`unsafe` Rust

Not Quite C

Jack Duvall & Cooper Pierce

Carnegie Mellon University

What is `unsafe`?

Rust, without the help of the compiler.

What is `unsafe`?

Rust, without the help of the compiler.

- We can't check lifetime validity for raw pointers

What is `unsafe`?

Rust, without the help of the compiler.

- We can't check lifetime validity for raw pointers
- We might use memory or type-unsafe compiler-exposed functions

What is `unsafe`?

Rust, without the help of the compiler.

- We can't check lifetime validity for raw pointers
- We might use memory or type-unsafe compiler-exposed functions
- We might have uninitialised memory

What is `unsafe`?

Rust, without the help of the compiler.

- We can't check lifetime validity for raw pointers
- We might use memory or type-unsafe compiler-exposed functions
- We might have uninitialised memory
- We might have extra, uncheckable requirements to guarateed soundness

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

- Values have one owner

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

- Values have one owner
- References are valid (i.e., don't dangle, correct lifetime, etc...)

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

- Values have one owner
- References are valid (i.e., don't dangle, correct lifetime, etc...)
- Mutable (exclusive) references are exclusive

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

- Values have one owner
- References are valid (i.e., don't dangle, correct lifetime, etc...)
- Mutable (exclusive) references are exclusive
- Values of a type have a memory layout consistent with that type, and aren't in some invalid state

Recall: Safety Guaratees

Importantly, this doesn't excuse us from any of the rules in "regular" Rust:

- Values have one owner
- References are valid (i.e., don't dangle, correct lifetime, etc...)
- Mutable (exclusive) references are exclusive
- Values of a type have a memory layout consistent with that type, and aren't in some invalid state

Moreover, when using `unsafe`, we might have additional requirements to uphold if we're calling an `unsafe` function or implementing an `unsafe` trait, so that code relying on some behaviour down the line isn't unsound.

Soundness

Because we're using the word unsafe to mean code that has access to some extra abilities (more on these in a second), it will be useful to have another term which means our code in `unsafe` blocks is correct.

We'll say code is *sound* if it cannot cause undefined behaviour, and unsound otherwise—regardless of whether or not the failure point is in the `unsafe` section or not.

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.
- Causing a data race

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.
- Causing a data race
- Executing code compiled with target features that the current thread of execution does not support

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.
- Causing a data race
- Executing code compiled with target features that the current thread of execution does not support
- Producing invalid values (either alone or as a field of a compound type such as enum/struct/array/tuple): see https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/behavior-considered-undefined.html

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.
- Causing a data race
- Executing code compiled with target features that the current thread of execution does not support
- Producing invalid values (either alone or as a field of a compound type such as enum/struct/array/tuple): see https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/behavior-considered-undefined.html
- Violating the https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/inline-assembly.html#rules-for-inline-assembly for inline asm.

Undefined Behaviour in Rust

- Dereferencing (using the * operator on) dangling or unaligned pointers (see below)
- Breaking the pointer aliasing rules
- Calling a function with the wrong call ABI or unwinding from a function with the wrong unwind ABI.
- Causing a data race
- Executing code compiled with target features that the current thread of execution does not support
- Producing invalid values (either alone or as a field of a compound type such as enum/struct/array/tuple): see https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/behavior-considered-undefined.html
- Violating the https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/inline-assembly.html#rules-for-inline-assembly for inline asm.

All in all, a lot less than C.

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer
- Call an `unsafe` function

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer
- Call an `unsafe` function
- Implement an `unsafe` trait

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer
- Call an `unsafe` function
- Implement an `unsafe` trait
- Access fields in a `union`

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer
- Call an `unsafe` function
- Implement an `unsafe` trait
- Access fields in a `union`
- Reading or writing to a mutable `static` variable

`unsafe` Powers

So what abilities does `unsafe` grant us?

