ChatGPT

Concise Summary:

- **AI Revolution & Bubble Debate:** The panel debated whether the AI-driven tech boom is a sustainable "fourth industrial revolution" or an overhyped bubble. Tech valuations are sky-high, fueled by AI excitement, but skeptics note that monetization of AI is still nascent and a correction is possible.
- **AI's Pitfalls – Energy & Scaling:** They flagged practical constraints in the AI boom, such as enormous power demands and the difficulty of endlessly scaling large language models. These could slow AI progress if not solved, tempering some of the most optimistic forecasts.
- **Rotation to Real Economy vs Tech:** Strategist Chris Verrone argued for a shift toward "real economy" sectors (transports, regional banks, commodities) after an "exhausting" year dominated by megacap tech. Dan Ives countered with continued bullishness on tech, especially AI leaders, predicting another strong year for top tech stocks.
- **Top Tech Picks (Microsoft, Oracle):** Dan Ives singled out Microsoft and Oracle as prime beneficiaries of the AI wave. Microsoft is seen entering an "inflection year" in 2026 with surging cloud/AI demand, while Oracle's AI cloud bets could pay off – though Oracle's heavy debt and spiking credit default swaps raised concerns among experts.
- **Software & Healthcare Comebacks:** Both software and healthcare stocks, laggards in 2025, were highlighted as poised for a rebound. Panelists noted that enterprise software firms could see renewed growth (and M&A activity) as AI is adopted across industries, and healthcare stocks – beaten down to decades-low valuations – may finally turn up in 2026 if headwinds (e.g. regulation and costs) abate.
- **Housing Market "Still Dead":** The hosts agreed the U.S. housing market remained stagnant in 2025, with sales stuck near 30-year lows due to high mortgage rates and poor affordability. They predicted only a slow recovery in 2026 unless interest rates fall significantly, keeping housing activity subdued for now.
- **Tesla's Uncertain Autonomy Bet:** Tesla's future was discussed with caution. Elon Musk's bold promises of widespread robo-taxis by 2025 fell short – a limited pilot launched with safety drivers still needed. Dan Ives remains optimistic (seeing Tesla's AI and robotics efforts driving a "monster year" in 2026), but others questioned the timing and probability of full self-driving at scale.
- **Financials & Bank Consolidation:** The panel saw value in beaten-down financial stocks. Bank of America was cited as a comeback story – strong earnings and deposit inflows suggest resilience – and there was consensus that regional banks will continue consolidating in 2026 (many "left for dead" regionals could be merger targets as regulators warm to deals).
- **"Left-for-Dead" Stocks & Credit Risks:** They pointed to other contrarian opportunities in neglected stocks/sectors that could rally if the cycle turns. However, an underlying risk discussed was the rapid growth of private credit markets outside traditional banks – a potential vulnerability if economic conditions worsen. Market sentiment, they warned, remains fragile: the narrow 2025 rally could quickly reverse if big AI bets disappoint or if liquidity tightens.
- **2026 Outlook – Cautious Optimism:** In closing predictions, the guests agreed AI will remain a dominant theme in 2026 but urged caution. The AI boom **could** mark the next industrial revolution, but a lot must go right (monetization, cost reduction, reasonable competition) to justify valuations. They assigned high probability that *long-term* AI adoption will transform industries, but also a significant chance of a *near-term* pullback or shakeout in overextended AI players. Similarly, they saw solid odds that unloved sectors (like healthcare or small-caps) rebound as leadership broadens, and noted that crypto's surge (e.g. Bitcoin hitting new highs) signals abundant risk appetite – which could either continue supporting markets or swiftly evaporate with any negative shock.

Detailed Report

AI Revolution: Bubble or New Industrial Revolution?

Statement: The episode opened with a debate on the AI-driven tech boom – is it a justified revolution or an overinflated bubble? Dan Ives likened the AI surge to a *fourth industrial revolution*, implying current valuations (e.g. in AI chip and cloud companies) are supported by future transformative impact. Chris Verrone, however, voiced concerns that 2025's "AI euphoria" has outpaced actual monetization, raising bubble risks.

Evidence: There is clear evidence of *bubble-like symptoms* in the AI sector. Over 75% of S&P 500 gains in 2023–25 came from AI-related stocks, and heavy capital investment in AI contributed **1.1%** to U.S. GDP growth in early 2025 [1]. Top CEOs are split: ~40% believe AI *overinvestment* will trigger a correction [2]. Major figures like Goldman Sachs' CEO and Jeff Bezos have publicly warned that much of the capital pouring into AI "won't deliver returns," calling the environment *"kind of an industrial bubble"* [3]. Even Sam Altman of OpenAI cautioned that people will "overinvest and lose money" in this phase of the boom [3]. On the other hand, optimists argue AI really is a decade-long *"supercycle"* – for example, AMD's CEO Lisa Su sees AI transforming industries and justifying a massive investment cycle [4]. History offers perspective: transformational tech often *does* spark bubbles before long-term payoff. Famed investor Howard Marks notes that every revolutionary innovation (from railroads to the internet) initially triggers *"overwhelming excitement"* and investor frenzy, often followed by painful corrections [5] [6]. Indeed, the **dot-com** boom was characterized by huge early gains, envy-driven buying, and eventual crash – yet decades later the internet fulfilled its world-changing promise [5] [7]. Similarly, current AI leaders' market caps have far outrun their near-term earnings – RBC Wealth Management finds the tech sector's market-cap share has *far* outpaced its share of net income since 2022 [8], a gap that usually precedes revaluation. Furthermore, a **MIT study** of companies adopting GenAI found **95%** had *zero* ROI despite $30–40 billion spent [9], underscoring that today's AI enthusiasm hasn't yet translated into profits. These facts support Verrone's skepticism that a speculative bubble may be forming around AI stocks.

Probability Assessment: Long-term, it's highly probable that AI will transform business and justify significant value – essentially all experts agree AI is a *real* technological revolution [10] [11]. But the **near-term probability** of a market correction in AI-heavy stocks is also high. Given historical patterns and current signals (extreme concentration of gains, stretched valuations, and executives openly hedging their optimism), there is a **strong likelihood** that many AI stocks could see a pullback or shake-out in 2026. In other words, AI is *not* "just a fad" (low chance of a total collapse in AI adoption), but the chance that current stock prices are ahead of themselves is significant. We assess a **70%+ probability** that some air will come out of the AI bubble – a healthy correction or at least a leveling-off – in the next year [2] [8]. Yet, we also assign a **high probability** (well above 80%) that AI will continue advancing and eventually fulfill much of its promise, even if early winners and losers change. The panel's nuanced view aligns with this: *cautious optimism*. AI truly could be the "next internet," but investors should be prepared for volatility, not just a straight line up. As Howard Marks put it, *"excitement…overrides reasonableness"* in bubbles [12] – a dynamic likely at play now, even amid genuinely world-changing tech progress.

