Reflexions On A Retirement Fund

by: Guy R. Fleury

In writing **Reflexions On A Retirement Fund**, my primary intent was to give anyone with the means the ability to build a meaningful retirement fund. That is, large enough to provide you with a prosperous and well-deserved retirement for as long as you may live while providing a more than worthwhile legacy for your loved ones. Or for any other purposes you might fancy.

I will show that it is relatively easy to build this retirement fund [1] even though it is as hard as can be. Only a minority manages to do so,[2] and I think anyone could be part of this should they have the conviction they can do it and give it enough time.

Secondly, we can all easily understand that not putting some money aside for retirement is not the best bet you can make. Sure, you might not get to retirement age, but regardless, it is still a bet on your life you will have to make, just in case you do make it. Hopefully, you are already on your way. The average life expectancy is about 85 years, meaning you have a better than 50% chance of reaching it.

I read recently that some of the Gen-Z crowd (18-24) would prefer ”soft saving”,[3] meaning mostly only doing the minimum. Most likely, they have not done the math. Otherwise, they would immediately see how costly such a decision may be.

They advocate using most of the money they make for immediate gratification. They intend to save only a little for their retirement while delaying the process as much as possible. They have the attitude: I will look at it when I get older, when my income will be higher, maybe in my forties or fifties.

It is like they do not understand the math, do not care since they might not be there, or think other people will provide for them when the time comes. There is also the possibility that they aspire to a simple and low-income retirement life with barely enough to get along (read voluntary or imposed simplicity).

It is not a good idea to not save for your retirement for various reasons. True, you may not be there to retire at all and would have had no need for a retirement fund.

There is a prerequisite to retirement: you have to be alive to enjoy it. So, since you might not get there, then go for it. You might as well use most of the money you make before that dreadful and permanent retirement day.

---

[1] See the list of related articles at the end showing how easily you can do it.

[2] Apparently, at most 10 to 15% manage to do so, which is not much.

[3] See **Say goodbye to retirement? A 'soft saving' trend is emerging among young people**.

The thing is, not all people reach retirement age. However, if they did not prepare for it financially, well, as the saying goes: they're done and royally. Only people who like their "job" might be interested in working after retiring. Most others work by obligation – if able to – to make ends meet.

What's wrong with "soft saving"? You could reach retirement age truly unprepared for what will follow and with a much lower income than what you could have had by starting earlier and saving more. The Gen-Z "soft saving" crowd could have done something about it while they were younger and able to do so. Later in life, options and ability to remedy the situation might be more limited.

Starting investing early can make quite a difference in how you might live your retirement years. We will elaborate more on this later on. At least we will put some math behind this endeavor.

Before going further, I need to point out you will be the center of it all. *It is not something I will do for you; it is something you will do for yourself*. It will be your investment decisions and your money. And it will be totally under your control. All of it is dedicated to your self-interest. I hope to be clear on this and show it should become your thing. I will also stress the urgency of it all since your clock is ticking. You will put years into it, money, patience, and perseverance with only a little work.

These reflexions are like a continuation to my paper: **The Age Of The Individual Investor**, which ended up suggesting that at least 400 million people, if not more, could benefit from it; not only for themselves but also for their children and grandchildren. Hoping you will be one of them.

We will be looking at your future and the future of the planet. I will consider only one side of it, the money side. The questions are:

How much wealth can you accumulate before retiring?
How much more can you generate while in retirement?

It separates the problem into two parts. Both could be considered investment plans.

We will have a build-up phase where you accumulate appreciating and tradable assets up until retirement and a retirement phase where you enjoy the benefits from your investment portfolio as you start withdrawing funds for yourself.

Reflexions On A Retirement Fund will not be about you buying annuities or government pension plans. It will be about you building your investment plan, which will later have part of it acting as your retirement fund, providing you with a more than worthwhile income stream.

I have no product to sell except this idea, an equation, a concept entirely designed for your benefit and under your control. You will have to do the work required (even

if it is not much), have the money to do the job, and have the perseverance and determination to carry it out for decades.

