Authorship/copyright claims by Tobias Diez (Re: Fwd: [sage-abuse] Tobias Diez (again))

12 messages

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Sat, Apr 20, 2024 at 12:43 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>, sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein
<wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun <vbraun.name@gmail.com>

Hi sage-conduct committee and William and Volker:

I have to bring a part of the below, an unresolved issue from
November, to your particular attention.
It is a false claim of authorship by Tobias Diez.
At the time, I had pointed out that it may need separate proceedings
[because such claims reach distinctly into the academic realm].

I'm re-upping this now because of Tobias Diez' present attempts to use
authorship / copyright to control how code from a PR of his is
integrated into Sage --
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37446#issuecomment-2063317419

Including William and Volker here (not sure who else should be
included; please feel free to share as appopriate) because such claims
reach beyond the Code of Conduct Committee's concerns, namely into the
project owners'/maintainers' concerns, as authorship/copyright claims
by contributors pose, if not great legal risk itself, the problem of
doubt of potential users regarding possible legal risk.

We may also have to discuss whether a CLA is necessary, for example
via https://github.com/apps/cla-bot

Best,
Matthias

On Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 5:35 PM Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:
>
> Dear Matthias,
>
> I had a look at the link you shared but could not come to the conclusion
> that the breach (if any) of the Code of Conduct is sufficiently clear
> that I must take immediate action here. [...]
>
> * Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> [2024-04-15 17:17:21 -0700]:
>
> > Resending for reference by the new committee.
> >
> > (I never got a response on this one.)
> >
> > ---------- Forwarded message ---------
> > From: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
> > Date: Sat, Nov 25, 2023 at 8:51 AM
> > Subject: Re: [sage-abuse] Tobias Diez (again)
> > To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
> > Cc: William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, sage-abuse <sage-abuse@googlegroups.com>
> >
> >
> > I'll note that Tobias is continuing with aggression.

> > - https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36753#issuecomment-1826257380
> > (using the painfully familiar
> > "accuse-the-opponent-what-they-are-guilty-of-themselves" technique)
> >
> >
> > On Fri, Nov 24, 2023 at 10:20 AM Matthias Koeppe
> > <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
> > >
> > > Hi David,
> > >
> > > On Fri, Nov 24, 2023 at 8:42 AM David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> wrote:
> > >> Thanks for bringing #36694 to my attention; I'm not going to review it because I think it's more valuable for me to preserve my neutrality so that I can more effectively act as a moderator for the discussion on policies overall.
> > >
> > > Of course.
> > >
> > >> On Tue, Nov 21, 2023 at 3:54 PM Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
> > >>> I do note that Tobias still appears to be in the Triage team, which means that he is still able to continue with abusive labeling.
> > >>
> > >> We are going to leave Tobias on Triage for now, and that we hope the policy discussion that was just started, about when it's appropriate to change/block the status change of a ticket, will resolve the issue. If it does not, we can remove Tobias from Triage.
> > >
> > >
> > > Sure, that's a meaningful strategy that is worth trying.
> > >
> > >>> [...] there are quite a number of affected PRs.
> > >>>
> > >>> A) My PRs that are currently being held up by Tobias's bad-faith demands and labeling abuse, and that I would like to see merged ASAP in the early 10.3 series:
> > >>>
> > >>> - https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36666 (Replace relative imports by absolute ones in sage.{algebras,...})
> > >
> > >
> > > Regarding this one, I do have a concern that may need particular attention or separate proceedings:
> > > https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36666#issuecomment-1805078169 (2 weeks ago), in which Tobias makes a false claim of authorship, and has so far declined to respond when called out for it (https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36666#issuecomment-1805084464, https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/36666#issuecomment-1813698262).

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

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 10:58 AM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>, sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun <vbraun.name@gmail.com>

All,
Has this been addressed at all?
The legal FUD is holding back
https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37482; this needs a public
response.

