

# RETHINKING THE DEVELOPMENT OF POST-CONFLICT SRI LANKA BASED ON THE SINGAPORE MODEL

*Sanika Sulochani Ramanayake*

*Chandana Shrinath Wijetunga*

Sri Lanka Journal of  
Economic Research  
Volume 5(2) March 2018  
SLJER.05.02.05:  
pp.81 - 102  
Sri Lanka Forum of  
University Economists



---

## *Abstract*

*This study explores three major points: namely, Singapore's development process, Singapore's model of economic development, and the economic challenges of post-conflict Sri Lanka. This study explores pages of Singapore's past and elaborates the focal points that resulted in its current development status. Sri Lanka's development is discussed and compared with that of Singapore. Insights into Sri Lanka and other developing countries are also provided. This study reveals clear influences of Singapore's nation-building process on its economic development. In contrast, Sri Lanka's civil conflict spanning three decades and its politically unstable post-colonial history are seen to have adversely affected the country's development. The industrial sectors of Sri Lanka are concentrated on low-skilled labour and manufacturing, mainly textile and clothing. The civil conflict in Sri Lanka ended in 2009, but many challenges remain. Therefore, this study examines the lessons that can be learnt in developing policies for rebuilding the nation and re-setting economic goals for post-conflict Sri Lanka.*

**Key Words:** *Singapore Model, Nation Building, Political Democracy, Economic Development, Sri Lanka, Singapore*

**JEL Code:** O40, P5

---

### **Sanika Sulochani Ramanayake**

IDRC Post-Doctoral Fellow, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Goregaon-East, Mumbai, India.

+91-2228416593 [sulochani00@gmail.com](mailto:sulochani00@gmail.com) , [sanika@igidr.ac.in](mailto:sanika@igidr.ac.in)

### **Chandana Shrinath Wijetunga**

Senior Lecturer, Kothalawala Defense University, Sri Lanka. Researcher, Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Seoul National University, South Korea. [shrinath@snu.ac.kr](mailto:shrinath@snu.ac.kr) , [bdmcswijethunga@gmail.com](mailto:bdmcswijethunga@gmail.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Singapore and Sri Lanka have a deep diplomatic relationship that started in the 1950s. The British colonial histories of both countries resulted in new opportunities and challenges. Sri Lanka and Singapore gained their independence in 1948 and 1965 respectively. Lee Kuan Yew<sup>2</sup> visited Sri Lanka for the first time in 1956 to start a diplomatic relationship; on this visit, he stated that Ceylon<sup>3</sup> had more resources and better infrastructure than Singapore (Jayaweera et al. 2010). In 1978, the late Sri Lankan president J.R. Jayewardene acknowledged Singapore's development and stated that 'Sri Lanka will be successful if it is able to follow the Singapore model.' During his rule as President, J.R. Jayawardena was able to introduce open economic policies in Sri Lanka (1978–1979) that were based on Singapore's policies. In 2014, former President Mahinda Rajapaksa claimed that Sri Lanka could not attain development using the 'Singapore model' because of the contrasting scales of the two countries: that is, since Singapore was a city State whereas Sri Lanka was an island nation. This political history created an interesting arena that can be explored in depth by concentrating on the economies of both countries.

In the 1980s, Singapore was described as 'the world's most successful economy' (Lim 1983) and 'the most successful of East Asia's four tigers'<sup>4</sup>, which included South Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan (Giordano and Kato 1993). Singapore's real Gross National Product increased thirteen-fold between 1960 and 1992. Singapore's economic growth increased, leading its per capita income to rise from the 33rd rank worldwide in 1965 to 17th in 1992: ahead of Spain, New Zealand and Ireland (World Bank 1994). Manufactured exports were the engines of Singapore's economic growth from 1970 to 1979. The proportion of direct manufactured exports to GDP increased from 7% to 12% in 1966 to almost half in 1979 and nearly three-fifths in 1992. After 1967, direct exports of manufactures grew considerably faster than manufactured output (Huff 1995). Lee Kuan Yew, the founding father of modern Singapore, played a huge role in its economic development. Lee became the Prime Minister of Singapore in 1959 and served for three decades until he stepped down in 1990. The per capita income of the city State increased from around \$428 (in 1960) to more than \$12,766 (in 1990), which is equivalent to a thirty-fold increase within three decades. In 2014, Singapore's per capita reached \$56,287, which is equivalent to a hundred

---

<sup>2</sup> Lee Kuan Yew was the first prime minister of Singapore and the force behind Singapore's independence from Malaysia. His pioneer role in politics and fight for freedom gave him the recognition as "the founding father of modern Singapore."

<sup>3</sup> 'Ceylon' was the former name for Sri Lanka.

<sup>4</sup>The four East Asian 'tigers' or 'dragons' are South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, which achieved exceptional economic growth within a short period.

and thirty two-fold increase in 65 years. In contrast, Sri Lanka only managed a three-fold increase from \$143 (in 1960) to around \$470 (1990); Sri Lanka's per capita in 2014 reached \$3,821, which is equivalent to a 27-fold increase in 65 years<sup>5</sup>.

Both countries were British colonies for nearly 150 years. Both inherited British social and economic systems and financial, health, and education sectors. Interestingly, after 70 years of independence, Sri Lanka is still following the colonial system in producing accountants. In contrast, Singapore moved away from the colonial system within four years of independence and showed extreme developmental improvements (Wijewardena and Yapa 1998). At present, Singapore is one of the East Asian tigers and serves as a model to many other developing countries. Sri Lanka continues to struggle with the same economic, social, and political problems since it has faced since independence.

