Alliance
FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND ETHICS LTDGTE

30TH DECEMBER 2025

HOW NATIONS LOSE ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POLICIES IN ASIA, EUROPE, AND AFRICA – PHILIPPINES, EU, AND NIGERIA.

By Hon.Dele Kelvin Oye

It's a curious thing, national ambition. It often starts with a grand vision, a chest-thumping declaration of destiny, only to sometimes end up like a promising soufflé that collapses in the oven. The ingredients were all there, the initial heat was perfect, but somewhere along the way, the recipe was fundamentally misunderstood. This is not just a culinary tragedy; it is the story of how nations, blessed with every advantage, can systematically choose a path away from prosperity.

This essay explores a tale of three continents, a comparative study in economic cause and effect, served with a side of cautionary humour. We begin with the Philippines, a nation that in 1950 stood as an economic beacon in Asia, second only to Japan in per capita income. It possessed a highly educated, English-speaking workforce, early reconstruction aid, and modern infrastructure—a veritable head start in the post-war race. Yet today, it looks up at neighbours it once looked down upon. We will contrast its story with the meteoric rise of the "Asian Tigers" and "Tiger Cubs" who chose a different path.

Then, we pivot to the developed world, examining the quiet divergence between the European Union and the United States. Two economic behemoths, seemingly on parallel tracks two decades ago, now find their growth trajectories separating. Here, the central tension is not about nascent industrial policy but about mature regulatory philosophy: the EU's preference for comprehensive, precautionary regulation versus the USA's appetite for disruptive innovation. It's a debate between building a very safe, comfortable car that struggles to get up hills and a faster, slightly more dangerous one that reaches new destinations.

Finally, we turn to Africa, where Nigeria, the continent's giant, is conducting a perilous experiment in real-time. With a labyrinthine bureaucracy of over 230 federal agencies often more focused on revenue collection than on trade facilitation, Nigeria stands at a crossroads. Its path is contrasted with the deliberate, business-friendly reforms of countries like Rwanda and Ghana, nations proving that strategic policy can triumph over historical or geographical constraints.

Through these three comparisons, a unifying theme emerges: economic leadership is not a birth-right, and its loss is rarely an accident. It is the cumulative result of specific policy choices. Whether through the self-imposed cage of protectionism, the slow suffocation of over-regulation, or the crushing weight of a state that views its businesses as sources of revenue rather than engines of growth, the outcome is depressingly similar. When government policies make it difficult for businesses to compete, innovate, and scale, organic economic development withers. The nation becomes dependent on the volatile prices of commodities and the benevolence of international creditors. Instead of growth, borrowing becomes a substitute—ultimately, a mortgage on the future paid for by the next generation through inflation, devaluation, and taxes. This is how the lead is lost, not with a bang, but with the quiet rustle of a thousand new regulations and one more tariff.

1. The Tale of the Overprotected Heir: The Philippines vs. the Asian Tigers

In the grand economic theatre of post-war Asia, the Philippines was cast as the lead actor. With a 1950 GDP per capita of 1,293, it stood significantly ahead of Taiwan, South Korea, and Thailand. It was a nation brimming with potential, a darling of the West, and seemingly destined for greatness. Yet, by the end of the 20th century, the Philippines had "missed out almost completely on the Asian boom." The lead actor had been relegated to a minor role, watching from the wings as its former understudies took center stage. South Korea, whose income was once 91% of the Philippines' in 1960, saw its relative income soar to 368% by 1996. The question is not just what happened, but why. The answer lies in a well-intentioned but ultimately crippling policy choice: protectionism.

1.1. The Gilded Cage of Import Substitution

Following its post-war reconstruction, the Philippines embraced a strategy of import-substituting industrialization (ISI). The logic seemed sound: erect high tariff walls to protect fledgling domestic industries from powerful foreign competitors. Give them a safe space, a "nursery," to grow strong. The government would nurture these local champions until they were ready to compete on the world stage.

Unfortunately, this nursery turned into a gilded cage. Sheltered from the harsh winds of global competition, Filipino industries grew comfortable, not strong. There was little incentive to innovate, improve quality, or increase efficiency. Why invest in costly research and development when your market is guaranteed and your customers have no other choice? This created a generation of "infant industries" that refused to grow up, perpetually dependent on state protection. While manufacturing growth was respectable in the 1950s, it soon began to slow as the limits of the domestic market were reached and inefficiencies mounted [4].

