Go Research Paper

Alissa Ronca, Yousuf Abdullah, Eileen Bohen

Abstract

This research will provide a thorough overview of the Go language, with emphasis on the history, design features, and types of problems that Go is well-suited to solve. Three applications/problem types will be researched in depth (one per author), and Go programs will be written as part of each section.

Contents

- I. Introduction
 - A. History of Go
 - 1. Who/When/Where/Why?
 - B. Interesting design features/how it compares with other languages we've studied
 - 1. Syntax
 - 2. Naming
 - 3. Semantics
 - 4. Concurrency
 - 5. Garbage Collection
 - 6. Dependencies
 - C. Kinds of problems the language is well-suited to solve
- II. Body
 - A. Eileen: How Does Go Compare to C?
 - B. Alissa
 - C. Yousuf
- III. Conclusion
- IV. References

I. Introduction

A. History of Go

The Go language was developed at Google by Robert Griesemer, Rob Pike and Ken Thompson, who began sketching the goals of the language in September of 2007. The creators felt frustrated with existing languages, specifically for the work being done at Google. In November of 2009, it was made public and open source.

The main goal of Go was to address the tradeoff programmers were making between efficient compilation, efficient execution, and writability. Often, programmers would choose ease over safety and efficiency, choosing dynamically typed languages like Javascript and Python. This report will look into some of the interesting design decisions made in order to avoid this tradeoff.

B. Design of Go

In Rob Pike's publication, he explains that Go was designed to improve the lives of software engineers and their coworkers. This meant that the language had to work at scale, for large programs with large numbers of dependencies and many programmers working on them. They also set out to create a language that was similar to C, as many Google programmers are familiar with C-like languages. Lastly, the creators wanted to make a modern language, with built-in support for concurrency.

1. Syntax

As part of the effort to design a language with readability in mind, the creators of Go made a series of decisions in implementing clear syntax. The language has only 25 keywords, much fewer than most modern languages.

2. Naming

Instead of using keywords like "public" and "private" to determine the visibility of an identifier, Go variables that start with a capital letter are public, whereas lowercase letters denote a variable only visible in that package. This rule applies to variables, types, functions, and everything else.

3. Semantics

Though this will be explored in depth later on, Go semantics are generally C-like, as the language was designed to be easy for C programmers to learn. There are a number of important differences, however, such as the lack of pointer arithmetic and implicit numeric conversions.

4. Concurrency

The work done at Google is highly reliant on concurrency, but programmers found that Java and C lacked proper support for it.

5. Garbage Collection

Go has no memory freeing operation, making garbage collection necessary.

6. Dependencies

Body

A. How does Go compare to C?

I found the following on https://talks.golang.org/2012/splash.article

"That said, Go makes many small changes to C semantics, mostly in the service of robustness. These include:

- there is no pointer arithmetic
- there are no implicit numeric conversions
- array bounds are always checked
- there are no type aliases (after type X int, X and int are distinct types not aliases)
- ++ and -- are statements not expressions
- assignment is not an expression
- it is legal (encouraged even) to take the address of a stack variable
- and many more

There are some much bigger changes too, stepping far from the traditional C, C++, and even Java models. These include linguistic support for:

- B. concurrency
- C. garbage collection
- D. interface types
- E. reflection
- F. type switches"

Because Go was written in C, and written for C programmers, I'd like to compare the two. I'll start by exploring the items on this list and will write small programs to demonstrate these differences.

G. Alissa's Section

H. Yousuf's Section

To learn a new programming language it is quite important to answer a few fundamental questions which could help us to stay committed to the learning process of the new language. The article "Using the Go programming language" basically is helping us to find reasons of why learning Go could be a good investment of our time. In the article the author says that the main reason to shift to a new programming language is basically to ease the software implementation process. The author also highlights the problems that Google was facing which needed to be addressed by finding a simple and permanent solution. The problems were: long build times,code readability and concurrency; Go was the perfect solution for those(Westrup and Pettersson 8).

The purpose of introducing the Go language was to address some issues like long build time, Garbage Collection and difficulty in implementing concurrency in the program. So Go has absolutely solved those issues by reducing the build time, applying runtime garbage Collection and an easier way to implement concurrency in the program(Westrup and Pettersson 9).

The author also discusses and compares the Golang build tools with CMake and Java's build tool Maven. In C and Java, developers do have to create that CMake file in C and Maven file in Java in order to configure them. The configuration of CMake is difficult to understand and modify which could lead to errors and could slow down the development process. Same goes with the Java's Maven which build files on the XML. So according to the author, this could be a time intensive task and error-prone. So GO provides a simple solution to this problem. It is so simple that we just need to create a directory in the GO workspace where the GO build tool automatically finds out the required dependencies that need to be compiled in order for the program to run(Westrup and Pettersson 40).

The author also discusses how the operation of concurrency was made easier compared to the other mainstream languages like c++ and Java. In Golang the whole concurrency is done by using goroutine and channels. This is the only way in Golang to work with concurrency. The author compares Golang with Java, where the concurrency mechanism is done by threading. And Java provides numerous ways to implement the concurrency which could confuse different users. It is much simpler to implement concurrency in Go(Westrup and Pettersson 39).

The author also emphasizes some missing features that are not provided by the Golang. Firstly, Golang does not support the object oriented programming approach but structures provide some of the features which are common in object oriented programming. It does not provide while loop and the keyword range has replaced the foreach loop which basically helps to iterate through the arrays in Golang. Surprisingly it does not support the exception and Generics(Westrup and Pettersson 23). So these missing features makes it compatible with the c programming language and Go can be integrated in the C programming language. However it would be really difficult because Go does support garbage collection but C does not, which might create confusion and inconsistency in the whole program for the user(Westrup and Pettersson 28).

The author also talks about the future of Golang. The mission of the Golang was to keep the code simple and clean, to avoid any complexity in the process of development. But to keep it simple, Golang has to sacrifice a lot of features like exceptions, Generics and object oriented programming. So we just have to wait and see if these compromises would help Golang to grow its popularity. The author also compares the popularity of Rust with Go where Rust provides those missing features in Go. So this could make the Golang team think into making those features available in the future(Westrup and Pettersson 46).

Work Cited

Westrup, Erik, and Pettersson, Fredrik. "Using the Go Programming Language in Practice." May 23, 2014.