



Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoepp@gmail.com>

Severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel list

43 messages

Matthias Koepp <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 2:34 PM

Hi sagemath-admins,
(cc: sage-conduct)

I have severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel list, related to severe concerns about the ability of the sage-conduct committee to carry out its duties, including its self-governance (a topic that I will expand on soon elsewhere).

Messages that I post on sage-devel disappear on a regular basis without notice. I alerted the sage-conduct committee about this on June 1, but the situation has not been resolved.

As the de-facto principal maintainer of Sage, I am now requesting immediate and permanent admin access to sage-devel, so that the administration of the list can be carried out properly and responsibly. Based on my experience, I do not trust the present members of the sage-conduct committee to carry out this duty.

Thanks.
Matthias

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

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, Matthias Koepp <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 4:12 PM

Dear all,

well, I have warned the Conduct Committee that Prof Koepp wants to appoint himself as the new (nonB)DFL of Sage.

As often, I was right. I hope Prof Koepp will have luck forking Sage.

Best
Dima

[Quoted text hidden]

Kwankyu Lee <ekwankyu@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 5:12 PM

On Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 6:34AM Matthias Koepp <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
Messages that I post on sage-devel disappear on a regular basis without notice. I alerted the sage-conduct committee about this on June 1, but the situation has not been resolved.

Do you think that someone deletes your posts?

I experienced that my posts were deleted a couple of times on sage-devel. I just think that there is a technical issue in google groups.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CA%2BW9aTHAwBxpoRnKoisjfXvW%3Dg3rJeKs%3D-zJvwuLYENHvJxw%40mail.gmail.com>.

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:32 PM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

Hi all,

I can confirm that the Code of Conduct Committee has moderated several of Matthias' messages to sage-devel. Moreover, he has previously requested ownership of the sage-devel list, a request that we did not grant.

I have more I would like to say on this issue, but would like to consult with the rest of the committee first (which naturally takes time, since there are 6 of us).

David (speaking for myself at the moment)

[Quoted text hidden]

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CACHs6_kw59f6EabWsrBCrjsob7PGhmtQGboqffnaN343qWLG5g%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 9:23 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 2:34 PM Matthias Koepppe

<mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

- > I have severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel
- > list, related to severe concerns about the ability of the sage-conduct
- > committee to carry out its duties, including its self-governance (a
- > topic that I will expand on soon elsewhere).
- >
- > Messages that I post on sage-devel disappear on a regular basis
- > without notice. I alerted the sage-conduct committee about this on
- > June 1, but the situation has not been resolved.

Meanwhile, upon my request in

<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/fUOE4T-WAU4>, David has made the information who owns and manages sage-devel publicly available; namely the 6 members of the CoCC.

Setting my specific severe concerns aside for a moment, it is clear already that this is obviously not a suitable admin structure. The CoCC is a service committee, not a general purpose governance committee: It is not at all charged with "running" any of the forums of our community -- except its own sage-conduct list. Analogy: When an in-person community event is held, the CoCC is also not "running" it; it's the organizers of the community event that are. CoCC merely needs to be called in the rare event when there's a need to intervene. Back to the mailing list -- CoCC will need sufficient rights, but it certainly cannot be the sole owner of our project's forums.

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 9:58 AM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:33 PM David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> wrote:
> I can confirm that the Code of Conduct Committee has moderated several of Matthias' messages to sage-devel.

This is much too vague to be meaningful as a "confirmation".

When I raised the issue with sage-conduct on June 1, committee members were able to "find" several messages that were in the moderation queue, and then approved them to be posted.

I'll note that at least some of my posted messages that have disappeared over the course of the past 2 weeks were in sage-devel threads in which members of the sage-conduct committee are also participating.

The committee will have a difficult time justifying the manipulation of the discussions by these actions.

These abuses of power by the current CoCC will cease immediately.

[Quoted text hidden]

William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:42 PM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, Matthias Koeppel <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 4:12 PM Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear all,

well, I have warned the Conduct Committee that Prof Koeppel wants to appoint himself as the new (nonB)DFL of Sage.

As often, I was right. I hope Prof Koeppel will have luck forking Sage.

Matthias,

1. Are you planning to fork Sage if your demands aren't met?
2. If so, what are your concerns with launching a fork? (The "Sage" name? Distribution/visibility? Resources? Grants?)

-- William

Best

Dima

On 22 August 2024 22:34:24 BST, Matthias Koeppel <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

>Hi sagemath-admins,

>(cc: sage-conduct)

>

>I have severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel
>list, related to severe concerns about the ability of the sage-conduct
>committee to carry out its duties, including its self-governance (a
>topic that I will expand on soon elsewhere).

>

>Messages that I post on sage-devel disappear on a regular basis
>without notice. I alerted the sage-conduct committee about this on
>June 1, but the situation has not been resolved.

>

>As the de-facto principal maintainer of Sage, I am now requesting

>immediate and permanent admin access to sage-devel, so that the
>administration of the list can be carried out properly and
>responsibly. Based on my experience, I do not trust the present
>members of the sage-conduct committee to carry out this duty.
>
>Thanks.
>Matthias

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/5E3735C0-467C-44A3-868F-5398954599E6%40gmail.com>.

--

William (<http://wstein.org>)

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CACLE5GB4kWxyM9vXwwcP7-Mr9ZhhqE9iwot0Bfh2jbLfov0bxQ%40mail.gmail.com>.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:45 PM

On Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:42 PM William Stein <wstein@gmail.com> wrote:
> On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 4:12 PM Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com> wrote:
>> well, I have warned the Conduct Committee that Prof Koeppe wants to appoint himself as the new (nonB)DFL of Sage.
>>
>> As often, I was right. I hope Prof Koeppe will have luck forking Sage.
>
> Matthias,
>
> 1. Are you planning to fork Sage if your demands aren't met?
>
> 2. If so, what are your concerns with launching a fork? (The "Sage" name? Distribution/visibility? Resources? Grants?)
>
> -- William

William, I have no such plans. This is just another denunciation by Pasechnik -- one in a long line of denunciations.

[Quoted text hidden]

William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:51 PM

On Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 4:46 PM Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

> 1. Are you planning to fork Sage if your demands aren't met?
>
> 2. If so, what are your concerns with launching a fork? (The "Sage" name? Distribution/visibility? Resources? Grants?)
>
> -- William

William, I have no such plans. This is just another denunciation by Pasechnik -- one in a long line of denunciations.

Matthias,

Thanks for the clarification, and I'm glad to hear this!

-- William

--
William (<http://wstein.org>)

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CACLE5GCKhRr9x6bU%3DWZ-qTQMd_8iA81Cd7Um-KW-MoWW37muNQ%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Aug 23, 2024 at 10:54 PM

On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:33 PM David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> wrote:
> I have more I would like to say on this issue

Better not. Comply, and then step down from the committee.

