

THE ORIGINS OF COLONIZATION:

*A Genetic and Historical Thesis on the Proto-European Origins
of Global Population Displacement*

By Maro A. Jones

*A Theoretical Framework for Understanding Colonization
as a Recurring Historical Pattern Rooted in Human Prehistory*

March 2026

Abstract

This thesis proposes and defends a unifying framework for understanding colonization not as a phenomenon unique to European expansion in the modern era (**roughly 1400–1900 CE**), but as a recurrent pattern of population displacement driven by peoples carrying West Eurasian, or proto-European, genetic ancestry. Drawing on ancient DNA studies, population genetics, paleoanthropology, and the archaeological record, this paper argues that the hallmarks of colonization; the introduction of foreign genetics, language replacement, cultural disruption, and the marginalization of darker-skinned indigenous populations, trace back to prehistoric expansions that began in the northern Eurasian landmass. The thesis further argues that Ethiopia represents a critical case study, likely the first instance of this pattern in the African continent, as Semitic-speaking migrants from the Arabian Peninsula bearing West Eurasian genetic ancestry displaced and absorbed older, darker-skinned indigenous populations as early as three thousand years ago. The recognizable pattern found across Ethiopia, India, Australia, the Americas, and Europe is argued to reflect a single, organically recurring dynamic: populations shaped by the pressures of harsh northern environments became mobile, technologically innovative, and expansionist, carrying proto-European genetic signatures, and the cultural systems derived from them, across the globe long before Columbus set sail.

1. Introduction: Rethinking Colonization

The term “colonization” in popular discourse is almost exclusively associated with European maritime expansion beginning in the fifteenth century. This framing, while historically useful, obscures a deeper and more ancient pattern. When colonization is defined by its core characteristics; the displacement of indigenous peoples by an incoming population that introduces foreign genetics, imposes new languages and cultural systems, and reduces the original inhabitants to marginal or subjugated status, then the evidence of colonization extends not centuries but millennia into the past.

This thesis argues that colonization, properly understood, has a single continuous thread running through human prehistory, and that thread leads back to populations bearing West Eurasian genetic ancestry. This is not to argue that these populations were racially “white” in any modern sense; such phenotypic categories did not yet exist in their fully expressed form. Rather, the argument is that the genetic lineage that eventually produced what we call white Europeans; the West Eurasian ancestral component, was the primary driver of population displacement events long before the Age of Discovery.

Three lines of evidence are brought together in this analysis: (1) the genetic timeline of skin depigmentation and West Eurasian admixture globally, (2) the archaeological and genomic record of nomadic Eurasian population expansions, and (3) the global pattern of marginalized dark-skinned indigenous populations existing alongside dominant, lighter-admixed populations in the very regions where prehistoric West Eurasian expansion occurred. Ethiopia functions as an anchor case study for the African continent within this framework.

2. The Genetic Timeline: When Did Pale Skin Emerge?

2.1 The Dark-Skinned Origins of All Humanity

The scientific consensus is clear on one foundational point: all modern humans descend from African ancestors with dark skin. The genes responsible for dark pigmentation in humans; specifically the **MC1R** gene variants and the **KITLG** locus, trace their origin to populations that evolved in equatorial Africa under high ultraviolet radiation. As the Smithsonian Institution and numerous genome studies confirm, humans who migrated out of Africa approximately 40,000 years ago carried dark skin that was advantageous under high solar intensity.

This means that prior to approximately 8,000 to 10,000 years ago, the populations inhabiting Europe, West Asia, and Central Asia were, by modern standards, darker-complexioned than the populations that occupy those regions today. The familiar phenotype we associate with European whiteness is a recent biological development.

2.2 The Emergence of Light Skin: A Stepped, Geographic Process

Research published across multiple peer-reviewed studies, including work by Dr. Nina Jablonski of Penn State University and large-scale ancient DNA analyses, has established that light skin did not appear uniformly or suddenly. Instead, it emerged through a convergence of environmental pressures and genetic events across thousands of years. Two key depigmentation genes, **SLC24A5** and **SLC45A2**, are central to this story. Studies confirm that approximately 8,500 years ago, early hunter-gatherers in Spain, Luxembourg, and Hungary still lacked the variants of these genes that produce pale skin in Europeans today. Central and Southern European populations retained darker pigmentation well into the Neolithic period.

Light skin first became prevalent among Neolithic farmers who originated in the Near East; specifically Anatolia and the Levant, who carried one of the two key depigmentation alleles. As these populations migrated into Europe and intermixed with indigenous hunter-gatherers, the light-skin gene began spreading across the continent. A second wave came with the Yamnaya pastoralists from the Pontic-Caspian steppe approximately 5,000 years ago, who contributed additional genetic material that accelerated depigmentation. As one major study covering 1,158 ancient genomes from West Eurasia observed, the evolution of light skin in Europeans was driven by selection on a relatively small number of high-impact gene variants, not an ancient, uniform trait.

The SLC24A5 variant, now found at near-100% frequency in modern Europeans, was almost entirely absent in the oldest samples. As the ancient DNA record from 45,000 years of Eurasian prehistory shows, light pigmentation emerged gradually and in a patchwork pattern, driven by the combination of low ultraviolet environments, the agricultural transition, and successive population movements.

The critical implication is this: the genetic components associated with what we now call European whiteness did not originate in Europe. They emerged among Neolithic Near Eastern farmers and Caucasian hunter-gatherers before being carried into Europe, East Africa, South Asia, and Central Asia by expanding populations.

2.3 The West Eurasian Genetic Signature in Ethiopia

Studies examining the genetic ancestry of Ethiopian populations reveal a striking pattern. Afro-Asiatic-speaking Ethiopian populations, including the Amhara and Tigrinya, the dominant highland groups carry between 40 and 50 percent West Eurasian ancestry, with the admixture dated to approximately 1,500 to 3,500 years ago. The origin of this admixture is traceable to Anatolian Neolithic and Caucasus Hunter-Gatherer populations; precisely the lineages that, upon further migration into Europe, produced modern Europeans.

Research published in Science found that the SLC24A5 variant; the same depigmentation gene that swept through Europe, is found in as many as half the members of some Ethiopian groups. This variant is estimated to have arrived in East Africa approximately 3,000 years ago, likely carried by people migrating from the Middle East. It is the same genetic lineage, in a different geographic theater, being introduced to a population of indigenous dark-skinned Africans.

By contrast, the Gumuz people of western Ethiopia, who carry negligible Eurasian ancestry, represent a genetic window into what the pre-admixture Ethiopian highlands population looked like. They are, in the language of population genetics, the indigenous baseline, the people who were there before the colonizers arrived.

3. The Yamnaya Expansion: Colonization as a Prehistoric Template

3.1 Who Were the Yamnaya?

The Yamnaya culture, named from the Russian word for pit graves, occupied the Pontic-Caspian steppe (roughly modern Russia and Ukraine) from approximately 3300 to 2600 BCE. Described in the archaeological literature as nomadic pastoralists with domesticated horses, wheeled wagons, and advanced metallurgy, the Yamnaya were well-positioned for large-scale mobility. Geneticists describe their ancestral composition as a mix of Eastern European Hunter-Gatherers and Caucasus Hunter-Gatherers: meaning they were already a product of prior inter-population mixing, carrying West Eurasian ancestral components in combination.

