

FORWARD!

THE LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES OF ULYSSES S. GRANT

DR. CRAIG VON BUSECK



Birmingham, Alabama

Chapter One

LEADING IS SERVING

The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy. — Martin Luther King Jr., from the speech “Strength to Love.”¹⁸

Before Abraham Lincoln finally found his general in the person of Ulysses S. Grant, he endured several officers who failed their troops, their president, and ultimately their country because of their self-centered leadership style. To fully appreciate Grant’s approach to leadership and the reasons President Lincoln eventually chose him to lead, it is helpful to compare him to the commanders who preceded him.

General Irvin McDowell: As the result of pressure from his mentor, Secretary of the Treasury Salmon Chase, General Irvin McDowell was pushed into command of the Army of Northeastern Virginia despite a lack of experience commanding troops in the field. This led to the disastrous defeat of Union troops at First Bull Run.

Later, McDowell became a corps commander under General John Pope. In 1879, a board of review commissioned by President Rutherford B. Hayes attributed much of the loss in the Second Battle of Bull Run to McDowell’s indecision, lack of communication, and inept behavior. The commission found he failed to deliver vital communication to one of his key commanders, Fitz John Porter, he failed to forward intelligence of Southern General James Longstreet’s position to General Pope, and he neglected to take command of the left wing of the Union army at a critical moment in the battle.

General George B. “Little Mac” McClellan: Other than Douglas MacArthur, there may have never been a more insubordi-

nate commanding general than George McClellan. While he was unsurpassed in the preparation of troops, when it came time to take them into battle, he was inexplicably slow and cautious. In utter frustration, President Lincoln declared, “If General McClellan isn’t going to use his army, I’d like to borrow it for a time.”¹⁹

At another time, the president reportedly declared, “I would be willing to hold McClellan’s horse if he would only give us victories.”²⁰

On one occasion, President Lincoln, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton, and presidential secretary John Hay paid a visit to McClellan at his home. They were told that the general was out at the moment and were invited to wait in the parlor for his return. After an hour, McClellan entered through the front door and was told by a porter that the president was waiting. McClellan ascended the stairs to his room without saying a word to his guests. Amazingly, after Lincoln waited another half hour, he was finally informed that McClellan had retired to bed.

Hay felt that the president should have been greatly offended, but Lincoln replied it was “better at this time not to be making points of etiquette and personal dignity.” Lincoln, however, made no more visits to the general’s home after the discourteous snub.²¹

McClellan, on the other hand, was exceedingly disrespectful to the president, at various times calling him a “coward,” “an idiot,” and “the original gorilla.” He privately referred to Lincoln, whom he had known before the war as a lawyer for the Illinois Central Railroad, as “nothing more than a well-meaning baboon” and “ever unworthy of ... his high position.”²²

On September 17, 1862, McClellan’s Army of the Potomac fought Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia to a standstill at the Battle of Antietam near Sharpsburg, Maryland—the bloodiest day of the war. While the Yankees suffered approximately 12,400 casualties, McClellan still had plenty of fresh troops that were never used in the fight. The Confederates, on the other hand, were greatly damaged—losing 10,320 casualties—which was a larger

percentage of their total troop strength.²³ That forced Lee and the crippled Army of Northern Virginia to retreat into Virginia.

For six weeks after Antietam, McClellan ignored Lincoln's urging to pursue Lee. In late October, McClellan finally began moving, but he took nine days to cross the Potomac. By that time, Lee's forces were safely guarded behind well-constructed entrenchments. Lincoln had enough. He was convinced that "Little Mac" could never defeat Lee, and on November 5, 1862, Lincoln fired George McClellan.

After his removal, McClellan battled with Lincoln yet again—for the presidency in 1864. In a moment of poignant irony, Lincoln defeated McClellan with the support of the majority of the soldiers in McClellan's old command, the Army of the Potomac.

General John Pope: In Ken Burns's documentary, *The Civil War*, Shelby Foote explained that many people saw General John Pope as a liar and a braggart. "Yes," said Abraham Lincoln of the accusation, "I knew his family back in Illinois. All the Papes were liars and braggarts. I see no particular reason why a liar and a braggart shouldn't make a good general."²⁴

Sadly, General Pope was not the strong leader Lincoln was seeking. After the disastrous defeat at Second Bull Run, Pope was sent to Minnesota to fight in the Indian wars.