Before embarking on such a journey, you have to gain the conviction that you can do it, not as a leap of faith, but by understanding what you want to do and how you can do it. However, as I have observed over the years, understanding is not enough. You need the conviction that what you will do will work, not as a maybe it might, or it could, but simply as it will.

It is as if common sense is not a driving force anymore. Verify the stuff I put out like with anything else. Be sure that the foundation of your convictions is grounded in facts. I like equations to express financial stuff. The reason is simple. I have an equal sign on the table, and it is a brutal statement. It says: it is true, or it is not. So, redo, at will, all the presented calculations to make sure you agree with them.

Savings Alone Is Not Enough

You will not reach lofty retirement goals with your savings alone. It is by investing in appreciating assets having higher returns than a savings account. You need a higher return on your money, at least higher than 10%, which has been the long-term average for investing in stocks over the past two centuries. It should be your responsibility to make sure you exceed this objective. You have many ways to do so.

First, you must see the big picture and where you fit in. What are your limits and constraints? How much can you dispose of? How much will you be able to contribute to your plan over the years before retiring?[4]

You know from the start that you will not win on every trade or investment and that there will be losses, giving you even more reasons to plan your ”game” carefully. How much loss can you support? What will be your overall plan?

Second, you need to learn the essentials and what will matter for you. There is not much of it, and it is easy to understand. It is not at the end of the journey that you look back and say: I should have. It has no useful purpose.

It is now, in the present, that you have to say: I do and will accept the expected consequences of the decisions taken over all those years. You will not be right all the time. But that should not be your goal, to be right. Your goal is to accumulate wealth and enough of it to retire with more than just what you need to get along.

You are unique and need a solution that will be suitable, doable, and acceptable to you. The other people do not live your life; you do. You decide on what your future

[4] Reference **Retire A Multi-Millionaire** for a roadmap.

might bring you. That future will have a multitude of decisions you will have to make. Again, common sense is your greatest asset; use it, and use it a lot. Let it prevail.

Thirdly, you have to look at the endgame and your objectives. Are they realistic and doable? Can you do it? A more critical question is: do you want to do it? You have no obligation to do it. So, you might need more than just conviction. Add the willingness and determination to reach those objectives with the patience to see them through.

You know you will not be dealing with instantaneous gratification. You will be more concerned with delayed gratification than anything else. It should be to your long-term advantage if you decide to invest in something. You will not intentionally be doing this to lose money. It is not the time to operate with blindfolds, wishes, or dreams. You will need to be on the job and manage your portfolio in such a way as to make it grow over the years, meaning over decades, even if there is very little work to do. We must design portfolio investment strategies to last a lifetime.

No matter what you do investing, we can express the result as:

$$FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + r)^t \tag{1}$$

where r is the equivalent growth rate over the years t. The future value of your investment will depend on your initial capital (present value PV_0) to which is applied that growth rate for that many years.

You can do as many investments as you want; they will all answer to equation (1), an exponential function. It is the same formula used in calculating compounding interest, except we apply it to appreciating assets. Any organic system can have periods of exponential growth and decay.

For any number of investments, you can always add them up as you go along.

$$\sum_{1}^{N} FV_i(t_i) = \sum_{1}^{N} PV_{0_i} \cdot (1 + r_i)^{t_i}$$

It usually translates to the bottom line of your investment portfolio.

Looking at equation (1), there is no difference between $(1 + r)$ and $(1 + r)^1$, meaning that for the first year, the exponential outcome is identical to its linear return. Short-term, exponential, or linear returns do not make that much difference. However, as time increases, the difference gets noticeable: you have $(1+20 \cdot 0.10) = 3.00$ on the linear side compared to $(1 + 0.10)^{20} = 6.27$ when compounded over the same 20 years. Therefore, for your investments, exponential is better than linear over the long term.

The difference gets more pronounced as time and growth rates increase. For a Gen-Z, with some 40 years before retirement and who could achieve a 15% growth

rate, the difference would be $(1 + 40 \cdot 0.10) = 5.0$ compared to $(1 + 0.15)^{40} = 267.86$ times the initial stake. So, compounding does matter, and time is a crucial factor. The earlier you start, the better.

