

**Chapter-by-Chapter Description of**

**THE GENE ILLUSION:**  
**GENETIC RESEARCH in PSYCHIATRY and**  
**PSYCHOLOGY UNDER the MICROSCOPE**

**By Jay Joseph, Psy.D.**

**Algora Publishing, 2004.**  
**Retail price \$26.95 paperback, \$29.95 hardcover. 407 pp.**  
**2003 United Kingdom Edition by PCCS Books**

**[Available at Amazon.com](http://Amazon.com)**

Contents of this web page © 2006-2009 by Jay Joseph, Psy.D. The material presented here is intended for personal, small group, or classroom use only. Please contact the author at jayjoseph22@gmail.com for permission to reproduce in large quantities, or to quote at length. Thank you.

**CHAPTER ONE | Introduction.**

It has been observed that “the knowledge that certain diseases run in families is thousands of years old.”<sup>1</sup> Today, it is widely understood that a trait or condition “running in the family” can be explained by any number of environmental factors related to the physical, social, and psychological environments shared by family members. For this reason, most genetic researchers recognize that family studies are unable to disentangle the potential influences of genes and environment. For example, a pair of prominent genetic researchers in psychiatry acknowledged that family studies can provide only “the initial hint that a disorder might have a genetic component,” because “disorders can ‘run in families’ for nongenetic reasons such as shared environmental adversity, viral transmission, and social learning.”<sup>2</sup>

Family studies identify persons manifesting a given trait or condition, and attempt to determine whether their biological relatives are similarly affected more often than are members of the general population or a control group. If a condition is found to aggregate in families, it is said to be familial. However, “familial” is not the same as “genetic.” Unfortunately, many people view these terms as being synonymous, when in fact they are not. Moreover, some researchers,

and more frequently the popular media, continue to erroneously cite family data in support of genetics.

## **CHAPTER TWO | Twin Research: Misunderstanding Twins, From Galton to the 21st Century.**

Psychologist Jay Joseph looks into the history of twin research in Chapter 2, and documents the largely unknown story of its origins in eugenics and the German “racial hygiene” movement.<sup>3</sup> He quotes many documents from the first half of the 20th century, many of which are translated from the original German for the first time. For example, German racial hygienist and twin research pioneer Hermann W. Siemens, who holds the distinction of being one of the most unknown and unheralded inventors of a widely used research technique, wrote in 1937 as follows:

“Since the National Socialist seizure of power the political goals that we, the racial-hygienists, are in favor of, have now become a part—and not the least important one—of the German government program. ‘Racial hygiene as a utopian dream’ became ‘Racial hygiene as political program’ . . . . Our future will be governed by racial hygiene—or it will not exist at all.”<sup>4</sup>

Later in the same work, Siemens discussed how the ideas of England’s Francis Galton, who founded the eugenics movement in the 19th century and became the first person to propose using twins to study heredity, were being put into practice in Hitler’s Germany:

“Galton already saw the possibility of integrating racial-hygienic ideals—just like a new religion—into the national conscious. The national [völkische] state, however, is now called on to be really serious about it. According to its *Führer*, it is the obligation of the national state ‘to declare children as a people’s most precious commodity’ so that ‘it will one day be considered reprehensible to withhold healthy children from the nation [emphasis in original].”<sup>5</sup>

The authors of two German twin studies of criminality published in 1936, Heinrich Kranz and Friedrich Stumpfl, called for the compulsory sterilization of criminals. According to Kranz,

“One could ascertain so far on the basis of twin concordance rates that have been found that the imbecile criminals are undesirable in terms of racial hygiene [rassenhygienisch unerwünscht]; furthermore, some types of criminal psychopaths are borderline psychotics and severe alcoholics. All of these are already being recorded to a large extent through the [1933 Nazi] sterilization law.”<sup>6</sup>

Kranz wrote that the genetic impairment of sex offenders “can hardly be questioned,” while adding that “the castration law is simultaneously fulfilling the racial hygienic task [rassenhygienische Aufgabe]”<sup>7</sup> Stumpfl went on to work in the Innsbruck *Intitut für Erb- und Rassenbiologie* (Institute for Genetics and Racial Biology) in Nazi-occupied Austria from 1939-1945.<sup>8</sup>

Leading German racial hygienists such as Ernst Rüdin and Hans Luxenburger (the latter published the first schizophrenia twin study in 1928) pushed hard for compulsory eugenic sterilization laws well before Hitler took power in 1933. In the United States, many states had already passed eugenic sterilization laws, and most twin research was carried out by eugenicists eager to supply data in support of the cause. For the most part, however, contemporary twin researchers have failed to highlight the fact that their discipline has its origins in eugenics and the German racial hygiene movement. Beginning with Galton, Joseph discusses the various ways that twins have been used for research purposes, as well as some of the methodological problems discussed by critics. Due to its association with Nazism and eugenics, interest in twin research waned in the late 1940s and 1950s, but began a revival in the late 1960s that continues to the present time. Today, twin studies constitute the main pillar of support for genetic theories in psychiatry and psychology, in part because the underlying assumptions of twin research are rarely questioned in the authoritative texts of these disciplines. However, past and present critics have made a strong argument that, due to researchers' reliance on unsupported theoretical assumptions and other factors, twin research provides no scientifically acceptable evidence in support of genetic influences psychological trait variation (such as IQ and personality) and psychiatric disorders.

### **CHAPTER THREE | The Twin Method: An Environmentally Confounded Research Method.**

Joseph looks closely at the theoretical underpinnings of twin research in this chapter. The main tool of behavior genetics<sup>9</sup> and psychiatric genetics<sup>10</sup> is the “classical twin method,” more commonly known as “the twin method.” The twin method compares the resemblance of reared-together identical (also known as monozygotic, or MZ) twins, who share 100% genetic similarity, versus the resemblance of reared-together same-sex fraternal (also known as dizygotic, or DZ) twins, who average a 50% genetic similarity. (Twin resemblance is usually measured with concordance rates or correlations.) Based on the assumption that the childhood and adult environments of both types of twins are comparable, known as the “equal environment assumption” or “EEA,” twin researchers attribute to genetic factors the usual finding of a significantly greater resemblance among identical versus same-sex fraternal twins.

