

University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

Honors Theses

Student Research

1998

Leadership and the war between the states

Matt Cobb

University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cobb, Matt, "Leadership and the war between the states" (1998). *Honors Theses*. 1348.
<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1348>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND LIBRARIES



3 3082 00655 8851

Leadership and the War between the States

By

Matt Cobb

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, Virginia

May, 1998

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA 23173

University of Richmond

Leadership and the War between the States

Presented to


Dr. Ciulla

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

By

Matt Cobb

13 April 1998

 **LIBRARY**
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
VIRGINIA 23173

Leadership and the War between the States

A firestorm swept the United States of America in the 19th century culminating in a bloody war which engulfed the nation. The causes of the War between the States have been debated since the fighting ceased, yet most historians agree that there are three major issues which the war was fought over. These include: state versus federal rights to govern, slavery, and sectionalism. The spark which instigated the conflict occurred in the presidential election of 1860 in which the Republican candidate, Abraham Lincoln, defeated a trio of Democratic challengers. Within weeks, much of the lower South had seceded from the Union with the Upper South following suit with President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers after the onset of hostilities at Fort Sumter, South Carolina on April 12, 1861.¹ Any hopes of a peaceful solution to the conflict disappeared after this date, and the need for leadership skyrocketed as each side clamored to fill leadership positions in the military while beginning to train others to fill the void.

At the outset of hostility in 1861, the United States Army stood at 16,367 officers and men.² Although such a small number of trained soldiers stood ready to forcibly reunite the eleven states comprising the Confederate States of America to the Union, few recognized what a difficult and long war it would be. Many in the North viewed the situation as a rebellion which would be quelled in three months time. The Unionists recognized their relative strength when

¹ William C. Davis, Battle at Bull Run: A History of the First Major Campaign of the Civil War, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 4.

² Ernest and Trevor Dupuy, The Compact History of the Civil War, (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1960), 27.

compared with that of the secessionists because of their manufacturing strength and enormous population size.

...The population of the eleven seceding states consisted of 5,500,000 whites and 3,500,000 Negro slaves. There were 22,000,000 inhabitants in the twenty-two Northern states...The ratio of available combat manpower was about five to two in favor of the North. The North, in both manufacture and agriculture was an economic entity capable of supporting a protracted war³....

This indicates that the Union could muster a larger military force than the Confederacy. It was extremely rare for the armies to be of equal size during any battle, often the Northern army would have a huge statistical advantage. Plus, the huge manufacturing advantage in the North seemed to spell doom for the South from the beginning. "The North, with its vast manufacturing and agricultural resources, would have little trouble in supplying clothing, equipment and food to its armed forces...The major supply source of the Confederate armies...would be by capture from the Union armies."⁴ These disadvantages were damaging to the Southern armies, but were not the ultimate reason for the demise of the Confederacy. Leadership was the primary reason that the North won the war, and it was the reason that the armies of the Confederacy were able to successfully defend their nation during the four years of war and with the disadvantages they faced.

The importance of the major generals to the war effort on each side is immeasurable, and no one disputes the vital role which their leadership played in the outcome of the Civil War. This paper will explore the leadership of the three major generals in command of the primary armies of the Confederacy and Union. The leadership of Confederate General Robert E. Lee, and

³ Dupuy, 29.

⁴ Dupuy, 30.

Union Generals George B. McClellan, and Ulysses S. Grant played a major part in determining the course of the war. This paper will explore the concepts of servant and charismatic leadership, and their applicability to Civil War leaders designated by this study. It will also view the various powers of influence used by these leaders to achieve their established goals. One of the more fascinating topics of inquiry is that of followership. This paper hopes to analyze the success in which these leaders served as followers, and to see how they supported and raised up their own followers. There are also three leadership issues which shall be examined and provide further insight in the leadership of not only the men listed above, but of countless others who fought and died for what they believed in. The development of new leaders is an important issue which will help in the examination of the leadership evident at this time.

I. Servant Leadership

The concept of a Servant Leader is fascinating because it seems to be an oxymoron. How can one be a servant if they are to lead? This seems even stranger when placed in the context of military leaders. Robert Greenleaf argued that “The servant-leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead.”⁵ Individuals such as Jesus Christ, Mohandas Gandhi, and Martin Luther King Jr. immediately seem to fit the definition for servant leaders. Each individual involved with the military serve their respective commanders, government, and country. This

⁵ Robert K. Greenleaf, “Servant Leadership,” J. Thomas Wren, ed., The Leader’s Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 22.

does not make every military leader a servant leader. Rather, it is the reasoning behind their actions which demonstrate the qualities of a servant leader.

With the secession of the lower South from the Union, Colonel Robert E. Lee was placed in a difficult position. Colonel Lee's reputation had been made during the war with Mexico and he was summoned to Washington D.C. on April 18, 1861 even as the Virginia legislature began meeting to discuss secession. Lee was offered command of the enormous federal army which would be used to quiet the rebellion in the South. The offer was rejected, and the next day Virginia's secession was official. Lee resigned his commission rather than take up arms against his state and the South on April 20, 1861.⁶ In his resignation letter from Federal service to General Winfield Scott, Robert E. Lee wrote that "I shall carry with me to the grave the most grateful recollections of your kind consideration, and your name and fame will always be dear to me. Save in the defense of my native State, I never desire to draw my sword."⁷ Lee was torn between the North and South, but felt a commitment to his home. On April 23, Robert E. Lee was offered command of Virginia's forces, and demonstrates in his acceptance speech a servant mentality:

...I accept the position your partiality has assigned me, though [I] would greatly have preferred your choice should have fallen on one more capable. Trusting to Almighty God, an approving conscience and the aid of my fellow citizens, I will devote myself to the defense and service of my native State, in whose behalf alone would I have ever drawn my sword...⁸

⁶ Burke Davis, Gray Fox: Robert E. Lee and the Civil War, (New York: Rinehart and Company Inc, 1956), 12-14.

⁷ Ibid, 9

⁸ The Wartime Papers of R.E. Lee, ed. Clifford Dowdey, (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1961), 11.