The applicability of the Singapore model to other economies has been debated (Lim et al. 2005; Chen 1975). Some studies suggest that the Singapore model is unique to the city State and cannot be implemented in other economies. A similar debate arose in describing the development models of the four East Asian tigers, which are impossible to recreate in other developing economies. This situation raises the question of whether the Singapore model is applicable or adaptable by other countries. Singapore's achievements are a result of a continuing process of integration, nation building, and strategies in economic development.

Introducing the 'flying geese' model Kojima (2000) explains how rapid economic growth models can be tested with a regional economic development plan and its applicability to other nations in Asia. Moreover, Lucas (1993) analyses recent models of growth and trade in search of descriptions of technologies that are consistent with rapid economic growth. Likewise, some argue that the applicability of 'economic models' for developing countries (Hirofumi 1965; Lucas 1988). Furthermore, others argue in favour of the applicability of 'economic models' for certain sectors to achieve development goals. Phang (2007) elaborates the relevance of housing and welfare state of Singapore model to other nations; while Yue (2005) forms an arena for discussion on industrial policy and the Singapore model and its applicable norms.

This study has two main objectives. First, it attempts to reveal characteristics of Singapore's development and link such characteristics to its nation building process and economic development. Second, we explore Sri Lanka's political and economic conditions and discuss the country's long-term development goals. The development goals of Sri Lanka can be addressed by exploring general theories of development.

---

<sup>5</sup> Statistics are in current US Dollars, Data source: World Bank – World Development Indicators online database.

Our aim is not only to elaborate the relevance of gaining insight into Singapore's model to facilitate Sri Lanka's development process, but also to show why political decision-makers fail to address the Singapore model in appropriate focal points.

The finding of this study identifies the success story of Singapore, which comprises nation building for economic success. These findings are used to project possible policy implications for Sri Lanka, and to help the country achieve economic success preceded by Singapore. The development process of Singapore thoroughly emphasized that the economic success can be achieved by a formerly colonized, multi-cultural, small country with few natural resources. Sri Lanka suffered from a traumatic civil conflict for more than three decades. Thus, the country was unable to continue new era of nation building, due to reasons including the struggle for political power, government malfunction, ethnic discrimination, and elitism-related issues. Sri Lanka's economic indicators improved when the civil conflict ended in 2009<sup>6</sup>. This new economic era, which can be referred to as a post-conflict era, heralds the country's reawakening. This era opens Sri Lanka to new opportunities and challenges and may be considered the start of a new era of economic development. Therefore, a well-planned approach along the lines of the Singaporean model, begun with commitment, may be recommended for adoption in Sri Lanka.

## **ECONOMIC HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF SINGAPORE**

Singapore is an island city State located South of Malaysia, with population of around 5.69 million<sup>7</sup> in 2016. Singapore transformed into a first-world metropolis from its status as a small, underdeveloped nation at the time of its independence. With a Gross National Product (GNP) per capita of less than US\$320, Singapore was a third-world nation with poor infrastructure and limited capital (EDB 1990). Low-end commerce was the mainstay of Singapore's economy. The handful of industries in the country produced only for domestic consumption, leaving no room for foreign direct investment (FDI).

The process of decolonization resulted in insecurity when Singapore formed its own government in 1959. When Singapore gained independence from Malaysia in 1965, Singaporeans were left to construct a nation with weakened social, political and economic infrastructure and scarce historical and cultural resources. At present, Singapore is one of the world's most prosperous countries with strong international trading links. Most of this economic growth can be explained by an open trade policy that promotes production and exports, and attracts foreign capital inflow. The rapid

---

<sup>6</sup>Civil war started in July 23, 1983 and ended in May 18, 2009.

<sup>7</sup> Using data from the World Bank - World Development Indicators online database, in 2016.

economic growth of Singapore improved the social and economic welfare of the country (Feridum and Sissoko 2011). Singapore has a highly developed, trade-oriented market economy which has been ranked as the most open country in the world, the seventh least corrupt, most pro-business with low tax rates (14.2% of GDP), and the third highest per-capita GDP in terms of purchasing power parity (PPP). Singapore's largely corruption-free government, skilled workforce, and advanced and efficient infrastructure have attracted investments from more than 3,000 multinational corporations (MNCs) from the United States, Japan, and Europe (WEF 1999; Huff 1995; Teo and Ang 2001).

Table 1 shows a few macroeconomic indicators of Singapore from 1960 to 2014. High GDP growth, export growth, and FDI helped Singapore to achieve its current economic status. Government expenditure for research and development (R&D) is also significant compared to other countries. The starting point of Singapore's industrialization is similar to that of South Korea, which started with factories that produced garments, textiles, toys, wood products, and hair wigs (See appendix Figure A1)<sup>8</sup>.

**Table 1: Selected Macroeconomic Indicators of Sri Lanka, 1960–2014 (%)**

Indicators	1960~ 1969	1970~ 1979	1980~ 1989	1990~ 1999	2000~ 2009	2010~ 2014
GDP growth (annual %)	8.85	9.47	7.79	7.30	5.28	6.44
Exports of goods and services (annual % growth)	n.a	14.90	11.59	11.01	8.10	6.31
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	n.a	5.57	9.57	11.33	15.62	20.73
Research and development expenditure (% of GDP)	n.a	n.a	n.a	1.59	2.18	2.13

Source: Period average data: using annual data from World Bank – WDI calculated by the authors (\*n.a = not available)

Singapore started with low-wage labor-intensive industries and later progressed to capital and technology-intensive industries. Manufacturing became increasingly sophisticated and included computer parts, peripherals, software packages and silicon

<sup>8</sup> South Korea, another Asian Tiger, developed its industries through low-technological labour-intensive industries (like the production of garments, wigs, etc.), then moved into heavy industry (such as ship-building) and then to capital intensive industries such as semiconductors, memory chips and automobiles (see appendix Figure A1).

wafers. This development led to new investments, particularly in the electronics sector, and to product diversification which greatly enhanced export performance despite global recession. MNCs began their R&D activities in Singapore as an extension of their successful manufacturing operations, which demonstrated their long-term confidence in Singapore. In the 1990s, companies moved up the value chain and intensified their use of technology while the service sector became an engine for growth.

