

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2008-06/msg01954.html>

- *From:* "Lee C." <nomail@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 29 Jun 2008 20:43:14 -0400
-

Okay, I've seen enough. You just do *not* get it. I won't waste another keystroke.

"Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:O2zcFlk2IHA.3884@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:

!> I'm the one following modern best-practices (separating content from code)

Sorry. Inline code is just as good a best-practice as code-behind.

re:

!> At this point, I have no interest in your ASP.NET co-authoring.

Ooh, nasty. I hope you feel better now that you got that zinger off. Let's see what Microsoft's VS bug team says about the bug you filed, OK ?

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP
asp.net faq : <http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros de asp.net, en español : <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee C." <nomail@xxxxxxx> wrote in message news:%23A3ULgk2IHA.4852@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

You say you understand, but you make statements that demonstrate otherwise. You've been arguing against my "what" and "why" all along; yet, I'm the one following modern best-practices (separating content from code)—which are required for my scenario. If someone chooses to mix them, that's their choice; but, it does not change the bug into a feature—regardless of your position that it does.

At this point, I have no interest in your ASP.NET co-authoring.

Cordially,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Lee

"Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:uJAnnYi2IHA.3600@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:
!> You clearly don't understand

That "clearly" is doubted by me.

How many times have I told you that I *do* understand what
you're saying
but that I'd like to see the bug response team's reply to your
"bug
report" ?

How many times will you repeat that I "don't understand",
when I do,
although I disagree with the premises you're putting forth ?

re:
!> Are you really an ASP.NET MVP? (Classic ASP,
maybe?)

The answer to that question is in my signature.
Maybe you haven't read any of the ASP.NET books I've
co-authored ?

Good luck with the response to your bug report.
Please remember to post the result here.

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP
asp.net faq : <http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros de asp.net, en español : <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee C." <nomail@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:eE3jN2g2IHA.4572@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Juan,

You clearly don't understand, or have not
thought about *why* the
ASP.NET team gave us separate places for
"design"/content (.aspx files)
and "procedure"/code (.aspx.vb). The ability
to separate the 2 was a
huge feature for ASP.NET, from classic
ASP.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Even though the particular content affected by the bug I found is not *visible* Web browser content, it is content none-the-less. Thus, its wiring belongs in the content file (.aspx)—not the code file (.aspx.vb). Sure, I could throw in some classic ASP style, and put a script element in my .aspx page to keep the wiring in the realm of the designer, but that changes nothing, because it's still programming, which should be done by programmers in the same place as every other line of programming in my site: the .aspx.vb pages. Just as badly, it means I'm achieving my I18N wiring in multiple ways, instead of being consistent.

By everything else, I meant all other I18N resource "wirings". (But, I take pride in how "light" my .aspx.vb files are—and how clean my .aspx files are, too.) You are obviously fine with having the designer(s) to set up and manage *most* of the I18N wirings, *and* having programmers to do some, too, (as they should not be doing) since bugs are not bugs for you if there is a workaround that violates good design practices and principles. I'm not fine with that.

Are you really an ASP.NET MVP? (Classic ASP, maybe?)

, Lee

"Juan T. Llibre"

<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:urCtna2IHA.4476@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:

!> Setting it

programmatically is an

incorrect implementation

!> when everything else on

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

my page is set declaratively.

Is everything else on your pages set declaratively ? Think about that for a second.

Why do we have inline scripts and code-behind, if "everything else is set declaratively" ?

In any case, we've certainly had enough of the "I think that..." back and forth.

Let's pause this discussion until the "bug" you reported is explained by the VS Dev team, OK ? I, definitely, want to see what their explanation is.

<https://connect.microsoft.com/VisualStudio/feedback/ViewFeedback.aspx?FeedbackID=62854>

Juan T. Llibre, asp.net MVP
asp.net faq :
<http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros de asp.net, en español
: <http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee C."
<nomail@xxxxxxx> wrote
in message
news:eQlpa4W2IHA.4704@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Correct
implementation?
What do
you mean
by that?

I stated
earlier on
that I
worked
around it.
It's still a

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

bug.
Setting it
programmatically
is an
incorrect
implementation
when
everything
else on my
page is set
declaratively.
Microsoft
offered
declarative
(explicit)
expressions,
and I want
to use
them--anywhere
and
everywhere
I choose in
accordance
with how
they are
stated to
work. When
I find one
that doesn't
work, it's a
bug; it's not
a case
of my doing
something
incorrectly.
I love
Microsoft
Visual
Studio
2008; but, I
won't
tolerate
bugs, or
suck them
up as, "Oh,
I must be
doing it
wrong since
it doesn't
work--even
though it

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

should."