General Ambrose Burnside: Unlike Pope and McClellan, some Union officers understood their limitations—and Ambrose Burnside was one of them. In contrast to many of the other leading generals of the time, Burnside did not want to be in command. But Lincoln chose Burnside to lead the Army of the Potomac despite the general turning down the appointment two previous times.²⁵ Yet once he was in command, Burnside determined to aggressively lead the army against the rebels and show the fighting spirit McClellan lacked.

On a frigid day in December 1862, Burnside directed the Army of the Potomac to cross a pontoon bridge across the Rappahannock River to attack the Confederates in Fredericksburg, Virginia—walking into Robert E. Lee's well-laid trap. When the battle was

over, the Union had endured 12,653 casualties, including 1,284 killed. In the aftermath of that bloodbath, Lincoln wrote, “If there is a worse place than hell, I am in it.”

Burnside was reassigned a month later.

General Joseph Hooker: “My plans are perfect,” General Hooker said before going into battle against the Army of Northern Virginia. “May God have mercy on General Lee, for I will have none.”²⁶ Unfortunately, this was yet another historic example of pride coming before a fall. Hooker’s attack at Chancellorsville ended in a Union debacle—and Lee’s most brilliant victory in the war.

Abraham Lincoln soon lost confidence in Hooker, and he was eventually replaced.

General George Gordon Meade: The final commander of the Army of the Potomac was George Meade, a competent administrator who took charge only three days before the critical Battle of Gettysburg.²⁷ While he was often short-tempered, Meade was a loyal, industrious, and subservient commander. He ably led Union forces to victory at Gettysburg, but he did not aggressively pursue the badly damaged Confederate army—much to Abraham Lincoln’s consternation. Meade later initiated a feeble attack against Lee in northern Virginia in the winter of 1863, but he turned back when he saw the seemingly impenetrable rebel fortifications at Mine Run.

Lincoln respected Meade, but he was looking for a general who would aggressively pursue Lee and not turn back. Unlikely as it seemed to officers who knew him at West Point and in remote West Coast garrisons, Lincoln found that leader in General Ulysses S. Grant.

FAILING FORWARD

With ten years of failure and disgrace behind him, Ulysses S. Grant could have been just a tragic and forgotten figure of history, but he rose from near obscurity to become one of America’s greatest leaders. How did Grant achieve so much in his remarkable life?

First, let's establish a working definition of leadership. In his aptly titled book, *Leadership*, James MacGregor Burns offers this description:

Leadership is leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent *the values* and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their *followers' values* and motivations.²⁸

One reason Grant caught Lincoln's attention is that they both appeared to have the same values and motivation. Unlike the seemingly timid McClellan, Grant was an aggressive fighter.²⁹ But Lincoln also observed in Grant a man who truly cared for his officers and his men and a commander who put the cause ahead of his own personal ambition. Today, leadership scholars would identify this as the behavior of a servant leader.

ULYSSES S. GRANT: SERVANT LEADER

Just as God placed natural laws in the universe, like the laws of gravity and thermodynamics, he also provided principles of wisdom and leadership that are equally unchanging. While these leadership principles have existed from creation, they have recently been discovered and defined by scholars, much as the natural laws were discovered by scientists.

By pairing the principles now accepted by leadership scholars as “best practices” with the actions and behaviors of great leaders of the past—like Ulysses S. Grant—we can learn much about why such a person overcame adversity and rose to a position of prominence in a time of crisis. Through this study, we can then apply these universal principles to our lives and experiences to hopefully gain success as well.

Robert K. Greenleaf was a pioneer in the leadership philosophy that has come to be known as servant leadership. One of his students, Larry Spears, extracted from Greenleaf's writings a set of

ten characteristics of the servant leader. It is fascinating to see that more than one hundred years earlier, Ulysses S. Grant displayed all ten of these characteristics in his military leadership during the Civil War.

1. Listening. According to Greenleaf, the servant leader seeks to identify the will of the group and helps to clarify that will. “He or she listens receptively to what is being said and not said. Listening also encompasses hearing one’s own inner voice. Listening, coupled with periods of reflection, is essential to the growth and well-being of the servant leader.”³⁰

Grant was a listener. It was one of his greatest attributes. He would talk too—eventually. Once he became comfortable with you as a friend, he became a veritable raconteur.