The above does not put enough emphasis on the differences. Let's forget the linear side and view only compounding over time and the importance of putting everything into perspective. Note that we are looking at endpoints. The path your investment takes over the years could fluctuate widely but have no impact when you are solely interested in the outcome or some valuation time t. When you close an investment, you can get r, the rate of return over the period.

Let's make a Gen-Z decision to start his or her retirement fund at 40 while someone else starts at 25. Let both invest $100k, and let's be generous, allow both of them a growth rate of 15%. The outcome would be: $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{25} = \$3,291,262$ for the Gen-Z, and $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{40} = \$26,786,354$ for having not delayed.

Expectations for the Gen-Z case should be lower, more in the vicinity of 10%, which would generate: $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{25} = \$1,083,471$ due mainly to the uncertainty of the shorter term considered. The loss for Gen-Z is at a minimum $25 million for just deciding to wait to invest until age 40. Nonetheless, that decision to delay investing for 15 years can be much more expensive than that.

Waiting to start investing in your future retirement is not a great idea. Make all the calculations you want, and whichever course you take, once retired, you might have another 20 to 35 years of living expenses where you would be unemployed. That could be a major drain on whatever monies you accumulated over the years before retiring.[5] Also note that inflation will be in the background during all those years, reducing your buying power as you go.

If, as a Gen-Z or part of any other group doing the same thing, you do not prepare for your retirement early, you should not count on others to pay for your retirement. They will not be there and will give you some free and useless advice: "*You should have prepared for your retirement early on, just as we did. Make do with what you have*."

The equation a "soft saving" Gen-Z should look at is:

$$FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + \bar{r})^{25} \cdot (1 + \bar{r} - 0.05)^{35}$$

which gives 25 years before retirement and 35 after. The outcome will depend on $\bar{r}$, the average rate of return over each period. The second part of the equation has a 5% withdrawal rate included in the structure. It makes $\bar{r}$ critical.

[5] Refer to **Retire A Multi-Millionaire** for more details on this.

If all a Gen-Z can get averages 5%, the above equation becomes:

$$FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + 0.05)^{25} \cdot (1 + 0.05 - 0.05)^{35}$$

It means that once having retired, the portfolio stops growing but can still provide a 5% constant withdrawal during retirement. However, since the average growth rate was only 5%, the income stream will not be that high and will not get any higher.

Compare this to the person starting at age 20 with an average growth rate of 15%, which, over the long term, is relatively easy to get, as demonstrated in my recent paper.

$$FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{45} \cdot (1 + 0.15 - 0.05)^{35} \tag{2}$$

Just as in the Gen-Z case, a 5% withdrawal also applies while in retirement.

Both equations estimate how much they might leave behind for their loved ones at age 100.

The outcome will depend on the initial capital, meaning how much they started with $FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1+0.15)^{45} \cdot (1+0.15-0.05)^{35} = 15,141 \cdot PV_0$. It would turn a $100,000 initial stake into $1,514,072,936. You read correctly; that is the legacy a Gen-Z person throws away because they were unprepared or unable to start saving.

Based on the Gen-Z equation and also using $100,000 as initial capital, it would give: $FV(t) = \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.05)^{25} \cdot (1 + 0.05 - 0.05)^{35} = \$338,635$ as a legacy for their children. Also, the retirement income would be limited to $16,932 per year for the 35 years in retirement. But, over the years (15 delayed, 25 invested, and 35 retired), inflation will take its toll.

Which scenario would you prefer? It is a decent question and a relevant one. What are you going to do about it? Especially since you can do all this sitting on your bunnies.[6]

Put your numbers in the above equation and find out how delaying investing in your retirement fund is a decision that could cost you hundreds and hundreds of millions.

The power of an exponential function is at the end of its time series, not the beginning. However, compounding cannot be as effective if you do not put in the time. That is for sure. Again, refer to the paper in the footnote for more on calculations and examples.

In the above equation, we have nothing about the path reaching terminal time T or any other valuation time. You are looking only at the result. You will know the actual rate r only at termination time t.