, Lee

"Juan T.
Libre"

<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote in

message

news:%23xhBpuW2IHA.2384@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:

!>

ASP.NET

should

make

it

easy

for

me--and,

it

does,

!>

but

there

is

a

bug

in

the

implementation.

The

fact

that

you

can

set

xml:lang

programmatically,

and

that

you

did

set

it

that

way,

as

I

did,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

should
tell
you
that
it
isn't
much
of
a
bug,
but
a
question
of
using
the
correct
implementation.

But,
again,
please
let
us
know
what
the
reply
to
your
bug
report
is.

Juan
T.
Libre,
asp.net
MVP
asp.net
faq
:
<http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros
de
asp.net,
en
español
:

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

<http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee

C."

<nomail@xxxxxxx>

wrote

in

message

news:%239PIQvU2IHA.2384@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Juan,

My

use

of

language

and

culture

in

ASP.Net

is

a

bit

different

than

most.

I

have

registered

numerous

country-code-specific

domains

(mysite.ca,

mysite.co.uk,

mysite.com.au,

etc.),

which

resolve

to

a

singular

"ASP.Net

Web

Site".

Nothing

new

there.

However,

I'm

not

doing

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

the
ASP.Net
usual
of
letting
the
user
agent
(HTTP
header
'accept-language')
determine
which
language
visitors
get;
I
have
the
country-code
TLD
drive
it.
Also,
it's
not
just
the
language
of
my
content
that
varies
by
cc
TLD,
it's
the
content,
too;
but,
lang
attributes
play
a
critical
role
in
informing
user

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

agents
(including
search
engine
bots)
for
what
"country"
my
content
is
aimed.

I
have
already
found,
first-hand,
that
the
better
of
the
major
search
engines
use
the
cc
TLD
and
the
HTML
lang/xml:lang
to
determine
whether
a
domain's
documents
(mysite.com.au/my-document.aspx)
should
show
up
when
a
searcher
searches
with
the
'Only

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

from
Australia'
checkbox
checked
on
Live.com,
for
example.

I'm
not
setting
lang
attributes
for
fun;
I'm
doing
it
to
correct
search
engine
results.
ASP.NET
should
make
it
easy
for
me—and,
it
does,
but
there
is
a
bug
in
the
implementation.

I
appreciate
your
interest
and
effort
to
help.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

in
page
meta
tags

What
?
You
don't
set
a
language/culture
in
web.config,
too
?
There's
a
use
for
overkill
!
(
only
kidding...
)

I
don't
see
too
clearly
the
purpose
of
declaring
a
single
language
for
a
web
page.

I
do
see
a
use
for
declaring

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

specific
language
attributes
in
a
collection
of
xml
documents,
so
that
individual
documents
can
be
parsed
for
a
particular
language
content.

But,
ymm...v...

I'd
still
be
interested
in
knowing
what
the
reply
is
to
your
bug
report.
I
bet
you'll
get
back
:
"That's
by
design".
<g>

Don't

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

forget
to
let
us
all
know
what
happens
with
that,
OK
?
Thanks
for
an
interesting
discussion.

Juan
T.
Libre,
asp.net
MVP
asp.net
faq
:
<http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros
de
asp.net,
en
español
:
<http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee
C."
<nomail@xxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:en1PZVT2IHA.524@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Juan,

In
theory,
I

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

like
your
idea
of
investigating
"the
standard";
but,
in
practice
it
has
serious
problems,
as
it
often
does.
First,
you
are
referring
to
the
XML
standard,
which
is
not
as
appropriate
as
HTML
and
XHTML
standards.
Second,
none
of
them
are
crystal
clear
on
best
practices
for
I18N.
There
is
a

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

lot
of
legal
(by
the
standard)
syntax,
that
makes
no
sense,
or
makes
some
sense
without
being
clearly
best.
The
W3C
site
often
states
something
to
the
effect
of,
"some
are
doing
this,
some
are
doing
that,
on
your
own
site,
at
least
do
something
and
only
time
will
tell
what

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

is
best."

Check
out
these
fine
examples,
which
mirror
my
syntax,
on
the
W3C
site.

