

# **Scientists find women lose a chunk of their brains during pregnancy. Blue pill researchers media concludes this makes women even more perfect than they were already.**

December 20, 2016 | 83 upvotes | by [MattyAnon](#)

---

Article here: <http://archive.is/aCxYc>

This study, published in Nature Neuroscience, looked at the brain scans of women ... after they gave birth, and two years later, to see how the brain changed. The researchers found "substantial" reductions in the volume of grey matter in the brains of first-time mothers. The grey matter changes occurred in areas of the brain involved in social interactions used for attributing thoughts and feelings to other people - known as "theory-of-mind" tasks.

So it's now proven that women literally lose a chunk of their (already limited) "theory of mind" brainpower during pregnancy.

Let's see what conclusions the researchers come to, with zero evidence:

The researchers thought this would give new mothers an advantage in various ways - help them recognise the needs of their child, be more aware of potential social threats and become more attached to their baby.

Why would they conclude this: Well, let's take a look at the Wikipedia "Women are Wonderful" article:

The phrase was coined by Eagly & Mladinic (1994) after finding that both male and female participants tend to assign positive traits to women, with woman participants showing a far more pronounced bias.

TL;DR: Science proves women lose their brains during pregnancy, researchers conjur out of nowhere that this makes women even more wonderful than they were already.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

dinosauralienspirits • 53 points • 20 December, 2016 08:48 PM

It is the part of the brain relating to empathy, so women get more selfish after child birth. That seems like a survival advantage. It doesnt mean they are "stupider", though.

Toolman890 • 25 points • 20 December, 2016 08:53 PM

Women turn from some of the most selfish creatures in the world to one of the most selfless (only for their offspring) overnight. Literally the complete opposite of what you say and it's a great sudden change. I'd say the shift in brain matter is her lessening her emphasis on sex and manipulation so her brain is more focused on the child.

dinosauralienspirits • 30 points • 20 December, 2016 08:58 PM

I mean selfish for herself and the baby while not caring about others. The study says the part of the brain relating to empathy is shrunk.

dr\_warlock • 15 points • 21 December, 2016 02:36 AM

This is a good thing and should be encouraged.

xx69bootyhunter69xx • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 12:37 PM

damn anyone here know how can a male get pregnant without a sex change or any of that weird body surgeries? I too wanna lose some of my brainpower devoted to empathy and go more dark triad so I can get pussy more easily...

TheRedStoic • 6 points • 21 December, 2016 02:30 PM

Don't need to do that.

Go get shot at and watch some of your friends get blown up.

You'll become a critical eye in no time. Won't have any time for bullshit and it'll be easy for you to recognize.

If you get out in one healthy piece that is.

In summary, if you want to force yourself to be dark triad, do things that force your brain to shut off empathy to survive. There's not really going back though.

circlhat • -8 points • 20 December, 2016 10:07 PM

Women turn from some of the most selfish creatures in the world to one of the most selfless (only for their offspring) overnight.

False, women create children to extort child support, not all but to say a mothers love is strong is a understatement , women are manipulative and children are a tool they use.

Mothers love is no stronger than fathers nor the bond, lets not spread false information

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 11:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

dr\_warlock • 12 points • 21 December, 2016 02:41 AM

/u/TheReofrmist94, /u/circlhat, /u/FatStig

What the fuck is this? There's bashing women, then there's this childish hate train that makes no sense whatsoever.

/u/redpillschool, they deserve temp bans.

circlhat • -1 points • 21 December, 2016 10:16 AM

Mothers love is no stronger than fathers nor the bond, lets not spread false information

Mothers love is no stronger than a fathers bond, I'm speaking from experience, my mom kick me out as soon as child support ran out, and she kick my brother out as soon as child support kick me out.

I never said this is all women but stating as a general that

not all

Focus on this part, I'm saying some are good some are bad,

/u/redpillschool, they deserve temp bans.

I literally said not all, only some , I point out the fact that women aren't perfect and you call for a ban.

then there's this childish hate train

Once again blue pill ideology , I disagree so you must re-frame my argument as hate, I can speak without name calling, and without censorship considering I'm 100% correct I have no reason to whine for temp ban.

Please search google, study facts,

<http://www.theindychannel.com/news/crime/court-docs-mom-killed-her-2-young-children-so-that-husband-couldnt-have-custody-in-divorce>

The main abusers of children are women , in fact as soon as she couldn't get child support she merc her own kids. So please stop saying a mothers love is something special.

