



Revised History

Boston Mayor and Contradictions

By Al Benson June 19, 2020

An article on *Breitbart* for June 16th by Joel R. Pollak shows the contradictory mindset of many Northern politicians.

The article stated: “Boston Mayor Marty Walsh (D) has come out in favor of removing a statue of Abraham Lincoln that has stood in the city for more than a century—but is opposed to renaming Faneuil Hall, which is named for a slave owner and is on the site of a slave market. As Breitbart News has reported, left-wing activists are trying to have a statue of Abraham Lincoln removed from Park Square after nearly 150 years because they find the depiction of an emancipated slave in the sculpture to be offensive.”

Actually, the statue is a replica of an original statue that was built with money donated by freed slaves. So now something bought and paid for by ex-slaves is not even good enough to please the minions of left-wing thought anymore! These people have to be the ultimate in political crybabies! Nothing satisfies them no matter what.

However, the Mayor’s office in Boston is in favor of removing the Lincoln statue and they wish to replace it with “one that recognizes equality.” Are they saying that Lincoln didn’t recognize the equality of the black man? He didn’t you know. All you have to do is to read the *Lincoln Douglas Debates* and that point comes through quite clearly, provided you get a copy of the unexpurgated text and not one of the newer sanitized versions. Abraham Lincoln was a racist, pure and simple. His answer to the problem of blacks in America was to ship ’em all back to Africa, or to someplace in South America—any place that would take them, because he didn’t want them here.

You have to wonder if Mayor Walsh has finally plumbed the depths of Lincoln’s racism. However, in the case of Faneuil Hall, named after a slave owner, Walsh favors keeping that name. He doesn’t want that changed. I’d be willing to bet that if he was the mayor in some Southern city he wouldn’t be able to get the name changed fast enough, but, in Boston, a historical building named after a slave owner is okay with him.

On the other hand, let’s leave the name of the building the same. In the long run that reflects that the North had as big a hand in slavery as the South did, maybe even bigger, because all the slave trading ships that brought slaves over here from Africa originated in the North, mostly Massachusetts, Rhode Island and New York.

This is something the leftists never talk about—slavery in the North—but it existed, every bit as much as it did in the South. The North just got rid of most of it a little bit earlier that’s all, but our current crop of “historians”—so called, don’t want to deal with that. It doesn’t fit their agenda for trashing the South for their sin of slavery if you have to admit that the North shared in that sin, and occupied the even more heinous sin of bringing the slaves over here to begin with. Southerners may have bought them, but the Northerners “brung ’em.” And quite a few of them ended up in the North.

It’s about time the leftists started dealing with that fact of life. And then there is the case of blacks owning other blacks as slaves, which was quite a common experience around the country, and there were American Indians that owned black slaves also. None of this is ever dealt with but it has been documented. In fact there is a book out there called *The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist* written by Annie Heloise Abel and printed by the *University of Nebraska Press*. The leftists ought to be able to find this one

really easily and check it out—but they probably won't. It doesn't fit their agenda of “white racism” so it will be ignored.

Many on the left continue to be a mass of contradictions. Get rid of a statue of Lincoln who was supposed to be their “great emancipator” (he wasn't) but keep the name of a building named for a slave owner.

Way back in 2013 I did an article on this blog about slavery in Rhode Island and it seems today that someone discovered it all over again because it has gotten over 40 views today, seven years after I posted it. Shows you the value of leaving these articles up. You never know who will end up discovering, or rediscovering them.