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Abstract

The Austrian and British alliance in the Western Mediterranean from 1703 to 1708 is used as a case study in the problem of getting allies to cooperate at the strategic and operational levels of war. Differing grand strategies can lead to disagreements about strategic priorities and the value of possible operations. However, poor personal relations can do more to wreck an alliance than differing opinions over strategy. While good personal relations can keep an alliance operating smoothly, it is often military necessity (and the threat of grand strategic failure) that forces important compromises. In the case of the Western Mediterranean, it was the urgent situation created by the Allied defeat at Almanza that forced the British and Austrians to create a workable solution.
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Introduction¹

There were few wars in European history before 1789 as large as the War of the Spanish Succession. This conflict, the last and greatest of the wars of Louis XIV, saw the construction of a coalition in the form of the Grand Alliance that successfully waged the war against the Sun King for a decade. The three leading members of the Grand Alliance, Great Britain, the United Provinces, and Austria, not only coordinated attacks across multiple theatres but also combined resources beyond the mere payment of subsidies.² The military and naval forces of the three states fought alongside each other in operations in the Low Countries, Germany, Italy, and the Iberian Peninsula.

Cooperation with allies at the strategic and operational levels of military activity brings new challenges and points of contention that often require hard negotiations to overcome mutual suspicion and distrust, since there is a question of what grand strategic purpose these activities serve. The military activity of Austria and Britain in the Western Mediterranean from 1703 to 1708, which surrounded the effort to prop up the regime of Archduke Charles in Catalonia, provides an excellent case study in the problem of getting allies to cooperate in strategy and in operations. Concerns over who was shouldering the burden, logistical limitations, conflicting and contradicting grand strategic priorities with their accompanying different operational emphases along with personal feuds all contributed to the problems that threatened to undermine the Allied war effort in the region and nearly did with the catastrophic defeat of the Allies at Almanza in 1707. The battle and the Austro-British reaction to it demonstrate why it is often necessary to take a chronological approach when dealing with wartime alliances, as important decisions were made in a world

---

¹ Much of the research this article is based upon comes from the author's 2015 PhD thesis at the University of St Andrews. The author would like to thank Guy Rowlands (St Andrews) for his help in conceiving of this article and the award committee of the "André Corvisier Prize" for the opportunity to present his initial research findings here. He would also like to thank Leopold Auer (Vienna) for his assistance in acquiring certain texts and the two anonymous peer reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions.

² The use of terms "Great Britain" and "Austria" is fraught with difficulty during this time period. Before the Act of Union in 1707, the kingdom of Great Britain was the separate kingdoms of England and Scotland. I have chosen to use the term British for the sake of consistency and in recognition of the fact that even before the Act of Union, the foreign policy of Scotland and the use of its military forces abroad was directed from London. Austria is used in reference to the lands possessed by and directly ruled by the "House of Austria". This is to acknowledge some separation from the Holy Roman Empire, although it is oftentimes difficult to separate the empire's forces from the emperor's forces.
of flux in which changing military realities forced a continual reassessment of strategy. Almanza forced the Austrians and the British to act decisively in 1708 and put together a unified war effort in Catalonia that would last until the British pulled out of the war in 1712.

The approach of analyzing an alliance at the grand strategic, strategic, and operational levels is prevalent in recent literature on alliances for more modern wars, but it has been lacking in studies of the War of the Spanish Succession. Previous studies of the Austrian and British alliance were conducted in the 1970s with a focus purely on diplomacy and the political considerations at play. Much of the wider literature on Britain and Austria in the war has either focused on the political or tactical levels of the conflict, oftentimes through the lens of biography. Likewise, these and other studies have elucidated how politics influenced the direction of the war. In Britain, this was driven by the fierce debate between the Whigs and Tories, which permeates many studies of Britain and its personalities during the Spanish Succession. In Austria, decision-making was driven by the intrigues between the various factions within the Imperial court. Consequently, these studies have given us a good grasp of the...
diplomatic and political dialogue, but they do not give us a sense of how the actual conduct of the war influenced these inter-allied discussions and how the two allies (Britain and Austria) adjusted their strategies and selected operational goals, especially in consideration of the military realities. The purpose of this case study on the war in the Mediterranean from 1703 to 1708 is to show the inter-allied dialogue at the strategic and operational levels of military activity. As a result, we can better understand how the Austro-British alliance functioned militarily as well as diplomatically.

2 Grand Strategies and the Western Mediterranean

In order to understand the dynamics of the Austro-British alliance, we must first briefly explore Austria and Britain’s grand strategic goals at the war’s opening and the role the Iberian Peninsula and the Western Mediterranean played in their policies and consequent grand strategies. For the sake of space, I will not outline the debates that formulated policy but restrict this discussion to what was decided so as to provide context for what follows. The Grand Alliance was ostensibly fighting on behalf of Habsburg claims to the entirety of the Spanish monarchy with the goal of containing French power, but this did not guarantee identical grand strategies as each was shaped by each belligerent’s geography and policy. The Austrian emperor Leopold I started the war by ordering Prince Eugene’s invasion of Lombardy in 1701 with the objective of satisfying part of his dynastic claims to the Spanish monarchy. Leopold’s highest priority and main goal was to capture the Duchy of Milan for the Austrian Habsburgs. The Milanese was something that Austria could contest using its own resources. The kingdom of Naples formed the second priority for the same reasons as Milan. After the more immediate dynastic concerns in Italy, Austrian objectives in capturing the Spanish Netherlands or recapturing the territory of the Holy Roman Empire lost to France over the course of the seventeenth century required greater consideration to be paid to allies. The capture of the Iberian Peninsula itself along with Sicily, Sardinia, and the Balearic Islands was simply beyond the capabilities of an exclusive land power such as Austria and required help from a maritime power such as Great Britain.7

---

However, British naval assistance meant that Austrian goals in the Western Mediterranean were left hostage to British whims and would be overridden by any conflicting British goals. The British entered the war with greater concern for containing France and protecting British trade. The emperor’s dynastic claims were useful but not necessarily essential in achieving these objectives. The foremost British goal in the region was the protection of British trade with Italy and the Levant. This, in part, could be achieved with a friendly monarch on the Spanish throne, because this would also help facilitate British trade with Spain’s colonies in the New World and hopefully gain the British the vaunted asiento contract. However, this would not necessarily protect British trade from the regular threat of Barbary pirates or the wartime threat of Bourbon privateers (as the experience of the Smyrna convoy proved during the preceding Nine Years War). Hence, the British required a permanent naval base in the Western Mediterranean from which the Royal Navy could protect trade but also carry out further operations for the duration of the war in conjunction with the British goal of encircling and wearing down France.