However, as Joseph documents, there is overwhelming evidence that identical twins experience much more similar environments than fraternal twins, and, perhaps more important, identical twins experience a stronger psychological bond and more often experience identity confusion.<sup>11</sup> Twin researchers often concede these points, yet continue to uphold the validity of the twin method and the equal environment assumption on the basis of two claims. The first is that, although identical and fraternal twin environments are different, *critics* must identify the “trait-relevant” environmental factors for which identical and fraternal twins experience dissimilar environments. (By “trait relevant,” twin researchers mean aspects of the environment that have been shown to contribute to the trait in question. For example, exposure to trauma contributes to post-traumatic stress disorder.) However, because a basic tenet of science holds that the burden of proof falls on the claimant, not on critics,<sup>12</sup> twin researchers themselves bear the burden of proof for showing that identical and fraternal twins are not differentially exposed to potentially relevant environmental factors. Moreover, although faced with a similar problem, twin researchers do not make the “trait relevant” argument when discussing potential

environmental confounds in *family* studies. In this case they are willing to concede that, because family members share a common environment (“trait-relevant” or not), one cannot draw valid conclusions in favor of genetic influences on behavior on the basis of a family resemblance of a trait.

The second defense of the twin method used by contemporary twin researchers is the claim that identical twins “create” more similar environments for themselves by virtue of their greater genetically-caused similarity of behavior.<sup>13</sup> Therefore the twin method’s validity, according to some twin researchers, is based on determining *why*—not *whether*—identical twins experience more similar environments than fraternal twins. Twin researchers and popularizers of their work, however, fail to understand that the *reason* identical pairs experience more similar environments than fraternal pairs, be it environmental or genetic, is irrelevant in assessing the validity of the EEA. For example, suppose that schizophrenia is caused solely by exposure to a toxic chemical. Because identical twins spend much more time together than fraternal twins, it is much more likely that both members of an identical twin pair will be exposed to the chemical, and be subsequently diagnosed with schizophrenia, than it is that both members of a fraternal pair will be exposed and diagnosed. However, even if identicals do indeed “create” more similar environments for themselves than do fraternal twins on the basis of their greater genetic similarity, it would be erroneous to conclude that higher identical versus fraternal concordance for schizophrenia is evidence that the condition has a genetic component. In this example—regardless of *why* identical pairs are together more often—higher identical twin pair concordance is caused solely by identicals’ propensity to be together more often than fraternal pairs, which leads them to be more similarly exposed to the toxic chemical that causes schizophrenia.

Thus, the only relevant question in determining the validity of the twin method is *whether*—not *why*—identical twin pairs experience more similar environments than fraternal pairs. Moreover, the “twins create their environment” argument uses circular reasoning, because the evidence that twins’ behavioral similarity is caused by genetics is implicitly derived from the results of previous twin studies. Therefore, Joseph argues, both family *and* twin studies are unable to disentangle the potential roles of genetic and environmental influences on psychological trait variation or psychiatric disorders. He concludes that there is no reason to accept that the twin method measures anything other than the more similar treatment, greater environmental similarity, and closer psychological association experienced by identical versus fraternal twin pairs.

## **CHAPTER FOUR | Genetic Studies of Twins Reared Apart: A Critical Review.**

Joseph begins Chapter 4 with an examination of stories released by twin researchers, and often reported by journalists, about separated (reared-apart) twins who, upon being reunited, are said to share an amazing set of common features, traits, preferences, etc. He points out, however, that most pairs come to the attention of researchers and journalists *because of* their similarities. It’s similar to the old “dog bites person versus person bites dog” rule in journalism. A dog biting a person isn’t newsworthy because it’s a common occurrence, whereas a person biting a dog is news because it is an *unusual* occurrence. If we read several articles describing a person biting a dog, we would be wrong to conclude that people bite dogs more frequently than dogs bite

people. The same is true for twins. Stories of similar reared-apart twins are news because they are interesting and compelling; stories about dissimilar twins are not.

More importantly, there are many *environmental* factors shared by reared-apart identical twins (and by reared-together identical twins) that would lead them to resemble each more than two randomly selected members of the world's population. These factors include that they are exactly the same age; that they are the same sex; that they are almost always the same ethnicity; that their appearance is strikingly similar, which probably will elicit similar treatment; that they usually are raised in the same socioeconomic class; that they usually are raised in the same culture; that they shared the same prenatal environment; and that they typically spent a certain amount of time together in the same family environment, were aware of each other's existence when studied, and often had regular contact over a long period of time. All of these factors work towards increasing the resemblance of reared-apart twins for non-genetic reasons, yet are rarely discussed in popular accounts of individual pairs. Together, these factors comprise the *cohort effect*, which accounts for similarities in people's behavior and preferences that arise from the characteristics of the historical periods and cultural milieu in which they experience stages of life at the same time.

A typical example of the failure to recognize cultural and cohort influences on twin resemblance, and to erroneously attribute this resemblance to genetics, is found in journalist Kay Cassill's 1982 description of reared-apart identical twins Keith Heitzman and Jack Hellback, who grew up in Louisiana:

“Although the mighty Mississippi divided these two physically, it could not separate their parallel lives. The welder from one side and the pump mechanic from the other found that they are both allergic to ragweed and dust. Both had done poorly in school. Both disliked sports and had cut their gym classes whenever they could. They are both addicted to candy. Their similarity of dress includes a penchant for wearing cowboy hats, which matches their parallel interest in guns and hunting.”<sup>14</sup>

As a critic commented, “Even if ‘the mighty Mississippi divided’ the twins, the fact that they both wear cowboy hats and like hunting is not that unusual for two [white] working-class men in the same region of Louisiana.”<sup>15</sup> The same point can be made about the celebrated reared-apart “Jim Twins,” two working-class white men who grew up in the same region of Ohio at the same time.

Joseph concludes that the stories of individual pairs of reared-apart identical twins, while interesting, tell us little to nothing about genetic influences on human psychological trait differences. As behavior geneticist Richard Rose commented, these stories make “good show biz but uncertain science.”<sup>16</sup> Judith Harris, author of *The Nurture Assumption*, has written that “there are too many of these stories for them all to be coincidences.”<sup>17</sup> And she is correct that they are not all coincidences. Rather, these stories are selectively reported “show biz” combined with a stunning failure to recognize the environmental factors influencing these twins' similar behaviors.

Joseph then turns his attention to the handful of systematic “twins reared apart” (TRA) studies published since the late 1930s, the most well known being the Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart (MISTRA) by Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr. and his colleagues.<sup>18</sup> Many people who remained unconvinced about genetics by the results of investigations using the twin method have

been convinced by these TRA studies. (TRA studies record twin pair test score correlations for psychological traits such as IQ and personality. There have been no systematic TRA studies of psychiatric disorders, such as schizophrenia.)

However, there are important problems with TRA studies. These include (1) the questionable “separation” of twins, who in many cases grew up together and had quite a bit of contact over much of their lives; (2) the similarity bias of the samples; (3) researchers’ failure to publish or share raw data and life history information for the twins under study (Bouchard’s MISTRA), and (4) the impact that the researchers’ bias in favor of genetic explanations may have had on the interpretation of their results.