Beginning around 3000 BCE, Yamnaya populations embarked on what ancient DNA studies describe as a massive expansion across Eurasia. The scale and speed of this expansion was extraordinary. In certain regions of Germany, steppe migrant DNA came to constitute as much as 70 percent of the local population's ancestry, **indicating widespread population replacement**. The Y-DNA of pre-existing Early European Farmers was virtually eliminated from the European gene pool in the Bronze Age, replaced almost entirely by Yamnaya-descended male lineages. The mtDNA of earlier female populations survived, **suggesting that the mechanism of replacement involved incoming males displacing or killing indigenous men and integrating with local women**, a ratio of approximately ten male migrants for every migrating female, a skew described by researchers as more extreme even than the Spanish Conquistadors.

3.2 The Yamnaya Expansion as Colonization

If colonization is defined as the large-scale movement of an outside population into a territory, accompanied by genetic, linguistic, and cultural displacement of the prior inhabitants, then the Yamnaya expansion meets every criterion. Within a few hundred years, they contributed to at least half of central Europe's genetic ancestry. They imposed Proto-Indo-European languages, displacing the non-Indo-European languages spoken by the Neolithic farmers. They introduced new social structures organized around small patrilineal family units and warrior hierarchies. Researchers have compared the disease dynamic to the European colonization of the Americas, suggesting that plague carried by Yamnaya migrants may have caused population collapse among indigenous European Neolithic communities before or during the migration.

One archaeological team described this as the beginning of cultures that sent out "bands of men to establish new politically aligned colonies in distant lands, as in later groups of Romans or Vikings." The Yamnaya were, in this reading, the first documented large-scale colonizers in the

modern sense of the word, and they were West Eurasian populations carrying the ancestral genetic components that would later, through further differentiation, produce white Europeans.

The Yamnaya's influence did not stop in Europe. Their expansion extended eastward across Central Asia and into the Indian subcontinent. Steppe-related ancestry of Yamnaya type is present in nearly all Indo-European-speaking populations of South Asia, with ancient Y-chromosome data showing that a significant fraction of Indian male lineages arrived from Eastern European populations within the last 5,000 to 7,000 years. The genetic influence is particularly prominent among groups historically associated with higher caste status, directly aligning with historical narratives of migration from the northwest.

4. The Global Pattern: Dark-Skinned Indigenes at the Margins

4.1 A Recurrent Signature

If the thesis holds, that a West Eurasian-origin population has been the engine of colonization across multiple historical episodes, then a testable prediction follows: wherever this expansion reached, the oldest indigenous populations should be darker-skinned, genetically distinct from the incoming population, and now reduced to marginal or endangered status. This prediction is confirmed across multiple continents.

4.2 South Asia: The Dravidians and the Andamanese

In South Asia, population genetics has identified two ancestral components: **Ancestral North Indians (ANI)** and **Ancestral South Indians (ASI)**. The ANI component is genetically close to Middle Easterners, Central Asians, and Europeans; it is a West Eurasian-derived lineage. The ASI component is not closely related to any living group outside the subcontinent. The closest living proxy for the ASI is the Andamanese, specifically the Onge; isolated hunter-gatherers with dark skin, peppercorn hair, and diminutive stature who have inhabited the Andaman Islands for approximately 26,000 years in near-complete genetic isolation.

Dravidian-speaking populations, who are more ASI-dominant than Indo-European-speaking populations, were likely widespread across the Indian subcontinent before the arrival of the Yamnaya-descended Indo-Aryan migrations. The Indo-European speakers carry higher proportions of ANI; the West Eurasian component. This maps directly onto the caste system, in which the highest-caste groups carry the most West Eurasian ancestry, and darker-skinned tribal populations of central and southern India carry the most ASI ancestry. The pattern is explicit: the West Eurasian-admixed populations dominate; the original dark-skinned indigenous populations are marginalized.

4.3 Australia and the Pacific

Australian Aboriginal peoples represent one of the deepest surviving genetic lineages on Earth, descending from the first humans to migrate beyond Africa more than 60,000 years ago. Their DNA reveals strong affinities to Dravidian tribes of southern India and to Melanesian and Oceanic populations, the same ancient southern coastal migration route that preceded all subsequent Eurasian expansions. When European colonizers arrived in the eighteenth century, they displaced these dark-skinned indigenous populations, reducing them to marginal status through disease, dispossession, and violence. This is conventionally described as colonization.

The thesis proposes that the Australian case is merely the most recent iteration of a recurring event. The Dravidian populations of India who share genetic ancestry with Aboriginal Australians were themselves displaced from dominant status across much of the subcontinent by Yamnaya-descended Indo-Aryan populations thousands of years earlier. The mechanics were nearly identical; only the technology and the historical record differed.

4.4 East Africa: The Gumuz and the Marginalized Original Inhabitants

As discussed, the Gumuz people of Ethiopia represent the pre-admixture indigenous baseline of the East African highlands. They carry minimal West Eurasian ancestry. In contrast, the Amhara and Tigrinya, who carry substantial West Eurasian admixture, have been the politically and culturally dominant groups in Ethiopian history, controlling the Aksumite Empire, the medieval Christian kingdom, and the modern Ethiopian state. The Gumuz, along with the Anuak and various Nilotic peoples of the lowlands, remain politically and economically marginalized. The pattern is identical to the one observed in India and Australia.

5. Why Nomadism? The Environmental Engine of Colonization

5.1 Harsh Environments as the Driver of Expansionism

A central pillar of this thesis is the claim that colonization is not an accident of European history but an organic product of the conditions faced by populations adapting to harsh, low-UV, northern environments. The argument runs as follows: populations living at high latitudes face chronic scarcity, seasonal food insecurity, extreme cold, and limited vitamin D synthesis. These conditions place a premium on mobility, technological innovation, and social organization capable of sustaining long-distance movement. Over generations, these pressures select for nomadic, expansionist cultures.

The Yamnaya exemplify this. They were pastoral nomads who had domesticated horses and invented wheeled transport, giving them mobility advantages over all contemporary peoples. Their social organization around war-bands of young men; described in ancient Indo-European mythology as “Black Youth”, was ideally suited to pioneer colonization. When population pressure, disease, or resource scarcity threatened their home steppe, they expanded outward. The same logic applies to later Indo-European migrations into South Asia, the Roman expansions, the Viking raids, and ultimately European maritime colonization. Each was an iteration of the same environmental imperative: expand or perish.

This model aligns with the observation that the regions most strongly associated with colonizing behaviors; the Pontic steppe, Anatolia, Northwestern Europe, the Arabian Peninsula, are precisely the regions that produced the West Eurasian genetic components now found in dominant populations across the globe.

