```
Hacker News new | comments | show | ask | jobs | submit
NoScript Not Available for Latest Firefox (noscript.net)
  51 points by Amezarak 2 hours ago | hide | past | web | 57 comments | favorite
   add comment
0xcde4c3db 1 hour ago [-]
  It's probably better to go straight to the blog post about the migration:
  https://hackademix.net/2017/11/14/double-noscript/
  Basically, the work to adapt NoScript and correspondingly expand the WebExtensions API has been going on for years, the original plan was to have a smooth transition
  when Firefox 57 came out, but there were some delays in the final days leading up to the release. Not recommended to stay on Firefox 56 because it won't get security
  patches; move to 52 ESR instead.
  <u>reply</u>
      shock 24 minutes ago [-]
         Moving to Firefox 52 isn't really an option for me because it's a pig compared to 55/56 (it consumes almost 5GBs of RAM compared to 1GB for 56).
         <u>reply</u>
amenod 55 minutes ago [-]
  I upgraded to Firefox 57 only to find all 4 of my extensions missing... I can live without others, but being without NoScript felt like walking on streets naked. So the first
  thing I did was downgrade to Firefox ESR, then I started looking for alternatives. Turns out that uMatrix fills this role perfectly (for me of course). Not only can I
  block/allow JS, CSS and similar resources, but I can do it based on domain / 3rd party domain matrix... Nice, I always hated that when I allow `gstatic.com` in NoScript
  for some domain it is allowed globally (for all domains). I will test uMatrix for a few more days just to see if I feel comfortable without NoScript, then I'll upgrade back to
  FF 57. It looks like this might have a silver lining after all. :)
  (for the record: I hate it that they broke compatibility with older extensions, and I hate that they changed UI, but if that gives FF greater market share, then I'm all for it)
  <u>reply</u>
      jchw 38 minutes ago [-]
         Killing the old extension API is a painful, but important, step.
         From a security standpoint, WebExtensions are a lot better, since they are sandboxed and require explicit permissions to be granted for many things.
         From a developer standpoint, they are easier to deal with, being JavaScript, and since Chrome and Edge support similar APIs, developers will no longer need
         multiple codebases to support their extensions on multiple browsers.
         They also work better with a highly concurrent browser. They use asynchronous APIs that don't directly call into browser APIs. FFs old extensions were known for
         leaking memory, which is a lot less of an issue with WebExtensions.
         Compatibility is another huge thing. With old Firefox extensions, compatibility was just an extension author saying, "Yep, the APIs still work the way I'm using
         them." They often broke in subtle ways and you could get them partially working by overriding the versions supported in the extension manifest. Not so great imo.
         WebExtension APIs are more or less like JavaScript APIs and compatibility is mostly going to be limited by support for capabilities. Like, I'm sure Firefox does not
         support the USB API that Chrome does.
         There's so much to be gained from getting rid of the old extension system for concurrency, extension compatibility, and the health of the ecosystem and individual
         browser installations. Many will be angry and stick to ESRs and others will be mildly upset but I think in the long run this will have been one of the better Mozilla
         decisions that make Quantum a success.
         <u>reply</u>
             ▲ Karunamon 22 minutes ago [-]
                From a usability standpoint, WebExtensions have a lot less control of the browser and some use cases are completely closed off. The Webex version of Tree
                Style Tabs, for instance, requires you to have a redundant tab bar on top because it's not allowed to hide the main one. Pentadactyl can't have it's sub-buffer
                anymore. Download managers/scrapers like DownThemAll can't even do their main function anymore. On and on and on.
                Part of security is availability - the most secure system is one that is unplugged and unusable. Mozilla has taken the step of putting covers on all the outlets
                (damn those who want to plug something in), bubble-wrapping all the knives (damn those who want to cut something), and essentially baby proofing the
                browser (damn those who are adults), making it far less usable in the process.
                Firefox was the extensible browser. That was its differentiation. Now it's yet another Chrome clone (hang the technical differences, those are not what I refer
                to) with an extension system to match, but it's not made by Google, so that's a positive, I guess?