The main problem with TRA studies such as Bouchard’s, however, is that the investigators mistakenly compared reared-apart identical twins (“monozygotic twins reared-apart,” or “MZAs”) to *reared-together* identicals—thereby failing to control for the fact that both sets share several important environmental similarities. As we have seen, these include common age (birth cohort), common sex, similar appearance, and similar political, socioeconomic, and cultural environments. (Bouchard’s group attempted to correct MZA correlations for age and sex effects, but these adjustments were inadequate and unclear.<sup>19</sup>) Thus, Joseph argues that all TRA researchers used the wrong control group, leading to their erroneous conclusions in favor of genetics.

A scientifically acceptable TRA study would compare the resemblance of a group consisting of MZAs reared apart from birth and unknown to each other, versus a control group consisting not of reared-together identical twins, but of *biologically unrelated pairs of strangers* sharing all of the following characteristics: they should be the same age, they should be the same sex, they should be the same ethnicity, the correlation of their rearing environment socioeconomic status should be similar to that of the MZA group, they should be similar in appearance and attractiveness, and the degree of similarity of their cultural backgrounds should be equal to that of the MZA pairs. Moreover, they should have no contact with each other until after they are evaluated and tested. After concluding such a study, Joseph suggests that we might find that the biologically-unrelated pairs correlate similarly to MZAs, which would suggest that MZA correlations are the result of environmental influences. Because no study of this type has ever been attempted, and because of the major flaws and biases in the studies that have been undertaken, Joseph argues that we can draw no valid conclusions in support of genetic influences on psychological trait variation from the reared-apart twin studies published to date.

## **CHAPTER FIVE | The Heritability Concept: A Measure of Inheritance or Inherently Misleading?**

Joseph writes in Chapter 5 against the utility of the concept of *heritability* in psychology and psychiatry, arguing that the heritability statistic is misleading as a measure of the genetic contribution to a trait or condition. The heritability concept is widely used in reference to genetic influences on psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation. However, heritability estimates falsely claim to approximate “how much” genetic influence there is. As dissident behavior geneticist Jerry Hirsch has pointed out, a numerical heritability estimate (coefficient) is not a “nature/nurture ratio” of the relative contributions of genes and environment.<sup>20</sup>

Contrary to popular belief, whether heritability is 10% or 90% says nothing about the potential efficacy of a particular environmental intervention, nor does a heritability estimate

greater than 50% imply that genes are more important than the environment. An example is phenylketonuria (PKU), a genetic disorder of metabolism which, without a specific environmental intervention, causes mental retardation. Although the population variance for PKU susceptibility is completely explained by genetic factors (heritability = 1.0, or 100%), the administration of a low phenylalanine diet to the at-risk infant during a critical period prevents the disorder from appearing. PKU is an excellent example of biologist Richard Lewontin's observation that a "trait can have a heritability of 1.0 in a population at some time, yet could be completely altered in the future by a simple environmental change."<sup>21</sup>

Approaching this question from a different angle, although the human trait of having two arms is inherited, the heritability of humans having two arms is *zero*. This is because the heritability statistic describes *variation* in a population attributable to genes. Because virtually everyone is born with two arms, and because people with one arm become that way on the basis of an environmental occurrence, 100% of the "armedness" variation in a population is caused by the environment, and 0% of the variation is caused by genes. At the same time, of course, having two arms is a genetically programmed human trait. Thus, a trait could be 100% *inherited*, yet have a *heritability* of 0%. Hirsch has reminded us that although "heritable" and "inherited" are very different concepts, many people wrongly believe them to be synonymous because they sound alike.<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately, the genetic literature does little to help people avoid such confusion.

A heritability estimate, which is applicable only in a specific population, in a specific environment, and at a specific point in time, was developed in agriculture as a means of predicting the results of a selective breeding program for economically desirable traits.<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, the invalid extension of the heritability statistic from a breeding predictor to a quantification of the genetic contribution to psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation has led to a great deal of misunderstanding about the role of genetic influences on these traits and disorders. Moreover, heritability estimates are based on rarely-met assumptions about humans.<sup>24</sup>

Heritability estimates are dubious for the additional reason that they are derived from family, twin, and adoptions studies, which are subject to the invalidating environmental confounds and biases documented in *The Gene Illusion*.

Thus, while it is theoretically possible that genetic factors underlie psychiatric disorders and psychological trait variation, it is inappropriate and misleading to use the heritability statistic to estimate the magnitude of this possible component. Behavior geneticist Richard Rende has written that the heritability statistic serves as "a useful statistical indicator to some, a rather meaningless index to others, and a potentially harmful, biased, and even blatantly incorrect calculation to the harshest critics."<sup>25</sup> Clearly, Joseph's views are similar to other "harsh critics" of the heritability concept.

## **CHAPTER SIX | The Genetics of Schizophrenia I: Overview.**

Chapter 6 begins a two-part critical examination of the evidence that genetic factors play a role in causing schizophrenia, the classical psychiatric disorder. Although the genetic basis of schizophrenia is currently seen as a virtual proven fact in psychiatry and psychology, Joseph shows that the evidence supporting this position is stunningly weak.

On the basis of the analysis made in previous chapters, Joseph argues that schizophrenia twin research, which includes studies using the twin method, individual case reports of supposedly reared-apart twins, and studies of the offspring of discordant identical twins, provides no support to genetic theories of schizophrenia. These theories typically hold that schizophrenia is caused by a genetic predisposition in combination with exposure to environmental triggers. Joseph writes that, paradoxically, the genetic predisposition concept speaks more to what we *don't* know (or are unable or unwilling to change) about the environment than it does to what we *do* know about genetics.

Several early schizophrenia twin researchers provided detailed case histories of identical twin pairs judged concordant for schizophrenia. A closer look at these case histories suggests that the close association and social isolation of identical pairs played a major role in their greater concordance for schizophrenia when compared to the histories of fraternal twins. Throughout the case histories of identical twin pairs we encounter researchers' observations such as, "they rather shut themselves up together," "never troubled to make separate friends," "no contact with other people," "they seemed to share one illness between them," "were never separated from one another," "longing intensely for her sister's company," "did not like to mix too much with others," "always clung together," "inseparable," "couldn't make a move without the other," and so on. Moreover, there are several trends in schizophrenia twin research, such as a 2- to 3-fold higher rate among same-sex versus opposite-sex fraternal pairs, that are difficult to explain on genetic grounds. Thus, twin studies of psychosis may have revealed little more than identical twin pairs' greater propensity to experience folie à deux (shared psychotic disorder) than fraternal pairs.

