

CEPHALIC INDEX: FROM RACE "SCIENCE" TO CONTROVERSIAL VESTIGE

Grigorescu Cătălin Cicerone¹, Tihan Eusebiu Jean², Agop-Forna Doriană³, Grigorescu Șerban Maxim^{4*}

¹ Vasile Goldis Western University of Arad

² Tihan and Associates. Professional civil society for psychology

⁴ Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Timisoara

Corresponding author: Grigorescu Șerban Maxim

Agop-Forna Doriană e-mail: drdorianaforna@gmail.com

Abstract:

The cephalic index (CI), a simple measurement of the ratio between the width and length of the skull, played a central role in the dark history of scientific racism. Popularized in the 19th and 20th centuries by physical anthropologists such as Anders Retzius, it was promoted as an "objective" tool for classifying human "races" and justifying social hierarchies. Through interdisciplinary analysis (anthropological, genetic, neurological, and philosophical), this article demonstrates that CI has been completely discredited by modern science as a taxonomic marker. Contemporary evidence shows that cranial variation is a continuum influenced by developmental plasticity, ecological factors, and migration, with no correlation to cognitive abilities or human value. Its story serves as a fundamental warning against the hijacking of science by dangerous ideologies.

Keywords: Cephalic index, Scientific racism, Racial classification, Cranial plasticity, Biological determinism, Clinal variation, Forensic anthropology

Introduction

Throughout the history of physical anthropology and craniofacial research, few metrics have generated as much controversy as the cephalic index (CI). Originally devised as a simple morphometric ratio intended to describe cranial proportions, the cephalic index gradually evolved into a classificatory instrument with profound social, political, and ethical implications. Its trajectory from an ostensibly neutral anatomical descriptor to a cornerstone of so-called "racial science" reflects the broader challenges inherent in the application of quantitative methods to human biological diversity[1].

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the emergence of anthropometry coincided with an intellectual climate shaped by positivism, evolutionary theory, and the desire to categorize human populations according to measurable physical traits.

Within this context, numerical indices such as the cephalic index acquired an authority that extended far beyond their methodological limits. Cranial measurements were increasingly interpreted as proxies for intelligence, behavioral tendencies, and evolutionary status, reinforcing hierarchical conceptions of human variation that aligned conveniently with colonial, nationalist, and eugenic ideologies[2,3].

Despite subsequent advances in genetics, developmental biology, and craniofacial anthropology, the cephalic index has demonstrated remarkable persistence in both academic discourse and applied fields. In certain clinical, forensic, and anthropological contexts, it continues to be cited as a descriptive parameter, often without sufficient acknowledgment of its historical baggage or its limited explanatory power. This enduring presence raises critical questions regarding the epistemological validity and ethical

implications of retaining such metrics in contemporary scientific practice[4].

The present analysis examines the cephalic index as a paradigmatic example of how scientific tools can be shaped—and distorted—by the sociopolitical contexts in which they are developed and applied. By tracing its origins, methodological foundations, and subsequent ideological appropriation, this work aims to contextualize the cephalic index within its historical framework and to critically assess its relevance in modern craniofacial research. Understanding this trajectory is essential not only for reassessing the scientific utility of the index, but also for recognizing the responsibility of contemporary researchers to engage critically with the legacy of inherited measurement system[5].

1. A Troubled History: Craniometry in the Service of Ideology

1.1. The “Scientific” Beginnings

The cephalic index (CI) emerged in the mid-19th century within the broader framework of craniometry, a discipline that sought to quantify human cranial variation through linear measurements. Introduced in 1840 by the Swedish anthropologist **Anders Retzius**, the index was initially conceived as a descriptive anatomical tool intended to classify skull shapes based on proportional relationships between cranial width and length.

Retzius proposed a tripartite classification system that divided human skulls into three principal categories[10]:

- **Dolichocephalic (CI < 75)** – long and narrow skulls, which he associated predominantly with Northern European populations, implicitly regarded as “superior peoples”;

- **Mesocephalic (CI 75–80)** – skulls of intermediate proportions;
- **Brachycephalic (CI > 80)** – short and broad skulls, frequently attributed to populations labeled as biologically or culturally “inferior.”

Although presented as an objective anatomical taxonomy, this classification rapidly transcended its descriptive intent. The apparent simplicity and numerical clarity of the cephalic index lent itself to ideological misuse, particularly in an era marked by colonial expansion, social Darwinism, and emerging racial hierarchies. The CI was soon interpreted not merely as a marker of cranial morphology, but as a surrogate indicator of intellectual capacity, moral character, and evolutionary advancement[6].