Pitfalls in the AI Boom: Energy and Scaling Challenges

Statement: A major caveat raised in the discussion was whether the current AI frenzy might hit physical and technical limits. Steve Eisman and Chris Verrone highlighted "power constraints" and the scalability challenges of ever-larger AI models as potential pitfalls. In short, even if AI demand stays hot, *can* we practically support and monetize it given the immense computing and energy resources required?

Evidence: The concerns are well-founded. Today's AI models (especially large language models like GPT-4) consume **enormous** energy in both training and deployment. Data centers already gobble an estimated **4.4% of U.S. electricity** (as of 2023), and that share *could triple by 2028* due to AI growth [13]. By some projections, data centers worldwide might use **20% of all electricity by 2030–2035** if current AI trends continue [14]. Professor Mahmut Kandemir, an expert in computing efficiency, warns that running thousands of power-hungry GPUs for months to train AI models makes AI research *"one of the most resource-intensive computing tasks"* today [15] [16]. Only a few tech giants can afford these costs, creating a potential bottleneck where smaller players are priced (or powered) out [16]. This aligns with the panel's point: if AI development is constrained to a handful of companies with massive power capacity, the broad "AI revolution" could stall or concentrate risk.

Scaling *up* models also faces diminishing returns. Researchers have noted that simply making models larger is yielding smaller improvements, especially if models are trained on data that might already contain answers (the *"data contamination"* problem) [17]. A leaked Apple ML study and MIT research suggest current AI reasoning may be less robust than it appears due to these issues [18] [19]. In other words, just scaling parameters might not equate to human-level reasoning without new breakthroughs – a point David Siegel (Two Sigma co-founder) emphasized, noting *"rarely does anyone speak about the limitations of current AI"* amid the hype [20]. The panel's mention of "LLM scaling issues" likely alludes to this idea that bigger isn't always better, and next-gen models might hit a wall in efficiency or training data quality.

On the infrastructure side, expert analyses show both concern and optimism. A comprehensive 2024 study by Epoch AI investigated whether AI computation can keep growing at ~4× per year through 2030. They identified **power availability and chip manufacturing capacity** as key constraints, but concluded that – with *massive* investment – it's *likely feasible* to train models 100× more powerful than GPT-4 by decade's end [21] [22]. However, achieving that would require "hundreds of billions of dollars" in new power plants, chip fabs, and data centers [23]. This essentially underscores the panel's warning: the AI boom *can* continue, but it's bumping against real-world limits of energy and capital. Already, companies like Oracle have borrowed tens of billions to build AI data centers (more on that below), indicating how capital-intensive this is [24] [25]. If energy costs spike or if chip supply chains falter, AI progress could slow abruptly.

Probability Assessment: The probability that energy and scaling challenges *meaningfully slow down* the AI boom in the near term is **moderate**. In the next 1–2 years, it's likely (>50% chance) we'll see some "growing pains" – e.g. delays in model training due to chip shortages or companies struggling with AI cloud costs. Tech giants are already racing to mitigate this (investing in more efficient chips, advanced cooling, etc.), so a catastrophic halt is unlikely. But the panel's caution is warranted: there's at least a **medium chance (≈50%)** that the AI frenzy will encounter a reality check from infrastructure limits, leading to more selective or efficient investment. For instance, if power grids in key regions get strained or if training the next big model costs *twice* as much electricity (and money) as anticipated, investor enthusiasm could cool. We've already seen hints of this – Meta and others have shifted focus from just making models bigger to making them *more efficient*. On balance, we predict the AI revolution will continue, but the **pace** may moderate because of

these constraints. Companies that can innovate around energy (e.g. better chips, smarter algorithms) will likely pull ahead. In summary, the panel's implied prediction that "physics and costs could catch up to AI" has a significant probability of being accurate – AI isn't *free*, and 2026 may make that more apparent.

Rotation to the "Real Economy" vs. Tech Leadership

Statement: Chris Verrone argued that 2026 might finally see a **market rotation** away from the handful of mega-cap tech stocks that dominated 2025's gains. He pointed to early signs of investors returning to *"real economy"* sectors like transports (e.g. shipping, railroads), regional banks, industrials and commodities. These sectors were relatively *left behind* during the AI-driven rally and thus could have more room to run if the economy remains resilient. In contrast, Dan Ives (and Steve Eisman to a degree) maintained that big tech – particularly AI-centric tech – would likely **continue leading** unless the macro environment drastically changes. Essentially, this was a debate between a **broadening rally** vs. the status quo of tech dominance.

Evidence: By late 2025, data indeed showed a *broadening* of market leadership beyond the "Magnificent Seven" tech giants. In December 2025, U.S. cyclicals and value stocks began outperforming growth stocks for the first time all year [26]. The Russell 1000 Value Index edged up +0.7% in Dec, beating the Growth Index's –0.6% decline [27]. Investors started rotating into **financials, industrials, and energy**, which led gains into year-end [28]. A market review noted *"leadership continued to broaden beyond mega-cap tech into year end as investors shifted toward cyclicals amid firmer growth expectations and optimism for further Fed easing"* [28]. This directly supports Verrone's case: as 2025 closed, transports and banks (classic economy-linked sectors) were catching a bid, and previously defensive sectors like healthcare even perked up a bit. International markets too saw this shift – developed markets outside the U.S. outperformed the S&P 500 for the first time in years in 2025, aided by value sectors rallying [29]. One reason is valuations: many industrial and bank stocks traded at relatively low P/E multiples after lagging while tech soared. As macro data improved (e.g. U.S. Q3 GDP came in surprisingly strong at +4.3% [30]), investors grew confident enough to *leave the comfort of Big Tech* and bargain-hunt elsewhere. Sam Stovall, a chief investment strategist, noted *"rotation into the non-tech cyclicals signals encouraging economic expansion expectations"* [31] – essentially, when investors expect sustained growth, they buy things like transports (trucks, airlines) which benefit from commerce, rather than hiding exclusively in tech.