### **Nation-Building Process**

According to Brown (1998), South East Asian nationalism was formed as a continuum spanning from 'ethno cultural' to 'multicultural' and 'civic'. This concept of nationalism explains Burma's extreme ethno-cultural nation-building and Singapore's civic nation-building approach. The nation-building approach of Singapore has two dimensions. The first aspect is building physical infrastructure and second the creation of a national community. The nation-building project was initiated by S. Rajaratnam, C.V. Devan Nair, George Yeo and Lee Kuan Yew. This process engaged first- to third-generation politicians in nation building. According to Barr and Skrbiš (2008), nation building is intertwined and co-dependent with the development of physical infrastructure and construction of national community. Karl W. Deutsch stressed that nation building follows the architectural and mechanical model:

The new roads, bridges, factories, airports and housing complexes represent thus more than merely useful utilities. They are, along with monuments built to memorialize the heroic efforts of nation builders, public displays of a successful nation-building project. The new infrastructure is a foundation for national imaginings and visibly articulates youthful enthusiasm, attempts to succeed against the odds and represents the previously inconceivable. In other words, they are the solid visible manifestations of spirit of new national community (Deutsch 1963).

The second dimension of nation building is the construction of a community of belonging, which is a complex process. Benedict Anderson stated that a community of belonging can be constructed with the involvement of communal and institutional bonds of belonging (Anderson 1993). Ideology and coercion are parts of the success story of Singapore. Elitism played a key role in nation-building. Existing literature emphasized that 'Singapore's brand of elitism' added color to vital elements of government proceedings. In nationalism theories, the elite are considered the key animators of nationhood (Anderson 1993). Lee's idea of elitism was intended for social progress. Lee understood that a 'creative minority' is an essential aspect of attaining positive social initiatives. The elitist vision of Singapore was an effective

tool of nation building because it resonated strongly with the indigenous societal vision of Singaporean Chinese communities.

The Chinese Singaporean community has strong Confucian foundations. Thus, the two main components of Lee's concept of elitism, namely, hierarchy/rationalism and education/scholarship, naturally blended with society (Yew 2013). His idea was that the elites should progressively reform from the top, where he believed they should be above average. Moreover he believed elites are above average and driving society forwards at a great pace.

Lee Kwan Yew strongly emphasized that the elite should not to be based on accidental factors, such as race, consanguinity or class, but only on merit. This process of elite formation mechanism was introduced as a visionary process. The Singapore Armed Forces (SAF), elite administrative service, government-linked companies (GLCs) and statutory boards were mainly involved in the formation process. These elite groups were affiliated with the Prime Minister's office (PMO), Ministry of Defense (MINDEF), Ministry of Education (MOE), Ministry of Finance (MOF), Ministry of Trade and Industry (MTI) and Ministry of Home affairs (MHA). Other elite groups, such as communal leaders and the economic, academic and religious elite, were introduced to other ends of the nation-building exercise.

The Singaporean community was constructed through elitism backed by Singapore's version of multiracialism. Since independence in 1965, Singapore did not attempt to synthesize ethnic differences into a new form of Singaporean ethnic identity. Brown (1998) divided the management of ethnicity in Singapore into periods. He distinguished three periods namely, 'ethnic mosaic' from 1959–1965, 'inclusionary corporatism' from 1966–1980 and 'Asianisation' post-1980. This era is broadly discussed by scholars by highlighting ethnic roots. Similar ethnic differences are evident in multi-ethnic Sri Lanka. The common query as to why, if Singapore is considered for its development, South Korea or Taiwan are not so considered does not fully take note of the situation mainly due to ethnic content. Rather than studying a country having low ethnic diversity, it is always insightful to study a multi-ethnic, multi-lingual society where many similar constrains are faced.

### **Singapore's Model for Economic Development**

Singapore's economic transformation was primarily driven by twin engines of growth: namely, finance and business services. The export-based manufacturing sector in Singapore had played a huge role in its development, similar to that of other East Asian tigers. The manufacturing sector is considered an economic pillar given its contribution of more than one-fifth of Singapore's gross national output since 1970. According to Moi (1998), about two-thirds of Singapore's domestic exports and the country's largest employers are covered by the manufacturing sector.

Manufacturing production was highly export-oriented, as shown in the increase of directly manufactured exports (excluding petroleum) from 13.6% of GDP in 1967 to 47.1% in 1979 (Huff 1995).

