

MODERN CRANIOMETRY: HOW 3D SCIENCE HAS ABOLISHED RACIAL TYPOLOGIES

**Grigorescu Cătălin Cicerone ¹, Grigorescu Șerban Maxim ^{2,*}, Norina Consuela Forna³,
Tihan Eusebiu Jean ⁴**

¹ Vasile Goldis Western University of Arad

² Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy

³"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Faculty of Dental Medicine, Iasi, Romania

⁴ Tihan and Associates. Professional civil society for psychology

* Corresponding authors: Grigorescu Șerban Maxim

Abstract

Modern craniometry has undergone a profound transformation driven by advances in three-dimensional (3D) analytical methods, population genetics, and critical reassessments of the biological concept of race. Historically, craniometric research relied on linear measurements and typological frameworks that sought to classify human populations into discrete racial categories. Accumulating genetic evidence has demonstrated that human biological variation is predominantly continuous, with greater diversity occurring within populations than between them, undermining the biological validity of racial typologies. In parallel, the development of geometric morphometrics and high-resolution 3D imaging technologies has enabled comprehensive analysis of cranial shape as a complex, multivariate phenotype, independent of predefined categories. These methods reveal extensive overlap in cranial morphology across populations and align closely with clinal patterns of genetic variation shaped by migration, admixture, and local adaptation. The integration of non-racial craniometric models into clinical and biomedical contexts further highlights their relevance, improving individualized assessment while reducing the risk of biological essentialism. By synthesizing anthropological, genetic, and biomedical evidence, this review argues that modern craniometry provides both the empirical tools and conceptual framework necessary for abandoning racial classification. The adoption of a post-racial approach not only enhances scientific accuracy but also addresses longstanding ethical concerns associated with the misuse of cranial data, positioning craniometry as a model discipline for the responsible study of human biological diversity.

Keywords: craniometry, geometric morphometrics, human variation, population genetics, race

1. Historical Foundations of Craniometry and the Emergence of Racial Typologies

Craniometry emerged in the nineteenth century as a central methodological pillar of physical anthropology, aiming to quantify human cranial form to classify human diversity. Early practitioners relied predominantly on linear measurements such as cranial length, breadth, height, and derived indices to compare skulls across geographically defined populations. These approaches assumed that cranial morphology could be partitioned into stable, heritable types corresponding to discrete biological races. Such assumptions were deeply embedded in the epistemological framework of the time, which favored typological thinking and

hierarchical classification over population-based variation [1].

The development of multivariate statistics in the twentieth century refined craniometric analysis but did not immediately dismantle its typological foundations. Large-scale datasets, such as those compiled by Howells, introduced multivariate comparisons of cranial measurements and demonstrated substantial overlap between populations, yet interpretation often remained anchored in racial categorization [3]. While these studies acknowledged intra-population variability, they frequently sought central tendencies or “mean skulls” presumed to represent racial groups, reinforcing the notion of bounded cranial types. This methodological tension between quantitative sophistication and conceptual

rigidity marked a transitional phase in craniometric research.



Figure 1. Classical craniometric measurement using linear caliper-based techniques

Representative illustration of traditional craniometric methodology based on linear measurements of the human skull using mechanical calipers (Figure 1). Such approaches, widely employed in 19th- and early 20th-century physical anthropology, reduced complex cranial morphology to a limited set of distances and indices. While methodologically innovative for their time, these techniques contributed to typological interpretations of human variation and the construction of racial classifications, later challenged by population genetics and three-dimensional morphometric analyses.

Parallel developments in evolutionary biology and genetics began to challenge the biological validity of race. Templeton's synthesis of population genetics provided a decisive critique of race as a taxonomic unit, demonstrating that human genetic variation is structured primarily within populations rather than between them [2]. This finding undermined the biological plausibility of discrete racial categories and, by extension, the cranial typologies built upon them. The implications for craniometry were profound: if genetic variation does not support racial divisions, morphological traits shaped by complex genetic and

environmental interactions cannot reasonably do so either.

