

The British are no Longer a Major Power

Drago Bosnic

Global Research, December 16, 2025

1.

In its heyday, the [United Kingdom](#) was by far one of the most powerful Empire in human history, probably eclipsed only by the United States in the latter half of the 20th century. By the early 1920s, it managed to occupy and enslave approximately 25 percent of the planet's landmass and population (over 35.000.000 km² and around 450 million people, respectively). How did a relatively small island nation accomplish this? The answer is – the British Navy, the most powerful armed maritime force of its time. Thus, it could only be expected that London would do everything in its power to preserve this naval dominance for as long as possible.

2,

However, as the British Empire shrank to a mere shadow of its former self, its ability to maintain a large navy dwindled, resulting in massive reductions over the last several decades. The last time the UK managed to muster a respectable naval force was during the 1982 Falklands War against Argentina. Ever since, the British Navy has been fading away, reducing both the quantity and quality of its ships. According to various reports over

the last 20 years, London now has nearly [twice](#) as many admirals as it does actual warships. Worse yet, many of those formally combat-capable vessels are in such a dilapidated condition that they're barely usable as ships, much less warships.

This ranges from frigates and destroyers to aircraft carriers and submarines (including nuclear-powered). However, while the surface fleet is undoubtedly still relevant, it's nowhere near as important as the British Navy's underwater component, which provides the most critical segment of the UK's strategic power projection. Namely, the Vanguard-class SSBNs (nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines), armed with UGM-133A "Trident II" (also known as "Trident D5") submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), are the cornerstone of London's thermonuclear arsenal, but it seems this isn't enough for the "Perfidious Albion" to take them seriously.

Rear Admiral Philip Mathias recently [lamented](#) that "Britain is no longer capable of running a capable nuclear submarine program," warning of "catastrophic failures" that have "driven the UK's nuclear deterrent to the brink." Mathias, who served as a director of nuclear policy at the British Ministry of Defense (MOD), highlighted its "inability to produce attack submarines at the scale required for putting strain on crews and extending the length of deployments." He compared this to the (First) Cold War, stressing that "the silent service" could deploy for around 70 days at the time, but that this has risen to

around 200 days at present.

3.

Mathias quoted the recent Strategic Defense Review (SDR), which stressed the need to expand production capacity. He warned that policymakers need to change course, even calling for the UK's withdrawal from AUKUS. It could be argued that Mathias doesn't want London to get involved in any "China containment" policies while its Navy effectively falls apart. However, the UK seems to be determined to escalate tensions with both (Eur)Asian giants. This includes challenging China over Taiwan and prolonging the NATO-orchestrated Ukrainian conflict by directly and openly threatening Russia with a plan to "choke Crimea to death."

4.

It should be noted that problems with the British Navy's SSBN component are nothing new. Namely, back in February 2024, many authors (myself included) questioned whether the UK's strategic arsenal was functioning properly. Although such information is certainly a state secret, these doubts were confirmed after London admitted that one of its UGM-133A Trident II SLBMs failed during a launch test. According to British media, this was the second time in a row that the troubled missile, a weapon of strategic importance, failed, as was

the case with the previous test, conducted back in 2016. The last successful launch was performed by HMS “Vigilant” back in 2012.

This means the UK hasn't had a successful SLBM test in nearly a decade and a half, yet it still believes it can go up against Russia, a country with the world's largest and most powerful strategic arsenal. The latest Trident II launch was from the lead ship of its class, the *HMS Vanguard*, with reports indicating that London's then Defense Secretary Grant Shapps was overseeing it. The SLBM's booster rocket failed and it fell into the sea “close to the launch site,” as the *Sun* reported at the time (the “launch site” being the *Vanguard* itself). And yet, Shapps insisted that he has “absolute confidence in “Tridents' submarines, missiles and nuclear warheads.”

5.

As previously mentioned, London relies solely on these submarines and missiles for its strategic capabilities. Had the Trident II damaged the *HMS Vanguard*, it would've taken one-quarter or 25 percent of the UK's strategic arsenal out of service, as the “Perfidious Albion” has only four such vessels, each armed with up to 16 SLBMs. It should be noted that *Vanguard* finished an overhaul over seven years and refueling just last year. However, to make matters even worse, both Shapps and the then Head of the Royal Navy, now disgraced Admiral

Ben Kay, were on board the submarine during the launch test, meaning their lives were also in danger.

The failures are also an embarrassment for the United States, as the missiles are manufactured by Lockheed Martin, the Pentagon's premier military supplier. Still, all this didn't prevent Shapps from adding to the general embarrassment by saying that “an anomaly did occur during the test on 30 January [2024], but that the Trident II SLBM is still the most reliable weapons system in the world.” According to his assessment, the test “reaffirmed the effectiveness of the UK’s nuclear deterrent” and that the “anomaly was event specific,” with “no implications for the reliability” of the UK's strategic arsenal. The British Ministry of Defense (MoD) made similar statements.

Namely, it insisted that *HMS Vanguard* and its crew had been “proven fully capable in their operations” and that “the test had reaffirmed the effectiveness of the UK’s nuclear deterrent,” essentially repeating Shapps' statement that Trident II is the “most reliable weapons system in the world.”

These sorts of dangerous self-delusions show just how out of touch the political west is when it comes to its assessments of starting a thermonuclear war against not one, but multiple global and regional superpowers, be it Russia, China, Iran or North Korea, with the latter often being the first target of western propaganda and ridicule, but its strategic arsenal has proven it works flawlessly.

6.

