Mobilization and the Economy: The Strategic Cost of Human Capital Reallocation

Suren Manukyan
ORCID: 0009-0003-5460-1848

Peer Review: Double-blind peer review
Reviewers:
Larisa Ivshina — ORCID: 0009-0007-5264-6566
Nikolai Fedenev — ORCID: 0009-0004-5073-195X

Editorial Note

This article is based on the author's earlier analytical publication titled *"Mobilization and the Economy: The Strategic Cost of Human Capital"*, originally published on 22 October 2022 in the informational journal *"Mirovaya Politika bez Kommentariyev"*.

The present version substantially expands the original journalistic analysis by incorporating a structured academic framework, interdisciplinary methodology, and systematic economic interpretation. The earlier publication was not peer-reviewed and served as the conceptual foundation for the current scholarly study.

Abstract

This article examines the economic consequences of large-scale mobilization through the lens of human capital theory and institutional economics. The study argues that the primary cost of mobilization is not limited to fiscal expenditures but manifests in the structural reallocation of productive human resources. Using qualitative institutional analysis and applied financial sector observations, the paper identifies three layers of impact: microeconomic disruption of small and medium enterprises, behavioral transformation of investment horizons, and long-term strategic risk associated with erosion of entrepreneurial initiative. The findings suggest that mobilization produces cumulative economic effects not immediately reflected in macroeconomic statistics but significant for long-term growth trajectories.

Keywords: mobilization, human capital, institutional economics, investment behavior, SME sector, economic adaptation, strategic risk.

1. Introduction

Mobilization in Knowledge Economies: Structural Shock or Adaptive Mechanism?

Large-scale mobilization has historically been associated with wartime industrial transformation. In the twentieth century, mobilization often led to centralized planning, industrial expansion, and, paradoxically, in some cases short-term output growth. However, such historical analogies may be misleading when applied to modern knowledge-intensive economies.

The contemporary economic structure differs fundamentally from that of early industrial societies. Production today relies less on interchangeable labor units and more on specialized human capital embedded within decentralized networks of innovation, finance, and entrepreneurship. Consequently, administrative reallocation of labor may generate structural distortions that differ qualitatively from earlier mobilization experiences.

This study seeks to analyze mobilization not solely as a fiscal or military instrument but as a structural economic shock affecting:

- human capital distribution,
- enterprise continuity,
- investment horizons,
- innovation capacity.

To deepen analytical clarity, this article introduces a comparative contrast between two mobilization environments:

1. A large continental economy with partial mobilization and centralized fiscal support mechanisms;
2. Israel — a long-standing mobilization-based economy operating under permanent security pressure yet demonstrating sustained innovation and growth capacity.

The Israeli case serves as a critical counterpoint. Unlike large-scale administrative mobilization in continental economies, Israel operates under a hybrid reserve-based mobilization model integrated into its institutional architecture. Despite frequent call-ups and security operations, Israel has developed a globally competitive high-tech sector, venture capital ecosystem, and strong entrepreneurial culture.

This contrast raises a central research question:

Why does mobilization in some systems produce innovation resilience, while in others it risks growth deceleration?

The working hypothesis of this study is that the economic consequences of mobilization depend less on the scale of labor withdrawal and more on institutional adaptability, reserve structure

design, predictability of service cycles, and integration of military experience into civilian innovation systems.

To evaluate this hypothesis, the article proceeds through three analytical layers:

- Modeling immediate labor reallocation shock;
- Examining behavioral transformation of investment horizons;
- Conducting comparative institutional analysis between large continental mobilization systems and Israel's reserve-based model.

The objective is not normative assessment, but structural explanation.

2. Analytical Framework: The Labor Reallocation Shock Model (LRSM)

2.1 Conceptual Premise

Mobilization represents a non-market reallocation of labor. Unlike cyclical labor shifts driven by wage signals or sectoral demand, mobilization is administratively induced and externally imposed on the economic system.

The Labor Reallocation Shock Model (LRSM) conceptualizes mobilization as a structural shock composed of three interrelated variables:

- **Intensity (I):** Proportion of economically active population withdrawn.
- **Skill Concentration (S):** Degree to which withdrawn labor belongs to high-specialization sectors.
- **Predictability (P):** Extent to which mobilization timing and duration are institutionally foreseeable.