General Lew Wallace recorded his impression of Grant’s calm demeanor just prior to the assault on Fort Donelson: “From the first his silence was remarkable. He knew how to keep his temper. In battle, as in camp, he went about quietly, speaking in a conversational tone; yet he appeared to see everything that went on, and was always intent on business. He had a faithful assistant adjutant-general [John Rawlins] and appreciated him; he preferred, however, his own eyes, word, and hand. . . . At the council—calling it such by grace—he smoked, but never said a word.”³¹

In 1864, after several months of fighting and travel with the Army of the Potomac, Grant had grown quite comfortable in the presence of his staff officers and corps commanders. Horace Porter described Grant’s behavior at headquarters during those challenging days: “While the general’s manners were simple and unconstrained, and his conversation with his staff was of the most sociable nature, yet he always maintained a dignity of demeanor which set bounds to any undue familiarity on the part of those who held intercourse with him. . . . He was scrupulously careful under all circumstances not to neglect the little courtesies which are the stamp of genuine politeness.”³²

2. Empathy. “One assumes the good intentions of coworkers and colleagues and does not reject them as people,” wrote Greenleaf,

“even when one may be forced to refuse to accept certain behaviors or performance. The most successful servant leaders are those who have become skilled empathetic listeners.”³³

Although Grant tried for three years to run a farm, he failed to make it productive. Then, in October 1857, the American economy went into a free fall. In one of the worst depressions in American history, thousands of banks closed along with tens of thousands of businesses and farms. Millions of Americans lost their jobs. Even the small amount of money Grant made selling firewood dried up.

To purchase Christmas presents for his wife, Julia, and their three children that year, Grant pawned his gold watch. A fourth child, Jesse, arrived two months after Christmas, increasing the financial burdens. Grant continued to make a go of the farm until his health gave out in the summer of 1858. He lacked the strength to work the land and the money to hire laborers. He eventually rented out the farm and went to work for a local real estate company as a rent collector.

During these years, Grant experienced grueling poverty, so he had empathy for those suffering the same plight, especially during an economic depression. This characteristic made Grant a tender-hearted person, but it also made him a poor rent collector. Soon he packed his family and moved to Galena, Illinois, to work in his father's leather goods store.

Yet even in those dark days, Grant looked out for his fellow man. For example, a laborer who had worked for Grant at the farm had his mule seized to satisfy a court judgment. When the mule went up for auction, Grant purchased it for fifty dollars and returned it to the original owner. Unfortunately, the writ called for a “change of possession,” so the mule was seized again. Once word of Grant's generosity spread in the community, no one bid against him at the auction, and he bought the mule again—this time for just five dollars. Since no change of possession had occurred, the mule was seized for the third time. Grant bought it again, paying only one dollar. He advised the owner to take it to another county and trade it for another mule. Even if that didn't work, Grant declared, “I am

going to have that old mule even if I have to buy it once a week all summer!”³⁴

3. Healing. Although extending healing to others is a part of being human, servant leaders recognize that they have an opportunity to help make others whole. “There is something subtle communicated,” wrote Greenleaf, “to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant leader and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share.”³⁵

In the spring of 1865, Abraham Lincoln was beset with illness and exhaustion after four years of war. “I’m a tired man,” he told a friend. “Sometimes I think I’m the tireddest man on earth.”³⁶

Unable to rise from bed, he was forced to hold his cabinet meeting in his bedroom. Photographs from the time show the careworn look on his face, making him look far older than his years. “It looked care-ploughed, tempest tossed and weather beaten,” observed Horace Greeley.³⁷

Reading similar comments in the newspapers, Julia Grant suggested that her husband issue an invitation for the president to visit them at City Point. By that time, Grant and Lincoln had grown to be more than just partners in the war—they had truly become friends. Ulysses agreed that a vacation from Washington would be a refreshing break for the careworn leader. “Can you not visit City Point for a day or two?” Grant telegraphed Lincoln on March 20. “I would like very much to see you, and I think the rest would do you good.”³⁸

With his wife, Mary, and their son Tad, he took a steamboat to Grant’s headquarters at City Point. There they met their eldest son, Robert, then serving on the commanding general’s staff, at the wharf with General Grant. Surrounded by the Army of the Potomac and the Army of the James, Lincoln enjoyed one of his best vacations during his time in the White House.

