

Israel, Somaliland, and the Limits of Alliance Alignment: Strategic Implications for U.S. Regional Enforcement

Abdulqasem Bakhshi

Disclaimer: This essay presents analytical perspectives on international strategy, alliance behavior, and regional security. It is based on publicly available information, historical precedent, and strategic reasoning. The views expressed are solely those of the author and do not constitute legal, military, policy, or official advice, nor do they represent the positions of any government or organization. Readers are encouraged to consult multiple sources and exercise independent judgment.

Introduction: Recognition as a Strategic Signal

Israel's recent recognition of Somaliland—a self-declared, unrecognized state in the Horn of Africa—raises critical questions about alliance behavior, regional stability, and the hierarchy of strategic authority in the Middle East. While Israel's action can be understood as a pragmatic military maneuver—countering Houthi influence in Yemen and establishing a potential foothold for forward military projection—it carries broader implications. By acting unilaterally without U.S. coordination, Israel risks undermining the enforcement system that the United States has maintained, which disciplines rivalries and prevents large-scale escalation across the region. From a strategic perspective, this recognition echoes Russia's behavior in Afghanistan: just as Moscow recognized the self-declared Taliban government, Israel is using recognition both as a political lever and as a soft-power instrument to advance its interests while exploiting perceived gaps in U.S. credibility. The implications extend beyond Somaliland, reflecting Israel's broader approach to managing asymmetry, projecting influence, and navigating the hierarchy of U.S. regional enforcement.

Israel, Mispricing, and Soft-Power Projection

Israel's recognition of Somaliland can be viewed as a calculated exploitation of mispriced regional dynamics, similar to Russia's leverage of U.S. credibility gaps in the Middle East:

1. **Political Signaling:** Recognition signals Israel's independence to states advocating Palestinian recognition or other regional shifts.
2. **Military Pragmatism:** Somaliland's location enables Israel to establish a military presence that could counter Houthi influence in Yemen and expand operational reach along the Red Sea corridor.
3. **Operational Testing:** Recognition provides a controlled environment to experiment with forward basing, logistics, and regional command structures without immediate confrontation with major powers.

While these objectives are rational individually, they conflict with broader U.S. strategies that prioritize higher-order threats, including radical Islamist movements and nuclear-armed adversaries such as North Korea.

U.S. Enforcement and the Hypothetical Institutional Replacement

The Middle East's relative stability has been maintained less by absent rivalry than by the United States' role as ultimate enforcer. American presence suppresses escalation, deters proxy wars, and mediates conflicts among allies and adversaries. If the U.S. were to partially withdraw or shift its focus, structural gaps would emerge, necessitating institutional replacements to prevent systemic collapse. Hypothetical frameworks include:

- **Middle East Union:** Normalize political and economic rivalries, embed states in rule-based cooperation, and manage trade, resources, and infrastructure disputes.
- **Middle East NATO-style Collective Defense:** Deter military escalation, provide mutual defense guarantees, and coordinate counterterrorism operations.

These frameworks are analytical constructs, not U.S. proposals, illustrating the vulnerabilities unilateral recognition exploits. Israel's actions risk preemptively exploiting such a strategic vacuum without coordination, potentially undermining long-term U.S. objectives.

Israel, Alliance Asymmetry, and Strategic Choice

Israel's recognition of Somaliland also reflects a broader pattern of asymmetry management in alliance politics. Historically, Israel has navigated its relationship with global powers by calibrating its alignment based on perceived U.S. or Russian positioning:

- When U.S. alignment is favorable, Israel prioritizes U.S.-aligned objectives.
- When U.S. attention is divided, Israel may adopt stances closer to Russian strategic positions.

While this flexibility is understandable from a national-interest perspective, it carries inherent risks. States that behave unpredictably within alliance frameworks risk delegitimization and reduced credibility, even with long-standing partners. The Middle East is a theater where misalignment can carry immediate and tangible consequences: militarily, diplomatically, and politically. Israel's actions mirror behaviors often associated with radical Islamist actors, who prioritize temporary alliances and opportunistic gains over long-term strategic coherence. Without a firm, sustained alignment with U.S. strategy, Israel exposes itself to the consequences of being perceived as unreliable or even adversarial within the regional hierarchy.

Military Pragmatism vs. Strategic Alignment

It is important to acknowledge Israel's military rationale. A presence in Somaliland offers operational leverage against the Houthis and strengthens forward projection in the Red Sea region. However, anything beyond this military utility, such as using recognition to influence U.S. policy or assert independent political leverage, conflicts with U.S. interests and the enforcement mechanisms that maintain stability in the region. The principle is simple: the United States remains the ultimate arbiter of regional hierarchy. Attempting to bypass U.S.

strategy to advance independent objectives risks undermining regional order and may unintentionally empower adversaries or destabilize cooperation frameworks. Past instances—such as Israeli strikes in Qatar, which occurred in proximity to U.S. forces—underscore the consequences of uncoordinated action.