5.2 Technology, Language, and Cultural Imposition

Colonization is not purely genetic. Its hallmarks include language replacement, the imposition of new cultural systems, and the introduction of technologies that render the indigenous population economically and militarily subordinate. The Yamnaya brought metallurgy, horses, and Indo-European languages. The Semitic migrants into Ethiopia brought Ge'ez script, Semitic language families, and the cultural framework that became the Aksumite Empire. European maritime colonizers brought gunpowder, ocean-going ships, and Christian or Enlightenment

ideological frameworks. The mechanism scales across time; the origin point is the same West Eurasian genetic and cultural lineage.

The fact that the Semitic-speaking populations that entered Ethiopia were themselves products of prior mixing with West Eurasian lineages, and therefore carried cultural influences traceable back to the same proto-European ancestral pool: means that their entry into the Horn of Africa constitutes an extension of the same long colonization arc, thousands of years before its European chapter.

6. Ethiopia: The First African Colonization

6.1 Reframing the Narrative

Ethiopia occupies a unique place in African historical consciousness. Its successful resistance at the Battle of Adwa in 1896 against Italian military invasion made it an enduring symbol of African independence and dignity. This framing is not wrong, but it is incomplete. If the analysis presented in this thesis is correct, Ethiopia was not a nation that resisted colonization; it was a colonized nation that resisted being colonized a second time.

The first colonization of Ethiopia occurred approximately 1,500 to 3,500 years ago, when Semitic-speaking populations from the Arabian Peninsula migrated into the East African highlands. These populations carried 40 to 50 percent West Eurasian ancestry, traceable to Anatolian Neolithic and Caucasus Hunter-Gatherer lineages. They introduced new languages; the Semitic language family, ancestor of Amharic, Tigrinya, and Ge'ez; new agricultural systems, new religious frameworks, and new political structures. The Aksumite Empire that emerged was one of the ancient world's great powers, but it was built on the foundation of a demographic and cultural takeover of the pre-existing dark-skinned Cushitic and Nilotic peoples.

6.2 The Evidence

Genetic evidence: The SLC24A5 depigmentation variant; the same gene that swept through Europe, arrived in East Africa approximately 3,000 years ago from the Middle East. The Gumuz, who carry negligible West Eurasian ancestry, represent the original indigenous population. Their genetic and cultural marginalization within modern Ethiopia mirrors the treatment of indigenous populations displaced by Yamnaya expansion in Europe and Asia.

Linguistic evidence: The Semitic languages dominant in the Ethiopian highlands are not indigenous to Africa. They belong to a language family whose origins lie in the Levant and Arabian Peninsula; the same region that was a major conduit for West Eurasian genetic spread. The displacement of Cushitic and Nilotic languages from dominant status mirrors the displacement of pre-Indo-European languages from Europe.

Cultural evidence: The Aksumite civilization introduced monumental architecture, a written script, and eventually Christianity; all cultural systems that arrived with or developed from the Semitic-speaking migrant population. The pre-existing indigenous cultures of the highlands were absorbed, marginalized, or erased. This is the cultural dimension of colonization, present in exactly the form expected by the thesis.

Political evidence: The historical record of Ethiopia is a record of Amhara and Tigrinya political dominance over groups like the Gumuz, Oromo, Anuak, and Somali; many of whom have experienced what can only be described as internal colonization by the highland state. The

distinction between “colonizer” and “colonized” within Ethiopia’s borders has always followed the line of West Eurasian admixture.

7. Abraham as Prototype: The Narrative Origin of Colonization

7.1 The Geographic Match

One of the most striking confirmations of this thesis is not found in a genetics laboratory but in the oldest religious literature of the West. The story of Abraham, patriarch of the Abrahamic faiths; Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, is set in precisely the geographic corridor the genetic evidence identifies as the epicenter of West Eurasian population spread. Abraham originates from Ur of the Chaldees, located in Mesopotamia, modern southern Iraq, at the heart of the Fertile Crescent. He does not come from the periphery of this thesis. He comes from its epicenter.

The Fertile Crescent was the staging ground for the Neolithic agricultural revolution, the origin point of the Semitic language family, and one of the primary corridors through which West Eurasian genetic admixture flowed southward into the Arabian Peninsula and East Africa, and northwestward into Europe. Abraham’s world is genetically and geographically the same world the thesis describes as the source of global colonization. This cannot be dismissed as coincidence. It is a convergence of mythology, genetics, and geography that demands serious attention.

7.2 Abraham as Nomadic Pastoralist

The social form of Abraham’s existence is the exact social form this thesis identifies as the engine of colonization: nomadic pastoralism. He is not a settled farmer or a city-dweller. He moves with herds, with family units, with portable wealth. He migrates from Ur to Haran to Canaan to Egypt and back. His journeys trace the precise corridors along which West Eurasian genetic admixture has been shown to travel by ancient DNA studies. He is, in the language of the thesis, a Yamnaya-type figure; a mobile patriarch whose mode of existence is defined by movement, by the capacity to project presence into new territories, and by the organization of kin groups around a single patriarchal lineage.

This is not a metaphor. The Yamnaya and their successor cultures organized society around exactly this model: the extended patriarchal family as the primary political and military unit, moving across open landscapes, displacing or absorbing settled populations. Abraham’s narrative is the literary crystallization of a social form that archaeology and genetics have independently confirmed as the primary vehicle of prehistoric colonization.

7.3 The Covenant as a Colonial Land Claim

The central event of the Abrahamic narrative is the covenant; a divine promise of land to Abraham and his descendants. The land promised is Canaan, already inhabited by a named list of peoples: the Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites, Girgashites, Hivites, Perizzites, and Canaanites. These are not abstract placeholders. They are the indigenous populations of the Levant, predating the Abrahamic migration into the region.

The covenant functions, in structural terms, as a divine title deed. It confers exclusive territorial rights on an incoming nomadic population over land already occupied by others. The ideological justification for the displacement is supernatural authority; God has promised it. This structure;

an incoming population using a transcendent ideological framework to legitimize the dispossession of an indigenous people, is definitionally colonial. It is also, notably, the same structure that European colonial powers would invoke millennia later when claiming the Americas, Africa, and Australia in the name of Christianity and civilization. The template was already ancient by then.

What makes the Abrahamic covenant particularly significant for this thesis is that it explicitly frames the incoming population's dominance as both inevitable and righteous. The indigenous populations of Canaan are not presented as wronged parties but as obstacles to a divinely ordained purpose. This ideological inversion; in which the colonizer is the victim of history and the colonized are the impediment to progress, is a consistent feature of every major colonization event the thesis examines. Abraham's story is its first written formulation.

7.4 The Abrahamic Religions as the Cultural Software of Colonization

The thesis has argued that colonization is not purely a genetic or demographic event but a combined package of genetics, language, technology, and culture arriving together. If the genetic hardware of West Eurasian expansion can be traced from the Yamnaya steppe through the Fertile Crescent into Africa, Asia, and Europe, then the Abrahamic religious tradition represents its most durable and widely distributed cultural software.

When European maritime colonizers arrived on the coasts of West Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas beginning in the fifteenth century, they arrived carrying the Abrahamic worldview as their primary ideological framework. The cross preceded or accompanied the flag in nearly every colonial encounter. The missionary project and the colonial project were not in tension; they were expressions of the same impulse. The divine mandate to spread a chosen people's civilization across the earth, to subdue it, and to convert or displace those who resisted, was Abrahamic in origin and had been refined across three thousand years of theological development before it was applied to the New World.