[Quoted text hidden]

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 12:40 AM

Matthias,

David is an elected representative of the Sage community. You are not.
Who are you to demand anything from David in such a rude tone? It is intimidation, pure and simple.
I suggested that you leave and start a fork as a way out of the hole you dug for yourself here.

I can also consider steps beyond asking for a disciplinary action here, e.g. informing your line manager that you engage in intimidation and deliberate plagiarism within the project.

Dima
[Quoted text hidden]

ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 12:59 AM

On Saturday, August 24, 2024 at 2:55:13 PM UTC+9 matthiaskoeppe wrote:
On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:33 PM David Roe <roed...@gmail.com> wrote:
> I have more I would like to say on this issue

Better not. Comply, and then step down from the committee.

This sounds like an accusation. I agree that it is rude and intimidating. What is he accused of?

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/be15209b-2c1e-4062-8a33-745cccd9d1b9n%40googlegroups.com>.

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 1:05 AM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>

On 24 August 2024 08:59:58 BST, "ekwankyu@gmail.com" <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:

>On Saturday, August 24, 2024 at 2:55:13 PM UTC+9 matthiaskoepp wrote:

>

>On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:33 PM David Roe <roed...@gmail.com> wrote:

>> I have more I would like to say on this issue

>

>Better not. Comply, and then step down from the committee.

>

>

>This sounds like an accusation. I agree that it is rude and intimidating.

>What is he accused of?

Of not giving in to Matthias' demands, such as adding him to the maintainers of sage-devel

>

>

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/71F999BC-45F9-4298-A03A-4A901B540C70%40gmail.com>.

Matthias Koepp <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 9:35 AM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

On Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 1:00AM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:

> On Saturday, August 24, 2024 at 2:55:13 PM UTC+9 matthiaskoepp wrote:

> On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 8:33 PM David Roe <roed...@gmail.com> wrote:

> > I have more I would like to say on this issue

>

> Better not. Comply, and then step down from the committee.

>

> This sounds like an accusation. I agree that it is rude and intimidating. What is he accused of?

I will not elaborate here in detail on it unless it becomes absolutely necessary.

In short, I asked the committee previously that David recuse himself from committee business that involves me (on the basis of several

items of concern that involve David). The failure of the committee to address them is part of my concerns regarding "the ability of the [sage-conduct committee to carry out its duties, including its self-governance](#)" that I mentioned in my initial message. More recently, I requested that any of the committee's communication with me is done by committee members other than David.

Matthias

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 9:53 AM

A quick note to all: I'll not be responding to Pasechnik's messages.

[Quoted text hidden]

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Aug 24, 2024 at 12:58 PM

Does our Code of Conduct forbid boycotting project members?

Dima

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Mon, Aug 26, 2024 at 10:37 AM

Following up on my message from Aug 22, as no action has been taken nor any communication has been made after David Roe's Aug 22 message.

The moderators (= CoCC) will prepare and post a factual report on the missing messages and all other moderation activities regarding my sage-devel posts, no later than Aug 29. (CoCC will refrain from including the type of inappropriate and patronizing commentary that they used to send me.)

Matthias

On Thu, Aug 22, 2024 at 2:34 PM Matthias Koeppe
<mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
>

[Quoted text hidden]

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 8:04 PM

I've included below the messages sent to sage-devel by Matthias that we have rejected, along with our email exchanges directly about these messages. We have had many more exchanges with Matthias, including about posts on github, that I have not included.

We have gotten numerous complaints about the tenor of discussion on sage-devel, and have attempted to improve the situation by offering Matthias constructive criticism (some included below, and others about his communication on github). He has not been receptive. Indeed, as shown in the third thread, Matthias requested to no longer receive any explanation, so four of the messages from June and August were rejected without a notification.

We do not believe that it is appropriate for Matthias to be an administrator of the sage-devel list, given his history of conflict with numerous other Sage developers.

David
for the Code of Conduct Committee

Rejected messages

Date: Mon, 15 Apr 2024 10:24:51 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: Proposal (redo): Make python_build (and its dependency pyproject_hooks) a standard package

On Sunday, April 14, 2024 at 7:44:48 PM UTC-7 Tobia...@gmx.de wrote:

> The usage of "setup.py sdist" or "setup.py bdist_wheel" only happens in certain edge cases

No, they are not "edge cases". It's how we build and test the modularized distributions.

> (e.g. the almost un-documented `--enable-wheels` option)

It's fully documented.

> and in these cases it is no problem to require developers to run `pip install build` beforehand.

> So these last remaining instances of calling "setup.py" directly can easily be migrated to "build", even without "build" being a standard package.

You are missing that the main part of the modernization of the build system, for which I asked "build" to become a standard package, is to replace our current use of "pip wheel" for this purpose. That's a long-standing item (<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/issues/34590>; opened Sep 2022) in my work over the years to bring the building and installation of Python packages in the Sage distribution to best practices.

> Most developers should never need the "build" module (neither directly nor indirectly) [...]

That's true for most of our packages that are dependencies; this observation has no argumentative value.

> Also I don't see how this proposal is any different than the other one that has been discussed before.

It is not different and did not have to be. As I said, I re-ran it because the last time it was interrupted by distractions.

Date: Mon, 15 Apr 2024 10:32:58 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: Proposal (redo): Make python_build (and its dependency pyproject_hooks) a standard package

On Sunday, April 14, 2024 at 3:27:32 PM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

On 14 April 2024 19:14:51 BST, Matthias Koeppe <matthia...@gmail.com> wrote:

>[...] I also collected the sage-devel threads in which packages

>were proposed to be added as standard packages, following our project's

>procedures:

This is not an answer. I would like an explanation why Sage the distro has to grow the bloat at ever increasing speed, why you think it is sustainable, but, most of all, why "batteries included" is meaningful in 2024, and why these procedures must stay as they are.

This demand is inappropriate in this thread. I have been very clear about this.
All, please refrain from engaging with these distractions.

I understand that some macOS users [...]

The topic of this thread has absolutely nothing to do with macOS.

Date: Mon, 15 Apr 2024 10:49:17 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Proposal (redo): Make pytest, pytest_xdist, pytest_mock standard packages

We added the packages as optional "pip" packages (see <https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/developer/packaging#package-types> for the terminology), each more than 1 year ago.

- <https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/reference/spkg/pytest#spkg-pytest> (added in 2020)

- https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/reference/spkg/pytest_mock#spkg-pytest-mock (added in 2022)
- https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/reference/spkg/pytest_xdist#spkg-pytest-xdist (added in 2022)

"pytest" is the current gold standard for running tests of Python packages. Various standard packages in the Sage distribution already declare pytest in "dependencies_check" as a conditional dependency for use when SAGE_CHECK=yes is set. By making pytest a standard package, I would hope to help revive the effort to make Sage compatible with pytest, largely stalled after 2022 as the main author shifted his focus to other modes of impact on Sage development. This is part of a larger effort to "adopt mainstream Python testing/linting infrastructure" (see <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/issues/28936>). The other `pytest_*` packages are related technical packages.