The economic impact (E) can be expressed qualitatively as:

$E \propto (I \times S) / P$

Where higher predictability reduces structural disruption.

This variable — predictability — becomes central in comparative analysis.

2.2 Immediate Shock: Enterprise-Level Disruption

At the microeconomic level, mobilization generates immediate discontinuity. The degree of disruption depends on organizational redundancy.

In large hierarchical enterprises, substitution mechanisms exist. However, in small and medium enterprises (SMEs), key personnel often embody multiple roles simultaneously: operational management, technical supervision, client acquisition, and financial oversight.

Empirical observation from financial-sector case patterns indicates:

- Production bottlenecks emerge within weeks when specialized technical staff are mobilized.
- Credit restructuring requests increase when firm leadership is withdrawn.
- Contractual penalty exposure rises due to supply delay.

Unlike market-driven labor turnover, mobilization produces sudden, simultaneous withdrawal, limiting adaptive capacity.

2.3 Skill Concentration Effect

Modern economies exhibit high specialization intensity. Engineers, software developers, financial analysts, and industrial technologists represent high-multiplier labor categories.

Withdrawal of general labor produces output decline proportional to workforce size. Withdrawal of specialized labor produces nonlinear productivity loss.

For example:

- A factory may continue operating with reduced output if assembly workers are replaced.
- It cannot maintain production continuity if a single process engineer is absent.

This asymmetry distinguishes mobilization in industrial economies from mobilization in knowledge-based systems.

2.4 Predictability as a Structural Stabilizer

Here the comparative dimension becomes essential.

In systems where mobilization is:

- Periodic,
- Predictable,
- Contractually structured,

economic actors incorporate service cycles into business planning.

Where mobilization is:

- Sudden,
- Indefinite,
- Administratively fluid,

planning horizons compress.

Predictability therefore acts as a stabilizing variable mitigating labor shock.

This is precisely where Israel's mobilization architecture diverges from ad hoc or large-scale administrative mobilization models.

3. Comparative Institutional Model: Israel as a Mobilization-Based Innovation Economy

3.1 Structural Characteristics of Israeli Mobilization

Israel operates under a reserve-based mobilization system integrated into national institutional design. Key features include:

- Universal conscription followed by structured reserve duty.
- Clearly defined service duration and legal protections.
- Strong reintegration mechanisms into civilian employment.
- Integration of military technological experience into civilian innovation sectors.

Mobilization in Israel is not episodic shock but continuous institutional reality.

3.2 Predictability and Planning

Israeli firms operate within an environment where reserve call-ups are expected and cyclically structured.

This produces several adaptive mechanisms:

- Firms build redundancy into technical teams.
- Venture capital structures account for service interruptions.
- Employers legally accommodate reserve obligations.
- Military technological training becomes human capital multiplier.

Predictability reduces uncertainty, even under high security pressure.

3.3 Human Capital Recycling Mechanism

A critical difference lies in what may be termed the Human Capital Recycling Effect.

In Israel:

- Military service often enhances technical skills.
- Elite technological units feed directly into startup ecosystems.
- Networks formed during service translate into venture partnerships.

Thus, mobilization functions partially as an innovation incubator.

In contrast, where mobilization:

- Is not skill-enhancing,
- Does not integrate with civilian innovation,
- Removes personnel without structured reintegration,

human capital erosion occurs instead of recycling.

3.4 Institutional Support Systems

Israeli economic resilience under mobilization conditions is supported by:

- Strong venture capital ecosystem,
- Deep integration into global technology markets,
- Legal clarity regarding employment protections,
- Rapid reintegration policies.

Mobilization becomes an institutionalized variable rather than an unpredictable shock.

4. Horizon Compression Model (HCM): Behavioral Adaptation Under Uncertainty

While LRSM explains structural labor withdrawal, Horizon Compression Model explains investment behavior.

When mobilization lacks predictability:

- Firms shorten planning cycles.

- Investors reduce long-term exposure.
- Credit demand shifts from expansion to liquidity preservation.

Financial sector indicators reflect:

- Decline in capital expenditure financing.
- Increase in short-term working capital restructuring.
- Elevated precautionary cash accumulation.

Horizon compression affects innovation velocity.

In Israel, planning horizons remain longer despite security volatility due to institutional normalization of mobilization.

In less institutionalized systems, uncertainty amplifies capital conservatism.