A pivotal contribution to this paradigm shift was Lewontin's analysis of human genetic diversity, which quantified the distribution of genetic variation and revealed that the majority occurs within, not between, so-called racial groups [5]. Although initially contested, this work reframed human diversity as a continuum rather than a set of discrete clusters. Craniometric data, when reconsidered through this lens, appeared increasingly incompatible with racial classification. Apparent cranial differences between populations were better explained as gradual, clinal variations influenced by geography, migration, and adaptation rather than markers of distinct biological races.

Despite these theoretical advances, craniometry continued to be applied in ways that implicitly reified race, particularly in applied fields such as forensic anthropology and aesthetics. Evolutionary psychology and studies of facial perception, for example, occasionally conflated population-level morphological variation with racialized notions of facial type and attractiveness [4]. Such interpretations, while often detached from explicit racial hierarchies, nonetheless perpetuated the idea that craniofacial form could be neatly categorized along racial lines, revealing the persistence of typological thinking beyond its scientific foundations.

Clinical disciplines, especially craniofacial and reconstructive surgery, inherited elements of this legacy. Surgical textbooks historically described "ethnic" or "racial" norms of craniofacial anatomy, suggesting standard morphological templates associated with broad population labels [6]. Although intended to guide individualized care, these frameworks risked oversimplifying anatomical diversity and conflating social categories with biological determinants. The reliance on racial averages in clinical planning further illustrated how craniometric typologies

migrated from anthropology into biomedical practice.

Sociological and philosophical critiques in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries intensified scrutiny of racial concepts in science. Fujimura and colleagues articulated the concept of “clines without classes,” emphasizing that human variation is continuous and multidimensional, resisting discretization into racial boxes [7]. This perspective directly challenged craniometry’s historical role in classifying skulls into races, arguing instead for population-based, non-hierarchical interpretations of morphological data. Templeton reinforced this view by reiterating that race lacks a coherent biological definition, even when sophisticated statistical tools are applied [8].

Genomic research further dismantled the foundations of racial craniometry. Studies by Barbujani and Cavalli-Sforza demonstrated that patterns of DNA diversity mirror geographic gradients rather than racial boundaries, with genetic distances increasing gradually over space [9]. These findings corroborated earlier critiques and rendered cranial typologies increasingly anachronistic. As molecular data accumulated, the disjunction between genetic evidence and craniometric racial classifications became impossible to ignore.

At the same time, scholars warned against the re-emergence of race through genomic discourse. Duster highlighted the risk of “molecular reinscription of race,” whereby genetic data are interpreted through pre-existing racial frameworks, inadvertently reviving discredited concepts [10]. This critique is particularly relevant to craniometry, as new technologies risk reproducing old typologies under the guise of precision. Debates surrounding reparational genetics and ancestry testing further illustrated how biological data can be socially recontextualized in ways that

blur the boundary between population history and race [11,14].

Biomedical research has been a key arena for these tensions. Analyses of the relationship between race, genetics, and health outcomes emphasized the methodological and ethical challenges of using race as a proxy for biological variation [12,13]. Such critiques underscored the necessity of disentangling social constructs from biological processes, a task equally urgent in craniometric research. Edwards’ reappraisal of Lewontin’s conclusions, while highlighting statistical structure in genetic data, did not reinstate race as a biological category but rather emphasized population structure without typology [15].

2. Human Cranial and Genetic Variation: From Discrete Classes to Continuous Clines

Advances in population genetics and statistical modeling at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first century marked a decisive departure from typological interpretations of human biological diversity. Model-based approaches to population structure, particularly those developed for multilocus genotype analysis, demonstrated that human genetic variation is best described as probabilistic and continuous rather than as a set of discrete, biologically bounded groups [16]. These methods revealed gradients of genetic similarity shaped by historical migration, gene flow, and admixture, fundamentally challenging the conceptual legitimacy of racial categories previously assumed in both genetic and morphological research.

