

Re: Seeing VERSIONINFO under Vista?

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VC/microsoft.public.vc.mfc/2007-05/msg01881.html>

- *From:* "Alexander Grigoriev" <alegr@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 24 May 2007 19:48:49 -0700
-

I had files lost with FAT32 under Win2K. A friend of mine lost directory with source code if the driver he was debugging.
But NTFS survived quite a lot of abuse, including memory errors.

"Joseph M. Newcomer" <newcomer@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:tj6c53dp05uhgk5iioifvn7h8tb6imdfar@xxxxxxxxxxxx

I had a lot of problems with FAT file systems, including one memorable night when it wiped the master boot record hours before I was supposed to leave on a trip with my computer. I spent six solid hours salvaging files. It Was Not A Fun Evening. I finished up ten minutes after the cab arrived to take me to the airport, at 4am (I fell asleep in the cab, which was good because we were going out in an ice storm, and the cab was all over the highway)
joe

On Thu, 24 May 2007 11:30:52 -0700, "David Ching" <dc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Joseph M. Newcomer" <newcomer@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:df6b531pbrrjmltrfud9jae812jo77lor@xxxxxxxxxxxx

Historical note: as recently as 2003, a certain large multinational company required that all machines be configured with a FAT file system under XP, "because it is more secure". This proves beyond all doubt that we are descended from monkeys, except for certain IT managers, who have not yet evolved. A friend of mine who worked there

Re: Seeing VERSIONINFO under Vista?

was
told this when
his computer was installed (the second day he worked there),
and when he
stopped laughing
he typed 'dconvert' to a command shell to convert it to NTFS.
When he
was
told 'you can't
do that' he looked blank and said "but I just did!". Ultimately
his
group
had the only
NTFS-based systems in the entire company (even the
servers were FAT,
except for his
group's servers).

I resisted NTFS for many years because it had poorer performance than a regularly defragmented FAT-32, especially if journalling is enabled, which it took a reg key to disable (don't know the case now). In addition, it was downright handy to use a Win98 boot disk to boot to DOS and be able to access files on drive C:. For me, the only reason to move to NTFS was its support of files larger than 4 GB, which I get regularly now that I record video using Media Center.

As for reliability, FAT-32 was plenty reliable. Even if you had to ScanDisk all the time. I rarely lost data that couldn't be recovered. BTW, you still have to Chkdsk even now after a crash, but in Vista, MS chose to display a blank screen when it's running. As if hiding the truth will somehow make the pain go away.

-- David

Joseph M. Newcomer [MVP]
email: newcomer@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Web: <http://www.flounder.com>
MVP Tips: http://www.flounder.com/mvp_tips.htm