MIGRATION OF VALUE

Prior Art Review: Related Work and Distinctions

Prepared by: Jason Dauphinee

Date: June 2026

Document status: Published — First EditionVersion: 1.0

1. Why This Review Was Undertaken

Before the Migration of Value framework is published or distributed beyond its current state, a systematic prior art review was conducted. The purpose is not to defend the framework against criticism. It is to answer a harder question: does this framework deserve to exist given what already exists?

The most significant trigger for this review was the identification of Adrian Slywotzky's Value Migration (Harvard Business School Press, 1995), which uses the same two-word phrase as the title of this framework. That discovery required an honest assessment of whether the overlap extends beyond the name to the substance.

A second trigger was intellectual honesty. A framework that asks to be taken seriously should be able to demonstrate that its author actively looked for work that might make it redundant, and found either that no such work exists, or that the work exists but is doing something meaningfully different.

This document records the search, the literature reviewed, the comparisons made, and the conclusions reached. It will be published alongside the framework. Transparency is not a weakness. It is the standard the work holds itself to.

2. Search Methodology

The search was conducted across the following domains:

- Value migration and economic value migration literature
- Business model innovation and disruption theory
- Creative destruction and neo-Schumpeterian economics
- Evolutionary economics and adaptive systems
- Sociology of technological change and institutional adaptation

    — Scarcity, abundance, and the economics of technology
- — Human adaptation psychology and identity disruption under technological change
- — Technology adoption lifecycle literature
- — Historical economics and long-wave theory
- — AI-era commentary using "value migration" terminology

For each source, the following questions were applied:

- — What problem is it trying to solve?
- — What mechanism does it propose?
- — What evidence does it use?
- — Where does it overlap with the Migration of Value framework?
- — Where does it differ?
- — Does it invalidate any part of the framework?

Search limitations: This review relied on publicly accessible sources. Paywalled academic databases were not fully accessible. Where significant works are known to exist behind access restrictions, they are flagged for follow-up retrieval. The search covered canonical and widely cited works; it is not exhaustive of all journal literature.

3. Literature Reviewed and Framework Comparisons

3.1 Slywotzky, Adrian J. — Value Migration (1995)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

Value Migration: How to Think Several Moves Ahead of the Competition. Harvard Business School Press, 1995.

CORE IDEA

Slywotzky defines value migration as the flow of economic and shareholder value away from increasingly outmoded business designs toward designs that more effectively satisfy customer priorities and generate superior profits. He identifies three phases: stability (value anchored in established models), tension (disruptions emerging), and migration (value decisively flowing to new business designs). He identifies seven patterns of migration and provides a diagnostic framework for managers.

MECHANISM

The mechanism is customer priority shift. When customers' highest priorities change, value migrates to the business design that best addresses the new priorities. The driver is superior business design, not technological abundance per se.

EVIDENCE

Case studies of firms including Microsoft, Nucor, Starbucks, Southwest Airlines versus IBM, U.S. Steel, General Foods, United Airlines. Predominantly 1980s and 1990s US corporate examples.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

The phrase "value migration" is shared. Both frameworks are concerned with the movement of value from one configuration to another. Both acknowledge that this movement is not random but follows a pattern that can be observed and anticipated.

DIFFERENCES

The differences are substantial and go to the core of each framework:

— Unit of analysis: Slywotzky's unit is the business design. The Migration of Value's unit is the capability.
— Driver: Slywotzky's driver is customer priority shift. The Migration of Value's driver is structural abundance created by technological change.
— Mechanism: Slywotzky's mechanism is business model reconfiguration. The Migration of Value's mechanism is human adaptation, differentiation collapse, and the unbundling of value from function.
— Scope: Slywotzky is a strategy guide for corporate managers. The Migration of Value is a historical descriptive framework tested across five centuries.
— Historical method: Slywotzky does not conduct adversarial historical stress tests. The Migration of Value uses a nine-stage adversarial methodology with a simulated interdisciplinary panel.
— The human dimension: Slywotzky does not address identity disruption, psychological adaptation, or the mechanism by which people grieve the loss of meaningful differentiation. The Migration of Value places human adaptation at its centre.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. The frameworks are operating at different levels of analysis with different mechanisms, different scopes, and different purposes. The overlap is terminological, not substantive. However, the shared phrase requires explicit acknowledgement in the Scholarly Context section of the First Edition to prevent the appearance of oversight.

