



Matthias Köppe <matthiaskoepp@gmail.com>

Re: Time to action

4 messages

Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>

Tue, May 28, 2024 at 3:34 PM

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

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

Dear Matthias,

Thank you for clarifying what questions you were still waiting on responses to. We've responded below, and are happy to have another Zoom meeting with you to discuss this further (here's a [scheduling poll](#) to determine availability).

1. 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?

We have not been allowing personal attacks by Dima or others. In contrast, his messages to sage-devel are moderated to prevent inappropriate language, and we have hidden github comments by him when they cross the line. Moreover, we are not aware of inappropriate comments from Dima since [this one](#) on May 6. While there have been times where his denunciations were daily, he seems to have improved his behavior recently. We are continuing to monitor his language, and if you observe more inappropriate behavior, please bring it to our attention.

While personal attacks are against the code of conduct, opposition to your proposals is not. Moreover, we have attempted to explain the ways in which your behavior contributes to the hostility you encounter, and have been met with outright dismissal on your part. We urge you to reflect on the messages we have written to you.

2. Clear words and actions are needed toward repeat offenders (Dima Pasechnik).

The committee has taken action with regard to Dima, and will continue to do so as warranted. We are not obligated to explain what those actions are.

3. Clear words and actions are needed toward repeat offenders (Tobias Diez).

Tobias has been less active in the last few months. We have publicly reprimanded him about his labeling behavior and worked on sage-devel to clarify the standards for review and create a process where PRs can be merged with enough support. If action is needed based on future violations by Tobias of the Code of Conduct, we will take it.

4. Regarding Tornaria:

- I suggest that the committee re-examine the recent interactions under the lens of recognizing disrespect, dominance posturing, and manipulations such as "playing the victim".

We have discussed your interactions with Gonzalo extensively within the committee. It is the judgment of the committee that you are wrong, as we explained in our message on May 3 (subject: Sage Code of Conduct reply to 'Examples of "acting offended"').

5. It's necessary to review / refine / affirm our review standards.

- a. *The burden of proof is on those who propose changes to the status quo.*
- b. *The importance of keeping PRs and their review narrowly focused.*
- c. *A clarification of the role of reviewers in relation to authors.*
- d. *The importance of shipping quickly what is good enough.*

As a committee, we do not believe that it is within our mandate to make judgments about whether reviewer objections are valid.

6. *my response to "Sage Code of Conduct reply to 'Examples of 'acting offended'" (from May 4), in which I walked you through the characteristics of manipulation by example;*

We chose not to reply because we did not feel that you engaged in good faith with the suggestions we offered. As we noted above, we disagree with your interpretation. To respond to the one question in your message, we do not agree that Gonzalo needs to apologize to you, so we have not asked him to.

7. *my reminder (from May 3) regarding the duty to correct publicly the damage that is done by the public actions of abusers. "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."*

You are welcome to your opinion. As we have said, we will consider concrete suggestions about public actions that will improve the situation. The suggestion to "Publicly correct the damage" is not sufficiently concrete.

8. *Is the declaration (from Nils' Apr 13 message) that Pasechnik's behavior does "not constitute systematic bullying and abuse" the position of the committee?*

Yes. To expand on this further, we agree that Dima frequently uses inappropriate language, and we will continue to police this. We do not agree that his behavior is systematic: we believe that he gets frustrated and that leads to misconduct, but it is not part of a planned campaign of misconduct.

9. *Does the committee consider that it has a duty to give support to targets of abuse in the community? I'll state that I do not feel to have received any such support. To the contrary, I feel systematically abandoned by the community and the committee.*

Yes, we believe that we have an obligation to support all members of the community when they come to us for help. Things that are in our power are actions that involve community interactions directly. We can intervene to reduce or stop ongoing violations of CoC.

When there is a conflict, we try to get feedback from all sides and work toward a fair resolution. When there are "severe and obvious breaches, e.g., personal threat or violent, sexist or racist language" as specified by our Code of Conduct, we are forced to take clear and immediate action. We have not observed such breaches.

We have always seriously considered your reports and on various occasions acted publicly or privately. If your understanding of what "support" should entail is fundamentally different, please tell us.

We are sad to read that you feel systematically abandoned by the Code of Conduct Committee. We value your extensive contributions to the Sage project. While we may not always agree with your perspective, we do share your stated goal to make the Sage project a welcoming place. Let us take this opportunity to review some of the work that we have done to help you and the community get to a better state.

1. We have hidden and deleted numerous posts that you reported to us. The response time has varied from almost immediate to a couple of days while we balance the benefits of swift action with the need to take fully informed and well-considered action.
2. We met with you to assess your point of view and we thank you again for collaborating with us, this meeting was very helpful in structuring our action. During this meeting, we also asked you for your collaboration in changing some of your language and pointed to wordings that we hope you would change. We see that you adapted your language and we thank you for that.
3. We told Dima that violations of the CoC will not be tolerated and there will be escalating consequences if he continues.
4. We put Dima on moderation on sage-devel, and we have seen a marked decrease in aggression on sage-devel. The situation has significantly improved from a couple of months ago.

Finally, we remind you that the current CoCC took over in March 2024. Its culture and experience is growing and we need the collaboration and trust of the community; and we answer to the community.

