

Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2005-12/msg01511.html>

- *From:* "Bruce Barker" <brubar_nospamplease_@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 8 Dec 2005 16:22:38 -0800
-

number 4 is relevant – a firewall can detect applet downloads and block (typically you strip the tag). as click once installs the app on the hard drive and it runs in the open sandbox its as dangerous as active/x.

vista will allow companies block click once, except from trusted (internal) sites.

microsoft has never suggested .net support for any o/s other than windows. there is an educational version for another o/s, but you are not allowed to write commercial software for it.

-- bruce (sqlwork.com)

"Rob R. Ainscough" <robains@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:uJsGvaD\\$FHA.1288@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:uJsGvaD$FHA.1288@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

> As I said,

>

> 1) Vista includes .NET 2.0

> 2) click once is a managed process and will be more secure WSE 3.0

> 3) .NET 2.0 will be available for mac/linux

> 4) not relevant — no more blocking than using web services

> 5) see 3)

> 6) .NET 2.0 compact framework for smart devices

>

> No doubt browsers will continue but they will be doing less and less of

> the interactive interface work — they are fundamentally not suited to get

> the job done well along with the myriad of other issues surrounding IE

> client (or whatever client you choose). Sure I can spend 6 months working

> on web based app interface, or I can spend 2 months for the same

> windowsforms based interface and get better functionality with equal

> exposure to all types of platforms/users.

Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?

>
> Continuing using IE for all the interface work is NOT gonna help bring in
> more customers/users -- most users that see the "Your going to an unsecure
> web site...blah blah" click on No and that's that -- potential customer
> gone. Why, because they have there security setup to do that and they
> didn't even know it -- could have happened because they installed Norton
> Internet Security. But think about it -- what do you see lining the store
> shelves -- it is at the point where there are more Antivirus, spyware,
> internet security tools than another other combine form of
> applications/games.
>
> Be a user for a day and take yourself out of the developer role -- walk
> into your local Fry's Electronics or BestBuy or Compusa or whatever
> software/hardware superstore and look around -- 50% of the software has
> something to do with keeping you system "clean" -- this is a pretty sad
> state of affairs. Sticking with an IE client to do the interface ALL the
> interface work is a dead end regardless of your platform.
>
> Rob.
>
> "Bruce Barker" <brubar_nospamplease_@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> [news:OVhAIHC\\$FHA.3096@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OVhAIHC$FHA.3096@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>> that's MS's hope. there are a couple issues
>>
>> 1) no MS o/s comes with .net installed. its currently an addon (22mb
>> download)
>> 2) click once is a great way to spread viruses (as the code does not run
>> in a sandbox), and MS has not tackled the author validation issues.
>> 3) requires ms o/s (apple is still > 6% share)
>> 4) many company firewalls will block click once (maybe even smart
>> clients)
>> 5) click once only supported by IE (<90% share).
>> 6) more personal devices with browsers
>>
>> with these issues, and ajax getting popular again, browser apps will be
>> around for a while.
>>
>> -- bruce (sqlwork.com)
>>
>>
>> "Rob R. Ainscough" <robains@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> [news:%23gqPHyB\\$FHA.140@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:%23gqPHyB$FHA.140@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)
>>> VS 2005 I have:
>>> ClickOnce deployment
>>> User's that hate and or don't want to use an IE Client (don't blame
>>> them)
>>>
>>> I don't see how ASPX web pages are going to survive? With .NET 2.0 and
>>> clickonce deployment my app is 427KB (even with modem dialup speed it
>>> doesn't take long to download) -- the user gets a very friendly secure
>>> WindowsForm app (most of them don't even notice they're not under IE

Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?

>>> anymore) that performs considerably faster than any ASP.NET app.
>>>
>>> The road map as I see it:
>>> IE client -- back to static just clickonce links that open up
>>> WindowsForms apps
>>> Vista -- .NET 2.0 built in (no need to download)
>>> WebServices -- called from WindowsForms apps (keeps it secure and
>>> firewall friendly)
>>> WindowsForms are a HELL of a lot more secure (no IE attached activex
>>> components, no data miners, click monitors, etc. etc.)
>>>
>>> The way I see it -- user interaction is going to move back to
>>> WindowsForms since the IE client by definition is just NOT user
>>> friendly, NOT programmer friendly, and has a ton of other issues
>>> surrounding it in terms of security and performance and flexibility.
>>>
>>> Don't get me wrong, web development will still exist (web services and
>>> basic static content), but I believe anyone doing serious business
>>> applications using the web will migrate to this approach -- it really is
>>> a win win.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

• **References:**

- ◆ **[Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?](#)**
 ◇ From: Rob R. Ainscough
- ◆ **[Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?](#)**
 ◇ From: Bruce Barker
- ◆ **[Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?](#)**
 ◇ From: Rob R. Ainscough

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Newbie Question – Use Repeater?](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Security Exception with Enterprise Library Data Block](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Are ASP.NET user interfaces essentially dead now?](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**