THE GROUNDWORK — ARTICLE 05

Why Diversify?

The free lunch that actually exists, and the mathematics that prove it

There is a famous line in finance, attributed to Harry Markowitz, that diversification is "the only free lunch in investing." Like most famous lines, it is repeated far more often than it is understood. In this article, we will explain what it actually means, why it works, and what it looks like in practice when applied to a real portfolio.

Over the previous four articles, we have established that risk premiums exist across multiple asset classes, that they compensate you for different types of discomfort, and that their size fluctuates with supply, demand, and policy. The natural next question is: if each asset class offers a risk premium, why not just hold the one with the highest premium? The answer — and it is the most important insight in portfolio construction — is that a combination of imperfect assets can produce a result that is better than any of them individually.

The Problem with Concentration

Equities have historically offered the highest risk premium of any liquid asset class. Over the long run, stocks have compounded at roughly 6–7% real per year. If you were immortal and had no emotions, you might conclude that the rational strategy is to hold 100% equities and wait.

The problem is that the path matters. A 100% equity portfolio has suffered drawdowns of 50% or more on multiple occasions in the last century. The S&P 500 lost 56% during the Global Financial Crisis, 49% during the dot-com bust, and 34% in the space of five weeks during the COVID crash. These are not theoretical risks. They are lived experiences that destroy wealth for anyone who sells during the decline, and that cause profound psychological damage even to those who hold on.

For an individual investor, a 50% drawdown might mean postponing retirement by a decade. For a company managing treasury reserves, it might mean a liquidity crisis. The long-term expected return is irrelevant if the short-term path is unsurvivable.

The *return you earn* is not the same as the *return the asset delivers*. If an asset compounds at 7% per year on average but you sell during a 50% drawdown, your personal return is catastrophically different

from the asset's return. This is the gap between time-weighted returns and dollar-weighted returns, and it is the reason most individual investors underperform the very assets they own. Diversification closes this gap by making the path survivable.

Correlation: Why Two Assets Are Better Than One

The mathematical foundation of diversification rests on a single concept: **correlation**. Correlation measures how two assets move relative to each other. If two assets are perfectly correlated (correlation = +1), they move in lockstep. Combining them reduces nothing. If they are uncorrelated (correlation = 0), combining them reduces portfolio volatility without reducing expected return. If they are negatively correlated (correlation = −1), combining them can dramatically reduce volatility.

This is the mathematical free lunch. When you combine assets with low or negative correlations, the portfolio's volatility is *lower* than the weighted average of the individual assets' volatilities. The expected return is the weighted average, but the risk is less than the weighted average. You are getting more return per unit of risk. Something for nothing. That is the free lunch.

> *When you combine assets with low correlation, the portfolio's risk falls below the weighted average of its components — but the expected return does not. You are getting more return per unit of risk. That is the only genuine free lunch in finance.*

Consider a simple example. Equities tend to fall during recessions as corporate earnings decline. Government bonds tend to rise during recessions as central banks cut rates and investors seek safety. Over the full economic cycle, both offer positive risk premiums. But because they respond differently to the same economic forces, combining them in a portfolio produces a smoother path than holding either one alone.

Now extend this logic. Add inflation-protected bonds, which perform well when inflation surprises to the upside — an environment where both equities and nominal bonds can struggle. Add commodities, which respond to supply shocks and inflationary pressures. Add gold, which performs well during periods of monetary debasement and currency uncertainty. Each addition brings a return

stream that is driven by different forces, and each one reduces the overall portfolio's dependence on any single economic outcome.

The Four Economic Environments

A useful framework for understanding diversification is to think about the four possible combinations of growth and inflation:

- Rising growth, low inflation — the "Goldilocks" environment. Equities tend to perform well. Most assets do fine.
- Falling growth, low inflation — recession/deflation. Nominal bonds and cash perform well. Equities and commodities suffer.
- Rising growth, high inflation — overheating. Commodities and TIPS tend to do well. Nominal bonds get crushed. Equities are mixed.
- Falling growth, high inflation — stagflation, the worst environment. Most financial assets struggle. Gold and commodities tend to hold up. Cash protects in nominal terms.

No single asset class performs well across all four environments. But a portfolio that spans all five major asset classes — equities, nominal bonds, inflation-protected bonds, commodities, and gold — has at least some engine producing returns in each one. The result is a portfolio that does not depend on any particular economic outcome. It collects risk premiums regardless of which environment materialises.