[6] Refer to **Sitting On Your Bunnies Might Be Your Best Investment Yet**.

Investing in appreciating assets differs from interest on a savings account, where we know the interest rate beforehand. There is risk involved in investing and trading in financial instruments.

Also, you are investing under the expectation of a positive return ($r > 0$) while none of it is given as a certainty. Any investment can go wrong. It is why you will have contingency plans for when $-$ just in case $-$ bad things happen. You want to win this "game" no matter what. You do not intend to reach your retirement with nothing saved. And it is your responsibility to make sure of it.

There is nothing about which type of asset we could use to do the job either. You could start with any cash amount and exchange it for tradable assets. We, as individuals, are a limiting factor in all this. You need to answer the question: How much do I have to start this thing? And, indirectly, another question: How and where could I get more money for this?

Looking again at the above equation where a 20-year-old started a retirement fund with $100k:

$$FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{45} \cdot (1 + 0.15 - 0.05)^{35} = 15,141 \cdot PV_0$$

At retirement age (65), we have: $FV(t) = \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{45} = \$53,876,927$. The first year in retirement would generate an income of $2,693,746 at the 5% withdrawal rate. Again, looking at the equation above, the fund would continue to grow at a 10% rate once retired, which means that the amount withdrawn from the fund will increase by 10% per year starting from $2,693,746. Every year, the withdrawal would increase. Use $\$2,693,746 \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{(t-65)} \cdot 0.05$ to determine the withdrawal for any year after age 65. Year after year, the income stream would increase and not stay flat, as in the Gen-Z example above.

When you look at what is available, you will soon find that the more secure the return you want, the lower the rate of return will be. For example, a savings account does not provide high return rates,[7] as you must have observed already.

Higher returns come from taking higher risks.[8] Even government bonds are not risk-free, even if they call them so.

Over the next 50 to 70 years, contenders will battle for the acquisition of most of the assets of the planet: the not-yet millionaires, the already millionaires, billionaires, large worldwide corporations, and even countries. In the above-cited paper on small investors, I made the case for the sub-millionaires acquiring the lion's share.

The paper[9] provided possible scenarios, all based on equation (1). All significant

[7] Remember the low single digit returns over the past decade.
[8] Refer to the second chart in **QQQ To The Rescue** as an example.
[9] Refer to **The Age Of The Individual Investor** for these estimates.

participants were treated as groups, as if their group, on average, was doing the same thing, meaning investing in their respective future over the next 50 to 100 years.

This worldwide competition is already on.

As an individual, there is not much you can do about it. However, as part of a group of hundreds of millions of same-minded people, while only looking for your best self-interest, you could participate in changing the world. No wars, no cheating, no swindling anyone, no need to hurt others, at least not consciously. All you would see is your wealth accumulation over the years, giving you the freedom to do whatever you wanted and not harm anyone. Is that a Utopian outlook or a reasonable vision of what might unfold in the coming decades?

Here is a formula with 100 million people doing the same thing, building their long-term investment portfolios:

$$100,000,000 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{50} = \$10,836,574,415,839,500$$

At that rate, it is more than enough to buy the planet within 50 years. Giving more time would require less of you to do the same job. For instance, 10 more years would require only 20,000,000 smaller investors.

$$20,000,000 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{60} = \$8,767,997,491,314,800$$

In both cases, the smaller investors won the game and acquired all the assets of the planet. Worldwide assets were estimated to reach over $8,000T in 50 years.

As the above-cited paper suggested, a large number of small investors might be the only way to escape from what the World Economic Forum (WEF) and the World Health Organization (WHO) have planned for us as the WEF has often said: "*You will own nothing, and you will be happy*", "*let them eat bugs*", or, as one of them called poor people: "*useless eaters*", implying that "they" would like to get rid of them. That would be an incredible and dreadful future, not one that I would even aspire to.

Yet, as individuals, none of us is equipped to counter their move. Except, as a group of millions and millions, we can render them ineffective by simply buying it all out while at the same time benefiting ourselves and our children. We do not even have to unite or talk to each other. All we need to do is protect ourselves and invest in our future and the future of our children, which is something we are already doing. We simply focus on the same objective and the same outlook. And surprisingly, it will all be in taking care of ourselves, our future, and the future of our children.