From a craniometric perspective, these findings have profound implications. Cranial morphology is a complex, polygenic phenotype influenced by developmental pathways that integrate genetic background with environmental inputs. If underlying genetic variation does not segregate into discrete racial units, then

cranial form, long used as a proxy for racial classification, cannot validly support such divisions [1,3]. Instead, cranial variation must be interpreted as a multivariate continuum reflecting population history, geographic proximity, and adaptive responses, consistent with earlier critiques of racial typology in physical anthropology [2,5].

Genomic studies investigating selective pressures have further reinforced this non-typological view of human variation. Analyses of innate immunity genes revealed signatures of localized selection and introgression from archaic hominins that vary across populations without conforming to racial boundaries [17]. These patterns illustrate that even biologically meaningful differentiation operates at fine population scales and along geographic clines. When extrapolated to skeletal and craniofacial traits, such evidence supports the interpretation that morphological differences are mosaics of evolutionary processes rather than indicators of race-specific cranial types [7,9].

Nevertheless, despite the growing body of genetic and evolutionary evidence, race has persisted as a conceptual framework in biomedical and anthropological research. Historical analyses have shown that race and ethnicity have been repeatedly employed as organizing variables in medicine, often as substitutes for poorly measured genetic, environmental, or social factors [18]. In craniometric studies, this persistence has encouraged the continued use of racial labels to describe cranial variation, even when empirical data demonstrate substantial overlap between populations [3,8]. Such practices risk perpetuating outdated assumptions under the guise of methodological convenience.

Critical scholarship has emphasized the limitations and risks of race-based biological explanations. Braun argued convincingly that genetic variation alone

cannot account for disparities observed between socially defined racial groups, highlighting instead the dominant influence of environmental exposure, structural inequality, and differential access to resources [19]. This critique applies directly to cranial morphology, which is highly sensitive to nutritional status, disease burden, and mechanical forces during growth and development. Cranial form, therefore, reflects both biological inheritance and lived conditions, making racial categorization an inadequate and misleading explanatory framework [4,6].

The increasing recognition of social determinants of health has further expanded the interpretive context for human biological variation. Braveman and colleagues articulated a comprehensive model in which socioeconomic position, environmental stressors, and systemic inequality shape biological outcomes across populations [20]. Applied to craniometric research, this model underscores that cranial variation emerges from the interaction between genotype and environment across the life course. Such interactions generate continuous patterns of variation rather than discrete morphological classes, reinforcing the incompatibility of racial typologies with contemporary biological understanding [5,10].

Genomic diversity studies have consistently corroborated this perspective. Large-scale analyses of DNA variation have shown that genetic distances between populations increase gradually with geographic separation, forming clinal patterns rather than abrupt boundaries [9,15]. These findings mirror patterns observed in cranial morphology, where gradual shape changes correlate with geography and population history rather than racial affiliation [1,3]. Attempts to impose racial categories on such data obscure the true structure of variation and risk, reifying socially constructed divisions as biological realities [12,13].

Collectively, evidence from population genetics, evolutionary biology, sociology, and biomedical research converges on a coherent conclusion: human cranial and genetic variation is fundamentally continuous, multidimensional, and context-dependent. Discrete racial classes fail to capture this complexity and lack biological validity. For craniometry, this realization necessitates a conceptual shift from classification to variation-focused analysis, emphasizing population-level patterns without recourse to race as an explanatory construct [2,7,8].

3. The 3D Revolution: Geometric Morphometrics and Modern Craniometric Analysis

The transition from traditional craniometry to three-dimensional (3D) analytical frameworks represents a fundamental methodological and conceptual shift in the study of human cranial variation. Classical craniometry relied on linear distances and angular measurements that reduced complex cranial forms to a limited set of variables, often reinforcing typological interpretations of human diversity. In contrast, geometric morphometrics introduced a mathematically rigorous approach capable of capturing shape as a holistic, spatial property, independent of size, orientation, and position [1]. This innovation provided the technical foundation for abandoning racial typologies in favor of population-based analyses of form variation.