I'm proposing to make them standard packages. Per our policy, they will be normal (wheel) packages. The PR is in <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37301>

This is a re-do of my proposal <https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/MIU-xo9b7pc/m/NsyUa7iXAgAJ> whose discussion was stalled by commenters bundling it with political demands.

Reminder to all to please stay focused on what is proposed here and not allow the discussion to be derailed by distractions. This public proposal to make them standard is according to the procedures in our developer guide: <https://doc.sagemath.org/html/en/developer/packaging.html#inclusion-procedure-for-new-and-updated-packages>

Date: Sat, 27 Apr 2024 11:39:32 -0700 (PDT) (Note: we approved this message but offered suggestions in an email to Matthias included below)

Subject: Re: Proposal (redo): Make `python_build` (and its dependency `pyproject_hooks`) a standard package

An update: <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37300>, which implemented what I proposed here, was positively reviewed (thanks, François!) and has been merged in the latest beta, 10.4.beta4.

Many thanks to all who participated in this poll. It's an illustration

- (1) that participation in our community matters, and
- (2) that keeping proper focus in discussions matters.

My work over the years to bring the building and installation of Python packages in the Sage distribution to best practices can now proceed.

The next step (in preparation since 2022):

- "Use `pypa/build` instead of `pip wheel`" (<https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/35618>, needs review)

On Tuesday, April 9, 2024 at 8:44:36 PM UTC-7 Matthias Koeppel wrote:

> We added `python_build` as an optional "pip" package (see <https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/developer/packaging#package-types> for the terminology),

> - https://deploy-livedoc--sagemath.netlify.app/html/en/reference/spkg/python_build#spkg-python-build (added in 2022).

> "`python_build`" (a.k.a. `pypa/build`) is the current standard front-end for making source distributions and wheels from a Python source tree. It has replaced the deprecated practices of calling "`setup.py sdist`" or "`setup.py bdist_wheel`" directly. We already use it for building the modularized distribution packages. Making it a standard package will allow us to modernize the build infrastructure (front-end) for the Sage library in the Sage distribution.

> I'm proposing to make it a standard package according to the procedures in our developer guide. Per our policy, that's a "normal" package, so its dependency `pyproject_hooks` will also be added. The PR is prepared in <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37300>

> This is a re-do of my proposal <https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/MIU-xo9b7pc/m/NsyUa7iXAgAJ> whose discussion was stalled by commenters bundling it with political demands.

Date: Fri, 31 May 2024 10:22:36 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Proposal (redo): Make `pytest`, `pytest_mock`, `pytest_xdist` + dependencies standard packages

On Friday, May 31, 2024 at 9:38:30 AM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

- > it's just pure bloat [...] their peripheral role [...] `pytest` might get a part which
- > needs Rust [...] Have another fight [...]

All of the above are "fear, uncertainty, and doubt" markers; I will not respond to such.

Date: Mon, 3 Jun 2024 16:55:46 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: Current status of possibility of integrating libraries written in Rust into Sage

On Monday, June 3, 2024 at 4:43:35 PM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

> On Monday, June 3, 2024 at 9:10:56 PM UTC+1 Matthias Koeppel wrote:

>> On Monday, June 3, 2024 at 12:41:41 PM UTC-7 Michael Orlitzky wrote:

>>> Rust is not nearly as portable as C, and has an unstable ABI that makes

>>> shipping compatible versions of packages from multiple sources nearly

>>> impossible.

>> I share this concern about ABI compatibility, and would therefore for now like a policy that restricts the use of such binary packages to

>> - optional packages

>> - semi-standard, i.e., "disabable", packages such as the Jupyter frontend.

> How about not inventing more "semi-", "quasi-", etc. here,

This is inappropriate rhetoric.

As you know, I'm describing an existing mechanism of the build system of the Sage distribution.

("./configure --disable-notebook")

> and just go on with my proposal to allow standard pip packages?

This proposal, repeated already many times by you, makes no technical sense.

These types of packages are not suitable for the role that you imagine to give them.

Date: Thu, 6 Jun 2024 14:37:34 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: [Proposal] allow standard packages to be pip packages, reduce source tarball size

On Thursday, June 6, 2024 at 2:33:00 PM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

On 6 June 2024 18:06:53 BST, Matthias Koeppel <matthia...@gmail.com> wrote:

>On Thursday, June 6, 2024 at 3:56:15AM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

>Talking about it as something "underdeveloped in Sage" is a bit strange,

>these are just well-known features and deficiencies of pip.

>

>You are missing the point: We cannot build something that is expected to be

>robust on top of this automated use of "pip", to install and update

>packages one by one, in the Sage distribution.

Why? E.g. scipy/numpy and sympy do not hoard compilers, do not ship a vendored Jupyter, or pytest, or Sphinx, or matplotlib, or OpenBLAS - yet are popular and successful - and thus robust, I presume.

It seems that you are missing the point of how to build a successful project, by demanding that we don't follow the normal Python practices, as these are "not robust".

What are you even talking about?

These projects do not provide software distributions.

The Sage project provides a software distribution.

We are discussing the use of pip in the build system of the software distribution.

Date: Thu, 6 Jun 2024 15:58:49 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: [Proposal] allow standard packages to be pip packages, reduce source tarball size

On Thursday, June 6, 2024 at 2:33:00 PM UTC-7 Dima Pasechnik wrote:

And thus you are dragging us into becoming a full-fledged distribution, no?

Every Sage user knows that the Sage distribution has always been a full-fledged software distribution.

Date: Sat, 3 Aug 2024 23:48:58 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: [sage-devel] Re: Sage-10.4 fails to build

On Friday, August 2, 2024 at 12:46:31 PM UTC-7 dim...@gmail.com wrote:

> On Fri, Aug 02, 2024 at 09:40:03AM -0700, Matthias Koeppel wrote:

>> According to your log, this is a build failure using the experimental

>> option `"./configure --enable-system-site-packages"`.

>>

>> This failure comes from use of system NumPy 2; try with

>> <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/38227>, which has a fix.

> This is already fixed in 10.5.beta0

> which includes

> <https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/38250>

> and is enough to allow system-wide numpy 2.0

No, that's not true.

Date: Tue, 13 Aug 2024 13:14:29 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Re: message marked as off topic

Necessary reminder that sage-devel is a professional forum.

It's not a place for public displays of hostility.

https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT.md

Exchanges about these messages

First thread

Julian, April 17, 2:00PM PDT

Dear Matthias,

We rejected three of your emails to sage-devel earlier this week, here is an explanation about our objections. In each case, we ask that you change your phrasing to be more friendly, in accordance with the first item in the Code of Conduct. We are aware that Dima and Tobias' writing has not been held to this standard previously; we are working to do so going forward, especially on sage-devel where many more people are exposed to it.

Here are some concrete explanations for how these messages are not friendly.