According to Teo and Ang (2001), factories that produced garments, textile, toys, wood products, and hair wigs, formed the highly labor-intensive manufacturing sector of Singapore in the 1960s. In 1970s, Singapore moved to capital- and skill-intensive industries and later shifted to technology-intensive industries; in the 1990s, Singapore ventured into knowledge-driven industries. According to Huff (1995), MNCs started their R&D activities in Singapore as an extension of their successful manufacturing operations and in order to demonstrate their long-term confidence in Singapore. Companies moved up in the value chain in the 1990s and intensified their use of technology while the service sector served as the engine for growth. The industrial development of Singapore is similar to that of South Korea. South Korea performed well in terms of long-term economic growth and became one of the Asian tigers, overcoming the middle income-trap (Lee 2013). In the late 1960s, the labor-intensive apparel (T&C) industry was the biggest export industry in Korea, but the sector started to decline in the 1970s. The Korean economy introduced the electric equipment industry in the mid-1960s and the automobile industry in the mid-1980s (see Appendix, Figure A1). Pillay (2004) offered the following explanation of the Singaporean economy:

On the economic side, the problem was essentially an existential one- employment and growth. It was tackled by attracting enough factors of production, that is, resources of capital, manpower, and technical and managerial know-how. Also land –think of Jurong (massive industrial estate created in on the western end of the island in the 1960s)...Management and technical know-how, as well as markets, could be acquired through joint-ventures with MNCs. (Pillay 2004, p.10)

According to UNCTAD-WIR (2012), Singapore benefited from the inward flow of FDI from global investors and institutions because of a highly attractive investment climate and a stable political environment. Singapore is considered the financier of major FDI outflow around the world. The high savings ratio of Singapore is another key point of its development (Balassa 1977; Huff 1995). The Ministry of Trade in Investment (MIT) of Singapore indicates that R&D is a key strategy of Singapore's future. According to data from the MIT (2011), government investment into R&D has grown more than eight times over the last two decades, from \$2 billion for the first five-year National Technology Plan from 1991 to 1995 to \$16.1 billion for the recently announced Research, Innovation and Enterprise Plan (2011–2015). In 2006, the government allocated more than \$13 billion to promote R&D over the next five



years as part of its goal of increasing gross expenditure on R&D (GERD) from 2.25% to 3% of GDP (Huff 1995)<sup>9</sup>.

The physical location of Singapore is a main factor behind its economic development. The country's strategic location, city-state status, and natural harbor highly facilitated its fast development. Young (1992), Hilton and Manning (1995), and Frost (2008) indicated that Singapore's geographical situation was astride the world's main east-west communications routes, thereby bridging the time zone gap in New York, London, Hong Kong, and Tokyo. Furthermore, 40% of world maritime trade passes through the Singapore harbor.

Moreover, Lee Kuan Yew's strong political and economic development policies heavily influenced Singapore's development. First, Lee attracted foreign trade and investments through government intervention. Huff (1995) and Findlay and Wellisz (1993) emphasized that government interventions were major features of the Singaporean model of economic development, wherein the government controls wages and labor. They indicated that the State played a central role in Singapore's development. The government adopted pro-foreign investment and export-oriented economic policy to promote growth and development in Singapore (Feridum and Sissoko 2011; Huff 1995). The government was small, efficient and honest. Singapore has low crime and virtually no official corruption. Singapore ranks high in terms of human development indicators, such as life expectancy, infant mortality and income per person. Life expectancy in Singapore is one of the longest around the world. Furthermore, we pay attention to the political stability or political democracy in Singapore. Since 1980s Singapore

Has had a strong and stable political democracy since the independence; and this was another cause for economic development in Singapore<sup>10</sup>.

Ethnic diversity and equal treatment of minorities were the major concerns of Singapore after gaining independence. Subramanian and Roy (2001) introduced the case of Mauritius and emphasized the importance of ethnic diversity on economic growth. Singapore consists of diverse ethnic groups: namely, Chinese (about 74%), which comprise the majority, and substantial minorities, such as Malays (13%) and Indians (9%) who acquired a national identity. When Lee introduced these groups, the crowd celebrated improbable patriotism instead of mourning. Lee declared English as the national language of Singapore to balance conditions for majority and minority groups in the country.

---

<sup>9</sup>See figure 4, it shows R&D in Singapore

<sup>10</sup> See Figure 3 for democracy in Singapore.

Singapore is a unique case in that it focused attention on economic accomplishments in infrastructure and planning. The economic growth of Singapore is supported by its housing infrastructure and urban planning. The main infrastructure provider of Singapore was the government. The most modern and efficient infrastructures were constructed, which include ports, airports, telecommunications, roads, and a rapid transit system. This development provided a subsidy for business in Singapore, which reduced expenses for operations within the country and in reaching world markets, which is called 'distance costs' (Helleiner 1973). Sandilands (1992) explained that domestic capital resources were mobilized for economic development when the government controlled savings to invest in infrastructure and housing. The plurality of Singaporean society was clearly addressed in the country's urban planning and design, which reduced ethnic problems of the government. Equal opportunities were given and the entire ethnic heritage was conserved and valued for a greater purpose. Housing plans were drawn with the objective of retaining and enhancing existing activities that are part of historical and cultural heritage. The aim of this approach was to restore buildings with historical and architectural significance, improve the general physical environment, retain traditional trades while consolidating new areas, introduce new features to enhance the identity of the place and involve public and private sectors in carrying out conservation projects<sup>11</sup>. According to the annual report of the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) (1988/89), conservation efforts primarily targeted historic places and districts associated with particular ethnic groups, such as Peranakan Place, Chinatown, Kampong Glam, and Little India. The city's colonial heritage was not neglected to preserve the multi-cultural heritage of indigenous and immigrant groups.

## **HISTORY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF SRI LANKA**

Sri Lanka<sup>12</sup>, which is an island located at the southeast tip of India, has a population of approximately 21 million. The vast majority of the population is Sinhalese (72%), 18% of the population is Tamil<sup>13</sup>, 8% is Muslim<sup>14</sup>, and other ethnicities comprise 2% of the population. Sri Lanka was colonized by three western powers. The Portuguese occupied Sri Lanka in the 16th century (1505), the Dutch then displaced the Portuguese in the 17th century (1679), and finally, the British took control of the

---

<sup>11</sup> A Manual for Kampong Glam Conservation Area, 1988, p. 26; A Manual for Chinatown Conservation Area, 1988, p. 46; A Manual for Little India Conservation Area, 1988, p. 27

<sup>12</sup> Sri Lanka was known as Ceylon under British colonial government before its independence in 1948.