                If I sound upset, it's because Mozilla took what was a big part of my daily life, an amazing and infinitely versatile tool that I'd grown with and customized over
                the years until it was like a comfortable pair of shoes and just completely fucked it in the most thorough way possible. Sure, an extension broke every
                upgrade or two, but it was survivable. This? This is not.
                Okay, it's faster. Neat. Whatever. I didn't use Firefox because of it's blazing speed.
                As of this moment, there are no good browsers. There is nothing out there that matches what Firefox was. (And ESR is just prolonging the inevitable).
                This is legitimately saddening for me and many others - and no amount of insisting this is better despite the many more important ways its worse will change
                that. Mozilla's target user at some point stopped being me and started being someone else. I can accept that. What I can't accept is this constant,
                infuriating, paternalistic posturing that it's for my own good.
                <u>reply</u>
              Amezarak 25 minutes ago [-]
                > There's so much to be gained from getting rid of the old extension system for concurrency, extension compatibility, and the health of the ecosystem and
                individual browser installations.
                I personally think that while it's clearly great for security and possibly good for Firefox in general, it's also terrible for the extension ecosystem. The set of
                possible extensions is being reduced from "literally anything computable" to "what the API supports." Sure, (some) popular extensions are basically being
                grandfathered in by having APIs added just for them, but that doesn't help the extensions that aren't written yet and will now never be written.
                Essentially, a major selling point of Firefox has been sacrificed in the hope that the increased security, better perf, and greater development velocity leads to
                greater marketshare. Well, I hope so, but I think the jury will be out on that for a while.
                Other than that, Quantum seems great. I did lose all my tabs when it updated (boo - that's never happened before), and I think the whole-window-width
                address bar dropdown is bizarre and ugly, but other than that it's great. I suppose the only long-term concern is that default merger of the address bar and
                search bar - configurable options have a habit of eventually being dropped, and I think a world of omnibars is less usable and less privacy-conscious.
                <u>reply</u>
      ynezz 21 minutes ago [-]
         > felt like walking on streets naked
         So browsing on the phone is not evoking similar feeling? :-)
         <u>reply</u>
vesinisa 1 hour ago [-]
  uMatrix is a replacement extension from the creator, and compatible with, uBlock. uMatrix migrated to Quantum leveraging the existing Chrome codebase already about a
  month ago: <a href="https://github.com/gorhill/uMatrix">https://github.com/gorhill/uMatrix</a>
  Some learning curve is required compared to NoScript since uMatrix allows even finer grained control (not just scripts, but images, cookies, iframes and XHR as well), but I
  personally migrated about a year ago successfully. Very happy with uMatrix so far with the latest Firefox.
  <u>reply</u>
      forapurpose 12 minutes ago [-]
         To add some important points:
         > uMatrix is a replacement extension from the creator, and compatible with, uBlock.
         To avoid any confusion, I think the parent means, 'from the creator of ... uBlock'. uMatrix is not by the creator of NoScript.
         Also, blocking just JavaScript is quicker and easier in uMatrix (at least easier than the current NoScript; I don't know about the upcoming version). The UI is far
         more efficient, and you configure it by origin/remote pairs (e.g., on foo.example.com allow googleapis.com; on other example.com hosts, block it; on example.org
         allow it everywhere).
         But NoScript does far more than block JavaScript; it's a sophisticated firewall, in some ways. Look through the options menus and lookup the features, such as ABE;
         it's impressive. uMatrix doesn't replace much of that functionality.
         <u>reply</u>
old-gregg 1 hour ago [-]
  I've always used YesScript, it has a much simpler UI -> basically a single button which remembers if JS is on/off for a given site. It's always been puzzling to me why
  YesScript is less popular... And yes, it's available for the latest FF as YesScript2 [1]
  [1] https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/yesscript2/
  <u>reply</u>
      TheDong 1 hour ago [-]
         "YesScript" is significantly less secure and powerful.