In `unsafe` code we can:

- Dereference a raw pointer
- Call an `unsafe` function
- Implement an `unsafe` trait
- Access fields in a `union`
- Reading or writing to a mutable `static` variable

What might be some use cases for these?

Rust Has Pointers?

There are two pointer types in Rust:

- `*mut T`
- `*const T`

Raw pointers have less guaratees than other types:

Rust Has Pointers?

There are two pointer types in Rust:

- `*mut T`
- `*const T`

Raw pointers have less guaratees than other types:

- aren't checked by the borrow checker

Rust Has Pointers?

There are two pointer types in Rust:

- `*mut T`
- `*const T`

Raw pointers have less guaratees than other types:

- aren't checked by the borrow checker
- they aren't guarateed to point to valid memory (cf. references)

Rust Has Pointers?

There are two pointer types in Rust:

- `*mut T`
- `*const T`

Raw pointers have less guaratees than other types:

- aren't checked by the borrow checker
- they aren't guarateed to point to valid memory (cf. references)
- they aren't guarateed to be aligned (cf. references)

Rust Has Pointers?

There are two pointer types in Rust:

- `*mut T`
- `*const T`

Raw pointers have less guaratees than other types:

- aren't checked by the borrow checker
- they aren't guarateed to point to valid memory (cf. references)
- they aren't guarateed to be aligned (cf. references)
- don't handle cleaning up the underlying resource (cf. owned values)

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

- non-null

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

- non-null
- aligned

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

- non-null
- aligned
- the read would be entirely contained within one allocation

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

- non-null
- aligned
- the read would be entirely contained within one allocation
- and some other rules: see https://doc.rust-lang.org/std/ptr/index.html

Using Raw Pointers

We we use a raw pointer we have to guaratee it is:

- non-null
- aligned
- the read would be entirely contained within one allocation
- and some other rules: see https://doc.rust-lang.org/std/ptr/index.html

```
let mut x = 42;
let x_ptr = &mut x as *mut i32;

unsafe {
  *x_ptr += 27;
}

assert_eq!(x, 69);
```

Another Example

```
let address = 0x012345usize;
let r = address as *const i32;

// Oh boy, now we can read arbitrary memory
unsafe {
  println!("{}", *r);
}
```

Another Example

```rust
let address = 0x012345usize;
let r = address as *const i32;

// Oh boy, now we can read arbitrary memory
unsafe {
  println!("{}", *r);
}
```

What does Miri have to say about this?

https://play.rust-lang.org/?version=stable&mode=debug&edition=2021&gist=e288775bda449a2edcaece3cc1e24211

Rust Has `unions`?

Like C, Rust has `union` types, mostly for FFI.

```
#[repr(C)]
enum ValKind { Int, Pointer }

#[repr(C)]
union ValContents {
    i: i32,
    p: *const std::ffi::c_void,
}

#[repr(C)]
struct Value {
    kind: ValKind,
    payload: ValContents,
}
```

Using a `union`

```
fn is_zero(Value { kind, payload } : Value) -> bool {
    unsafe {
        match kind {
            ValKind::Int     => payload.i == 0,
            ValKind::Pointer => payload.p.is_null(),
        }
    }
}
```

Rust Has `static` Variables?

Slightly different from `const` variables, which we haven't talked about much:

- actually corresponds to a location in the program
- can take a reference to it
- can read from any non-mutable `static` variable iff it is `Sync` without `unsafe`

Rust Has `static` Variables?

Slightly different from `const` variables, which we haven't talked about much:

- actually corresponds to a location in the program
- can take a reference to it
- can read from any non-mutable `static` variable iff it is `Sync` without `unsafe`

```
static VAR1: &'static str = "Hello";
static mut VAR2: &'static str = " World";

fn main() {
    println!("{}", VAR1);
    unsafe {
        println!("{}", VAR2);
    }
}
```

1 `unsafe` Features

2 **Type Sizing**

3 FFI
- With C
  - `bindgen`
- With C++
  - `cxx`

Zero Sized Types

There are a number of types in Rust which take up zero bytes!