It was pursuit of these goals on the part of the British that slowly drew the Austrians into making a firm commitment to the capture of the Iberian Peninsula. The bungled Anglo-Dutch attempt to capture Cadiz in 1702 forced the British to seek at least a short or medium term diplomatic solution for a naval base, especially as Austrian calls for assistance in Italy gained greater urgency when the Austrian war effort began to break down progressively.

---


10 The Austrian calls for assistance included requests for diversionary attacks by the navy and assistance for an amphibious invasion of Naples, Jarnut-Derbolav, Die Österreichische Gesellschaft, 96–102. One of the solutions explored was the use of the Adriatic port of Buccari (Bakar), Alan Cook, “An English Astronomer on the Adriatic: Edmond Halley’s Surveys of 1703 and the Imperial Administration”, Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatarchivs 38 (1985): 123–162.
diplomacy was already at work to provide another option in the form of Lisbon by bringing Portugal into the war in May 1703. Aside from an Iberian port, Portugal’s accession to the Grand Alliance opened up another front against the Bourbon powers where the Bourbon succession in Madrid could be directly contested on behalf of the Habsburgs, which the British hoped would force Austria to commit militarily to the Iberian Peninsula. The subsequent treaty of alliance with Portugal obligated the British, Dutch, and Austrians each to provide troops and subsidies, but this was simply beyond Austria’s capabilities, leaving the British to pick up their slack. However, only Leopold could provide two stipulations of the treaty: assent to the Portuguese conquest of Spanish territory and the person of the Archduke Charles as King Charles III of Spain.

There were additional costs in implementing these last two treaty obligations. First, the promise of Spanish territory risked alienating the very domestic support Charles would need for any successful bid for the Spanish throne. Second, the inability of the emperor to support militarily or financially his son in Roman Catholic Spain meant that Charles would go “to Spain with a Protestant fleet, surrounded by Protestant soldiers”. This last point had implications that went far beyond the domestic politics of Spain, Charles’ reliance on British military and financial aid gave the British significant leverage in determining strategy in the Western Mediterranean, without which most operations would be impossible. The Austrians quickly found this out in the simple question of which route Charles should take from Vienna to Spain. From the emperor’s point of view, it presented an excellent opportunity to gain the Royal Navy’s assistance in conquering Naples by having Charles go to Spain via southern Italy. However, the British saw bringing Charles to Portugal via Britain as a way of gaining further influence over the young man by personally indebting him to the Queen. The British envoy in Vienna, George Stepney, succinctly summarized British sentiments in the matter: “By this means our young Prince will be more obliged to the Queen than to his own Parents who only brought him into

14 The National Archives, Kew, London (TNA), State Papers (SP) 80/21, fo. 15, George Stepney to Charles Hedges, 6 June 1703; TNA, SP 80/21, fo. 137, George Stepney to Charles Hedges, 13 July 1703.
the world as an Archduke, whereas Her Majesty will be the Chief Instrument in placing him on a Throne.”¹⁵ In London, Charles was received with the fanfare fit for a king, and Queen Anne provided him with a regular stipend to help him maintain a court befitting his royal status until he could establish himself firmly in Spain.¹⁶

However, these realities did not mean that Charles was simply a British puppet. Ideally, Charles was the sovereign King of Spain, and the British had to respect that sovereignty, at least on the surface. British commanders were instructed to take commands and suggestions from Charles into their consideration. This meant that Charles could advocate for Austrian strategic goals in the Western Mediterranean, but the ideal was not lost on Charles. As “King of Spain”, he had his own ideas and priorities that differed from his relatives in Austria. Nonetheless, the presence of British troops meant that the British could undermine Charles’ sovereignty when it suited them. This was the case with the capture of Gibraltar in 1704.

The fortress was captured by Anglo-Dutch force under the joint command of Admiral Sir George Rooke and Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt, whom Leopold sent to London with some Imperial banners in 1702 for the Cadiz expedition.¹⁷ Hesse-Darmstadt raised the Imperial flag over the fortress, and Charles appointed him as governor. However, the garrison was entirely British and the responsibility of the port’s upkeep fell on the Royal Navy. Gibraltar belonged *de jure* to Charles, but it belonged *de facto* to Great Britain.¹⁸ This would lead to eventual British sovereignty over the fortress and its environs. If the Habsburgs wished to prevent any further partitioning of Spain along such lines, Austrian troops needed to be present in the Iberian Peninsula, but for the time being Charles’ bid for the throne could only be backed by British, Dutch, and Portuguese troops.

Although this situation was advantageous for the British in the short term, it was another question as to whether Britain could sustain the manpower commitment needed to conquer Spain for Charles. This became even more taxing once a second front was opened up in Catalonia. Men and horses died in droves in the overseas journey from the British Isles to Portugal, which caused Charles to request repeatedly throughout 1704 that Leopold send him two cavalry

---

¹⁵ TNA, SP 80/21, fo. 105, George Stepney to Charles Hedges, 4 July 1703.
regiments along with 500 hussars. The earl of Galway, the British commander in Portugal who reported this information to London, suggested that the British should back Charles’ requests since this logistically made more sense. Since these troops would be drawn out of the manpower pool in Central Europe and in the pay of the emperor, the only cost the British would have to shoulder would be their transport from Austria to Portugal, which, Galway reasoned, would cost about the same as the transport of troops from Britain.\footnote{British Library, London (BL), Additional Manuscripts (Add MS) 61121, fo. 61, Earl of Galway to Charles Hedges, 30 November 1704.}

Nonetheless, Galway’s proposal could not be entertained since the emperor was not in a strategic position that would allow him to spare any troops for Iberia. In 1704, the Austrian monarchy was caught in an existential struggle with Bavaria that culminated in the Blenheim campaign. Although the Bavarian threat was extinguished, Charles’ older brother, the new emperor Joseph I, had been left a long list of more immediate problems to be addressed in 1705. These pressing issues included the imminent collapse of the Austro-Savoyard war effort in Lombardy, a massive rebellion in Hungary, and demands by the Maritime Powers for a vigorous showing on the part of the Imperial army on the Rhine. Furthermore, the government in London was of little help since the inherent unsustainability of the British manpower system in Iberia had not yet revealed itself (and they consequently saw no cause for concern), and they, like Joseph, were growing more concerned about the deteriorating situation in Italy.

