

Re: RubyOnRails and IntraWeb

Source:

<http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2006-12/msg03122.html>

- *From:* "Paul Nichols [TeamB]" <"Paul Nichols [TeamB]">
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Dec 2006 03:34:19 -0500
-

Relaxin wrote:

"none" <"paul\"@none"> wrote in message
[news:4584aa99\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:4584aa99$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Relaxin wrote:

"none" <"paul\"@none"> wrote in message
[news:458387ba\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:458387ba$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Looks interesting for newbies. However, like all of these other frameworks that generate code for you, sooner or later you are going to need to do something that it cannot do for you.

Have you even looked at their product or Demo?
Obviously not.

Yes, I have, and that is why I wrote what I did!!

What does AJAX or a Web site have to do with sticking design in a Database? Want to make your web site run super slow? Use a Database.

That is not to say that certain "data" (aka Dynamic constantly changing data), should not be stored in a DB, but for normal static type text? Get real!!

Morfik is for creating Web Applications, not necessarily websites.
There is a difference.

A very subtle one, unless by web sites, you are meaning very small static ones, like a mom and pop shop might put up with Front Page or some individual might put up to show family pictures, etc.

Another difference might be if you are using a Client/Server approach, where the Client is a true rich client running inside/outside the browser, and downloaded to the local machine and using HTTP as the transfer

Re: RubyOnRails and IntraWeb

protocol, much like a Flash, Java Applet, or Java Web Start application.

All Browser based Web Apps and Web Sites. use the basic HTTP protocol. There are inherent restrictions in a simple request/response model. The bytes of data transferred are a one way connection. Data is either sent or requested to be sent to the server and the server responds by sending bytes of data back through a socket usually running on port 80. It doesn't make any difference if you are coding a full Web Site or a browser based application, that is the way it works.

The only difference between what you may term a "dynamic" web site and a Web Application would be the requirements. However, most of the business web sites I have worked with contains hundreds of pages and tens to hundreds of applications through a portal. The portal determines security access, look and feel, and who gets access to which application.

These applications (unless they are embedded into a browser like ActiveX, Flash, or Java Applets), are not coded any differently than the Web Sites. You use the standard HTML.XHTML, or DHTML to code the pages, the standard HTTP protocol to handle the request and response. and if you are using AJAX, the XMLHttpRequest to send request and a callback method to handle the response once the readyState and status of the XMLHttpRequest is determined.

The only thing that will change, programmatically, is the requirements of the application or web site itself. The semantics and the coding paradigm doesn't change. Most Web Sites connect to databases and/or Web Services, handle input from users, and respond accordingly. Most Web Application deal with Databases or Web Services. handle request from users and respond accordingly. Little difference here.

If you had "really" looked at the product you would know that it is very scaleable.

I did not see any matrixes on scalability. Could be I missed that. But I did not see any fortune 1000 companies using the product for their major work (or even minor work) either.

I can say a product is scalable, but what does that mean? As Brian stated, we are talking server farms here, not 10 to 100 users.

What do mean proprietary, are you referring to Apache. Isn't it consider one of the best?

Apache is open source. If I want to change code in Apache, I can. If I need to add functionality, I can. I know that the product stated they built using Apache, but I do not know what that means.

You need to write your own extensions. How are you going to do that? You need to modify your JS libraries, because the Scripting language and glue tools do not do what you need to do. Well, you are either going to have to create work arounds, or start over.

Re: RubyOnRails and IntraWeb

Here is a demo show that you can use other offerings that you want to include in your Morfik design.

<http://cooleffects.labs.morfik.com/>

That demo is just illustrating some effects that can be done using the tool. So? I can do things like this all day long writing my own scripts or using a lib like Scriptaculous. But I do not see what this buys me using the product.

Basically, all they are doing here is using a script library called CoolEffects.js and passing some GUID as a part of the description. I would suspect they are using this GUID as an identifier to the server as to which process they are to run (probably a page pointer back to the page(s) that requested it, or to the library itself).

Here is a snippet of the JavaScript (if you are interested)

```
function o(m,s,t){
var c=t.t8.prototype;
while((t.vmd=t[c.t7+m])==void(0)){
if(c.t3==null)return false;
c=c.t3.prototype;
}
if(c.t8==s)return false;
return true
}
```

One note: I did copy the script locations and the GUID call for this app, ran it in a browser, and noticed that I got a full return of a Script back, along with encoded messages. Is that the way this normally works?

If so, this could really be a security risk!

They are using Script.aculo.us in this Morfik application.