- `()`
- `enum`s with one variant
- Unit-like `struct`s
- `struct`s with entirely zero-sized fields

Zero Sized Types

There are a number of types in Rust which take up zero bytes!

- `()`
- `enum`s with one variant
- Unit-like `struct`s
- `struct`s with entirely zero-sized fields

This is useful in some cases: something like a `Set<T>` can be implemented as a `Map<T, ()>` and because the compiler knows the values are zero-sized, it can avoid loads and stores to memory.
Likewise, something like `Vec<()>` can avoid allocating.
Sometimes, we do have to be careful about accounting for ZSTs in `unsafe` code, because it means the size of a type might not give us a valid offset or alignment.

Dynamically Sized Types

We've already seen a couple of dynamically sized types:

Dynamically Sized Types

We've already seen a couple of dynamically sized types:

- `dyn Trait`

Dynamically Sized Types

We've already seen a couple of dynamically sized types:

- `dyn Trait`
- `[T]`, `str`

Dynamically Sized Types

We've already seen a couple of dynamically sized types:

- `dyn Trait`
- `[T]`, `str`

These can't be stored directly on the stack, because we don't know their size. `struct`s are allowed to have a DST as their last field, and if so, will themselves be a DST:

```
struct AllocBlock {
    header: u64,
    data: [u8],
}
```

Layouts

Unlike C, Rust does not guarantee a specific data layout for your types, e.g.:

```
struct Foo {
    i: i32,
    f: f64,
    j: i32,
}
```

might only take up 16 bytes, instead of 24! That said, all `Foo`s will have the same layout (for a given compiler version, subject to some other caveats).

Layouts

Unlike C, Rust does not guarantee a specific data layout for your types, e.g.:

```
struct Foo {
    i: i32,
    f: f64,
    j: i32,
}
```

might only take up 16 bytes, instead of 24! That said, all `Foo`s will have the same layout (for a given compiler version, subject to some other caveats).

... but what if I want a guaranteed layout because I'm doing something which relies on it?

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

- Rust—the default

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

- Rust—the default
- C—do what C does; not valid for some types

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

- Rust—the default
- C—do what C does; not valid for some types
- transparent—for one field structs[1]; do the same as that field.

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

- Rust—the default
- C—do what C does; not valid for some types
- transparent—for one field structs[1]; do the same as that field.
- packed—no padding; byte aligned

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

Specifying a Layout

There are a number of attributes we can use to ensure a specific layout:

- Rust—the default
- C—do what C does; not valid for some types
- transparent—for one field structs[1]; do the same as that field.
- packed—no padding; byte aligned
- a couple more we won't discuss, see here

To use one of these, we use an attribute:

```
#[repr(C)]
struct UnboundedArray<T> {
    len: usize,
    capacity: usize,
    contents: *mut T,
}
```

[1] really, one non-zero sized field

1 `unsafe` Features

2 Type Sizing

3 FFI
- With C
  - `bindgen`
- With C++
  - `cxx`

With C

So You Want To Call C From Rust, Huh?

Conceptually, not too bad, just a few simple steps:

- Declare what C functions are avaliable
- Link against the C library
- Call the function, using `unsafe`

Reivew: Calling Conventions

a/k/a the ABI

Reivew: Calling Conventions

a/k/a the ABI

a/k/a how to talk to people (i.e., C code)

Reivew: Calling Conventions

a/k/a the ABI

a/k/a how to talk to people (i.e., C code)

- How are arguments passed?
- What registers are clobbered?
- How do you get the return value?

Rust Supported Calling Conventions (via LLVM)

- "Rust"—Rust's own calling convention
- "C"—(default) calling convention used by your C compiler
- "system"—calling convention used by your OS, usually same as "C" except on Win32 where it's "stdcall"
- "cdecl"—x86_32 calling convention
- "stdcall"—Win32 x86_32 ABI
- "win64"—x86_64 Windows ABI
- "sysv64"—x86_64 non-Windows
- "aapcs"—ARM
- "fastcall"
- "vectorcall"

See https://doc.rust-lang.org/reference/items/external-blocks.html for details.