3 Peterborough and the Problem of Command in Catalonia

This concern was enough to manifest itself in a large Anglo-Dutch force under the command of the earl of Peterborough tasked with executing an amphibious operation to capture the French naval base of Toulon. The strategic benefits of the operation were twofold: the capture of the port would give Britain clear naval superiority in the Mediterranean and the operation would draw French forces away from Prince Eugene’s army in Lombardy as he made his bid to rescue the duke of Savoy from the tightening French noose around Turin.\footnote{TNA, SP 92/27, fo. 128, Richard Hill to Charles Hedges, 8 July 1705. Peterborough’s appointment for the command was more appropriate for the operation against Toulon than for the role he would actually play in Catalonia. He possessed experience in naval warfare but had little experience of land war. Moreover, his noble rank was not high enough to gain him the respect of the German counts and princes of Charles’ court. Even though
However, the British ministry was not interested in a mere diversionary attack. The capture of Toulon was the primary aim, and in order for this to happen, Peterborough’s instructions stipulated that there had to be a landward attack towards the city on the part of the Austrians and Savoyards. If this was unfeasible, Peterborough was given the option of attacking Barcelona. If these instructions did not give enough leeway for British involvement in Catalonia, the embarkation of Charles, his Austrian ministers, and Hesse-Darmstadt onto the fleet at Lisbon at the end of July only complicated matters. Charles’ personal presence created a lobby for the capture of Barcelona, and British recognition of his royal status meant that his ideas had to be entertained. This led to a heated debate in a council of war onboard the fleet, in which all the Anglo-Dutch officers, except Peterborough, voted to ignore Barcelona and continue on to Toulon. Peterborough was certain that the Austrians and Savoyards would not be able to assist the Toulon expedition anyways and, instead, argued that the force was bound to obey Charles as king of Spain.

Whether or not Peterborough used this argument in his own personal bid to be a kingmaker in Spain, his argument to gratify Charles’ pretensions to royal sovereignty quickly inconvenienced his own conduct of operations in Catalonia. After the successful capture of Barcelona, Charles began to set up a regime to rival that of Philip V, which included a military establishment. In order to maintain his royal court, Charles utilized the kingly sums provided by Queen Anne, which often arrived in Barcelona alongside the funds for the maintenance of Allied forces in Catalonia. Although Charles’ regime was financially dependent upon Britain, his chief minister, Prince Anton Florian von Liechtenstein, refused to let this reality undermine Charles’ claims to full sovereignty by attempting to control finances when they arrived in Barcelona even if it brought him into conflict with the heavy-handed and impetuous Peterborough. The feud that developed threatened to undermine the very war effort in Catalonia.

---

Peterborough saw his English peerage as making him an equal, there was a general perception that English titles were lesser than their equivalents in Europe. Galway experienced similar problems in working with the nobles of Portugal. Francis, The First Peninsular War, 152–160.

21 TNA, SP 94/75, fo. 7, Instructions to the Earl of Peterborough, 7 May 1705 Old Style (OS). The British did not adopt the Gregorian calendar until 1752; documents dated in Julian calendar are noted with an OS for “Old Style”.

22 TNA, SP 94/75, fo. 17, Earl of Peterborough to Charles Hedges, 12 July 1705 OS; TNA, SP 94/75, fo. 25, Minutes of Council of War, 22 August 1705 OS.
Liechtenstein and Charles’ other ministers used the funds to lavishly reward Charles’ loyal Catalanian subjects to help secure the political basis of Charles’ regime in a way not out of step with how monarchs of the time used royal patronage as a means to build a stable basis of power. However, Peterborough thought this was a gross misuse of funds, especially when the basic needs of the army were not being met. He accused Charles’ Austrian ministers, chief of whom was Liechtenstein, of mismanaging finances to such an extent that the soldiers lacked proper quarters and hospitals leading to the deaths of a thousand men. The dispute reached such a fever pitch that it threatened operational paralysis in Catalonia, and it forced interventions on the part of the government in London and Charles in an attempt to prevent it. The ministry in London sent James Stanhope to act as envoy to Charles in order to provide some separation between Peterborough and Liechtenstein. After several months of attempting to defuse the situation, which only got worse, James Stanhope complained to Sidney Godolphin that the only way to fix the Spanish command problems was to bring in Prince Eugene, since he would be respected universally and obeyed by all parties.

The realities of operating in Catalonia did little to calm a firebrand such as Peterborough, and there is no doubt that he witnessed the slow death of hundreds of his soldiers from disease and exposure. However, Peterborough’s accusations of criminal neglect had not grasped the true root cause of the problem, which were the serious deficiencies in the logistical system that brought British manpower to the Iberian Peninsula. The health of these men (and their horses for that matter) had already been compromised by the nature of the journey from the British Isles. The conditions on board British transport ships were often appalling, and these men had to spend weeks inside dark, cramped, wet, vermin-infested quarters while on the high seas. The end result was that

23 William O’Reilly has argued that Charles needed to institute comprehensive administrative reforms in order to undercut pro-Bourbon arguments about historical Habsburg mismanagement and, consequently, he needed to engage in this financial practice in order to make his reforms more palatable to the Spanish elites, “A Life in Exile: Charles VI (1685–1740) between Spain and Austria”, in Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II, ed. by Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte (Basingstoke, 2011), 70–72.


25 TNA, SP 94/76, fo. 1, Instructions to James Stanhope, 5 January 1706 OS.

26 Kent History and Library Centre, Maidstone, Kent (kHLC), Stanhope of Chevening Manuscripts (U1590)/O136-4, fo. 16, James Stanhope to Sidney Godolphin, 8 November 1706.
sometimes half of the troops would be lost to sickness and death upon arrival in Iberia.27

The stress caused by these dwindling numbers only amplified the turbulent relationship between Peterborough and Charles’ ministry, and this would lead to a collapse in the command structure in Catalonia. Even though in the opening months of 1706 Peterborough conducted a brilliant campaign in Valencia through bluff and manoeuvre, he had taken his army to Valencia in order to get away from Charles’ ministers and this left Barcelona open to be besieged by Bourbon forces. The Valencia campaign endangered the person of Charles, but the timely arrival of the Royal Navy under Sir John Leake allowed Peterborough to land his army near Barcelona to relieve the siege. The Bourbon army hastily retreated, and Peterborough received the credit for the victory.28 This no doubt only created a sense of validation in Peterborough and served to justify his sense of superiority towards Charles’ ministry.