Threat: Low

3.2 Schumpeter, Joseph A. — Creative Destruction (1942)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. Harper & Brothers, 1942.

CORE IDEA

Creative destruction is the process of industrial mutation that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, destroying the old and creating the new. Innovation by entrepreneurs is the disruptive force that sustains economic growth while destroying established companies and labour that held monopoly power from previous paradigms.

MECHANISM

Entrepreneurial innovation displaces established products, services, and organizational forms. The mechanism is market competition between the old and the new, with the new eventually displacing the old through superior performance or cost.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks observe that technological change destroys established value positions. Both acknowledge that disruption is a recurring structural feature of technological economies, not an anomaly. The Migration of Value explicitly cites Schumpeter in its Scholarly Context.

DIFFERENCES

- Schumpeter describes what happens to industries and firms. The Migration of Value describes what happens to capabilities and the people who built advantage on them.
- Schumpeter's mechanism is competitive displacement. The Migration of Value's mechanism is structural abundance and differentiation collapse.
- Schumpeter does not explain where value goes after disruption. The Migration of Value's primary claim is a specific account of where value migrates to.

— Schumpeter does not address the identity and psychological dimension of disruption. The Migration of Value names this as the human cost of Stage 4.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. The frameworks are complementary. Schumpeter describes the macro-economic structure of disruption. The Migration of Value describes the micro-mechanism of value movement and human adaptation within that structure. The adversarial review correctly identified partial redundancy at the industry level and the First Edition addresses this explicitly.

Threat: Low

3.3 Christensen, Clayton M. — Disruptive Innovation (1997)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail. Harvard Business School Press, 1997.

CORE IDEA

Disruptive innovations start at the bottom of the market or in non-consumption, with inferior products that incumbent firms rationally ignore. Over time, they improve and displace incumbents who were too focused on their best customers to respond. Sustaining innovations improve existing products for existing customers; disruptive innovations create new markets or enter at the low end.

MECHANISM

Rational incumbent inaction in the face of initially inferior technology, combined with improvement trajectories that eventually overshoot mainstream needs, allowing the disruptor to capture the market.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks address why established organizations fail under technological change. Both acknowledge that the response to disruption is often institutionally irrational-seeming but individually rational. The Migration of Value explicitly cites Christensen in its Scholarly Context.

DIFFERENCES

- Christensen's framework is prescriptive for managers: how to identify disruption and respond. The Migration of Value is descriptive: what happens to value when capability becomes abundant.
- Christensen focuses on the firm's strategic choices. The Migration of Value focuses on the structural movement of value regardless of firm-level strategy.
- Christensen does not address the post-disruption question of where value migrates to. The Migration of Value's central claim is an account of the migration destination.
- Christensen's mechanism is market entry and improvement trajectory. The Migration of Value's mechanism is structural abundance and differentiation collapse.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. The frameworks address adjacent but distinct questions. Christensen explains why firms fail under disruption. The Migration of Value explains where value goes when they do.

Threat: Low

3.4 Polanyi, Karl — The Great Transformation (1944)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Farrar & Rinehart, 1944.

CORE IDEA

The double movement describes the dialectical tension between the expansion of market forces (commodification of land, labour, and money) and society's protective responses against those forces. Polanyi argues that markets are not natural or neutral but are constructed through political and social processes, and that their expansion generates countermovements of institutional protection.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks address the consequences of economic and technological change for human social organization. Both acknowledge that the transition from one economic regime to another produces significant social disruption and institutional resistance. The Migration of Value's convergence analysis explicitly flags Polanyi as a relevant adjacent framework.

DIFFERENCES

— Polanyi's primary concern is the commodification of fictitious commodities (land, labour, money) and the political consequences of market society. The Migration of Value is concerned with the movement of value after technological abundance, not commodification per se.
— Polanyi's mechanism is the double movement: marketization followed by social protection. The Migration of Value's mechanism is differentiation collapse followed by adaptive reorganization.
— Polanyi is fundamentally a political economist. The Migration of Value does not engage with state power or political economy as primary variables.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. Polanyi and the Migration of Value are complementary but operating in different registers. The First Edition adds explicit engagement with Polanyi in the Scholarly Context, as recommended in the convergence analysis.