Internationalization

Best
Practices:
Specifying
Language
in
XHTML
&
HTML
Content

<http://www.w3.org/TR/i18n-html-te>

Tutorial:
Declaring
Language
in
XHTML
and
HTML
(Draft)

<http://www.w3.org/International/tuto>

Juan,
you
wrote:

But,
it
seems
to
me
that
setting

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

xml:lang
for
the
html
tag's
attribute
values
is
unneded,
since
they
must
be
in
English,
and
they
must
be
attributes
set
to
a
language
identifier,
as
defined
by
IETF
RFC
4646
(<http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4646>)

You're
not
setting
it
for
"the
tag's
attribute"
you're
setting
it
for
the
contents
all
contents,
of

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

the
element
(unless
overridden
by
a
sub-setting),
which
makes
perfect
sense
so
that
I
don't
have
to
set
it
individually
on
every
child
element--that
is
the
power
of
a
hierarchy!
You
seem
to
be
focused
on
the
technical,
with
some
misunderstanding,
versus
the
spirit
of
what
we're
trying
to
accomplish:
telling

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

user
agents
who
our
intended
audiences
is,
by
language,
as
best
we
can...which
is
why
I'm
also
setting
lang
in
the
HTTP
headers
and
in
page
meta
tags.

,
Lee

"Juan
T.
Libre"
<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
news:OYI4upK2IHA.5140@xxxxxxxx

re:
!>
I
found
an
MSDN
document
that
explains

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

why
what
I'm
trying
to
do
should
work

Lee,

From
:

<http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml>

"A
special
attribute
named
xml:lang
may
be
inserted
in
documents
to
specify
the
language
used
in
the
contents
and
attribute
values
of
any
element
in
an
XML
document."

If
anything,
I
can
see
xml:lang

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

being
declared
for
specific
content
values,
for
example
:

```
<p  
xml:lang="en-GB">What  
colour  
is  
it?</p>
```

```
<p  
xml:lang="en-US">What  
color  
is  
it?</p>
```

Then,
an
xml
parser
could
identify
regional
US
and
British
spellings
but,
given
that
all
the
attribute
values
must
be
in
English
in
an
html
doc,
what
would
be
the

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

purpose
of
declaring
xml:lang
for
the
html
markup
?

A
similar
explanation
is
given
here
:
<http://www.simonstl.com/xm>

----000----
<SECTION>
<DESCRIPTION
xml:lang="en">
Caesar
begins
by
describing
the
geography
of
Gaul.
</DESCRIPTION>
<QUOTE
xml:lang="la">
Gallia
est
omnis
divisa
in
partes
tres,
quarum
unam
incolunt
Belgae,
aliam
Aquitani,
tertiam
qui
ipsorum
lingua

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Celtae,
nostra
Galli
appellantur.
</QUOTE>
---000---

That's
perfectly
good
usage
for
xml:lang,
as
a
parser
could
selectively
identify
content
in
different
languages.

But,
it
seems
to
me
that
setting
xml:lang
for
the
html
tag's
attribute
values
is
unnecessary,
since
they
must
be
in
English,
and
they
must
be
attributes

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

set
to
a
language
identifier,
as
defined
by
IETF
RFC
4646
(<http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc4646>)

So,
I
think
that
requisite
pretty
well
establishes
the
futility
of
setting
xml:lang
for
all
the
attributes
in
an
html
document.

If
anything,
it
seems
that
the
xml:lang
attribute
is
included
in
the
html
server
tag
for

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

compatibility
purposes,
or
perhaps
out
of
ignorance.

If
there's
a
need
to
identify
that
the
contents
of
a
particular
markup
tag
are
in
a
specific
language,
that
identification
can
be
included
in
the
tag
itself,
for
example
:

```
<div  
lang="MX-es"  
xml:lang="MX-es">  
Algo  
de  
contenido  
en  
español  
mejicano.  
</div>
```

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

That
makes
a
lot
more
sense
than
setting
xml:lang
for
the
attribute
values
in
the
html
tag.

Juan
T.
Llibre,
asp.net
MVP
asp.net
faq
:
<http://asp.net.do/faq/>
foros
de
asp.net,
en
español
:
<http://asp.net.do/foros/>

=====
"Lee
C."
<no.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:%23ocUnoI2IHA.2188>

I
found
an
MSDN
document
that

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

explains
why
what
I'm
trying
to
do
should
work.

ASP.NET
Web
Server
Controls
Overview
<http://msdn.microsoft.com>

Note
the
distinction
between
HTML
Server
Controls
and
Web
Server
Controls
in
the
document.
Also,
note
the
explanation
of
"pass-through"
attributes
for
HTML
Server
Controls.