This means the cultural dimension of the colonization pattern can be traced in an unbroken line from Abraham's covenant in Mesopotamia, through the Israelite conquest of Canaan, through the Roman adoption of Christianity, through Islamic expansion across North Africa and Central Asia, through the Crusades, and finally to European colonial expansion. The genetic lineage and the narrative tradition traveled together, reinforcing one another, across the entire arc of this thesis.

7.5 Ishmael, Isaac, and the Bifurcation of the Pattern

The Abrahamic narrative contains an internal bifurcation that maps precisely onto the dual pathways of West Eurasian expansion the thesis describes. Abraham fathers two sons: Ishmael, ancestor of the Arab peoples, and Isaac, ancestor of the Israelites. Ishmael's line produces the Arabian Peninsula populations whose southward migration carried West Eurasian admixture into East Africa; the colonization event that created the Semitic-speaking dominant populations of Ethiopia. Isaac's line produces the Israelite tradition that becomes the root of Christianity and eventually European civilization. Both lines descend from the same patriarch, originating in the same Mesopotamian corridor, and both carry the same colonization dynamic forward in different geographic directions. The myth encodes the population split that genetics has independently confirmed.

This is not to argue that the Biblical narrative is a literal historical record. It is to argue that it functions as a preserved cultural memory of a real demographic reality; the expansion of a nomadic pastoral people from the West Eurasian genetic heartland into surrounding territories,

and that this memory was formalized into a theological framework that then justified and propelled further expansions for thousands of years. Abraham is the narrative prototype of the colonizer not because his story is unique, but because it is the story that all subsequent West Eurasian colonial enterprises told about themselves.

8. Monsters of Memory: Jacob, Esau, and the Mythological Encoding of the Colonial Encounter

8.1 The Twins as Archetypes

Among the most overlooked details in the Abrahamic narrative is the description of the twin brothers at birth. Esau emerges first from the womb covered in red hair so thick the text describes his entire body as a garment of fur. He is named for this: Esau connects to the Hebrew for hairy, his alternate name Edom to the word for red. He is a hunter, a man of the open wilderness, physically dominant, and governed by appetite; he famously surrenders his birthright, the most significant inheritance a firstborn son could hold, for a bowl of red stew because he cannot override his hunger in the moment. He is a creature of the body, of instinct, of the untamed world outside the tent.

Jacob emerges second, smooth-skinned and grasping his brother's heel. He is a dweller in tents; interior, domestic, civilized. His defining characteristic is not physical power but cunning. He obtains what he wants not through strength but through sustained, premeditated deception: he tricks Esau out of his birthright, he disguises himself in goatskin to deceive his blind father Isaac into giving him the blessing intended for Esau, and later he outmaneuvers his father-in-law Laban through patient genetic manipulation of the flocks. His name, in its root meaning, is the heel-grabber; the one who comes from behind and takes what the stronger one had first.

These are not merely two brothers. They are two archetypes of human social type, placed in structural opposition from before their birth. And their opposition maps with startling precision onto the two most enduring monster archetypes of European folklore: the werewolf and the vampire.

8.2 Esau as the Werewolf

The werewolf is defined by its body. It is hairy; extraordinarily, supernaturally hairy, in exactly the way Esau is described. It is a creature of the wild, of forests and open fields, of night and the hunt. Its transformations are governed by forces it cannot control: the lunar cycle overrides its will the way hunger overrides Esau at the pot of red stew. The werewolf is physically formidable, perhaps the most physically powerful creature in its folklore tradition, and yet it is consistently outmaneuvered, trapped, and destroyed by opponents who are weaker in body but more sophisticated in mind.

The geographic and social coding of the werewolf in European folklore is equally telling. Werewolf legends cluster in rural, peasant communities; the people of the land, the open field, the forest margins. They are the people who were in a place before civilization arrived. In the regions where werewolf mythology is most dense; the Balkans, the Carpathians, the Slavic territories of Eastern Europe; these are precisely the populations whose pre-Indo-European, pre-West-Eurasian cultural substrate was most violently disrupted by the Yamnaya expansion. The werewolf is the monster of the displaced indigenous: hairy, strong, wild, ultimately subordinated.

The connection to Esau deepens when the territorial dimension is considered. Esau's descendants become Edom, a people perpetually in conflict with Israel, eventually subordinated to it, inhabiting the rugged wilderness territories while Jacob's descendants inhabit the cultivated highlands. In later Biblical prophecy, Edom becomes a byword for the enemy, the outsider, the one who was displaced. The werewolf in folklore occupies exactly this position: the creature of the margins, the one whose territory was taken, the one whose power is real but whose civilization is absent.

8.3 Jacob as the Vampire

The vampire inverts the werewolf on every axis. Where the werewolf is hairy and wild, the vampire is smooth, pale, and immaculately presented. Where the werewolf is a creature of appetite it cannot control, the vampire is defined by supreme self-control and patient predation; it plans, it waits, it manipulates. Where the werewolf takes by force, the vampire takes by charm. It must be invited in. Its power is not brute strength but the capacity to make its victims complicit in their own consumption.

Jacob must be invited in too. He does not seize the blessing by force. He constructs an elaborate deception that makes his blind father Isaac a willing participant in his own dispossession. He does not steal Esau's birthright; he purchases it in a transaction Esau enters voluntarily, if thoughtlessly. His entire career as a patriarch is built on making others complicit in transactions that serve his interests at their expense. This is the vampire's mode of operation rendered in human terms.

The vampire's association with aristocratic bloodline and inherited power maps directly onto the Jacobite covenant. The vampire's power is transmitted through blood; it is a lineage system. Jacob's covenant with God is also a blood lineage system: the promise passes through his sons, through the twelve tribes, through an unbroken chain of chosen descent. The vampire does not merely survive; it perpetuates its line across centuries. The Israelite theological tradition, and through it the entire Abrahamic inheritance, claims exactly this: an eternal covenant transmitted through bloodline, conferring special status across all generations.

The vampire's relationship to blood consumption also echoes the thesis's broader argument about West Eurasian populations absorbing rather than simply destroying the peoples they encountered. The vampire does not kill its prey and abandon it. It feeds, transforms, and perpetuates itself through the encounter. The West Eurasian expansions did not produce simple genocide. They produced admixture, the genetic absorption of indigenous populations into the expanding lineage. The vampire does not empty the land. It inherits it.

8.4 The Ancient Enmity Between the Monsters

In virtually every iteration of vampire and werewolf mythology across European folklore and into modern fiction, the two creatures share an ancient, irresolvable enmity. They do not merely compete; they are natural enemies across time, locked in a conflict whose origin predates any living member of either group. Neither can remember when the war began. It simply has always been. This precisely mirrors the relationship between Jacob and Esau's descendants: Israel and Edom are perpetually at war across the entire span of the Hebrew Bible, and the conflict is explicitly framed as beginning before birth, in the womb, when God tells Rebekah that two nations are struggling within her and the older shall serve the younger.