No researcher has been able to perform a systematic study of schizophrenia among reared-apart identical twins. However, several individual case histories of ostensibly separated pairs have been reported. In Susan Farber's exhaustive 1981 review of these cases she concluded that, according to her "lenient criteria," nine identical pairs warranted consideration as legitimately separated twins.<sup>26</sup> However, in all of these cases (6 pairs were considered concordant by Farber) the twins were aware of each other's existence and had periodic contact.

Regardless of how many individual reared-apart pairs are reported concordant for schizophrenia, however, they do not constitute scientifically acceptable evidence in favor of genetics. As we have seen, twin pairs often come to the attention of researchers because of their similarities. In this case, researchers or hospital administrators might become aware of a pair of identical twins hospitalized for schizophrenia, whereas a discordant pair, where only one twin is hospitalized, would not come to their attention as often. Moreover, most cases were reported by genetically-oriented investigators, whose bias influenced which pairs they chose to report, how they reported them, and how they diagnosed the twins. In any case, a basic principle of science is that a collection of anecdotes does not equal data.

Another method of studying twins compares schizophrenia rates among the offspring of discordant identical twin pairs (that is, one member of the pair is diagnosed with schizophrenia, and the other is not). The most frequently cited study in this area was published by Gottesman and Bertelsen in 1989.<sup>27</sup> After performing a detailed review of this body of research, Joseph concludes that it provides no evidence in support of genetic influences on schizophrenia.

Chapter 6 ends with the following conclusion:

"Genetic influences on schizophrenia cannot be established by the results of family studies, twin studies, published studies of the offspring of discordant identical pairs, or

individual cases of ‘reared apart’ identical twins. Taken together, this body of research points merely to the *possibility* that genes influence schizophrenia, and nothing more.”

## **CHAPTER SEVEN | The Genetics of Schizophrenia II: Adoption Studies.**

The schizophrenia adoption studies of the 1960s and 1970s are largely responsible for closing the “genetics of schizophrenia” debate in favor of genetics. In Chapter 7, Joseph undertakes an in-depth critical analysis of these studies, which were carried out in the United States, Denmark, and Finland. He argues that genetic theories of schizophrenia are flawed on several critical dimensions rarely discussed in mainstream accounts. The task of highlighting these flaws has been left to critics, who are usually ignored or dismissed by mainstream sources intent on demonstrating the definitive nature of this research.

In theory, an adoption study is able to disentangle potential genetic and environmental influences on psychiatric disorders because adoptees receive their genes from one family, but are raised in the environment of another family. We will see, however, that the theorized separation of genetic and environmental factors is not as clear cut as it might appear on paper.

To date, there have been six major schizophrenia adoption studies. The first, published by Leonard Heston in 1966, compared the rate of schizophrenia among 47 adopted-away biological offspring of women diagnosed with schizophrenia who were confined to Oregon state mental hospitals, versus a control group of 50 adoptees of non-diagnosed mothers. In 1968, American psychiatric investigators Seymour Kety, David Rosenthal, Paul Wender and their Danish colleagues published the results of studies based on the records of Danish adoptees and their families. Rosenthal and colleagues studied the adopted-away offspring of parents diagnosed with schizophrenia, “schizophrenia spectrum disorders,” or manic depression. Using a different design, in 1968 Kety and colleagues began with the records of adoptees from the greater Copenhagen area, identified those diagnosed with a schizophrenia spectrum disorder, and recorded diagnoses among their adoptive and biological relatives. In a 1975 follow-up, the investigators interviewed and re-diagnosed many of the 1968 relatives. The study was then extended to the rest of Denmark, and the final results were published in 1994. Wender and his Danish-American colleagues published a study using the “crossfostering” design in 1974.

The final study was performed by Pekka Tienari and colleagues in Finland, who first published results in the 1980s and continued to publish into the 21st century. In contrast to the earlier investigations, Tienari studied adoptees’ family environments as well their genetic background. He and his colleagues concluded that both genes and adoptive family rearing environment are “predictor variables” for schizophrenia.

\* \* \*

In all of these studies, the investigators concluded in favor of important genetic influences on schizophrenia, while Tienari and colleagues added a finding that disturbed family environments also contribute to the condition. However, Joseph and previous reviewers have detailed several important biases and methodological flaws in schizophrenia adoption research. Among these are included, but are by no means limited to:

- (1) The investigators decided to expand the definition of schizophrenia to include non-psychotic “schizophrenia spectrum disorders,” and they would not have found statistically significant results without such an expansion. In fact, the Kety et al. 1968 study found *zero* cases of chronic schizophrenia among the 65 identified first-degree biological relatives of adoptees diagnosed with a schizophrenia spectrum disorder, and Rosenthal and colleagues found that only 1 of the 76 adopted-away biological offspring of a parent diagnosed with a spectrum disorder had received a hospital diagnosis of schizophrenia. Moreover, there is reason to believe that the researchers decided to expand the definition of schizophrenia only after they had obtained their initial results.
- (2) In Kety’s famous 1968 study, there is evidence suggesting that the researchers decided to change the design of their study after the initial relative group comparisons failed to obtain statistically significant results in the genetic direction.<sup>28</sup>
- (3) The researchers failed to adequately define schizophrenia and schizophrenia spectrum disorders.
- (4) In Rosenthal’s study, manic depression was included in the schizophrenia spectrum despite the investigators’ insistence elsewhere that this diagnosis is genetically *unrelated* to schizophrenia.<sup>29</sup> Without manic-depressive subjects, Rosenthal would not have been able to claim statistically significant results in the genetic direction.
- (5) In the Kety et al. studies using interviews to make diagnoses, there were inconsistencies in the way that the researchers counted and diagnosed dead or unavailable relatives.<sup>30</sup>
- (6) The researchers failed to provide case history information on adoptees or relatives, and (apart from Tienari) failed to study important environmental variables.
- (7) As an earlier critic noted, in Kety’s study the “procedure of counting up all the possible relatives of each index case and pooling them as if they were independent samples . . . would allow some families to disproportionately affect the results.”<sup>31</sup> Thus, the investigators’ decision to emphasize the spectrum rate among individual *relatives*, as opposed to individual *families*, violated the assumption of independent observations underlying the statistical comparisons they used.
- (8) In the Kety studies, first- and second-degree relatives were counted with equal weighting.
- (9) In the Denmark and Oregon studies, the genetic bias of the investigators appeared to influence their decisions on how to count relatives, how they defined schizophrenia, the types of comparisons they made, and the conclusions they reached.
- (10) The researchers decided to include many late-separated and late-placed adoptees in their samples. This implies that, during critical developmental periods, these adoptees (a) were reared for certain period of time by their biological parents, (b) suffered a disruption

of attachment bonds with their biological parents, and/or (c) were placed in unstable environments between separation and adoption.