5. Strategic Divergence: Adaptive Mobilization vs Growth Deceleration

The comparative analysis suggests two possible trajectories:

Adaptive Mobilization Model

- High predictability
- Institutional integration
- Human capital recycling
- Innovation spillover

Decelerative Mobilization Model

- Administrative suddenness
- Skill concentration withdrawal
- Planning uncertainty
- Entrepreneurial erosion

The divergence does not depend solely on scale, but on institutional architecture.

6. Historical Mobilization Economies: Lessons from the 20th Century

Mobilization is not a new economic phenomenon. However, its structural impact has varied significantly depending on industrial structure, technological intensity, and institutional design.

A historical comparison allows us to isolate variables that differentiate adaptive mobilization from decelerative mobilization.

6.1 World War I: Industrial Substitution and Gender Reallocation

During World War I, European economies experienced mass conscription that removed millions of working-age men from industrial sectors. However, industrial production did not collapse proportionally. Several compensatory mechanisms emerged:

- Large-scale integration of women into factory labor.
- Expansion of centralized industrial planning.
- Conversion of civilian production into military output.
- Simplified production processes emphasizing volume over specialization.

The industrial economy of 1914 was characterized by lower specialization intensity. Labor tasks were more interchangeable. Production lines relied more on mechanical repetition than on highly individualized expertise.

Thus, although mobilization created strain, substitution elasticity was relatively high.

In knowledge-based economies, substitution elasticity is significantly lower. A software architect, financial risk modeler, or semiconductor engineer cannot be replaced through rapid reallocation of general labor.

This structural shift explains why historical analogies to early industrial mobilization may overestimate modern adaptive capacity.

6.2 World War II: Total War and Centralized Command Economies

World War II introduced fully centralized mobilization systems in the United States, Germany, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom.

Key characteristics included:

- Total economic redirection toward war production.
- Central allocation of raw materials and labor.
- Suspension of market allocation mechanisms.
- Expansion of state-directed industrial investment.

In the United States, wartime mobilization temporarily increased industrial output and employment. However, this expansion was embedded within a unique context:

- Massive state financing.
- Geographic insulation from domestic destruction.
- Long-term industrial buildup prior to mobilization.

The wartime model functioned under total-war logic, where private-sector dynamism was subordinated to centralized production objectives.

Modern economies differ fundamentally:

- Innovation ecosystems are decentralized.
- Growth depends on venture capital and technological iteration.
- Private-sector initiative drives competitive advantage.

Total mobilization models are incompatible with decentralized innovation systems unless institutional integration is carefully structured.

6.3 Late Soviet Experience: Prolonged Military Burden and Stagnation

The late Soviet period (1970s–1980s) provides a different comparative case. Although not characterized by full-scale mobilization, the prolonged military burden — including the Afghan War — coincided with economic stagnation.

Key structural features included:

- Resource diversion toward military-industrial sectors.
- Reduced consumer-sector innovation.
- Declining productivity growth.
- Institutional rigidity limiting entrepreneurial initiative.

While mobilization was not the sole cause of stagnation, sustained prioritization of military allocation without corresponding productivity-enhancing integration contributed to structural deceleration.

This case highlights a critical variable: mobilization becomes economically sustainable only when integrated into productivity-enhancing institutional design.

7. Israel as a High-Mobilization, High-Innovation Economy

7.1 Reserve System Architecture

Israel represents a rare example of a state operating under permanent mobilization conditions while sustaining high innovation output.

The Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) operate through:

- Mandatory conscription.
- Structured reserve duty cycles.
- Clearly defined service durations.
- Legal employment protections for reservists.

Unlike sudden large-scale mobilization, reserve duty is embedded within the economic planning framework.

Predictability is institutionalized.

7.2 Technological Spillover: Unit 8200 and Innovation Networks

A critical factor in Israel's adaptive mobilization model is technological spillover.

Elite units such as Unit 8200 function as:

- Advanced cybersecurity and intelligence training environments.
- Talent identification and network formation hubs.
- Pre-incubation ecosystems for startup founders.

Many Israeli high-tech founders and venture capital partners originate from elite military units.

Thus, military service does not merely withdraw human capital; it often enhances it.

This creates a Human Capital Recycling Loop:

Military training → Skill enhancement → Civilian innovation → Venture creation → Economic growth.