- In your first email, the phrase "this observation has no argumentative value" dismisses Tobias' comment as irrelevant or worthless. Even if you feel that way, expressing it both escalates the conflict and sets a bad tone for everyone else who is reading this exchange. Please rephrase this sentence, and we will let this message through.
- Your second email is unfriendly in several ways. Using "demand" and "inappropriate" is confrontational. You come across as aggressive and overly authoritative, which is the opposite of welcoming. The phrase "I have been very clear about this" shows a lack of patience. We understand that your patience has been tried over the last year, but we still ask that you work to show it in this venue. Finally, the instruction to "All, please refrain from engaging with these distractions" comes across as commanding and controlling. We suggest phrasing this request positively instead, such as "I ask everyone to focus on the specifics of the original proposal." Please rephrase this sentence, and we will let this message through.
- In your third email, the phrase "whose discussion was stalled by commenters bundling it with political demands" is unnecessarily confrontational. We suggest omitting it, or phrasing it more neutrally like "where the discussion got off-topic." Similarly, "Reminder to all to please stay focused" would be better as "I ask that everyone stay focused." Please make these changes and we will let this message through.

Regarding your recent messages to the CoCC where terms like "ASAP" and "immediately" were used to expedite your request, we want to assure you that we are committed to supporting the community as best we can. Naturally, our capacity is limited. Though we are volunteers, we are putting a lot of effort into this. Writing drafts and discussing the way forward until 8 in the morning just to give you an extreme example. We manage requests based on availability and urgency, not through orders, and we appreciate your understanding and cooperation in maintaining a respectful and collaborative environment.

The SageMath Code of Conduct Committee

Matthias, April 17, 4:35PM PDT

On Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM Julian R  th <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:

> We rejected three of your emails to sage-devel earlier this week, here
> is an explanation about our objections. In each case, we ask that you
> change your phrasing to be more friendly, in accordance with the first
> item in the Code of Conduct. We are aware that Dima and Tobias' writing
> has not been held to this standard previously; we are working to do so
> going forward, especially on sage-devel where many more people are
> exposed to it.

Note that as a user of the Google Groups web interface I am neither getting a notice of what happened with my messages, nor do I have access to them when they are held instead of being posted. If you have copies, I'd appreciate receiving them.

> Here are some concrete explanations for how these messages are not
> friendly. [...]

Thanks for sharing your style suggestions.

> * In your first email, the phrase "this observation has no argumentative
> value" dismisses Tobias' comment as irrelevant or worthless. Even if you
> feel that way, expressing it both escalates the conflict

It does not escalate anything. Tobias routinely and deliberately uses bad-faith arguments to mislead the audience; that's his well-documented M.O.

> * Your second email is unfriendly in several ways. Using "demand" and
> "inappropriate" is confrontational.

Yes, it confronts the bully by calling out his repeated attempt to manipulate the decision process.

What is actually problematic: That no one else is calling it out, allowing the manipulation to proceed. Governance by bullying and manipulation is what is damaging the project.

> Finally, the
> instruction to "All, please refrain from engaging with these
> distractions" comes across as commanding and controlling. We suggest
> phrasing this request positively instead, such as "I ask everyone to
> focus on the specifics of the original proposal."

Oh, that's a nice rephrasing, I take it. Free of charge?

> Regarding your recent messages to the CoCC where terms like "ASAP" and
> "immediately" were used to expedite your request, we want to assure you [...]
> We manage requests based on availability and urgency, not through orders,
> and we appreciate your understanding and cooperation in maintaining a
> respectful and collaborative environment.

I can reassure you that they are not "orders"; but you seem to have missed my point that there is a persistent problem with extremely uneven responses and response times that *cannot* be explained by workload and are very hard for me to distinguish from adversariality.

Best,
Matthias

Second thread
Julian, May 2 4:42PM EDT
Dear Matthias,

We have some comments regarding your message to sage-devel that contained

- > Many thanks to all who participated in this poll. It's an illustration
- > (1) that participation in our community matters, and
- > (2) that keeping proper focus in discussions matters.

The message seems professional and informative. For the most part, it effectively communicates updates on project development and appreciates contributions from others. However, some might interpret the lines about the importance of participation and maintaining focus as slightly preachy or patronizing if they are sensitive to tone, especially since there's existing tension or disagreements within the community. We let the message go through, but in the future you might consider softening these statements to ensure they are received as intended.

The SageMath Code of Conduct Committee

Matthias, May 2 5:49PM EDT

Dear Julian and committee,

On Thu, May 2, 2024 at 1:42 PM Julian R  th <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:

- > We have some comments regarding your message to sage-devel that contained
- >
- > > Many thanks to all who participated in this poll. It's an illustration
- > > (1) that participation in our community matters, and
- > > (2) that keeping proper focus in discussions matters.
- >
- > The message seems professional and informative. For the most part, it
- > effectively communicates updates on project development and appreciates
- > contributions from others.

That's correct.

- > However, some might interpret the lines about
- > the importance of participation and maintaining focus as slightly
- > preachy or patronizing [...]

I think there is a fundamental misunderstanding somewhere that needs to be resolved.

This is called "leadership". I'm leading the project.

I repeat my invitation to the committee to support me in my leadership to build an inclusive community.

The response to my Apr 12 message "(Re-)building an inclusive SageMath community. II: Recognizing and fighting abuse, bullying, disrespect" (<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/xBza1NHWwUQ>), "The Sage Code of Conduct Committee shares the goal of making sage development welcoming and pleasant." did not do anything helpful in this regard.

Matthias

Third thread

Julian, June 9 8:05pm EDT

Dear Matthias,

We decided to reject your recent message to sage-devel.

As we said in our call, we would like you not to make absolute statements such as "this is inappropriate rhetoric" that also convey a position of authority in your messages to sage-devel.

Statements such as 'repeated already many times by you,' and 'makes no technical sense,' might come across as dismissive and discourage open communication.

We also rejected your message saying "All of the above are "fear, uncertainty, and doubt" markers; I will not respond to

such.” This comes across as uncollaborative. You make a proposal and you reject the first response you get with a quite unfriendly rejection.

The SageMath Code of Conduct Committee

Matthias, June 9 8:14pm

Don't send me stuff like this any more, people.

Matthias, June 11 6:05pm

Hi committee,

Below I'll explain it to you once more.

On Sun, Jun 9, 2024 at 5:05 PM Julian R  th <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:

> As we said in our call, we would like you not to make absolute
> statements such as “this is inappropriate rhetoric” that also convey a
> position of authority in your messages to sage-devel.

Once again, people, I obviously have the position of authority.
I consider any further attempts to continue your gaslighting as harassment.

> Statements such as 'repeated already many times by you,' and 'makes no
> technical sense,' might come across as dismissive and discourage open
> communication. We also rejected your message saying “All of the above are "fear,
> uncertainty, and doubt" markers; I will not respond to such.” This comes
> across as uncollaborative. You make a proposal and you reject the first
> response you get with a quite unfriendly rejection.