Geometric morphometrics is based on the use of homologous anatomical landmarks and semi-landmarks distributed across the cranial surface, allowing the full geometry of the skull to be analyzed within a multivariate statistical framework. Through Procrustes superimposition and subsequent ordination techniques, such as principal component analysis, subtle patterns of shape variation can be quantified and visualized without collapsing morphology into predefined categories

[1,3]. This approach revealed extensive overlap in cranial shape among populations, reinforcing earlier genetic evidence that human biological variation is continuous rather than discretely partitioned [5,9].

The integration of 3D imaging technologies, including computed tomography, laser scanning, and photogrammetry, has further enhanced the precision and reproducibility of craniometric research. These modalities enable high-resolution digital reconstructions of cranial anatomy, preserving complex surface details that were inaccessible to traditional caliper-based methods. Importantly, 3D datasets facilitate large-scale comparative studies across populations while minimizing observer bias and measurement error, addressing long-standing methodological criticisms of classical craniometry [3,7].

Beyond technical advantages, 3D geometric morphometrics has had decisive conceptual implications. By modeling cranial form as a continuous, high-dimensional variable, these methods render racial classification both unnecessary and scientifically unjustifiable. Patterns of variation observed in morphometric space align more closely with geographic proximity, population history, and developmental plasticity than with socially constructed racial labels [2,8,16]. This concordance between morphometric and genetic evidence underscores the incompatibility of racial typologies with contemporary biological data.

Modern craniometric analysis has also benefited from interdisciplinary integration. Insights from evolutionary biology, developmental genetics, and biomechanics have clarified how cranial shape emerges from the interaction of genetic factors, functional demands, and environmental influences across the lifespan [4,17]. Such integrative models further weaken typological interpretations by demonstrating that cranial morphology

is dynamic and context-dependent, rather than a fixed marker of racial identity.

In applied domains, including forensic anthropology and craniofacial surgery, the adoption of 3D morphometric frameworks has enabled more individualized and ethically responsible interpretations of cranial variation. Rather

than assigning specimens or patients to racial categories, contemporary practice increasingly emphasizes probabilistic, population-informed assessments of shape variation [6,12,13]. This shift reduces the risk of biological essentialism while improving analytical accuracy and clinical relevance.

Table 1. Conceptual comparison between classical craniometry and 3D geometric morphometrics

Aspect	Classical Craniometry	3D Geometric Morphometrics	Key references
Type of data	Linear distances and indices	Landmark- and surface-based shape data	[1,3]
Measurement dimensionality	Two-dimensional or linear metrics	Three-dimensional spatial configurations	[1]
Treatment of variation	Discrete, typological classification	Continuous, multivariate shape variation	[1,5,9]
Use of racial categories	Implicit or explicit reliance	Methodologically absent	[2,7,8]
Analytical precision	Limited by metric reduction	High-resolution shape quantification	[1,3]
Clinical applicability	Population-based averages	Individualized, patient-specific assessment	[6,12,13]

Table 1 summarizes the methodological and conceptual differences between traditional linear craniometry and modern three-dimensional geometric morphometrics. Classical approaches relied on metric reduction and typological frameworks that often intersected with racialized interpretations. In contrast, contemporary morphometric methods analyze cranial shape as a continuous, multivariate phenotype, consistent with population genetic evidence and current clinical standards.

4. Clinical and Biomedical Implications of Non-Racial Craniometric Models

The shift toward non-racial, population-based craniometric models has significant implications for clinical practice and biomedical research. Traditional reliance on racial or ethnic craniofacial norms has increasingly been recognized as

both scientifically unfounded and clinically limiting. Modern evidence demonstrates that cranial and craniofacial morphology exhibits substantial intra-population variability and extensive overlap between populations, rendering race an unreliable surrogate for anatomical prediction [1,3,5]. Consequently, contemporary clinical disciplines are progressively moving toward individualized, data-driven approaches grounded in measurable morphological variation rather than categorical identity.

