

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2008-06/msg01960.html>

- *From:* "Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 29 Jun 2008 21:23:10 -0400
-

re:

!> the bug prevents me from doing it the "right" way for my scenario

What you have been saying all along is that code-behind is "better".

It certainly might be more suited for your purposes, but it's not "better", it's only better suited to particular scenarios like the one you describe.

The problem is that you shouldn't generalize your scenario to all programmers.

For every programming team that works like you do, there's hundreds of independent programmers who don't need to use code-behind and who, in fact, encounter many unneeded difficulties when implementing code-behind, not the least of which is the added complexity of maintaining two pages in synch (the aspx and the code-behind source).

re:

!> You do seem to have a handle on the internals of ASP.NET.

Seem ? Your generosity astounds me. <g>

I'll be looking forward to the response which your bug filing prompts from the VS Team.

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:OaAr\\$Ik2IHA.528@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:OaAr$Ik2IHA.528@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

One last reply...

You can promote the technical merits and effectiveness of mixing content and code all day long. Once you need/want a designer and a programmer to work on the same page—at the same time—you need to separate them, which is where I am.

(There are *many* other great reasons, too.) You're not being there does not turn a bug into a

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

feature.

I'm not trying to get you, or anyone else, to stop mixing content and code; I'm trying to explain why your, or my, workaround to the bug I've found is not satisfactory to me. (Even if it were, a but still exists and should be reported.) You keep asserting that your workaround is just fine; it's not—it's a workaround—not a solution—because the bug prevents me from doing it the "right" way for my scenario (keeping content and code separate), which is something the ASP.NET team has worked hard to empower me to do easily. It just happens that they missed a spot, and I've discovered it.

You do seem to have a handle on the internals of ASP.NET. You appear to not have a handle on some of the practical issues of Web (application) development.

Cordially,
Lee

"Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:%23WNbcpi2IHA.3884@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:
!> 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

One last comment...

You seem to think there's no place for inline code for ASP.NET programming,
and that the only place where code should be placed in is code-behind.

In fact, inline programming in .aspx pages is just as effective as code-behind programming,
and there's no reason to assert that anything "belongs" in code-behind, when inline programming
is every bit as efficient as code-behind.

Your "comparison" of inline aspx programming with the "classic ASP style" of programming
is meaningless, given that "classic ASP" used interpreted script technology while inline code
in aspx pages is not interpreted, but truly compiled code.

Add to that the fact that aspx pages are object-oriented and are not, like ASP used to be,
interpreted in the order the code was written, but in relationship to the objects created,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

and you should understand why you are really comparing apples and oranges.

My personal preference is using inline code in the aspx pages, and compiling my business rules/database access classes to assemblies, from where the classes can be easily imported to any aspx page.

Choosing codebehind or inline is very much a question of personal preference, not of the inherent superiority of either of the two methods over the other one.

Ymmv, of course.

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: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.

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:

!> Setting it programmatically is an incorrect implementation

!> when everything else on 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=...>

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:eQlpa4W2IHA.4704@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Correct implementation?
What do you mean by that?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

, Lee

"Juan T. Llibre"
<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:%23xhBpuW2IHA.2384@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:
!>
ASP.NET
should
make it easy
for
me—and, it
does,
!> but there
is a bug in
the
implementation.

The fact
that you

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

can set
xml:lang
programmatically,
and that you
did set it
that way,
as I did,
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.
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:%239PIQvU2IHA.2384@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Juan,

My
use
of
language
and
culture

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
the
ASP.Net
usual
of
letting
the
user
agent
(HTTP
header
'accept-language')
determine
which
language
visitors
get;
I
have

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

I
have
already
found,
first-hand,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

I'm
not
setting
lang
attributes
for
fun;
I'm
doing

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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.

,
Lee

"Juan
T.
Libre"
<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
news:uBUnOxT2IHA.4164@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

re:
!>
versus
the
spirit

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

of
what
we're
trying
to
accomplish:
telling
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

What
?
You
don't
set
a
language/culture
in
web.config,
too
?
There's
a

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Juan,

In
theory,
I
like
your
idea
of
investigating
"the
standard";
but,
in
practice
it
has
serious
problems,
as
it
often
does.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
lot
of
legal
(by
the
standard)
syntax,
that
makes
no
sense,
or
makes
some
sense
without
being
clearly

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
is
best."

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

Internationalization

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Best
Practices:
Specifying
Language
in
XHTML
&
HTML
Content
<http://www.w3.org/TR/i18n-html-tech-lang>

Tutorial:
Declaring
Language
in
XHTML
and
HTML
(Draft)
<http://www.w3.org/International/tutorials/lang>

Juan,
you
wrote:

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

You're
not
setting
it
for
"the
tag's
attribute",
you're
setting
it
for
the
contents,
all
contents,
of
the
element
(unless
overridden
by
a
sub-setting),
which
makes
perfect
sense
so
that
I
don't
have
to
set

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
user
agents
who
our
intended
audiences
is,
by
language,
as
best
we
can...which
is
why
I'm
also
setting

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

lang
in
the
HTTP
headers
and
in
page
meta
tags.