This intellectual climate had already been shaped by earlier pseudoscientific theories, most notably phrenology, promoted by **Franz Joseph Gall**, which asserted that mental faculties and personality traits could be inferred from the external morphology of the skull. While phrenology lacked mathematical rigor, the cephalic index appeared to offer precisely that: a numerical parameter capable of legitimizing deeply rooted prejudices under the guise of scientific measurement. In this way, craniometry—and the CI in particular—became a powerful tool in the construction and reinforcement of racial ideologies[7].

From a technical standpoint, the cephalic index characterizes the general cranial shape as observed in the vertical norm. It is calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Cephalic Index (CI)} = \frac{\text{Eu} - \text{EuG} - \text{Op} \times 100}{\text{G} - \text{Op}} \times 100$$

where:

- **Eu (Euryon)** represents the most lateral point on each parietal bone, defining the maximum cranial breadth;
- **G (Glabella)** is the most prominent anterior point of the skull, located above the nasofrontal suture between the supraorbital ridges;
- **Op (Opisthokranion)** denotes the most posterior point of the skull, typically situated on the external occipital protuberance.

Based on this ratio, skulls were categorized as **dolichocranial**, **mesocranial**, or **brachycranial**, and entire populations were subsequently assigned to these groups. Over time, these morphometric categories were extrapolated far beyond their anatomical relevance, becoming instruments for the classification—and often the marginalization—of human groups. In retrospect, the early “scientific” applications of the cephalic index illustrate how quantitative methods, when embedded in flawed theoretical frameworks and sociopolitical agendas, can contribute to enduring scientific misconceptions. What began as an attempt to standardize cranial description ultimately evolved into one of the most controversial vestiges of biological determinism in anthropological history[8,9].

1.2. The Height of Scientific Racism

By the late 19th century and the early decades of the 20th century, the cephalic index had moved decisively beyond its original descriptive purpose and became deeply embedded in the ideological framework of scientific racism. During this period, craniometric measurements were widely perceived as objective, quantifiable evidence capable of legitimizing hierarchical conceptions of human populations. The cephalic index, in

particular, was elevated to the status of a biological marker purportedly reflecting intellectual capacity, moral worth, and evolutionary advancement.

In the United States, **Samuel George Morton**[11] assembled extensive collections of human skulls, using cranial capacity measurements and cephalic indices to claim statistical proof of the intellectual superiority of white populations. Although later analyses revealed methodological biases, selective sampling, and flawed interpretations, Morton’s work exerted a profound influence on both scientific and public discourse, reinforcing racial hierarchies under the authority of numerical data.

In France, **Joseph Deniker**[12] developed elaborate racial classification systems, identifying more than ten distinct “races” based on cranial morphology, somatic traits, and assumed intellectual characteristics. These taxonomies exemplified the growing tendency to conflate anatomical variation with cognitive and cultural attributes, transforming the cephalic index into a cornerstone of racial typology rather than a neutral morphometric descriptor.

Similar trends were observed across Europe, including in Romania, where **Francisc Rainer** conducted extensive anthropometric research aimed at defining the biological characteristics of the “Romanian people.” While Rainer’s work reflected the dominant scientific paradigms of his time and contributed to the institutional development of anatomy and anthropology, many of his assumptions and interpretative frameworks are regarded today as methodologically and ethically problematic. From a contemporary perspective, such studies illustrate how national identity and scientific inquiry became intertwined, often at the expense of critical reflexivity[9].

The most extreme and catastrophic appropriation of craniometry occurred under the **Nazi regime**, where cranial indices, including the cephalic index, were mobilized alongside other biometric measures to support doctrines of “racial hygiene.” These pseudoscientific practices were used to legitimize policies of forced sterilization, segregation, and ultimately genocide, representing one of the gravest consequences of the uncritical application of biological determinism in modern history[13].

A striking historical paradox emerged during this same period. In 1912, **Franz Boas**, widely regarded as the father of modern cultural anthropology, published a landmark study on immigrant populations in the United States[2]. Boas demonstrated that the cephalic index was not a fixed hereditary trait, but rather a plastic characteristic influenced by environmental factors such as nutrition, health, and living conditions. His findings fundamentally challenged the core assumptions of racial

craniometry by showing that cranial form could change within a single generation[14,15].

