HAIRAN Series IIUS
Expert Notes 2026-12

고려대학교 통일융합연구원
Institute for Interdisciplinary Unification Studies

Japan's Networked Minilateralism Democratic Cooperation and Strategic Lessons for Korea

June 15, 2026

JIMBO, Ken
Professor, Keio University

Ken Jimbo is Professor of International Relations at Keio University and Managing Director of Programs at the International House of Japan. He also serves as Co-Director of the Research Institute for Advanced Innovation and Geopolitics. His research focuses on Japanese foreign and security policy, the U.S.-Japan alliance, and Indo-Pacific security architecture.

Great-power rivalry is reshaping the institutional landscape of the Indo-Pacific. Economic interdependence is increasingly weaponized, technology and supply chains have become matters of national security, and universal institutions often move too slowly to address fast-changing strategic risks. At the same time, democratic cooperation has not disappeared. It is being reconfigured through smaller, more flexible, and function-oriented coalitions.

Japan stands near the center of this transformation. Tokyo is not abandoning multilateralism. It is adapting it through what can be called networked minilateralism: a modular strategy that links alliances, trilateral and quadrilateral arrangements, economic frameworks, and capacity-building initiatives into a layered regional order. The purpose is not to build a rigid bloc of democracies against authoritarian powers. It is to create overlapping platforms that can deliver concrete goods – maritime security, supply-chain resilience, technology standards, infrastructure connectivity, and capacity-building – while keeping the broader regional order open and legitimate.

Reconfiguring Multilateralism

Japan's approach has evolved from a largely strategic and normative Free and Open Indo-Pacific vision toward a more practical and networked model of cooperation. Earlier versions of FOIP emphasized maritime commons, freedom, the rule of law, and open regional order. While these principles remain central, they also carried the risk of being perceived as narrowly anti-China or insufficiently attentive to ASEAN concerns.

The revised Japanese approach places greater emphasis on openness, inclusiveness, co-creation, dialogue, and rulemaking through consent. This shift matters. It suggests that Japan's strategy is not simply to assemble like-minded states into an exclusive security coalition. Rather, Tokyo seeks to connect different layers of cooperation: alliance coordination, minilateral groupings, ASEAN-related mechanisms, economic security frameworks, and capacity-building programs.

This is visible in the emerging security latticework across the Indo-Pacific. The Quad supports cooperation on maritime domain awareness, cyber, critical minerals, and technology standards. Japan-Australia cooperation has deepened through a Reciprocal Access Agreement, undersea cable protection, advanced technology cooperation, and critical minerals. Japan-U.S.-ROK cooperation has expanded through exercises such as Freedom Edge, maritime enforcement, and capacity-building for ASEAN partners. Japan's Official Security Assistance also supports maritime domain awareness and surveillance capacity in countries such as the Philippines.

The logic is functional. Different platforms serve different purposes. Some strengthen deterrence. Others build resilience in supply chains and infrastructure. Others provide capacity to regional partners that do not want to choose sides but do need practical support. Japan acts as a strategic connector, translating alliance assets into regional public goods.

Economic statecraft is now part of the same architecture. Security competition and economic governance can no longer be separated. CPTPP represents Japan's commitment to high-standard, rules-based trade. IPEF addresses supply chains, clean economy, and fair economy issues with a wider set of Indo-Pacific partners. Critical minerals cooperation seeks to reduce vulnerability created by excessive concentration. Japan-Australia economic security cooperation focuses on energy, undersea cables, and supply-chain resilience. The aim is neither autarky nor full decoupling. It is a more diversified, rules-based, and politically sustainable form of interdependence.

This is the core of Japan's networked minilateralism. It is layered, because it works through multiple overlapping frameworks. It is networked, because it connects allies and partners across regions. It is functional, because it focuses on concrete problems rather than grand institutional design. It is bridging, because it tries to link small-group cooperation to ASEAN and broader regional institutions.

The Promise and Limits of Networked Cooperation

Networked minilateralism offers clear advantages. It is faster than universal multilateralism, more practical than broad declaratory forums, and more flexible than treaty-centered institutions. It allows states to cooperate where interests converge without waiting for full consensus across the region. In a period of institutional stress, this flexibility is valuable.

Yet the model also faces serious limits. The first is U.S. dependency. Japan can connect, convene, and operationalize cooperation, but it cannot fully substitute for American military and political weight. If U.S. commitment becomes less reliable, more transactional, or more distracted by crises in other regions, Japan's latticework will face a major stress test. The question is not only whether networked minilateralism can hedge against Chinese coercion. It is also whether it can manage uncertainty about American reliability.