On Sat, Apr 20, 2024 at 12:43 PM Matthias Koeppe
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 11:39 AM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

yes, this has been adressed by the CoCC. As we wrote, we decided not to take any public action.

If you would like to report a concrete CoC violation, I would appreciate it if you could start a new e-mail thread and link to the precise message that you deem is in violation of the CoC.

julian

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:07 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>, sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun <vbraun.name@gmail.com>

> On Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 10:58 AM Matthias Koeppe
> <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
> > Has this been addressed at all?
> > The legal FUD is holding back
> > https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37482; this needs a public
> > response.
> >
> > On Sat, Apr 20, 2024 at 12:43 PM Matthias Koeppe
> > <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> wrote:
> > >
> > > Hi sage-conduct committee and William and Volker:
> > >
> > > I have to bring a part of the below, an unresolved issue from
> > > November, to your particular attention.
> > > It is a false claim of authorship by Tobias Diez.
> > > At the time, I had pointed out that it may need separate proceedings
> > > [because such claims reach distinctly into the academic realm].
> > >
> > > I'm re-upping this now because of Tobias Diez' present attempts to use
> > > authorship / copyright to control how code from a PR of his is
> > > integrated into Sage --
> > > https://github.com/sagemath/sage/pull/37446#issuecomment-2063317419
> > >
> > > Including William and Volker here (not sure who else should be
> > > included; please feel free to share as appopriate) because such claims
> > > reach beyond the Code of Conduct Committee's concerns,

Thanks Julian for a quick confirmation, sent separately, that CoCC considers this addressed.

> > namely into the
> > project owners'/maintainers' concerns, as authorship/copyright claims
> > by contributors pose, if not great legal risk itself, the problem of
> > *doubt* of potential users regarding possible legal risk.
> >
> > We may also have to discuss whether a CLA is necessary, for example
> > via https://github.com/apps/cla-bot

Does anyone have an opinion on this question? (A matter of governance, not conduct.)

I plan to raise it on sage-devel otherwise.

Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:25 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun <vbraun.name@gmail.com>

Dear Matthias,

> Does anyone have an opinion on this question? (A matter of governance,
> not conduct.)

It's my personal opinion that as soon as you push code to GitHub
in a repository that says that all files are GPL, then you published
that code under the GPL. I am not a lawyer, but I cannot see how this
could be any different.

At the same time, I am undecided if as a community we would want to go
too far with this. Say, we probably would not want to take any code that
was put into a PR and before that PR gets merged, the author retracts
that PR.

Here of course, if I understand correctly, the file in question is
rather trivial. It's just a list of package names.

That being said, I believe that Tobias is entitled to set any PR to
needs work and request changes and then set it to disputed if he's
unhappy with the changes. If the points he makes are not convincing,
then he'll likely lose the vote on the disputed PR. At the same time
this is of course complicated because it appears that he cannot comment
on the PR(s) in question.

julian

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:47 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun <vbraun.name@gmail.com>

Dear Julian and all,

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:26 PM Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:
> > Does anyone have an opinion on this question? (A matter of governance,
> > not conduct.)
>
> It's my personal opinion that as soon as you push code to GitHub
> in a repository that says that all files are GPL, then you published
> that code under the GPL. I am not a lawyer, but I cannot see how this
> could be any different.

I agree; I'm also not a lawyer (although I was once married to one, a
long time ago), but to me it's completely obvious.

> At the same time, I am undecided if as a community we would want to go
> too far with this. Say, we probably would not want to take any code that
> was put into a PR and before that PR gets merged, the author retracts
> that PR.

I agree, it spells trouble for the project to merge code that is
encumbered with such claims regarding copyright/license/right to use
etc.

Which is exactly why, once this claim was made, it needs to be
addressed clearly by the project in public.

> Here of course, if I understand correctly, the file in question is
> rather trivial. It's just a list of package names.

Sure, there would of course even be doubt that changes of this kind
are copyrightable.