<sup>13</sup> Descendants of the ancient migration from South India (around 100 B.C.), or the more recent Importation of laborers for the tea plantations by the British in the 19th century.

<sup>14</sup> They are called the Moors.

country in the beginning of the 19th century (in 1796 or 1815: 1796 when Dutch were overpowered by British, and 1815 when the Sinhalese kingdom in Kandy was conquered). Sri Lanka regained its independence in 1948. Post-independence Sri Lanka was governed by two major political parties, namely, the United National Party (UNP) and the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP).

Sri Lanka suffered from a civil conflict between government troops and the Liberation Tamil Tiger Eelam (LTTE), a terrorist group which emerged in areas where a majority of the population was Tamil. When the country gained independence, problems emerged among Sinhalese and Tamils over ethnic rights, and the government failed to offer a stable solution. Disagreements led to a civil armed conflict in the late 1970s that lasted for three decades until the LTTE was destroyed by government forces in 2009. Sri Lanka's economic history can be divided into three major eras, namely, the colonial era (1505–1948), post-colonial era (1949–2013), and post-conflict era (after 2009).

### **Colonial to Post-Colonial Era**


The British introduced plantation economy to Sri Lanka during the colonial era. Coffee was first introduced and then tea was incorporated into the highlands. Crop agriculture then revolutionized the Sri Lankan economy. During this era, Indian Tamil plantation workers were introduced to Sri Lanka. They now comprise 6% of the total population and are a majority in Nuwara Eliya in Central Sri Lanka (Wijetunga and Sung 2015). By the end of the 19th century, rubber plantations were developed as an additional source of export earnings. Later, cinnamon, rubber and Ceylon tea became the main produce and national exports of the country. Rice and coconut were produced primarily for the domestic market.

Sri Lanka gained independence from the British in 1948. In the past, Sri Lankan economy was heavily based on labor-intensive agriculture. In 1960, agriculture comprised 32% of the Sri Lankan GDP, which then declined to 10% in 2014. The country is rich in mineral resources, such as clay, gems, graphite, limestone, mineral sands, and phosphate rock. At present, Sri Lanka's main export-earning industry is textile and clothing (T&C). After introducing export processing zones (EPZs) in the 1970s, the T&C industry became the largest export-earning industry in Sri Lanka since 1986. T&C is also the country's largest net foreign exchange earner since 1992. The total value of export earnings in the sector was 2,424 million US dollars, which account for 52% of the total export earnings in 2002. The contribution to GDP was 5.3% in 2002 (Dheerasinghe 2003). Today, in Sri Lanka's T&C export share is over 80% of total exports, and T&C is the largest export-oriented manufacturing industry in the country.

Sri Lanka is a lower-middle income developing nation with a GDP of about \$32 billion. In terms of economic situation, the country’s economic growth averaged at around 4.5% because of the civil conflict that broke out in 1983. Year 2001 was significant because GDP growth reached negative 1.4%, which was the only contraction since the country’s independence. GDP increased by 6.8% in 2007, which was a decrease from the 7.7% growth in 2006. Sri Lanka's key exports, such as garments and tea, performed well. The service sector is the largest component of GDP at around 58% in 2014 (Figure 1). The tourism industry is the biggest service industry that brings foreign currency to Sri Lanka. Moreover, the country’s growing information technology sector, especially information technology training and software development, are important service sectors. The industrial sector remained at 32% and the agricultural sector remained at 10%.

Foreign migrant workers and their remittances have a significant impact on the Sri Lankan economy. This group is composed of around two million Sri Lankans working abroad and remitting money to Sri Lanka. This amount comprises 10% of the total population and is the second largest contributor of foreign exchange earnings in Sri Lanka.

**Figure 1: Sectorial Behaviors in Sri Lanka (2015)**



Sources: Using data from Department of Census and Statistics (2nd Quarter of 2015) and Central Bank of Sri Lanka (2014) created by the authors.

### Recent Economic Development in Sri Lanka

The economic growth of Sri Lanka is among the fastest in South Asia in recent years, with a growth average of 6.3% between 2002 and 2013 and GDP per capita increase

from US\$583 in 1961 to US\$3638 in 2015<sup>15</sup>. Growth during the past five years has been in the form of a peace dividend that resulted from reconstruction efforts and increased consumption. Post-conflict Sri Lanka is dependent on the service sector, primarily the tourism sector. According to the tourism officials of the country, tourist arrivals increased by 50% or an increase to 160,000 in the first quarter of 2010 from 106,000 in 2009. Tourists are flooding back by 50% this past year, and hotel tariffs are three times their rates during conflict period. The only international hotel chain in downtown Colombo was Hilton, but after the end of the conflict, Shangri-La, Marriott and Hyatt started their investments in Sri Lanka. Southern Sri Lanka neglected sustainable development projects during the conflict, but this is changing because of development projects run by the Chinese government.

According to the analysis of annual GDP growth, exports, foreign direct investments and R&D increased significantly after the civil war in Sri Lanka, especially GDP and exports (Table 2). However, R&D expenditure remains low at 0.16 %. Lee (2013) and Lee and Kim (2009) emphasized that growth in education and R&D is a necessary condition for developing countries to enable them to move up in the technological cycle, which many developing countries are unable to achieve. According to Ramanayake and Lee (2015), export growth is the key international integration variable of economic growth in South and North countries.

