WORKING DRAFT

Journal of Developmental Neuroscience & Behavioral Genetics · Vol. 11, No. 3

Divergence Without Disorder: Toward a Genetic Framework for Affective Resistance in Non-Pathological Populations

A Preliminary Survey of Heritable Trait Clusters in Individuals Presenting Atypical Emotional Integration

Margaret L. Reyes, Ph.D.
Department of Behavioral Genetics, Harwick Institute for Cognitive Research, Portland, OR

Received: February 3, 1994 · Revised: still revising — MLR

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a preliminary taxonomic survey of a heritable trait cluster observed in a subset of the general population exhibiting what the author terms *affective resistance* — a non-pathological but statistically anomalous pattern of emotional processing characterized by reduced susceptibility to external affective influence, atypical stimulus-response latency, and persistent divergence from normative behavioral calibration across social contexts. Drawing from longitudinal family studies, twin cohort data, and emerging epigenetic literature, the author proposes that this cluster may represent a stable genetic expression — tentatively designated here as the *divergence phenotype* — rather than a disorder of insufficient treatment or socialization. Implications for educational classification, psychological assessment, and the ethics of behavioral normalization are discussed.

Keywords: epigenetics, affective resistance, neurodivergence, behavioral genetics, heritability, HPA axis, emotional regulation, gifted education, outlier phenotype

1. Introduction

Among clinicians who work extensively with atypical populations, a particular kind of child is familiar: intellectually precocious, socially oblique, emotionally self-contained in a way that resists the usual diagnostic frameworks. They do not present with the flat affect of depression, the dysregulation of early attachment failure, or the stimulus-seeking of attention deficit profiles. They are, in a word that clinicians rarely permit themselves, *different* — and the difference appears stable across time, resistant to intervention, and frequently heritable.[1]

The literature has been slow to address this population on its own terms. Existing frameworks tend to assimilate atypical emotional processing into one of two categories: pathological deficit (autism spectrum disorder, alexithymia, reactive attachment disorder) or giftedness-adjacent trait (introversion, high sensitivity, overexcitability as described in Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration). Neither framework satisfactorily accounts for what the present author has observed across fifteen years of clinical practice and six years of structured research: a coherent, heritable pattern of affective processing that is not disordered, not merely introverted, and not adequately explained by existing taxonomies.

This paper proposes a preliminary framework for understanding this population. It is offered not as a definitive account but as a provocation — an attempt to name something the field has been circling for decades without quite landing on.

2. Defining the Divergence Phenotype

The trait cluster under examination is defined by three core characteristics, each of which is discussed in detail below. It is important to note at the outset that none of these characteristics, individually or in combination, constitutes a disorder. The individuals in this study are, by conventional measures, functional. Many are highly functional. The divergence is not from health — it is from a particular *kind* of normality that the author has come to suspect is itself a narrower category than clinical practice assumes.

2.1 Affective Resistance

The first characteristic is what the author terms affective resistance: a reduced susceptibility to emotional contagion and externally-generated mood influence. Neurotypical individuals demonstrate well-documented responsiveness to social-emotional cues — mirroring, entrainment, the largely unconscious adoption of the affective states of those around them. The divergent phenotype individual processes these cues differently. They register them — they are not emotionally blind — but the cues do not complete their usual circuit. The emotion is received as information rather than as invitation.[2]

Parents of divergent children frequently describe the experience of attempting to comfort or celebrate with the child and finding the attempt somehow deflected — not rejected, not ignored, but *processed sideways*, received in a register the parent cannot quite read. The child is not cold. The child is elsewhere.

2.2 Stimulus Integration Latency

The second characteristic is an atypical latency in emotional integration — a measurable delay between stimulus and felt response. Where a neurotypical subject might report immediate emotional response to a charged image, narrative, or social situation, the divergent subject reports that the response arrives later: sometimes hours, sometimes days. The emotion is not absent. It is *slow*.

This latency has obvious social costs. It produces what observers frequently misread as blunting, dissociation, or indifference. In academic and professional contexts, it is often misidentified as poor empathy. In childhood, it generates the particular loneliness of the child who laughs at the funeral joke three days later, alone, in their room, finally getting it.

2.3 Calibration Resistance

The third characteristic — and the one the author finds most theoretically interesting — is a resistance to what developmental psychologists call behavioral calibration: the ongoing social process by which individuals adjust their behavior, values, and self-presentation in response to feedback from their environment. Neurotypical individuals are exquisitely sensitive to this process; it is, in many accounts, the engine of socialization itself. Divergent phenotype individuals participate in calibration — they are not antisocial — but they do not complete it. Something in the loop does not close.[3]

3. Heritability and Family Lineage

The evidence for heritability in this trait cluster is, frankly, stronger than the author expected when the research began. Across forty-seven family units studied over six years, the divergence phenotype — as operationalized by the author's assessment battery — demonstrated a heritability coefficient of 0.71, placing it solidly in the range of traits with strong genetic contribution. This figure is, the author acknowledges, preliminary and requires replication. But it is difficult to look at these families without concluding that *something* is being passed down.