The loop transforms mobilization from extraction into reinvestment.

7.3 Legal and Financial Reintegration Mechanisms

Israeli institutional design supports economic continuity through:

- Legal guarantees for employment reinstatement.
- Compensation frameworks for reservists.
- Venture capital tolerance for service interruptions.
- Rapid reintegration cycles.

Firms plan around service periods. Investors incorporate mobilization into risk modeling.

Mobilization becomes normalized rather than destabilizing.

8. Structural Divergence: Why Outcomes Differ

The comparison reveals five structural variables determining economic trajectory:

1. Predictability of service duration.
2. Skill-enhancing versus skill-neutral mobilization.
3. Reintegration mechanisms.
4. Institutional support for entrepreneurship.
5. Global market integration.

Where mobilization lacks predictability and reintegration, human capital erosion dominates.

Where mobilization is institutionalized and skill-enhancing, adaptation may preserve growth velocity.

9. Integrated Model: Adaptive vs Decelerative Mobilization

We can now synthesize the analysis into two archetypes:

Adaptive Mobilization System

- Institutionalized reserve cycles
- Skill enhancement during service
- Strong reintegration guarantees
- Innovation ecosystem integration
- Stable investment horizons

Decelerative Mobilization System

- Sudden administrative withdrawal
- Indefinite service duration
- Weak reintegration mechanisms
- Horizon compression
- Entrepreneurial contraction

The divergence is institutional rather than purely quantitative.

10. Analytical Operationalization and Empirical Strategy

10.1 From Conceptual Models to Measurable Indicators

To strengthen empirical grounding, the LRSM, HCM, and the Human Capital Recycling Loop can be operationalized through a set of measurable proxies. The objective is not to claim definitive causality within this article, but to propose a replicable analytical framework for further empirical verification.

We define three model components:

- **Labor Reallocation Shock (LRSM)**
- **Horizon Compression (HCM)**
- **Recycling Capacity (RCL)** — the ability of mobilization institutions to convert military service into civilian innovation and productivity.

10.2 Labor Reallocation Shock Model (LRSM): Proxy Variables

(A) Withdrawal Intensity (I)

A practical proxy can be the ratio of mobilized individuals to the economically active population in a given region or sector.

Possible indicators:

- Regional labor-force participation shift (if available),
- Sectoral vacancy growth rates,
- Firm-level staff depletion (survey-based).

(B) Skill Concentration (S)

This reflects whether mobilization disproportionately affects high-skill or high-centrality roles.

Possible indicators:

- Share of mobilized individuals from knowledge-intensive occupations,
- SME dependency on single-role specialists (measured via organizational redundancy index),
- Average training time required for replacement.

(C) Predictability (P)

Predictability is central in comparative analysis.

Possible indicators:

- Average notice period before deployment,
- Variance in deployment duration,
- Institutional regularity of call-ups (scheduled vs ad hoc).

In Israel, P is structurally higher due to reserve cycle institutionalization. In ad hoc mobilization environments, P is lower.

10.3 Horizon Compression Model (HCM): Financial and Behavioral Indicators

HCM can be empirically proxied using financial-sector and business-behavior markers.

(A) Credit Horizon Shift

When uncertainty rises, long-term borrowing decreases relative to short-term liquidity borrowing.

Possible indicators:

- Ratio of long-term investment loans to short-term working capital facilities,
- Growth of restructuring requests relative to new investment applications,
- Average maturity of newly issued business loans.

(B) Investment Postponement Index

Derived from enterprise-level indicators, such as:

- Decline in capex-related bank financing,
- Reduced equipment leasing activity,
- Business surveys reporting delayed expansion.

(C) Liquidity Preference Shift

In uncertain environments, firms prefer cash buffers.

Possible indicators:

- Increase in corporate cash-to-revenue ratios,
- Growth in demand for overdraft facilities over capex loans,
- Higher precautionary savings at household level.

These indicators are consistent with the author's applied banking observations, where post-mobilization client behavior shifts from expansion discussions toward survival and liquidity management.

10.4 Human Capital Recycling Loop (RCL): Israel as Contrast

The Recycling Capacity variable explains why high mobilization does not necessarily mean economic deceleration.

Israel's RCL can be proxied through:

- Share of startup founders with elite unit backgrounds,
- Venture capital density per capita,
- Rate of technology transfer from defense sectors to civilian markets,
- Network intensity (measured via founder–investor ties originating from service cohorts).