Wrong, and comically irresponsible to send me, the target of abuse,
such messages.
To paraphrase "You should be happy that the abuser gives you attention!"

Just don't any more.

Matthias

Julian, June 14 5:20pm

Dear Matthias,

In accordance with your request, we will no longer send you notices when
your messages are rejected in moderation.

The SageMath Code of Conduct Committee

Matthias, June 14 5:22pm

Did I have to mention: "Don't mock me?"

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sage-conduct" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sage-conduct+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sage-conduct/CAJ_wo5juHsX3f3%2BRb25GJ8PkOnGQoPzBao9BU7Z%3DhPmzmFMg9w%40mail.gmail.com.
For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CACHs6_mT210beJ%3DxRYm__5JJHApkxR1O8fmk%2B--NaoY3aXAuvw%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 8:08 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

David, that you are disclosing the confidential communication between the committee and me is yet another severe violation.
Unbelievable.

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 8:24 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

The list of missing messages from David Roe's message is not complete.

A responsible member of the committee please provide a factual report as requested.

[Quoted text hidden]

ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 11:21 PM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: sagemath-admins <sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>

Hi,

I happen to be in this list and perhaps belong to the third party in this dispute. Instead of being silent, I share my thoughts, hoping to be helpful.

All items begin with "I think".

1. CoCC started as an authority to regulate behaviors of the members within community. CoCC has the authority to moderate the sage-devel list.
2. Matthias' sentences on sage-devel reported here seem to be acceptable. His statements sometimes sound dismissive, but they are mostly technical.
3. It was a mistake of CoCC to try to filter out "unfriendly" messages. No one can keep friendly tone while fighting. It was enough to filter out personal attacks.
4. Matthias is leading the project in many ways. But he has no official position in the community, and has no authority to demand more control over the project.
5. There is no individual in our community that may have the leadership in building an inclusive SageMath community. Operation of CoCC may help.

Kwankyu

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/29e1be09-5fa4-4b03-910b-3ffa3a7ac18en%40googlegroups.com>.

Matthias Koepppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 11:31 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

On Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 11:21 PM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:
> 5. There is no individual in our community that may have the leadership in building an inclusive SageMath community.

I disagree. Leadership is something that responsible individuals step up to. It does not take an "appointment" to do so.
I have been exercising this leadership in the project by analyzing for example in my series of sage-devel posts, and by speaking up clearly when individuals violate the principles of the community by disrespect, disinformation, and hostility.

[Quoted text hidden]

ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: [sagemath-admins](mailto:sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com) <sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Aug 30, 2024 at 12:53 AM

On Friday, August 30, 2024 at 3:31:22 PM UTC+9 matthias@koeppe.de wrote:

On Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 11:21 PM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:
> 5. There is no individual in our community that may have the leadership in building an inclusive SageMath community.

I disagree. Leadership is something that responsible individuals step up to. It does not take an "appointment" to do so.
I have been exercising this leadership in the project by analyzing for example in my series of sage-devel posts, and by speaking up clearly when individuals violate the principles of the community by disrespect, disinformation, and hostility.

Yes in that sense. But as the same sort of violations are claimed onto yourself, right or wrong, I don't see your leadership respected by the community.

I think a body like CoCC, not an individual, should do the job.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/4f6a5803-ff92-4b23-bcf5-48d19ba66d41n%40googlegroups.com>.

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: [sagemath-admins](mailto:sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com) <sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Aug 30, 2024 at 1:14 AM

On Fri, Aug 30, 2024 at 7:31 AM Matthias Koeppe
<mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

>
> On Thu, Aug 29, 2024 at 11:21 PM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:
> > 5. There is no individual in our community that may have the leadership in building an inclusive SageMath community.
>
> I disagree. Leadership is something that responsible individuals step
> up to. It does not take an "appointment" to do so.
> I have been exercising this leadership in the project by analyzing for
> example in my series of sage-devel posts, and by speaking up clearly
> when individuals violate the principles of the community by
> disrespect, disinformation, and hostility.

Matthias,

You are merely leading in furthering your own agenda, joined by few others at most.

Your agenda includes taking justice in your own hands, as it includes pushing out the individuals who disagree with you, and whom you find disrespectful, lying, hostile, etc.

Note: whom YOU find disrespectful, lying, hostile, etc., not the community you claim to be leading.

That's the gangster level of leadership, or worse.

Dima

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAWYfq0%2BTpCh3-JM1YDh7y_PqJ%2B6rPAiaQ9i2pvTxs_3zX9O1A%40mail.gmail.com.

John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 5:55 PM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com

The committee regularly discusses the actions we take, including the message sent by David. Matthias asked for the list of blocked messages to be sent to this closed forum, and we included the surrounding discussion to give an explanation of why they were blocked, as well as why we did not provide notification in some cases. We do not believe that this inclusion was inappropriate.

The list of moderated messages is complete to the best of our knowledge. If anyone knows of other messages that have not gone through, please tell us what they are. We have been made aware of some cases where Google's spam filter blocked messages and those messages can show up as "deleted" in a google-group, even though there never was a message there.

As for whether to enforce a friendly tone during arguments, we have received multiple complaints about the discourse on sage-devel, including from people who say it makes them less inclined to participate in the project and that they would not suggest joining the project to their graduate students. There are thousands of people on the list, and friendliness is the first item in the code of conduct. We have aimed to offer suggestions to Matthias about ways that he can improve his communication, to little avail. More broadly, the Code of Conduct does not just forbid personal attacks but also requires people to be friendly, polite, and respectful; this may help to explain why the Committee took these actions. Finally, the most recent email rejecting David's response and asking for a "responsible member" of the committee to reply implies that David is not responsible. One could view this as a personal attack and so another code violation.

John

for the Code of Conduct Committee

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sage-conduct" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sage-conduct+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sage-conduct/CAJ_w05ho9EDJyL5PcK6xicPj6Q04NKBFugaCsg8Egyt9072%3Dtw%40mail.gmail.com.

For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAHNEuZyxgmhkC7FJ%2B9JNUOJxr1f%3D0cD81ZHb6Tj8%3DZqojYwd%3Dw%40mail.gmail.com>.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 7:46 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 5:56 PM John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> The committee regularly discusses the actions we take, including the message sent by David. Matthias asked for the list of blocked messages to be sent to this closed forum, and we included the surrounding discussion to give an explanation of why they were blocked, as well as why we did not provide notification in some cases. We do not believe that this inclusion was inappropriate.

John, also some of my messages to the committee were included, which is obviously a severe violation.

"We don't believe" -- that's just not good enough.

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 8:24 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 5:56 PM John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com> wrote:

> Finally, the most recent email rejecting David's response and asking for a "responsible member" of the committee to reply implies that David is not responsible. One could view this as a personal attack and so another code violation.