The Code of Conduct Committee

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>
To: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>
Cc: sage-conduct <sage-conduct@googlegroups.com>

Tue, May 28, 2024 at 5:09 PM

On Tue, May 28, 2024 at 3:35 PM Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com> wrote:

> Thank you for clarifying what questions you were still waiting on responses to. We've responded below, and are happy to have another Zoom meeting with you to discuss this further (here's a scheduling poll to determine availability).

Thanks; I've filled out the poll.

> 1. 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?

>

> We have not been allowing personal attacks by Dima or others. [...]

> [... further down in the post]

> We have hidden and deleted numerous posts that you reported to us. The response time has varied from almost immediate to a couple of days while we balance the benefits of swift action with the need to take fully informed and well-considered action.

Not good enough.

I'll explain it once more: The "damage done" needs to be counteracted by more than just deleting the message after the fact.

> While personal attacks are against the code of conduct, opposition to your proposals is not.

Perhaps explain why you would possibly feel the need to explain this to me?

> Moreover, we have attempted to explain the ways in which your behavior contributes to the hostility you encounter, and have been met with outright dismissal on your part. We urge you to reflect on the messages we have written to you.

> [... further down in the post]

> > 6. my response to "Sage Code of Conduct reply to 'Examples of 'acting offended'" (from May 4), in which I walked you through the characteristics of manipulation by example;

> We chose not to reply because we did not feel that you engaged in good faith with the suggestions we offered.

A "dismissal", and "I didn't engage in good faith"? Hardly. The problem is that you have been trying to explain human behavior to me on the grade school level --- without showing any acknowledgment or awareness of the relevant issues that are at play, viz., manipulation and narcissism. I think you may need to re-read my response and take advantage of the learning experience that I have offered you there.

> 5. It's necessary to review / refine / affirm our review standards.

> a. The burden of proof is on those who propose changes to the status quo.

> b. The importance of keeping PRs and their review narrowly focused.

> c. A clarification of the role of reviewers in relation to authors.

> d. The importance of shipping quickly what is good enough.

>

> As a committee, we do not believe that it is within our mandate to make judgments about whether reviewer objections are valid.

5a.-d. were part of my response to the question "How Sage development should proceed" raised in the last Zoom meeting. Yes, I agree that these are leadership questions and as such clearly outside the scope of the committee.

> 8. Is the declaration (from Nils' Apr 13 message) that Pasechnik's behavior does "not constitute systematic bullying and abuse" the position of the committee?

>

> Yes. To expand on this further, we agree that Dima frequently uses inappropriate language, and we will continue to police this. We do not agree that his behavior is systematic: we believe that he gets frustrated and that leads to misconduct, but it is not part of a planned campaign of misconduct.

I'm sorry to say that, but it is very difficult to take you seriously if you make such declarations that are obviously counterfactual. Pasechnik has made it clear that he acts deliberately and is justified in what he is doing. You have the links, I'll not send them again.

> 9. Does the committee consider that it has a duty to give support to targets of abuse in the community? I'll state that I do not feel to have received any such support. To the contrary, I feel systematically abandoned by the community and the committee.

>

> Yes, we believe that we have an obligation to support all members of the community when they come to us for help. Things that are in our power are actions that involve community interactions directly. We can intervene to reduce or stop ongoing violations of CoC.

See above; not good enough.

> We have always seriously considered your reports and on various occasions acted publicly or privately. If your understanding of what "support" should entail is fundamentally different, please tell us.

I can easily tell you what the _opposite_ of support is:

- Defending the abusers and minimizing their conduct.
- Thanking the abusers in public.
- Blaming the target of abuse for the abuse.
- Equating the conduct of the target of abuse and the abuser.
- Attacking the target of abuse for criticizing the committee after it equated the conduct of the target of abuse and of the abuser.

> We are sad to read that you feel systematically abandoned by the Code of Conduct Committee.

Well, that's a first step; I recommend further reflection.

Matthias

--

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

John Palmieri <jhpalmieri64@gmail.com>

Fri, May 31, 2024 at 9:42 AM

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

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

Dear all,

We have scheduled the meeting for Tuesday, June 4, 11:30am - 12:30pm PDT. We will use the link
<https://washington.zoom.us/j/95901288622>.

Regards,
John

John Palmieri is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: CoCC meeting with Matthias
Time: Jun 4, 2024 11:30 AM US/Pacific

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://washington.zoom.us/j/95901288622>

Meeting ID: 959 0128 8622

[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_wo5jqd56MWLBWwNjvNmN_JP0e69y%2Be1BP9Ez%3DWkPuzW80_w%40mail.gmail.com.
For more options, visit <https://groups.google.com/d/optout>.

--

John H. Palmieri

Matthias Koeppe <mkoeppe@math.ucdavis.edu>

Mon, Jun 3, 2024 at 8:22 PM

To: Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com>

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

On Tue, May 28, 2024 at 3:35 PM Nils Bruin <bruin.nils@gmail.com> wrote:

> 1. 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?

>

> We have not been allowing personal attacks by Dima or others. In contrast [...]

I ask again: How much longer.

[Quoted text hidden]