> *No single asset performs well in all environments. But a portfolio spanning five asset classes has at least some engine running in each one. It does not depend on any particular economic outcome to deliver.*

The Evidence: Drawdowns and Recovery

The table below shows approximate maximum drawdowns during three major crises for three different portfolio approaches: 100% equities, the traditional 60/40, and a risk parity allocation. The long-term return and risk characteristics are also shown for reference.

	100% Equities (SPY)	60/40 Portfolio	Risk Parity
Worst Drawdowns			
Global Financial Crisis (2008–09)	−56%	−35%	−20%
COVID Crash (2020)	−34%	−22%	−12%
Dot-com Bust (2000–02)	−49%	−22%	−11%
Long-Term Characteristics (Illustrative)			
Annualised Real Return	~6.5%	~5.0%	~5.5%
Annualised Volatility	~16%	~10%	~8%
Return per Unit of Risk	~0.41	~0.50	~0.69

Source: Illustrative, based on historical index data. Risk parity approximated as a balanced allocation across equities, long bonds, TIPS, commodities, and gold weighted by inverse volatility. Past performance is not indicative of future results.

The pattern is clear. As you diversify away from a single asset class, the severity of drawdowns falls dramatically. The risk parity portfolio's worst drawdown was roughly one-third the size of the all-equity portfolio's. Meanwhile, the long-term return per unit of risk (the Sharpe ratio) actually *improves* with diversification. You are not sacrificing return for safety. You are getting a more efficient return.

Recovery time matters too. A portfolio that falls 50% needs to gain 100% to recover. A portfolio that falls 20% only needs to gain 25%. The mathematics of compounding strongly favour the portfolio with smaller drawdowns, even if its headline return is modestly lower. Over a full market cycle, the less volatile portfolio often compounds to a similar or superior ending value, because it spends less time recovering from losses.

Diversification Is Not Just for Bear Markets

A common misconception is that diversification is defensive — something you do to protect against crashes. In reality, diversification improves the portfolio in all conditions, including bull markets. When equities are roaring, a diversified portfolio will underperform a 100% equity portfolio — that is obvious. But it will outperform cash, outperform most bond allocations, and do so with lower volatility and smaller interim drawdowns.

More importantly, diversification allows you to **stay invested**. The biggest risk to long-term wealth is not a bear market. It is selling during a bear market and not re-entering. A portfolio with smaller drawdowns is easier to hold through adversity. It tests your resolve less. It gives you a better chance of collecting the risk premiums that only accrue to those who stay the course.

> *The biggest risk to long-term wealth is not a bear market. It is selling during a bear market and failing to re-enter. A diversified portfolio is easier to hold — and holding on is where the returns come from.*

What This Means for Desert Frontier Beta

The Desert Frontier Beta portfolios are built on the principle that diversification is not a nice-to-have. It is the structural foundation of everything else. Each asset class is included because it brings a return stream that is driven by different forces. The portfolio is weighted by risk contribution, so that no single asset dominates. And the result is a beta engine designed to compound through all four economic environments, not just the ones that favour equities.

For individual investors, this means a portfolio that is easier to live with, easier to stick with, and more likely to deliver the long-term returns that risk premiums promise. For companies managing surplus capital, it means a treasury allocation that is transparent, balanced, and not dependent on a single macro outcome.

The Bottom Line

Diversification is the only free lunch in investing. It reduces risk without reducing expected return. It works because different assets respond to different economic forces, and combining them produces a portfolio whose risk is less than the sum of its parts. The evidence is overwhelming: across every historical period, diversified portfolios have delivered better risk-adjusted returns than concentrated ones.

In the final article of the Groundwork series, we will bring everything together. We will show why the traditional 60/40 portfolio is not as diversified as most people think, make the case for risk parity as a superior framework, and walk through the specific construction of the Desert Frontier Beta portfolios — the assets, the weights, and the rationale behind each decision.

*This article is part of **The Groundwork** — a series by Desert Frontier Advisors covering the foundations of beta investing.*
*Next in the series: **Beyond 60/40 — Building the Desert Frontier Beta Portfolios**.*

Disclaimer: This content is published by Desert Frontier Advisors – FZCO, incorporated in Dubai, for educational and informational purposes only. It does not constitute investment advice, nor a solicitation to buy or sell any security. Past performance is not indicative of future results. Desert Frontier Advisors publishes model portfolios and research; we do not manage client assets or provide personalised financial advice. Consult a qualified professional before making investment decisions.