Robert E. Lee demonstrates his desire to be servant first by having preferred the position go to one more capable than he, but he would be honored to serve the state in whatever capacity possible. This continues with his desire to serve only in defense of his state. It was his wish to serve only in defense of his country, and that willingness to serve allowed him to step forward and lead the armies of Virginia, and eventually of the Confederacy. Robert E. Lee could have chosen to retire to his plantation in Arlington, Virginia and allowed the war to pass him by, but his willingness to serve and protect his state led to Lee's action. Lee wanted to avoid a war, his acceptance speech clearly demonstrates his reluctance to fight, but he desired to serve his beloved Virginia and that led to the action he took.

Lee's servant nature towards his followers can still be seen after fighting the war through his surrender at Appomattox Courthouse in April of 1865. General Lee needed to serve his soldiers, and the best way he could accomplish that was by surrendering the army and ending any future suffering for the men who followed him. Lee wrote in General Order, No 9 to his troops, "but feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that would compensate for the loss that must have attended the continuance of the contest, I determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen."⁹ There was no longer any real hope for victory, and even if it could be attained the price was too high. Lee demonstrated his continued service to the men by surrendering them at Appomattox.

George B. McClellan was the man the North turned to lead their forces after the rejection of General Lee. After a successful campaign to help liberate the territory which would later become West Virginia, McClellan entered Washington as a hero. He was soon thereafter

⁹ The Wartime Papers of Robert E. Lee, 934.

assigned to the command of Union forces in Virginia and the District of Columbia. In a letter to his wife, McClellan wrote:

...I find myself in a new and strange position here-President, Cabinet, General Scott and all deferring to me-by some strange operation of magic I seem to have become *the* power of the land...I see already the main causes of our recent failure-I am sure that I can remedy these and that I can lead these armies of men to victory...I will endeavor to enclose with this the "thanks of Congress" which please preserve. I feel very proud of it. General Scott objected to it on the ground that it should be accompanied by a gold medal. I cheerfully acquiesce in the Thanks by themselves, hoping to win the medal by some other action¹⁰....

The implications of this letter are quite obvious. He refers to himself as the power of the land, and believes that he is the right choice to lead the Union to victory. This hardly sounds like what one would expect from an individual who wished to serve first. McClellan as this paper will explore further in later sections believed that it was his place to lead, not to serve or follow. There is very little humbleness in his letter when compared to that of Lee. Whereas, Lee was willing to accept the post offered, but wished a more deserving candidate would be chosen, McClellan indicates that he was worthy of the position and the power which came with it. It can be inferred that he was willing to serve for his country, not because they requested it, but because he deserved it.

It seems that McClellan enjoyed the glory and power of his position too much to be a servant leader. General McClellan apparently allowed his reputation and ability to go to his head. Shortly after his appointment to lead the Union troops, he was at a dinner party with a variety of dignitaries. McClellan wrote that he entered the room "with the old General leaning on me-the old veteran (Scott) and his young successor; I could see that many marked the

¹⁰ The Civil War Papers of George B. McClellan: Selected Correspondence, 1860-1865, ed. Stephen W. Sears, (New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1989), 70.

contrast.”¹¹ This quote indicates that McClellan clearly viewed himself as the man of the hour, the leader of the future. The dinner party continued and the British ambassador referred to McClellan as the next president of the United States.¹² With all the praise and adulation that McClellan was receiving, it is understandable that his ego was growing, yet from the very beginning it did not seem as if he was interested in being a servant leader because he was performing a service to his country with the focus being on the benefits which would be received for leading.

McClellan would probably have been repulsed by the idea that he was a servant, but he did serve his soldiers. McClellan was always concerned for the well being of his troops. He would delay taking military action until he was certain that the risk to his followers would be minimal. During the Peninsular campaign, McClellan moved slowly and only attacked when convinced he outnumbered the Confederates at that particular spot. This slow, deliberate approach demonstrates how he served to protect his troops. However, McClellan did not maintain a servant mentality when dealing with his superiors. On June 25, 1862, shortly after the battle of second Manassas, McClellan writes that “If I save this army now, I tell you plainly that I owe no thanks to you or any other persons in Washington. You have done your best to sacrifice this army.”¹³ McClellan is not viewing his actions as serving his country, rather, he understands his job to save the army. The difference between the words serving and saving is

¹¹ Stephen W. Sears, George B. McClellan: The Young Napoleon, (New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1988), 96.

¹² Ibid, 96

¹³ Mitchell, Joseph, Military Leaders in the Civil War, (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1972), 16.

important when exploring the servant attitude of leaders. To save someone is to rescue them, to salvage a situation, which is quite different from being a servant. A leader can save a situation while still maintaining a servant mentality and focus, yet McClellan is unwilling to view himself as a servant. Rather, he sees himself as a savior.

On March 9, 1864, Union General Ulysses S. Grant received the commission of lieutenant-general thus promoting him to the highest ranking military position in the country as he now commanded all of the Federal armies.¹⁴ General Grant was promoted to a rank which had previously not existed, but unlike McClellan, Grant did not allow the honor to feed his ego, he desired only to serve his country to the best of his capabilities. With his military successes in the Western theater at Forts Henry and Donnelson and the Battle of Shiloh, Grant had fast entered the limelight of the American public. It took a concerted effort on the part of the general to finally dissipate the talk of his running for President in the election of 1864, because Grant believed he could best serve the country while he was in the army. Grant even discussed turning the promotion to Lieutenant-General down because he feared it would trap him in Washington, and he wanted to serve his country and men by being at the forefront of the conflict.¹⁵ Grant wanted to serve his country, not accept any positions or be seen as a figure head, rather, he wanted to do the best job he could to end the war and reunite the union.

¹⁴ Ulysses S. Grant, Personal Memoirs of U.S. Grant, (New York: Charles L. Webster and Company, 1894), 404-405.

¹⁵ Bruce Catton, Grant Takes Command, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968) 104-110.

A major difference between Generals Grant and McClellan was the ability of Grant to recognize the importance of others. Shortly after receiving news of his promotion, Grant dispatched a letter to Generals Sherman and McPherson in which he stated:

...Whilst I have been eminently successful in this war in at least gaining the confidence of the public, no one feels more than me how much of this success is due to the energy, skill, and the harmonious putting forth of that energy and skill, of those who it has been my good fortune to have occupying a subordinate position under me...but what I want is to express my thanks to you and McPherson as the men to whom above all others, I feel indebted for whatever I have had of success. How far your advice and suggestions have been of assistance, you know. How far your execution of whatever has been given you to do entitled you to the reward I am receiving¹⁶....