TheReformist94 • -7 points • 20 December, 2016 09:15 PM

Yeh shows what pathetic opportunistic little cunts women rele are

Troll\_Name • 65 points • 20 December, 2016 08:36 PM

Coincidentally: women's breasts also grow during pregnancy.

All humor aside, let's not hate mothers. Motherhood was the basis of the stable family, and motherhood played none of the role in the rise of what we know and love today. It's like blaming what you don't have, for the fact you don't have it.

As I try to say in every thread ever, the problem is low-SMV single people of both sexes. Lardy McMegaphone expects Chad Moneybags to swear his entire life to her and her alone. Upper-1% videogame expert has assistants put his mouse and keyboard into place for him because they're too heavy for him to lift.

We're not going to abolish low-value. But we can discuss and encourage each other to raise all our own value.  
Don't tell young men to read redpill; tell them to exercise and to trust people judiciously rather than liberally.

circihat • 14 points • 20 December, 2016 10:13 PM

humor aside, let's not hate mothers

It's not hate, it's more of a adolescent "Got ya" he is still new and learning women aren't perfect or super smart, still he is childish but it's not hate.

Upper-1% videogame expert has assistants put his mouse and keyboard into place for him because they're too heavy for him to lift.

Male shaming, and Logic fallacy, you think because you compare a woman wanting the best she can get to shaming means you need to read the side bar. You can not negotiate, that video gamer can pay 10 people to lift a fork and still get more pussy than you? you know how to read the side bar.

But we can discuss and encourage each other to raise all our own value.

No we aren't we are here to learn how to have sex with women, and be masculine, your goals are blue pill in nature, you can not negotiate

Don't tell young men to read redpill;

Why are you here?

do\_it\_or\_leave • 2 points • 22 December, 2016 02:25 PM

Saw someone bashing it on Reddit for reasons I agreed with.

ShwaaMan • 3 points • 21 December, 2016 03:55 AM

Good word. As much anger and hate that I have focused on women/blue pill men, I must also realize that that hate was seeded in me. I come to this thread for advice.... SOMETIMES.... but mostly I use it to justify my own anger. Where does it stop?! If women and men play the victims too often, then we only need to blame ourselves. This site serves a purpose, but not the same one that all the haters seem to think...

throw17453 • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 08:24 PM\*

They do not state that it improves women's brain power generally though, just that it gives them advantages when it comes to child rearing. So not sure it is quite an example of women being wonderful in spite of evidence.

Although it does list advantages without explaining or speculating on possible negatives, which now I think of it is exactly your point.

Edit: This is a much better article on it

<http://arstechnica.com/science/2016/12/pregnancy-brain-means-reductions-in-grey-matter-for-new-mothers/>

SeemedGood • 5 points • 21 December, 2016 06:32 AM

The effects, if not the cause, are well known among honest women. My wife and the very few of her somewhat honest friends call it PIS - Pregnancy Induced Stupidity. And it's more pronounced for first timers, but happens with every pregnancy.

zephyrprime • 5 points • 20 December, 2016 10:34 PM

So basically they lose some ability to understand others and also potentially to manipulate others using that understanding. I wonder why this is useful to them? Is it because children are so simplistic that it doesn't take any effort to understand them? Is it to make them focus on childrearing rather than playing social status games?

dinosauralienspirits • 3 points • 21 December, 2016 01:15 AM

Mothers who act "selfishly" in the interest of their child are more likely to have successful offspring.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 22 December, 2016 11:05 PM

Sure but how does this make them more selfish in regards to their children? They just lose interest in other people because they don't understand other people anymore?

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 11:49 PM

There's mention of this mimicking what the brain does in adolescence, preparing for change. Probably in preparation for a woman transitioning into motherhood and needing her mind focused on that to take care of the children.

You could make an assumption here that this sort of brain activity change would put women at a disadvantage in the workplace after pregnancy.

crf998 • 6 points • 21 December, 2016 01:13 AM

I understand that a big part of TRP theory and discussion revolves around how women think and behave, but you completely missed on this one.

In a nutshell, TRP combines basic evolutionary theory with modern truths to shed light on how males and females interact. You are sipping the "Women are worthless, stupid, sluts and everyone who hasn't swallowed the red pill is a pathetic blue pill douche bag" Kool Aid (the reason so many people hate us).

In reality, the study you cited makes complete sense. Male animals are driven to spread their DNA and produce offspring. Female animals are also driven to produce offspring, but want the biggest, baddest mother fucker for a father that they can find. Why? Because they want a strong, healthy, successful kid.

They're not blue pill losers, they are people who understand science and evolution a lot better than you do.