What is particularly striking is the pattern of *skip generation expression*. In fourteen of the forty-seven families, the trait cluster is strong in the grandparent, attenuated in the parent, and strong again in the grandchild — a pattern consistent with epigenetic silencing and reactivation rather than simple Mendelian inheritance. The gene, or gene complex, or regulatory mechanism — whatever it is — appears capable of lying dormant for a generation and then re-expressing in response to conditions the author cannot yet specify.[4]

The family histories in these cases are *interesting*. Several of the grandparents in the skip-generation cohort share a demographic profile that initially struck the author as coincidental: military service in the interwar or early wartime period, relocation to California or the Pacific Northwest following discharge, limited medical records from the period of service. The author notes this without drawing conclusions. The sample is small. *It is probably nothing.*

It is worth noting, separately, that several of the grandchildren in this cohort — the ones with the most pronounced divergence phenotype expression — were identified in childhood as gifted and placed in what various school districts described as enrichment programs. The author will return to this point.

4. Neurobiological Correlates

The neurobiological literature on emotional processing offers several candidate mechanisms for the divergence phenotype. The HPA axis — the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal system governing stress response — shows consistent variation in this population, with divergent individuals demonstrating a flatter cortisol curve across the diurnal cycle and an atypical recovery pattern following acute stressors. This is not the hyperactivation seen in PTSD or the hypoactivation seen in chronic depression. It is, rather, a *different shape* entirely — a stress-response profile the existing literature has not quite named because it has not, until recently, been looking for it.[5]

More suggestive, from the author's perspective, is recent work on the serotonin transporter gene and its regulatory variants. A small number of studies — none of them, it should be said, conducted with adequate sample sizes or methodological rigor, which is part of why this literature has not yet cohered into anything the field takes seriously — have identified a variant in the promoter region of the SLC6A4 gene that appears to affect not the transport of serotonin itself but the *timing* of its uptake: not how much of the signal arrives, but how quickly it completes its circuit. The author finds this mechanistically compelling as a possible substrate for stimulus integration latency. The emotion is not absent. It moves through a different channel at a different speed.

The author has been in informal correspondence with a researcher at ~~the University of~~ *can't use his name here* who has been tracking a related variant — one that does not appear in any published registry — in a small cohort drawn from families with documented military service between 1928 and 1942. He calls it, informally, the *quiet switch*. He has not published. He says he has been advised not to publish.

> *[the author is aware this paragraph does not belong in this section and will relocate it in revision — MLR]*

4.1 Epigenetic Transmission and Stress Exposure

The emerging science of epigenetic transmission has begun to offer a framework for understanding how environmental exposures — including severe stress, chemical exposure, and trauma — can alter gene expression in ways that are heritable across generations. The mechanisms are complex and not fully understood, but the core finding is consistent: what happens to a body can change not only that body but the bodies of its descendants, through modifications to the regulatory switches that determine which genes are expressed and when.[6]

The author has spent considerable time with this literature over the past eighteen months. More time, perhaps, than the scope of the present paper strictly requires — but the author has found it difficult to set aside, because the implications for the families in this study are, if one follows the logic to its end, quite significant, and the question of who might have known this — who might have understood, even in crude form, that what you do to a man in his twenties will express itself in his grandchildren — is a question that the

author finds herself returning to at night, which is not a scientific observation and does not belong in this paper.

5. Educational Identification and the Gifted Classification Problem

The author returns, as promised, to the question of gifted education.

In the early 1970s, a number of school districts across the United States — concentrated, the author has noted, in California, Colorado, Virginia, and the Pacific Northwest — began implementing what various administrative documents describe as "enhanced identification protocols" for students exhibiting atypical cognitive and behavioral profiles. These programs existed alongside, but were distinct from, standard gifted education initiatives. They were smaller. They were less documented. In several cases, the author has been unable to locate any public record of their existence despite confirmed reports from former participants.[7]

The author came to this literature sideways, through the family histories. Several of the families in the divergence cohort — specifically those in the skip-generation expression group with the military-service grandparents — produced children who were identified for these programs in the 1968–1976 window. The author does not know what to make of this.

> *[the author is aware that "I don't know what to make of this" is not an acceptable formulation for peer-reviewed publication — but the honest answer is that she does not know what to make of it, and she has been in this field for twenty-two years and she trusts her own pattern recognition even when she cannot yet articulate the pattern — MLR]*

The programs the author has been able to document share certain characteristics. They were residential, at least in part. They included what administrative records describe as "socialization assessment" alongside academic enrichment. Participation appears to have been, in at least some cases, non-voluntary in any meaningful sense — families were told their children had been selected, that it was an honor, that the children would benefit. Former participants — those who are willing to speak, which is not many — describe a persistent sense of being *observed* more than taught. Several describe the programs as having ended abruptly, with no explanation given to families.[8]

The author participated in one of these programs. She was eight years old. She has not previously disclosed this in published work, and she is disclosing it now only because she has come to believe that her own experience of the program — specifically the persistent, unresolved quality of certain memories from that period — is relevant to her interest in the divergence phenotype and to the question of what these programs were actually doing.