Two
quotes
that
sum
it
up:
1.
Any

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

HTML
element
on
a
page
can
be
converted
to
an
HTML
server
control
by
adding
the
attribute
runat="server".

2.
You
can
add
any
attributes
you
need
to
an
HTML
server
control
and
the
page
framework
will
render
them
without
any
change
in
functionality.

,
Lee

"Lee
C."

<no.spam@xxxxxxx>
wrote

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

in
message
<news:Oe38JYI2IHA>

Juan,

I
appreciate
your
trying
to
help,
but
you're
wrong,
and
you
are
the
one
who
is
confused.
:]

I
am
not
disputing
that
when
inserted
programmatically
the
xml:lang
attribute
renders
to
the
browser.
I
did
just
that
as
a
work
around
(right
after
I

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

31

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

discovered
this
bug);
but,
I
should
not
have
to.

I
am
not
confusing
html
attributes
with
runat="serve
attributes,
as
you
call
them.
Using
your
logic,
none
of
the
declarative
(html)
attributes
should
render
to
the
browser
after
I
add
the
runat="serve
in
ASP.NET;
yet
all
of
them
(xmlns,
lang,
and

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

dir)
do--except
xml:lang.

I
started
with
an
html
element
with
4
attributes
(xmlns,
lang,
xml:lang,
and
dir)
all
set
declaratively
With
no
5th
attribute
of
runat="serve
all
4
attributes
render.
If
I
add
the
5th
attribute
of
runat="serve
which
does
not
and
should
not
render,
I
no
longer
get
all

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

4
attributes
that
should
render
(xmlns,
lang,
xml:lang,
and
dir),
I
only
get
3
(xmlns,
lang,
and
dir).
My
logic
says
I
should
get
4,
your
says
I
should
get
3?
It
would
be
4
or
0,
and
4
is
right.
Not
0...and
not
3.

When
I
add
runat="serve
it

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

does
not
magically
make
the
xml:lang
attribute
a
server-side
attribute,
while
keeping
the
other
three
attributes
as
"html"
attributes.
All
four
are
still
"html"
attributes---
should
render.

I
think
the
simplification
of
my
example
may
be
confusing
you.
It
is
odd
that,
in
my
example,
I
set
runat="server"
but
do

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

not
have
any
server-side
attributes.
(I
have
all
4
as
literal
strings,
for
simplicity
of
an
example.)
Well,
in
my
real-world
use,
I
do
have
server-side
attributes,
which
I
want
set
declaratively
(no
code-beside
and
no
script).
I
have:

```
<html  
runat="serve  
xmlns="http  
xml:lang="<  
Resources:G  
ContentAudi  
%>"  
lang="<%$  
Resources:G  
ContentAudi  
%>"
```

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

dir="ltr">

Both
of
those
declarative
explicit
localization
expressions
should
work
without
my
having
to
write
any
more
"procedural"
(code-beside
code
or
script.

It
actually
does
work
fine
for
the
lang
attribute---a
it
should:
but
not
for
the
xml:lang
attribute---*
is
a
bug***.

^
Lee

"Juan
T.
Libre"
<nomailrepl

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

wrote
in
message
news:u0WzL

re:
!>
I
think
you
are
misu
Juan

Wel
I
think
you
are
misu
*me

re:
!>
I
had
the
xml:
attri
in
the
html
tag
(dec
like
this:

Yes.
beca
it's

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

stan
html

re:
↳
If
I
simp
add
runa

That
decl
the
cont
to
run
serv
side

For
any
attri
to
be
prog
serv
you
need
a
scrip
just
as
you
need
a
scrip
to
mod
any
serv
cont
attri

Did
you
run
the
samp
page
I

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

sent
?

It
itera
throu
the
attri
for
the
html
serv
cont
and
shov
that
the
xml:
attri
is
adde
prog

re:
↳
If
I
simp
add
runa
leav
in
the
xml:
attri
that
↳
rend
with
runa
all
of
the
(dec
attri
are
↳
rend
to
the
brow

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

the
xml:
attrib
That
is
a
bug.

I
think
you'
conf
html
attrib
with
runa
attrib

Htm
attrib
can
be
inse
in
norm
html
Serv
attrib
mus
be
inse
in
code

May
I'm
not
expl
this
as
well
as
I
shou
Try
to
get
som
else'
opin
on

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

this
matt
if
you
don'
acce
mine

Juan
T.
Llib
asp.n
MV
asp.n
faq
:
http:
foro
de
asp.n
en
espa
:
http:
====
"Lee
C."
<no.
wrot
in
mes:
new:

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?