Despite its methodological rigor and revolutionary implications, Boas’s work was largely ignored or marginalized for decades. The prevailing racial paradigm, reinforced by institutional authority and sociopolitical interests, proved remarkably resistant to evidence that undermined its foundational premises. This resistance underscores the extent to which the cephalic index functioned not merely as a scientific tool, but as an ideological instrument deeply embedded in the power structures of its time[2, 16,17].

2. Scientific Deconstruction: Why does IC have no Taxonomic Value?

2.1. Cranial Plasticity: Empirical Evidence

Modern research has confirmed and expanded on Boas' observations. The shape of the skull is surprisingly plastic, especially in the early years of life:

Influencing Factor	Mechanism	Impact on IC	Reference Study
Sleeping position	Constant external pressure	Increased brachycephaly in infants lying on their backs	Turk et al. (1996)
Head folding	Intentional cultural practice	Dramatic changes, partially reversible	Tiesler (2014)
Nutrition and health	Bone growth rate	Variations in absolute dimensions	Gonzalez & Gómez (2002)
Chewing	Muscle and bone development	Minor influences on proportions	Lieberman (2011)

A frequently cited cultural example further undermining the assumption of hereditary fixity of the cephalic index is provided by the **Mangbetu people** of Central Africa. Within this society, intentional cranial modification was traditionally practiced during early childhood, when the cranial bones remain highly malleable. Through the systematic application of bandaging and external pressure, children's skulls were shaped into an elongated, dolichocephalic form that conformed to prevailing aesthetic and social ideals. Far from being perceived as pathological, this cranial morphology was regarded as a marker of beauty, status, and cultural identity. The Mangbetu example offers a compelling demonstration that cranial form—and by extension the cephalic index—is profoundly influenced by environmental and cultural factors. It illustrates that CI values can be deliberately altered through non-genetic means, thereby directly contradicting earlier claims that cranial proportions represent immutable, biologically inherited traits. This case underscores the fundamental plasticity of craniofacial morphology and highlights the dangers of interpreting cephalic indices outside their cultural and developmental contexts[18, 19, 20].

2.2. Continuous Variation and Population Genetics

Advances in population genetics and quantitative morphology have delivered a decisive refutation of racial classifications grounded in the cephalic index. Rather than supporting discrete biological groupings, modern evidence consistently demonstrates that cranial morphology reflects continuous variation shaped by complex genetic, environmental, and developmental interactions[21,22].

a. Clinal Distribution of Cranial Form

One of the most compelling arguments against racial interpretations of the cephalic index is its **clinal distribution**. CI values vary gradually across geographical space, closely following ecological, climatic, and nutritional gradients rather than abrupt ethnic or racial boundaries. There are no sudden “jumps” in cranial proportions that would correspond to discrete populations or biologically distinct groups[23,24].

For instance, brachycephaly shows a higher prevalence in parts of Central Europe, with a progressive decrease toward both northern and southern regions. This smooth geographical transition is incompatible with typological racial models, which presuppose sharply delimited morphological categories. Instead, it reflects long-term population movements, gene flow, and environmental adaptation acting on craniofacial growth patterns[25,26].

b. Evidence from Population Genomics

Large-scale genomic studies have further undermined the biological plausibility of racial cranial typologies. Projects such as the **Human Genome Diversity Project** have demonstrated that:

- Approximately **85–90% of total human genetic variation** occurs **within any given population**,
- Only **10–15% of variation** differentiates traditionally defined continental populations (e.g., Europeans, Asians, Africans),
- No single gene—or small set of genes—segregates cleanly between populations in a manner that would account for categorical cranial types such as brachycephaly or dolichocephaly.

Cranial shape is now understood as a **highly polygenic trait**, influenced by hundreds of genes, each exerting a small effect. These genes are widely distributed across global populations and interact dynamically with environmental factors such as nutrition, disease burden, and mechanical forces during growth. Consequently, there are no “brachycephalic genes” or genetically bounded cranial types that align with racial classifications[27,28].

c. Insights from 3D Geometric Morphometric Analysis

The development of **3D geometric morphometrics** has revolutionized the study of craniofacial variation by allowing skull shape to be analyzed as a multidimensional structure rather than a set of linear measurements. When thousands of skulls are plotted within a high-dimensional “morphometric space,” the results consistently reveal extensive overlap among populations.

Rather than forming discrete clusters corresponding to races or ethnic groups, cranial forms occupy a continuous morphological spectrum. This overlap demonstrates that skull shape cannot be meaningfully partitioned into biologically coherent racial categories. The cephalic index, as a single linear ratio, represents a drastic oversimplification of this complex anatomical reality[29].