Sadly, it would be his last.

4. Awareness. “Awareness is not a giver of solace,” wrote Greenleaf, “it is just the opposite. It is a disturber and an awakener.

Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their own inner serenity.”³⁹

Serving as quartermaster for his regiment early in his career, Grant traveled on the journey from New York to California with the 650 soldiers of the Fourth Infantry, along with sixty army wives and twenty children. Unfortunately for Grant and his unit, a cholera epidemic had broken out in Panama shortly before they left New York. The unit surgeon had warned the War Department that it would be “murder” to send the regiment into a cholera zone, but he was overruled.

As they made their way across the Isthmus of Panama, the cholera epidemic was in full strength, with dead and dying railroad workers clustered in huts all along the track. The regimental commander left Grant in charge of the women, children, and the sick—along with all the regimental baggage—while he forged ahead with the healthy soldiers. As Grant’s group trudged along the muddy trail, cholera took its toll.

“Almost every mile between the Atlantic and the Pacific, Grant had to bury someone in the mud,” writes biographer Geoffrey Perrett. “Grant himself avoided cholera by never touching water and drinking only wine. He urged others to do the same and the soldiers tended to heed his advice, but the women and children were likely to ignore it—the sign of what looked like attractive springs gushing pure, cool water was too tempting. But the springs were polluted by cholera sufferers who had tried to wash away the traces of diarrhea from their clothes and their bodies. And it was not only the water that spread the disease. So did the flies, which transported it from the feces of the dead to the food of the living.”

On July 26, Grant and the survivors arrived at the Pacific Ocean. Of those who had set off from the Atlantic port of Cruces two weeks earlier, one in three had perished. According to one officer, Grant “took a personal interest in each sick man. [He was] a man of iron, so far as endurance went, seldom sleeping, and then

only two or three hours at a time. . . . He was like a ministering angel to us all.”

The ordeal haunted Grant for the rest of his life, and he became convinced that no one should ever be forced to go on such a dangerous, primitive journey. In his first message to Congress as president, Grant called for a canal to be built across Panama to carve “a path between the seas.”⁴⁰

5. Persuasion. “The servant leader seeks to convince others, rather than coerce compliance. This particular element offers one of the clearest distinctions between the traditional authoritarian model and that of servant leadership. The servant leader is effective at building consensus within groups.”⁴¹

If there was ever a time that required the skill of persuasion, it was during the preparations for the assault on Vicksburg. As a centerpiece to his plan of attack, Grant asked the navy to run the dangerous rebel batteries perched high on the bluff above the Mississippi River. Whatever ships survived would then ferry the army in an amphibious crossing downstream. When Grant announced his strategy to his generals on March 30, William Tecumseh Sherman, his most trusted subordinate and friend, shook his head in disbelief. Grant’s plan broke many of the rules they had learned at West Point. Ulysses understood this, but he was a pragmatist—one of the reasons he had been somewhat half-hearted in his study of strategy at West Point. Grant knew then, as he understood during the war, that not all circumstances fit neatly into textbook theory.

Sherman preferred returning north to Memphis and moving south on the overland route through central Mississippi. But this would be a tactical retreat, and Grant didn’t like to retreat (more on this key trait in another chapter). Though daring, Grant believed his plan would work.

“Grant is brave, honest, & true,” Sherman had concluded earlier that month, “but not a Genius.”⁴²

“To anyone who would listen,” writes biographer Brooks Simpson, “he [Sherman] recited his doubts about running the batteries and coming at Vicksburg from the south, ending with the almost

fatalistic rejoinder that he would obey orders. Believing that Grant was down to his last chance, he distanced himself from his friend's proposal even as he professed his loyalty."

Sherman handed Grant a written protest of the operation, making sure his concerns were placed in the official record. And Grant was okay with that.