On the other hand, **big tech's dominance** in 2023–25 was so extreme that completely reversing it may be hard. By mid-2025, just seven tech-related stocks made up over 25% of the S&P 500's market cap, the highest concentration in decades [8]. These firms (Apple, Microsoft, Google, Amazon, Nvidia, Tesla, Meta) delivered outsized earnings growth and stock gains thanks to AI optimism and robust fundamentals [32]. For example, even after a slight cooling in late 2025, the Nasdaq 100 ended the year **>20% up**, and Microsoft, Apple etc. were near all-time highs. Wall Street analysts largely expected AI to *"continue to drive the market higher in 2026,"* though many noted *"the gains won't be limited to tech"* [33] – suggesting a broader rally *including* tech rather than *excluding* it. Dan Ives himself projected tech stocks could climb **20–25% in 2026**, calling it a "prove it year" for AI – meaning if AI use cases start translating to real revenue, tech would surge further [34]. Recent history favors tech: whenever the economy wavered in the past few years, investors flocked back to the high-growth, cash-rich FAANGs. **J.P. Morgan** strategists even caution that betting against U.S. tech remains tricky – their top economist predicted no Fed rate cuts in 2026 (staying moderately tight) [35], which could actually *hurt* cyclicals more and favor the secular growth of tech.

Probability Assessment: We assign a **high probability (≈70%)** that market leadership *will* broaden at least somewhat in 2026. The late-2025 rotation signals were genuine: cyclicals beat defensives into year-end [36],

and valuation gaps have grown too large to ignore. Many "real economy" stocks (small caps, energy, materials) are at multi-year relative lows versus tech. If the economy avoids recession and the Fed even hints at easing, those sectors stand to gain ground. For example, regional banks – crushed in early 2023 – could rebound if credit fears stay contained and M&A picks up (more on banks later). Commodity stocks might rally if China or global demand improves. We see maybe a **60% chance** that value/cyclical indexes outperform growth in 2026, after several years of the opposite. However, we do *not* foresee a collapse in tech leadership – big tech likely remains a major market driver (those companies are financially strong and still growing earnings). The most probable scenario is a **more balanced market**: tech continues to rise but no longer solely carrying the index, as other sectors catch up. Indeed, one can be bullish on both – a *Goldman Sachs* 2026 outlook noted enthusiasm for AI will persist but "the gains won't be limited to tech" as other sectors benefit from a good economy [33]. In summary, Verrone's prediction of a rotation has merit and is already unfolding, but we expect it to be **incremental** rather than a wholesale flip. Tech's crown might loosen, but it won't be easily toppled unless something like significantly higher interest rates or antitrust action specifically hits tech. Given current information, the panel's stance to watch *both* tech and real-economy plays is wise – we anticipate broader participation in the rally (high likelihood), which is healthy for the market's stability.

Tech Sector Outlook: Microsoft, Oracle, and AI Winners

Statement: Dan Ives was emphatic that certain tech companies will remain big winners in 2026, specifically **Microsoft** and **Oracle**. He views Microsoft as one of the *"favorite large-cap tech names"* poised to benefit from an AI-driven upgrade cycle in cloud computing. Similarly, he expressed bullishness on Oracle's position in the AI/cloud infrastructure space (Oracle was discussed at length, likely due to its huge AI cloud deal with OpenAI). The panel noted Oracle's stock had surged then stumbled in 2025, raising questions. Thus, the prediction bundle here is: Microsoft will have a *breakthrough* AI year, and Oracle – despite debt worries – could ride the AI wave (perhaps via increased enterprise cloud demand and potential M&A).

Evidence (Microsoft): There is broad agreement among analysts that **Microsoft** stands to reap enormous gains from enterprise AI adoption. Wedbush's Dan Ives himself wrote that 2026 is the *"true inflection year of AI growth"* for Microsoft's Azure cloud [37]. He noted Wall Street might be underestimating how much Azure's usage could spike as companies deploy AI – CIO spending on cloud AI services is building rapidly [37]. Microsoft has unique positioning: it invested early in OpenAI's GPT models and is integrating AI features across Office, Azure, and its developer tools. Its financial performance remains strong (2025 saw ~16% stock gain [38], solid for a company its size). One insider forecast has Microsoft's earnings accelerating as AI services ramp up, which is why Wedbush raised its price target to $625 (about 28% above late-2025 levels) [38]. Indeed, Microsoft's CEO Nadella called AI a *"platform shift as big as the web or mobile,"* hinting at new revenue streams from AI copilots, cloud AI hosting, etc. We've seen tangible evidence: Microsoft's cloud capex is soaring to build AI data centers, and Azure's AI services usage reportedly contributed materially to its 2025 growth. All this *supports* Ives' prediction – **Microsoft is very likely (estimated >80% probability)** to continue thriving in 2026. It's financially robust (over $60B annual profit) and using that muscle to lead in AI. Risk factors like competition (Google, AWS) exist, but the enterprise trust in Microsoft and its head start via OpenAI partnership give it an edge. In short, the claim that Microsoft will have a "breakthrough year" in 2026 is highly plausible. Even independent of AI, Microsoft has secular growth drivers (cloud, gaming, business software). If anything, one must watch if **antitrust** or regulatory issues arise (for example, the Activision Blizzard deal, etc.), but on AI, Microsoft is arguably ahead of the pack.

Evidence (Oracle): Oracle is a more complex story. In 2023–2024, Oracle repositioned itself as an AI cloud contender (thanks to a partnership hosting OpenAI workloads on Oracle Cloud). This led to a *36% jump* in Oracle's stock on Sept 2025 when it announced a whopping **$400+ billion cloud contract backlog** (largely attributed to OpenAI) [39] [40]. Dan Ives' optimism likely stems from Oracle's **explosive cloud revenue growth**: in the quarter around Sept–Nov 2025, Oracle's cloud infrastructure sales were expected up +71% year-on-year – dramatically faster than AWS or Azure's growth rates [41]. This suggests Oracle is indeed selling a lot of AI-related capacity. The company also touted new deals beyond OpenAI, like a $20B cloud agreement with Meta Platforms [42], indicating broader demand. So on the surface, Oracle *could* be a big AI winner, and its stock remains much cheaper than, say, Nvidia or Microsoft, which is attractive to some investors. **However,** the panel rightly pointed out risk flags. Oracle embarked on a *debt-fueled* data center building spree to capture AI demand. It borrowed over **$56 billion** in 2023–25 to fund this expansion [24], and entered into ~$36B of new project financing for data centers in New Mexico, Texas, etc., as a tenant with huge lease obligations [25]. As a result, Oracle's **5-year credit default swap (CDS)** prices spiked to the highest since 2008 – reaching ~1.25%/year in late 2025 and threatening to break past 1.5–2.0% (2008 crisis levels) if investors remained anxious [43] [44]. Morgan Stanley warned in Nov 2025 that Oracle's credit spreads were surging as it became the market's *"barometer for AI risk"*, with heavy hedging by banks and bondholders [45] [25]. In plainer terms, some sophisticated investors are *betting against Oracle's debt*, using it as a hedge in case the AI boom busts. One reason: Oracle's AI success is *over-reliant* on one customer. **OpenAI** – valued at ~$500B but still unprofitable – accounts for a huge portion of Oracle's cloud bookings [46] [47]. If OpenAI can't secure funding to pay these massive contracts (over $1 trillion in spend expected by 2030) [46], or if AI demand slows, Oracle could be left with giant data centers and debt but not enough revenue. This concentration risk is so notable that Bernstein analysts described Oracle's OpenAI deal as *"unprecedented single-customer exposure"* [48]. Indeed, after the initial euphoria, Oracle's stock **gave up all its gains** by late 2025 [40], reflecting these worries.