General Grant recognized that the reason he had gained public support, and the reward of a promotion was due to the effectiveness of his subordinates as followers, and as leaders. In essence, Grant was showing thanking his followers for their servant leadership, and by doing this he was demonstrating his servanthood to his men.

The impression of the historian John Lothrop Motley had after meeting Grant probably best describes how Grant was a servant leader: "I cannot get over the impression he made on me...that of entire loss of self-hood in a great aim which made all the common influences which stir up other people as nothing to him."¹⁷ The impression that Grant made on people was that of an individual who cared more about his country and duty than about himself. Personal achievements meant very little in comparison to his service to the country.

II. Charismatic Leadership

¹⁶ Ibid, 123.

¹⁷ Ibid, 119.

There are many different views and definitions of charismatic leadership. All the definitions refer to a variety of traits, or actions which a charismatic leader might take. Each of these theories and traits can fall into three components of charismatic leadership. These are Envisioning, Energizing, and Enabling. If a leader can meet the three components, then it is probable that he or she is charismatic. During a war, charisma is often valued in a leader, and the three major generals of the American Civil War seemed able to provide the charisma desired.

Envisioning “involves the creation of a picture of the future, or of a desired future state with which people can identify and which can generate excitement...the leader provides a vehicle for people to develop commitment, a common goal around which people can rally, and a way for people to feel successful.”¹⁸ Simply having a vision is not enough to be considered a charismatic leader. One must also have the ability and the rhetorical skills to cause the followers to believe in the attainment of the vision. A Charismatic leader would “...stir dissatisfaction with the present while they build support for their picture of a new future...Although the leader’s message is important, so is the way it is communicated.”¹⁹ It is this ability to develop and communicate a vision which allows one to reach out and unite followers behind the vision.

¹⁸ David A. Nadler and Michael Tushman, “Beyond the Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change,” J. Thomas Wren, ed., The Leader’s Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 109.

¹⁹ Richard Hughes, Ginnet, and Curphy, Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience, (Burr Ridge: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1993), 437.

Robert E. Lee was a visionary in that he saw a Virginia at peace as a goal to be achieved. Lee united his men behind the vision of their homes, their families, and their state. In order to protect and serve these things they must repel the Northern invaders and fight for their freedom. His short term visions were for successful campaigns and winning battles in unorthodox manners, Lee was a risk taker who had a vision of how the battle should go, and more times than nought it went his way. General Lee assumed command of the Army of Northern Virginia with its backs facing the gates of Richmond in Spring, 1862, with a numerically superior force in his front. Instead of bracing for a siege as most generals would have done in this situation, Lee went on the offensive attacking McClellan and forcing him back during the Seven Days Battle. Later that summer, shortly after the Confederate victory at Second Manassas, the Southern army launched an offensive into Maryland in the hopes of alleviating Virginia from the pressures of war. Lee had the vision of gaining support in the border state of Maryland during the offensive. With a solid victory, the Confederacy could hope for the intervention of European countries. This vision was shared by all the Southern troops who marched into the North, and they marched into Maryland with optimism for the future. Once again outnumbered, Lee chose to split his army into two forces and send one to attack Harpers Ferry while the other would delay the Union force. Although this vision would not be attained as the Army of Northern Virginia withdrew from the North after the battle, the troops still hoped for victory.

McClellan was also a visionary, although his vision was often doubted by those around him. McClellan's vision was for a war in which his brilliance alone would win, and he would continue in the public's eye until his death. McClellan disagreed with the three prong assault planned by General Winfield Scott at the outset of the war. He was in favor of one massive

army to serve as a juggernaut against the Southern states. His vision was for an army of 273,000 troops to march South and take each of the major Confederate cities. McClellan argued that with the addition of garrison and reserve forces, he would need direct control over three quarters of the 500,000 men that had been authorized to quell the rebellion.²⁰ This vision was never officially approved by the Federal government, and McClellan failed to achieve it although he continually asked for more troops even as his army exceeded 100,000 combatants.

McClellan was quite capable of transferring his vision to the troops. Not the strategy above, rather, he was able to cause the men to see themselves as the finest equipped and grandest of all armies. He helped mold this vision to his troops through their extensive periods of training and their grand reviews. On November 20, 1861, as McClellan organized a review of 65,000 troops with bands playing, and cannons firing in salute. The spectacle was attended by more than 30,000 people including President Lincoln, his cabinet and many other dignitaries mixed with the commoners who composed the remainder of the crowd.²¹ Reviews such as this did wonders for the Army of the Potomac as they heard the thousands cheering for them and read in the papers of how grand and marvelous they were. McClellan did his best to stroke the egos of his troops and make them believe in themselves and their purpose of fighting the Confederacy. For all the speeches, reviews, and training, little action was taken which caused some wavering of belief in McClellan's vision amongst the troops and the government. McClellan had spread his vision of a grand army to his men, and they became eager to act and

²⁰ Stephen W. Sears, 98-99.

²¹ Stephen W. Sears, 134.

end the rebellion. As time passed, many troops, as well as the government, began losing faith in McClellan due to the inactivity of the Army of the Potomac.

Ulysses S. Grant envisioned a reunited Union. His vision was clear and his methods of attaining it were equally apparent. General Grant spent little time parading his army, instead, he made sure his force was prepared and then marched South and into battle. It was his willingness to fight and show a commitment to achieving his vision that endeared men to him. One of the way his vision was transferred was in the "...relentless way Grant reached out to take soldiers from the bombproof Washington garrison and add them to the fighting force." He was attempting to "...get every available man into the field as early as possible."²² Grant took men from the defenses of Washington and other garrisons in an effort to strengthen his force, not because he feared a larger Confederate force as McClellan had, but because he wanted to fight and continue to fight the Southern soldiers. The ideal example occurred at the Battle of the Wilderness in the Summer of 1864. The Army of the Potomac fought, and suffered terrible losses. Grant's vision was demonstrated to his troops in his commitment to fight the South. Rather than retreating as previous generals had, Grant chose to bring the full force of the Union army against the Confederates. His refusal to accept defeat, and willingness to face enormous losses if it meant victory, won many of Grant's soldiers to share his vision.