In the end, Sherman went along with Grant's bold strategy. "Whatever plan of action he may adopt will receive from me the same zealous cooperation and energetic support as though conceived by myself."⁴³

"It was a daring plan," writes Simpson, "made no less daring by the failure of alternatives. It was also a plan shaped by concerns not purely military. Grant knew that even the appearance of a setback might cost him his job. He was confident his plan would work. It had to work."⁴⁴

It did work—and military colleges still teach Grant's strategy to their students. True to form, Sherman gave Grant all the credit for the victory.

6. Conceptualization. "Servant leaders seek to nurture their abilities to dream great dreams," Greenleaf observes. "Servant leaders are called to seek a delicate balance between conceptual thinking and a day-to-day operational approach."⁴⁵

Colonel Horace Porter, one of Grant's most trusted staff officers, gives a fascinating description of Grant's methods for conceiving a plan of action during the Overland Campaign in Virginia:

He would sit for hours in front of his tent, or just inside of it looking out, smoking a cigar very slowly, seldom with a paper or a map in his hands, and looking like the laziest man in camp. But at such periods his mind was working more actively than that of any one in the army. He talked less and thought more than any one in the service.

He was one of the few men holding high position who did not waste valuable hours by giving his personal attention to petty details. . . . He held subordinates to a strict accountability in the performance of such duties, and kept his own time for thought. It was this quiet but intense thinking, and the well-matured ideas

which resulted from it, that led to the prompt and vigorous action which was constantly witnessed during this year [1864], so pregnant with events.⁴⁶

That is how Grant conceived his plans for both the brilliant Vicksburg and Overland Campaigns.

7. Foresight. “This enables the servant leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future. It is deeply rooted within the intuitive mind. Closely related to conceptualization, the ability to foresee the likely outcome of a situation is hard to define but easier to identify.”⁴⁷

In May 1864, Grant ordered all the armies of the United States—more than a million men—to move out of winter camp and to advance upon the enemy. The general maintained his headquarters in the field, traveling with the Army of the Potomac and their commander, General George Meade. “This advance by General Grant inaugurated the seventh act in the ‘on to Richmond’ drama played by the armies of the Union,” said General John B. Gordon of the Army of Virginia.⁴⁸

Since the beginning of the war, the Army of the Potomac had positioned itself primarily on the eastern side of Richmond so that while fighting the battles against the rebels, they could still defend Washington, DC. This position also allowed them to transport supplies, troops, and the wounded by the various rivers flowing south-eastward toward the Chesapeake Bay and then on to Washington or Fortress Monroe.

Grant understood the importance of defending the capital, but he was also completely focused on defeating Lee’s army. He comprehended, as previous commanders had not, that to defeat Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia was to defeat the Confederacy. The only way to weaken Lee’s army to the point where it could be driven to its knees was to do what he did in Vicksburg—cut off all supplies to the enemy. Those goods flowed into Richmond nearly unhindered from the south and the west—the opposite side of

where the Army of the Potomac had focused its efforts up to that time.

Grant believed Lee would defend Richmond first and foremost, rather than pulling away to attack Washington in full force. So if he could engage the Army of Northern Virginia—and the other Union forces could keep the smaller rebel armies in check—Lee would have no forces available to attack Washington, and Grant could move around to the southern and western side of Richmond to begin the siege that would eventually choke off the supplies and defeat the rebel army.

“We can defend Washington best by keeping Lee so occupied that he cannot detach enough troops to capture it,” Grant declared.⁴⁹

Grant could hold enough troops around Washington to keep it safe from any small rebel force Lee might send against it. In a crisis, he could rush more troops from south of Richmond by water down the James River, around Old Point Comfort on the Chesapeake Bay, and then up the Potomac River to Washington. In the meantime, he would lay siege to the Army of Northern Virginia—and as General Lee warned Jubal Early—“then it would only be a mere question of time.”⁵⁰

This played out exactly as Grant foresaw it. There was a siege. One by one, Grant cut off the supply lines that fed Lee’s army. The blockade brought the Southern economy to its knees. Responding to desperate letters from home, soldiers left the Army of Northern Virginia in droves in late 1864 and early 1865 until Lee’s lines were too weak to hold back the Union forces. As Lee foresaw, it was a mere question of time.

8. Stewardship. Greenleaf’s view of institutions was one in which CEOs, staffs, and trustees all played significant roles in holding their organizations in trust for the greater good of society.⁵¹

“I want to push on as rapidly as possible to save hard fighting,” Grant wrote to Julia. “These terrible battles are very good things to read about for persons who lose no friends, but I am decidedly in favor of having as little of it as possible. The way to avoid it is to push forward as vigorously as possible.”⁵²

FORWARD!

