Could an existing sequence of returns possibly meet these criteria?

Stocks

Must have an intial year decline that is in worst one-in-ten in history

Within the first six years, it must contain one of these events . . .

✓ worst two-year return in history

worst three-year return in history

worst four-year return in history

worst five-year return in history

✓ worst six-year return in history

Extra weight for longer periods of worst in history: more sustained damage

✓ Bonus points if the intial six years contain more than one of these events.

✓ Stocks must decline in at least six of the first ten years

The cumulative return for the first ten years must be -25% or worse.

✓ It must take 15 or more years for stocks to recover – gain back the cumulative decline.

Bonds

✓ Must have an initial year decline that is in worst one-in-ten in history

✓ Returns must mis-match stocks:

when stocks decline by -10% or greater, bonds also must decline.

✓ Bonds must decline in at least six of the first ten years

The return sequence must contain one of these events . . .

worst two-year return in history

✓ worst three-year return in history

✓ worst four-year return in history

✓ worst five-year return in history

✓ worst six-year return in history

✓ Extra weight for longer periods of worst in history: more sustained damage

Bonus points if the sequence contains more than one of these events.

✓ Must take 15 or more years for bonds to recover – gain back the cumulative decline.

YES!!! The actual sequence of return that started in 1969 will meet these criteria!!!

Will "statistics" conclude these criteria are too rosy? I don't think so!!

Dollars and returns stated in constant spending power

History = since 1871. 151 years.

Use LC stocks for stocks. Use 30% LT and 70% Intermediate government bonds for bonds.