Threat: Low

3.5 Arthur, W. Brian — Increasing Returns and Path Dependence (1989, 1994)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

"Competing Technologies, Increasing Returns, and Lock-In by Historical Events." The Economic Journal, 99(394), 1989. Increasing Returns and Path Dependence in the Economy. University of Michigan Press, 1994.

CORE IDEA

In knowledge-based economies, technologies and markets are subject to increasing returns rather than diminishing returns. Small historical accidents can lock in specific technological paths regardless of their efficiency relative to alternatives. Network effects and adoption dynamics can create winner-take-most outcomes that are not predictable from standard supply and demand analysis.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks acknowledge that the economics of knowledge and technology differ fundamentally from the economics of physical resources. Both are concerned with path dependence and the non-linear dynamics of technological adoption.

DIFFERENCES

- Arthur's primary concern is the mechanism of technological lock-in. The Migration of Value is concerned with the movement of value after a capability becomes abundant, not with predicting which technology will dominate.
- Arthur's framework is mathematical and formal. The Migration of Value is historical and descriptive.
- Arthur does not address the human adaptation dimension, identity disruption, or the psychology of differentiation loss.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. Arthur's increasing returns mechanism is relevant to the research agenda (Cases 04 and 06) but does not conflict with the core framework. It may require integration in Version 4 when platform dynamics are tested.

Threat: None

3.6 Nelson, Richard R. and Winter, Sidney G. — Evolutionary Economics (1982)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change. Harvard University Press, 1982.

CORE IDEA

Economic change is better understood through an evolutionary framework drawing on analogies with biological evolution. Firms operate with bounded rationality, using routines rather than optimizing. Technological change is driven by search and selection processes analogous to mutation and natural selection. Industries evolve through the differential survival of firms with more fit routines.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

The evolutionary framing is shared in spirit. Both frameworks use adaptation as a central concept and acknowledge that economic change is better understood as a dynamic process than as movement between equilibria.

DIFFERENCES

- Nelson and Winter's unit of analysis is the firm and its routines. The Migration of Value's unit is the capability and the human adaptation to its abundance.
- Nelson and Winter do not address value migration specifically or the post-abundance question of where differentiation emerges after a capability commoditizes.
- The evolutionary analogy in Nelson and Winter is formal and mathematical. The Migration of Value uses evolutionary language (adaptation, fitness, selection) but does not formalize it mathematically.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. The evolutionary economics tradition is a relevant intellectual ancestor and the framework's Open Question 1 (whether humans value differentiation or fitness) directly engages this tradition.

Threat: None

3.7 Perez, Carlota — Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital (2002)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital: The Dynamics of Bubbles and Golden Ages. Edward Elgar, 2002.

CORE IDEA

Five great surges of technological development have occurred since the first industrial revolution, each following a recurring sequence: a technological revolution irrupts, an installation period follows (characterized by financial speculation and decoupling of new from old), a turning point occurs, and a deployment period follows (the golden age of productive application). Each surge is driven by a new techno-economic paradigm that displaces the previous one.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks are historically based, identify recurring patterns across multiple centuries of technological change, and use the industrial revolution and other canonical disruptions as test cases. Both acknowledge that technological change produces periods of institutional mismatch before a new order stabilises. Perez is the closest to the Migration of Value in historical ambition and scope.

DIFFERENCES

- Perez's primary concern is the macro-economic dynamics of financial bubbles, golden ages, and institutional recomposition at the civilisational scale. The Migration of Value is concerned with the movement of value at the capability and individual level.
- Perez does not address the identity disruption dimension or the psychology of differentiation loss.
- Perez's mechanism is the interaction between financial capital and productive capital across a techno-economic paradigm shift. The Migration of Value's mechanism is structural abundance and differentiation collapse.
- Perez does not ask where value goes after disruption at the individual or capability level; she addresses where productive investment goes at the macro level.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. Perez and the Migration of Value are operating at different scales with different mechanisms. Perez is the most significant adjacent framework in terms of historical method and ambition, and the Scholarly Context section should add explicit engagement with her work in Version 4.

Threat: Low

3.8 Veblen, Thorstein — Conspicuous Consumption (1899)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions. Macmillan, 1899.