The second component of charismatic leadership is the ability to energize others behind the vision or goal. The energizing component includes such things as seeking, finding and using

²² Bruce Catton, 163.

success, expressing personal confidence and demonstrating excitement.²³ A Charismatic leader will “build trust in their leadership and the attainability of their goals through seemingly unshakable self-confidence, strength of moral conviction, personal example and sacrifice of unconventional tactics or behavior.”²⁴ This second component is equally important in determining whether or not a leader can be considered charismatic.

Robert E. Lee replaced the wounded Joseph Johnston, during the Peninsula campaign, on June 1, 1862. Lee sent an order to the soldiers of the Army of Northern Virginia announcing his replacement of General Johnston. Lee wrote of his disappointment over the loss of Johnston and that “He hopes his absence will be but temporary , and while he will endeavor to the best of his ability to perform his duties, he feels he will be totally inadequate to the task unless he shall receive the cordial support of every officer and man.”²⁵ General Lee was attempting to gain the support of his disheartened troops at the outset, but it was with the first of numerous victories over the Seven Days Battle that succeeded in energizing the Confederate soldiers as the Union army was pushed from the gates of Richmond back down the Peninsula. Lee was successful in seeking, finding and using success with some unorthodox tactics as the undermanned Army of Northern Virginia went on the offensive against the much larger Union force. While success in battle won the hearts of the troops, General Lee gained support from his officers after calling them all together shortly after taking over and discussed his plans and listened to their ideas.

²³ David A. Nadler and Michael Tushman, “Beyond the Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change,” J. Thomas Wren, ed., The Leader’s Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages, (New York: The Free Press, 1995), 109.

²⁴ Richard Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy, 438.

²⁵ Ed., Clifford Dowdey, 181.

This allowed Lee to succeed in energizing his officer corp because “the field officers who were to lead the Army of Northern Virginia felt themselves vital parts of the growing force; they had the feeling that the commander knew their problems and valued their opinions.”²⁶ Meetings such as this built trust between General Lee and his officers and allowed them to see the confidence that he had in them, the common soldiers, and himself. With the belief that their commander was committed to victory and was willing to trust them, they became energized for the future of the Army of Northern Virginia.

There are many examples which demonstrate the success General Lee had in energizing his men. In early summer, 1864, the army of Northern Virginia clashed with the Army of the Potomac during the first offensive led by General Grant at the Battle of the Wilderness. The Wilderness was an area of thickets, trees, and vines which made vision and coordination nearly impossible. It also helped to negate the huge size advantage that the Federal force had. On June 5th, after a bloody battle, the Confederate force was pushed back, disorganized, with units scattered across the battlefield. Many of the soldiers began to withdraw from the field anticipating a retreat and the disorientation of the troops made defeat a real possibility. General Lee recognized the disarray which threatened to destroy his army and moved to organize and lead the counterattack himself. “But the soldiers would have none of it. One of them grabbed the horse’s bridle, and led the fuming general back down the road, while his comrades shouted: ‘General Lee to the rear, General Lee to the rear!’²⁷ The men rallied and moved to attack. The presence of Lee and his willingness to risk his own life energized the troops. Their love for the

²⁶ Burke Davis, Gray Fox, (New York: Rinehart & Co. Inc., 1956), 80.

²⁷ Dupuy, 292.

general and desire to please him led to their reorganization and counterattack which saved the Confederate army from destruction. Their counterattack succeeded in stopping the Federal advance, but the Northerners did not retreat as General Grant used his numerical superiority to flank the Confederates and force them to retreat. They cared for their leader so much that they refused to enter battle with him at the front because of the likelihood he would be killed.

Another example occurred at the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia at Appomattox Courthouse on April 9, 1865. As Lee returned to his army after surrendering to Grant, the gloom, disappointment, and despair that hung over the air was lifted as he approached. One of Lee's soldiers, Charles Blackford described the scene.

...When they saw the well-known figure of General Lee approaching, there was a general rush from each side of the road to greet him as he passed, and two solid walls of men were formed along the whole distance. As soon as he entered his avenue of these old soldiers, the flower of the army, the men who had stood to their duty through thick and thin in so many battles, wild, heartfelt cheers arose which so touched General Lee that tears filled his eyes and trickled down his cheeks as he rode his splendid charger, hat in hand, bowing his acknowledgments. Many expressions of confidence and affection were given...One man, I remember, extended his arms, and with an emphatic gesture, said, "I love you just as well as ever, General Lee!"²⁸

The valiant men who comprised the Army of Northern Virginia had just lost the war which they had fought so dearly for. Yet, the presence of General Lee energized and brought them to cheers.

General McClellan also saw the importance in energizing his troops. The personal confidence that McClellan had can be seen in his return to command the Army of the Potomac

²⁸ Blackford, Charles, Memoirs of Life In and Out of the Army in Virginia During the War Between the States, Ed. Susan Blackford, (Lynchburg, VA: J.P. Bell Company, Book, Job and Commercial Printers, 1896), Appendix V.

for the second time. McClellan upon hearing of his commission wrote his wife that “Again I have been called upon to save the country.”²⁹ McClellan never lacked self-confidence, and that was something which was contagious among the troops. One of McClellan’s strengths was in his ability to build trust among his soldiers. Between the building of confidence of his troops with the grand marches and parades, McClellan himself “believed morale was related directly to the confidence officers and men felt in the general commanding: if they believed in him they would believe in the tasks he set for them.”³⁰ How did the man who would become known as “Little Mac” accomplish this? McClellan would “often stop to chat casually with a squad or company. He might ask the men if they were ‘ready for a brush’ with the Rebels, and when they shouted that they were, he promised to risk it with them.”³¹ It was this ability to energize his troops by building trust and showing self-confidence which helped McClellan achieve some charisma. However, as time passed his men were itching for a battle, yet they were still endeared McClellan for the good care he provided them.

Ulysses S. Grant had self-confidence in his plan to defeat the South because of his recognition of the disparity between the two sides in regards to manpower, and economics. By taking the war to the South he was guaranteed eventual success if nothing else than for the attrition which would occur in the Southern army. He sought out and found success on the battlefield, and it served to provide him with the best way of building trust and energizing soldiers. When Grant took command of the Army of the Potomac, he had the reputation of a

²⁹ Ed., Stephen Sears, 435.