- (11) The Danish-American investigators used substandard interviews to make diagnoses. In the Kety et al. studies, many of these “interviews” never occurred, and were simply *fabricated* by the investigators on the basis of hospital records.<sup>32</sup> In the raw data Kety called them “pseudo-interviews,” but no mention of them appeared in any of the Danish-American investigators’ publications. Of the interviews that were conducted, the researchers believed that a five-minute doorstep conversation was sufficient to diagnose someone with schizophrenia.<sup>33</sup>
- (12) Problems with Wender’s 1974 crossfostering study include (a) the researchers’ decision to use global mental health ratings in place of diagnosing schizophrenia, (b) the use of selected post-hoc comparisons which were used to support the genetic position, (c) the failure to find statistically significant differences between important comparison groups, (d) the researchers’ failure to consider alternative explanations of their results, and (e) that the mean age of the crossfostered adoptees at the time their adoptive parents were diagnosed with a spectrum disorder was 12-years-old. By the 1980s, Wender himself would admit that, in his 1974 study, “the question of what would happen if children born of normal parents were placed in the homes of typical schizophrenics cannot be answered.”<sup>34</sup>

\*\*\*

Like the twin method, adoption studies contain their own set of critical yet rarely mentioned theoretical assumptions. The most critical is the assumed absence of selective placement (called the “no selective placement assumption”). Researchers must assume that factors relating to the adoption process (including the policies of adoption agencies) did not lead to the placement of experimental group adoptees into environments contributing to a higher rate of the condition or trait in question. They must assume that children were not placed into homes correlated with the biological or socioeconomic status of their biological family. In the various studies, however, the evidence suggests that experimental group adoptees experienced more harmful rearing environments than those experienced by control adoptees. This suggests that children whose biological family had a history of mental disorders were seen as inferior potential adoptees, and were more likely to be placed into more chaotic and pathogenic adoptive families. Thus, adoption studies’ theoretical ability to disentangle genetic and environmental influences may not have occurred in these studies.

The adoptees who became the subjects of schizophrenia adoption research were placed in the early-to-middle part of the 20th century in three regions: Denmark, the United States (Oregon), and Finland. However, all three countries had laws permitting the compulsory eugenic sterilization of people diagnosed with schizophrenia and other “mental disorders.” These laws

were passed on the basis of a widespread belief in these countries that people diagnosed with schizophrenia and other disorders were the dangerous carriers of “hereditary taint.”

**Denmark.** In 1929, Denmark became the first European nation to pass a eugenically-inspired sterilization law. A more comprehensive statute was passed in 1935.<sup>35</sup> These laws were in force until well after the last studied Danish adoptees were placed (placements were made between 1924 and 1947). Moreover, the Danish adoption agencies clearly stated that a potential adoptee’s genetic family background was checked to determine his or her suitability (or desirability) for adoption.<sup>36</sup> One can therefore conclude that, under the conditions then existing in Denmark, the most qualified potential adoptive parents, who were usually informed of “deviance” in the adoptee’s family background, would not have selected children with a biological family history of mental disorders.

**Oregon.** Similar conditions existed in Oregon, where the adoptees under study were placed between 1915 and 1945. Although Heston and virtually all subsequent reviewers and textbook authors failed to mention it, in 1917 Oregon passed a law creating a “State Board of Eugenics,” whose duty was to authorize, in the words of the law, the compulsory sterilization of “all feeble-minded, insane, epileptic, habitual criminals, moral degenerates and sexual perverts,” because they might produce “inferior” offspring. The law gave the Board of Eugenics power to examine the “family traits and histories” of such persons, and to perform “a type of sterilization as may be deemed best by said board.”<sup>37</sup> An additional law passed in 1919 stipulated that the mere fact that a person had been admitted to a mental hospital constituted “prima facie evidence that procreation by any such person would produce children with an inherited tendency to feeble-mindedness, insanity, epilepsy, criminality or degeneracy.” Given that all of Heston’s experimental group adoptees were born to women hospitalized with schizophrenia, it is extremely unlikely that these children were placed into the same types of adoptive homes as the “untainted” control adoptees (and many were placed in an orphanage for several months or years).

**Finland.** Finland also had a long history of eugenics-inspired legislation aimed at curbing the reproduction of “hereditarily tainted” people.<sup>38</sup> A government commission was created in 1926 to look into the desirability of promoting the sterilization of people seen as “mentally retarded,” “mentally ill,” or epileptic. In 1935, the Finnish parliament passed the Sterilization Act, which allowed the compulsory sterilization of “idiots,” “imbeciles,” and the “insane,” which included people diagnosed with schizophrenia and manic-depression. The law permitted the compulsory sterilization of people if there was reason to believe that their conditions could be genetically transmitted to their children. In 1950, Finland passed the Castration Act, which permitted the compulsory castration of criminals, the mentally retarded, and the “permanently mentally ill.” It was not until 1970 that compulsory sterilization was legally abolished in Finland.

\*\*\*

Because the Kety studies began with diagnosed adoptees (as opposed to diagnosed biological parents), they might appear less vulnerable to selective placement bias. However, in 8 of 33 experimental group *adoptive* (rearing) families, a parent had been admitted to a Danish psychiatric facility, which was true for none of the 34 control adoptive families.<sup>39</sup> This statistically significant finding suggests that experimental adoptees were placed into more unstable and psychologically harmful adoptive homes than were the control adoptees. Thus, the higher rate of schizophrenia spectrum disorders among experimental versus control biological

relatives might reflect little more than the agencies' placement of children with "tainted" biological relatives into more psychologically harmful adoptive homes. Psychosocial theories of schizophrenia emphasize, and Tienari's findings confirm, that these types of homes are more likely to produce psychologically unstable (and possibly "schizophrenic") adults.

Thus, if we look at schizophrenia adoption research in the context of the social and political environments in which it was performed, it is clear that *the great majority of adoptees were given up for adoption at a time when the compulsory sterilization of "schizophrenics" for eugenic purposes was permitted by law in the country or state in which their adoptions took place (Denmark, Finland, Oregon)*. Leaving aside all other problems, the evidence suggesting that selective placement occurred in these studies is reason enough to reject any conclusions in favor of genetics, until someone produces convincing evidence that placements were not influenced by the genetic stigmatization of experimental group adoptees on the basis of their perceived biological background. Unfortunately, adoption researchers rarely discuss selective placement other than to briefly dismiss its impact on their results. When we consider these studies' other serious methodological problems, there is little reason to accept their authors' conclusions in favor of a role for genetics in causing schizophrenia.