Grant was keenly aware of his stewardship responsibilities as the general in chief—and they weighed heavily on him. To end the war, Grant understood, the Union needed to fight hard against the rebellious South to bring it to its knees. President Lincoln promised to support Grant in any way possible.

To Lieutenant General Ulysses S. Grant
April 30, 1864

I wish to express, in this way, my entire satisfaction with what you have done up to this time, so far as I understand it. The particulars of your plans I neither know, or seek to know. You are vigilant and self-reliant; and, pleased with this, I wish not to obtrude any constraints or restraints upon you. ... If there is anything wanting which is within my power to give, do not fail to let me know it.⁵³

Grant responded to Lincoln's kind letter of support with his gratitude. "I have been astonished at the readiness with which everything asked for has been yielded without even an explanation being asked." Fully equipped, Grant knew the responsibility was on him to bring victory to the Union. "It will be my earnest endeavor that you, and the country, shall not be disappointed."⁵⁴

In his groundbreaking documentary, *The Civil War*, Ken Burns describes the way Lincoln fulfilled his promise to sustain Grant in his fight with the rebels:

Near Petersburg, the Union camp at City Point on the James River suddenly found itself one of the world's busiest seaports, with bakeries, barracks, warehouses, 200-acre tent hospital, more than a mile of wharves, and a new 70-mile railroad built by Herman Haupt in record time to bring supplies and fresh troops right up to the Union trenches.

"Not merely profusion, but extravagance," a visitor wrote. "Soldiers provided with everything." An industrial machine of unparalleled power now kept the war supplies streaming to the front.⁵⁵

9. Commitment to the Growth of People. “Servant leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers. The servant leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything in his or her power to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues.”⁵⁶

By the time of the Battle of Shiloh, General Sherman understood that his old friend Ulysses S. Grant was a man of both vision and detail. He knew Grant would go into battle prepared with a strategy for victory and fully equipped with the means to achieve it. “When you have completed your best preparations, you go into battle without hesitation ... no doubts, no reserve,” Sherman wrote to Grant. “I tell you that it was this that made us act with confidence. I knew wherever I was that you thought of me, and if I got in a tight place you would come—if alive.”⁵⁷

Grant also played a key role in the personal and professional growth of numerous other commanders, including James B. McPherson, Horace Porter, Phil Sheridan, Rufus Ingalls, and George Meade.

10. Community Building. “All that is needed to rebuild community as a viable life form for large numbers of people,” Greenleaf explained, “is for enough servant leaders to show the way, not by mass movements, but by each servant leader demonstrating his or her unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group.”⁵⁸

Porter wrote of the atmosphere of community, democracy, and respect among officers at Grant’s headquarters:

“Whether receiving the report of an army commander or of a private soldier serving as a courier or a scout, he listened with equal deference and gave it the same strict attention. ... He never criticized an officer harshly in the presence of others. If fault had to be found with him, it was never made an occasion to humiliate him or wound his feelings.

“The fact that he never ‘nagged’ his officers, but treated them all with consideration, led them to communicate with him freely and

intimately; and he thus gained much information which otherwise he might not have received. To have a well-disciplined command he did not deem it necessary to have an unhappy army.”

As the siege of Petersburg dragged on, Grant changed his habits about going to bed early and began to sit up and chat with his men late into the night. “Many a night now became a sort of ‘watch-night’ with us,” Porter explained. “But the conversations held upon these occasions were of such intense interest that they amply compensated for the loss of sleep they caused.”⁵⁹

This is the servant leader Lincoln chose to bring the war to a close. Modern-day leaders can learn much from his example. Grant was able to accomplish what he did in large measure because of the character trait we will examine in the next chapter.

GRANT’S LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES

- Serve others, both individually and collectively, understanding that the achievements of the group will bring success to the individual.
- Manifest these traits in everyday behavior:
 1. Listening
 2. Empathy
 3. Healing
 4. Awareness
 5. Persuasion
 6. Conceptualization
 7. Foresight
 8. Stewardship
 9. Commitment to the growth of people
 10. Community building