So we have a tale of two Oracles: **short-term growth star** vs. **long-term leverage gamble**. The panel seemed divided similarly – Ives focusing on the growth and "AI arms dealer" angle, Verrone/Eisman on the credit red flags.

Probability Assessment: Microsoft: Extremely high probability (≈90%) of continuing strong performance in 2026. It's a diversified tech leader with clear AI catalysts (likely to see double-digit revenue growth in AI divisions). We concur with Ives that Microsoft's AI momentum is real and should translate to earnings (e.g. selling Azure AI services, Microsoft 365 Copilot subscriptions, etc.). Barring an unforeseen event, Microsoft remains a top pick with a high likelihood of upside – we'd assign at least ~**70–80% chance** it outperforms the broader market in 2026, supported by evidence of underestimation of Azure's growth [37].

Oracle: This is a tougher call. The probability of Oracle **benefiting from AI demand** (i.e. showing strong revenue growth) in the next year is fairly high – perhaps ~**60%** chance Oracle delivers solid earnings gains from its cloud segment, given contracts in hand. However, the probability of Oracle's **stock** being a big winner is more uncertain. If interest rates stay high and investors remain worried about its debt, the stock could lag despite growth. We saw Oracle's stock *already* struggle in late 2025 even as its revenue beat forecasts, due to those structural concerns [40] [49]. We'd put maybe a **50/50 chance** on Oracle stock outperforming in 2026 – it could rally if, say, OpenAI secures funding (easing payment concerns) or if Oracle uses its cash flow to pay down debt faster. Conversely, any stumble (e.g. OpenAI scaling back, or higher financing costs) could send it down. In essence, Oracle is a higher-risk, higher-reward AI play than Microsoft. The panel's cautious view on Oracle's risk is backed by data: its CDS spreads nearing **2008 crisis levels** is a glaring warning [45]. Given that, we lean that Oracle's upside is *moderate* and tied to smooth

execution; the probability that Oracle significantly *underperforms* due to its financial leverage is perhaps equal to the probability it shines from AI growth. Investors should monitor Oracle's debt metrics and whether AI cloud revenue actually translates to cash (not just backlog).

In summary, **Microsoft** is a very solid bet (we concur with the bullish prediction), whereas **Oracle** is a more speculative one – the company is riding the AI wave but also "betting the house" on it. The episode captured this nuance, and our evaluation aligns: we strongly favor the likelihood of Microsoft's success and advise caution that Oracle's story, while exciting, carries material risk that could derail the bullish outcome.

Software & Cloud Stocks: Struggles and M&A Prospects

Statement: The guests discussed how many enterprise software companies (especially smaller cloud/SaaS firms) **struggled** in 2025 even as the mega-cap techs soared. These "left behind" software stocks might be primed for a turnaround in 2026. A key prediction here is that we'll see increased **M&A activity** in the software sector: larger companies or private equity could acquire beaten-down software firms at attractive prices, and generally the software industry could rebound as AI investment trickles down beyond just the biggest players. Dan Ives hinted that software, cybersecurity, and infrastructure are "derivative AI trades" that he's bullish on – meaning beyond the obvious AI winners, the enabling software and services should also benefit.

Evidence of 2025 struggles: Indeed, outside the Magnificent Seven, tech had a mixed year. Many cloud software stocks underperformed the broad market. For example, **Salesforce (CRM)** – a bellwether enterprise software stock – dropped ~20% in 2025 while the S&P 500 rose ~16% [50]. This is a stark underperformance, attributed to slower-than-expected growth and perhaps fears that AI offerings from Microsoft/others could encroach on smaller software vendors [50]. Similarly, mid-sized SaaS firms and fintechs saw their valuations compress significantly from pandemic highs. The **IGV** (software ETF) was reportedly flat-to-down for much of 2025, lagging the Nasdaq. Reasons include: rising interest rates (which hurt high P/E growth stocks), and a "flight to quality" where investors preferred only the largest, proven tech companies. However, this sets the stage for *mean reversion*. A Morningstar analysis noted that as of early 2026, **many** tech stocks outside the top group appeared undervalued relative to their fundamentals [51]. For instance, a basket of software firms had implemented cost cuts in 2023–24, improving their margins, but their stock prices hadn't yet recovered accordingly.

M&A signs: There are clear signs that **software M&A** is picking up. After a lull in 2022 (post easy-money boom), 2025 saw notable deals: private equity firms took several tech companies private and bigger fish started swallowing smaller ones. Industry experts (e.g. DA Davidson) highlighted specific software names likely to be acquisition targets. By Q4 2025, **U.S. bank M&A** was already up (44 deals announced in Q4) [52], and a similar trend often follows in tech when valuations are attractive. The panel mentioned "software's struggles" and likely alluded to consolidation. Supporting this, in 2025 we saw big legacy tech companies like IBM, Oracle, even Cisco making acquisitions to bolster their cloud and software portfolios. Moreover, the cost of capital, while higher than 2021, stabilized in late 2025 with some Fed easing, making deal-making easier again. A **Morgan Stanley** outlook predicted a "new wave of consolidation" in various sectors as recession fears faded [53] – software was explicitly mentioned by some analysts as ripe for takeovers after steep stock drops in 2022–23. In fact, some large-cap tech firms were sitting on huge cash piles (e.g. Google, Oracle) and could buy growth via M&A. Private equity also amassed record dry powder, eyeing cash-generative software firms that have subscription revenues.

Probability Assessment: We find it **highly likely (≈75% probability)** that the software sector will rebound in 2026 relative to 2025. There are a few drivers for this optimistic view:

- **AI Diffusion:** As AI tools become more mainstream, even smaller software companies can incorporate AI features, potentially reigniting their growth and investor interest. For instance, a cloud HR software firm could add AI analytics, making its product more compelling. This "AI halo" may start benefiting secondary tech names, not just the Nvidias and Microsofts. Dan Ives referred to this as *"AI derivative plays"* – e.g. cybersecurity companies like CrowdStrike (one of his top picks [54]) stand to gain as enterprises secure their new AI systems. We concur that many software niches (security, data management, cloud infrastructure) will see **renewed demand** thanks to the AI rollout, boosting those stocks.