The key comparative logic is:

High mobilization + high predictability + high RCL → resilience
High mobilization + low predictability + low RCL → deceleration

11. Empirical Hypotheses

Based on the models, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: LRSM Hypothesis (SME Disruption)

Regions/sectors with higher I and S will exhibit increased SME instability, measured by higher restructuring rates and elevated closure probabilities.

H2: HCM Hypothesis (Investment Horizon)

Lower predictability (P) will correlate with measurable horizon compression: a shift from long-term investment borrowing to short-term liquidity preservation behavior.

H3: Recycling Hypothesis (Innovation Resilience)

Higher Recycling Capacity (RCL) mitigates the negative relationship between mobilization intensity and innovation output.

Israel is predicted to exhibit:

- higher P,
- higher RCL,
- weaker horizon compression effects,
  even under frequent call-ups.

12. Applied Research Design: How This Could Be Tested

A feasible empirical design could combine:

1. **Financial sector micro-indicators**
   Aggregated anonymized bank lending maturity distributions and restructuring rates.
2. **SME longitudinal observations**
   Business registry survival analysis before and after mobilization periods.
3. **Innovation output proxies**
   Patent filings, startup formation rates, venture funding flows (cross-country comparison).
4. **Predictability index construction**
   A composite measure of notice duration and deployment variability.

Comparative analysis would then place Israel as a high-P, high-RCL benchmark.

13. Discussion: Why Israel Provides a Strong Contrast

Israel's mobilization economy demonstrates that persistent security pressure does not mechanically produce economic stagnation. The structural difference lies in institutional design.

Israel normalizes mobilization through predictable reserve cycles and reintegration mechanisms, while simultaneously converting defense-related human capital into civilian innovation via:

- elite technical units,
- dense startup networks,

- venture capital absorption,
- global market integration.

This creates a compensatory mechanism absent in systems where mobilization is abrupt, indefinite, and weakly connected to innovation ecosystems.

14. Implications for Long-Term Growth Trajectories

The combined LRSM–HCM–RCL framework suggests that mobilization's economic cost is primarily expressed through *trajectory modification* rather than immediate output collapse.

The strategic risk emerges as:

- reduced innovation velocity,
- reduced entrepreneurial experimentation,
- persistent short planning horizons,
- a shift toward defensive economic behavior.

Israel demonstrates that these risks can be mitigated through institutional predictability and recycling capacity.

15. Discussion: Institutional Architecture as the Decisive Variable

15.1 Mobilization Is Not Economically Neutral

The preceding analysis demonstrates that mobilization cannot be treated as a fiscally isolated event. It operates as a structural intervention in labor allocation, investment behavior, and innovation ecosystems.

However, the economic trajectory following mobilization is not mechanically determined by the scale of labor withdrawal. Instead, outcomes are mediated by institutional architecture.

The integrated LRSM–HCM–RCL framework shows that three variables determine whether mobilization produces adaptive resilience or long-term deceleration:

- Predictability of service cycles,
- Reintegration capacity,
- Innovation spillover mechanisms.

The divergence between systems lies not in mobilization intensity alone, but in how mobilization is embedded within economic institutions.

15.2 Institutional Predictability and Economic Confidence

Predictability reduces uncertainty. Even under high security pressure, predictable mobilization cycles allow firms to:

- pre-plan temporary labor substitution,
- distribute managerial authority,
- build redundancy,
- model financial exposure.

Israel institutionalized predictability through structured reserve service and clear employment protections. As a result, mobilization does not collapse planning horizons.

In contrast, where mobilization is sudden and open-ended, Horizon Compression intensifies. Firms reduce long-term commitments, investors shorten capital cycles, and innovation slows.

The distinction is structural rather than ideological.

15.3 Human Capital Recycling Versus Human Capital Erosion

The Recycling Capacity variable explains the most important contrast.

In Israel:

- Military training enhances high-tech competence.
- Service cohorts become entrepreneurial networks.
- Defense experience translates into civilian cybersecurity, AI, and advanced engineering startups.

This creates positive feedback loops.

In systems without recycling mechanisms:

- Mobilization withdraws skilled labor without reintegration enhancement.
- Military service does not systematically convert into entrepreneurial capital.
- Human capital may deteriorate through interruption.

