Moderation on sage-devel

18 messages

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 9:30 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,
As I said earlier today, the committee shares your goal of making the Sage community a friendlier and more inclusive place. The discussion in [this thread](link) 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.

We will be discussing this issue further in our meeting on Friday, and will reach out to you by the weekend.
David
for the sage-conduct committee

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com> Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 9:33 PM
To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

This continued both-siding is unacceptable.
[Quoted text hidden]
--
Matthias Koeppe -- http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~mkoeppe

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com> Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 9:50 PM
To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

On Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 9:30 PM David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> wrote:
> As I said earlier today, the committee shares your goal of making the Sage community a friendlier and more inclusive
place. The discussion in this thread did the opposite. The language you used violated the Code of Conduct.

I also need to know exactly *what* language was a violation in your opinion.
(I have to ask this now, David, because I'm still waiting for your
explanation for the incident earlier this year when you decided to
remove me from ownership of the sagemath organization and restricted
my posting rights.)

Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com> Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 11:43 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Julian already explained in the thread itself.
David

[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@

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Wed, Apr 10, 2024 at 11:46 PM
To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

No, David, that's not good enough.
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Thu, Apr 11, 2024 at 12:05 AM
To: David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

David,
I have to ask that you recuse yourself from any other discussions and
actions involving me in the CoCC.
Your mishandling of this has caused too much damage already.

Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

David Roe <roed.math@gmail.com>   Thu, Apr 11, 2024 at 12:20 AM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

I will discuss your request with the rest of the committee.

As I said in the initial email, we will send you more details by the weekend.
David
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 9:20 AM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>
Cc: William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>

All:
I still have not received a suitable explanation. This is highly
inappropriate. My posts to sage-devel are still being held. One of
them takes the necessary and overdue leadership that calls for the
rebuilding our community on the basis of recognizing and fighting
abuse, bullying, and disrespect.

And the damage done by
- David's post in
https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/Wjw2wcvgf8k/m/DJUHj9OgAAAJ
- Julian's post in
https://groups.google.com/g/sage-devel/c/Wjw2wcvgf8k/m/KWpNXtVwAAAJ

needs to be repaired ASAP.

Thanks
Matthias
[Quoted text hidden]

Jean-Philippe Labbé <jean-philippe.labbe@etsmtl.ca>   Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 1:16 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

I am writing this email as a member of the Code of Conduct Committee, not on its behalf.

As you were writing this morning, we were having our weekly meeting. We met for almost 3 hours, dealing with a long list of reports and on-going processes.
I see that you impatient to see actions being taken to find lasting solutions to the language abuse you are victim of, and your detailed reports do help us to analyze the situation and to get a full picture.

I want to reassure you that we are actively working to find lasting solutions as well---we do not want half-baked solutions---and lasting solutions require thorough discussions, hence taking time.
These discussions are challenging when several new events occur between each meeting and much time is taken to stay up-to-date with the complaints before we can meaningfully discuss them.

For one thing, I find it frustrating to spend several hours on writing a thoughtful response and consider relevant actions to be taken, when the situation has taken a different turn and neither the written response nor the actions we considered in the meeting are relevant anymore. This is something that we have to deal with.

I hope you understand that our job isn't easy, and that you feel that we take matters seriously, because we certainly do. We were able to make a lot of progress, but when new CoC issues arise, we can not progress as fast.

You should expect a more satisfactory reply from the committee over the weekend.

Schöne Grüße,
J-P
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 1:28 PM
To: Jean-Philippe Labbé <jean-philippe.labbe@etsmtl.ca>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear J-P,
Thanks a lot for your message, I really appreciate it!

Best
Matthias

On Fri, Apr 12, 2024 at 1:16 PM Jean-Philippe Labbé
<jean-philippe.labbe@etsmtl.ca> wrote:
>
> Dear Matthias,
>
> I am writing this email as a member of the Code of Conduct Committee,
> not on its behalf.
>
> As you were writing this morning, we were having our weekly meeting. We
> met for almost 3 hours, dealing with a long list of reports and on-going
> processes.
> I see that you impatient to see actions being taken to find lasting
> solutions to the language abuse you are victim of,

Quick note: I'd prefer "target" instead of "victim".
[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Mon, Apr 15, 2024 at 9:02 PM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>
Cc: William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>

sage-conduct committee:

3 days later, and I still have not received any meaningful explanation.
My posts to sage-devel are still being held.

This needs to be fixed ASAP.

Once again, that actions that are harming me are taken within minutes, but explanations for those actions cannot be obtained after days or even months is just wildly unacceptable.

Matthias

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Tue, Apr 16, 2024 at 11:16 PM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

I wrote "ASAP", but the correct word would be "immediately".
Someone please step up and fix this.
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

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 Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 4:35 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Julian,

On Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM Julian Rüth <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,

[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Wed, Apr 17, 2024 at 4:51 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

  * Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com> [2024-04-17 16:35:36 -0700]:

  > If you have copies, I'd appreciate receiving them.

  Please find the messages below.

  julian

  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.

  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.

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

---

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Sun, Apr 28, 2024 at 10:17 AM
To: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>
Cc: William Stein <wstein@gmail.com>

sage-conduct committee:
My posts to sage-devel are still being held or rejected, for days
without notice.
I cannot work like this.
[Quoted text hidden]

Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>   Thu, May 2, 2024 at 1:39 PM
To: Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Dear Matthias,

Upon review, we found that, contrary to our promise in the April 10
message, we did not follow up with a further explanation specific to
imposing moderation by the weekend. Our apologies for that. We are
improving our procedures of providing committee statements more

expeditiously. We now follow up with a specific explanation.

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.

[Quoted text hidden]

Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoeppe@gmail.com>   Thu, May 2, 2024 at 9:56 PM
To: Julian Rüth <julian.rueth@fsfe.org>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

It's necessary for the committee to immediately correct the current
course of encouraging abusers by minimizing their conduct and
reprimanding the targets of abuse for calling out the abuse. The
committee does not have my cooperation in the continued denial of
abuse and the disrespectful and harmful disregard for the damage that
this course is inflicting on my work.

If individual members of the committee are unable or unwilling to step
up to properly handle the duties of this service committee, they
should step down.