- **M&A Catalysts:** We also put a **high probability (>60%)** on increased M&A in software. A notable example: **Adobe's 2023 attempted acquisition of Figma** (a design SaaS) and **Broadcom's purchase of VMware** – large deals showing incumbents willing to pay for software growth. In 2025, there were rumors of takeovers (like Salesforce itself facing activist pressure, or smaller SaaS like Twilio or Splunk being M&A candidates – Splunk indeed got acquired by Cisco in 2023). With valuations still reasonable, 2026 could see a *"consolidation wave"* akin to what Skadden's January 2026 report described for banks [55] [56]. We've already seen that in **fintech** and **cloud**, where companies like Qualtrics (experience software) were taken private in 2023. This trend should continue.

- **Investor Rotation:** As mentioned earlier, if mega-cap tech takes a breather, investors will look for growth elsewhere. High-quality software companies that were "left for dead" could suddenly become market darlings again.

That said, not *every* software stock will rebound – the probability is lower for those with flawed models or heavy competition. But broadly, we anticipate an **above-average year for the software sector**. The panel's forecast of a turnaround and pickup in M&A aligns with these conditions. We'd specifically note: companies with solid cash flow and strategic assets (customer base, data) have a high chance of being scooped up. The chance of a *major* software M&A deal (>$10B) in 2026 is quite high (we'd gauge ~70% given current signals). In summary, we agree with the episode's implication: the software sector's struggles are likely *temporary*. The combination of improved sentiment, AI tailwinds, and corporate actions (M&A) makes a 2026 rebound for software stocks a realistic scenario. Investors should still discriminate (profitless "story" stocks may not recover), but the basket as a whole looks poised for better performance – a tail probability of continued severe underperformance seems low barring a big economic downturn.

Healthcare Sector: Poised for a Turnaround?

Statement: The guests highlighted **healthcare stocks** – another 2025 laggard – as a potential *"inflection point"* sector for 2026. Steve Eisman specifically noted healthcare (excluding health insurance companies) had been "left for dead" but might be ready to bounce. This likely stems from healthcare's defensive nature and extremely depressed valuations after a year of being overshadowed by AI/tech. The prediction is that pharmaceuticals, biotech, medical device makers, and perhaps hospital companies could see improved performance going forward, assuming some headwinds (political/regulatory or cost pressures) ease.

Evidence: Healthcare's underperformance in 2025 was indeed dramatic. The healthcare sector (S&P 500 Health Care Index) lagged the broader S&P by the widest margin **in over 20 years** [57]. Essentially, while the S&P 500 was up ~16% in 2025, healthcare stocks barely broke even or even fell for much of the year. Reasons included: intense political pressure on drug pricing (the U.S. began allowing Medicare to negotiate prices on certain drugs, threatening pharma profits), cost inflation and labor shortages in healthcare delivery, and investors chasing sexier tech plays (leading to continuous outflows from healthcare funds for 12+ months) [58] [59]. By late 2025, healthcare equities were trading at valuation discounts not seen since the early 2000s [60]. For example, UnitedHealth Group (the largest health insurer) saw its P/E multiple compress to multi-year lows – which actually attracted notable value investors like Warren Buffett's Berkshire Hathaway, who took a stake in Q4 2025, causing a bounce in UNH's stock [61]. This is a telling sign: when Buffett steps into a sector, it often marks a bottom or a turning point. His move added ~$50B in market cap to UnitedHealth as others followed [61], suggesting sentiment may be shifting.

Additionally, fundamentally, some catalysts are emerging: **demographic tailwinds** (aging populations requiring more care) are strengthening, and **innovation** in healthcare is very real (e.g. new obesity drugs like GLP-1 agonists showed breakthrough efficacy in 2025, creating huge potential markets). The LOM Financial analysis pointed out that unlike the 1999 dot-com era, today healthcare has clear innovation bright spots – such as AI in diagnostics, personalized medicine, and blockbuster drugs – that could *"accelerate recovery once policy fog clears."* [62]. Another sign: in the final quarter of 2025, healthcare actually *became the best-performing S&P sector* for a brief period (+7% in Q4 vs +1% S&P) [63], after some M&A deals and clinical trial successes lifted sentiment. This indicates a nascent rotation. Major pharma companies that had been in a slump (like Pfizer, down in 2025 due to waning vaccine sales) could stabilize as their pipelines mature or as investors seek defensive earnings if economic growth slows.

However, not all healthcare is equal. The panel specifically *excluded insurers* from their bullish view – likely because health insurers face unique challenges (Medicare Advantage reimbursement cuts, higher medical cost ratios post-pandemic). Indeed, insurers were particularly hit by policy changes in 2025 (Medicare drug price negotiations, etc.). So the opportunity might lie more in pharma/biotech (where valuations are low and any positive drug news can re-rate stocks) and medical devices or healthcare services. The "inflection" call probably comes from the observation that healthcare's relative performance line hit a multi-decade low and has started to tick up, reminiscent of how it behaved after the 2000 tech bust (when healthcare then outperformed strongly as money sought safer havens) [64]. In 2000–2002, healthcare stocks rose ~+30% while the S&P fell, as noted in that analysis [65]. With tech stocks at lofty levels now, a similar defensive rotation could occur if tech stumbles or if interest rates remain somewhat high (which tends to favor dividend-paying, stable sectors like healthcare).

Probability Assessment: We believe there is a **high probability (~70%)** that healthcare stocks will outperform the market in 2026. This is conditioned on a couple of things: at least *some* alleviation of the big headwinds. Notably, U.S. drug pricing reforms – the initial list of drugs subject to Medicare negotiation was announced in 2025 and those changes will phase in over several years. The uncertainty around this was arguably worse than the actual impact (the worst-case scenarios are likely priced in). If 2026 brings clarity (e.g. legal challenges or moderated implementation), pharma stocks could rally from deeply oversold levels. Also, if inflation continues to slow, the cost pressure on hospitals and device makers eases, improving margins. Given that by end-2025 core inflation was down to ~2.6% [66], it's likely labor and supply costs in healthcare won't worsen further, which should help earnings.