The detail about birth order is critical for both mythologies. The werewolf; like Esau, came first. The wilderness, the hunter, the indigenous inhabitant was there before the vampire arrived. The vampire; like Jacob, is the latecomer who displaces the firstborn. In most vampire-werewolf

narratives, the vampire holds the dominant position: more organized, more politically powerful, associated with courts and hierarchies and inherited wealth. The werewolf is more powerful in raw physical combat but loses the longer game. Esau could have killed Jacob multiple times. He chose not to, because Jacob was his brother, because Esau was governed by loyalty where Jacob was governed by strategy. This asymmetry; the indigenous population's fatal combination of superior strength and inferior cunning, is one of the thesis's central arguments about why the colonization pattern succeeded across so many independent encounters.

8.5 The Geographic Origin of Both Myths

Perhaps the most structurally compelling piece of evidence for this connection is geographic. The richest and oldest traditions of both vampire and werewolf folklore in Europe emerge from the same region: the Balkans, the Carpathian basin, Romania, and the broader Slavic territories of Eastern Europe. These are the vampire's home territories in folklore; Transylvania is not a coincidence of Gothic imagination but a reflection of where the mythology was genuinely densest and oldest. And they are simultaneously the territories most associated in the archaeological record with the collision between the Yamnaya expansion and the older Neolithic agricultural populations of Europe.

The people who generated these myths were the descendants of exactly the encounter this thesis describes: the smooth, cunning, aristocratic lineage and the hairy, powerful, displaced indigenous lineage meeting in the Pontic-Carpathian corridor and producing a civilization haunted by the memory of that encounter. The monsters are the memory. The folklore preserved, in the language of the supernatural, what the historical record had forgotten or suppressed: that there were two kinds of people, that they were enemies from before memory, that one took what belonged to the other through means that could not be resisted by strength alone, and that the world the survivors inhabited was built on that original dispossession.

8.6 The Monster as Cultural Fossil

This analysis proposes that vampire and werewolf mythology functions as what might be called a cultural fossil; a preserved imprint of a historical encounter so old and so foundational that the civilization it produced could no longer consciously remember it, but could not entirely forget it either. The memory was encoded in story, in the language of the supernatural, and transmitted across thousands of years in the form of monsters.

This is consistent with a broader pattern of mythological encoding that this thesis has identified throughout: Abraham's story as a preserved memory of the nomadic expansion; the Abrahamic covenant as a theological encoding of colonial land seizure; the storytelling traditions of modernity perpetuating the colonial template in fictional futures. The vampire and the werewolf sit at the oldest layer of this tradition, predating the written Abrahamic texts, emerging from the oral traditions of the very peoples among whom the original Jacob-and-Esau dynamic played out at civilizational scale. They are the most ancient layer of the thesis's argument about cultural transmission: the point at which history became myth, and myth became monster.

9. The Colonized Imagination: Storytelling and the Normalization of Inevitability

9.1 Science Fiction, Fantasy, and the Colonial Default

If this thesis is correct that colonization is an ancient, recurring, and deeply embedded pattern in human civilization, then we should expect to find its logic not only in history and genetics but in the stories human beings tell themselves. And we do. The most popular and enduring genres of speculative fiction; science fiction and fantasy, are saturated with colonization as a narrative premise, and more revealingly, as an assumed inevitability.

Consider the foundational texts of Western science fiction. In story after story, humanity ventures outward into the cosmos and encounters other peoples, other worlds, other civilizations. The narrative frameworks almost universally replicate the colonial template: a technologically advanced civilization expands into territories inhabited by others, displaces or transforms them, and frames this displacement as progress, destiny, or survival. The alien planet is the new continent. The indigenous species is the new savage. The starship captain is the new conquistador. This is not accidental. The writers of science fiction grew up in societies shaped by the colonial experience, and they projected that experience forward in time and outward in space because it was the only framework of expansion available to their imaginations.

Fantasy literature follows an identical pattern. The genre's foundational works almost invariably feature a chosen people; often lighter in complexion, more technologically or magically sophisticated; defending or reclaiming territory against darker, more primitive antagonists. The racial coding of Tolkien's Middle-earth has been extensively documented by scholars: the free peoples of the West facing the dark armies of the East and South. The righteous war of territorial reclamation. The divine mandate backing the true king's claim to the land. These are the Abrahamic and Yamnaya templates dressed in elvish cloaks. The colonial imagination did not stop at the borders of the real world. It colonized the imaginary one too.

What makes this culturally significant is not merely that these stories exist, but that they are the stories consumed most voraciously by the largest audiences, across the most generations. They are the myths of modernity. And like all myths, they do not merely describe the world, they instruct their audience on what the world is like, what it has always been like, and what it must inevitably continue to be. When colonization appears in story after story as the natural condition of any expanding civilization, the audience absorbs the lesson without being aware a lesson is being taught.

9.2 Inevitability as Ideology

The most powerful function of narrative is not to argue for a position but to make that position feel self-evident. An argument can be refuted. An assumption embedded deep enough in story cannot, because it is never surfaced as a claim. When science fiction presents humanity's expansion into space as an unquestioned good, when fantasy presents the reconquest of ancestral lands as heroic destiny, when adventure narratives from Robinson Crusoe to Avatar position the outsider arriving in indigenous territory as the protagonist whose perspective the audience inhabits; colonization is not being advocated. It is being assumed. And assumptions are far more durable than arguments.

This thesis proposes that the narrative ubiquity of colonization as an inevitable feature of civilizational expansion is not a coincidence or a creative failure. It is the surface expression of something much deeper: a pattern so ancient, so genetically and culturally embedded in the populations that produce and consume most of the world's dominant storytelling, that it has become invisible to them. The descendants of the Yamnaya, of Abraham's covenant, of the Semitic highland kingdoms, of the Roman Empire, of the European colonial powers; when these populations imagine the future, they imagine it in the shape of their own past. Expansion.

Displacement. Dominance. Destiny. The colonial arc of history has been so thoroughly internalized that it presents itself as the arc of nature.

The reader who grows up consuming these stories; regardless of their own ancestry, is being trained, subconsciously and continuously, to experience colonization not as a crime or an aberration but as the normal, expected, even admirable behavior of any civilization that has the power to expand. The pattern that began on the Pontic steppe five thousand years ago now perpetuates itself not only through genetics and political power, but through entertainment. It has become self-replicating at the level of the imagination itself.

10. The Gullible Pharaoh: Human Innocence, Deception, and Social Evolution

10.1 A Recurring Puzzle in the Biblical Record

A pattern runs through the Biblical narratives that has received surprisingly little systematic analysis: the enemies of the Abrahamic tribe are consistently and remarkably easy to deceive. Pharaoh is fooled not once but twice; first by Abraham, who passes Sarah off as his sister to avoid being killed, and later by Moses, through a sequence of signs and negotiations that culminates in the liberation of the Israelite people. Jacob deceives his blind father Isaac to steal the birthright from Esau. Laban is deceived by Jacob over the flocks. The Canaanite city of Gibeon is deceived by the Israelites into a peace treaty. In each case, the deceived party; often powerful, often ruling over vastly greater resources and armies; fails to see through stratagems that, to a modern reader, appear relatively transparent.