**Table 2: Sri Lanka macroeconomic indicators, 1960–2014 (%)**

Indicators	1960– 1969	1970– 1979	1980– 1989	1990– 1999	2000– 2009	2010– 2014
GDP growth (annual %)	4.67	4.23	4.15	5.26	5.00	7.44
Exports of goods and services (annual % growth)	1.32	1.92	6.26	6.99	3.60	6.46
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	n.a	0.15	0.75	1.21	1.31	1.38
Research and development expenditure (% of GDP)	n.a	n.a	n.a	0.18	0.15	0.16


Source: Period average data: using annual data from World Bank –WDI calculated by the authors (\*n.a = not available)

When we compare Sri Lanka and Singapore in terms of income level (GDP per capita), Figure 2 indicates that the GDP per capita in 1960 in Sri Lanka was almost

<sup>15</sup> According to World Bank- World Development Indicators data

similar to that of Singapore. However, Singapore's income level started to increase in the 1970s after their independence. Sri Lanka became independent in 1948, but is still considered a lower-middle income country.

**Figure 2: GDP per capita in Singapore and Sri Lanka from 1960-2014**



Source: using World Bank- WDI data created by the authors

Singapore assumed a peculiar economic niche among the other developing nations, whereas Sri Lanka was left far behind. The per capita growth rate of Sri Lanka started to increase rapidly since 2009, given the post-conflict development process. The GDP per capita growth rate of Sri Lanka in 2009 was 2.8%, 7.2% in 2010, and 8.3% in 2012. This growth started to decline in 2013, which reached 2.6%, but increased again to 3.8% in 2015<sup>16</sup>. Figure 2 shows the GDP per capita in Singapore and Sri Lanka from 1960 to 2015. This figure indicates the rapid economic growth of Singapore and the stagnation of Sri Lankan economy.


### Singapore vs. Sri Lanka

In this particular section we decided to compare two most significant economic factors, which are unique to Singapore's economic development and are significantly weaker in Sri Lanka. We have to emphasize that there are other factors already discussed in our paper, but in this comparison we limit ourselves to only the variables of democracy and research and development (R&D). As we mentioned earlier, democracy since the independence of Singapore was strong and stable. However, many developing nations are unable to maintain democracy and many of them suffer due to unstable political conditions. Figure 3 compares the political stability and economic growth in terms of GDP per capita growth in Singapore versus Sri Lanka.

<sup>16</sup> GDP per capita growth data is taken from World Bank, World Development Indicators online data base

According to that, the Sri Lankan figure shows political stability<sup>17</sup> typical of a developing country, which affects growth by virtue of a negative correlation.

**Figure 3: Political Democracy and Economic Growth in Singapore and Sri Lanka**




Source: using data from Lee and Kim (2009) data base created by the authors

\*Data period from 1080-2005

Somehow, since 2000 politics shows positive correlation with growth till 2005. But in Singapore, it has been stable from the 1980s to 2005.

**Figure 4: R&D as a Percentage of DGP in Singapore & Sri Lanka (1995-2010)**



Source: using World Bank – WDI data created by the authors

<sup>17</sup> Political democracy data was taken from Lee & Kim (2009) data base. They have calculated data for more than 150 countries, data available from 1980 to 2005. Democracy data range goes from 1 to 10; if the index is more close to 1 indicates that country has high democracy; index close to 10 means less democracy and politically unstable, crisis and more corruptions. See Lee & Kim (2009) for more details.

Innovation is a key factor to remain globally competitive. Therefore R&D plays a significant role in economic growth and development in any economy. The Figure 4 above indicates the trends of R&D in Singapore and Sri Lanka as a percentage of GDP. It is very clear that Singapore since 1996 rapidly increased R&D. According to the Ministry of Trade and Industry of Singapore R&D is a key strategy for Singapore's future. Over the last two decades, Government investment into R&D has grown more than eight times, from \$2b for the first five-year National Technology Plan from 1991 to 1995, to \$16.1 billion for the recently announced Research, Innovation and Enterprise Plan (2011-2015) (MIT 2011). In Sri Lanka it shows a negative trend. Furthermore, the rapid increase of R&D in Singapore during 1990s contributed to its economic success. Moreover this indicates that developing countries need to invest extensively in R&D for their development.

### **WHY SRI LANKA FAILED?**

Sri Lankan governments post-independence failed to implement a proper vision for Sri Lankan economic development. When Singapore initiated its first 'nation building' movement, the government and society failed to blend into this new strategic plan. South Korea also implemented 'five years plans' during its catching-up period (late 1960s), which was initiated by President Park. Sri Lankan governments proposed political ideologies to gain civilian votes instead of strategically planning future economic development. The two major political parties that shared political power in governing the country failed to uplift the economy of the nation. Sri Lanka has a two-party system. Thus, attaining electoral success for one party is difficult. After independence, the United National Party and Sri Lanka Freedom Party ruled the country and represented two major streams of political ideologies. Another major concern is that areas in which a majority of Tamils live are dominated by Tamil parties. Communal politics and the race for power push aside certain development initiatives that the country should implement as a whole.