The second limit concerns institutional density. More institutions do not automatically produce more resilience. Overlapping frameworks can generate complementarity, but they can also create duplication, coordination failures, or contradictory commitments. The key question is therefore whether Japan's networks actually deliver measurable outputs. Do they improve maritime surveillance? Do they help partners respond to coercion? Do they diversify supply chains in practice? Do they coordinate effectively in a crisis? Networked minilateralism will be judged not by the number of platforms it creates, but by whether those platforms produce functional results.

The third limit is regional perception. Japan presents its approach as open, inclusive, and rules-based. But if China reads the latticework primarily as containment, the gap between intention and perception can still intensify security-dilemma dynamics. ASEAN states may also worry that minilateral cooperation, however useful, could narrow their diplomatic space or weaken ASEAN centrality. This is why repeated reassurance is not mere rhetoric. It is part of the strategy. Still, reassurance must be institutionalized, not only declared. ASEAN and other non-allied partners need meaningful agenda-setting roles, not just capacity-building benefits.

The fourth limit is over-securitization. As supply chains, technology, infrastructure, and development cooperation are folded into security competition, the risk is that the open order Japan seeks to preserve becomes more closed and exclusionary. Minilateralism works best when it delivers public goods without becoming a rigid bloc. If it is perceived as a containment architecture, it may lose the wider participation that makes FOIP politically viable.

The 2026 Iran war and Hormuz crisis underline these vulnerabilities. For Japan, energy security in the Strait of Hormuz is not an abstract issue. It is a direct national security concern. At the same time, U.S. military consumption in the Middle East raises questions about overstretch and deterrence gaps in the Indo-Pacific. If U.S. attention and assets are pulled away, Japan's networked partnerships must do more to compensate. This does not invalidate Japan's strategy. It clarifies the conditions under which the strategy must operate.

What This Means for Korea

For South Korea, Japan's networked minilateralism is not only a Japanese foreign policy story. It is directly relevant to the Korean Peninsula. Seoul faces a strategic environment in which deterrence, economic security, technology governance, cyber threats, maritime monitoring, and alliance coordination are increasingly connected. No single institution can manage these challenges alone.

South Korea already operates within a layered security environment. The U.S.-ROK alliance remains the foundation of deterrence. U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral cooperation has become more important for missile warning, maritime security, sanctions enforcement, cyber coordination, and combined exercises. These arrangements are essential in responding to North Korea's nuclear and missile threats.

But Korea also needs a wider institutional strategy. North Korea-related challenges are no longer confined to traditional military deterrence. They include cyber theft, illicit finance, maritime sanctions evasion, arms transfers, missile technology, space and drone capabilities, humanitarian vulnerabilities, food insecurity, public health, and climate-related risks. These issues require alliance coordination, but they also require broader minilateral and multilateral networks involving Europe, Australia, Canada, ASEAN partners, the United Nations, and technology-oriented coalitions.

The Korean lesson from Japan's experience is therefore twofold. First, Seoul should continue to strengthen alliance-based and trilateral cooperation where hard security is concerned. Deterrence must remain credible, operational, and institutionalized. Second, Korea should avoid allowing its regional strategy to be defined only by hard-security alignment. It should use its strengths in technology, development cooperation, digital governance, supply-chain resilience, and humanitarian assistance to build broader forms of institutional cooperation.

This dual strategy would help Korea avoid two risks. One is excessive dependence on a single alliance framework, especially at a time when U.S. policy can become more transactional or distracted. The other is over-securitization, in which every form of economic or technological cooperation is absorbed into bloc competition. Korea needs strong deterrence, but it also needs diplomatic flexibility and institutional legitimacy.

Japan's experience shows that minilateralism can be a useful supplement to multilateralism, but not a full replacement for it. The same applies to Korea. U.S.-ROK-Japan cooperation is indispensable, but it should be connected to ASEAN, the United Nations, European partners, and Global South cooperation where possible. The purpose should be to provide concrete public goods: maritime security, cyber resilience, supply-chain transparency, nonproliferation enforcement, disaster response, climate adaptation, and humanitarian support.

For the Korean Peninsula, the ultimate goal is not simply to build more networks. It is to design networks that strengthen deterrence, preserve rules, and keep open the diplomatic space for long-term stability. Japan's networked minilateralism offers a useful model, but Korea must adapt it to its own geography and threat environment. Unlike Japan, South Korea faces an immediate nuclear-armed adversary on its border. Unlike many Southeast Asian states, Korea cannot afford strategic ambiguity on core security questions. Yet like other middle powers, Korea has agency. It can combine alliances, minilateral platforms, and multilateral institutions in ways that serve both national security and regional order.

The future of democratic cooperation in the Indo-Pacific will not depend on one grand institution. It will depend on the density, coherence, legitimacy, and performance of many connected institutions. Japan has moved early in building such a networked architecture. South Korea now faces its own task: to build a Korean Peninsula strategy that is strong enough to deter, flexible enough to cooperate, and legitimate enough to sustain rules-based regional order under conditions of geopolitical stress.