³⁰ Stephen Sears, 110.

³¹ Stephen Sears, 97.

winner from his exploits in the Western theater where he earned the nickname of “Unconditional Surrender” Grant for forcing rebels to surrender unconditionally at Fort Henry and Donelson. He took the army, and demonstrated that they were going to be used and they were going to fight the battles necessary to win the war. During the campaign for Richmond, numerous battles were fought with dreadful losses for the federal forces, yet “the army remained capable of rapid movement, and its morale seemed to be as high as ever because when all was said and done the soldiers felt that they had made genuine progress in a month of campaigning.”³² Although the army was losing enormous numbers, the men were still confident because they had been winning engagements with the Army of Northern Virginia and were marching towards victory. As one Union soldier said, “Grant does not know how to retreat...confidence is unbounded in him.”³³ This confidence and desire to win was contagious among the troops and helped energize them for continued bloody battle. He provided the men with tangible success which energized them because they had never achieved that under their previous leaders.

The third component of a Charismatic leader is that of Enabling. This occurs when the leader is capable of demonstrating personal relations with the followers, and expresses confidence in their troops.³⁴ This might be the most difficult component to achieve in that expressing confidence in ones troops often means allowing them to make their own decisions.

General Lee was very accessible to his men. He cared for his men tremendously as demonstrated in his first actions in 1861 which were to ask the governor of Virginia about the

³² Bruce Catton, 268.

³³ Bruce Catton, 268.

³⁴ Ed, J. Thomas Wren, 109.

arrangements that were being made to properly supply the troop.³⁵ Lee was concerned over the lack of supplies being sent by the states to the troops because the Confederate states were withholding supplies to be used on their home guards, or militias rather than for the army. His early concerns was over the care of his troops, because if they were not taken care of, then victory could never be achieved. He also demonstrated his desire to encourage and enable his soldiers through his common dealings with them. A courier, Captain Blackford, wrote that “He (Lee) always had some word to say which cheered me, asked me questions as to where different brigades or batteries were moving, or something which, if not useful to him, made me feel of some consequence.”³⁶ Lee would enable his soldiers by making them feel important, he was able to make each individual feel as if they were making important contributions to the war effort.

One of General Lee’s greatest strengths was his ability to show confidence in his followers by trusting them to take the right actions. As his generals proved themselves, Lee would allow them to do more things independently. This did not always work out for good as demonstrated by his willingness to allow General J.E.B. Stuart to ride freely at Gettysburg to do whatever damage he could backfired when General Stuart failed to provide the main Confederate force with information on the positions of the Northern troops.³⁷ This forced the Army of Northern Virginia into a battle it was ill-prepared to fight. However, by enabling his

³⁵ Ed., Clifford Dowdey, 9

³⁶ Letter’s From Lee’s Army. Ed. Charles Blackford, (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1947), 114-115.

³⁷ The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official records of the union and Confederate Armies, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), 923.

subordinates to make their own decisions, and by expressing confidence in their decisions, secured Lee his greatest victory.

The Battle of Chancellorsville was the crowning achievement of Lee's enabling of followers. General Lee was discussing strategy with General Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson. He proposed a flanking maneuver by which a large contingent of Confederates would move down the battle line and attack the exposed flank of the Union army. "Since the moment Lee suggested it, the move had grown in Jackson's mind. He had no intention of merely rattling Hooker, of trying to distract the Federals...He meant to destroy the Union army."³⁸ Jackson had thought the plan over and wanted to enlarge it. During the maneuver, Lee would be left with 14,000 troops versus the 70,000 Union soldiers. His response to this was two words: "Go on."³⁹ Lee did not know exactly how Jackson's plan would work or if it would even be successful, yet he had confidence that if Jackson recommended it then it could be done.

McClellan definitely lacked the enabling quality of a charismatic leader. Although he had good relations with the troops and could inspire confidence in them, he simply could not enable his followers to take the initiative. Shortly after being assigned command of the Army of the Potomac in 1861, he wrote his wife: "I must ride much every day for my army covers much space, and unfortunately I have no one on my staff to whom I can entrust the safety of affairs."⁴⁰

³⁸ Ernest Furgurson, Chancellorsville 1863: The Souls of the Brave, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1992), 142.

³⁹ James Robertson Jr, Stonewall Jackson: The Man, The Soldier, The Legend, (New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan, 1997), 714.

⁴⁰ Ed., Stephen Sears, 95.

If McClellan could not trust his staff to look after the army when it was simply training in the outskirts of Washington D.C., how could he hope to enable others during battle? The answer is simple, he did not expect anyone else to step forward during battle. He had that little confidence in the capability of his men to lead while having extreme confidence in his own leadership abilities. McClellan was angry that the president had intervened and appointed corps commanders because he had planned on assigning people to the position after they had proven themselves in battle. This would mean that McClellan himself would be directing over 130,000 men himself in the first major engagement.⁴¹ This never occurred due to the presidential intervention and the forcible institution of officers to lead segments of McClellan's army. It does not seem as if McClellan had confidence in anyone but himself.

General Grant seemed to relate more with Robert E. Lee in this component than he did with McClellan. Grant encouraged and rewarded his troops for taking actions on their own. As they showed their ability, Grant's confidence would build and they would be given even more daunting challenges to pursue. General Phil Sheridan is a prime example of this. The feisty cavalry commander showed his ability at the battle of Chattanooga. The union force was trapped in the city of Chattanooga with the Confederate forces entrenched in the mountains surrounding the city. His men were sent to storm Missionary Ridge, but after taking the first line of rifle pits, he realized his orders were vague and sent for clarification. While waiting he chose to continue pushing forward and eventually took Missionary Ridge from the deeply entrenched Confederates.⁴² This sparked confidence in Sheridan as Grant recognized his ability to lead men

⁴¹ Stephen Sears, 161.

⁴² Bruce Catton, 82-83.

and think for himself. Later, at the Battle of the Wilderness, General Sheridan told his superiors that if it were left to him he would take his cavalry and “whip” J.E.B. Stuart. When Grant heard of this, his response was: “Did Sheridan say that?...He usually knows what he is talking about. Let him go ahead and do it.”⁴³ Grant did not know what actions Sheridan would take, but he had the confidence in his subordinates that he was willing to allow him to take action without understanding what the plan was.

