

the trend of the times. Different from economic openness, social and cultural openness involves the transnational movement of people, which is restricted by factors such as transportation, culture, language, among others, and therefore, cannot be as smooth as trade in goods. As a result, social and cultural openness is far from reaching the optimal level of openness. Increased openness means improved social well-being, and a higher level of openness is a goal that any economy should pursue. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure that one economy's level of openness should match the conditions of its economic and social development; the level and performance of openness should, therefore, be evaluated from the perspective of openness appropriateness.

#### IV. Main Conclusions

The openness index provides a clear description of the level of openness and dynamic trends of the world's major economies, serving as a reference path for choosing the most rational openness policies.

First, **the world still has a great openness potential**. In 2019, the highest openness index reading of a single economy is 0.8646 (Singapore), which is not only lower than the highest reading on the list (0.9328), but also significantly lower than the theoretical upper limit (1). In fact, in terms of cross-border personnel openness (in the social field) and information, knowledge and technology openness (in the cultural field) measured by this index, the economies still have an even greater potential in cross-border openness.

Second, **expanding openness is in the common interest of mankind**. The previous analysis in this report shows that one economy's economic development or growth (which accumulates to form economic scale) is positively correlated with openness, although this positive correlation will become stronger or weaker, or become looser or closer, due to the heterogeneity of the economy (such as development stage, policy choices, population, geographic location, among others). The more open one economy is, the more developed it becomes. This is an indisputable fact, and we should be full of confidence in the prospect of the world's openness in the future.

Third, **one economy should follow the principle of *seeking truth from facts as it opens up***. Appropriate openness means balanced opening. It is not that the greater

the openness of one economy is, the better it will be for that economy; or the faster one economy opens up, the better it will be for that economy. The appropriateness of openness should be based on conditions of the concerned economy or the world, and a balance should be struck between level of openness and national conditions. It should also be based on one economy's need to promote reform and development, take into consideration the special characteristics of national conditions, improve capabilities, and assume international responsibilities, so that policymakers can properly manage the strength, level and speed of opening-up.

Fourth, **the openness theory needs to be further built**. In the field of economics, the theoretical relationship between economic development and openness has been clearly clarified and well established. In other fields, more efforts should still be made to establish the theoretical relationship between social development and social openness, between cultural development and cultural openness, and between comprehensive national power and comprehensive openness, so that more scientific theories can serve as guidance for the opening-up practices all over the world.

Last but not least, **the openness index itself still needs to be improved**. The heterogeneity between theories, methods, and data of the openness index needs to be improved. The time series length of the openness index need to be expanded, the number of economies need to be increased, and the timeliness lag of the index release needs to be improved through improving basic data predictability.

To sum up, openness contributes to the well-being of mankind and is the only way to achieve civilization rejuvenation. If we return to the closed-door policy, the space for human development would be narrowed, and we may even repeat the mistakes of the Great Depression in the 1930s. Given the painful lessons of history, we human beings should reflect on the fact that an isolationist and closed-door policy would not make people rich or make the economy strong; sharing and co-prosperity, as a prophecy to fulfil, can only be achieved through opening-up.