This inward-looking strategy stood in stark contrast to the paths forged by its neighbours. South Korea and Taiwan, also starting with ISI, quickly pivoted to an export-oriented industrialization (EOI) model. They recognized a crucial truth: the global market is the ultimate whetstone for sharpening industrial competitiveness. Their governments didn't just protect; they pushed. They used state support, credit, and subsidies not to create comfortable domestic monopolies, but to force their companies—chaebols like Samsung and Hyundai—to compete and win in the most demanding markets in the world: America, Europe, and Japan. This relentless external pressure was the crucible in which their economic miracles were forged.

1.2. The Curse of Small Scale and Stifled Innovation

A direct consequence of the Philippines' protectionist stance was the failure of its industries to achieve economies of scale. A domestic market, even one of millions, is a pond compared to the ocean of global demand. South Korean automakers, Taiwanese semiconductor firms, and Thai electronics assemblers scaled their production for a global audience, driving down per-unit costs and enabling massive investment in cutting-edge technology. They were playing a volume game that Filipino firms, confined to their domestic market, simply could not enter.

This lack of scale reinforced the innovation deficit. Without the profits and competitive pressure that come from global sales, investment in new machinery, product design, and efficient processes lagged. The Philippines' initial advantages—its educated, English-fluent workforce—were squandered. Instead of becoming engineers and innovators in world-beating export industries, many of the brightest Filipinos found better opportunities abroad, creating a persistent brain drain that further hollowed out the country's economic potential. The economy remained service-oriented, with a relatively modest manufacturing sector, heavily reliant on remittances from its global diaspora rather than the export of high-value goods.

While its neighbours were building global brands and integrating into complex international supply chains, the Philippines' protected industries became relics. They were too inefficient to export and too complacent to innovate. The policy designed to create industrial champions ended up creating dependents. This pivotal divergence explains why the Philippines, despite its promising start, fell behind. It chose to build a wall around its garden while its neighbours were busy building ships to trade with the world.

2. The Tortoise and the Hare on Hormones: EU Regulation vs. U.S. Innovation

Moving from the developing world to the titans of the global economy, we find a different, more subtle, yet equally profound divergence. For much of the late 20th century, the economic trajectories of the United States and the European Union seemed intertwined. They were the twin engines of global growth, sharing similar levels of wealth, technology, and human capital. Yet, over the past two decades, a noticeable gap has emerged. While the U.S. economy has roughly doubled in size, the EU's growth has been comparatively anemic. This isn't a story of tariffs and protectionism, but one of fundamentally different philosophies on the role of the state in managing a modern economy: the EU's ethos of harmonization and precaution versus the U.S.'s mantra of disruption and market dynamism.

2.1. The Precautionary Principle: Better Safe Than Rich?

The European Union has built the world's most sophisticated and comprehensive single market, a monumental achievement in regulatory harmonization. The goal is noble: to create a level playing field for all member states and ensure the highest standards of consumer protection, environmental safety, and social welfare. From the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) to stringent rules on genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and artificial intelligence, the EU operates on the "precautionary principle." In essence, if a new technology or business practice carries a potential risk of harm, it should be heavily regulated or restricted until proven safe.

The impulse is understandable. It's the logic of a responsible parent telling their child not to run with scissors. However, when applied to an entire economy, this approach can inadvertently stifle the very experimentation and risk-taking that fuel breakthrough innovation. The process of getting a new product to market can become a marathon of compliance, a bureaucratic gauntlet that favours large, established corporations with deep legal departments over nimble start-ups with disruptive ideas. It creates a system that is exceptionally good at optimizing existing processes but less adept at creating entirely new ones.

The U.S., by contrast, generally operates on a "permission less innovation" model. The default stance is that you can try something new unless there is a specific law against it. This encourages a culture where failure is seen not as a disaster to be avoided at all costs, but as a necessary stepping stone on the path to success. The legal framework, including relatively streamlined bankruptcy laws, allows entrepreneurs to fail, learn, and try again. This environment, combined with the world's deepest pool of venture capital, creates a powerful ecosystem for turning radical ideas into market-dominating companies, particularly in the tech sector which has driven much of American growth.

2.2. The Innovation Gap and its Economic Consequences

The result of these differing philosophies is a growing "innovation gap." While Europe has many world-class companies, they tend to be concentrated in established, high-precision manufacturing sectors like automotive and engineering. The U.S., meanwhile, dominates the next-generation industries of the digital economy—social media, cloud computing, AI, and biotechnology. It is no accident that the world’s largest and most influential technology companies are almost exclusively American or Chinese, not European.