CORE IDEA

Conspicuous consumption is the practice of acquiring goods as outward symbols of wealth and status, not for their functional utility. Status differentiation drives consumption patterns. Scarcity and cost are signals of status; abundance undermines status because it removes the signal function of ownership.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Veblen's account of status differentiation is directly relevant to the Migration of Value's mechanism and to the quartz crisis case study. The observation that scarcity enables status signalling, and that abundance undermines it, is foundational to the framework's account of why differentiation collapses when a capability becomes abundant.

DIFFERENCES

- Veblen is primarily a social and cultural theorist of consumption. The Migration of Value is a historical framework of value movement across technological disruptions.
- Veblen does not address where value migrates after scarcity collapses; he describes the static relationship between scarcity and status.
- The Migration of Value extends and applies Veblen's insight to the dynamic process of technological change.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. Veblen is an intellectual ancestor whose insights on scarcity and status are incorporated into the framework's mechanism, particularly in the three-type differentiation taxonomy added in the First Edition.

Threat: None

3.9 Moore, Geoffrey A. — Crossing the Chasm (1991)

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAIL

Crossing the Chasm: Marketing and Selling High-Tech Products to Mainstream Customers. HarperBusiness, 1991.

CORE IDEA

There is a structural gap (the chasm) between early adopters and the early majority in technology adoption. The two groups have fundamentally different motivations and requirements. Successfully crossing the chasm requires a shift from product-centric positioning to market-centric positioning, focused on a specific beachhead segment.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

Both frameworks address the dynamics of technology diffusion and the shift in what constitutes a differentiator as adoption moves through different segments. The Migration of Value's Stage 2 (Capability Spreads) corresponds loosely to the chasm dynamic.

DIFFERENCES

- Moore is writing a marketing strategy guide for technology product managers. The Migration of Value is a historical descriptive framework.

- Moore does not address what happens to value after a technology crosses the chasm and becomes abundant. The Migration of Value's central question begins where Moore's ends.
- Moore's mechanism is buyer psychology and market segmentation. The Migration of Value's mechanism is structural abundance and differentiation collapse.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. Moore is a practitioner framework that addresses an adjacent but different question.

Threat: None

3.10 Contemporary Scarcity-Abundance Literature (2019—2024)

REPRESENTATIVE WORKS

Desai & Lemley, "Scarcity, Regulation, and the Abundance Society" (2023); Hora, "Role of Servitization in Transitioning from Scarcity to Abundance Paradigm" (2022); Kop, "Abundance and Equality" (2022).

CORE IDEA

A cluster of recent academic work addresses the transition from scarcity-based to abundance-based economies, primarily driven by digital technologies, 3D printing, AI, and platform economics. These works examine the legal, regulatory, and economic implications of structural abundance in specific domains.

OVERLAP WITH MIGRATION OF VALUE

The scarcity-to-abundance transition is directly described by the Migration of Value's Stage 3 (Capability Commoditises). Both bodies of work acknowledge that this transition changes the economics of how value is produced and captured.

DIFFERENCES

- The contemporary literature addresses abundance in specific domains (intellectual property, digital content, food production) without a unified historical mechanism.
- None of this literature proposes the specific nine-stage sequence or the differentiation collapse and adaptation mechanism of the Migration of Value.
- None addresses the human identity dimension of the transition.

DOES IT INVALIDATE ANY PART OF THE MIGRATION OF VALUE?

No. The contemporary abundance literature confirms the relevance of the framework's central observation without proposing a competing explanatory mechanism.

Threat: None

4. Literature Matrix

The following matrix summarises all works reviewed. Threat Level reflects the degree to which the work risks making the Migration of Value framework redundant or requires significant repositioning of its claims.

Author / Year	Discipline	Core Idea	Overlap	Difference	Threat Level	Verdict
Slywotzky (1995)	Strategy / Management	Value moves between business designs when customer priorities shift	Shared phrase; both address value movement	Unit of analysis, mechanism, scope, historical method all differ	Low	Acknowledge explicitly in Scholarly Context
Schumpeter (1942)	Economics	Creative destruction: innovation destroys old order, creates new	Both address disruption of established value positions	Schumpeter does not explain where value goes; MoV does	Low	Complementary; already cited
Christensen (1997)	Strategy / Management	Disruptive innovation enters from below and displaces incumbents	Both explain why incumbents fail	Christensen: why firms fail; MoV: where value goes	Low	Complementary; already cited
Polanyi (1944)	Political economy	Double movement: marketisation vs social protection	Both address social disruption from economic change	Polanyi: commodification and politics; MoV: capability abundance and differentiation	Low	Add explicit engagement in Version 4