By the time the army in Portugal marched towards Madrid in the spring of 1706, the open disrespect between Peterborough and Charles’ ministers was rampant. In May, Charles appointed Peterborough supreme commander of his forces in an effort to get his generals and ministers to comply with the Englishman.29 But this did little to dissuade Charles’ Austrian officers and ministers from intriguing against Peterborough. Liechtenstein used his contacts in Vienna to have Joseph’s ministry press London for Peterborough’s removal, and Peterborough later claimed that Liechtenstein intercepted all of his letters to the English envoy, George Stepney, and the Bohemian chancellor, Count Wratislaw, in Vienna.30 Moreover, as the Anglo-Portuguese army under Galway called for the person of Charles to be conveyed to Madrid, Charles’ Austrian officers, namely Count Noyelles and Heinrich of Hesse-Darmstadt, worked to

29 TNA, SP 94/76, fo. 17, James Stanhope to Charles Hedges, 9 May 1706.
30 Henry Snyder, ed., The Marlborough Godolphin Correspondence, 3 vols. (MGC) (Oxford, 1975), fo. 594, Sidney Godolphin to Duke of Marlborough, 11 June 1706; TNA, SP 94/76, fo. 64, Earl of Peterborough to Charles Hedges, 3 September 1706. There may be some merit to Peterborough’s claim, since Stepney’s correspondence makes no reference to receiving Peterborough’s letters nor did he report advocating for Peterborough at the Viennese court. However, further research is required, if this point is to be conclusively proven. Nevertheless, Peterborough’s accusation of foul play on Liechtenstein’s part underscores their mutual hostility.
undermine Peterborough’s planned advance to Madrid through Valencia and openly championed an alternate line of advance through Aragon. Peterborough did little to ingratiate himself with Charles by sending a steady stream of complaints to Barcelona, which wildly accused Charles’ ministers of obstructionism and neglect. Charles finally took offense and opted to follow the Aragonese route but not after serious delays that only helped to undermine the occupation of Madrid. The thoroughly discredited Peterborough left for Savoy before his recall order could arrive, and in his stead, Galway led the two armies in a retreat towards Barcelona.31 Harassed by guerrillas and acting on poor intelligence, Galway marched his forces to confront the recently reinforced Bourbon army under Berwick at Almanza. In the resulting battle, the Allied army was routed with a catastrophic number of soldiers either wounded, killed, or taken prisoner.32

4 Almanza’s Aftermath

The aftermath of the battle of Almanza showed that the ad hoc system that had come into place since the beginning of the Iberian war was unsustainable and unworkable in the medium term. Britain could not sustain the manpower commitment on its own nor could it provide a commander with the prestige needed to bring peace to the command structure in Spain (removing Marlborough from Flanders was not agreeable, although not necessarily unthinkable). A Parliamentary inquiry after Almanza revealed that while Parliament paid for a total of 29,395 English subject troops in the Iberian Peninsula, there were only 8,660 actually present at the time of the battle. This in part could be explained through the usual corruption endemic in early eighteenth century armies and in the realities of troop transport noted above. Yet, these issues were also compounded by the short British recruiting season, which left recruiting parties from Iberia spending more time on ships than actually recruiting soldiers in the British Isles. This, too, was not helped by the fact that Iberia was an unpopular destination for recruits.33 If the troop numbers were low before the battle, they were even lower afterwards due to casualties sustained

32 Bourbon forces received timely reinforcements thanks to Joseph I’s decision to allow the French to extract their forces from Italy following the relief of Turin in the Milan Convention of March 1707, Francis, The First Peninsular War, 244–5.
33 Burton, “Supply of Infantry”, 35–46, 55; Scouller, Armies of Queen Anne, 120.
in combat. The Dutch contingent, which was also subject to the same transportation problems as the British, had taken such a beating in the battle that it was ruined to such an extent that the United Provinces saw it as an opportunity to scale down their involvement in the Iberian Peninsula.\textsuperscript{34}

Any attempt to make the war effort in Catalonia work in a sustainable way would have to require the assistance of Austria, and this was only fair in the minds that made up the British ministry since, as they saw it, the whole war was being fought to advance Austrian dynastic goals. However, up until Almanza, aid from the emperor had been conspicuously absent in Catalonia. Charles’ presence in Barcelona certainly created an intra-Habsburg lobby in Vienna for an Austrian military commitment to assist his bid for the throne. However, as far as Joseph could see it, it was strategically unsound to divert Austrian resources towards assisting the war in Catalonia. He had far too many more immediate priorities in his strategy. The strategy of Joseph and his ministry called for securing the Austrian-Bohemian core lands first before slowly securing the theatres closest to the Austrian centre. Each step would allow Austria to project its power further and further in a more sustainable way than if Austrian forces immediately embarked on more adventurous and peripheral operations such as a descent on Naples. Joseph left as little hostages to fortune as possible by keeping Austrian troops in roles and on territory that served Austrian interests, which would not be compromised if an ally chose to make a separate peace.\textsuperscript{35}

However, this prudent prioritization came at the cost of occasionally turbulent relations with Great Britain over strategic priorities, and by the time of Almanza, Austro-British relations had grown cold. After Bavaria was defeated in 1704, the two immediate military problems facing the emperor was the French offensive against Turin and the Rákóczi rebellion in Hungary. The British fully agreed with the allocation of resources to Lombardy since these forces under Prince Eugene were being used directly against France and their success would keep the duke of Savoy in the Grand Alliance. The British went as far as to provide subsidy troops from the Palatinate and Prussia as well as loans to facilitate Prince Eugene’s spectacular success in relieving the French siege of Turin in September 1706.\textsuperscript{36} On the other hand, Joseph’s commitment