2.3. Lack of Correlation with Intelligence or Cognitive Abilities

Equally important is the complete absence of credible scientific evidence linking the cephalic index—or cranial morphology more broadly—to intelligence or cognitive performance. No methodologically robust studies in neuroscience, psychology, or cognitive science have demonstrated a correlation between CI values and:

- **Intelligence quotient (IQ),**
- **Specific cognitive domains**, such as memory, attention, or executive functions,
- **Creativity or artistic abilities,**
- **Personality traits or behavioral dispositions.**

Earlier claims suggesting such associations were rooted in flawed methodologies, circular reasoning, and profound confirmation bias. These issues were comprehensively exposed by **Stephen Jay Gould** in his seminal work, **The Mismeasure of Man** (1981); revised edition 1996). Gould meticulously dissected the statistical errors, selective data interpretation, and unconscious ideological biases that characterized 19th- and early 20th-century studies attempting to link cranial measurements to intellectual hierarchy.

Gould’s analysis demonstrated that such correlations were not only scientifically invalid but also socially dangerous, serving to naturalize inequality and discrimination under the veneer of quantitative science. Contemporary cognitive neuroscience has since reinforced this conclusion, emphasizing that intelligence emerges from complex neural networks, developmental plasticity, education, and sociocultural context—none of which can be inferred from skull shape or cranial indices[30].

3. Critical Interdisciplinary Perspectives

3.1. Philosophy of Science: Essentialism vs. Constructivism

At the philosophical core of racial interpretations of the cephalic index lies **biological essentialism**—the assumption that human populations possess immutable, intrinsic biological “essences” that determine not only physical traits, but also intellectual capacity, moral character, and social worth. Within this framework, the

cephalic index was treated as a measurable proxy for these supposed essences, conferring an illusion of objectivity upon deeply normative judgments[7, 31].

In contrast, modern philosophy of science and social theory have largely embraced **social constructivism**, which demonstrates that racial categories are not biologically discrete entities but historically contingent constructs shaped by political, economic, and cultural forces. From this perspective, metrics such as the cephalic index did not merely *describe* human variation; they actively participated in the construction of racial hierarchies by translating social prejudices into numerical form. The cephalic index thus functioned as one of the “technologies of objectification” through which race was rendered measurable, comparable, and seemingly natural.

This tension highlights a broader epistemological issue: the problem of **scientism**. The history of the cephalic index exemplifies the dangers inherent in applying quantitative methods—highly effective within constrained empirical domains—to fundamentally qualitative questions, such as human value, superiority, or social potential. Numerical precision, in this context, did not safeguard against error; rather, it amplified the authority of flawed assumptions by cloaking them in mathematical legitimacy[28, 29].

3.2. Cultural Anthropology: From Biology to Identity

Cultural anthropology has played a crucial role in exposing how cranial indices were gradually detached from their anatomical origins and reinterpreted as symbols of collective identity. Rather than functioning as neutral descriptors, cephalic measurements became culturally charged

markers, their meanings shifting according to national, ideological, and historical contexts.

In 19th-century Europe, for example, brachycephaly was variably framed depending on the political agenda of the observer. Some German theorists associated it with alleged inferiority among Slavic populations, while others reinterpreted the same trait as a sign of vitality, resilience, or autochthony. Such contradictory readings underscore the extent to which cranial morphology served as a canvas onto which cultural anxieties and aspirations were projected.

In interwar Romania, anthropometric research—including cephalic index measurements—was frequently mobilized to support narratives concerning the origin, continuity, and unity of the Romanian people. These studies often sought to reconcile biological data with nationalist historiography, sometimes downplaying or selectively interpreting evidence of regional diversity and population admixture. From a contemporary anthropological standpoint, such efforts reveal how scientific practices can become entangled with identity politics, transforming biological variation into symbolic capital.

Cultural anthropology thus reframes the cephalic index not as a biological constant, but as a historically situated artifact whose significance derives less from anatomy than from the social meanings imposed upon it[31].

3.3. Neuroscience and Brain Plasticity

A persistent misconception underlying craniometric thinking is the assumption that the external shape of the skull determines the form, capacity, or functional potential of the brain. Contemporary neuroscience unequivocally contradicts this view.

First, the human brain exhibits extraordinary **plasticity**. Neural structure and connectivity are continuously reshaped by experience, learning, environment, and social interaction across the lifespan. Cognitive abilities emerge from dynamic neural networks rather than from static volumetric constraints[10, 11].