         Most importantly, with NoScript I can block tracking and ad-related javascript while still running the page's first-party javascript.
         With yesscript, I don't get that granularity.
         Perhaps that's why it's less popular. I also believe that it came out later and thus hasn't had the time to gather such a following as noscript has (though who would
         use a worse version of noscript instead?)
         <u>reply</u>
mrich 1 hour ago [-]
  The plugin breakage is the only downside of the new Firefox, the rest is just awesome.
  I'm still looking for a new auto form filler that can have multiple profiles and fills in all fields at once with a hotkey. This is useful for filling in bugzilla bug reports where
  some fields always get the same data.
  <u>reply</u>
      kreetx 1 hour ago [-]
         Yes for awesome, and the new Web Extension API which now breaks things will make cross-browser browser extension development possible (as far as I have
         read!). I can very well live in default-land for a couple of weeks for that.
         Also, this extension-breakage taking place right now seems to be mostly the extension developers' fault, since they've known well in advance that this is coming.
         (Not judging, just saying -- many/most extensions are probably hobby projects, and porting them appears to take a non-trivial effort.)
         EDIT: removed a word from a wrong place:) Definitely not a spelling mistake, not wording either, hmm, what should I write here.
         <u>reply</u>
             awirth 36 minutes ago [-]
                I have a small extension (~100 users) that I forgot to upgrade until 57 landed and broke it. I hastily threw together a WebExt version and pushed on
                Wednesday night, but forgot to set the strict_min_version flag correctly (which was, unfortunately, Firefox 57).
                The new version worked fine for people on 57, but for anyone that was on ESR or a slightly out-of-date version of firefox and updated they got a broken
                WebExtension that I couldn't push another update to to fix it - Firefox doesn't let you "downgrade" from a WebExtension to a native extension. Thankfully a
                user emailed me about it and I had it fixed in less than 48 hours, but it was still a mess. All I could do was add a note to the addon description and disable
                the bad versions and anyone that got broke had to manually downgrade.
                The new Webextensions are nice, but it was definitely easy to shoot yourself in the foot with the transition. I know that NoScript also needs the same API that
                I was using (the ability to inspect response bodies), FWIW.
                The extension is <a href="https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/qpsdetect/">https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/qpsdetect/</a> for those curious
                EDIT: brevity
                <u>reply</u>
      Endy 1 hour ago [-]
         "The only downside" Sure. Aside from the number of other extensions that simply won't work in new Firefox. And the lack of any user control to make the browser
         not work like or look like Chrome.
         <u>reply</u>
             babuskov 20 minutes ago [-]
                And the fact that today was the first time I have seen Firefox crash after 3+ years of heavy everyday usage. Luckily I didn't "upgrade" Firefox on my main
                machine. I'm staying away from 57 until they get it together.
                <u>reply</u>
              colemickens 36 minutes ago [-]
                > And the lack of any user control to make the browser not work like or look like Chrome.
                How is that? The omnibox is toggle-able. The entire browser UI is drag-n-drop customizable. I literally don't know of a single thing that is less customizable in
                57 than 56, but I'm curious to hear more about what you're referring to?
                reply
              brador 57 minutes ago [-]
                And Telemetry that's difficult/impossible to remove.
                reply
      pera 30 minutes ago [-]
         I love FF57 performance, but I'm having a hard time without Vimperator.
         <u>reply</u>
             gfodor 25 minutes ago [-]
                Saka keys provides a slice of vimperators functionality, might be worth trying. It's far from vimperator but better than nothing.
                <u>reply</u>
      tempestn 1 hour ago [-]
         Can do that with Lastpass fwiw, but being as it's not a primary feature it's probably a bit clunkier than a dedicated tool. Mostly intended for filling in mailing
         addresses.
         <u>reply</u>
user98793728364 1 hour ago [-]
  The correct title should be "NoScript Not YET Available for Latest Firefox"
  <u>reply</u>
      el_benhameen 1 hour ago [-]