III. Powers and Influences

There are a variety of Powers and Influences which can be used by a leader to enforce his will or to help motivate the followers towards the goal or objective. These are:

- 1) Reward Power- the ability to mediate the distribution of positive or negative reinforcers
- 2) Coercive Power- the capacity to dispense punishments to those who do not comply with requests or demands.
- 3) Legitimate Power- Authority that derives from the power holder’s legitimate right to require and demand compliance.
- 4) Referent Power- Influence over others that is based on their identification with, attraction to, or respect for the power holder.
- 5) Expert Power- Power that derives from others’ assumption that the power holder possesses superior skills and abilities.⁴⁴

It is interesting to note that the generals all shared certain powers. As in any organization, the military, uses a variety of methods to motivate soldiers to work towards the goal. This paper will focus on reward, coercive, and legitimate powers because of their importance in a military environment.

⁴³ Ibid, 216

⁴⁴ Donelson Forsyth, Group Dynamics, (Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1983), 182.

Each of the leaders being examined demonstrated the use of Reward power through their ability to reward their respective followers through a variety of means. A soldier could be rewarded in many different ways during the Civil War. The first was through commendation such as medals, awards, and special recognition during parades or military reviews. Another way in which the leaders could exert reward power is through promotions. The military is a hierarchical structure with ranks ranging from the lowest common soldier to the general in command of all Union or Confederate forces. Soldiers were often rewarded for their efforts to perform their duty to the best of their ability in the hopes of attaining the goal shared by all in the military. A soldier could be promoted through a variety of levels for officers and common soldiers. This upward mobility also provided means through which individuals could attain success and elevate themselves from low to high status in the military which could translate to a higher social status after the war. Another intriguing way in which troops were rewarded by their commanding officers was by placing units in a position of honor for battle. For example, shortly before the second battle of Manassas took place, Captain Greenlee Davidson company was transferred. Captain Davidson wrote home that:

...General Lee in anticipation of a fight has assigned my company temporarily to General [Winfield S.] Featherstone's Brigade. The Brigade is one of the best fighting commands in the army and is always sent in the advance. I consider it a compliment to be assigned to such a Brigade.⁴⁵

Companies, Battalions, and even entire corps often considered their placement in the army or in a battle as a reward. Captain Davidson, and his company, believed that they were rewarded for their valor in previous engagements by being assigned to a brigade steeped in success and

⁴⁵ "Captain Greenlee Davidson: Letters of a Virginia Soldier." Ed. Charles W. Turner. *Civil War History*, Vol. XVII, No. 3. September, 1971, 205.

prestige that was known for leading the charge. Casualties in those brigades were often high, but it was considered an honor to be trusted to be the first Union or Confederate unit to engage the enemy.

Another type of power exerted by the generals of this study was that of coercive power. Coercive power has been defined as the ability to punish those who fail to comply with the instruction of leaders. Lee, McClellan, and Grant all exhibited coercive power as a means to keep the army in line. The greatest sin that a soldier could commit next to treason was that of desertion in the face of the enemy. Reasons for desertion varied which led to the designation of troops as Absent Without Leave (AWOL). These were soldiers who were not present but not believed to have deserted. This most often occurred after battles when soldiers were separated from their comrades due to the confusion that set in on a battlefield, or when troops were faced with a family emergency and would rush home without getting proper authorization. It occurred as men would go visit loved ones who lived near the army encampment or while they were out foraging for much needed supplies and food. This was a problem that was rampant in both Union and Confederate armies. A Union soldier, John Billings, wrote that “there was no time in the history of the Army of the Potomac, after its organization by McClellan, when it reported less than one-fourth its full membership absent without leave.”⁴⁶ Soldiers were most often reprimanded and their permanent military records would record that they were AWOL and list the dates that they were missing from active duty.

⁴⁶ Soldier Life in the Union and Confederate Armies, Ed. Philip Van Doren Stern, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961), 107.

General Lee had final authority over the executions since the soldiers had appealed their punishment. Jackson argued that the punishments should not be overturned because then the troops would see this as an opportunity for them to disobey military orders and law without fear of consequences. General Lee agreed with Jackson on this case and approved the three death sentences. Thus, coercive power is seen as a means of punishing troops and demonstrating to the remaining soldiers that not following the orders of the leaders potentially could be met with punishment. Edward Moore, a cannoneer under Jackson viewed these executions “as a warning to others, the whole division was mustered out to witness the painfully solemn spectacle.”⁵⁰ Making the entire division view the executions as a warning was in effect demonstrating that the leaders have the write to punish the troops.

Although those guilty of being separated from their units for short periods of times were often not punished, those guilty of other offenses were often severely punished. In the Federal army, a soldier who was labeled a coward would be drummed out of camp. Billings writes that “Whenever a man’s courage gave out in the face of the enemy, at the earliest opportunity after the battle he was stripped of his equipments and uniform, marched through the camp with a guard on either side...while a fife and drum corps brought up the rear.”⁵¹ In this situation, the leaders would attempt to instill courage in the troops by punishing cowards. The men were stripped of all military belongings and humiliated as they were marched out of camp in front of their fellow troops to the tune of the fife and drum. This demonstration of coercive power was

⁵⁰ Edward Moore, The Story of a Cannoneer Under Stonewall Jackson, (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1907), 99.

⁵¹ John Billings, 106.

effective in that it would make a soldier think twice before fleeing during a battle. Most Civil War companies were organized by states, counties, and cities before being attached to the army. This meant that they were humiliated in front of neighbors, friends, and family. Word would certainly reach their homes about the incident and they would be haunted by their actions for the rest of their lives.

Legitimate power is another which is prevalent in the military during the Civil War. The followers had to believe that the leaders had the right to order them. The War Between the States can almost be viewed as a war over legitimacy. Generals Grant, and McClellan were able to exert legitimate power because their soldiers had taken an oath to their country. They believed that the United States was the lawful government, and it was fighting against the states which had illegally withdrawn from the Union. This belief in the validity of the United States transferred Legitimate power to the leaders of their armies, because the valid government had placed those officers in leadership positions.