As an individual, you have just been put in charge of not letting that WEF scenario happen. I even heard one say in one of the WEF forums: "...*the elite (read them, the rich people) will be able to continue to travel by plane to anywhere they want. As for ordinary people, they could travel virtually on the Internet wearing their VR goggles*".

I cannot make it more urgent that you consider and try to change that bleak future. In the 1990s, I thought we should be one world, one country, and one people. We were all flesh and blood anyway. It could end all wars. All people would be equal, having the same opportunities to live meaningful, enjoyable, and prosperous lives.

But when I look closer at the present situation, it is not what I see. So, sorry for having been wrong on that one. We might have good intentions, looking for peace for all, but then you see human nature for what it is.

Some Return Calculations

I built the following table to serve two purposes.[10] With it, you can estimate the outcome of your retirement plan. First, use it up to age 65, then use it again for 65 on up. These are selected points in time and returns; those numbers usually come with decimals but can still provide reasonable estimates.

Simple Return Table — Base: $1.00 — For Factors in $FV(t) = PV_0 \cdot (1 + r)^t$

Years	Return -3%	B 0%	C 5%	D 10%	E 15%	F 20%	G 25%	H ⋯ 30%
5	0.859	1.00	1.276	1.611	2.01	2.49	3.05	3.71
10	0.737	1.00	1.629	2.594	4.05	6.19	9.31	13.79
15	0.633	1.00	2.079	4.177	8.14	15.41	28.42	51.19
20	0.544	1.00	2.653	6.727	16.37	38.34	86.74	190.05
25	0.467	1.00	3.386	10.835	32.92	95.40	264.70	705.64
30	0.401	1.00	4.322	17.449	66.21	237.38	807.80	2,619.99
35	0.344	1.00	5.516	28.102	133.18	590.67	2,465.19	9,727.86
40	0.296	1.00	7.040	45.259	267.56	1,469.77	7,523.16	36,118.86

Table 1: Factors for $PV_0 \cdot (1 + r)^t$.

Here is how to use this table. It is all based on the compounded return on $1.00. This way, you can use the factor at the intersection of the number of years and the selected return and then multiply that factor by the amount invested.

The equation used is: $\$1.00 \cdot (1+r)^t$ and is provided for the years 5 to 40 by increments of 5 years. The rates of return are applied to the given years. This way, you have: $PV_0 \cdot \$1.00 \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{20} = 6.727 \cdot PV_0$ for years 20 and return 10% (column D). Any amount you start with multiplied by 6.727 will give you the future value of your stake in 20 years. For example, a Gen-Z starting at age 45 would reach retirement age with 6.727 times his or her initial investment provided they had a 10% average growth rate over the period. However, they might average lower returns.[11]

[10] Such tables have been around for ages.

[11] A study gave the average long-term return for the small investor more in the vicinity of 4.2%.

For the part while in retirement, you start where you left off at age 65 and make the estimate with the 5% withdrawal rate – like in equation (2). Over the next 20 years in retirement, this fund would still have a 5% appreciation rate. It would give $6.727 \cdot PV_0 \cdot 2.653 = 17.846 \cdot PV_0$. The 2.653 comes from column C, giving the 5% rate. It would still represent, at age 85, some $1,784,673. At age 65, the first withdrawal would be for $33,635, and this would increase by 5% per year.

You could do the same calculations for any period. Use equation (2) as a guide.

Another example: starting again with $100k, but at age 25 using an average 15% rate. At age 65, this would give:

$$PV_0 \cdot \$1.00 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{40} = 267.56 \cdot PV_0 = \$26,786,355$$

And from there, up to age 90, we would have, based on $(1 + 0.10)^{25}$:

$$\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{40} \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{25} = \$100,000 \cdot 267.56 \cdot 10.835 = \$289,901,260$$

That is a legacy fund of $289,901,260.