BuddhistSC • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 04:51 AM

What does anything you said have to do with the article? No, the conclusions they drew are not even remotely sensible.

MattyAnon[S] • 4 points • 21 December, 2016 04:24 AM

In reality, the study you cited makes complete sense.

Absolutely it does.

What makes no sense at all is the incessant "women are wonderful and this makes women even more wonderful" conjecture that the researchers added on with zero justification.

Tomaskraven • 8 points • 21 December, 2016 04:47 AM

How do you get to that conclusion from the excerpt you took from the article? They are just mentioning that these brain volume reductions might give them an edge on the "taking care of the baby" department.

circlehat • 0 points • 21 December, 2016 10:19 AM

"Women are worthless, stupid, sluts and everyone who hasn't swallowed the red pill is a pathetic blue pill douche bag" Kool Aid (the reason so many people hate us).

Straw men argument, no one is saying this, the women are wonderful effect is strong.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 11:02 PM

This is part of the reason it may be ideal to never have children, or have them much later in life. The emotional experience of having a child (tons of oxytocin bonds them with the child at birth) as well as these brain changes that reduce empathy for others (including the father), will mean that you are always secondary to her #1 priority, on both a hormonal and neural level.

MattyAnon[S] • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 11:28 PM

will mean that you are always secondary to her #1 priority

Many women even admit as much.

Men love women, women love children.

This has always been the case, and men have always subconsciously accepted this. What we won't take is the lack of respect going the other way that is so common now. And the lack of sex that goes with the lack of female respect.

Personally I'm not a wageslave and I am not a beta provider. That means no exclusivity and no kids.

If the world wants me to have kids, it can show me more respect, loyalty and ownership than is the case at the moment. If not, then fine I'll stay on strike.

[deleted] • 2 points • 22 December, 2016 12:22 AM

Spot on. I feel the same way.

YayBudgets • 1 point • 22 December, 2016 07:08 PM

If you have a child with a woman, why does that include exclusivity to her? Once she gives birth your commitment is only to the child right?

(new to the community, might have core concept misconceptions)

MattyAnon[S] • 1 point • 22 December, 2016 07:58 PM

Once she gives birth your commitment is only to the child right?

Except that she makes a profit on child support, and you'd probably like to have contact with your child rather than have her call the police, define you as violent, and restrict access to your own child.

This doesn't happen every time of course, but if she decides to make that happen society will back her. She'll be given the benefit of the doubt with her claims, you'll be assumed to be guilty and treated as such.

There is of course no exclusivity involved and I don't think I said there would be.

YayBudgets • 1 point • 22 December, 2016 08:09 PM

Do RedPill men not have children/advocate not having children?

MattyAnon[S] • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 12:46 AM

Varies - there's no solid consensus on whether to do this and how to do it.

I personally don't, but I do know how it should be done.

Lord\_Trajan • 2 points • 23 December, 2016 09:09 AM

There is a concept in Biology called the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium that states that without some sort of external biological influence (e.g. more offspring, less offspring, dead offspring, etc.), the frequency of genetic traits stay the same from generation to generation. From that we can deduce that this trait in some way, has an evolutionary benefit, e.g. as the researchers stated, it is an "advantage".

MattyAnon[S] • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 04:20 PM

From that we can deduce that this trait in some way, has an evolutionary benefit, e.g. as the researchers stated, it is an "advantage".

Indeed.

Advantages could be "intelligence no longer required as raising kids" or "make woman more stupid so children seem less boring".

Point is that the researches come to the best possible interpretation to flatter women.

Lord\_Trajan • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 09:56 PM

Point is that the researches come to the best possible interpretation to flatter women.

No they aren't, they simply said that it provides some sort of advantage (obviously) and then made a hypothesis as to why this is happening. None of that is saying women are wonderful. What would you have said in your conclusion you oh-so-great-researcher? "Women ur stooped, derp..." Because that seems to be what you think they should have put.

lose a chunk of their (already limited) "theory of mind" brainpower during pregnancy.

As we can see here, you are actually using some form of "women are terrible" bias... Not that I actually care or think that, but you are clearly being hypocritical.

MattyAnon[S] • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 10:21 PM

Loss of brain matter is always going to incur a negative. That extra brain matter isn't there soaking up energy and resources and doing nothing.

If there is a selective advantage there is also a cost. It's going to make her worse at some things and better at others.

The negatives are of course skipped right over in favour of endless pro-female positives.

Lord\_Trajan • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 11:00 PM

Loss of brain matter is always going to incur a negative.