External Linkage With `extern`

```
extern fn printf(format: *const u8, ...);

extern {
    fn my_c_function(x: i32) -> bool;
}

extern "C" {
    fn my_other_c_function(x: i32, y: i32) -> i32;
}
```

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: “hey OS i want this library please load it for me”

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: "hey OS i want this library please load it for me"
  - Pros: Smaller binary size, flexible to upgrade library

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: "hey OS i want this library please load it for me"
  - Pros: Smaller binary size, flexible to upgrade library
  - Cons: Code can't handle upgrades in a significant number of cases

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: "hey OS i want this library please load it for me"
  - Pros: Smaller binary size, flexible to upgrade library
  - Cons: Code can't handle upgrades in a significant number of cases
- Static Linkage: "hey Compiler please insert this library into me directly"

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: "hey OS i want this library please load it for me"
  - Pros: Smaller binary size, flexible to upgrade library
  - Cons: Code can't handle upgrades in a significant number of cases
- Static Linkage: "hey Compiler please insert this library into me directly"
  - Pros: You always get the library version you want

[1] okay, probably not

Review[1]: Linkage

How can we link code?

- Dynamic Linkage: "hey OS i want this library please load it for me"
  - Pros: Smaller binary size, flexible to upgrade library
  - Cons: Code can't handle upgrades in a significant number of cases
- Static Linkage: "hey Compiler please insert this library into me directly"
  - Pros: You always get the library version you want
  - Cons: Upgrading requires re-compilation

[1] okay, probably not

Specifying Linkage for `extern` C Functions

```
#[link(name = "foo")] // kind = "dylib"
extern {
    fn cool_foo() -> *const u8;
}

#[link(name = "bar", kind = "static")]
extern {
    fn cool_bar() -> *const u8;
}
```

Things To Watch Out For

A couple of potential linking pitfalls:

- Your compiler can find the library you're linking against
  - For dynamic libraries, OS needs to find too!
- Your definitions in Rust exactly match the definitions in C

bindgen

Idea: Computer, Write Rust FFI For Me

Steps:

- Tell `bindgen` to make bindings at compile time
- Use `include!` macro to textually include generated bindings
- Link against C library
- Call the functions using `unsafe`

How Do We Do Stuff At Compile Time?

`build.rs` scripts!

- Placed at root of package next to `Cargo.toml`
- Run before Rust code compiled, can do arbitrary configuration since it's a binary itself
- Special output used to control behavior of Cargo

Small `build.rs` Example

```rust
fn main() {
    // Tell Cargo that if the given file changes, to rerun this
    // build script.
    println!("cargo:rerun-if-changed=src/hello.c");

    // Use the `cc` crate to build a C file and statically link it.
    cc::Build::new()
        .file("src/hello.c")
        .compile("hello");
}
```

`bindgen build.rs` Example

```rust
fn main() {
    println!("cargo:rustc-link-lib=bz2");
    println!("cargo:rerun-if-changed=wrapper.h");
    let bindings = bindgen::Builder::default()
        .header("wrapper.h")
        .parse_callbacks(Box::new(bindgen::CargoCallbacks))
        .generate()
        .expect("Unable to generate bindings");
    let out_path = PathBuf::from(env::var("OUT_DIR").unwrap());
    bindings
        .write_to_file(out_path.join("bindings.rs"))
        .expect("Couldn't write bindings!");
}
```