The same holds true for the Confederates. They were fighting for what they believed to be the legitimate government, and thus the legitimate leaders of the military. After the war, Robert E. Lee was questioned by the Congress of the United States and was asked if the South had committed treason by seceding. Lee replied that "most Southerners believed secession had been the responsibility of the states rather than of individuals...The act of Virginia, in withdrawing herself from the United States, carried me along as a citizen of Virginia; her laws and her acts were binding on me."⁵² The Southerners who recognized the Confederate States of America would acknowledge that government as having legitimate power over them. 286 out

⁵² Marshall Fishwick, Lee After the War, (New York: Dood, Mead, and Co., 1963), 121.

of 1,036 United States Army officers resigned their commissions and joined the Confederate military when the Confederacy was first formed.⁵³ The recognition of legitimacy is seen in the actions of these officers.

...With the flagrant exception of General Twiggs' treasonable surrender in Texas, these officers honored their oath of allegiance to the United States until their actual departure from their posts. The great majority were most meticulous in turning over their commands and accounts in strict conformity to regulations⁵⁴ ...

The Southern officers granted legitimacy to the government of the United States with power over them as long as they actively served in the army. The legitimate power that the United States had over these men was recognized by most and because of it they honored their commitment and oath to the government of the United States until their resignations were accepted and they could leave their post. These troops honored the legitimacy of the United States by performing their duties and handing over their command without having undermined it or purposely caused any damages. These soldiers even returned the equipment granted them by the government, even though it would have been of great benefit to the Confederate military.

As the soldiers gained confidence in their leaders and began respecting what they were doing, then the leaders gained referent power. Expert power is something each of these generals had because it was assumed that they would each possess it, although whether or not General McClellan actually held expert power is a question.

IV. Followership

⁵³ Dupuy, 28.

⁵⁴ Dupuy, 29.

Richard Hughes, Robert Ginnett, and Gordon Curphy argue that “People are motivated to meet five basic sorts of needs.”⁵⁵ The five stages form a hierarchy and has been referred to as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. The lowest stage is that of Physiological needs, then Security needs, Belongingness needs, Esteem needs, and finally Self-actualization needs. These five stages of need should be provided for if one wishes to successfully motivate followers

The first stage of physiological needs is simply the basic needs for survival, they include food, shelter, and water. General Lee and the Confederacy did the best they could to provide the soldiers with all of these items, although as the war ran on, they began to lose the ability to take care of the troops, so rations began to shrink. The Rebels often went without having their basic needs met, but because of the success they achieved in battle, the men were willing to survive on the bare necessities. However, when the end drew near for the Confederates, the inability to meet these needs began to effect the followers. They were no longer winning on the field of battle, so the higher level needs, such as esteem, were not being met. This made it much more difficult for the followers to survive off the minimum fulfillment of physiological needs. The surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia occurred after Federal cavalry under General Sheridan captured several trainloads of rations meant for the Confederates, they had little choice but to capitulate because they could not even care for their most basic needs.⁵⁶ The two Confederate invasions of the North were done for a variety of reasons, one of which was to

⁵⁵ Richard Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy, “Understanding and Influencing Follower Motivation,” J. Thomas Wren, ed., The Leader’s Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages, (New York: The Free Press, 1995) 328.

⁵⁶ Frank P. Cauble, The Surrender Proceedings, (Lynchburg: H.E. Howard, Inc, 1987), 122.

for the future. Lee continued to serve, to lead, and he did it by attempting to heal the wounds of a divided nation. In honor of Lee for his service to the state and to the college, the school changed its name to Washington and Lee. After a failed presidential bid in 1864, McClellan retired although he consistently tried to remain in the eye of the public. In 1877, he was nominated for the governor of New Jersey, a post to which he was quickly elected. Although he never served in the capacity of President as the British ambassador had predicted back in 1861, McClellan made the best of his situation and contributed greatly to the state of New Jersey.⁶⁴ He successfully guided the state through difficult economic and political times before retiring to write his memoirs. General Grant would continue in the public's eye as well as he accepted the nomination for President of the United States where he served two terms in office. Grant viewed things such as this as an opportunity to continue to serve his country and although his administration faced many controversies and scandals, he was always willing to serve his country in whatever capacity possible.

VI. Leader Development

It is amazing how important leader development is in a conflict such as the civil war. The attrition rate for leaders at all levels were quite high because they could die from disease or battle on any given day. The development of leaders in the Northern and Southern armies is very interesting and goes a long way in explaining the armies and where they stood during the war.

⁶⁴ Stephen Sears, 396-397.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, the South had numerous military leaders step forward because they had resigned their commissions in the United States Army, or had served as instructors at a variety of military academies. From the early stages of the war, Southern leaders were given more leeway and independence to act. Stonewall Jackson, and J.E.B. Stuart struck havoc at the Union forces with their freedom to move and make decisions based on their situations. This offered a stark contrast to the Union army who under McClellan had no freedom of leadership, nor were efforts made to develop young leaders because McClellan felt that only he could lead the army to victory. It is no wonder that leaders such as Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan emerged from the Western theater where Grant had allowed his commander some autonomy and as they proved themselves more and more.

As the war progressed and Southern leaders died, fewer and fewer people stepped forward to fill those positions. With the loss of Stonewall Jackson at the Battle of Chancellorsville, there was no development of new leaders to replace him, and those who filled his role often failed. The Army of Northern Virginia, under Lee, also did a good job of developing leaders. Lee quickly focused on the likes of Generals Stonewall Jackson, and J.E.B. Stuart who proved themselves on the battlefield and to the men. Jackson especially was a success in whom Lee could entrust the most daring of plans. Historians familiar with the faith Lee had in Jackson wrote that "So long as Jackson was alive, there was never any doubt in Lee's mind to whom he should entrust the most daring venture."⁶⁵ The important distinction is that this held true while Jackson was alive. General Lee had grown so accustomed to his subordinates being effective followers that when Jackson died, he never developed anyone to

⁶⁵ Joseph Mitchell, 75.

replace the missing leadership. Jackson died of wounds received at the Battle of Chancellorsville when he was accidentally shot by his own men while scouting ahead of the army. In the ensuing Northern invasion, General Lee suggested that General Ewell take the high ground. He did not make it an order because he was used to having someone like Jackson taking a suggestion and effectively carrying it out with their personal expertise and additions to the plan. This was a crucial mistake in the battle, because once the Union gained control of the high ground, there was little chance for victory by the Confederates. It was the loss of trained, effective leaders and the failure to train replacements that began to cost the Confederates at major engagements. The South had started the war developing many leaders, but as the war progressed it became harder for them to develop and once that process broke down, they began to lose more battles which eventually cost them the war. Defeats at Gettysburg, Atlanta, and Petersburg can be attributed to the failure to develop new leaders. The Union progressed on an opposite course. They started out losing many battles during the war because they did not do a good job of developing leaders. However, as the war progressed and they began to develop the likes of Sherman and Sheridan who could operate independently and still achieve the desired goals secured victory for the Northern force.