Moreover, healthcare tends to do well late-cycle or if a mild recession hits, due to its defensive characteristics (people need healthcare regardless of economy). With some economists expecting slower growth by late 2026, investors might preemptively shift into healthcare for safety. We saw a hint of this with those Q4 flows. Additionally, **valuation re-rating** potential is significant – if the sector merely goes from the current ~15x earnings back to its historical ~18x, that's a substantial price increase without requiring huge earnings growth. The downside risks include: if political interference gets even worse (e.g. expansion of price caps) or if some high-profile drug failures happen, that could stall the recovery. But overall, the risk-reward for healthcare looks skewed to the upside now.

Therefore, we concur with the panel's positive bias: the **likelihood** of a healthcare sector rebound in 2026 is strong. It may not be the top-performing sector, but we expect it to at least match or beat the S&P after a rare multi-year stretch of underperformance. Specifically, big pharma and biotech (which were down despite cash-rich balance sheets) have a good chance to surprise to the upside – perhaps a **60–70% chance** those groups see double-digit gains next year. We also expect increased M&A in healthcare (large pharma acquiring smaller biotech with promising drugs, etc.), which is another catalyst. In summary, calling healthcare "overdue for a booster shot" is apt [60] – we see it as a likely correct call that healthcare will get that boost in 2026, making this prediction quite credible. Investors just need patience and a stomach for headline noise.

Housing Market: "Still Dead" Going into 2026

Statement: In the episode, Steve Eisman quipped that **housing is still dead** – reflecting that the U.S. housing market remained in a slump through 2025. The panel noted the combination of **high mortgage rates** and **soaring home prices** kept home sales at extremely low levels, a trend expected to persist. Their implicit prediction is that the housing market will *not* markedly recover until affordability improves (likely via lower interest rates or income catching up), and that in 2026 we might see only a modest uptick at best. Essentially, don't expect a housing boom – the sector will stay tepid.

Evidence: The data strongly supports the "housing is dead" characterization for 2025. Sales of existing homes in the U.S. were stuck around an annual pace of ~4.0 million units – **about a 30-year low** [67]. In fact, 2025 marked the fourth consecutive year of declining or stagnant home sales, as the market cooled after the 2020 frenzy [68]. The National Association of Realtors (NAR) reported the **median existing home price** was ~$414,000 in 2025, slightly *up* (~+1.7%) from the prior year [67], meaning prices didn't crash but that actually made affordability worse with higher rates. Mortgage rates hovered around **6.5–7%** for 30-year loans for much of 2025 (up from ~3% two years prior). With prices near record highs and rates double what they were, the typical mortgage payment became prohibitively expensive for new buyers. This caused what economists call a **"lock-in effect"**: homeowners who previously locked-in 3% mortgages were unwilling to sell (since buying a new home at 7% would raise their costs dramatically). Thus, inventory of homes for sale dried up, and transactions plunged. By one measure, 2025 had on average ~424,000 home sales per month, far below 2020's ~585,000 per month [69]. As Eisman said, the housing market was essentially frozen – low inventory and low demand at these prices. New home construction helped a bit (homebuilders sold new houses to some buyers), but even housing starts were below historical trend because builders feared the high-rate environment.

Looking to 2026, what do experts expect? Many housing forecasters predict *some* stabilization but no full recovery unless rates fall. **Redfin's 2026 outlook** dubbed it "The Great Housing Reset," expecting mortgage rates to dip slightly but likely stay in the 6% range for a while [70]. JPMorgan's economists recently revised

their view to **no Fed rate cuts in 2026** (holding the Fed funds rate ~3.5–3.75% through the year) [71] [72], which implies mortgage rates could stay elevated around ~6% (or higher if inflation persists). If that holds, affordability remains tough – a Bankrate forecast noted rates *could* go as low as ~5.5% by late 2026 *if* Fed cuts happen, but that's uncertain [73]. Meanwhile, **home prices** have not materially declined because supply is so constrained; 2025 even saw slight price increases nationally [74]. The NAR expects maybe a stabilization or slight increase in sales by 2026 (they optimistically cited a potential +14% sales increase in 2026 if rates ease a bit [75]), but that would still be below normal levels. A 14% rise on 4 million is ~4.56 million annual sales – still recessionary by historical standards (normal pre-pandemic was 5–6 million/year). So "still dead" is a fair descriptor – even with a mild pickup, activity would be anemic.

Housing is also very **rate-sensitive** and tends to lag interest rate changes by many months. Even if the Fed starts cutting mid-2026 (not consensus, but let's suppose), it might be 2027 before housing meaningfully rebounds. Furthermore, an affordability index from NAR hit its worst level in decades in 2025 – in some regions, the median household could afford only a fraction of median home prices. Unless either rates drop or prices fall, that won't improve. Homebuilders did gain some market share by offering rate buydowns and incentives, which helped new home sales a bit (new home sales were a relative bright spot in 2025, because no existing homes were on the market), but even builders face constraints like higher costs and limited land in key areas.

Probability Assessment: We assess a **very high probability (~80%)** that the housing market remains slow in 2026. It is **unlikely** (perhaps <20% chance) that we'll see a major housing boom next year. The only scenario that could significantly boost housing would be a steep drop in mortgage rates (say, to <5%). Given current inflation and Fed stance, that's improbable in the next 12 months. More plausible is a gradual easing: maybe rates creep down to high-5% by late 2026, which might bring some buyers back. But even then, prices need to adjust or incomes need to rise to restore affordability. We might already be seeing slight price corrections in overheated markets, but nationally prices haven't cracked much. So the *base case* is continued stagnation: sales perhaps tick up from rock-bottom, but remain well below normal. Home values will likely be flat to slightly down in expensive markets (because buyers can't pay more), but a crash is not expected absent a recession, since inventory is so scarce. Essentially, "dead" in volume but not a price collapse – a *stalled* market. That matches Eisman's implication: housing won't be a growth driver for the economy in the near term.

One nuance: if the U.S. does enter a recession in late 2026, the Fed would cut more aggressively and that could finally revive housing by 2027 – but in 2026 itself, we don't foresee dramatic improvement. We give maybe a **1 in 3 chance** that by late 2026, conditions improve enough (rates ~5-5.5%, slight price dip) to see sales notably rise, but even that would be from a very low base. For the first half of 2026 especially, the odds are high that housing metrics (home sales, mortgage applications) remain near current lows [68]. Homebuilders' stocks might do okay (they have managed through this by focusing on eager buyers who have no alternatives), but the *existing home* market is likely to stay "frozen."

Therefore, the panel's dour outlook on housing is well-supported. We concur that 2026 will likely be another challenging year for real estate activity, with perhaps the *worst* behind it but no strong rebound yet. In sum, the **prediction** that housing will stay relatively "dead" is *highly likely* to be accurate, barring an unforeseen collapse in mortgage rates or a policy intervention in housing.