Elites in Singapore played a vital role in its nation-building process and economic succession. Singaporean and Sri Lankan elite do not considerably differ in terms of origin. However, their roles in the country's socio-political arena significantly differ. Lee Kuan Yew represents Singaporean elite, wherein a majority were Chinese Singaporeans. As an eldest son born into an elite English-speaking Chinese family, he was surrounded by considerable comfort. He was educated in elite institutions (Raffles Institution of Singapore) and later in Cambridge Law School in England. His presence in the government enabled the country to secure ethnic minority rights, thereby establishing English as the national language and securing civic economic development. S.W.R.D. Bandaranayake was an elite who became the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka. He was educated in elite schools in Sri Lanka and later studied in Oxford



University. After gaining political power, he initiated the 'Sinhalese Nationalist' movement and established Sinhalese as the national language and neglected ethnic minorities. This approach is a great example of how and why Sri Lankan elite ideologies affected the downfall of a rising nation and contributed to its current economic situation.

Corruption among politicians was a major phenomenon in Sri Lanka, similar to the rest of South Asia. Corruption led to too many trust issues between the political elite and non-elite. In contrast, Singapore was one of the least-corrupt countries in the world for decades, as shown in the corruption perception index (CPI) score published by Transparency International in 2016. Sri Lanka ranked among corrupt nations along with other South Asian counterparts. Corruption was committed in the government by ministers, politicians and government organizations. This practice distances the general public from the government thereby resulting in trust and reliability issues.

Lee's concept of 'the elite' became central to the operation of the Singapore system. It grew in his mind into a self-conscious, self-righteous class of talented and people with strong character, who are imbued with a collective sense of purpose and a consciously collective understanding of the thinking of the group. (Barr and Skrbis 2008, p.58)

Education reforms in Singapore produced the 'Singapore version of elites.' This well-educated civilians were awarded with scholarships to enable them to pursue their higher studies in elite universities or abroad and give them opportunities to join the government. Singapore is one of the countries in the world which are least affected by brain-drain. In contrast, Sri Lanka followed the British system after independence, although it was clearly at odds with the present need of the country. The Sri Lankan government is still struggling to allocate sufficient money for education and R&D. Recent education activism was fighting for a 6% of GDP allocation for education. Singapore focuses on high technology and R&D in every essential field. Singapore introduced many educational and research facilities, which benefited the economy and society<sup>18</sup>. Sri Lanka began to focus on R&D only recently. Sri Lanka requires additional facilities to create new products and acquire patents on products and systems.

Singapore and Sri Lanka are both multiethnic societies. However, Singapore has managed to establish a stable political arena with less ethnic conflicts and discrimination. The concepts of the nation-building program of Singapore were

---

<sup>18</sup>In Singapore the government spent 2.92% in education as a percentage of GDP in 2013 (according to World Bank-World Development Indicators data).

instrumental in this regard. Singapore's success is mainly due to its conflict-free history after independence, which was a result of government policies and planning. The government created equal rights for all citizens and encouraged Singaporeans to accept each other.

Therefore, Singaporean Chinese, Singaporean Indians, Singaporean Muslims and others exist together. In Sri Lanka, ethnicity of a group comes first rather than nationality. Conflicts are common among majority Sinhalese population and Tamils and Muslims. The government should end this racial segregation. Instead of separating Sri Lankan Tamils and Indian Tamils, they should be introduced by addressing them as Sri Lankan Tamils and Sri Lankan Indians. Moreover, the government should implement rights to safeguard ethnic heritage of all ethnic groups.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Singapore's development was the result of a visionary process. Nation building and the Singapore model of economic development played a significant role in achieving the country's development goals. Nation building in Singapore contains two dimensions. The first dimension involves building physical infrastructure and second dimension refers to the creation of a national community of belonging. The process was driven by three major points: government's ownership of the nation-building process, micro management of everyday life, and the role played by the elite. Lee Kuan Yew's 'Singapore version' of elitism was not based on accidental factors as race, consanguinity or class, but purely only on merit. The Singapore community was constructed through elitism backed by the Singapore version of multiracialism. Singapore's physical location, political democracy, anti-corruption, education reforms and research and development (R&D) are behind the country's economic development. Democracy is maintained by promoting a plural society with equal treatment of minorities.

Sri Lanka suffered from a civil conflict that lasted for 30 years after gaining independence. Political leadership in the country was unstable, the government was corrupt, and political interference was high on peasants. Ethnic minority rights were neglected or violated in many political agendas. Sri Lanka needs a visionary process to rebuild the nation after the civil war which damaged every aspect of country's economy and economic development. The country should concentrate on policies that safeguard political stability, minority rights, R&D, manufacturing sector investments, and increased benefits for FDI. FDI is the main knowledge-transferring engine, particularly for modern science and technological know-how, which is rare and necessary in most developing countries, including Sri Lanka. Proper educational reforms should be introduced, which played a key role in Singapore's path to economic development. To overcome economic stagnation, Sri Lanka should

concentrate on developing small and medium entrepreneurs (SMEs). The country should first build the chain of SMEs with sufficient technological knowhow, which can then develop into something akin to the high technological big industries from which Singapore gained economic stability.