The conventional theological reading of these passages attributes the success of deception to divine intervention: God protects and empowers the patriarch's scheme. But this thesis invites a different reading; one grounded not in theology but in social evolution. What if the ease with which these peoples were deceived reflects not their stupidity or the miraculous, but something genuinely true about the social and cognitive condition of humanity at that moment in history? What if the peoples encountered by Abraham and his descendants had not yet fully developed the cognitive and cultural defenses against sophisticated deception, because sophisticated deception was new?

10.2 The Hypothesis of Original Innocence

This thesis proposes the following: that prior to the social evolutionary moment represented by the Abrahamic migrations and the West Eurasian expansions more broadly, a significant portion of humanity operated in social contexts where deliberate, sustained, high-stakes deception was rare enough to be effectively outside their model of how the world worked. They were, in a meaningful sense, innocent; not morally superior, but experientially unprepared.

This is not as radical a claim as it may initially appear. Evolutionary psychology has established that trust is the default social setting for human beings operating within a stable community. Humans are wired for cooperation, and cooperation requires a baseline assumption of honesty. Deception exists in all human societies, but the scale, sophistication, and strategic deployment of deception as a tool of political and territorial expansion; the kind of deception practiced by Abraham in Egypt, by Jacob at the well, by Moses before Pharaoh, represents a qualitatively different order of social behavior. It is not the petty lie of a child or the negotiation of a village dispute. It is systematic, premeditated, and deployed against strangers in contexts of high

power differential. This kind of deception requires both a particular social intelligence and a particular social context in which it has been refined and normalized.

The populations that the West Eurasian migrants encountered; whether in Canaan, Egypt, or the European Neolithic, had not necessarily developed the same degree of this refined strategic deception. They lived in social worlds organized around face-to-face community trust, seasonal cycles, and relatively stable territorial arrangements. When they encountered a people for whom deception was a honed social tool; refined perhaps across generations of nomadic existence where the ability to read strangers, misrepresent intentions, and outmaneuver settled populations was a survival advantage; they had no adequate defense. Not because they were inferior, but because they had never needed one.

10.3 Nomadism as the School of Deception

This observation connects directly to the thesis's broader argument about nomadism as the engine of colonization. Settled agricultural communities build social intelligence adapted to their context: reading the weather, managing harvests, negotiating within known kin groups, maintaining long-term reciprocal relationships with neighbors they will see again next season. Nomadic pastoral communities build a different set of social intelligences: reading strangers rapidly, misrepresenting intentions when passing through unfamiliar territories, negotiating from positions of apparent weakness while concealing actual strength, and moving on before the consequences of deception could catch them.

The Yamnaya who swept across Europe, the Semitic pastoralists who entered the Levant and East Africa, the Abrahamic patriarch who navigated the courts of Pharaoh; all operated from a nomadic social intelligence honed for exactly this kind of encounter. The settled populations they displaced were not cognitively inferior. They were simply adapted to a different social environment, one that had not required the same defenses. The encounter between nomadic West Eurasian migrants and settled indigenous populations was, among other things, an encounter between two different levels of sophistication in the use of deception as a social tool.

10.4 The Evolutionary Question: Advancement or Regression?

This leads to the most philosophically significant question the thesis raises, and the one to which it deliberately refuses to provide a final answer. If the capacity for sophisticated strategic deception was a competitive advantage that allowed West Eurasian populations to displace, dominate, and absorb other peoples across the globe, then it must be accounted as a form of social evolution in the strictly Darwinian sense: a trait that increased reproductive fitness and group survival. The populations that carried it expanded. The populations that lacked it contracted. By this measure, the ability to deceive at scale was an evolutionary advancement.

But the same evidence can support the opposite conclusion. Every major crisis of civilization; political corruption, financial fraud, war justified by false pretenses, the systematic deception of colonized peoples about the intentions of their colonizers, can be traced to the same capacity for strategic deception being turned inward, deployed within societies rather than between them, by the powerful against the powerless. If the ability to deceive at scale was the tool that built civilizational dominance, it was also the tool that made those civilizations internally unstable, hierarchical, and prone to the exploitation of their own members. A world without that capacity might have been less expansionist and less technologically dynamic, but it might also have been more equitable, more stable, and more genuinely cooperative.

Whether the emergence of sophisticated deception as a social tool represents an evolutionary advancement or a form of de-evolution; a gain in competitive power at the cost of something

more fundamentally human, is a question this thesis intentionally leaves open. It is, ultimately, a question about what humanity is for. The evidence for both conclusions is present in the same historical record. The reader is invited to weigh it.

11. “Indian”: The Word That Colonized Before the Ships Arrived

11.1 The Standard Explanation and Its Limits

The conventional account of why Columbus called the indigenous peoples of the Caribbean “Indians” is straightforward: he believed he had reached the Indies, the loosely defined Asian territories Europeans associated with spices, wealth, and the courts of the Great Khan. His letter to the Spanish crown confirms this; he refers to the Indies repeatedly, and his use of “Indios” for the people he encountered follows naturally from this geographic belief. The name was, on this reading, a simple navigational error, corrected by history and retained by inertia.

This explanation is not wrong. But it is incomplete in a way that matters enormously for this thesis. It explains the mechanics of the naming without explaining why the name transferred so seamlessly, why it stuck so completely, and why the peoples of two entirely separate hemispheres; the dark-skinned inhabitants of South Asia and the dark-skinned inhabitants of the Americas, ended up sharing a colonial label across five centuries of history. The thesis proposes that this was not an accident of navigation. It was the activation of a pre-existing colonial category, and the category was already defined not by geography but by phenotype and status.

11.2 “India” as a Colonial Category Before Columbus

By 1492, the word “India” in European usage referred not to a precise geographic territory but to an enormous, loosely bounded region encompassing everything south and east of Persia; effectively the entire dark-skinned world beyond the boundaries of the West Eurasian civilizational sphere. The oldest surviving terrestrial globe, produced in 1492, labels a vast expanse stretching from the Indus River to the Pacific as “India.” This was not a cartographic error. It reflected a genuine European cognitive category: India was the name for the world of the Other, the non-Christian, the dark-skinned, the colonizable.

The Portuguese, who had been systematically working down the West African coast for decades before Columbus sailed, had already applied this framework. The Indian Ocean trade routes they were attempting to access were defined by their relationship to “India” as a destination and a category. The dark-skinned peoples of the African coast, the Arabian Peninsula, and the subcontinent itself were all subsumed under the same broad cognitive umbrella: they were the people of the south, the people of the heat and the equator, the people outside the pale; in both the literal and figurative sense, of West Eurasian civilization.

India was therefore already the West’s first named colonial theater. It was the place where the template of encountering, categorizing, trading with, exploiting, and eventually dominating dark-skinned indigenous peoples had been most extensively developed before 1492. When Columbus encountered the Taíno people of the Caribbean; dark-skinned, indigenous, living entirely outside the West Eurasian civilizational framework; the word “Indian” came to him not merely because of geographic confusion but because they fit the pre-existing category that word described. They looked like Indians. They occupied the same structural position as Indians. And “Indian” was already the word his civilization used for that kind of person.