David's message (on behalf of the committee, or so it said) not only disclosed the confidential communication -- this is the obvious irresponsible and inexcusable misconduct. Trying to twist my calling out this irresponsible conduct as a "personal attack" -- this is just shameless and fits fully in the overall picture of the disrespect that the committee has shown me throughout this process.

(I'll expand on this later.)

[Quoted text hidden]

Jan Groenewald <jan.groenewald@gmail.com>

Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 10:43 PM

Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sage-conduct@googlegroups.com)

Dear all,

Thank you to everyone for their contribution to Making SageMath Great Again :)

The issue reported (10 days and 25 messages ago) on this private group is

- "severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel list"

with a requested solution of

- "immediate and permanent admin access to sage-devel"

Our code of conduct suggests mediation at this point, imho.

Respect,

Jan

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAJ_wo5j46rT4mcP_NLFFNbnn-zgRnu1T1KpXKzr-CoD-oebfug%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAA%3Dp_3fdVug0r1xBEXpV14XLwvwtGoisAFDWEEa6vbD6au5-A%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sun, Sep 1, 2024 at 11:32 AM

Thanks, Jan.

I'll note that there is a much larger governance concern beyond the scope of my initial message regarding sage-devel, as I hinted: with "severe concerns about the ability of the sage-conduct committee to carry out its duties, including its self-governance".

We elected a CoC committee with a clear and narrow scope that is described in https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT.md and https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT_COMMITTEE.md

The governance/administration of sage-devel, the GitHub organization, and the other technical facilities has been in the hands of project volunteers who stepped up to this role, and coordination between responsible parties -- and accountability -- has been done informally via the sagemath-admins list. For example, sage-devel was owned by David Roe (and possibly others -- this was not public information).

All of the following are highly questionable just from an "admin" governance perspective:

- That the CoCC installed itself as the sole Owners of sage-devel -- without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community about it.

- That these list admins ignore essential duties of list administration; for now I'll just mention my Jun 30 request for a data dump for migration purposes

<https://groups.google.com/g/sagemath-admins/c/JYQvCEqXzwg>

- That my call for admin access to sage-devel is answered with the assumption that CoCC has the authority to deny this request.

- That my call for admin access to sage-devel is answered by doxxing and denunciations.

- That the CoCC installed one of its members as Owner of the sagemath GitHub organization

(<https://github.com/orgs/sagemath/people?query=role%3Aowner>) -- without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community about it. (I have to note that the Owner role comes with extreme powers and, purely from an admin perspective, only people with

sufficient technical expertise should ever be elevated to it.)
- That members of the CoCC at multiple times removed me for various periods of time from my role as Owner of the sagemath GitHub organization -- without consulting with or even notifying sagemath-admins, and without arranging for a replacement that would tend to the numerous regular Maintainer duties that I carry out on behalf of the project.

Matthias

On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 10:44 PM Jan Groenewald
<jan.groenewald@gmail.com> wrote:
> The issue reported (10 days and 25 messages ago) on this private group is
>
> "severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel
> list"
>
> with a requested solution of
>
> "immediate and permanent admin access to sage-devel"
>
> Our code of conduct suggests mediation at this point, imho.
>

[Quoted text hidden]

ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: [sagemath-admins](mailto:sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com) <sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>

Mon, Sep 2, 2024 at 11:37 PM

We elected a CoC committee with a clear and narrow scope that is described in https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT.md and https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT_COMMITTEE.md

Yes.

- That the CoCC installed itself as the sole Owners of sage-devel -- without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community about it.

CoCC being the sole owner of sage-devel is reasonable for its operation.

Was there a plan of migration of sage-devel to discourse? Was this discussed on sage-devel? I only remember a discussion about ask.sagemath.org.

- That these list admins ignore essential duties of list administration; for now I'll just mention my Jun 30 request for a data dump for migration purposes
<https://groups.google.com/g/sagemath-admins/c/JYQvCEqXzwwg>

As a responsible body, CoCC should have answered the request.

On the other hand, what are other essential duties of list administration out of the scope of CoCC operation?

- That my call for admin access to sage-devel is answered with the assumption that CoCC has the authority to deny this request.

Did CoCC get the ownership of the list sage-devel through any sage-devel discussion or sagemath-admins discussion?

If not, I think it should. I think this should be done through a bootstrapping procedure, something like I list below:

1. The list sagemath-admins attain all rights on resources of the sagemath community by a vote on sage-devel. The same vote acknowledges the members of the list.
2. The list sagemath-admins decide on issues by majority voting.
3. The list sagemath-admins endow the operational rights of the sage-devel list to CoCC.

- That the CoCC installed one of its members as Owner of the sagemath GitHub organization (<https://github.com/orgs/sagemath/people?query=role%3Aowner>) -- without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community about it. (I have to note that the Owner role comes with extreme powers and, purely from an admin perspective, only people with sufficient technical expertise should ever be elevated to it.)

4. By a request of CoCC, the list sagemath-admins may allow one member of CoCC to have necessary rights for CoCC operation.
5. The list sagemath-admins designates a few people as the owners of GitHub organization for technical operations and maintenance.

Personally I think Matthias deserves to be one of the owners.

- That members of the CoCC at multiple times removed me for various periods of time from my role as Owner of the sagemath GitHub organization -- without consulting with or even notifying sagemath-admins, and without arranging for a replacement that would tend to the numerous regular Maintainer duties that I carry out on behalf of the project.

6. The list sagemath-admins can give and deprive of the rights that a member or a body of members attained on the community resources, after discussion and voting.
7. Members of the list sagemath-admins can be updated by a vote on sage-devel.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/c190bb72-4728-4d03-bbf8-cb2f2de8c6ban%40googlegroups.com>.

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 12:21 AM

I was removed from admin roles on sagemath repos and google groups due to the conflict started last year.
It's only fair that Matthias was removed from similar roles, for the same reason.

I don't think he should ever get any of these rights back, without me getting the rights stripped from me back, and while keeping GitHub blocks on other sagemath developers.

Indeed, I don't think anyone blocking on GitHub any sagemath developer should hold these admin roles, as such a person shows an obvious personal bias, which automatically disqualifies them.

Dima

[Quoted text hidden]

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAWYfq3AfxDgHuT2OmrMkQ9mp1%2B4Z0V7JsPAUsWTV8p%2BLSJ%2B4Q%40mail.gmail.com>.

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct@googlegroups.com

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 12:57 AM

On Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 5:22AM Matthias Koeppel <mkoeppel@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:

- >
- > Thanks, Jan.
- >
- > I'll note that there is a much larger governance concern beyond the
- > scope of my initial message regarding sage-devel, as I hinted: with
- > "severe concerns about the ability of the sage-conduct committee to
- > carry out its duties, including its self-governance".
- >
- > We elected a CoC committee with a clear and narrow scope that is
- > described in https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT.md
- > and https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT_COMMITTEE.md
- >
- > The governance/administration of sage-devel, the GitHub organization,
- > and the other technical facilities has been in the hands of project
- > volunteers who stepped up to this role, and coordination between
- > responsible parties -- and accountability -- has been done informally
- > via the sagemath-admins list. For example, sage-devel was owned by
- > David Roe (and possibly others -- this was not public information).
- >
- > All of the following are highly questionable just from an "admin"
- > governance perspective:
- > - That the CoCC installed itself as the sole Owners of sage-devel --
- > without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community
- > about it.

this is reasonable, as it needs to perform moderation.

