



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 11, 2026

California's Plan to Wipe Out "Indians"

It isn't actually true that Christopher Columbus committed genocide against the Indians. Ironically, though, the very people who accuse him of such are now trying to wipe out "Indians."

They also want to eradicate "Apaches," "Braves," "Chiefs," "Chieftains," "Chippewa," and "Comanches."

That is, social engineers want to partially erase Indians' memory by nixing the above terms.

This is happening culture-wide. At issue today, however, is California's AB 3074, a measure signed into law by Democratic Governor Gavin Newsom in 2024. The alleged problem with the above terms, according to the legislation?

They're "derogatory" "Native American names."

Reporting on the matter Tuesday, the *New York Post* [wrote](#):



nico_blue/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Not content with the ban on "Redskins," which Newsom's predecessor Jerry Brown signed into law in 2015, the new law banned the terms "Apaches, Big Reds, Braves, Chiefs, Chieftains, Chippewa, Comanches, Indians, Savages, Squaw, and Tribe."

There are only two exceptions: Public schools that are run by Native American tribes are allowed to use these names; and schools that obtain the "written consent from a local federally recognized tribe to use a derogatory Native American term for the school or an athletic team name, mascot, or nickname."

The law doesn't say what should happen if Native American tribes disagree over whether a name is "derogatory."

Marysville High School in Yuba City is trying to save the name of its long-time mascot the "Indians" from the effects of the law by asking a Native American tribe — any tribe, really — to give it the OK.

The irony is that the term "Indian" has come back into vogue in recent years. Some indigenous Americans feel that "Native American" is too sterile, and actually prefer "Indian."

That is one of the reasons that the federal agency that deals with indigenous peoples, the US Bureau of Indian Affairs, has not changed its name — not even in the "woke" Obama and Biden administrations.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 11, 2026

“Native American,” by the way, is also imprecise. After all, if you were born on our shores, you’re a “native American.”

This is ridiculous on many levels. As the *Post* points out, how is it rational banning “Chiefs”? Will California cover up the name of the NFL team thus identified when it competes in the Golden State?

And what about the Atlanta Braves? To be consistent, perhaps California should ban the team from the state unless it changes its name. Or are laws just for the little athletes?

The *Post* also mentions that offensive-name laws aren’t necessary. People generally discern what’s considered “offensive” all by themselves.

And, by the way, what’s with the “Squaw” bit? Does anyone really think a school sports team will assume that name? Are mascots the concern? Because according to data, not even *one* school in California thus uses the term.

What’s in a Name?

Of course, some may wonder how most of the proscribed names are offensive at all. “Chiefs,” “Chieftains,” and “Braves”? Really? “Braves,” in fact, is associated with “Courage” (or Fortitude), which technically is a *virtue*. No one has ever been insulted by being called brave. This said, the California language police do have a point (just a bad one). So let’s delve deeper.

The Golden State’s banned terms are a really confused hodgepodge. Some, such as in the above paragraph, are definitionally neutral or positive. So is “Indians,” which, of course, originated with explorer Columbus’ famous geographical mistake: He believed he’d reached the East Indies.

“Chippewa” is neutral, too. The name most commonly refers to “puckered,” describing the distinctive puckered seams on the tribe’s traditional moccasins. And, no, I’m not aware of any Chippewa religious injunction against referencing their footwear.

Then there are “Apaches” and “Comanches.” Interestingly, they’re both Indian terms that could mean “enemy.” “Comanche,” in fact, is sometimes interpreted as “anyone who wants to fight us all the time” (e.g., leftists?).

As you might’ve guessed by now, though, these pejoratives were originated *by other Indian tribes*. So much for the “noble savage living in harmony” narrative.

Does this, however, mean they should be deep-sixed? As leftist vocabulary manipulators are fond of pointing out, *language changes*.

The Ones Watching Our Mouths Should Watch Their Ideology

For example, more Americans than ever today happily call themselves “pagans.” (There are now [more pagans than Presbyterians in the U.S.](#)) Yet this word, derived from the Latin *paganus*, was originally applied to such people by early Christians. It wasn’t a compliment, either: It essentially meant “backwards hick.” The term “boy,” possibly from the Latin *boia*, originally meant “servant,” “knave,” “rascal,” or “urchin.”

The point, however, is that “Comanches’,” “Apaches’,” and other such names’ connotations are now strikingly positive. They evoke ideas of bravery, honor, valor, and perseverance. That’s why they’re applied to sports teams. No one calls his team the Bangor Cowards, Seattle Sissy Boys, or Winona Wimps. Becoming a team name is a high honor.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 11, 2026

Ironically, most of the terms in question aren't even like the n-word. Leftists don't mind black Americans routinely peppering conversations with the latter, but it does have a negative contemporary usage. But the language police do want to make the Indian terms like the n-word in one way.

They aim to give the minority groups they're associated with veto power over who can utter them.

This is troubling because it serves to further intensify the phenomenon of having two tiers of linguistic norms. Worse still, it's made official through law. (You must "obtain the 'written consent from a local federally recognized tribe'" to use the terms.) Isn't it quite divisive — won't it create ill will — when you give one racial/ethnic group partial control over another group's tongue?

The Way Forward

Since the Left wants to, though, and is thus legislating, there is a solution. Many note that these white-savior efforts to ban Indian words essentially erase Indian culture. Well, we should then lean into it — and into our Western culture. The forbidden team names can be replaced with European-origin ones. Examples are Vikings, Berserkers, Gaels, Highlanders, Saxons, Teutons, Spartans, Legionnaires, Gladiators, Argonauts, and Paladins.

For that matter, we can start replacing all our Indian place names (e.g., Chappaqua, New York) with Western ones, too. Wouldn't want risk giving offense now.

The Left can then get the Indian cultural genocide they apparently want and the Western culture we know they love oh so much.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.