,
Lee

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

re:
!>
I
found
an
MSDN
document
that
explains
why
what
I'm
trying
to
do
should
work

Lee,

From
:

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

"A
special

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
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
```

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
purpose
of
declaring
xml:lang
for
the
html
markup
?

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

That's
perfectly
good
usage
for
xml:lang,
as
a
parser
could
selectively

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

identify
content
in
different
languages.

But,
it
seems
to
me
that
setting
xml:lang
for
the
html
tag's
attribute
values
is
unnneeded,
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.txt>).

So,
I
think
that
requisite

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
compatibility
purposes,
or
perhaps
out
of
ignorance.

If
there's
a
need
to
identify
that
the
contents
of

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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>
```

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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."

<no.spam@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote

in

message

<news:%23ocUnoI2IHA.2188@xxxx>

I
found
an
MSDN
document
that
explains
why
what
I'm
trying
to
do
should
work.

ASP.NET
Web
Server
Controls
Overview

<http://msdn.microsoft.com/er>

Note

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:Oe38JYI2IHA.4772@?>

Juan,

I
appreciate
your
trying
to
help,
but
you're
wrong,
and
you
are

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

I
am
not
confusing
html
attributes
with
runat="server"

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

attributes,
as
you
call
them.
Using
your
logic,
none
of
the
declarative
(html)
attributes
should
render
to
the
browser
after
I
add
the
runat="server"
in
ASP.NET;
yet
all
of
them
(xmlns,
lang,
and
dir)
do--except
xml:lang.

I
started
with
an
html
element
with
4
attributes
(xmlns,
lang,
xml:lang,
and
dir)

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

all
set
declaratively.
With
no
5th
attribute
of
runat="server",
all
4
attributes
render.
If
I
add
the
5th
attribute
of
runat="server",
which
does
not
and
should
not
render,
I
no
longer
get
all
4
attributes
that
should
render
(xmlns,
lang,
xml:lang,
and
dir),
I
only
get
3
(xmlns,
lang,
and
dir).

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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="server",
it
does
not
magically
make
the
xml:lang
attribute
a
server-side
attribute,
while
keeping
the
other
three
attributes
as
"html"

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

attributes.
All
four
are
still
"html"
attributes--which
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
not
have
any
server-side
attributes.
(I
have
all
4
as
literal
strings,
for
simplicity
of
an
example.)
Well,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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="server"  
xmlns="http://www.  
xml:lang="<%$  
Resources:GlobalLa  
ContentAudienceLa  
%>"  
lang="<%$  
Resources:GlobalLa  
ContentAudienceLa  
%>"  
dir="ltr">
```

Both
of
those
declarative
explicit
localization
expressions
should
work
without
my
having
to
write
any
more

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

"procedural"
(code-beside)
code

or
script.

It
actually
does

work

fine

for

the

lang

attribute--as

it

should:

but

not

for

the

xml:lang

attribute---***which

is

a

bug***.

^
Lee

"Juan
T.
Libre"

<nomailreplies@xxx

wrote

in

message

news:u0WzB9H2IH.

re:

!>

I

think

you

are

misunderstan

Juan.

Well,

I

think

you

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

36

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

are
misunderstan
me.

re:
!>
I
had
the
xml:lang
attribute
in
the
html
tag
(declarative)
like
this:

...an
it
rend
to
the
brow
as
it
shou

Yes.
because
it's
standard
html.

re:
!>
If
I
simply
add
runat="serve

That
declares
the
control
to
run
server

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

side.

For

any

attribute

to

be

programmed

server-side

you

need

a

script,

just

as

you

need

a

script

to

modify

any

server

control's

attributes.

Did

you

run

the

sample

page

I

sent

?

It

iterates

through

the

attributes

for

the

html

server

control,

and

shows

that

the

xml:lang

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

38

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

attribute
is
added
programmatically

re:
!>
If
I
simply
add
runat="serve
leaving
in
the
xml:lang
attribute
that
!>
renders
without
runat="serve
all
of
the
(declarative)
attributes
are
!>
rendered
to
the
browser--ex
the
xml:lang
attribute!
That
is
a
bug.

I
think
you're
confusing
html
attributes
with
runat="serve
attributes.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Html
attributes
can
be
inserted
in
normal
html.
Server-side
attributes
must
be
inserted
in
code.

Maybe
I'm
not
explaining
this
as
well
as
I
should.
Try
to
get
someone
else's
opinion
on
this
matter.
if
you
don't
accept
mine.

Juan
T.
Libre.
asp.net
MVP
asp.net
faq
:

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

<http://asp.net/foros/de/asp.net/en/espa%C3%B1ol>
:
<http://asp.net/>
=====
"Lee
C."
<no.spam@...>
wrote
in
message
<news:enam1...>

I
think
you
are
misu
Juan
I
had
the
xml:
attrib
in
the
html
tag
(dec
like
this:

<htm
xml
xml:
lang
dir=

...an
it
rend
to
the
brow
as
it
shou

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

If
I
simp
add
runa
leav
in
the
xml:
attri
that
rend
with
runa
all
of
the
(dec
attri
are
rend
to
the
brov
the
xml:
attri
That
is
a
bug.

<htm
runa
xml:
xml:
lang
dir=

Corc
Lee

"Jua
T.
Llib
<non
wrot
in
mess:

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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?