Thus, mobilization becomes extractive rather than regenerative.

15.4 The Strategic Growth Variable: Innovation Velocity

Modern economic competitiveness depends on innovation velocity — the rate at which new firms, technologies, and business models emerge.

Horizon compression reduces innovation velocity by:

- discouraging long-term R&D investment,
- limiting venture capital exposure,
- reducing entrepreneurial risk appetite.

Even if GDP remains stable in the short term, innovation slowdown produces long-term growth deceleration.

The strategic risk lies not in visible recession, but in slower compounding of productive capacity.

15.5 Historical Context Revisited

The historical comparison reinforces this conclusion:

- World War I and II mobilization succeeded under centralized industrial substitution.
- Late Soviet prolonged military prioritization coincided with stagnation.
- Israel demonstrates adaptive mobilization under high institutional integration.

The structural difference is not mobilization per se, but institutional absorption capacity.

16. Policy-Relevant Structural Insights (Without Normative Prescription)

While this study does not advocate policy direction, the comparative framework reveals structural mechanisms that influence economic resilience:

1. Institutionalizing predictability reduces horizon compression.
2. Reintegration guarantees stabilize enterprise continuity.
3. Linking military training to innovation ecosystems enhances recycling capacity.
4. Protecting SME continuity reduces cumulative micro-level disruption.
5. Maintaining global capital integration sustains investment flow under security stress.

These variables operate as multipliers or dampeners of mobilization shock.

17. Limitations of the Study

Several limitations must be acknowledged:

- The analysis relies primarily on qualitative institutional modeling and sectoral observation rather than full-scale quantitative datasets.
- Israel represents a unique geopolitical and demographic case; direct replication may not be feasible.
- Macroeconomic lag effects require longitudinal study beyond immediate mobilization period.
- The models require empirical testing using cross-national data for robust validation.

Future research should integrate panel data on labor withdrawal, innovation metrics, and investment horizon proxies across mobilized economies.

18. Conclusion: Mobilization and Economic Trajectory

Mobilization in a knowledge-based economy represents a structural reallocation shock whose long-term consequences depend on institutional absorption capacity.

The LRSM–HCM–RCL integrated framework suggests:

- Immediate productivity friction is only the first layer.
- Behavioral horizon compression is the second.
- Strategic innovation deceleration is the third and most consequential.

Israel demonstrates that high mobilization can coexist with innovation dynamism when institutional design transforms labor withdrawal into human capital recycling.

In contrast, where predictability is low and reintegration mechanisms are weak, mobilization risks altering long-term growth trajectory.

The ultimate cost of mobilization is therefore not merely fiscal or cyclical. It is temporal — measured in reduced future potential.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Publishing.

Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica, 60*(2), 323–351. https://doi.org/10.2307/2951599

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago Press.

Ben-David, D. (2018). *Israel's economic miracle: The institutional foundations of growth*. Taub Center for Social Policy Studies in Israel.

Breznitz, D. (2007). *Innovation and the state: Political choice and strategies for growth in Israel, Taiwan, and Ireland*. Yale University Press.

Eichengreen, B. (1992). *Golden fetters: The gold standard and the Great Depression, 1919–1939*. Oxford University Press.

Higgs, R. (2006). *Depression, war, and cold war: Studies in political economy*. Oxford University Press.

Israel Defense Forces. (2020). *Reserve service framework and integration mechanisms*. Government of Israel Publications.

Manukyan, S. (2022, October 22). *Mobilizatsiya i ekonomika: Strategicheskaya tsena chelovecheskogo resursa* [Mobilization and the economy: The strategic cost of human capital]. *Mirovaya politika bez kommentariyev*. https://wpnc.ru/2022/10/22/mobilizatsiya-i-ekonomika/

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2021). *The role of human capital in economic growth*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/xxxxxxxx

Olson, M. (1982). *The rise and decline of nations: Economic growth, stagflation, and social rigidities*. Yale University Press.

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy, 98*(5), S71–S102. https://doi.org/10.1086/261725

Senor, D., & Singer, S. (2009). *Start-up nation: The story of Israel's economic miracle*. Twelve.

Tooze, A. (2006). *The wages of destruction: The making and breaking of the Nazi economy*. Penguin Press.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations.

World Bank. (2020). *World development report: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*. World Bank Publications.