Arthur (1989/1994)	Economics	Increasing returns create technological lock-in	Both address non-linear technology adoption dynamics	Arthur: lock-in mechanism; MoV: post-abundance value migration	None	Relevant to Cases 04 & 06
Nelson & Winter (1982)	Evolutionary economics	Firms evolve through routine variation and selection	Shared evolutionary framing	Unit of analysis and formal method differ	None	Intellectual ancestor
Perez (2002)	Economic history	Five great surges; installation and deployment periods	Both are historical, multi-century frameworks	Perez: macro financial dynamics; MoV: capability-level value migration	Low	Add explicit engagement in Scholarly Context
Veblen (1899)	Sociology / Economics	Scarcity enables status signalling; abundance undermines it	Veblen's scarcity-status insight underpins MoV mechanism	Veblen is static; MoV is dynamic across disruption	None	Intellectual ancestor; incorporated
Moore (1991)	Marketing strategy	Chasm between early adopters and mainstream buyers	Both address technology diffusion dynamics	Moore: marketing strategy; MoV: historical value migration	None	Adjacent; different purpose
Abundance literature (2022-24)	Mixed	Scarcity-to-abundance transitions in specific domains	Confirms MoV's central observation	No unified mechanism; no historical depth; no human dimension	None	Supports originality claim

5. Redundancy Test

The redundancy test asks one question repeatedly across all reviewed works:

If this work already exists, why does the Migration of Value framework still need to exist?

5.1 Against Slywotzky

Slywotzky describes value moving between business designs when customer priorities shift. The Migration of Value describes value moving from scarce capabilities to new sources of differentiation when technology makes those capabilities structurally abundant. The questions are different. The mechanisms are different. The scopes are different. The phrase is the same. The framework is not redundant.

5.2 Against Schumpeter

Schumpeter describes what happens to industries. The Migration of Value describes what happens to capabilities and to the people who built advantage on them, and specifically where value goes after creative destruction. Schumpeter answers "what is destroyed." The Migration of Value answers "where does value go afterward and why." The framework is not redundant.

5.3 Against Christensen

Christensen explains why good companies fail to respond to disruption. The Migration of Value explains what happens to value during and after disruption, regardless of whether any specific company responds well or badly. The framework is not redundant.

5.4 Against the Full Literature

No work reviewed proposes the following specific combination: a nine-stage descriptive sequence explaining how value redistributes when a capability becomes structurally abundant through technological change, with a named differentiation collapse mechanism, a three-type differentiation taxonomy, a bifurcated distribution model, and a human adaptation account that includes identity disruption and the unbundling of functional from social value.

The individual components have precursors and relatives in the literature. The specific combination and the specific explanatory mechanism do not. The framework is not redundant. It is, at minimum, an integrative synthesis with an original mechanism and an original explanatory sequence.

6. Areas of Genuine Overlap

Intellectual honesty requires naming the areas where overlap is real, not just terminological:

6.1 The phrase "value migration"

Slywotzky used this phrase thirty years earlier. This requires explicit acknowledgement in the Scholarly Context section. It does not require a name change, because the frameworks are doing different things, but it cannot be left unacknowledged.

6.2 Creative destruction at the industry level

The adversarial review correctly identified that at the industry level, Stages 1-4 of the Migration of Value describe a pattern that Schumpeter already described. The First Edition addresses this. The Migration of Value adds explanatory value through the differentiation mechanism and the post-disruption account.

6.3 Evolutionary framing

The language of adaptation, fitness, and selection appears in Nelson and Winter, Perez, and others. The Migration of Value uses this framing. Open Question 1 acknowledges that the relationship between differentiation and fitness is unresolved.

6.4 Scarcity and status

Veblen's insight that scarcity enables status signalling and abundance undermines it is incorporated into the Migration of Value's mechanism without being explicitly attributed. The Scholarly Context should add Veblen as an acknowledged intellectual ancestor.

