

# Re: engineers' brains

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2006-06/msg04460.html>

---

- *From:* [mrdarrett@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mrdarrett@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 21 Jun 2006 00:20:11 -0700
- 

bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx wrote:

mrdarrett@xxxxxxxx wrote:

bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx wrote:

mrdarrett@xxxxxxxx wrote:

John Larkin wrote:

<http://www.eetimes.com/news/latest/showArticle.jhtml;jsessionId=LMOBPT>

John

So the moral of the story is, we engineers  
should choose... um, how do  
I say this politely... less intellectually  
talented females for wives?

Scarcely. There are lots of ways of being intelligent in lots of  
different fields. My wife is a psycholinguist, a professor and  
the  
author of a lot of heavily cited papers. Her opinions on the  
way our  
central heating system should be run are firmly held and  
perfectly  
rational as far as they go, but wrong, because she doesn't  
understand  
the engineering involved and isn't in a position to appreciate  
the depth  
of her ignorance.

## Re: engineers' brains

"...isn't in a position to appreciate the depth of her ignorance." I like that line. I like it a lot. ;)

Just curious, what \*were\* her ideas on the modifications to the central heating system?

She insisted that the hot water be heated only for about four hours every night, so that it was hot when we took our showers in the morning, rather than letting the central heating boiler keep the hot water up to temperature all the time.

She had found this to be a good scheme when living on her own in a house with a very poorly insulated hot water tank, and insisted on sticking to the strategy in a house with a double insulated hot water tank that had an thermal time constant of three days.

She was right, in the sense that her strategy did save us about ten dollars a year, but it meant that if I came back from hockey practice soaked with sweat, I had a s