Tesla’s Autonomous Ambitions and Stock Outlook

Statement: The episode devoted a segment to **Tesla**, focusing on Elon Musk’s promises of autonomous vehicles (robO-taxis) and the uncertainty around Tesla’s future in that realm. The major points included: Musk’s bold prediction that Tesla would have fully self-driving robo-taxis operating by the end of 2025 did *not* fully materialize, making Tesla’s autonomy timeline questionable. Chris Verrone likely examined Tesla’s stock chart and fundamentals, suggesting some caution (“uncertainty”), while Dan Ives remained characteristically bullish – he predicted 2026 could be a “monster year” for Tesla, citing progress in AI and robotics and even floated Tesla’s market cap potentially reaching $2–3 trillion by 2026’s end in a bull case [76]. The panel essentially weighed Tesla’s *hype vs. reality*: will Tesla deliver on autonomous driving soon, and how much of that is already baked into the stock?

Evidence: Tesla’s track record on autonomous driving promises is littered with missed timelines. Elon Musk has for years claimed true self-driving was just around the corner. Notably, in early 2025 he declared that by *June 2025*, Tesla cars would be operating *with no human inside* as robo-taxis in Austin [77], and that by end of 2025 *“half the population of the U.S.”* would have access to Tesla’s robotaxi service [78]. By the close of 2025, this simply did not happen. **InsideEVs** reported that while Tesla did launch a *pilot* robotaxi program in Austin in mid-2025, those vehicles still had safety drivers present (fingers hovering over a kill-switch) [79]. Musk’s claim of removing the safety driver by year-end kept getting pushed – he said maybe by October, then by December, and even did a demo ride himself without a driver [79]. But in practical terms, Tesla had **fewer than 50** experimental driverless vehicles and none operating broadly for paying customers without supervision [80]. In contrast, competitors like Waymo and Cruise did have some fully driverless taxi operations in cities like Phoenix and San Francisco (though Cruise hit setbacks with accidents leading to a suspension in California). So Tesla, despite its bold stance, is arguably *behind* in full autonomy compared to those players using lidar and high-definition mapping (which Tesla eschews in favor of pure vision). InsideEVs summarized that *“Tesla’s robotaxi army failed to conquer the world in 2025”* and that any notion of full autonomy by then *“has come and gone again”* [81]. It points out that this pattern echoes prior years: Musk has been “swearing” the safety driver would not be needed soon, only to delay repeatedly [78].

On the flip side, Tesla *did* achieve some things: it rolled out its “Full Self-Driving (FSD) Beta” to more customers, and its cars logged millions of miles on Autopilot/FSD. Musk also unveiled the **“Cybercab”** – a two-seater autonomous vehicle concept without steering wheel/pedals – a few prototypes of which were spotted testing in Austin [82]. These suggest Tesla is still pushing toward the goal, just not at the pace Musk initially asserted.

From a stock perspective, Tesla had a volatile 2025 but ended up about +19% for the year [83]. This was decent, though not as high as some peers (e.g. Nvidia was up much more). Tesla’s valuation remains rich (~$800+ billion at end-2025), which arguably prices in a lot of future growth including autonomy/robotaxi potential. Bulls like Dan Ives argue Tesla’s advantages in AI (its custom HW3/HW4 chips in cars, vast driving data, Dojo training supercomputer) will eventually yield an autonomous breakthrough and other AI-driven products (e.g. Tesla Bot robots). That underpins their ~$600 stock target and calls for a multi-trillion market cap in a bull scenario [76]. Certainly, if Tesla solved full self-driving at scale, the upside could be enormous – robo-taxis could open a new recurring revenue stream that some analysts say could make Tesla more of a “transportation as a service” company. Ark Invest (Cathie Wood) is famous for such projections, assuming in their best case that Tesla’s autonomous network yields massive profits by late this decade.

However, **objective assessments** of autonomy progress suggest caution. Even by late 2025, Tesla's FSD is classified as Level 2 (driver-assist) – the car cannot drive without human oversight for extended periods, and regulators have not approved Tesla to operate driverless in public outside limited tests. In fact, the U.S. **NHTSA** kept investigating Tesla's Autopilot after some crashes, and in late 2023 it even forced Tesla to modify FSD behavior due to safety concerns. There's a **real possibility** that regulatory hurdles (and the need for near-perfect safety) mean true robo-taxis are several years away. Waymo and GM's Cruise, using more conservative approaches, have had mishaps even after millions of driverless miles; Tesla's approach might encounter similar or worse issues if deployed widely without safety drivers in 2026. So the timeline might extend.

Probability Assessment: We estimate the probability that **Tesla achieves widespread Level 4/5 autonomy (no safety driver) in 2026** is **low**, perhaps under 30%. It's more likely they continue advanced beta tests in a few cities, but not a broad rollout. The panel's skepticism on Musk's promises is justified – given the history, hitting a true robotaxi network at scale by 2026 would be surprisingly fast. More likely, Tesla will keep improving FSD and maybe start limited driverless service late in 2026 in one or two locales (like what Cruise/Waymo did), but "Robo-taxis everywhere" is probably a story for *later* in the decade (if at all).

As for **Tesla's stock**: The probability of Tesla having a "monster year" in 2026 (say, stock up significantly) isn't zero. Tesla benefits from multiple narratives: EV sales growth (it's still the global EV leader and expanding capacity), new model launches (Cybertruck deliveries began in late 2025), and AI hype (Dojo supercomputer, etc.). Dan Ives' bull case of a $2–3 trillion market cap implies the stock would roughly triple, which is extremely optimistic. That would require both continued EV dominance and investors valuing Tesla as an autonomy/AI company – basically *assuming* it will win the self-driving race and perhaps the humanoid robot race. We view that scenario as *very low probability* (maybe <10%) within a one-year frame; it's a long-term speculative case. However, the *base-case probability* that Tesla's stock performs well (though not necessarily triple) is moderate. If the market stays risk-seeking and Tesla executes (growing earnings via cost cuts, new models), it could rise. Conversely, if interest rates stay high and competition in EVs bites into margins (which is happening – Tesla has cut prices to stoke demand, hitting margins), the stock could also stagnate or fall. Tesla's valuation is sensitive to growth rates: any disappointment in deliveries or profit, and the stock can drop (as seen in past corrections).

We'd assign roughly a **50% chance** that Tesla's stock rises in 2026 (maybe not massively, but a solid gain), and a **50% chance** it underperforms or is volatile/flattish. It's truly an uncertain case – hence "Tesla's uncertainty." The episode title "Tesla's Uncertainty" likely reflects this coin-toss nature. Technical analysis might show Tesla's stock at a crossroads (for example, if Chris Verrone looked at charts, he might have noted key support/resistance around 2025's trading range). If the broader market rotates away from high-valuation names, Tesla could be vulnerable given it trades at a high multiple of earnings relative to auto peers. But Tesla also has a fervent investor base and arguably a lead in EV technology and charging network, which are genuine strengths.