         Yeah, when I saw the title and that the link was to the noscript site, I thought there must be some bad blood or something between Mozilla and noscript. Instead it's
         just a polite "hey everyone, working hard!". Which is great, but not really what the title indicates.
         <u>reply</u>
      Amezarak 31 minutes ago [-]
         I thought about making the title something like that, but I didn't want it to seem as if the author should be maligned for not having it finished yet and I felt that it
         would have that connotation. I thought the title as written would be more neutral in that respect.
         I personally consider NoScript an absolute must for security reasons, so I am not updating most of my machines until it is available. I thought that would be
         newsworthy for other people who have a similar mindset.
         reply
mnl 47 minutes ago [-]
  And no MAFF nor MHTML support in Quantum... as MAFF is/was great, now I have to keep yet another browser just to read my old files.
  <u>reply</u>
ryuuchin 1 hour ago [-]
  uBlock Origin and uMatrix can both do the same thing and are compatible.
  This is just my opinion but both have better and more intuitive interfaces as well.
  <u>reply</u>
      milofeynman 29 minutes ago [-]
         uMatrix felt like a lot of work. But I finally took the plunge and I love it. It is insightful how different websites are pieced together.
         <u>reply</u>
      forapurpose 10 minutes ago [-]
         They do some of the same things, but there's a lot they don't do.
         https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=15730800
         <u>reply</u>
      csdreamer7 46 minutes ago [-]
         Love uBlock Origin. The author made it compatible months ago.
         <u>reply</u>
      solnyshok 42 minutes ago [-]
         one more vote for uBo. Since I discovered its advanced script blocking interface, I went and disabled NoScript.
         <u>reply</u>
staticassertion 1 hour ago [-]
  I just use uMatrix.
  <u>reply</u>
benjaminjackman 1 hour ago [-]
  Anyone know if xmarks is going to end up working with it? It works in Chrome and has for a long time, so it should be pretty straightforward to port, though xmarks
  doesn't get a lot of development at all (not even sure it needs it).
  If not is there an alternative sync bookmarks between chrome and firefox solution anyone can recommend?
  <u>reply</u>
K0nserv 1 hour ago [-]
  I use UBlock Origin to achieve pretty much the same behaviour as NoScript. Haven't found a reason to use NoScript since I started doing that.
  <u>reply</u>
      jszymborski 1 hour ago [-]
         I've used NoScript for quite a while, and was sad to let it go when I switched to Quantum in Beta a while back.
         I tried using uMatrix, which is from the same folks that made uBlock Origin, and I have to say I'm supperr happy with it. It applies the same heuristics that I usually
         apply manually (namely, allow 1st-party scripts automatically, allow 3rd-party manually as required).
         I'm going to install NoScript when the WebExt version comes out, mainly for the excellent XSS/Canvas/misc. support. It remains to be seen which I'll use for
         blocking scripts, but I'm glad to have options.
         <u>reply</u>
      notanote 1 hour ago [-]
         Yes, once you turn on the "I am an advanced user" setting, you can fine tune script blocking in Ublock Origin. It's called dynamic filtering.
         https://github.com/gorhill/uBlock/wiki/Dynamic-filtering:-qu...
         <u>reply</u>
      ehllo 1 hour ago [-]
         I use also UBlock Origin and there is really clear difference. With NoScript you can Browse most of the Sites without Javascript-Gimmicks like Parallax-News-
         Scrolling (for example Bloomberg) or On-Site-Embeded-Advertisemet (no JS no Ads). UBlock is nice but without NoScript it is not good enough for my personal
         <u>reply</u>
      ▲ topspin 1 hour ago [-]
         I use UBlock on mobile hardware where I want more aggressive filtering and Ghostery on the desktop. Both work in FF 57. I used NoScript in Chrome for many
         years and for a long time it worked very well, but the web evolved and I found myself forever wading through blocked scripts and unblocking or disabling NoScript
         altogether to get sites to function properly.
         <u>reply</u>
      forapurpose 9 minutes ago [-]
         There's a lot of overlap, but uMatrix doesn't replace NoScript.
         https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=15730800
         reply
ufo 1 hour ago [-]
  BTW, is anyone here knowledgeable enough about NoScript's development to know whether their "until the end of this week" prediction is solid or if it is more vague like
  ValveTime?
  <u>reply</u>
smegel 1 hour ago [-]
  > NoScript's unique whitelist based pre-emptive script blocking approach