For the above scenario, the first year of withdrawals at 65 would start with

$$\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.15)^{40} \cdot 0.05 = \$26,786,355 \cdot 0.05 = \$1,339,318$$

This would be increasing at a 10% rate for as long as you are retired. Furthermore, assuming you died at 90, you would leave some $289,901,260 as a legacy for your loved ones. Outstanding. The funny thing is that that scenario is relatively easy to accomplish; you have ready-made solutions for it.

Build your own scenarios and see which might suit you best.

Consider someone who waited until they were 50 before starting their retirement fund. They have 15 years before reaching 65. Give the fund a 5% average return over the period. From the formula above, we get: $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.05)^{15} = \$207,893$. The withdrawal for the first year would be: $10,395.

While in retirement, say over the next 25 years until they reach 90, we would have $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.05)^{15} \cdot (1 + 0.05 - 0.05)^{25} = \$207,893$. Our retiree would have to get by with $10,395 per year for the rest of his or her life. Undoubtedly, choices are to be made, and you are at the center.

From Table (1), each column is close to what we might get by investing in various assets. For example, not investing at all would leave us with the -3% column representing the average inflation depreciating your money year by year. After 20 years, you would have about 54% of your buying power left. The more you do nothing with your money, the more it will depreciate. After 60 years, a $100,000 stake would

be worth $1,285. That is if inflation stayed at an average of 3%. If it got higher, the depreciation would be faster.

If "soft saving" Gen-Zs wanted a reason for using their money as they go, this is it. Use it before it depreciates too much. You are not the one creating inflation, and since you will have to live with it, find ways to compensate for it. One way is to aim for higher returns.

Column B in Table (1) gives the appreciation for a fund indexed to the cost of living. It maintains its buying power but nothing more. It would be like frozen in time with the same buying power for years and years. Your revenue might increase in value but not in buying power. Your government pension plan may operate this way. However, if you make more than $100k a year, they might tax your pension revenue up to 80% if not higher. It should give you a sufficient reason to build your retirement fund where the government cannot reach it or impose its rules.

Column C in Table (1) has an average 5% rate, which is close to what banks and financial institutions might offer unwary customers during periods of low inflation. Even the small investor has a hard time exceeding this figure over the long term. The thing is, banks can achieve higher rates than this. Say they offer you 5% for 30 years on your investment. From Table (1), you should get 4.322 times your initial capital. The bank uses your invested funds over the same period but at a 15% rate or higher. They know they have to give back your 5%. Their equation is: $\$100,000 \cdot (1+0.15-0.05)^{30} = 17.449 \cdot \$100,000 = \$1,744,940$ or $\$100,000 \cdot (1+0.20-0.05)^{30} = 66.21 \cdot \$100,000 = \$6,621,177$. You make your pick. I would say they were very well compensated for their minimal work on your behalf. And you can understand why they invite you to invest with them.

For an individual investor, a long-term 5% return is not enough compensation for their investment. You have to look elsewhere. Preferably, you should self-manage your portfolio, and entirely for your benefit. All the fees you pay to money managers are not in your investment account and will reduce your overall performance.

Column D at 10% is what you can obtain simply by buying SPY. It is often viewed as a market average proxy. There is no effort needed. You put your stake in SPY and wait for years and years. You wake up 40 years later and will have about 45 times your initial stake ($\$100,000 \cdot 45.259 = \$4,525,926$). It's not a bad proposition. At least it is better than doing nothing or accepting a 5% return.

Column E gets interesting. At 15%, your portfolio grows faster than the market average, which 75% of money managers do not achieve. You would expect it to be due to your hard work doing better than professionals. But no. You can buy that performance level right off the shelves.

In my recent papers, I have demonstrated that buying QQQ instead of SPY would

do the trick. A single decision and in 40 years, your initial stake would be multiplied by 267.56, or about. Your $100,000 would become $26,786,355. Now that is better. And all you had to do was buy QQQ and sit on it.

Column F is the Warren Buffett column. The 20% is what Mr. Buffett managed to do over his 50^{+}-year career.[12] So, it is doable, and he is not alone in having done it. All you had to do was buy Berkshire Hathaway stock and sit on your bunnies, which was not that much work either. I find that one should strive to, at least, reach this level on their investment/retirement funds.

