his offensives on his men. In this respect in can be thought that Haig’s leadership had a negative impact as it would appear he did lack regard for human life.

Furthermore, Haig’s leadership can be seen to have had a short term negative impact in World War One because he was not well liked by his troops which can be seen to have lowered morale. Morale is an important factor in warfare as higher morale means winning the war is more likely as soldiers have a reason to continue fighting and so are less willing to accept defeat in battles against the enemy. From source E which states ‘I never saw Haig’ and that there was a ‘gulf between the officer staff and the fighting army’ it can be inferred that Haig was disliked by the common soldier. If a ‘gulf’ was present this meant that officer staff and foot soldiers were less likely to cooperate fully or effectively which would minimise chances of winning battles and ultimately the whole war against Germany. As Haig was the Chief Field Marshall his presence would be necessary for soldiers to feel a sense of worth and importance form his visited but if he was ‘never’ seen then in fact the opposite would be felt by troops and consequently would lower morale and make them less tolerant of Haig’s decisions which resulted in mistakes such as higher death tolls. Friction with the army is undoubtedly a negative impact of Haig’s leadership. However, whilst it is true that Haig was not a popular man source E is written from the memoirs of a single soldier so may not represent the feelings of all the soldiers present in the army at the time and may be biased because of the emotional ordeal he suffered as a consequence of the decisions made at higher levels within the army. These views should not be disregarded though as they may reflect the views of others at the time and offer an insight into army life for the common man who was of course the most plentiful type of soldier in World War One.