While McClellan was in command of the Eastern Theater for the Union forces, he did not believe in enabling others. As demonstrated in the earlier quote, McClellan wanted to command all of the troops without delegating responsibility to any other leaders. This failure to develop new leaders hindered the war effort for the Union. McClellan was replaced as commander of the Army of the Potomac on two different occasions. His replacements fared little better against Robert E. Lee and the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia. McClellan

had failed to develop these individuals as leaders, and they learned from observing McClellan lead the army. The result of this was a mixture of ideas on what proper action should be. General Burnside was overly aggressive, most likely from observing McClellan's hesitancy. This led to his leading the Army of Potomac in an unwise assault on the entrenched Confederate troops at Fredericksburg. The resulting blood bath led to his replacement with General Hooker. "Fighting Joe" Hooker was also more aggressive, yet he did not cover the details which McClellan did, thus leaving him susceptible to the flank attack by Stonewall Jackson. Finally, General Meade fought the Confederates to a standstill at Gettysburg, yet he had adopted the slowness of McClellan and did not pursue the weakened Confederates.

This led to the appointment of General Grant as commander of the Army of Potomac. Grant spent the early years of the war fighting in the Western theater where McClellan had little control and even less interest. This freedom from the influence of McClellan allowed Grant the freedom to develop and train his subordinates. A testament to the Grant's development of leaders in the West lies in those individual leaders' success as independent commanders. When Grant assumed command of the Army of the Potomac, he brought many of his corps commanders from the West with him. He also chose to place key subordinates in positions where they could demonstrate their own leadership abilities. He placed General William Tecumseh Sherman in command of an army and gave him free reign with the only orders being to advance towards Atlanta and cut the heart out of the Confederacy. His Cavalry commander Phil Sheridan was given freedom to maneuver and engage the Confederate cavalry as he saw fit. Grant had recognized the ability of these men and entrusted them to make correct decisions in order to secure the future of the war.

The generals on both side would stand by the decisions of their followers. General Lee trusted Jackson, or Stuart to make independent decisions and to lead the troops to the best of their ability. Grant, did the same. When General Sherman's treaty with General Johnston was not approved by the government, Grant was ordered to go down and take over. Secretary of War Stanton, "ordered Grant to take over personal command of Sherman's armies. Grant, refusing to do this, soon calmed ruffled feelings."⁶⁶ Grant joined Sherman in North Carolina, but allowed Sherman to continue negotiating by himself. General Grant was available as a resource for Sherman to use in coming to terms with the surrender of the Confederate Army led by General Joseph Johnston. He trusted the decisions and efforts of his subordinates and did not interfere, Grant was just present to offer his opinion and expertise when Sherman needed it.

VIX. Conclusion

Many individuals have associated the success that the Confederacy had early in the war with the leadership of its generals. They also assume that the demise was due to the seemingly overwhelming advantage that the North had in regards to manpower, and manufacturing capabilities. Although the North did have a large advantage, it was their leadership that ultimately won the war for the Union. As the war dragged on, the South began to lose its leadership edge as the North found a general who was equally capable of leading.

It seems that when examining the wide variety of types of leadership, traits, and powers that the primary military leader in the South, Robert E. Lee, had a sizeable advantage to that of his adversary, George B. McClellan. McClellan failed to train new leaders, he did not search for

⁶⁶ Dupuy, 417.

effective followers, nor did he effectively follow his superiors. Rather, McClellan seems to have viewed himself as the only one truly capable of leading the Army of the Potomac to victory. McClellan's failure to successfully lead his troops to victory, and the same failure which his subordinates had when they had the opportunity led to the introduction of General Ulysses S. Grant to the Eastern theater.

It is interesting to see that in a hierarchy, such as the military, when the commanding officer fails to lead, then his subordinates are not prepared to lead, and the troops cannot effectively follow. General Grant was operating in the Western theater of the War between the States and created his own system of leadership. When Grant was promoted and transferred to command of the Army of the Potomac, the only thing which changed was the leaders at the top of the command structure. Yet, the men who comprised the Army of the Potomac did not change. These followers were not transplanted from the West. Rather, they for the first time had strong leadership which allowed them to become more effective followers and allow them to fulfill the goal of winning the war.

The system of leader development that Robert E. Lee used was quite similar to the one Grant had in the West. Lee and Grant both allowed their subordinates to prove themselves in battle and slowly take more and more responsibility until their followers were effective leaders. With the death of Stonewall Jackson, General Lee failed to replace him because he found no one capable of stepping right into the same place Jackson held. General Lee treated the variety of generals who attempted to replace General Jackson as if they were of the same mold. He did not slowly bring anyone along, he continued to order them the same way he would have ordered Jackson. At Gettysburg, Lee suggested that Ewell take action knowing that if it had been

Jackson that order would have provided the freedom to take the initiative and win the battle. Yet, Ewell had not developed to that point yet and needed strict orders. The lax in leader development greatly hurt the South in the latter portion of the war.

Once the Army of the Potomac obtained effective leaders, they were able to bring the full weight of the North against the Army of Northern Virginia. With sound leadership, Grant was able to make the manufacturing and manpower disadvantage devastating to the Southern cause. It was the leadership of both sides which shaped the course of the War between the States, and ultimately decided the outcome. The Civil War provided an outlet for many leaders to develop. Many of the leaders of the war, continued to lead after the war in an effort to heal the wounds and make the Union whole. Leaders on both sides, Lee with his work in education, Grant and McClellan in their political lives all made a difference in the post war era. Just as their leadership made a difference to the men whom they were endeared to. Their names will live on in the annals of American history as men who were willing to lead when the country most needed leadership.