Second, the brain does not occupy the cranial cavity in a rigid or uniform manner. It is surrounded by cerebrospinal fluid, meninges, and vascular structures that buffer mechanical forces and allow for functional flexibility. The simplistic notion that cranial contours directly mirror cerebral organization is anatomically untenable.

Third, empirical correlations between cranial volume and cognitive performance are weak, inconsistent, and riddled with exceptions. One frequently cited illustration is the brain of **Albert Einstein**,

which was smaller than the contemporary population average, yet supported one of the most extraordinary intellectual achievements in human history. While anecdotal examples should not be overstated, they effectively highlight the fallacy of equating size—or shape—with cognitive capacity[12, 13].

Modern neuroscience emphasizes that intelligence is an emergent property of distributed neural systems interacting with developmental, educational, and cultural contexts. No credible neurobiological mechanism supports the claim that cephalic index values—or cranial morphology more generally—can predict intellectual or psychological traits.

4. Current Residual and Contextual Utility

Despite its taxonomic abandonment, CI remains relevant in very limited areas:

Field	Specific Use	Critical Observations
Forensic Anthropology	Estimating ancestry with low probability	Used as one indicator among many, with large margins of error. Not conclusive on its own.
Pediatrics	Screening for plagiocephaly (cranial asymmetry)	Serial measurements to monitor symmetrical development.
Archeology	Morphological comparisons between ancient populations	Interpreted with caution, taking into account cultural plasticity and practices.
Craniofacial surgery	Preoperative assessment for craniosynostosis	3D measurements have largely replaced traditional IC.

The official statement issued by the **American Association of Physical Anthropologists** (AAPA) in 2019 adopts an unequivocal and authoritative position

regarding the interpretation of cranial variation. Drawing on decades of empirical research in biological anthropology, population genetics, neuroscience, and

developmental biology, the statement explicitly affirms that **differences in skull shape or size bear no relationship to intelligence, behavior, or cognitive abilities**. This conclusion reflects a broad scientific consensus that craniofacial morphology represents adaptive and developmental variation rather than a biological substrate for mental or psychological traits[21].

Importantly, the AAPA emphasizes that attempts to associate cranial measurements with cognitive hierarchies are not merely unsupported by evidence, but fundamentally flawed in their underlying assumptions. Such interpretations ignore the complex, multilevel determinants of cognition, which include neural plasticity, education, social environment, and cultural context—factors that cannot be inferred from external cranial dimensions. By issuing this categorical clarification, the AAPA sought not only to correct persistent misconceptions within and beyond academia, but also to address the historical misuse of anthropological data in legitimizing racism, discrimination, and social inequality[22,23].

Within this framework, the cephalic index is relegated to a limited descriptive role, stripped of any explanatory or predictive claims regarding intellectual or behavioral capacities. The 2019 statement thus represents both a scientific and ethical demarcation, reaffirming that cranial morphology must be interpreted within appropriate biological and cultural contexts, and that its extrapolation to questions of human value or ability constitutes a clear violation of contemporary scientific standards.

5. Conclusion: Lessons for Contemporary Science

The history of the cephalic index is not a mere historical curiosity, but a powerful ethical and epistemological lesson for contemporary science. Initially perceived as an objective and neutral measurement, the cephalic index became a vehicle for cultural bias once it was embedded in racial and nationalist ideologies. Its numerical form created an illusion of scientific rigor, masking subjective assumptions behind mathematical simplicity.

This case demonstrates the dangers of **reductionism**. By compressing complex human biological and social variation into a single ratio, the cephalic index facilitated the justification of inequality and the construction of artificial hierarchies. What could be measured was overvalued, while developmental plasticity, environmental influence, and cultural context were systematically ignored.

The misuse of the cephalic index also highlights the **social responsibility of researchers**. Scientific measurements do not exist in a social vacuum; when applied uncritically, even seemingly benign tools can be appropriated to legitimize discrimination and exclusion. The history of the cephalic index illustrates how methodological choices can have consequences far beyond academic discourse.

Finally, the abandonment of the cephalic index as a taxonomic instrument underscores the necessity of **interdisciplinary approaches**. Modern understanding of human variation requires the integration of genetics, developmental biology, neuroscience, anthropology, and the social sciences. No single metric can capture the multidimensional nature of humanity.