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Jones, \textit{Marlborough}, 147.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Joseph I’s biographer, Charles Ingrao, noted that, “Spain was the last entry on a long list of priorities”, Ingrao, \textit{In Quest and Crisis}, 163.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Wilson, \textit{German Armies}, 118–122; Hochedlinger, \textit{Austria’s Wars of Emergence}, 179; Hans Leo Mikoletzky, “Die große Anleihe von 1706: Ein Beitrag zur österreichischen Finanzgeschichte”, \textit{Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs} 6 (1954): 268–293.
\end{itemize}
to suppressing the Rákóczi rebellion militarily caught the ire of his British as well as his Dutch allies. They saw the commitment of forces to Hungary as a dangerous diversion from the war against France, and matters were only complicated by sympathies for the Protestants of Hungary. Hence, the Maritime Powers insisted on mediation between Joseph and his rebellious subjects as a way of freeing up troops for the west by quickly ending the conflict through a negotiated peace, which would also protect the rights of Hungary’s Protestants. Rákóczi skilfully exploited these Protestant sentiments in order to drag out the negotiations and buy his rebellion more time. Furthermore, the mediation compromised George Stepney, who began to champion the Hungarian cause openly in the Viennese court. Consequently, Joseph requested Stepney’s recall from Vienna, which took place in September 1706, but problems in finding a suitable replacement for Stepney meant that Britain did not have a representative in Vienna until June 1707.37

This lack of an official representative in Vienna did little to help British attempts to influence Austrian strategy in 1707 as disaster struck in the Iberian Peninsula. In the wake of the victory before Turin, the Godolphin ministry in London resurrected the idea of an attack on Toulon. They hoped that the operation would force France to divert troops and resources away from the Iberian Peninsula, which would help compensate for the disastrous retreat from Madrid.38 Moreover, the British did hope that the attack would help reignite the Camisard revolt in the Cevennes and consequently tie down more French troops.39 The proposed operation required a landward attack by a large Austro-Savoyard army supported by the Anglo-Dutch navy and its marines. Neither Prince Eugene nor Duke Victor Amadeus II of Savoy thought highly of the operation’s feasibility and preferred an invasion of Dauphiné, which would have the same strategic effect of drawing off French forces. But Dauphiné did not serve British purposes in the Mediterranean in the same way as Toulon, so the British forced Prince Eugene and Victor Amadeus to consent to the plan by threatening to remove the Palatine, Prussian, and Hessian troops in

38 kHlc, U1590/O137-16, fo. 2, Earl of Sunderland to James Stanhope, 28 January 1707 OS.
39 The Camisard revolt was suppressed largely by 1704, but even in 1707 the British held out hopes for a renewed rebellion in the region. An account of British attempts to aid the Camisards can be found in chapter 9 of W. Gregory Monahan, Let God Arise: The War & Rebellion of the Camisards (Oxford, 2014), 158–169.
Anglo-Dutch pay from their army, which would cripple their proposed invasion of Dauphiné.\footnote{Ciro Paoletti, “Prince Eugene of Savoy, the Toulon Expedition of 1707, and the English Historians: A Dissenting View”, The Journal of Military History 70 (2006): 945–947.}

As for Joseph and his ministers, they could appreciate the Toulon operation’s strategic value, despite Prince Eugene’s misgivings about the operational realities. Joseph could make the attack on Toulon serve his two main strategic purposes in Italy. His main goal was to secure the Duchy of Milan in the wake of Turin by keeping the French out of Lombardy and on the other side of the territories of the duke of Savoy. He was able to achieve the first through the signing of the Milan Convention in March 1707, which allowed the French to withdraw nearly 20,000 troops out of their garrisons in Lombardy back into France. This infuriated the British, since these troops could now be redeployed to oppose the attempt on Toulon or to support Philip V in Spain.\footnote{Paoletti, “The Toulon Expedition”, 945–947.} Even if this was the case, as far as Joseph was concerned, the British project to attack Toulon put the conquests in Lombardy in jeopardy if the French forces there were not neutralized first. Even if the French garrisons from Italy could reinforce the Toulon garrisons, at least the Toulon operation put the French on the defensive in Provence, and it kept the forces of Austria’s chief rival for the Duchy of Milan, the duke of Savoy, moving his troops in the opposite direction.\footnote{As a part of his accession to the Grand Alliance, Leopold I promised a slice of territory from the Duchy of Milan to Victor Amadeus II. After the French were expelled from Lombardy, Joseph I continually avoided ceding the territory, which caused such a souring of relations with Savoy that the Maritime Powers insisted on arbitration, see chapter 9 of Geoffrey Symcox, Victor Amadeus II: Absolutism in the Savoyard State, 1675–1730, (London, 1983).} Secondly, by attacking the French Mediterranean fleet at its home base, it was unlikely that the French could use their fleet to assist Bourbon territories in the Western Mediterranean. This was particularly helpful if Austrian forces were to besiege the great port city of Naples in an attempt to conquer the kingdom of the same name as a part of Charles’ inheritance (and this invasion could be done with purely Austrian resources). The Milan convention also assisted this potential operation by placing the French garrisons in France rather than in Naples. Furthermore, if the British controlled the Mediterranean, then the Austrians could use British maritime supremacy to move beyond the Italian mainland to conquer the Mediterranean islands of Sicily and Sardinia in Charles’ name. Therefore, the Austrians could use the selfish pursuit of British interests by the British for the selfish pursuit of Austrian interests.\footnote{Ingrao, In Quest and Crisis, 85–88.}
However, the British were furious at Austrian plans for invading Naples as they saw it as an unnecessary diversion from fighting France. As far as they saw it, the Naples detachment would fatally weaken the Toulon expedition. With the news of Almanza, the Toulon operation became a strategic cure-all in the mind of the ministry in London. Secretary of State Sunderland told Stanhope that the ministry saw Toulon’s capture as the only way of preventing total defeat in Catalonia. The Lord Treasurer Sidney Godolphin, for whom the operation was just short of an obsession, believed that Toulon’s capture would have completely reversed the course of the war in Spain, leading to final victory there. This attitude only made the British more adamant that the Naples expedition not take place so the troops could be used against Toulon, especially since the British had to divert their marines to Catalonia in order to shore up the defences there. Prince Eugene merely replied that the emperor had foreseen their complaints and allotted sufficient troops for the operation. The Naples operation went ahead anyways, and even though the Toulon expedition did not result in the capture of the city, the French Mediterranean fleet was destroyed in the siege. Moreover, the invasion of Provence forced a significant diversion of French troops from Spain and prevented any French attempt to relieve Naples, which quickly fell to the Austrian invasion force under Count Daun. Joseph and his ministry were correct in their strategic assumptions, and now Austria was in a position from which it could assist the war effort in Catalonia.