11.3 The First Dark-Skinned People They Colonized

This thesis proposes a reading that runs parallel to and deeper than the standard navigational account: that “Indian” became the transferable label for dark-skinned indigenous peoples in the Americas because India represented the first large-scale encounter between West Eurasian expansion and dark-skinned indigenous civilization. India was the prototype. The Indian subcontinent was where the colonization pattern; the same pattern this thesis has traced from the Yamnaya steppe through the Fertile Crescent and into East Africa; first produced a named, categorized, and ideologically framed relationship between the West Eurasian colonizer and the dark-skinned colonized Other.

The thesis has already established that the Indian subcontinent was one of the primary theaters of Yamnaya-descended Indo-Aryan expansion, with steppe ancestry arriving in South Asia approximately 3,500 to 4,000 years ago and producing the caste stratification that placed lighter-skinned, higher-ANI populations at the apex and darker-skinned, higher-ASI populations at the base. This was colonization in the fullest sense: genetic, linguistic, cultural, and social. The dark-skinned inhabitants of the subcontinent were the first people to be formally categorized by a West Eurasian-descended civilization as a distinct, inferior, colonizable Other, and it was their name, their geography, their label, that Columbus reached for when he encountered the next dark-skinned indigenous peoples on his path.

The word “Indian” did not merely describe a geographic confusion. It carried, embedded within it, an entire history of West Eurasian encounters with dark-skinned indigenous peoples going back thousands of years. When Columbus wrote “Indios” in his log, he was not just making a navigational error. He was placing the people he had found inside the oldest colonial category his civilization possessed; the category that said: these are the dark-skinned people, the people of the south and the east, the people who can be claimed, converted, and subjugated. The name colonized them before any soldier stepped ashore.

11.4 Language as the Leading Edge of Colonization

This observation connects to the thesis’s broader argument about language as a component of the colonization package. The Yamnaya replaced the languages of Neolithic Europe with Proto-Indo-European. The Semitic migrants into Ethiopia replaced or subordinated the Cushitic languages of the highlands. The Abrahamic tradition encoded colonial land claims in sacred narrative. The vampire and werewolf myths preserved the memory of the colonial encounter in folklore. And the word “Indian” demonstrates that by 1492, the West Eurasian civilizational tradition had developed a ready-made linguistic category for dark-skinned indigenous peoples that could be applied to any new encounter anywhere on earth.

Language in this context functions as the advance scout of colonization. Before the political apparatus arrives, before the missionaries, before the soldiers, the language arrives, and with it, the entire framework of categories that determines how the encountered people will be understood, classified, and treated. The indigenous peoples of the Americas were called Indians before they were enslaved, before their lands were taken, before their populations were decimated by disease. The name preceded every subsequent act of colonization and made those acts cognitively possible. You cannot systematically dispossess a people without first having a name for them that places them outside the circle of full humanity. “Indian” was that name, already loaded with three thousand years of West Eurasian colonial history, waiting to be deployed the moment the ships found a new shore.

The fact that “American Indian” and “Native American” remain contested and politically charged terms today, that the descendants of the people Columbus named still carry a label that was never theirs, that referred to a place they had never been, that encoded their status as the colonial Other from the moment it was applied, is itself a testament to the durability of the

colonial naming power. The word has outlasted the empire that produced it. It continues to do colonial work five centuries after Columbus wrote it in his log.

12. Objections and Responses

12.1 "The Incoming Populations Were Not White Europeans"

This is correct. The thesis does not claim they were. It claims they carried the genetic ancestry that is ancestral to what we call white Europeans; the West Eurasian lineage originating in Anatolian Neolithic and Caucasus Hunter-Gatherer populations. The phenotypic whiteness familiar today is a recent and further differentiated expression of that underlying genetic reality. The argument is about genetic lineage, not contemporary racial categories. The same logic by which we describe Native Americans as genetically Asian: meaning their ancestry traces to Northeast Asian and Siberian populations, not that they are culturally or phenotypically Asian, applies here. West Eurasian ancestry is the ancestral genetic substrate of whiteness, wherever it appeared.

12.2 "Colonization Requires State Power and Intent"

This objection defines colonization too narrowly. The systematic displacement and marginalization of indigenous peoples by incoming populations does not require a formal colonial administrative apparatus to qualify as colonization in the meaningful sense. The Yamnaya had no European colonial office. The Semitic migrants into Ethiopia had no viceroy. Yet both achieved the same outcomes: genetic replacement or admixture, language displacement, cultural imposition, and the reduction of the original population to marginal status. Colonization is a demographic and cultural event; the political machinery that sometimes accompanies it is not its defining feature.

12.3 "All Human Populations Have Displaced Other Populations"

This is partially true but does not undermine the thesis. The argument is not that West Eurasian-origin populations are uniquely sinful, but that there is a specific, traceable, and recurrent pattern in which a population bearing West Eurasian genetic ancestry has been the displacing force, across multiple independent historical episodes, in Africa, Europe, South Asia, Central Asia, and ultimately the Americas and Australia. The pattern is striking enough to warrant a unifying explanatory framework.

13. Conclusion

This thesis has argued that colonization, properly understood, is not a European invention but a recurring pattern whose engine is the expansion of populations bearing West Eurasian genetic ancestry. The evidence marshaled in support of this argument includes the genetic timeline of depigmentation showing that West Eurasian ancestral populations began carrying light-skin genes before they entered Europe; the Yamnaya expansion, which represents the first fully documented large-scale colonization event in the archaeological record; the global pattern of dark-skinned indigenous peoples; Andamanese, Dravidians, Aboriginal Australians, Gumuz, and others; existing in marginalized status precisely where West Eurasian-admixed populations became dominant; the Ethiopian case study, where Semitic-speaking migrants carrying West Eurasian ancestry displaced or absorbed the original dark-skinned indigenous inhabitants of the

East African highlands millennia before the European colonial era; the figure of Abraham, whose story encodes the colonization pattern as theology and whose narrative has functioned as the ideological template for every subsequent West Eurasian colonial enterprise; the Jacob and Esau archetypes, whose opposing descriptions; the smooth cunning insider and the hairy powerful outsider; survive as the vampire and the werewolf in Eastern European folklore, cultural fossils preserving the memory of the original colonial encounter in the language of monsters; the word “Indian,” which demonstrates that by 1492 the West Eurasian civilization, derived from the first great theater of West Eurasian colonial expansion in South Asia; and applied it to the Americas before a single colony was established; the storytelling traditions of modernity, which so thoroughly embed colonization as an assumed inevitability that audiences absorb its logic without ever consciously examining it; and the hypothesis of original human innocence, which proposes that the ease with which settled indigenous populations were displaced and deceived reflects not their inferiority but their inexperience with the specific form of strategic deception that nomadic expansion both required and perfected.