This has tangible economic consequences. The U.S. economy has proven more dynamic, creating jobs at a faster rate and recovering more quickly from economic shocks. Its greater flexibility allows capital and labour to shift more rapidly from declining sectors to emerging ones. The EU's model, with its stronger labour protections and more rigid market structures, provides greater social stability and lower inequality, which are laudable goals. However, this stability has come at the cost of dynamism. The EU's "social model" is an expensive one, funded by taxes on an economic base that is growing more slowly than its primary competitor.

The lesson is not that regulation is inherently bad. Sensible rules are the bedrock of any functioning market economy. The danger lies in the character and cumulative weight of that regulation. When the regulatory state becomes so complex, so risk-averse, and so focused on managing the present that it inadvertently penalizes the future, it becomes an anchor on growth. The EU chose to build a safer, more predictable economic space. The U.S. chose a more chaotic, more unequal, but ultimately more innovative one. Over two decades, the compounding effect of that choice has become a multi-trillion-dollar difference.

3. The Labyrinth of Intentions: Nigeria vs. Africa's Reformers

Our final case study takes us to Africa, a continent of immense potential and complex challenges. Here, we examine Nigeria, the continent’s most populous nation and largest economy, a country whose economic performance often seems to defy its incredible human and natural resources. Nigeria’s story provides a powerful lesson on how a state's administrative posture—whether it acts as a facilitator of commerce or an extractor of revenue—can be the single most important determinant of its economic fate. We contrast its struggles with the purposeful, business-friendly reforms undertaken by countries like Rwanda and Ghana.

3.1. Nigeria: Death by a Thousand Agencies

To an aspiring entrepreneur in Nigeria, the government can feel less like a helping hand and more like an octopus with a hand out from every tentacle. The country is home to an astonishing number of federal agencies, with estimates exceeding 230. Many of these bodies have overlapping mandates and seem to operate with a primary directive: generate revenue for the state. This creates a business environment that can be charitably described as challenging, and more accurately as a bureaucratic labyrinth designed to frustrate commerce.

From securing permits and clearing goods at the port to paying taxes and complying with myriad regulations, businesses face a constant barrage of fees, levies, and time-consuming hurdles. This focus on revenue collection over trade facilitation is a critical flaw. It treats businesses not as partners in national development but as cash cows to be milked. The World Bank ranked Nigeria among the world's poorest by GDP per capita in 2025 (e.g., 12th poorest by IMF data) and its annual ratings placed Nigeria at 131st out of 190 economies for ease of doing business in 2019. These deeply reflects the challenging environment where the friction of doing business acts as a heavy tax on growth.

This administrative burden has several corrosive effects. It discourages foreign investment, as international firms balk at the uncertainty and hidden costs. It pushes local entrepreneurs into the informal economy, where they can avoid the regulatory sludge but are cut off from formal credit, legal protection, and the ability to scale. Most damagingly, it diverts the energy and resources of business owners away from innovation, customer service, and expansion, and towards simply navigating the bureaucracy. When Nigerian businesses CEO's, spend more time dealing with regulators than with customers, the economy is on the wrong track.

3.2. The Reformers' Blueprint: Ghana and Rwanda

The Nigerian experience is not an immutable African reality. It is not as a result of natural disasters, but man made, It is a policy choice. And other African nations are choosing differently. Look at Rwanda. A country that emerged from one of the worst genocides in modern history has systematically transformed itself into one of the continent's most lauded business destinations. It consistently ranks high for its policy and institutional quality, leading Sub-Saharan Africa in the World Bank's 2024 CPIA report.

Rwanda's success is not accidental. It is the result of a deliberate, top-down political will to slash red tape, fight corruption, and make the country attractive for investment. The government has streamlined business registration, digitized land registries, and established a transparent legal system [8]. This has created an environment of predictability and efficiency that stands in stark contrast to the Nigerian quagmire. Similarly, Ghana has made strides by focusing on political stability and creating investment-friendly policies, making it a more attractive destination for capital in key sectors. While both countries still face immense challenges, their trajectories demonstrate a profound truth: a government that is serious about making it easy to do business can unlock dramatic economic potential.

The contrast is stark. Nigeria, with its vast oil wealth and huge domestic market, is punching below its weight. Its regulatory environment acts as a self-imposed sanction on its own economy. Rwanda and Ghana, with fewer natural advantages, are over performing by simply getting the basics right. They have recognized that the state's most valuable economic function is not to extract the maximum revenue today, but to create the conditions for a much larger and more prosperous private sector tomorrow.

