

# State of the Python Union

OSCON, July 24, 2002

Guido van Rossum  
Director of PythonLabs at Zope Corporation

[guido@zope.com](mailto:guido@zope.com)  
[guido@python.org](mailto:guido@python.org)







# Recent Releases

- Python 2.2
  - iterators!
  - generators!!
  - new-style classes!!!
  - and too much to summarize here...
- Python 2.1.3
  - bug fix release for 2.1; focus on stability
- Python 2.2.1
  - bug fix release for 2.2; ditto
- What's with this stability focus...? (...see later!)



# Python Organizations

- Python Software Foundation
  - [www.python.org/psf](http://www.python.org/psf)
  - US non-profit for research and education
  - owns the current Python copyright
  - looking for donations and sponsors
- Python Business Forum
  - [www.python-in-business.org](http://www.python-in-business.org)
  - EU non-profit for businesses based on Python
  - plans:
    - Python in a Tie
    - Compile farm
- Python Secret Undergr



# Python in a Tie

- Result of stability discussion on c.l.py
- Plan:
  - pick a release and maintain it for 18+ months
  - bleeding edge development releases continue
- Purpose:
  - have a reliable target for commercial users
  - stability more important than latest features
- Which release will wear the tie?
  - Python 2.2!



# PBF Compile Farm

- Joint venture of PBF and Lysator
  - Lysator: oldest Swedish computer (student) society
  - Lysator owns a very diverse hardware farm
  - PBF provides motivation, funding
- Goals:
  - testing on many platforms
    - Python-in-a-Tie as well as bleeding edge code
    - core Python as well as 3rd party extensions
  - build binary releases for Python-in-a-Tie
    - hopefully "sumo releases"



# Python Conferences in 2003

- EuroPython will probably be repeated
- Python11 will be at OSCON 2003
- Yet Another Python Conference (YAPyC)
  - these plans are ***tentative***
  - co-organizers: YAS and PSF
  - registration fee:  $\leq$  \$150; expect 300 attendees
  - time: January/February 2003
  - location: downtown Washington, DC (GWU)
  - format: workshop-like
  - *looking for volunteers to help organize!*



# Python.Org HTTP Statistics

- May 2002
  - 7.9M HTTP requests from 257K hosts
    - 291K hits for "/"
  - 52K downloads of Python 2.2.1
    - about 70% Windows installer
- Feb 2001
  - 5.5M HTTP requests from 164K hosts
    - 212K hits for "/"
  - 23K downloads of Python 2.0
    - over 70% Windows installer





# Controversy of the Year

- Yearly recap of a recent flame war
- This year's topic:
  - to bool or not to bool



## Why bool()?

- I always regretted having left it out
- If it's not built-in, people define their own
- Explicit is better than implicit: "return True"
- A bool result is distinguished in output
  - ```
>>> x == y
True
>>>
```
- "bool(x)" normalizes Booleans
  - was "not not x"
- RPC tools can special-case Booleans



# Why Not bool()?

All misunderstandings (in my opinion)

- Will "if x:" require x to be a bool? (***Never!***)
- Some people write "if x == True:" (Yuck)
- "No function should return a bool" (Huh?)
- It's confusing to teach
  - I don't buy this:
    - You need to explain the Boolean concept anyway
    - You need to pick representatives anyway
    - You need to explain that (almost) all types have a Boolean interpretation anyway



## How To bool()?

- bool is a new built-in type
- True and False are the only values
  - singletons like None ("dualtons"?)
- Cannot be subtyped
- bool is a subtype of int, for compatibility
  - `True + 1 == 2`
  - `True == 1`
  - `str(True) == "True"` # The only incompatibility
  - will stay this way in Python 3.0
    - it's useful and harmless



# Lessons Learned

- It's a growth opportunity!
- Everything is controversial
  - QOTY: "When a group becomes large enough there are no uncontroversial topics any more."
    - Erik van Blokland (in personal email)
- Anticipate potential misunderstandings
  - explain in advance
  - I *thought* the PEP was clear - not so :-)
- In the end, do what you think is right
  - can't please everyone



# The Future: Python 2.3

- No new syntax, except yield w/o `__future__`
- Library focus, e.g.:
  - support extended slices, e.g. `"dlrow olleh"[::-1]`
  - `bool()` and `enumerate()`
  - more callable types; `basestring`
  - import from zip files
  - timeouts for sockets
  - logging module
  - `gnu_getopt` and option parser modules
  - new compiler package
  - `berkeleydb` module
- Fixing bugs



# PendingDeprecationWarning

- Discourage certain things in new code
  - But don't warn about them normally
  - Use:
    - `warnings.warn("your message here", PendingD...)`
      - No output by default (unlike other warnings)
  - To see the warnings:
    - `python -Wall::PendingDeprecationWarning`
- **Potential** examples:
  - string module (use string methods)
  - types module (use built-in type names)
  - `has_key()` (use 'in' operator)



## 2.3 Release Schedule

- Surprise: we have none!
- Focus on feature completeness, not dates
- Hope: alpha soon, final before 2002 ends
- See PEP 283 for details





# Pace of Change

- Users demand a stop to all new features
- Except for their personal favorite
  - this contradiction seems unavoidable
- What do do about this?
- Is Python-in-a-Tie sufficient?



# "Would You Rather..." [1]

- Learn more syntax; *or*
- use a library module?
  
- Understand a deep concept; *or*
- live with fuzzy rules?
  
- Fix design mistakes; *or*
- be backwards compatible?

[1] <http://barry.wooz.org/poems/wyr.html>



# Example: String Interpolation

- Problem: % interpolation is cumbersome
  - `print x, "+", y, "=", x+y`
  - `"%s + %s = %s" % (x, y, x+y)`
  - `"%(x)s + %(y)s = %(z)s" % vars()`
  - `str(x) + " + " + str(y) + " = " + str(x+y)`
- The print form is most readable
  - but not general enough (doesn't return a string)
- The other forms leave a lot to desire
- This is a very common need
  - so a clean solution would be nice; hence PEP 292



# Solutions Explored

- Solution 1: "\$foo".sub() # runtime
  - "\$x + \$y = \$z".sub()
- Solution 2: x"\$foo" # compile-time
  - x"\$x + \$y = \$(x+y)"
- Alternatives: %x, `x`, <<x>>, ?x?, @x@
- Solution 3: *func*(foo) # no new notation
  - *func*(x, " + ", y, " = ", x+y)
- None of these are satisfactory!
- Even more issues when considering i18n



# Why Is This Important To Me?

- Preserve the "sweet spot". Python is:
  - small enough to learn and remember easily
  - convenient for expressing common patterns
  - powerful for advanced usage
- Improving 2 or 3 often threatens 1
- Compatibility requirement prevents throwing away failed experiments
  - like `back ticks` or lambda
- No obvious solution



# Python 3.0

- No release schedule either :-)
- Not within two years
- Question: what to focus on???
- Zope 3 experience may be relevant
  - Rebuild from scratch
    - Refactor mercilessly during development
    - No concern for backwards compatibility
      - But learn from past: good ideas, bad ideas
    - Use coding "sprints"
  - Later, add compatibility (Zope 3x -> Zope 3)
  - Or: Later, merge best features back into 2.x



# Open Mike

It's your turn!