`build.rs` Handles Linkage For Us!

```
println!("cargo:rustc-link-lib=bz2");
```

does dynamic linking, looking for libbz2.so, and

```
println!("cargo:rustc-link-lib=static=bz2");
```

does static linking, looking for libbz2.a

See https://doc.rust-lang.org/cargo/reference/build-scripts.html for all options

Including Generated Bindings

This step needs to be done because Cargo only looks at the source tree for files to compile, and `build.rs` scripts should not be modifying that directly:

```
// Contents of src/lib/ffi.rs

#![allow(non_upper_case_globals)]
#![allow(non_camel_case_types)]
#![allow(non_snake_case)]
include!(concat!(env!("OUT_DIR"), "/bindings.rs"));
```

Example C Header To Parse

```c
typedef struct CoolStruct {
    int x;
    int y;
} CoolStruct;

void cool_function(int i, char c, CoolStruct* cs);
```

Example `bindgen` Generated Bindings

```rust
#[repr(C)]
pub struct CoolStruct {
    pub x: ::std::os::raw::c_int,
    pub y: ::std::os::raw::c_int,
}

extern "C" {
    pub fn cool_function(i: ::std::os::raw::c_int,
                         c: ::std::os::raw::c_char,
                         cs: *mut CoolStruct);
}
```

With C++

One Option: “C++ is just C”

One Option: “C++ is just C”

- Make a C interface to your C++ library

One Option: “C++ is just C”

- Make a C interface to your C++ library
- Use the same techniques as before to use that interface in Rust

One Option: “C++ is just C”

- Make a C interface to your C++ library
- Use the same techniques as before to use that interface in Rust
- ???

One Option: “C++ is just C”

- Make a C interface to your C++ library
- Use the same techniques as before to use that interface in Rust
- ???
- Profit?

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

- Lots of common types are painful to convert back to C representations

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

- Lots of common types are painful to convert back to C representations
  - `std::string` → `char *`

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

- Lots of common types are painful to convert back to C representations
  - `std::string` → `char *`
  - `std::vector<int>` → `int *`

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

- Lots of common types are painful to convert back to C representations
  - `std::string` → `char *`
  - `std::vector<int>` → `int *`
- We lose safety guarantees if we just use pointers

The Issue: C++ Is Not Just C

- Lots of common types are painful to convert back to C representations
  - `std::string` → `char *`
  - `std::vector<int>` → `int *`
- We lose safety guarantees if we just use pointers
- Hey, wait a minute, doesn't Rust solve those same problems?

cxx

Main Features

- Shared Structs/Enums
- Opaque Types (on either side)
- Functions (on either side)
  - Not type-generic ones though!

Canonical Example

```
#[cxx::bridge]
mod ffi {

    extern "Rust" {
        // Rust stuff
    }

    unsafe extern "C++" {
        // C++ stuff
    }

}
```

Rust Stuff: All The Stuff You Love!

```
type MultiBuf;

fn next_chunk(buf: &mut MultiBuf) -> &[u8];
```

- Can also use `String`, `&str`, `Vec<T>`, `&[T]`, `Box<T>`!
- Converted to `rust::String`, `rust::Str`, `rust::Slice<T>`, `rust::Box<T>`, `rust::Vec<T>` in C++ code
- These are C++-native types, with the utilities you expect, much easier to work with than raw pointers

C++ Stuff: All The Stuff You Can Tolerate!

- `std::unique_ptr<T>`, `std::shared_ptr<T>`, `std::string`, `std::vector<T>`
- Converted to `UniquePtr<T>`, `SharedPtr<T>`, `CxxString`, `CxxVector` in Rust code
- `Result<T>` from Rust will be `rust::Error` in C++ and a C++ function throwing an exception will be `Result<T, cxx:Exception>` in Rust

C++ Stuff: Code Example

```
include!("example/include/blobstore.h");

type BlobstoreClient;

fn new_blobstore_client() -> UniquePtr<BlobstoreClient>;

fn put(self: &BlobstoreClient, buf: &mut MultiBuf) -> Result<u64>;
```

Not Quite Complete

There are a couple missing features on the todo list:

- Async Rust with Futures $\leftrightarrow$ C++ Coroutines
- C++ function pointers $\rightarrow$ Rust