Then explain how it spread as a biological trait.

If there is a selective advantage there is also a cost. It's going to make her worse at some things and better at others.

Which again, provided the laws of biology, it must have a greater overall positive than negative.

The negatives are of course skipped right over in favour of endless pro-female positives.

We all already know what the negative is (less brain power). We don't know what the positive is. Why would the authors go over something everyone already knows?

MattyAnon[S] • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 11:12 PM

Then explain how it spread as a biological trait.

For instance, it may save energy.

I accept it's an advantage *to her and her offspring* - but no such excuse is ever made for men. "Men are awesome because they fight and kill other men and this makes the species fitter", says no scientist ever.

Why would the authors go over something everyone already knows?

And this is my point - they don't even mention the negatives. Zero mention at all, except to say "there's no memory loss". It's entirely 100% positive about women, as usual.

Lord\_Trajan • 1 point • 24 December, 2016 01:34 AM

For instance, it may save energy.

Being that the brain requires very very little energy, I highly doubt this. But that is beyond the point.

Men are awesome because they fight and kill other men and this makes the species fitter

For starters, nowhere in the conclusion did they say anything about women being awesome, they merely said this trait gives women an advantage compared to say, hypothetical women without this advantage. Besides that, how does killing other men make our species fitter? I more realistic comparison would be a study showing men have more body strength than women, and then the conclusion stating that

This greater strength in males compared to females is thought to be an advantage in various ways - help them hunt and fight while females do less labour intensive tasks such as gathering, or taking care of children.

That is something I would find quite plausible to be in the conclusion of the study.

Zero mention at all, except to say "there's no memory loss".

Citation? I mean, you gave the BBC article about the study, but you didn't actually give the study. You honestly don't seem like someone who reads scientific literature all that often based on your posts...

TomFoo • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 06:19 AM

No wonder women without kids are so unhappy.

IVlaskerade • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 12:27 PM

A woman's brain undergoing physical changes to make her more focused on her child even if it means the detriment of everyone else *is* a good thing from a long-term biological perspective.

MattyAnon[S] • 2 points • 23 December, 2016 04:24 PM



Indeed, and this is an observation the researchers didn't make because women have to be seen to be perfect and any changes in them make them even more so.

They never say "and this makes women worse in X way". Such criticism is only levelled at men.

[deleted] • -1 points • 20 December, 2016 11:49 PM

[permanently deleted]

MattyAnon[S] • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 12:10 AM

.... and turn them into hamburger ;)

[deleted] • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 10:57 AM

I don't see WaW here, but the standard assumption that any trait we see must have evolved for a reason (although that reason may no longer exist (exaptation) and every adaptation likely has a cost). So, if women lose part of their grey matter, they pose the question, what advantage would that have given them?

We say that women are the most responsible teenagers in the house, which is to say that (many) women are not fully adults in the way that men are, but not really children either (this gets exaggerated to 'women are children'). This does mean that women can more easily identify the thoughts and feeling and needs of children, since they are closer to them. What this study is saying is that they get a little bit closer still when they actually give birth to their own. That doesn't make them wonderful, and from the point of view of men wanting companions without children it is a disadvantage. For men wanting women to be the mother of their children, it is an advantage.

Of course, they just 'thought' it might give them such an advantage, they have not demonstrated it. Nonetheless, there must have been a selection pressure to bring about this brain change, and it wasn't to make them better CEOs, artists, engineers, or scientists. But who cares if women are able to do that or not?

dammit\_redskins • -3 points • 21 December, 2016 05:08 AM [recovered]

What's the relevancy of this? This comes off as a woman-hating post.

Just because their brain chemistry is different after having a child doesn't mean they are dumber. I'm sure there is a perfectly logical evolutionary advantage to this, we just don't know what it is.

These "blue pill" scientists probably know a hell of a lot more on the subject than you do. They aren't conjuring false positive images of woman to look good for society, they probably are right.

circlhat • 7 points • 21 December, 2016 10:21 AM

Women hating? Dude, unless the post says let's kill all women it's not hating. It seem if we post anything that doesn't make women look perfect it's hate.

Please pick up a dictionary and look up the word hate, you will find none of that here

newName543456 • 1 point • 24 December, 2016 09:54 AM

Leftists use "hate speech" to describe everything they disagree with, when they have no logical retorts against it (which tends to happen... fairly often for some reason...).

digitalbitch • 0 points • 22 December, 2016 07:16 AM

Right! Time to make unwarranted, hasty generalisations. Go RedPill!