

Re: FAT32 vs. NTFS

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2006-05/msg06749.html>

- *From:* "Asher_N" <ashernat@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 18 May 2006 12:11:22 -0700
-

All Things Mopar <none_of_your@xxxxxxxx> wrote in
<news:Xns97C6A39345BE3ReplyScoreTag@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

Today attempted to dazzle everyone with this profound
linguistic utterance

why, exactly?

Security for one! FAT32 has no way of securing files
between one user and another, NTFS has file permissions and
EFS. Quotas & auditing for 2, you can't set quota limits or
audit file ownership on FAT32. Functionality for 3, NTFS
supports much larger disk sizes, also supports volume mount
points.

First, SP2 has no more security than did SP1 in this regard,
but it really doesn't matter in a single-use environment, that
used by the vast majority of XP users outside corporate IT
houses. Add to that the simple fact that "microsoft security"
is in the same class of oxymoron as "military intelligence" or
even the TLA "MAD", used during the Cold War, which was itself
a 3-word oxy – Mutually Assured Distruction.

Read first. Not talking about SP. Talking about file systems. I'd contend
that a majority of non-corporate systems do indeed have multi users
(dad,mom, kids). Only NTFS allows you to secure folders by specific user.

I agree with R. McCarty, now a days, I see no reason to use

Re: FAT32 vs. NTFS

FAT32 on a single boot XP system. Only time I would use FAT32 is between a dual boot OS where the other OS doesn't support NTFS. Even then I'd use NTFS for the boot partition, and FAT32 for a second data partition.

I use NTFS for my primary partitions and for one of my two data partitions, primarily to get greater-than-4-gig file sizes, not for performance, which is best described in my many years of experience as "dismal".

But, as another said, YMMV. Cheers!