It is clear that investigators such as Kety, Rosenthal, and Wender intended to find—and desired to find—that genetic factors underlie schizophrenia. As seen clearly in their published works, they changed definitions, comparisons, and ways of counting to ensure that they would find what they were looking for, while at the same time turning a blind eye to the confounding influence of selective placement factors. It is not a matter of fraud, but rather of how ostensible scientific experiments are transformed into a statements of the investigators' *beliefs*. Genetic research has a long history of these types of conclusions, going all the way back to Galton.

Thus, the results of family, twin, *and* adoption studies provide no scientifically acceptable evidence that genes influence the appearance of a set of behaviors given the name "schizophrenia." And as we enter 2009, over two decades of heavily funded molecular genetic research has failed to uncover any "schizophrenia genes." It is likely that "schizophrenic" behavior is the way that some people respond to having experienced "seriously disturbed families," and seriously disturbing social and political environments. "All symptoms of schizophrenia," wrote psychologist Bertram Karon, "may be understood as manifestations of chronic terror and defenses against terror."<sup>40</sup>

According to Thomas Szasz,

"Every 'mental' symptom is a veiled outcry of anguish. Against what? Against oppression, or what the patient experiences as oppression. The oppressed speak in a million tongues. . . . What of the psychiatrist or of others who wish to help such a person? Should they amplify the dissent and help the oppressed shout it aloud? Or should they strangle the cry and repress the fugitive slave? This is the psychiatric therapist's moral dilemma."<sup>41</sup>

Calling this response a "disease" or a "genetic disorder" de-emphasizes the role of environmental factors and perpetuates the belief that people diagnosed with schizophrenia are a problem for society. It is more accurate to say that society is a problem for them.

## **CHAPTER EIGHT | Is Crime in the Genes? A Critical Review of Twin and Adoption Studies of Criminal and Antisocial Behavior.**

In Chapter 8, Joseph critically examines twin and adoption studies of criminal and antisocial behavior. At the same time, he outlines the historical and political context in which these studies were performed. Genetic theories of criminality are currently regaining the foothold they had before they were discredited by their association with eugenics, Nazism, and German “criminal biology.” Joseph argues that, like schizophrenia, the reported greater resemblance of identical versus fraternal twins for criminality found in some of the studies can be plausibly explained on environmental grounds. Joseph then moves on to criminality adoption studies, where he highlights several invalidating flaws and biases. The chapter concludes as follows:

“Family, twin and adoption studies provide no scientifically acceptable evidence for the existence of a genetic predisposition for any type of ‘criminal,’ ‘psychopathic,’ or antisocial’ behavior, however it has been defined at any given time or in any given society. Finally, given (1) the potential social impact of criminal genetic research, which includes the further unwarranted stigmatization of ethnic minorities; (2) the well-known social factors leading to crime; and (3) the political aspects of deciding who is and is not labeled a criminal, it is questionable whether this type of research should even be performed.”

## **CHAPTER NINE: Genetics and IQ.**

The “genetics of intelligence” question has been a central issue in the “nature-nurture debate” for over 100 years. Historically, eugenicists and behavior geneticists used family, twin, and adoption studies of IQ test scores, the latter allegedly measuring innate or “native” intelligence, to argue that intelligence has an important genetic component (or is “significantly heritable”). In previous chapters, Joseph highlighted problems with family, twin, and adoption research in general, as well as problems with the heritability concept. In Chapter 9, he extends his analysis to genetic studies of IQ.

It is important to determine what IQ tests actually measure. Genetic studies of IQ depend on the assumption that the tests accurately measure some agreed upon definition of intelligence. The claim that standardized IQ tests actually measure intelligence (or general intelligence, represented as  $g$ ) has been the subject of intense debate. Over the years, critics have highlighted many problems in IQ testing, which include (1) that general intelligence is merely the product of a mathematical formula, and therefore has no physical reality; (2) that there is no consensus definition of “intelligence”; (3) that IQ tests measure school learning more than innate intelligence; and (4) that IQ tests measure only narrow abilities and ignore “real world” intelligence.

Joseph notes these and other problem areas, and goes on to argue that IQ test creators’ assumptions about the lower intelligence of the working class and oppressed ethnic groups are *built into* their IQ tests. Psychologist Ken Richardson captures this position in the following quotation:

“In effect, then, Galton’s aim, and that of his followers, became simply an attempt to reproduce an existing set of ranks (social class) in another, the test scores, and pretend that the latter is a measure of something else. This is, and remains, the fundamental strategy of the intelligence-testing movement.”<sup>42</sup>

It is therefore puzzling how anyone who knows how these tests are constructed could argue that the lower IQ scores of African-Americans versus whites, or working class versus upper class, are the result of genetic differences. Indeed, the tests are *designed* to obtain these results. To illustrate this point, imagine that the developers of a new IQ test find that laborers have a mean IQ score of 122, while brain surgeons have an mean IQ of 91. What would the test creators do after obtaining these results? Most likely, they would reload their IQ test with tasks and questions which they already knew brain surgeons performed much better than laborers, and they wouldn’t stop until they produced a test in which brain surgeons scored 122, and laborers scored 91. Correspondingly, suppose the same IQ test developers find that their test produces a mean IQ of 95 for whites, and a mean IQ of 108 for blacks and Latinos. In this case they would probably adjust the questions to at least allow whites to score as high as blacks and Latinos, based on an a priori assumption that whites are not less intelligent than ethnic minorities. However, IQ test creators historically have made no such assumption for ethnic minority groups versus whites. Thus, in reality, IQ tests are designed to match their creators’ assumptions about which members of society are and are not intelligent, as opposed to their claim that they are merely recording the distribution of intelligence “in nature.”

A belief in the existence of genetically-based racial and class differences in IQ has existed since the beginning of IQ testing. In the first half of the 20th century, this idea was axiomatic among large sections of academia and the upper classes. Eugenically oriented psychologists’ use (and creation) of IQ tests in support of a “scientific” basis for racism has been well documented by many authors.<sup>43</sup> Compulsory eugenic sterilization laws in the United States, Germany, Scandinavia and elsewhere targeted “mental defectives” and the “feebleminded.” A low IQ score for a German child in the late 1930s was sometimes a death sentence.