But the doubt is exactly part of the method here in this issue.
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>　　　　　　　Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:57 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Narrowing to sage-conduct for this response:

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 12:26 PM Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:
> That being said, I believe that Tobias is entitled to set any PR to
> needs work and request changes and then set it to disputed if he's
> unhappy with the changes. If the points he makes are not convincing,
> then he'll likely lose the vote on the disputed PR. At the same time
> this is of course complicated because it appears that he cannot comment
> on the PR(s) in question.

Let me just point out this description as a prime example of how the
doublespeak about "disputes" has already corrupted the understanding
of how we review tickets.

No, participants are not "entitled" to do whatever they want on PRs.
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>　　　　　　　　　　Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 1:03 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun
<vbraun.name@gmail.com>

Dear Matthias,

> > At the same time, I am undecided if as a community we would want to go
> > too far with this. Say, we probably would not want to take any code that
> > was put into a PR and before that PR gets merged, the author retracts
> > that PR.

let me clarify that this paragraph was explicitly not meant to relate to
the concrete question at hand. If I am not mistaken, the code in
question is still in one of Tobias' PRs.

So, a broad discussion about this on sage-devel is not needed from my
point of view. If you think it's helpful to spell these rules out
explicitly, feel free to make a proposal of course.

> But the doubt is exactly part of the method here in this issue.

I do not think there is any "doubt" here and I also see no indication
that Tobias is using "doubt" as a "method".

To me it's understandable that Tobias would like to see his contribution
used in the setting he envisioned. Personally, I would hope that you can
find some middle ground with him.

julian

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>　　　　　　　　　　Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 1:05 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

> No, participants are not "entitled" to do whatever they want on PRs.

They are certainly not and that's not what I said.

julian

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 1:09 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>, William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>, Volker Braun
<vbraun.name@gmail.com>

Dear Julian and all,

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 1:03 PM Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:
> > > At the same time, I am undecided if as a community we would want to go
> > > too far with this. Say, we probably would not want to take any code that
> > > was put into a PR and before that PR gets merged, the author retracts
> > > that PR.
>
> let me clarify that this paragraph was explicitly not meant to relate to
> the concrete question at hand. If I am not mistaken, the code in
> question is still in one of Tobias' PRs.

That's correct.

> So, a broad discussion about this on sage-devel is not needed from my
> point of view.

How does this follow?

> If you think it's helpful to spell these rules out
> explicitly, feel free to make a proposal of course.
>
> > But the doubt is exactly part of the method here in this issue.
>
> I do not think there is any "doubt" here and I also see no indication
> that Tobias is using "doubt" as a "method".

I'll take note that recognizing FUD and other disinformation and
manipulation techniques should be added to the training materials.

> To me it's understandable that Tobias would like to see his contribution
> used in the setting he envisioned. Personally, I would hope that you can
> find some middle ground with him.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argument_to_moderation
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 2:36 PM
To: Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

* Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> [2024-06-06 13:09:08 GMT]:

> I'll take note that recognizing FUD and other disinformation and
> manipulation techniques should be added to the training materials.

I would like to express to you that I am feeling offended by such a statement.

> > To me it's understandable that Tobias would like to see his contribution
> > used in the setting he envisioned. Personally, I would hope that you can
> > find some middle ground with him.

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

I did not say that the middle ground is a good solution because it is
the middle ground. I meant to express my hope that you can find a good
solution near the middle ground.

Anyway, I think everything has been said here and if we want to discuss
this further we should move this to one of our public mailing lists.

julian

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>   Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 2:42 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

On Thu, Jun 6, 2024 at 2:36 PM Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org> wrote:
>
> * Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu> [2024-06-06 13:09:08 GMT]:
>
> > I'll take note that recognizing FUD and other disinformation and
> > manipulation techniques should be added to the training materials.
>
> I would like to express to you that I am feeling offended by such a statement.

That's an understandable human reaction, but I think upon further
reflection you might agree that to serve in a professional way on the
"code of conduct committee" might require basic understanding of
certain topics.
[Quoted text hidden]