Parallels with Russia and the Taliban

Israel's approach resembles Russia's post-U.S. withdrawal strategy in Afghanistan:

- Recognition of self-declared authorities to project influence and test military leverage.
- Selective engagement with adversaries based on convenience rather than principled governance.

Both illustrate the derivative principle of alliances and asymmetry management: actors exploit gaps in enforcement authority and recalibrate alignment opportunistically. While pragmatically rational, this behavior is risky in a U.S.-dominated enforcement hierarchy. The Somaliland recognition parallels Russia's engagement with the Taliban: a self-declared government treated as legitimate due to short-term utility. Israel has historically aligned with the U.S. when advantageous and hedged toward Russia when U.S. priorities diverge. Such behavior is structurally rational but, without a firm long-term alignment, may resemble opportunistic, short-term coalitions akin to those formed by radical Islamist actors.

A Troubling Parallel: Somaliland and the Taliban

Israel's recognition of Somaliland bears an uncomfortable resemblance to Russia's engagement with—and de facto recognition of—the Taliban government in Afghanistan. In both cases, a self-declared authority is treated as legitimate not because it fits into a stable institutional framework, but because it offers short-term strategic utility. This parallel is not accidental. Israel has historically managed its asymmetry risk by aligning closely with U.S. positions when it serves its interests and hedging toward Russia when U.S. priorities diverge. Russia, for its part, has consistently exploited such hedging behavior, positioning itself as an alternative power broker in regions where U.S. enforcement is perceived to be weakening. The danger lies not in hedging per se—strategic flexibility is a rational behavior—but in the absence of a firm long-term alignment. States that prioritize temporary tactical alliances over durable strategic commitments begin to resemble the behavior of radical Islamist actors, who also operate through opportunistic, short-term coalitions devoid of institutional loyalty. While Israel is fundamentally different in nature and values, patterns of behavior matter in international politics. An ally that behaves unpredictably is, over time, treated as unreliable.

Misalignment and Its Consequences

Israel's recognition of Somaliland is not an isolated incident. It fits a broader pattern of actions that have failed to align with U.S. strategic interests, including kinetic operations conducted in sensitive locations such as Qatar, where the largest U.S. military presence in the region is based. These actions may serve immediate Israeli security concerns, but they impose externalities on the very enforcement structure that has guaranteed Israel's

long-term security. In the Middle East, respect for U.S. enforcement authority is not symbolic—it is structural. Actors that repeatedly misbehave, regardless of past relationships, implicitly position themselves against U.S. strategy. This does not require formal hostility; it is enough to erode trust, coordination, and legitimacy. Delegitimization is the inevitable consequence of sustained misalignment.

The Unanswered Question: Selective Counterterrorism

A final and critical question exposes the deeper strategic inconsistency shared by both Israel and Russia: if radical Islamist groups constitute a global threat, why are some treated as legitimate governing actors while others are designated as targets for elimination? Israel has demonstrated its capacity to strike Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis far beyond its immediate borders. Russia has conducted extensive counterterrorism operations across multiple theaters. Yet since the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan, neither state has treated the Taliban as a legitimate target of counterterrorism operations, despite the Taliban's ideological alignment with radical Islamism and its harboring of transnational extremist networks. This selective application of force suggests not a principled counterterrorism strategy, but a convergence of opportunistic behavior. In this sense, Israeli and Russian approaches increasingly resemble each other—not in ideology, but in method. Both exploit power vacuums created by U.S. restraint while avoiding the costs of confronting ideologically entrenched actors whose elimination would require long-term commitment rather than tactical strikes.

Conclusion: Alignment or Erosion

Israel's recognition of Somaliland highlights the tension between national interest, military pragmatism, and alliance discipline:

- Military objectives—countering Houthis, testing forward basing—are operationally defensible.
- Political and strategic objectives that conflict with U.S. enforcement risk undermining regional stability and Israel's credibility.
- Hypothetical regional institutions—Middle East Union and NATO-style defense—illustrate the structural gap unilateral actions exploit.

Allies in the Middle East must carefully manage asymmetry. Uncoordinated behavior, even by capable partners, carries consequences when it disrupts U.S.-maintained enforcement hierarchies. Israel must decide whether its long-term alignment is firmly with the United States; failure to do so risks strategic marginalization, delegitimization, and weakened influence in a region where radical Islamism, proxy conflicts, and institutional fragility remain the primary threats.