Given (1) the controversy over what IQ tests actually measure; (2) the racial and class bias built into the most widely used IQ tests; (3) environmental confounds in family, twin, and adoption studies; (4) problems with applying the heritability concept to IQ and other psychological traits; and (5) that IQ genetic research is based on a number of questionable assumptions, the argument put forward by the authors of 1994’s *The Bell Curve*<sup>44</sup> and others in favor of the innate cognitive inferiority of ethnic minorities and the working class is preposterous, to say the least. “Nothing,” wrote critics Richard Lewontin, Steven Rose, and Leon Kamin in 1984, “demonstrates more clearly how scientific methodology and conclusions are shaped to fit ideological ends than the sorry story of the heritability of IQ.”<sup>45</sup>

## **CHAPTER TEN | Molecular Genetic Research in Psychiatry and Psychology: An Exercise in Futility?**

In Chapter 10, entitled “Molecular Genetic Research in Psychiatry and Psychology: An Exercise in Futility?,” Joseph points out that genes for the major psychiatric disorders remain

undiscovered, and that the reason may be that such genes do not exist. Similarly, molecular genetic studies searching for IQ and personality genes may also be doomed to failure. The belief that such genes exist is based on the results of family, twin, and adoption studies, which molecular genetic researchers interpret as evidence in favor of genetics. As Joseph argues throughout his book, however, this body of research does not provide scientifically acceptable evidence in favor of genetics. This may explain the ongoing failure to find genes in psychiatry and psychology. Unfortunately, over two decades of media reports of subsequently unreplicated “gene findings” have led the general public to believe that “mental illness,” IQ, and behavioral genes have been found. In fact, they have not been found.<sup>46</sup> Indeed, by 2005, Kenneth Kendler, a leading twin researcher and psychiatric geneticist, could write,

“The strong, clear, and direct causal relationship implied by the concept of ‘a gene for ...’ does not exist for psychiatric disorders. Although we may wish it to be true, we do not have and are not likely to ever discover ‘genes for’ psychiatric illness.”<sup>47</sup>

## **CHAPTER ELEVEN: Where Do We Go From Here?**

In the final chapter, Joseph sums up his critique of family, twin, and adoption studies. He calls on the psychiatry and psychology fields to perform a critical reassessment of whether these research methods provide solid evidence in support of genetics. In addition, he suggests ways that all research could be improved, and calls for a reassessment of behavior geneticists’ use of concepts such as “heritability,” “IQ,” and “personality.” Furthermore, Joseph warns that the current ascendancy of genetic theories and genetic determinism, albeit on the basis of faulty research, could lead to a rebirth of the eugenics movement. He concludes his book with the following paragraph:

“In contrast to the bleak hereditarian view of humans and their future, there exists a radically different perspective. Human psychological distress, to the extent that it goes beyond people’s normal reactions to life events, is primarily the result of well-known and well-documented psychologically traumatic environments and events, and conditions such as racism, sexism, homophobia, unemployment, economic inequality, war, and social alienation. Future societies free of these conditions will see a dramatic reduction in human suffering, as well as a flourishing of ability and innovation, and any possible role of genetic influences in shaping human psychological differences will be of interest mainly to historians.”

**[Available at Amazon.com](#)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Alper, J. (2002). Genetic Complexity in Human Disease and Behavior. In J. Alper, C. Ard, A. Asch, J. Beckwith, P. Conrad, & L. Geller (Eds.), *The Double-Edged Helix: Social Implications of Genetics in a Diverse Society* (pp. 17-38). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

<sup>2</sup> Faraone, S. V., & Tsuang, M. T. (1995). Methods in Psychiatric Genetics. In M. Tsuang, M. Tohen, & G. Zahner (Eds.), *Textbook in Psychiatric Epidemiology* (pp. 81-134). New York: Wiley-Liss.

<sup>3</sup> *Eugenics* is a doctrine which holds that humans can be “improved” by selective breeding to eradicate “undesirable” traits in society. Eugenists argue that many social problems and psychiatric disorders are caused by inherited genetic traits in people, which can be bred out of the population for the benefit of future generations. Many German eugenists of the first half of the 20th century preferred the term *racial hygiene* to eugenics.

<sup>4</sup> Forward to Siemens, H. W. (1937; quotation translated). *Grundzüge der Vererbungslehre, Rassenhygiene und Bevölkerungspolitik* [Foundations of Genetics, Racial Hygiene, and Population Policy] (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Munich & Berlin: J. F. Lehmanns Verlag.

<sup>5</sup> Siemens, 1937, p. 180 (quotation translated).

<sup>6</sup> Kranz, H. (1936, pp. 250-251; quotation translated). *Lebensschicksale Krimineller Zwillinge* [The Life Destiny of Criminal Twins]. Berlin: Julius Springer Verlag.

<sup>7</sup> Kranz, 1936, p. 251 (quotation translated).

<sup>8</sup> Weindling, P. (1989). *Health, Race, and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>9</sup> *Behavior genetics* is a discipline, rooted in the field of psychology, that uses family, twin, and adoption studies to assess possible genetic influences on “continuously distributed” psychological traits such as personality and I.Q, and also on psychiatric disorders. In other areas of behavior genetics, researchers work primarily with non-human animals.

<sup>10</sup> *Psychiatric genetics* is a discipline founded by Ernst Rüdin and his German colleagues in the early part of the 20th century. German psychiatric geneticists used family and twin studies in an attempt to establish the genetic basis of psychiatric disorders. Their primary goal was to promote the eugenic program (called “racial hygiene” in Germany) of curbing the reproduction of people they viewed as carrying the “hereditary taint of mental illness,” by sterilization or other means. After the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, the leaders of Rüdin’s “Munich School” of psychiatric genetics supported and helped popularize Hitler’s program of forcibly sterilizing “eugenically undesirable” people. Contemporary psychiatric geneticists investigate the causes of mental disorders in order to better treat and prevent them. Unlike the previous era, they usually avoid discussions of eugenics in relation to their findings. The implications of their theories, however, are obvious, and they often promote the use of genetic counseling.

<sup>11</sup> Jackson, D. D. (1960). “A Critique of the Literature on the Genetics of Schizophrenia.” In D. Jackson (Ed.), *The Etiology of Schizophrenia* (pp. 37-87). New York: Basic Books.

