1. Contrary to common belief, one-time (short-period) shocks to the economic system may have permanent effects on its long-run equilibrium (Galor and Tsiddon, 1992). Studying the impact of shocks on the economy therefore deserves more attention than is currently paid to the issue in economic analysis. (Chapter 1)

2. Increase in real energy prices may create a disincentive to invest in basic research on energy-saving technologies, insofar as it lowers profitability of the basic R&D sector. The “induced technological change” argument may therefore fail. (Chapter 2)

3. Neither the equilibrium economics, nor the disequilibrium economics approach is theoretically optimal in explaining long-run macroeconomic behavior. This is because economies alternate between their equilibrium and disequilibrium in long-run cycles. The latter are due to discontinuities in technological innovation, which are triggered by profit opportunities in incremental technologies of existing technological paradigms that eventually get exhausted. (Chapter 3)

4. Contrary to intuition, the costs of indirect effects of earthquakes may well surpass those of their direct effects. The same applies to the impact of such indirect and direct effects on the economy (Chapter 4)

5. It is a misconception that economies may recover fairly rapidly from a one-time catastrophe by relying on market forces only. In order to achieve such a recovery, government involvement is mostly imperative. (Chapter 5)

6. In economic analysis, a systematic treatment of shocks in deterministic frameworks does not exist. (Chapter 6)
7. Rephrase your paper a thousand times; revise it a thousand times; and have your paper accepted at once (derived from the Turkish proverb: “Listen a hundred times; ponder a thousand times; speak once”) may be a good rule of behavior for researchers.

8. Research-skills can only be mastered through learning-by-doing, not by just watching the process (inspired by the Turkish proverb: “If skill could be gained by watching, every dog would become a butcher”).

9. At least one referee under a double-refereeing process, two referees under a triple-refereeing process, etc., will never entail proper refereeing.