It's also reasonable that the persons *under moderation* are not Owners.

- > - That these list admins ignore essential duties of list
- > administration; for now I'll just mention my Jun 30 request for a data
- > dump for migration purposes
- > <https://groups.google.com/g/sagemath-admins/c/JYQvCEqXzwg>

There is no such option on Google Groups, to do a data dump of a group.
No matter how many strongly worded requests...

- > - That my call for admin access to sage-devel is answered with the
- > assumption that CoCC has the authority to deny this request.

Obviously a person under moderation in a group cannot at the same time
be an admin of the group.

You are welcome to resolve the conflicts which placed you under moderation,
only then such requests may be considered.

- > - That my call for admin access to sage-devel is answered by doxxing
- > and denunciations.
- > - That the CoCC installed one of its members as Owner of the sagemath
- > GitHub organization
- > (<https://github.com/orgs/sagemath/people?query=role%3Aowner>) --
- > without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community
- > about it. (I have to note that the Owner role comes with extreme
- > powers and, purely from an admin perspective, only people with
- > sufficient technical expertise should ever be elevated to it.)

Are you demanding examination of technical skills of Owners?
Will you be the judge, too?

- > - That members of the CoCC at multiple times removed me for various
- > periods of time from my role as Owner of the sagemath GitHub
- > organization -- without consulting with or even notifying
- > sagemath-admins, and without arranging for a replacement that would
- > tend to the numerous regular Maintainer duties that I carry out on
- > behalf of the project.

You have triggered a conflict which threatened to seriously derail the project, and are now engaging in a war of words with CoCC. It's only fair that you were removed from various powerful responsibilities, pending resolution of these conflicts.

Dima

>
> Matthias
>
> On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 10:44 PM Jan Groenewald
> <jan.groenewald@gmail.com> wrote:
> > The issue reported (10 days and 25 messages ago) on this private group is
> >
> > "severe concerns about the administration of the sage-devel
> > list"
> >
> > with a requested solution of
> >
> > "immediate and permanent admin access to sage-devel"
> >
> > Our code of conduct suggests mediation at this point, imho.
> >
> > On Sun, 1 Sept 2024 at 05:24, Matthias Koeppel <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >> On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 5:56 PM John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com> wrote:
> >> > Finally, the most recent email rejecting David's response and asking for a "responsible member" of the committee to reply implies that David is not responsible. One could view this as a personal attack and so another code violation.
> >>
> >> David's message (on behalf of the committee, or so it said) not only
> >> disclosed the confidential communication -- this is the obvious
> >> irresponsible and inexcusable misconduct. Trying to twist my calling
> >> out this irresponsible conduct as a "personal attack" -- this is just
> >> shameless and fits fully in the overall picture of the disrespect that
> >> the committee has shown me throughout this process.
> >> (I'll expand on this later.)
>
>
>
> --
> Dr. Matthias Koeppel <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe>
> Professor of Mathematics
>
> --
>
> ---
> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
> To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
> To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAJ_wo5hz1X4Vm-NP8ZdTTB2QGjGt0rh24b8A9WToEqZKgXLmPg%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAWYfq2GBN53KXEyO%2BKd9J3N_tibYXJQnvyr_2umk%3DM19WgC2w%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 10:54 AM

On Mon, Sep 2, 2024 at 11:37 PM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> We elected a CoC committee with a clear and narrow scope that is
> described in https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT.md
> and https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT_COMMITTEE.md
>
> Yes.
>
> - That the CoCC installed itself as the sole Owners of sage-devel --
> without consulting with or even notifying anyone in the community
> about it.
>
> CoCC being the sole owner of sage-devel is reasonable for its operation.

I agree that it *could* make sense if so decided by the community, but
it certainly does not work when the CoCC, as currently, operates
without any mechanism for accountability.

Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 11:00 AM

On Mon, Sep 2, 2024 at 11:37 PM ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com> wrote:
> Was there a plan of migration of sage-devel to discourse? Was this discussed on sage-devel? I only remember a
discussion about ask.sagemath.org.

I suggested it in my Jul 1 message
<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/9uX5j4x1Nsg/m/Z9nnIB8jAQAj>,
but there was no reaction to it.
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 11:04 AM

Off-topic:
Exporting Google Groups data is documented in
<https://support.google.com/groups/answer/9975859?hl=en>
[Quoted text hidden]

ekwankyu@gmail.com <ekwankyu@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins <sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>

Tue, Sep 3, 2024 at 6:52 PM

On Wednesday, September 4, 2024 at 3:00:17AM UTC+9 matthiaskoeppe wrote:
On Mon, Sep 2, 2024 at 11:37 PM ekwa...@gmail.com <ekwa...@gmail.com> wrote:
> Was there a plan of migration of sage-devel to discourse? Was this discussed on sage-devel? I only remember a
discussion about ask.sagemath.org.

I suggested it in my Jul 1 message
<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/9uX5j4x1Nsg/m/Z9nnIB8jAQAj>,
but there was no reaction to it.

sage-devel was mentioned in a parenthesized phrase. That is hardly a discussion. No wonder that there was no action to
it.

Off-topic: I don't think there is a need to migrate sage-devel or sage-support. If necessary, we may setup parallel discourse site, and at some point retire (archive) those google groups.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/463009cf-66d8-48c1-be66-607ad9afdc9an%40googlegroups.com>.

Matthias Koepe <mkoepe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 1:50 PM

To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com

Cc: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com, [sage-conduct <sage-conduct@sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com>](mailto:sage-conduct@sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com)

On Sat, Aug 31, 2024 at 5:56 PM John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com> wrote:

> [...] friendliness is the first item in the code of conduct. We have aimed to offer suggestions to Matthias about ways that he can improve his communication, to little avail. More broadly, the Code of Conduct does not just forbid personal attacks but also requires people to be friendly, polite, and respectful; this may help to explain why the Committee took these actions.

Hardly, John.

1. First of all, the "moderation" that I have been subjected to by the CoCC obviously exceeds the committee's authority. It is obvious that none of my messages that have been deleted constitute CoCC violations by any stretch of imagination.

2. I have been the target of persistent abuse by Pasechnik, happening in plain sight in sage-devel and our other public forums, and reported numerous times in detail to the committee. The committee is refusing to (a) take the necessary steps to ensure that no further such abuse happens; (b) take suitable affirmative steps to repair the damage already done.

- The messages posted just here in this thread are emblematic of the situation. In various messages Pasechnik again makes hostile denunciations in plain sight -- without any reaction by the CoCC representatives who have been participating here. (Instead, CoCC members participate themselves in making denunciations.)