- 
- <sup>12</sup> Lilienfeld, S. O., Lynn, S. J., & Lohr, J. M. (2003). "Science and pseudoscience in clinical psychology: initial thoughts, reflections, and considerations." In S. Lilienfeld, S. Lynn, & J. Lohr (Eds.), *Science and Pseudoscience in Clinical Psychology* (pp. 1-14). New York: Guilford.
- <sup>13</sup> Kendler, K. S. (1983). "Overview: A current perspective on twin studies of schizophrenia." *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *140*, 1413-1425.
- <sup>14</sup> Cassill, K. (1982, p. 183). *Twins: Nature's Amazing Mystery*. New York: Atheneum.
- <sup>15</sup> Dusek, V. (1987, p. 21). Bewitching science. *Science for the People*, *19*, 19-22.
- <sup>16</sup> Rose, R. J. (1982, p. 960). Separated twins: Data and their limits. *Science*, *215*, 959-960.
- <sup>17</sup> Harris, J. R. (1998, p. 293). *The Nurture Assumption: Why Children Turn out the Way They Do*. New York: The Free Press.
- <sup>18</sup> Bouchard, T. J., Jr., Lykken, D. T., McGue, M., Segal, N. L., & Tellegen, A. (1990). Sources of human psychological differences: The Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart. *Science*, *250*, 223-228.
- <sup>19</sup> McGue, M., & Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (1984). Adjustment of twin data for the effects of age and sex. *Behavior Genetics*, *14*, 325-343.
- <sup>20</sup> Hirsch, J. (1997). Some history of heredity-vs-environment, genetic inferiority at Harvard (?), and The (incredible) Bell Curve. *Genetica*, *99*, 207-224.
- <sup>21</sup> Lewontin, R. C. (1974, p. 400). The analysis of variance and the analysis of causes. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, *26*, 400-411.
- <sup>22</sup> Hirsch, 1997.
- <sup>23</sup> Lush, J. L. (1949). Heritability of quantitative characteristics in farm animals. *Hereditas* (Suppl.). G. Bonnier & R. Larsson (Eds.), 356-375.
- <sup>24</sup> Hirsch, J. (2004). Uniqueness, diversity, similarity, repeatability, and heritability. In C. Coll, E. Bearer, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Nature and Nurture: The Complex Interplay of Genetic and Environmental Influences on Human Behavior and Development* (pp. 127-138). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- <sup>25</sup> Rende, R. (2004, p. 112). Beyond heritability: Biological process in social context. In C. Coll, E. Bearer, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Nature and Nurture: The Complex Interplay of Genetic and Environmental Influences on Human Behavior and Development* (pp. 107-126). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- <sup>26</sup> Farber, S. L. (1981, p. 165). *Identical twins reared apart: A reanalysis*. New York: Basic Books.
- <sup>27</sup> Gottesman, I. I., & Bertelsen, A. (1989). Confirming unexpressed genotypes for schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *46*, 867-872.
- <sup>28</sup> Compare Rosenthal's 1967 description of the relative groups the researchers planned to compare, versus the description of relative group comparisons in the 1968 Kety et al. publication. See Rosenthal, D. (1967). An historical and methodological review of genetic studies of schizophrenia. In J. Romano (Ed.), *The Origins of Schizophrenia: Proceedings of the First Rochester International Conference on Schizophrenia, March 29-31, 1967* (pp. 15-26). New York: Excerpta Medica Foundation, versus Kety, S. S., Rosenthal, D., Wender, P. H., & Schulsinger, F. (1968). The types and prevalence of mental illness in the biological and adoptive families of adopted

---

schizophrenics. In D. Rosenthal & S. Kety (Eds.), *The Transmission of Schizophrenia* (pp. 345-362). New York: Pergamon Press.

<sup>29</sup> For example, see Rosenthal, D. (1971). *Genetics of Psychopathology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

<sup>30</sup> See Lidz, T., & Blatt, S. (1983). Critique of the Danish-American studies of the biological and adoptive relatives of adoptees who became schizophrenic. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *140*, 426-435.

<sup>31</sup> Benjamin, L. S. (1976, p. 1130). A reconsideration of the Kety and associates study of genetic factors in the transmission of schizophrenia. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *133*, 1129-1133.

<sup>32</sup> Kendler, K. S., & Gruenberg, A. M. (1984). An independent analysis of the Danish adoption study of schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *41*, 555-564; Lewontin, R. C., Rose, S., & Kamin, L. J. (1984). *Not in Our Genes*. New York: Pantheon.

<sup>33</sup> See Paikin, H., Jacobsen, B., Schulsinger, F., Godtfredsen, K., Rosenthal, D., Wender, P. H., & Kety, S. S. (1974, pp. 308-310). Characteristics of people who refused to participate in a social and psychopathological study. In S. Mednick, F. Schulsinger, J. Higgins, & B. Bell (Eds.), *Genetics, Environment and Psychopathology* (pp. 293-322). New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company.

<sup>34</sup> Wender, P. H., & Klein, D. F. (1981, p. 175). *Mind, Mood, and Medicine*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

<sup>35</sup> Hansen, B. S. (1996). Something rotten in the state of Denmark: Eugenics and the ascent of the welfare state. In G. Broberg & N. Roll-Hansen (Eds.), *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland* (pp. 9-76). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

<sup>36</sup> Mednick, S. A., & Hutchings, B. (1977). Some considerations in the interpretation of the Danish adoption studies in relation to asocial behavior. In S. Mednick & K. Christiansen (Eds.), *Biosocial Bases of Criminal Behavior* (pp. 159-164). New York: Gardner Press.

<sup>37</sup> Olson, C. P. (Ed.). (1920). *Oregon Laws: Showing All the Laws of a General Nature in Force in the State of Oregon* (Vol. 2). San Francisco: The Bancroft-Whitney Company.

<sup>38</sup> Hietala, M. (1996). From race hygiene to sterilization: The eugenics movement in Finland. In G. Broberg & N. Roll-Hansen (Eds.), *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland* (pp. 195-258). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

<sup>39</sup> Lewontin et al., 1984.

<sup>40</sup> Karon, B. P. (1999, p. 3). The tragedy of schizophrenia. *General Psychologist*, *34*, 1-12.

<sup>41</sup> Szasz, T. S. (1968, p. 52). Hysteria. In D. Sills (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Vol. 7, pp. 47-52). New York: Macmillan.

<sup>42</sup> Richardson, K. (2000). *The Making of Intelligence*. New York: Columbia University Press.

<sup>43</sup> For example, see Chase, A. (1980). *The Legacy of Malthus: The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*. Urbana, IL/Chicago: University of Illinois Press (Originally published in 1977); Gould, S. J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

<sup>44</sup> Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (1994). *The Bell Curve*. New York: The Free Press.

---

<sup>45</sup> Lewontin et al., 1984, p. 100.

<sup>46</sup> For more details on failed gene finding attempts in psychiatry, see Chapter 11 of Joseph, J. (2006). *The Missing Gene: Psychiatry, Heredity, and the Fruitless Search for Genes*. New York; Algora

<sup>47</sup> Kendler, K. S. (2005, p. 1250). "A gene for ...": The nature of gene actions in psychiatric disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 1243-1252.