... Another mode of impeaching the wisdom of emancipation, and one that seems to give pleasure to
our enemies, is, as they say, that the condition of the colored people of the South has been made
worse; that freedom has made their condition worse.

The champions of this idea are the men who glory in the good old times when the slaves were under
the lash and were bought and sold in the market with horses, sheep and swine. It is another way of
saying that slavery is better than freedom; that darkness is better than light and that wrong is better
than right. It is the American method of reasoning in all matters concerning the negro. It inverts
everything; turns truth upside down and puts the case of the unfortunate negro wrong end foremost
every time. There is, however, always some truth on their side.

When these false reasoners assert that the condition of the emancipated is wretched and deplorable,
they tell in part the truth, and I agree with them. I even concur with them that the negro is in some
respects, and in some localities, in a worse condition today than in the time of slavery, but I part with
these gentlemen when they ascribe this condition to emancipation.

To my mind, the blame for this condition does not rest upon emancipation, but upon slavery. It is not
the result of emancipation, but the defeat of emancipation. It is not the work of the spirit of liberty,
but the work of the spirit of bondage, and of the determination of slavery to perpetuate itself, if not
under one form, then under another. It is due to the folly of endeavoring to retain the new wine of
liberty in the old bottles of slavery. I concede the evil but deny the alleged cause.

The land owners of the South want the labor of the negro on the hardest possible terms. They once had
it for nothing. They now want it for next to nothing and they have contrived three ways of thus
obtaining it. The first is to rent their land to the negro at an exorbitant price per annum, and compel
him to mortgage his crop in advance. The laws under which this is done are entirely in the interest of
the landlord. He has a first claim upon everything produced on the land. The negro can have nothing,
can keep nothing, can sell nothing, without the consent of the landlord. As the negro is at the start
poor and empty handed, he has to draw on the landlord for meat and bread to feed himself and family
while his crop is growing. The landlord keeps books; the negro does not; hence, no matter how hard he
may work or how saving he may be, he is, in most cases, brought in debt at the end of the year, and
once in debt, he is fastened to the land as by hooks of steel. If he attempts to leave he may be
arrested under the law.

Another way, which is still more effective, is the payment of the labor with orders on stores instead of
in lawful money. By this means money is kept entirely out of the hands of the negro. He cannot save
money because he has no money to save. He cannot seek a better market for his labor because he has
no money with which to pay his fare and because he is, by that vicious order system, already in debt,
and therefore already in bondage. Thus he is riveted to one place and is, in some sense, a slave; for a
man to whom it can be said, “You shall work for me for what I shall choose to pay you and how I shall choose to pay you,” is in fact a slave though he may be called free man …

Under the mortgage system, no matter how industrious or economical the negro may be, he finds himself at the end of the year in debt to the landlord, and from year to year he toils on and is tempted to try again and again, seldom with any better result.

With this power over the negro, this possession of his labor, you may easily see why the South sometimes brags that it does not want slavery back. It had the negro’s labor heretofore for nothing, and now it has it for next to nothing, and at the same time is freed from the obligation to take care of the young and the aged, the sick and the decrepit …