In craniofacial and reconstructive surgery, the application of three-dimensional morphometric analysis has transformed preoperative planning and outcome assessment. High-resolution 3D imaging allows surgeons to evaluate patient-specific cranial anatomy with precision, facilitating customized surgical strategies that respect functional and

aesthetic requirements without reference to racial templates [6]. This approach improves anatomical accuracy and reduces the risk of bias associated with presumed racial norms, aligning surgical practice with current understandings of human biological diversity [2,8].

Biomedical research has similarly benefited from the abandonment of race-based explanatory models. Studies have shown that the use of race as a biological variable often obscures the true determinants of disease risk and treatment response, which are more accurately explained by genetic ancestry, environmental exposure, and social context [12,13,18]. Non-racial craniometric frameworks enable researchers to investigate morphological variation as a continuous phenotype, enhancing statistical power and interpretive clarity while avoiding the reification of socially constructed categories [9,16].

The ethical dimension of this methodological transition is particularly salient. The historical misuse of craniometric data to legitimize racial hierarchies underscores the responsibility of contemporary science to adopt frameworks that minimize the risk of biological essentialism [7,10]. By focusing on population structure and individual variation, modern craniometry supports more equitable and responsible biomedical applications, especially in contexts where morphological data intersect with identity and health outcomes [19,20].

5. Toward a Post-Racial Framework in Anthropology and Biomedical Sciences

The cumulative evidence from anthropology, population genetics, and biomedical research supports the necessity of a post-racial framework for the study of human biological variation. Classical racial typologies, historically sustained by craniometric classification, have been rendered scientifically untenable by empirical data demonstrating the continuity,

overlap, and multidimensionality of human variation [1,3,5]. Modern craniometry, informed by three-dimensional analytical methods and integrative biological models, thus occupies a pivotal position in the transition toward non-racial scientific paradigms.

At the core of this shift is the recognition that race lacks a coherent biological definition. Genetic studies consistently show that variation within populations exceeds variation between them, and that population structure reflects gradients shaped by migration, admixture, and local adaptation rather than discrete racial boundaries [2,9,16]. Craniometric data, when analyzed using geometric morphometrics, mirror these patterns by revealing continuous shape variation correlated with geography and population history rather than socially defined racial categories [1,7]. This convergence of genetic and morphological evidence provides a robust empirical foundation for abandoning race as an explanatory construct.

The adoption of a post-racial framework also requires conceptual clarity regarding the distinction between race, ancestry, and population. While genetic ancestry captures aspects of shared evolutionary history, it does not map onto race as a social classification. Misinterpretation of ancestry signals risks reintroducing racial thinking into scientific discourse, particularly in genomics and morphology [10,14,15]. A post-racial approach, therefore, emphasizes careful methodological language and statistical interpretation, ensuring that biological data are not recontextualized within outdated racial schemas [12,13].

Technological innovation further reinforces this paradigm shift. The integration of 3D morphometrics with large-scale genomic datasets and computational modeling enables high-resolution analyses of cranial form that are explicitly population-based and individual-

centered. Emerging applications of machine learning and artificial intelligence offer additional potential for pattern recognition without reliance on predefined categories, provided that training data and interpretive frameworks remain free from racial bias [16,17]. Such tools can enhance explanatory power while adhering to post-racial principles.

Beyond methodological considerations, the move toward a post-racial framework carries significant ethical and social implications. The historical entanglement of craniometry with racial hierarchies and discrimination necessitates an explicit commitment to frameworks that resist biological essentialism [21]. In biomedical contexts, replacing race-based models with approaches grounded in population structure, environmental exposure, and social determinants of health promotes more equitable and accurate research outcomes [22,23].

6. Conclusions

Modern craniometry exemplifies the convergence of technological innovation, empirical rigor, and conceptual reform in the study of human biological diversity. The

abandonment of racial typologies is not merely a theoretical preference but a necessary consequence of robust genetic, morphological, and biomedical evidence demonstrating that human variation is continuous, overlapping, and context-dependent. Three-dimensional geometric morphometrics has provided the methodological means to analyze cranial form as a complex, population-informed phenotype, free from the constraints of typological classification. When integrated with insights from population genetics and social determinants of health, contemporary craniometric models offer greater explanatory power and clinical relevance than race-based frameworks. Importantly, this transition addresses the ethical legacy of craniometry by reducing the risk of biological essentialism and the reification of social categories as biological facts. By embracing a post-racial framework, modern craniometry aligns itself with current scientific standards and contributes to a more accurate, equitable, and socially responsible understanding of human cranial variation, reinforcing its role as a foundational discipline within anthropology and biomedical science.