5 A New Allied Understanding

The best way for Austria to assist in Catalonia was to correct the manpower and command problems. The most pressing issue was ensuring there was an army to command. As early as July 1707, the new British envoy to Vienna, Sir Philip Meadows, offered transportation on British ships to Catalonia for the 8,000 men earmarked for the Naples expedition. No doubt this offer also doubled as an attempt to prevent the Naples expedition from going forward. Joseph countered that he could only spare two cavalry regiments immediately

---

44 KHL, U1590/O137-16, fo. 10, Earl of Sunderland to James Stanhope, 8 July 1707 OS; KHL, U1590/O138-11, fo. 7, Earl of Godolphin to James Stanhope, 8 July 1708 OS.
45 BL, Add MS 6151, fo. 38, The Project for attack on Toulon with the responses of Prince Eugene and the Duke of Savoy.
and after Naples was conquered, some of the units sent there.\textsuperscript{47} Joseph also told Meadows that transporting the troops to Catalonia was simply beyond Austria's capabilities. If the British were serious about getting Austrian troops to Catalonia, they would have to transport the troops themselves.\textsuperscript{48} As a counter to British attempts to derail Naples, Joseph's minister, Count Sinzendorf, suggested to Meadows that if the British wanted troops in Catalonia so badly, then they could use troops being used to support British interests (namely Toulon and the duke of Savoy). The British could transport the Palatine troops in Anglo-Dutch pay currently involved in the Toulon expedition.\textsuperscript{49}

Joseph and his ministers were serious about sending Austrian troops to Catalonia, but it had to be on Austrian terms. By September 1707, the Austrian hereditary lands were secure to the point where Joseph could consider sending Austrian troops further away. Not only was Naples conquered, but the rebellion in Hungary had been seriously undermined. Once Joseph spurned Anglo-Dutch attempts at mediation in 1705, he was able to appoint Count Guidobald Starhemberg, second only to Prince Eugene in talent and reputation, over an increased army establishment in Hungary in order to break the back of the Rákóczi rebellion. In 1707, Joseph had to increase the size of Starhemberg's army in order to monitor the movements of the unpredictable Swedish King Charles XII whose forces were operating just across the border in Poland and Saxony in the parallel Great Northern War.\textsuperscript{50} Once an understanding was reached with Charles XII, Joseph's government expressed a willingness to start sending troops over to Catalonia, but at that point, the British fleet was on its way back to England for the winter.\textsuperscript{51} If there were to be the possibility of a sustainable manpower system in Catalonia that drew upon Austrian reserves, it would require a naval base that allowed the British to maintain a fleet year-round in the Western Mediterranean.

Despite this minor setback, the Austrian and British governments used the winter season to negotiate a solution to Catalonia's manpower problems. On their end, the British partially solved their short-term manpower problems in the Iberian Peninsula by mortgaging it in the long term through the introduction of three year recruitment contracts.\textsuperscript{52} They also took up Sinzendorf's suggestion and agreed to transport the Palatine troops in Anglo-Dutch pay from

\textsuperscript{47} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 15, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 6 July 1707.
\textsuperscript{48} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 14, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 2 July 1707.
\textsuperscript{49} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 21, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 16 July 1707.
\textsuperscript{50} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 29, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 6 August 1707.
\textsuperscript{51} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 41, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 17 September 1707.
\textsuperscript{52} Scouller, \textit{Armies of Queen Anne}, 103, 112–114.
Italy to Barcelona.  

The Palatine troops plus two Austrian infantry regiments, which made for a total of about 6,000 men, departed from Vado on board Royal Navy and contracted Italian vessels (paid for by the British) in January 1708. These measures were a start, but they could not put the Catalonian establishment on a suitable offensive, let alone defensive, footing. More readily equipped and trained Austrian troops were needed for this, but this would put on Austria the burden of raising fresh regiments with all the included start-up costs. This required a subtraction of troops from one of Austria’s other military commitments. If the British were so desirous of a strong Catalonian establishment in order to advance Charles’ claim for the Spanish throne, then Joseph was going to use it to his advantage to ease the burden of the war on his own military and financial establishment. Meadows was informed that if Austria was going to divert a further 6,000 troops to Catalonia as requested, then Joseph expected that the British and the Dutch would provide money for the raising of replacement regiments for the army on the Rhine. Meadows balked at this proposal, but he countered with the offer that the British would take into their pay two-thirds of all Austrian troops sent to Spain.

This back and forth between Meadows and the court of Vienna was only the start of negotiations over these troops. It became readily apparent that the contentious issue between the British and the Austrians was their conflicting strategic priorities for 1708. The British did not want the Austrian army attached to the duke of Savoy weakened, but this was the most logical source from which to draw ready troops for Catalonia due to its proximity to the Italian ports of Vado and Genoa. Therefore, the Austrians would have to replace those troops from another theatre, namely the Rhine, or the British had to provide levy money for their replacement. Meadows rejected the second suggestion out of hand and recommended that if any theatre was to be weakened, it was to be Hungary. However, these discussions were just a matter of running in circles. What could be agreed upon was that Austrian troops needed to be in Catalonia, only the British were capable of providing for their transportation, and if the British wanted the Austrians to maintain forces in areas, which the British had a stronger strategic interest in, then the British had to pay.
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Marlborough and Prince Eugene cut to the heart of the issue when they sat down in The Hague to negotiate the first treaty that brought Austrian troops to Catalonia. The treaty of 14 April 1708 stipulated that Austria would provide 4,000 infantrymen to be transported at British expense to Catalonia. They would be transferred into British pay the day they were embarked on the transports, and Britain would provide Austria with levy money at the rate of 20 crowns per soldier.\(^59\)