## REFERENCES


- Anderson, B. (1993). Imagining 'East Timor'. *Arena Magazine* (Fitzroy, Vic), (4), 23.
- Balassa, B. (1977). 'Revealed 'Comparative Advantage Revisited: An Analysis of Relative Export Shares of The Industrial Countries, The Manchester School, 45(4), 327-344.
- Barr, M. D., & Skrbiš, Z. (2008). *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and The Nation-Building Project*, Nias Press.
- Brown, D. (1998). Globalisation, Ethnicity and the Nation-State: The Case of Singapore. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 52 (1), 35-46.
- Central Bank of Sri Lanka. (2015). Press Releases. Retrieved from: [http://www.cbsl.gov.lk/htm/english/02\\_prs/P\\_1.Asp?Yr=2015](http://www.cbsl.gov.lk/htm/english/02_prs/P_1.Asp?Yr=2015)
- Chen, P.S.J. (1975). Elites and National Development in Singapore. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), 17-25.
- Dheerasinghe, R. (2003). International Trade. Present Status and Future Directions. *World*, 8(7.2), 13-1.
- Deutsch, K. W. (1963). *The Study of Nation-Building, 1962-1966*. Nation-Building.
- Economic Development Board (Edb). (1990). *Singapore Local Economic Development*, Edb, Singapore. Retrieved from: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/intled/resources/339650-1194284482831/4356163-1211318886634/Singaporeprofile.Pdf>
- Feridun, M., & Sissoko, Y. (2011). Impact of Fdi on Economic Development: A Causality Analysis for Singapore, 1976–2002. *International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*, 1, 7-17.
- Findlay, R. & Wellisz, S. (1993). *Five Small Open Economies*. Oxford University Press,
- Frost, E.L. (2008). *Asia's New Regionalism*. Nus Press.

- Giordano, R. & Kato, S. (1993). Singapore: The Most Successful 'Asian Dragon'. Goldman Sachs, The International Economics Analysts, 8(2), 1-12.
- Helleiner, G.K. (1973). Manufactured Exports From Less-Developed Countries And Multinational Firms. *The Economic Journal*, 21-47.
- Hilton, M. J. & Manning, S.S. (1995). Conversion of Coastal Habitats in Singapore: Indications Of Unsustainable Development. *Environmental Conservation*, 22(04), 307-322.
- Huff W.G. (1995). What Is The Singapore Model Of Economic Development?. *Cambridgejournal of Economics*, 19, 735-759.
- Jayaweera, S., Sanmugam, T., & Amarasuriya, H. (2010). Impact of Macro Economic Reforms in Sri Lanka: Retrenchment and Early Retirement of Workers.
- Kojima, K. (2000). Regional Policy Implication For Economic and Development. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 11(4), 375-40.
- Lee, K. (2009). How Can Korea Be A Role Model for Catch-Up Development? A 'Capability-Based View'. United Nations University. World Institute for Development Economic Research (Unu-Wider) Research Paper No.2009/34, 6.
- Lee, K. (2013). Schumpeterian Analysis of Economic Catch-Up: Knowledge, Path-Creation, and The Middle-Income Trap. Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, K., & Kim, B.Y. (2009). Both Institutions And Policies Matter But Differently For Different Income Groups Of Countries: Determinants Of Long-Run Economic Growth Revisited. *World Development*, 37(3), 533-549.
- Lim, C. Y. (1983). Development Economics by R. M. Sundrum: A Review Article. *Malayan Economic Review*, 28(1), 88-103.
- Lim, S., Goh,J., & Krishnamurthy, S. (2005). Applicability of the Generic Principles of Excellent Public Relations in a Different Cultural Context: The Case Study of Singapore. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(4), 315-340.
- Lucas, R.E. (1993). Making a Miracle. *Econometrica*, 61(2), 251-272.
- Lucas, R.E. (1988). On The Mechanics of Economic Development, *Journal of Moneta~Economics*, 22(1), 3-42.
- Moi, L. K. L. (1998). Case Studies on Application of Information Technology in Manufacturing Firms in Asia. Singapore (National Report). (Asian Productivity Organization, Tokyo), 224– 247.

- Mit. (2011). Ministry Of Trade in Investment Singapore, Research and Development. Retrived from: <https://www.mti.gov.sg/mtiinsights/pages/research-and-development.aspx>
- Phang, S.Y. (2007). The Singapore Model of Housing and the Welfare State: Housing And The New Welfare State: Perspectives From East Asia And Europe. Research Collection School of Economics, 15-44.
- Pillay, J.P. (2004). Reflections of a Recycled Bureaucrat. Journal of the Civil Service College, 1-10.
- Ramanayake, S.S. & Lee, K. (2015). Does Openness Lead To Sustained Economic Growth? Export Growth versus Other Variables AS Determinants of Economic Growth. Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy, 20(3), 345-368.
- Sandilands, R. J. (1992). Savings, Investment and Housing in Singapore's Growth: 1965-90. Savings and Development, 119-144.
- Teo, T.S.H. & Ang, J.S.K. (2001). Singapore's Manufacturing Sector as Engine for Economic Growth: Past, Present and Future. Science and Public Policy, 28(5), 361-70.
- Ura, Authority, Urban Redevelopment. (1988). Ura Annual Report: 1988–1989.
- Hirofumi, U. (1965). Optimum Technical Change in an Aggregative Model of Economic Growth. International Economic Review, 6, 18-31.
- Wijetunga, C.S. & Sung, J.S. (2015). Valuing the Cultural Landscapes Past and Present: Tea Plantations in Sri Lanka. Landscape Research, 40(6), 668-683.
- Wijewardena, H. & Yapa, S. (1998). Colonialism and Accounting Education in Developing Countries: The Experiences of Singapore and Sri Lanka. The International Journal of Accounting, 33(2), 269-281.
- World Bank. (1994). World Development Report 1994, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wef, World Economic Forum. (1999). the Global Competitiveness Report 1999, Geneva.
- Yew, L.K. (2013). The Wit & Wisdom of Lee Kuan Yew. Editions Didier Millet.
- Young, A. (1992). A Tale of Two Cities: Factor Accumulation and Technical Change in Hong Kong and Singapore. Nber Macroeconomics Annual, 7, 13-54.

**APPENDIX**

**Figure A1: Changing trend in the Composition of Major Export Items in South Korea**



Source: Lee (2009), (% in total Exports)