  Is that unique apart from what Chrome has built in by default? (obviously you still need to opt-in).
  reply
gdulli 1 hour ago [-]
  The utility of the long tail of Firefox plugins was what gave it its value. I've been using a hybrid of Pale Moon and Firefox since the last round of losing plugins and now
  don't see a reason to keep Firefox at all.
  reply
      ▲ Etheryte 1 hour ago [-]
         While I definitely see where you're coming from, I certainly prefer building for better peformance as opposed to supporting everything forever. Analogous to
         Windows, supporting all the old things gave them a strong edge in their business, but they also paid a very hefty price on it (performance issues, security loopholes,
         BSODs to name a few).
         <u>reply</u>
      pbhjpbhj 1 hour ago [-]
         I'd value a resource with a simple explanation of the changes that prevent a compatibility layer from enabling all the old plugins?
             majewsky 1 hour ago [-]
                In one sentence, the move to more aggressive multithreading and sandboxing. The old extension model conflicts with the boundaries that had to be
                established for both these things.
                <u>reply</u>
                    noisem4ker 40 minutes ago [-]
                      They used to provide shims to ease making old addons compatible with multiprocessing, although with serious performance implications.
                       <u>reply</u>
              noisem4ker 46 minutes ago [-]
                Part of the breakage is precisely due to the explicit intention to drop all the legacy APIs and the respective shims that have become too much of a burden to
                maintain over time.
                One major technical change would be the deprecation plan of XUL/XBL (the toolkit used to build the interface, which could be freely accessed by addons) in
                favor of a wholly HTML future.
                <u>reply</u>
              forapurpose 5 minutes ago [-]
                AFAIK, the old add-ons could interface with Firefox in any way they wanted; they had carte blanche. You can imagine the dependency hell and security risks;
                it's not desirable to duplicate that.
                <u>reply</u>
akerro 1 hour ago [-]
  Brave Browser has "Shield" mechanism where you can block ads/trackers and JS. It's built-in feature, you can set it up to be enabled by default or per-domain.
  reply
      majewsky 1 hour ago [-]
         Switching browsers just because some extension does not work for a few days after an upgrade seems like blowing it waaaay out of proportion.
         <u>reply</u>
             babuskov 17 minutes ago [-]
                > does not work for a few days after an upgrade
                "A few days" is an understatement. Extension developers have known for months that these changes would break. If they hadn't created compatible versions
                by now, they certainly won't be able to do some in just a couple of days.
                <u>reply</u>
              digi_owl 26 minutes ago [-]
                People stuck with Firefox because of the old, potent, extension framework.
                Now they have no reason to stick with Firefox because the extension framework is just another Chrome clone, so why not switch to an actual Chrome clone?
                <u>reply</u>
andrei_says_ 1 hour ago [-]
  The title of this post is incorrect.
  Seems like it is available, just in the old extension format.
  From the noscript site:
  > Please be patient: if you feel naked while you're waiting for the "brand new" NoScript, you can still use the "regular" NoScript 5.x (and all the other extensions of yours)
  on Firefox 52 ESR, which will receive security updates until June 2018. See you soon!
  Edit: my statement is incorrect, the noscript page refers to the ESR version of firefox.
  > authors suggest to use ESR, which is Extended Support Release, not the latest firefox.
  reply
      pbhjpbhj 1 hour ago [-]
         Latest Firefox is 57.0 "Quantum", for which it's not available, as in the title.
         I feel the way addons were handled in the upgrade was wrong, most of mine were just removed rather than being listed and marked as "incompatible". That seems
         wrong to me.
         <u>reply</u>
      ycmbntrthrwaway 1 hour ago [-]
         It is not, authors suggest to use ESR, which is Extended Support Release, not the latest firefox.
         <u>reply</u>
             andrei_says_ 1 hour ago [-]
```

I see, my bad.

mariuolo 12 minutes ago [-]

Or you know, "if you feel unsafe" you can always downgrade to 56 or chromium.

Webextensions should have been sorted out by then. Hopefully.

Or ESR if you are willing to re-create your profile. It's based on 52.x and is going to be supported until March 2018.

<u>reply</u>

zython 1 hour ago [-]

<u>reply</u>

<u>reply</u>