I shall not be talking about Korea because I circulated my paper to you, so if you have time, please do read it.

On the question of East Asia architecture, I would like to make four very quick points. First, the question is very significant not just for the region but for the world because of the fact that East Asia is the growth center of the world.

East Asia architecture is not easy to build because of the fact that we are talking about different political systems. We are talking about different economic systems. Still, there is only one common thing: that is the question of prosperity. Therefore, in order to make sure that we prosper in the region, we would have to be very considerate, with a lot of wisdom. That's point number one.

Point number two, we would have thought about East Asia-only institution that it's getting more and more difficult. Why? Because China has grown too big in a very short period of time; therefore, it is not feasible for us to talk about East Asia-only institutions. Then we need to consider two objectives. The East Asia-only institution can be pursued, but at the same time that needs to be discussed in the much wider context of Asia Pacific. That is my second point.

Third point, as I said, there has not been much in common, not like in Europe. We have different cultural backgrounds, we have different development stages. We have different political systems. We have different economic systems as well. Therefore, let us be very pragmatic and realistic instead of idealistic. Let's talk about realism. We would have to assume realism in a sense that we talk about precise functions. Instead of institutions, let's talk about functions and how best we would develop functions in different architectures. So, that's my third point.

The fourth point, what about precise functions? I would like to talk about three important functions: security, rulemaking, and resource development. Those are the three crucial functions which we need to develop our cooperation in the region and also in the much wider context of Asia Pacific.
First, security. Unfortunately, we cannot talk about collective defense mechanism or collective security mechanism because of the fact that we have different threat perceptions. China has different threat perceptions from us. Therefore, we would have to maintain various bilateral security arrangements with US-Japan as a main thing. And I think we need to build various strategic partnerships, such as trilateral, Japan-United States-Korea, and other forms of strategic partnerships. It's not for the purpose of containing China. Simply, we do not have confidence in relation to future China and the future region because we have different political systems and so on.

Our security discussion shouldn't stop there. We need to be talking about how best we can develop confidence-building mechanisms. And, clearly, there is a strong need for trilateral mechanisms between China, United States, and Japan because China talks about US-Japan security and we talk about China, so why not? Why not create a trilateral mechanism between Japan, the United States, and China so that we could talk about confidence building, such as transparency of the military budget and possible joint operations to protect lives of the people in natural disasters, how to protect and how to jointly operate in those types of things. As I said, in terms of security, we cannot talk about collective security mechanisms, collective defense mechanisms, so we should be talking about the confidence-building mechanism.

Second, the question of rulemaking. On economic rules, here comes the harder approach. We have the discussion regarding TPP initiated by P4. Japan expressed its interest in joining the negotiation for TPP. The importance about TPP is to do with rulemaking in very large scope of issues. So, it is important for the future of East Asia, and I'm sure China will join in TPP in, say, ten years’ time. But at the same time, we would like to pursue economic integration in the region, meaning that we wish to go for trilateral free trade agreements between Japan, China, and Korea. We should also go for a regional mechanism based upon ASEAN Plus 6 concept, ASEAN Plus 6 meaning ASEAN plus Japan, Korea, China, Australia, New Zealand and India. So, by pursuing parallel objectives with a wider TPP and also East Asia integration, we may be able to achieve a wider free trade area.

Third, question of resource development. We discussed the South China Sea this morning, and I think the question of resources is going to be one of the key elements in East Asia. Why don't we pursue joint resource development in the context of the East Asia Summit, for instance, which has the right members, when we talk about resource development as well.

So, these three functions, we need to pursue in terms of architecture making. I would really like to see active debates taking place on these subjects in various meetings, including the East Asia Summit. Thank you.