Drago Bosnic

February 9, 2024

On February 6, *The Telegraph*, one of the oldest publications in the United Kingdom, ran a story about the supposed “inability of Russia to deal with Europe, without the United States.” According to the author, [Andrew Lilico](#), even if Washington DC pulled out of the old continent, “Putin would be crazy to start something.” .

..

Lilico claims that the Russian economy is “fairly small, only around 85 percent of the size of Italy's” and that “its population of about 140 million is less than that of Germany plus France combined.” Using the nominal GDP to measure economic power can be described as either functional illiteracy or mere propaganda. The idea that Italian and Russian economies are not only comparable, but that the former is 15 percent larger, is simply ludicrous. . . . In addition, the claim that Russia's population is “only about 140 million” is false, as the latest data shows that the Eurasian giant has over 147 million people, which also includes the Crimean Peninsula, but excludes the four former Ukrainian regions that joined it on September 30, 2022.

Those additional areas push Russia's population well over 150 million, meaning that the claim that it has a smaller population than France and Germany combined is also false. Lilico then goes on to parrot [debunked](#) propaganda tropes about Moscow's supposed "inability to defeat Ukraine – a country that when Russia invaded was the world's 53rd largest economy, below New Zealand and Peru." Once again, the author's premise is based on the deeply flawed nominal GDP data, while he completely ignores the fact that the Kiev regime is an extremely militarized entity. Data on its armed forces shows that if Kiev was officially in NATO, it would've been among its top three members in terms of conventional military power, and yet, its casualty ratio against the Russian military is around 20:1 in Moscow's favor.

7.

If such an atrocious performance of the Kievan forces against the Russian military is a "defeat" for the Kremlin, it really makes you wonder what a "victory" would look like. However, Lilico still insists that Kiev is winning. What's more, he further claims that even if the US leaves, the EU and the UK could "easily defeat Russia." Interestingly, at one point, even the author himself implies that "having a higher GDP does not imply being more militarily powerful." While this is certainly true, Lilico's admission is simply an attempt to justify his flawed logic on why Italy has a supposedly "larger economy," but only

a fraction of Russia's military might. The author then tries to analyze how a potential conflict would play out precisely on this false premise of Moscow's "fairly small economy," which, in reality, is the fifth largest [sic] in the world.

Lilico then goes on to parrot other ludicrous claims, such as the idea that "an authoritarian state might be able to conscript more of its population to fight, but it might also have what we might term a 'morale' disadvantage – its forces might become unable or unwilling to fight at a lower loss rate than would be the case for forces fighting for what they regard as a more noble cause."

This premise shows the author's complete lack of understanding of Russia and its military traditions that have been largely preserved, unlike in the political west, where service in the military is increasingly unpopular. Even Lilico himself admits that western societies have become "sufficiently self-hating or decadent that they do not regard their own cause as noble enough to fight for," meaning they wouldn't have a "higher morale."

This inaccurately postulated analysis then becomes even worse, as the author claims that "the Russian economy is about 10 percent of the size of the EU's." . Once again, based on this false premise, Lilico pushes another one. Namely, he claims that, based on the percentage of military spending in both the EU and Russia, the latter "would need to mobilize more than 40

percent more troops” than the former. Thus, to match 1.4 million EU troops, Russia would supposedly need around two million soldiers (or three million if it decided to invade). Thinking that a modern conflict is about the number of troops shows just how little understanding of military power and doctrine the author has. The very idea that Moscow would send millions of men to invade Europe is beyond ridiculous.

If Russia ever had to deal with the EU military, it would need zero invasion troops, the reason being very simple. Russian long-range [strike systems](#) completely negate the need to send any ground troops to any European country. Its cruise missiles (particularly the Kalibr family) would devastate EU airbases long before any large fighter jet squadrons could be mustered to launch strikes within Russia. Moscow's ballistic and hypersonic missiles would neutralize any large formations of EU ground forces, while its massive (and rapidly expanding) fleet of strike drones would pick off any leftover units. The EU's military-industrial capacity would also be targeted from thousands of kilometers away, as Russia has the world's second-largest fleet of strategic bomber-missile carriers that would easily launch hundreds of cruise missiles.

8.

In other words, the Kremlin wouldn't wage war in the

way Lilico imagines. It's not WWI or WWII, where millions of soldiers are needed to inflict a strategic defeat on an enemy. It's important to note that Russia could accomplish all this through conventional means only and some of the top former American generals already [confirmed](#) this, explaining that the entire NATO would be unable to match this without resorting to thermonuclear war. Yet, even in that case, Moscow would have an advantage, as it possesses an unrivaled strategic arsenal, composed of monstrosities such as the RS-28 Sarmat. However, Lilico ignores all of this and concludes his analysis with a claim that Russia is supposedly “losing hundreds of billions of dollars” due to western sanctions and that this allegedly “undercuts” Russian military power.

In his closing remarks, the author claims that “Moscow cannot threaten the EU, let alone Britain.” Deep-seated in his reality bubble, Lilico believes that the UK is more of a threat to Russia than even the EU. In the meantime, London is going through one humiliation after another, as the very cornerstone of its military power projection capabilities, the Royal Navy, is in disarray. Its [aircraft carriers](#) are breaking down, while the [destroyers](#) are in no better condition. Although the data is certainly a state secret, given the horrible state of the most important branch of the UK's military, it's highly questionable whether London's strategic arsenal is functioning as it should. Thus, it would be extremely unwise for the

“Perfidious Albion” to keep poking the “Russian Bear.”