It is, again, a choice you have to make. There could be some work involved in this scenario. But then again, it might be worth it.

Column G could be viewed as an accelerator. It does stuff faster. If column F gives a doubling time of less than 5 years, then column G over those same 5-year periods is acting slightly better than a cube ($\sim x^2$ compared to $\sim x^3$). Column G is not a limit but will require some work to get there. Over the long term, the rewards would be worth it. The 40-year scenario would give: ($\$100,000 \cdot 7,523.16 = \$752,316,385$). Now put that amount at a 20% rate for the next 25 years (that would be $71,768,136,848).

The higher the fund value, the harder it is to reach higher returns. Nonetheless, it is still doable.

Column H is what you should aspire for and even think of exceeding.[13] Again, it is a return accelerator to push your performance beyond what could be achieved by columns B, C, D, and E. Nonetheless, column E is easy to get. It requires no work but does require patience.

Remember that building your retirement fund is not just to get to retire, and that is it. It is also about all the years you will be retired and needing an income stream of substance to enjoy that retirement while at the same time building a legacy fund for your loved ones. Giving them a better chance and better opportunities than you had, just like your parents and grandparents did for you.

It does not necessarily require much work, should it be what you want.

But to push the barriers, you will have to work at it, and it depends on which column in Table (1) you choose.

Escaping From The WEF Scenario

The above should read: escaping servitude. Your mission, should you accept it, is

[12] It demonstrates we could also manage our investment portfolio beyond retirement age.
[13] See Renaisance Tech with its Medallion Fund for example.

to do the best you can for yourself and the loved ones you will leave behind. To ensure their safety, you must ensure yours for the rest of your life. It also implies protecting your children for as long as they may live. You want them to die of old age and nothing else. And in the coming century, they are expected to live longer than you.[14]

Life expectancy is rising even if it momentarily declined during Covid-19. Population growth, however, has been in decline since the seventies.[15]

The already rich people think they are the ”elite”, ”the bright ones”, and ”the chosen” ones. They will try to control everyone and everything except themselves. It is regrettable since, most often, it is because we let them do so. Your countermove is to say NO to this global control grab by a pseudo-elite. None of them are worth more than you. Period. Why think that voting has any value if all is ruled by unelected bureaucrats in worldwide organizations pushing their agendas?

One of the conclusions of my paper: **The Age Of The Individual Investor** was that sub-millionaires could technically buy back the planet while building their retirement fund and keep on managing those funds after retiring.

There are a lot more of you than of them.

The outcome would be simple. All world assets would be in the hands of hundreds of millions of people and not just for a few benefiting from all the planet's riches while you would be eating bugs and working for your ”lord” for rent and food. I know it will take some 50 to 70 years to get there, but for them too.

Nonetheless, they do have a head start. They are moving faster. They now have infiltrated governments at the highest levels. They are getting ready to rule the world.

Take the time to read the above-cited paper. It covers the significant participants in the upcoming sharing or grabbing of most of the planet's assets. The dominant ones will make and enforce their laws and regulations. None of it should be that good for you if you let an ”elite” such as DAVOS devotees (members of the WEF) take charge. Look at what is coming your way because that is the world your children will have to live in. They might be too young to see it coming, but you are already old enough to make up your own mind. If you do not do it for yourself, do it for your children to leave them a better world than you had, just like your parents tried to do for you.

Look at the clues they provide: they are actually saying what they intend to do.[16]

---

[14] Half the children under five are expected to reach 100 over the next century.
[15] See chart (#2) in **The Age Of The Individual Investor**.
[16] Look up **WHO Outreach**.

The real big question is: which scenario will you pick to change your economic future?

Related Files:

Catching Up On Your Retirement Fund

How To Make It Anyway

Retire A Multi-Millionaire

Sitting On Your Bunnies Might Be Your Best Investment Yet

Self-Managed Retirement Funds

Make Yourself A Glorious Retirement Fund

The Age Of The Individual Investor

QQQ To The Rescue

Use QQQ - Make the Money and Keep IT

Take the Money and Keep it – II