MACRO · May 28, 2026

Inflation Regimes and Asset Allocation: Lessons from 1970–2024

Using historical inflation regime data, we construct asset allocation frameworks that responded to high-inflation periods differently than the standard 60/40 portfolio.

1. Defining the Regimes

Not all inflation is the same for portfolio purposes. It is useful to separate three regimes: low-and-stable inflation (roughly 1–3%, the post-1990s norm until 2021), disinflation (inflation falling from a higher base, as in the 1980s–90s), and high-and-volatile inflation (above 5% with meaningful month-to-month variance, as in the 1970s and again in 2021–22). Each regime has historically rewarded a different asset mix, and conflating them is the single biggest reason 'what worked' advice from one era fails badly when applied in another.

2. The 1970s Case Study: When Stocks and Bonds Both Lose

The defining feature of the 1970s stagflation era was that the standard diversification benefit between stocks and bonds broke down. Rising, unanchored inflation pushed bond yields higher (and prices lower) while simultaneously squeezing corporate margins and compressing equity valuation multiples — both asset classes fell together in real terms across much of the decade. The S&P; 500 delivered roughly flat nominal returns from 1968 to 1982 while inflation cumulatively eroded purchasing power by well over half.

What worked instead: hard assets. Gold rose from $35/oz at the start of the decade (post Bretton Woods) to over $800/oz by January 1980. Broad commodity indices and energy equities, direct beneficiaries of the inflation itself, meaningfully outperformed the broad market. Real assets with pricing power — companies able to pass rising input costs to customers — also outperformed those without it.

3. The 1980s–2010s: The Great Disinflation and the Golden Age of 60/40

Paul Volcker's Fed broke the back of inflation through the early 1980s with punishing real rates, and the four decades that followed saw inflation trend structurally lower, punctuated by only brief, contained spikes. This was, not coincidentally, the greatest period in history for the traditional 60/40 stock-bond portfolio: falling inflation pushed bond yields steadily lower (bond prices higher) for forty years, while low and stable inflation supported equity valuation multiples. Bonds and stocks moved inversely during growth shocks, delivering exactly the diversification benefit the 1970s had denied investors.

4. 2021–2023: The Regime Snapped Back

Post-pandemic fiscal stimulus, supply chain disruption, and an energy shock from the Ukraine war combined to push U.S. CPI to a four-decade high above 9% in mid-2022. The 60/40 portfolio suffered its worst calendar-year return since at least the 1930s in 2022, as the correlation between stocks and bonds flipped positive — both sold off together, echoing 1970s dynamics far more than the prior forty years of experience most living investors and advisors had actually lived through.

5. An Inflation-Aware Allocation Framework

The practical lesson is not to permanently overweight commodities or gold — that trade loses money for years at a time during low-inflation regimes. The lesson is to treat inflation regime as a variable that should shift portfolio construction, not a constant.

In a low-and-stable regime, the classic 60/40 remains a reasonable, cheap, and well-diversified default. In a rising or high-and-volatile regime, historical evidence favors tilting toward: Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS) and shorter nominal-bond duration to reduce rate sensitivity; real assets including commodities, energy, and inflation-linked infrastructure; equities in sectors with demonstrated pricing power (staples, energy, select industrials) over long-duration growth stocks whose valuations are most sensitive to discount-rate increases; and a meaningfully reduced reliance on nominal bonds for portfolio ballast, since their diversification benefit specifically depends on the low-inflation regime holding.

6. Conclusion

Fifty years of data across three distinct regimes point to the same conclusion: asset allocation frameworks calibrated to one inflation regime will underperform, sometimes badly, when the regime shifts. The 60/40 portfolio is not broken — it is regime-specific, and investors who treat it as a universal constant rather than a disinflation-era product are the ones most exposed when the next inflation shock arrives.