I know. I can see the .js code.

Here are other demos where they are using controls from Google Maps, Yahoo, DoJo and ZapaTec.

[http://www.morfik.com/#6I\(frmXappMain!!\)I\(Morfik%20Pioneers!frmXappMain%3ASubForm1!\)I\(frmMain](http://www.morfik.com/#6I(frmXappMain!!)I(Morfik%20Pioneers!frmXappMain%3ASubForm1!)I(frmMain)

Well good to know that it doesn't prohibit you from going outside the framework. That is a plus. I still do not know what the server side stuff is doing however.

Re: RubyOnRails and IntraWeb

So I still believe that you don't know Morfik as well as you are try to make us believe.

Hmmmm, please point me to a statement where I stated I knew it? I stated I looked at it.

So you do have control

Seems like you can use normal Scripts with it at least. I still do not know how you can control the basic framework they are using, because I do not know what the basic framework is.

Maybe it's you who is being fooled into believing that Web App development can't get any better than where it currently stands.

That's actually funny!! I believe I stated I would love to have a full fledged JavaScript IDE. I think that would do more for Web Development than anything else. I am certain that I am not alone. :)

What I would really like to see is something like Nvu with a full fledged JavaScript IDE built in. You can visually design your Page or Page Fragment, Templates, etc. Click on the XHTML tags, add your Java Script code, code your JS functions, point to your server, and then within the IDE, debug the application; Java Script functions and all. We almost have this with Firefox and the Web Tools, but not quite.

Read the following article about why Google and Microsoft are getting into the JavaScript compiler business also.

Do you know more than them?

<http://blogs.zdnet.com/web2explorer/index.php?p=197>

Why in the world do we want a JavaScript compiler? Who is going to determine what the compiled code will look like? What VM are we going to use? Are we going to have one for Windows and another for everyone else? I am sure MS would love this; more platform lock in.

I am not against an XUL type runtime, (we already have that with Mozilla's XUL under MPL license), but Microsoft will not allow it to be used in IE. The entire reason that AJAX is so attractive, is that it does not require a downloadable runtime like Java or Flash, the browser contains the interpreter.

If we could truly have a non proprietary totally STANDARDS BASED compiled browser language, then count me in!! I think everyone but Microsoft could agree on it. I would love to eat my words, but I do not think there is any way MS would ever agree (and live by what they agreed to), a true XPlatform browser VM. We had one (and still do) with Java and MS took it and tried to make it proprietary. When they could not make it proprietary, they quit shipping that VM
(Yes, I know Sun sued MS, but Sun's lawsuit was because they released a non standard, proprietary Java using

Re: RubyOnRails and IntraWeb

the Java license, which was clearly illegal. The judgment only required that MS could not continue work on the illegal copy of the MS VM, not that they could not ship a legal JVM).

If you are suggesting that we have a Server Side Java Script compiler, I would suggest that you take a look at the old Netscape LiveScript as an example of why we do not need this kind of beast.

I do know what Google is doing with their Google Toolkit and they are not making a Java Script compiler. What they are doing is using Java Tag Libraries that manage the Java Script for you, by using specialized tags that are interpreted by tag libraries (which is a standard part of JSP programming, BTW), instead of writing all of the Java Script yourself.

This can be useful, but you still will not find everything you need in the Google Toolkit. It is a start and can really help aid you in your coding quest (especially against their services), and it is a model I myself use quite often. And we are certainly not the only ones (Google, nor my development teams). This is what DWR does with their library, Yahoo has and is doing with Java and PHP, Oracle has been doing with ADF, and JavaSoft is doing with the Java Server Faces. The My Faces, and Apache's Open Faces are going down the same path. That is quite different however, than a Java Script Compiler.

I don't want to hijack this thread and continue to give you a platform to talk about yourself and stroke your own ego.

LOL!! So when it is your suggestion, it is submitted with the utmost in humility. But when anyone else might question that opinion, it is because they are stroking their own ego?

I was just simple presenting the OP another option to look into, to aid him in his quest for a framework for AJAX development.

Nothing at all wrong with this. It may fit his model. My suggestion was and is, that you do not depend upon a code generation tool. If it works as you seem to believe it does, then it may be OK. But from what I have seen and read, I have serious questions about it.

Do not get me wrong, it may be a step in the right direction in some degree, but I would warn people about taking shortcuts into Web Development in general.

I have seen and interviewed far too many people who rely on Wizards and code generators who think they have careers, only to have that belief dashed, when they are forced to look for new employment.

I am curious however. Are you working for or with this company?

.