7. Areas of Genuine Distinction

The following claims distinguish the Migration of Value from all reviewed prior work:

- A specific nine-stage sequence describing value migration as a consequence of structural capability abundance — this sequence was not identified within the scope of this review.
- The differentiation collapse mechanism — the specific claim that value migrates because structural abundance destroys the scarcity that made a capability a differentiator — is not present in Schumpeter, Christensen, Slywotzky, Perez, or Nelson and Winter.
- The unbundling mechanism — that technology separates the bundle of functional, social, and identity value organised around a capability, and that the components migrate at different rates — is not present in any reviewed prior work.
- The three-type differentiation taxonomy (revealed, created, socially constructed) — this classification was not identified within the scope of this review.
- The identity disruption account — the specific claim that people mourn differentiation collapse as an identity loss, not merely an economic one — is not present in the

economic or strategy literature reviewed. It appears in psychology and sociology literature but not integrated into a value migration framework.

— The adversarial historical methodology — the nine-stage stress test with simulated interdisciplinary peer review, default assumption of failure, and formal criticism register — does not appear in the reviewed prior work.

8. Remaining Questions

The following questions were not resolved by this review and require follow-up:

8.1 Full database search

A search of JSTOR, Web of Science, SSRN, and Google Scholar for the specific terminology of this framework would determine whether the mechanism has been named elsewhere in academic literature. This search requires database access not available in the current review. The search should cover the following term combinations specifically:

- capability commoditisation / capability commoditization
- differentiation collapse
- capability abundance AND value
- value redistribution AND technological change
- human differentiation AND scarcity AND technology
- technological abundance AND differentiation
- differentiation economics AND technological change
- post-scarcity differentiation
- adaptive differentiation AND technology

The search is not conducted in expectation of finding invalidating prior work. It is conducted because the methodology demands it. A framework that claims to have searched and not found is more credible than one that claims originality without having looked.

8.2 Non-Western scholarship

The review covered primarily English-language Western scholarship. The Western-centric vulnerability identified in the criticism register applies to the prior art review as well. Japanese, Chinese, and Indian economic history scholarship may contain relevant frameworks not captured here.

8.3 Perez and the Migration of Value — full comparison

Carlota Perez's work is the closest in historical ambition and scope. A full chapter-by-chapter comparison of Technological Revolutions and Financial Capital against the Migration of Value framework would strengthen the distinction claim and potentially identify additional integration opportunities.

8.4 Independent expert review

Once the prior art review is complete, a one-page summary should be submitted to at least one economic historian and one innovation scholar with the question: "What have I missed?" This panel review is Phase 7 of the proposed prior art methodology.

9. Final Assessment

The Migration of Value framework is an integrative framework with an original sequence and an original mechanism. These are related but distinct claims and should be understood separately.

The individual components — evolutionary framing, creative destruction, scarcity-abundance dynamics, identity and differentiation, technological disruption — have precursors and relatives across multiple disciplines. The framework does not claim to have invented these observations. It claims two things that were not identified in prior work: a specific sequence and a specific mechanism. Those are not the same claim.

The original sequence is the nine-stage progression from technological perturbation through environmental change, structural abundance, differentiation collapse, individual displacement, adaptive reorganisation, value migration, and power redistribution to a new cycle. No reviewed prior work proposes this specific progression as a named descriptive sequence. The original mechanism is differentiation collapse, unbundling, human adaptation, and redistribution. No reviewed prior work proposes this specific combination as the explanatory engine of value migration. These are related claims — the mechanism is what drives the sequence — but they are not identical, and they should be evaluated independently. A critic who finds a precursor to the sequence would not thereby invalidate the mechanism, and vice versa.

The most important prior art action before publication is the following statement in the Scholarly Context section:

"Adrian Slywotzky's Value Migration (1995) uses the same phrase to describe a different phenomenon: the movement of economic and shareholder value between business designs when customer priorities shift. The Migration of Value uses the phrase to describe a different mechanism operating at a different scale: the redistribution of value after technology makes a previously scarce capability structurally abundant. The frameworks share a name and a general observation that value moves. They differ in unit of analysis, mechanism, scope, historical method, and the human dimension that is central to this work. Both can exist."

That statement is honest, defensible, and strengthens rather than undermines the framework's credibility.

Outcome Classification: Integrative Framework with Original Sequence and Original Mechanism

The Migration of Value is not redundant. It is not fully novel — no serious framework built from historical observation could be. It is a synthesis of observations from multiple disciplines, assembled into an original explanatory sequence with a named mechanism, tested adversarially, and honest about what it has not yet resolved. That is a significant intellectual contribution.

Published alongside the Migration of Value, First Edition — migrationofvalue.com