> *[the author acknowledges this disclosure may compromise the perceived objectivity of the present paper — she has decided she does not care — MLR]*

6. Toward a Unified Framework

The author had intended, at this point in the paper, to present a tidy synthesis: a proposed nomenclature, a research agenda, a call for collaborative investigation. She finds she cannot write that paper today.

What the author can say is this: the divergence phenotype is real. It is heritable. Its distribution in the population is not random. The families that carry it in its most pronounced form share a demographic history that is ~~almost certainly coincidental~~ *not coincidental*. The programs that identified and ~~studied~~ *processed?* their children in the early 1970s were not standard gifted education. And somewhere between a military base in [redacted] in the early part of this century and a classroom in [redacted] in 1971, something was done to certain bloodlines that is still expressing itself in their grandchildren.[9]

The author does not know what was done. She knows what it looks like from the outside, forty years later, in the children who carry it. She knows what it looked like from the inside, when she was eight years old in a room with no windows, being asked to solve problems she did not understand while someone behind glass took notes.

She knows that she was not alone in that room.

She knows that the other children's names were never in any file she has been able to locate.

7. ~~Conclusions and Future Directions~~

The author is going to set aside the question of conclusions.

There is a file. The author has seen a partial copy. It is not a genetics file and it is not a psychology file. It uses the language of both without being either. It refers to the subjects — the children, let the reader understand — as *vectors*. It refers to the expression being studied as [redacted]. The author had not seen this designation before she saw this file. She has since found it in two other documents, both fragmentary, both from the same decade. She does not know what Division 42 refers to. She knows it is not the name of a university program.

The author has discussed this paper with her department chair. She has been advised to revisit her conclusions. She has been advised that the personal disclosure in Section 5 is inappropriate for publication. She has been advised that the paper as currently written could be perceived as — the word used was *unhinged*.

The author is submitting it anyway.

If you are reading this and you were in one of these programs — if you remember being selected, being observed, being told you were special in a way that felt less like praise and more like classification — the author would like to hear from you. The address at the top of this paper is current. She checks it.

If you are reading this and you know what Division 42 is —

The author would still like to hear from you.

She has been waiting a long time.

---

1. The author uses "heritable" here in the broad sense, acknowledging that the field has not yet established a clean genetic mechanism for the trait cluster under discussion. The heritability evidence is behavioral and epidemiological. A molecular account remains to be written.

2. "Received as information rather than as invitation" is not standard clinical language. She uses it because it is accurate.

3. Dabrowski's concept of "positive disintegration" — the idea that psychological overexcitability represents a developmental asset rather than a deficit — is the closest existing framework to what the author is describing, though Dabrowski's model does not account for the genetic and epigenetic dimensions the present paper emphasizes. See Dabrowski (1964); Piechowski (1979).

4. Skip-generation epigenetic expression has been documented most extensively in studies of trauma transmission. See Yehuda et al. (1989) on Holocaust survivor descendants; Meaney & Szyf (1988) on maternal behavior and HPA axis programming in rodent models. The author notes that the human literature in this area is in its infancy and that most of what is known comes from animal studies. This will not remain true for long.

5. The author has been unable to locate a published paper adequately describing this cortisol profile. She has described it to colleagues as "calm in the wrong direction." This is not a clinical term. She is working on a better one.

6. The mechanisms of epigenetic inheritance are the subject of intense and occasionally acrimonious debate in the current literature. The author takes no strong position on the relative contributions of DNA methylation, histone modification, and non-coding RNA in the specific transmission patterns she has observed. She notes only that *something* is being transmitted, and that the existing vocabulary is insufficient to describe it.

7. The author has filed four FOIA requests in connection with this research. Two were denied on the grounds that no responsive records exist. One was denied on the grounds that responsive records exist but are exempt from disclosure under [redacted]. One has not been answered in fourteen months.

8. The author has spoken with eleven former participants. She will not be citing them by name. Three of them asked her not to contact them again. She has honored this request. She understands it.

9. The author is aware that the previous sentence, as written, would not survive peer review. She is leaving it.

References

Dabrowski, K. (1964). *Positive disintegration.* Little, Brown.

Meaney, M.J., & Szyf, M. (1988). Environmental programming of stress responses through DNA methylation: Life at the interface between a dynamic environment and a fixed genome. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience, 7*(2), 103–123.

Piechowski, M.M. (1979). Developmental potential. In N. Colangelo & R.T. Zaffran (Eds.), *New voices in counseling the gifted* (pp. 25–57). Kendall/Hunt.

Yehuda, R., Kahana, B., Schmeidler, J., Southwick, S.M., Wilson, S., & Giller, E.L. (1995). Impact of cumulative lifetime trauma and recent stress on current posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in holocaust survivors. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152*(12), 1815–1818.

[additional references withheld pending verification of source availability — MLR]

[one source the author is not citing because she does not know its provenance and is not certain it is real — MLR]