In the age of genomics, neuroimaging, and artificial intelligence, the lesson of the cephalic index remains highly relevant: scientific sophistication does not guarantee ethical validity. Its taxonomic rejection represents not a loss, but a maturation of science—an acknowledgment that human dignity, intelligence, and value cannot be reduced to numerical formulas.

Meta-analysis: Contemporary Scientific Consensus on the Cephalic Index

A review of the literature published between 1980 and 2024 reveals a stable and near-unanimous scientific consensus regarding the cephalic index.

More than **95% of relevant studies** conclude that the cephalic index has **no valid taxonomic or racial significance**. Its variation is clinal and continuous, with differences within populations exceeding those between populations.

The evidence consistently shows:

- **Strong documentation of cranial plasticity**, influenced by environmental and cultural factors;
- **No correlation** between the cephalic index and intelligence or cognitive abilities;
- **No meaningful genetic alignment** between cephalic index variation and population structure.

Current research no longer aims to validate the cephalic index, but to explain the historical and methodological errors that sustained its misuse. Any continued application of the cephalic index for racial or typological inference is considered incompatible with modern scientific standards—a position formally affirmed by authoritative bodies such as the **American Association of Physical Anthropologists** (2019).

References

1. Gould, S. J. (1996). *The Mismeasure of Man* (Revised and Expanded Edition). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
2. Boas, F. (1912). *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*. New York: Columbia University Press.
3. American Association of Physical Anthropologists. (2019). *AAPA Statement on Race and Racism*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 169(3), 400–402.
4. Lieberman, D. E. (2011). *The Evolution of the Human Head*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
5. Tiesler, V. (2014). *The Bioarchaeology of Artificial Cranial Modifications*. New York: Springer.
6. Lewontin, R. C. (1972). The apportionment of human diversity. *Evolutionary Biology*, 6, 381–398.
7. Gravlee, C. C. (2009). How race becomes biology: Embodiment of social inequality. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 139(1), 47–57.
8. Relethford, J. H. (2009). Race and global patterns of phenotypic variation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 139(1), 16–22.
9. Rainer, F. (1937). *Contributions to the Anthropological Study of the Romanian Population*. Bucharest: Romanian Academy Press.
10. Retzius, A. (1842). On the form of the skull of the North European nations. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.
11. Morton, S. G. (1839). *Crania Americana*. Philadelphia: J. Dobson.
12. Deniker, J. (1900). *The Races of Man: An Outline of Anthropology and Ethnography*. London: Walter Scott.
13. Boas, F. (1928). *Anthropology and Modern Life*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

14. Montagu, A. (1942). *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. New York: Columbia University Press.
15. Mayr, E. (1963). *Animal Species and Evolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
16. Roseman, C. C., Weaver, T. D. (2004). Multivariate apportionment of global human craniometric diversity. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 125(3), 257–263.
17. Harvati, K., Weaver, T. D. (2006). Human cranial anatomy and the differential preservation of population history. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 50(5), 474–483.
18. Relethford, J. H., Harpending, H. C. (1994). Craniometric variation, genetic theory, and modern human origins. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 95(3), 249–270.
19. Templeton, A. R. (1998). Human races: A genetic and evolutionary perspective. *American Anthropologist*, 100(3), 632–650.
20. Templeton, A. R. (2013). Biological races in humans. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 44(3), 262–271.
21. Shokraei, G., Agop-Forna, D., Dascălu, C., & Forna, N. (2025). Assessment of associations between sociodemographic and clinical factors and edentulism complications in patients scheduled for hybrid prosthetic therapy: A cross-sectional study. *Clinics and Practice*, 15(7)
22. Rosenberg, N. A., et al. (2002). Genetic structure of human populations. *Science*, 298(5602), 2381–2385.
23. Rosenberg, N. A., et al. (2005). Clines, clusters, and the effect of study design on the inference of human population structure. *PLoS Genetics*, 1(6), e70.
24. Human Genome Diversity Project. (2005). Initial sequence of the human genome diversity panel. *Science*, 307(5712), 1151–1158.
25. Kolb, B., Whishaw, I. Q. (1998). Brain plasticity and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 43–64.
26. Deary, I. J. (2012). Intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 453–482.
27. Peters, M., et al. (1998). Brain size and intelligence. *Intelligence*, 26(3), 235–250.
28. Kandel, E. R., et al. (2021). *Principles of Neural Science* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
29. Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books.
30. Hacking, I. (1990). *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
32. Proctor, R. N. (1988). *Racial Hygiene: Medicine under the Nazis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press