

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.framework.aspnet/2008-06/msg01974.html>

- *From:* "Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 30 Jun 2008 07:33:10 -0400
-

re:

!> The Microsoft team has confirmed the bug.

Don't raise your hopes up too high, though :

"The product team will review this issue and make a decision on whether they will fix it or not for the next release"

Seriously : congratulations.

I still disagree with a few of the other statements you made, particularly those personally directed at me, though, Mr Kettle.

<chuckle>

I hope you don't mind taking that comment in stride.

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:e3ioH1n2IHA.1768@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Mr. Pot,

The Microsoft team has confirmed the bug.

"We were able to reproduce the issue you are seeing. We are escalating this *****bug***** to the product unit who works on that specific feature area. The product team will review this issue and make a decision on whether they will fix it or not for the next release"

Cordially,
Mr. Kettle

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

"Juan T. Llibre" <nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:eo2Lf\$k2IHA.2188@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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
unnecessary 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@xxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:OaAr\$lk2IHA.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 feature.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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,
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@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

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?)

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

, Lee

"Juan T. Llibre"
<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
news:urCtna2IHA.4476@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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.](https://connect.microsoft.com/VisualStudio/feedback/ViewFeedback)

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:eOlpa4W2IHA.4704@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Correct
implementation?
What
do
you
mean
by
that?

I
stated
earlier
on
that
I

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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

=====
"Lee
C."

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

<nomail@xxxxxxx>

wrote

in

message

news:%239PIQvU2IHA.2384@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

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

the

ASP.Net

usual

of

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
agents
(including
search
engine

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
from
Australia'
checkbox
checked

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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.

,
Lee

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

"Juan
T.
Libre"

<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxxxx>

wrote

in

message

news:uBUnQxT2IHA.4164@xxxxxxxxxxxx

re:

!>

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

lang

in

the

HTTP

headers

and

in

page

meta

tags

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
specific
language
attributes
in

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
forget
to
let
us

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@xxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:en1PZVT2IHA.524@xxxxxxxx>

Juan,

In
theory,
I
like
your
idea
of

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
lot
of
legal
(by

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
is
best."

Check

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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->

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

Juan,
you
wrote:

But,
it
seems
to
me
that
setting
xml:lang
for
the
html

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

tag's
attribute
values
is
unnecessary,
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/>)

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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
user
agents
who
our

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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.
Llibre"
<nomailreplies@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:OYI4upK2IHA.5140@>

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

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

to
do
should
work

Lee,

From
:

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

"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
being
declared
for
specific

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

content
values,
for
example
:

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

```
<p  
xml:lang="en-US">  
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
purpose
of
declaring
xml:lang

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

for
the
html
markup
?

A
similar
explanation
is
given
here

:
<http://www.simonstl>

---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.

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

</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
set
to
a
language

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

identifier,
as
defined
by
IETF
RFC
4646
(<http://www.ietf.org/>)

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
compatibility
purposes,
or
perhaps

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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>
```

That
makes
a
lot

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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/foro>

=====
"Lee
C."
<no.spam@xxxxxxx>
wrote
in
message
<news:%23ocUnoI2II>

I
found
an
MSDN
document
that
explains
why
what
I'm

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

trying
to
do
should
work.

ASP.NET
Web
Server
Controls
Overview
<http://msdn.1>

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
HTML
element
on
a

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

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@...>
wrote
in
message
news:Oe38J...

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

Juan

I
appr
your
tryin
to
help
but
you'
wron
and
you
are
the
one
who
is
conf
:]

I
am
*not
disp
that
whe
inse
prog
the
xml:
attri
rend
to
the
brov
I
did
just
that
as
a
worl
arou
(righ
after
I
disc
this
bug)
but,

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

I
shou
not
have
to.

I
am
*not
conf
html
attrib
with
runa
attrib
as
you
call
them
Usin
your
logic
none
of
the
decl
(htm
attrib
shou
rend
to
the
brow
after
I
add
the
runa
in
ASP
yet
all
of
them
(xml
lang
and
dir)
do--
xml:

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

I
start
with
an
html
elem
with
4
attri
(xml
lang
xml:
and
dir)
all
set
decl
With
no
5th
attri
of
runa
all
4
attri
rend
If
I
add
the
5th
attri
of
runa
whic
does
not
and
shou
not
rend
I
no
long
get
all
4
attri
that
shou

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

rend
(xml
lang
xml:
and
dir),
I
only
get
3
(xml
lang
and
dir).
My
logic
says
I
shou
get
4,
your
says
I
shou
get
3?
It
wou
be
4
or
0,
and
4
is
right
Not
0...a
not
3.

Whe
I
add
runa
it
does
not
mag
mak

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

the
xml:
attrib
a
serv
attrib
whil
keep
the
othe
three
attrib
as
"htm
attrib
All
four
are
still
"htm
attrib
shou
rend

I
think
the
simp
of
my
exan
may
be
conf
you.
It
is
odd
that,
in
my
exan
I
set
runa
but
do
not
have
any
serv

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

attrib
(I
have
all
4
as
liter:
strin
for
simp
of
an
exan
Wel
in
my
real-
use,
I
do
have
serv
attrib
whic
I
wan
set
decl
(no
code
and
no
scrip
I
have

```
<htm  
runa  
xml:  
xml:  
Resc  
Con  
%>"  
lang  
Resc  
Con  
%>"  
dir=
```

Both
of

Re: ASP.NET Internationalization bug?

those
decl
expl
local
expr
shou
worl
with
my
havi
to
writ
any
more
"pro
(cod
code
or
scrip
It
actu
does
worl
fine
for
the
lang
attri
it
shou
but
not
for
the
xml:
attri
is
a
bug?

Lee

"Jua
T.
Lib
<no
wrot
in
mess
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?

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?