The conventional narrative places colonization’s origin point in fifteenth-century Lisbon and Seville. The genetic and archaeological record places it on the Pontic-Caspian steppe at the dawn of the Bronze Age, and perhaps earlier in the corridors between the Levant and the Horn of Africa. The Abrahamic tradition places its narrative origin in Ur of the Chaldees. The monsters of Eastern European folklore preserve its emotional memory in the Carpathian highlands where the Yamnaya corridor ran. The storytelling traditions of modernity carry it forward into imagined futures. All of these sources converge on the same region, the same people, and the same dynamic, approached through different lenses across thousands of years of human cultural transmission.

Whether the emergence of sophisticated deception as a social tool represents an evolutionary advancement or the beginning of something the species is still paying for is a question this thesis leaves deliberately open. The reader who has followed the argument this far is equipped to form their own judgment. What the thesis insists upon is only this: that the question deserves to be asked, that the pattern deserves to be seen whole, and that the stories we tell ourselves; whether in scripture, in folklore, or in science fiction, about the inevitability of expansion and displacement deserve to be recognized as stories, not nature, not destiny, but inherited narratives that can, if we choose, be examined, questioned, and rewritten.

Ethiopia’s resistance at Adwa was a genuine and heroic assertion of sovereignty. But the sovereignty being defended was itself built on an earlier act of colonization. The most honest accounting of history holds both of these things to be true at once.

References and Evidentiary Sources

The following studies and sources form the evidentiary foundation of this thesis:

Gibbons, A. (2015). “How Europeans Evolved White Skin.” *Science*. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mathieson, I. et al. (2015). “Eight Thousand Years of Natural Selection in Europe.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.

Mathieson, I. et al. (2020). “The Evolution of Skin Pigmentation-Associated Variation in West Eurasia.” *PNAS*, 118(1).

Reich, D. et al. (2018). "The History of Human Populations from Ancient DNA." *Cell / Who We Are and How We Got Here*.

Jablonski, N.G. & Chaplin, G. (2000). "The Evolution of Human Skin Coloration." *Journal of Human Evolution*, 39(1).

Lucock, M. et al. (2022). "The Evolution of Human Skin Pigmentation: A Changing Medley of Vitamins, Genetic Variability, and UV Radiation During Human Expansion." PMC/NIH.

Tishkoff, S.A. et al. (2017). "New Gene Variants Reveal the Evolution of Human Skin Color." *Science*. University of Pennsylvania.

Lazaridis, I. et al. (2016). "Genomics of the Origin of Modern Humans." Harvard Medical School / Broad Institute.

Jakobsson, M. et al. (2017). "Thousands of Horsemen May Have Swept Into Bronze Age Europe." *Science*.

Kristiansen, K. & Willerslev, E. (2017). "Steppe Migrant Thugs Pacified by Stone Age Farming Women." University of Gothenburg / University of Copenhagen. ScienceDaily.

Narasimhan, V. et al. (2019). "The Formation of Human Populations in South and Central Asia." *Science* 365(6457).

Reich, D. et al. (2013). "Genetic Evidence for Recent Population Mixture in India." PMC/NIH.

Thangaraj, K. et al. (2005). "Reconstructing the Origin of Andaman Islanders." *Science* 308(5724).

Anthony, D.W. (2007). *The Horse, the Wheel, and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton University Press.

Wikipedia / Ancient DNA Consortium. (2024–2026). "Western Steppe Herders." Wikipedia. (Aggregating peer-reviewed ancient DNA findings.)

Basu, A. et al. (2016). "Revisiting the Out-of-Africa Event with the HGDP-CEPH Dataset." PMC/NIH.

Pugach, I. & Stoneking, M. (2013). "Genotyping Data from Aboriginal Australian Populations." Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Finkelstein, I. & Silberman, N.A. (2001). *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology's New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts*. Free Press.

Dever, W.G. (2003). *Who Were the Early Israelites and Where Did They Come From?* Eerdmans Publishing.

Speiser, E.A. (1964). *Genesis*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Doubleday. (On the Mesopotamian origins and cultural context of the Abrahamic narratives.)

Wright, N.T. (2013). *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Fortress Press. (On the theological development of covenant theology and its ideological function.)

Rodinson, M. (1971). *Mohammed*. Translated by Anne Carter. Penguin Books. (On the Abrahamic framework in Islamic expansion.)

- Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books. (On the ideological construction of the colonized Other in Western narrative and scholarship.)
- Rieder, J. (2008). *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*. Wesleyan University Press. (On the colonial underpinnings of the science fiction genre.)
- Lavender, I. (2011). *Race in American Science Fiction*. Indiana University Press. (On racial coding and colonial logic in speculative fiction.)
- Shippey, T. (2000). *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century*. HarperCollins. (On the cultural and historical sources of Tolkien's racial and territorial imagination.)
- Trites, R.S. (2000). *Disturbing the Universe: Power and Repression in Adolescent Literature*. University of Iowa Press. (On power dynamics and inevitability in popular narrative.)
- Trivers, R. (2011). *The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self-Deception in Human Life*. Basic Books. (On the evolutionary origins and social functions of deception.)
- Cosmides, L. & Tooby, J. (1992). "Cognitive Adaptations for Social Exchange." In Barkow, Cosmides & Tooby (eds.), *The Adapted Mind*. Oxford University Press. (On the evolved cognitive architecture underlying social trust and cheat detection.)
- Tomasello, M. (2009). *Why We Cooperate*. MIT Press. (On cooperative behavior as the human default and the social conditions under which deception emerges.)
- Dunbar, R.I.M. (1998). "The Social Brain Hypothesis." *Evolutionary Anthropology* 6(5). (On social intelligence, group size, and the cognitive demands of complex social environments.)
- Barber, P. (1988). *Vampires, Burial, and Death: Folklore and Reality*. Yale University Press. (On the Eastern European origins and anthropological roots of vampire mythology.)
- Summers, M. (1933). *The Werewolf in Lore and Legend*. Kegan Paul. (On the geographic distribution and folkloric traditions of werewolf mythology in Eastern Europe.)
- Lecouteux, C. (2011). *The Secret History of Vampires*. Inner Traditions. (On the pre-literary Slavic and Balkan roots of vampire folklore and its relationship to death and displacement beliefs.)
- Beal, T.K. (2002). *Religion and Its Monsters*. Routledge. (On the relationship between religious narrative, monster mythology, and the encoding of cultural anxieties.)
- Cohen, J.J. (1996). "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)." In *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. University of Minnesota Press. (On monsters as cultural fossils encoding suppressed historical trauma.)
- Greenblatt, S. (1991). *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. University of Chicago Press. (On the linguistic and cognitive frameworks Columbus brought to the Americas and how European categories structured the colonial encounter.)
- Hulme, P. (1986). *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean 1492–1797*. Methuen. (On the naming of the Caribbean peoples and the colonial ideology embedded in the term "Indian.")

Seed, P. (1995). *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World*. Cambridge University Press. (On the ritual and linguistic mechanisms of colonial land claiming.)

Deloria, V. (1969). *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Macmillan. (On the political and cultural consequences of the imposed label "Indian" from an indigenous perspective.)

Schwartz, S.B. (1994). *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters Between Europeans and Other Peoples*. Cambridge University Press. (On the cognitive frameworks through which Europeans categorized non-European peoples during the Age of Exploration.)