from committee members that repeat
such unqualified expressions of bothsidesing or attempt to gaslight me
as abusive in their own right. Time to fix the committee.

Matthias

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>   Sat, May 18, 2024 at 5:02 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

The Code of Conduct committee reminds you that if a message is signed with "The Code of Conduct Committee" then the
message has been crafted, reviewed, and approved by the committee as a whole.
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Sat, May 18, 2024 at 5:30 PM
To: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>

I don't believe you.
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Mon, May 20, 2024 at 1:14 PM
To: John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com>, Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>

Hi John and Nils,
May I suggest that you have a word with the junior colleagues on the
committee to make sure that they do not send out comically
irresponsible messages in the name of the committee?
(Really, what's next? "Yes, Pol Pot has made questionable choices. So
have you.")

Thanks
Matthias

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, May 18, 2024 at 5:02 PM
Subject: Re: Bizarre interaction with a sage-conduct committee member
on sage-devel
[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>   Tue, May 28, 2024 at 3:34 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

We are disappointed that you met one of our recent communications with a terse "I don't believe you". We strive to provide you with truthful, well-considered, and relevant communication. Furthermore, we have very good communication within the committee, so your concerns that emails signed with "The Code of Conduct Committee" would be anything other than that, are entirely unfounded. The committee speaks with one voice.

We are furthermore not at all inclined to make, and take exception to, any comparisons between your or any other community member's actions and historical genocides. There are no grounds for such comparisons and making them, even in jest, is highly disrespectful to the victims and their relatives.

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Tue, May 28, 2024 at 3:37 PM
To: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

No. Try again.

[Quoted text hidden]
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, May 30, 2024 at 12:05 AM
To: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

I'm waiting for the necessary rewrite of this highly inappropriate message, Nils.

[Quoted text hidden]