4. The Inescapable Conclusion: Policy is Destiny

Across three continents and three vastly different economic contexts, a single, powerful lesson rings true: a nation's economic trajectory is not predetermined by its resources, its history, or its starting position. It is forged in the crucible of policy. The Philippines tragically demonstrates how the best-laid plans of protectionism can pave a road to relative decline, creating a complacent and uncompetitive industrial sector that squanders a nation's initial advantages. The country chose security over dynamism and, in the long run, achieved neither.

The quiet divergence of the EU and the U.S. offers a more nuanced but equally important lesson for the developed world. It shows how an understandable and even admirable quest for safety, stability, and social harmony through comprehensive regulation can, over time, calcify an economy. By prioritizing the mitigation of risk over the encouragement of innovation, Europe has inadvertently traded a degree of its future dynamism for present comfort, a choice with compounding economic consequences.

Finally, the stark contrast between Nigeria and its more nimble African peers like Rwanda and Ghana provides the most urgent and actionable lesson. It reveals that the very machinery of the state can become the primary obstacle to prosperity. When government agencies view the private sector as a target for revenue extraction rather than a garden to be cultivated, they choke the life out of the economy. The reforms in Rwanda and Ghana are a testament to the fact that leadership and a clear-

headed focus on creating a business-friendly environment are the most potent tools for development.
The common thread is the crippling effect of shielding economies from reality—whether the reality of global competition, the reality of disruptive technology, or the reality of entrepreneurial ambition. Such policies inevitably lead to a dead end. When organic growth is stifled, governments are forced to turn to borrowing, substituting the illusion of progress for the real thing. But every loan is deferred taxation. It is a mortgage placed on the future, a bill that will be paid by the next generation through the insidious taxes of inflation, the pain of currency devaluation, or the blunt force of higher direct levies.

For the policymakers in Manila, Brussels, and Abuja, the message should be as clear as it is challenging. The path to sustained prosperity does not lie in building higher walls, writing more detailed regulations, or creating more agencies to collect fees. It lies in dismantling barriers. It lies in promoting competition, embracing innovation, and treating entrepreneurs as the heroes of the economic story, not the villains. Economic leadership is a choice, and it must be chosen again and again, every day, with every policy decision. To choose otherwise is to choose, slowly but surely, to be left behind.

Thank you.

***NB:* Who we are.**
The Alliance for Economic Research and Ethics (AERE) LTDGTE is a Nigerian non-profit working to strengthen both the private and public sectors in Nigeria. It achieves this by conducting independent, evidence-based research, advocating for sensible policies, providing regulatory support for businesses, bringing stakeholders together, and promoting transparent, ethical reforms to improve Nigeria's "Ease of Doing Business".

Statement by Alliance for Economic Research and Ethics LTDGTE.

Hon. Dele Kelvin Oye
Chairman, Alliance for Economic Research and Ethics Ltd/Gte
22nd President NACCIMA, Immediate Past Chairman Organized Private Sector of Nigeria.
Email: info@allianceforethics.org, deleoye@allianceforethics.org and *allianceforethics@gmail.com*
Tel: *+234 704 660 0857*
Facebook: *allianceforethics;* ***Twitter:*** *alliance4ethics*
Website: *www.allianceforethics.org*

References

[1] The Sick Man of Asia? Economic development in the … https://snf.no/media/dkpkatht/a24_00.pdf
[2] Economy > GDP per capita in 1950: Countries Compared. https://www.nationmaster.com/country-info/stats/Economy/GDP-per-capita-in-1950
[3] The Philippine economic mystery.
https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/46642/1/544227565.pdf
[4] ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE PHILIPPINES.
https://factsanddetails.com/southeastasia/Philippines/sub5_6g/entry-3916.html
[5] Economy of the Philippines - Wikipedia.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economy_of_the_Philippines
[6] Ease of Doing Business in Nigeria - Trading Economics.
https://tradingeconomics.com/nigeria/ease-of-doing-business
[7] Rwanda Leads 2024 World Bank Rankings on Policy and …
https://www.ecofinagency.com/news/1607-47700-rwanda-leads-2024-world-bank-rankings-on-policy-and-governance-in-africa
[8] Top 10 African Countries with the Most Favourable Business …
https://www.africanexponent.com/top-10-african-countries-with-the-most-favourable-business-environments-in-2025/