

Re: Fedora on ReiserFS

Source: <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/alt.os.linux.redhat/2004-11/0300.html>

From: m.marien (mm)

Date: 11/18/04

Date: Thu, 18 Nov 2004 12:25:12 -0600

"General Schvanzkoph" <schvanzkoph@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:pan.2004.11.18.15.11.04.846146@yahoo.com...

>

>>> *swap 1 GB*

>>> */ all the rest*

>>

>> *If you have several drives you might be forced to partition differently*

>> *but*

>> *if you only have one drive why partition?*

>

> *This is really stupid. At the very least you want /home to be separate for*

> */ otherwise you can't do a clean install of a new OS. I always have at*

> *least two partitions for the OS / and another one to be used for a future*

> *upgrade, plus a /home. WHen you do the upgrade you use the alternate*

> *partition so that you don't blow away your current working system.*

>

First, I think an upgrade means an upgrade of the current system on the current partition. You can't do an upgrade to a blank partition, that's called a *new* install. However, I can see your point of multiple partitions for multiple o/s. I do that all the time. My test system has eight operating systems and my workstation has six over two drives.

However, I didn't see any mention here of multi-booting, just sizing of the partitions. If he has no intention of putting anything else on this drive, then multiple partitions on a single drive for a single boot system is just a problem (allocation of space) waiting to happen. That argument is backed up by the first reply which questioned the initial posters partition size choices. Rhetoric aside, when it comes right down to it, the one partition solution will cover more situations than any other scheme.

IMHO, I think the multiple partitions is a hold back of the old days when a system had multiple drives. The whole idea of mounting drives on directories is so that there was a homogenous file system. Why partition it up, just to put it back together?