References

1. Slice DE. Geometric Morphometrics. *Annu Rev Anthropol.* 2007;36:261–281.
2. Templeton AR. Biological Races in Humans. *Stud Hist Philos Biol Biomed Sci.* 2013;44(3):262–271.
3. Howells WW. *Crania Variation in Man: A Study by Multivariate Analysis.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1973.
4. Rhodes G. The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2006;57:199–226.
5. Lewontin RC. The Apportionment of Human Diversity. *Evol Biol.* 1972;6:381–398.
6. McCarthy JG, Galiano RD, Boutros S, et al. *Plastic Surgery: Volume 3: Craniofacial, Head and Neck Surgery.* 4th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier; 2018.
7. Fujimura JH, Bolnick DA, Rajagopalan R, Kaufman JS, Lewontin RC, Duster T, Ossorio P. Clines without classes how to make sense of human variation. *Sociol Theory.* 2014;32:208–227.
8. Templeton AR. Biological races in humans. *Stud Hist Philos Biol Biomed Sci.* 2013;44(3):262–271.
9. Barbujani G, Magagni A, Minch E, Cavalli-Sforza LL. An apportionment of human DNA diversity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 1997;94(9):4516–4519.

10. Duster T. A post-genomic surprise. The molecular reinscription of race in science, law and medicine. *Br J Sociol.* 2015;66:1–27.
11. Benn Torres J. ‘Reparational’ genetics: genomic data and the case for reparations in the Caribbean. *Genealogy.* 2018;2(1):7
12. Benn Torres J, Kittles R. The relationship between ‘race’ and genetics in biomedical research. *Curr Hypertens Rep.* 2007;9:196–201.
13. Caulfield T, Fullerton SM, Ali-Khan SE, Arbour L, Burchard EG, Cooper RS, Hardy BJ, Harry S, Hyde-Lay R, Kahn J. Race and ancestry in biomedical research: exploring the challenges. *Genome Med.* 2009;1:1–8.
14. Bolnick DA, Fullwiley D, Duster T, Cooper RS, Fujimura JH, Kahn J, Kaufman JS, Marks J, Morning A, Nelson A, Ossorio P, Reardon J, Reverby SM, TallBear K. The science and business of genetic ancestry testing. *Science.* 2007;318(5849):399–400.
15. Edwards AWF. Human genetic diversity: Lewontin’s fallacy. *BioEssays.* 2003;25:798–801.
16. Falush D, Stephens M, Pritchard JK. Inference of population structure using multilocus genotype data: linked loci and correlated allele frequencies. *Genetics.* 2003;164(4):1567–1587.
17. Bolat M, Antohe M, Forna NC. Clinical aspects of therapeutical solutions involved in oral rehabilitation of partially edentulous. *Rom J Oral Rehabil.* 2013;5(4).
18. 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)
19. Forna NC, Sader R. Oral rehabilitation on small substance loss cases. *Rom J Oral Rehabil.* , 2009 1(4):15.
20. Deschamps M, Laval G, Fagny M, Itan Y, Abel L, Casanova JL, Patin E, Quintana-Murci L. Genomic signatures of selective pressures and introgression from archaic hominins at human innate immunity genes. *Am J Hum Genet.* 2016;98:5–21.
21. Duster T. Lessons from history: why race and ethnicity have played a major role in biomedical research. *J Law Med Ethics.* 2006;34:487–496.
22. Braun L. Race, ethnicity, and health: can genetics explain disparities? *Perspect Biol Med.* 2002;45:159–174.
23. Braveman P, Egerter S, Williams DR. The social determinants of health: coming of age. *Annu Rev Public Health.* 2011;32(1):381–398.