While the negotiations for the troops were taking place, there were also discussions as to how to solve the other problem in Catalonia, that of command. As Stanhope had noted back in 1706, the army lacked a commander who all parties respected and whose authority in the field would be unquestioned. In the mind of the British and the Dutch, there were only two thinkable candidates, Marlborough and Prince Eugene, and it was not agreeable to send Marlborough away from his command in Flanders. Therefore, the British, the Dutch, and Charles began to lobby Joseph’s court to send Prince Eugene to Catalonia to take up the command in 1708. However, sending Austria’s best general to the Iberian Peninsula was not agreeable for political and strategic reasons. There was still the ever present threat of intervention by Sweden or the Ottoman Turks, and then there were Prince Eugene’s duties as the president of the Imperial War Council (\textit{Hofkriegsrat}).\(^60\) Eugene feared that Guido Starhemberg would supersede him as president in his absence or that other enemies of his at court would meddle in military affairs.\(^61\) Joseph had a far more important role for Prince Eugene, which was to command an Austrian army along the Moselle near Marlborough’s army in Flanders. Not only did this keep Eugene in close proximity to Vienna, but it put him close to Marlborough and The Hague. This proximity to Marlborough was crucial if the British and the Austrians were going to work together to advance Charles’ cause in Spain. Eugene already possessed a friendship with Marlborough that translated into a good working relationship, which they formed over the Blenheim campaign. Additionally, Marlborough had a history of finding effective compromises in his dealings with the Austrians, and Marlborough himself would have no objections to working with Prince Eugene. Therefore, Marlborough and Eugene

\(^59\) All of the treaties regarding the transport of Austrian troops to Catalonia can be found in Alfred Pribram, \textit{Österreichische Staatsverträge England}, vol. 1 (Innsbruck, 1907), 243–247.

\(^60\) TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 76, Philip Meadows to Robert Harley, 28 December 1707.

would form the most important diplomatic link between London and Vienna through which much of the military aid for Catalonia would be arranged.  

Instead of appointing Prince Eugene to the command, Joseph appointed Guido Starhemberg to the command knowing that he possessed the necessary credentials to meet Catalonia's needs. Regardless of Starhemberg's qualifications, the fact that he was not Eugene caused the Maritime Powers to fumigate. Nevertheless, Joseph knew it would only be brief as his ambassador to London, Count Gallas, rightly pointed out that the refusal to send Eugene could not possibly aggravate the Maritime Powers to the extent they had been in 1707 when their relations with Austria had grown especially frigid over Hungary and Toulon.  

Furthermore, Joseph knew that the British respected Starhemberg's abilities. In 1705, Sidney Godolphin had suggested him as a replacement for Margrave Louis of Baden on the Rhine.

With the troop shortages and the problem of command solved, the last issue at hand was the creation of a workable and sustainable supply system in the Western Mediterranean that tied Italy to Catalonia. Since the British controlled the finances and sea, the responsibility for this devolved onto them. The particular man tasked with ensuring the execution of the treaty was the British envoy in Turin, John Chetwynd, due to his proximity to the financial centres of Turin and Genoa. In order to transport Austrian troops to Catalonia successfully, Chetwynd had to manage his credit carefully in between the arrival of remittances from London, while hiring Genoese and Tuscan contractors for supply and transport. Then he had to coordinate his contractors' activities with those of the fleet and the Austrian military administration in Milan so the troops could be transported as efficiently and cheaply as possible. The task was so great that it interfered with his duties at the Savoyard court, so John sent his brother William to Genoa to carry out most of the preparations. As further treaties were signed providing for the transport of recruits and additional
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62 Michael Hochedlinger has argued that Marlborough was the emperor's key diplomatic and intelligence link in London, Michael Hochedlinger, “Friendship and Realpolitik: Marlborough and the Habsburg Monarchy”, in Marlborough: Soldier and Diplomat, ed. John B. Hattendorf (Rotterdam, 2012), 260. Joseph also needed his army to be near the Spanish Netherlands if he wanted to back up any Habsburg claims to sovereignty over the region on Charles' behalf.
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regiments to Catalonia on the same terms as the first, the British government officially tasked William Chetwynd to take on many of the above responsibilities. William Chetwynd’s diligence in his task was a key part in making the transport of Austrian troops a reality.\textsuperscript{67}

However, at the strategic level, this responsibility for the transportation and pay of the troops gave the British the power to decide how and where forces in the Western Mediterranean would be used. Joseph and his ministry quickly learned in the summer of 1708 that the British were more sensitive to their own and Charles’ strategic priorities. In June of that year, news circulated in the court of Vienna of an apparent revolt against Bourbon rule in Sicily, and this seemed as ample an opportunity to conquer the island.\textsuperscript{68} But, as Gallas observed in the following year, for the conquests of any of the Mediterranean islands, the Austrians were wholly dependent on the British.\textsuperscript{69} Charles thought Sardinia was a more important target than Sicily, since it would serve as an important source of grain for Catalonia.\textsuperscript{70} The British fleet commander, Sir John Leake, did give the Sicily expedition serious consideration, since Charles did stipulate that it was a lower priority option and the Austrian commander in Naples, Count Daun, attempted to influence Leake to help.\textsuperscript{71} Sardinia, nevertheless, served British needs better since they saw the addition of the island to Charles’ patrimony as a way of reducing Charles’ dependence on the British.\textsuperscript{72}

With Sardinia captured in August, there was still time for Leake to assist Daun in an attack on Sicily, but the needs of Catalonia once again trumped Austrian priorities. Charles needed more reinforcements from Italy to enable Starhemberg to relieve the Bourbon siege of Tortosa.\textsuperscript{73} Charles then derailed any other possibilities for attacking Sicily by recommending that Leake attack and capture Port Mahon on Minorca.\textsuperscript{74} There is little doubt that the arguments

\textsuperscript{67} For a further discussion of their activities, see chapter 5 of Aaron Graham, \textit{Corruption, Party, and Government in Britain, 1702–1713} (Oxford, 2015).

\textsuperscript{68} TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 154, Philip Meadows to Henry Boyle, 27 June 1708.

\textsuperscript{69} HHSA, St Abt, England, DK, Karton 42, fo. 5, Graf Gallas to Joseph I, 18 January 1709.

\textsuperscript{70} BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 66, Charles III to John Leake, 28 May 1708; BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 101, Charles III to John Leake, 30 July 1708.

\textsuperscript{71} Leake’s orders for 1708 were open ended and allowed him to take Charles’ recommendations into account, BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 86, Graf Daun to John Leake, 8 June 1708; BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 87, John Leake to Graf Daun, 12 June 1708 OS.

\textsuperscript{72} William Chetwynd later remarked that he hoped Sardinia’s acquisition would reduce Catalonia’s dependence on Genoa for grain, thereby reducing costs, KHL, C 1590/C9-23, fo. 7, William Chetwynd to James Stanhope, 13 September 1708.