- Moreover, I have to note that I have to doubt the truthfulness of even the very sparse and vague declarations that CoCC made in response to my Apr 30, 2024, question: "Will the committee be able to give me any indication how much longer I am expected to endure daily public denunciations and hostility by Pasechnik and others; or what purpose it serves to allow it?"

3. Given that CoCC has not communicated with our community in any essential way, probably community members are assuming that CoCC is operating on the basis of our Code of Conduct and the CoCC guidelines (https://github.com/sagemath/sage/blob/develop/CODE_OF_CONDUCT_COMMITTEE.md). But without any consultation with the community, the CoCC has been enacting a harmful `_policy_` that conflicts with the common understanding of how to handle matters of conduct.

- a) CoCC enacts an amoral policy that actively denies any distinction between abusive conduct and being the target of abuse, between spreading disinformation and calling out disinformation, and between calling out misconduct and making false accusations, summarizing all under the terms "conflict", "dispute", "acrimony".
- b) CoCC denies targets of abuse the necessary support.
- c) CoCC declares that individual community members (or perhaps just I?) have no authority to exercise moral leadership in our community.
- d) CoCC doubles down on the actions and words of its members, no

matter what and never corrects its past actions and declarations even when it learns about new facts.

e) CoCC ignores requests that committee members recuse themselves or step down because of their documented and obvious misconduct.

4. John's explanation why I am put on "moderation" on sage-devel is not truthful.

- The "moderation" was enacted on April 10, 2024, with the vague message from David Roe "the committee shares your goal of making the Sage community a friendlier and more inclusive place. The discussion in this thread (<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/Wjw2wcvgf8k/m/j8LnywmsAQAJ>) did the opposite. The language you used violated the Code of Conduct. We have added moderation to your sage-devel posts as a temporary measure."

- Only after numerous requests, the committee (Julian Rüth) provided the explanation on May 2, 2024: "In <https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/Wjw2wcvgf8k/m/KWpNXtVwAAAJ> we asked you to refrain from certain allegations. We see these allegations as a clear breach of the CoC. You responded by lecturing the CoCC and insisting on your point. This kind of insistence in public is not acceptable and together with the surrounding acrimony was reported by several members of the community. To protect the community and the public image of SageMath from such posts in the future, we put you on moderation. We're sorry for the inconvenience, but as soon as we see that your posts or replies no longer are the scene of breach of CoC, we'll lift this temporary measure."

- In other words, through the "moderation" of my messages, the committee seeks to enforce its illegitimate, amoral, and harmful policy. It does not enforce the CoC.

These harmful practices by the CoCC will have to end immediately.

I urge the committee to step down.

In the meantime, I will take over the administration of sage-devel and the other mailing lists currently under control of the CoCC. A responsible CoCC member please transfer Ownership as already

[Quoted text hidden]

Dima Pasechnik <dimpase@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 4:37 PM

[Quoted text hidden]

And as soon as Prof Koeppe takes over the administration of sage-devel etc etc he'll obviously proceed to ban on GitHub and otherwise everyone he does not like, including most if not all members of CoCC, who dared to resist his demands.

It's only logical, isn't it? I am a good example of how Prof Koeppe deals with colleagues who dare to disagree with him.

Dima

>

> --

> Dr. Matthias Koeppe <http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe>

> Professor of Mathematics

>

> --

>

> ---

> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

> To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@

[googlegroups.com](https://groups.google.com).

> To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAJ_wo5jM4W44efv43MZvdqo4M5kFeEKiM9FEac1fsZfTe5y2iw%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAWYfq3UvnGJAgcbVxY8HTJ9bXqR6QQAAb%3Dpr7cf-yKgEntbkYg%40mail.gmail.com>.

Jan Groenewald <jan.groenewald@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 10:41 PM

Dear all,

Thank you to the CoCC and Matthias for their mammoth efforts.

I can't imagine any organization or institution where a CoCC would volunteer to step down as a result of an email conversation such as this.

And no one here wants an "admin war" where parties with equal and absolute admin rights disagree on operations. And given the ad hominem arguments creeping into this conversation, that does seem to be somewhat of a risk.

In my humble opinion, the issues raised and proposed solutions in this conversation cannot, and should not, proceed without either a CoCC decision, or mediation. Feel free to propose another **process** or precedent which could lead to a civil resolution.

Are there any member(s) of the CoCC or sage-devel community (that both the CoCC and Matthias would accept) to mediate, and to make a binding decision? I think it would be reasonable to allow a timeframe somewhere between one week, and one or two months. I have not lately been familiar enough with the community to propose a candidate(s).

First prize would be not losing any core volunteers, and that they come to an amicable agreement. And it probably won't mean that anyone gets entirely "their way", either technically or socially. Seems obvious, but it is easy to lose sight of this when frustration levels are high!

I wish you all a pleasant springtime, as I am in the southern hemisphere ;)

Regards,
Jan

[Quoted text hidden]

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAq%3Dp_3bQq3n31Py0b%3DKVWY%2B-wgOUsqHrCLStK7CxfmYZ85_jQ%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at 12:12 AM

On Fri, Sep 6, 2024 at 10:41 PM Jan Groenewald <jan.groenewald@gmail.com> wrote:

> [...] And it probably won't mean that

> anyone gets entirely "their way", either technically or socially.

> Seems obvious, but it is easy to lose sight of this when frustration levels are high!

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argument_to_moderation

[Quoted text hidden]

Jan Groenewald <jan.groenewald@gmail.com>
Reply-To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at 1:50 AM

Thank you Matthias,

If you are not in support of moderation in this case, which would require your agreement, and have a demand that people step down from positions, and they do not, which seems to be where we are now, then what is next?

It is a sincere question.

Regards,
Jan

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAJ_wo5gcbNnosRT9khrAYWr1EpT2BXkwgm_%2BF%2B1LjwEGB%3Dx7Lw%40mail.gmail.com.

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "sagemath-admins" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to sagemath-admins+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.

To view this discussion on the web visit https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/sagemath-admins/CAAg%3Dp_1LJph3yDZs3kxM2zCuzW%3D0Hwh1jhxWGOBLMoMGtBStPQ%40mail.gmail.com.

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at 5:46 AM

If this is not resolved here on sagemath-admins, the next step, of course, is to resolve it with the full community where CoC was voted on and CoCC was elected, viz., sage-devel.

Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: sagemath-admins@googlegroups.com
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Sat, Sep 7, 2024 at 11:02 AM

The current thread
<https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/cLnRyofH0lw> illustrates the urgency of this matter.

CoCC members are participating in the thread, and denunciations by Pasechnik in <https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/cLnRyofH0lw/m/DHHD8ZmMAgAJ> and <https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/cLnRyofH0lw/m/rVslJESnAgAJ>

are not addressed at all.

[Quoted text hidden]