\textsuperscript{73} BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 114, Minutes of Council of War, 14 August 1708 OS.

\textsuperscript{74} BL, Add MS 5431, fo. 117, Charles III to John Leake, 23 August 1708.
of James Stanhope were behind this order since Port Mahon was the deep-water port that Britain needed in the region. Charles was already amenable to the idea, for Port Mahon’s strategic value was not lost on the Habsburgs and their servants. Prince George of Hesse-Darmstadt had suggested its capture as early as 1702.\textsuperscript{75} Even Joseph ordered Gallas to lobby the British court for its capture since it would provide the fleet with the natural base it needed to capture the Mediterranean islands.\textsuperscript{76} As for questions of who would control Minorca after the war, they conspicuously remained unasked for the sake of Allied unity. Stanhope and Leake conquered the island in the name of King Charles III of Spain with primarily British troops, and they left a British garrison on the island. This gave Stanhope the leverage he needed to later negotiate the “temporary” transfer of the island’s sovereignty over to Great Britain with the stipulation that Charles could have it back once he had repaid British subsidies.\textsuperscript{77}

The conquest of Minorca certainly achieved one of Britain’s main grand strategic goals in maintaining a permanent deep-water naval base in the Mediterranean, but it also met the short-term logistical needs in helping maintain the year-round flow of troops and supplies to Catalonia from Italy. However, despite Joseph’s hopes, the British navy never assisted in the conquest of Sicily. Firstly, within British strategy the priority of supporting Catalonia always trumped other operations in the region. In London, Count Gallas recognized this, and he even went as far to argue that the capture of Sicily was essential to the security of Catalonia.\textsuperscript{78} However, Gallas’ argument proved to no avail, because the British had grand strategic reasons for keeping Austrian troops out of Sicily for the time being. With control of the Mediterranean, the British had the power to determine the fate of Sicily, and they could use it as a carrot to entice more aid for Catalonia out of their Austrian allies or as a stick at the negotiating table with Louis XIV. The year of 1709 saw a delayed start to most operations, as there seemed to be a real possibility of peace with the negotiations at The Hague.\textsuperscript{79} Once operations did begin, the British navy stayed closer to the Iberian Peninsula since it was mostly concerned with transporting troops to Catalonia and another attempt on Cadiz (which did not materialize).\textsuperscript{80}
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At the strategic level, Sicily was sacrificed at the altar of Madrid. Charles and the British were more concerned with final victory in Spain, which would naturally bring Sicily (and the Americas for that matter) with it. Beginning in 1708, they repeatedly requested that Joseph send even more troops over to Spain, while Joseph had kept the Naples garrison on a stronger footing for a possible invasion of Sicily. Nevertheless, the British firmly indicated that they had little intention of capturing Sicily in the near future by advising Joseph to weaken the Naples establishment by a few thousand men for their dispatch to Spain. If the British were so determined to divert Austrian resources away from immediate Austrian interests, then Joseph would consent only on the following conditions: Austrian troops would be taken into British pay, transported at British expense, and their recruiting costs paid for by the British. Upon seeing the proposal, Marlborough lamented, “The Court of Vienna would lay the whole burden of the War in Spain upon us”.82

6 Conclusion

Despite Marlborough’s misgivings, this was the price Britain had to pay to ensure Allied cooperation in the Mediterranean and elsewhere. Joseph saw things differently; Austria had to maintain contingents in armies in Flanders, along the Rhine, in Hungary, in Piedmont, and Naples. If the British wanted the emperor to commit to one more theatre, especially a significant contribution under the command of Prince Eugene in Flanders alongside Marlborough’s army, then the British needed to shoulder the financial burden in Catalonia. Despite the seeming selfishness on both sides, the debate surrounding strategy, operations, and logistics in the Western Mediterranean produced positive results for the Allies. Along with the clear conquests of Naples, Sardinia, and Minorca, Austrian and British cooperation managed to annul the effects of the loss at Almanza through the rebuilding of the Catalanian establishment on a more sustainable source of manpower drawn from Austrian forces in Italy.

With British control of the Mediterranean, Austrian troops were transported safely to Catalonia from 1708 to 1710, and the footing of the bill by the British allowed Austria to maintain its other military commitments in the above-mentioned theatres. On the eve of the 1710 campaign, the full army establishment paid for the British in Catalonia was computed at £541,542. 2s. 7.5d. Of

81 TNA, SP 80/29, fo. 164, Philip Meadows to Henry Boyle, 1 August 1708; Arneth, *Eigenhändige Correspondenz*, fo. 21, Charles III to Graf Wratislaw, 11 July 1708.
82 BL, Add MS 61128, fo. 144, Duke of Marlborough to Henry Boyle, 7 September 1708.
this amount, £185,933. 8s. 5d. was for the pay of 12,200 Imperial troops. The remainder covered 14,311 British subject troops, 3,879 Portuguese troops, and a small contingent of 700 Swiss troops. The size of this army was large enough to give Stanhope the confidence that he could launch an offensive campaign to capture Madrid in that year. Although historians have pointed to the political considerations in London that drove Stanhope to insist on the capture of the Spanish capital, but without the Austrian contingent, Stanhope could not have considered offensive action in first place, regardless of the political climate in Britain.

Stanhope’s rash and heavy-handed behaviour during the 1710 campaign would underscore the negative influence of poor personal relations on an allied war effort in the same manner as Peterborough and Liechtenstein’s feud from 1705 to 1707. On the other hand, the good working relationship between Marlborough and Prince Eugene was fundamental in cutting through the thorny questions surrounding strategic priorities, which allowed two men to negotiate several troop treaties that brought Austrian troops over to Spain at British expense. Their achievement, and one should not forget the support of their home governments in the matter, exposes what it took to bring two allies to find a workable solution despite an icy relationship due to differing strategic and operational priorities. In this case, it was the military necessity created by the loss at Almanza, which threatened both Austrian and British grand strategic goals that rode on the person of the Archduke Charles. In short, the crisis generated by Almanza reminded the two allies why they needed each other in the first place and served to underscore the grand strategic as well as military raisons d’être for the alliance. Britain had the money and the ships; Austria had the men. Both were needed if Charles were to have a chance to capture the throne.
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