In summary, we judge the panel's cautious stance to be prudent. **We find it unlikely Tesla will fully deliver on Musk's autonomous vision in 2026** (low probability). We do think Tesla will make progress (improving FSD, perhaps demonstrating more robo-taxi rides), but not enough to justify the rosiest predictions within the year. As for the **stock**, the probability of a moderate rise is maybe slightly above that of a fall, given Tesla's momentum and potential for positive news (e.g. if the economy improves, EV demand will too). But it's close to a toss-up, reflecting "uncertainty." Investors should be prepared for volatility – Tesla often

swings ±30% on sentiment alone. So the episode's mixed perspective is warranted: Tesla remains a story of great *long-term potential* vs. *short-term execution risk*, and our outlook echoes that duality.

Financial Sector Predictions: Big Bank Resilience and Regional M&A

Statement: The panel turned to **financials**, highlighting a potential comeback in large bank stocks (specifically Bank of America was mentioned) and a continued wave of **M&A among regional banks**. Steve Eisman, famous for shorting banks in 2008, noted that despite strong earnings, bank stocks had lagged – implying value opportunities. The prediction here is two-fold: (1) Major banks like BofA, which struggled in the rising rate environment of 2022–25, could see their stock prices rebound in 2026 as the rate cycle stabilizes and their earnings remain solid. (2) The regional banking sector, which went through turmoil in 2023 (with several high-profile failures and distress), will undergo consolidation – numerous mergers and acquisitions – in 2026, as weaker players get absorbed and the industry restructures. This consolidation is portrayed as an opportunity (for strong regionals to buy others, and for investors to pick up beaten-down names that might be bought at a premium).

Evidence (Big Banks): Bank of America (BofA) is a prime example of a big bank that underperformed in stock terms but has robust fundamentals. In 2023–24, BofA's stock fell significantly (it was down over 30% at one point from its highs), largely due to two issues: unrealized bond losses on its balance sheet (as rates rose, the bonds it owned lost value) and shrinking net interest margins as deposit costs went up. However, by late 2025 BofA started reporting **very strong results**. In Q3 2025, BofA's revenue was up +11% y/y and net income up +23% y/y – $8.5 billion in one quarter [84] – not the profile of a struggling company. It also beat the S&P 500's return in 2025 (BofA's stock had recovered enough by year-end to slightly outperform the index) [85]. This suggests the pessimism was overdone. BofA's CEO also guided for *5–7% net interest income growth in 2026* [86], showing confidence that even if Fed cuts a bit, they can keep loan profits growing. Additionally, the banking panic of March 2023 (when Silicon Valley Bank and others failed) ironically benefited the likes of BofA – many depositors fled small banks for "too big to fail" banks. BofA gained deposits and clients during that time [84]. So Eisman's point about a "fine quarter" and confidence in 2026 is backed by those facts [86]. BofA, JPMorgan, Wells Fargo, etc., all posted *record or near-record profits* in 2025, but their stocks didn't fully reflect that, as investors were spooked by one-time issues and higher capital requirements. If 2026 brings calmer waters (no new bank scares, and maybe the Fed pausing rate hikes), these earnings could translate to stock gains. Valuation-wise, BofA is modestly valued (~10–11× earnings, below the market average) [87]. Simply reverting to a normal P/E could lift the stock. Analysts on SimplyWallSt and others deemed BofA *undervalued* on several metrics [87]. We see similar for other big banks. The downside risk for them – a severe recession causing loan losses – hasn't materialized; credit quality is still decent so far (though commercial real estate loans bear watching). The panel's view seems to be that the market overly punished banks in 2023, and there's room for "catch-up."

Evidence (Regional Bank M&A): The **regional/community bank** space went through a crisis of confidence in 2023 (with failures like SVB, Signature, First Republic). By 2025, while acute crisis subsided, many regionals were left with depressed stock prices and strategic challenges (narrow margins, tech investment needs, etc.). Historically, such an environment leads to consolidation. The data confirms that a *"long-anticipated wave"* of bank mergers finally started in 2025: by year's end, announced U.S. bank M&A deals exceeded 2024's totals, with aggregate transaction value moving "decisively higher" [56]. Q3 2025 was the busiest quarter for U.S. bank deals in four years [88]. Drivers include regulators becoming more permissive – in 2025, regulators explicitly rolled back anti-merger policies and approved deals at the fastest pace since 1990 [89]. Even the FDIC and OCC indicated they support consolidation for stability [90]. This is crucial: one

big reason there weren't mergers earlier was regulatory skepticism, but now that's changed (perhaps because they'd rather have voluntary mergers than messy failures). As a result, numerous deals got announced: e.g., **UBS** acquired Credit Suisse globally (not U.S. regional, but indicative of consolidation mood), and in the U.S., **PacWest** merged with Banc of California, **SVB's remnants** got bought by First Citizens, etc. Looking ahead, industry experts expect "a steady stream of strategic deals in 2026, particularly among community and regional banks" [91]. We also have activism: some mid-sized banks face pressure from shareholders to explore a sale (examples in late 2025 include Comerica and KeyCorp rumored to be potential sellers). The reasons to merge are strong: gaining scale, cutting redundant costs (branches, back-office), and dealing with an aging leadership (some community bank CEOs looking to retire will sell the bank) [92] [93]. Larger regionals can acquire smaller ones to expand geographically or in products. Also, as the panel hinted, many regionals' stocks are trading below their book value, making them attractive targets. Private equity and hedge funds might also push for deals (the Skadden report mentioned *"vocal shareholders"* doing so [92]).

Given this setup, it's quite likely 2026 will see a number of bank M&A announcements – possibly even some sizable ones. The predicted outcome: survivors' stocks could rally on takeover speculation and on improved fundamentals post-merger (the combined entities are stronger). For investors, historically bank M&A waves (like the late '90s) were lucrative for owning regional bank stocks. Eisman pointing it out suggests he sees parallels.

Probability Assessment: We assess a **high probability (~70%)** that **large banks' stocks (e.g. BofA)** will perform well in 2026. They have already shown earnings resilience. If the Fed holds or slightly cuts rates, net interest margins might compress a bit, but loan growth and lower provisions could offset that. And if the economy doesn't tank, their credit losses remain low. Many investors have underweighted banks, so any sign of stability could lead to re-rating. Also, banks are doing buybacks (once allowed again) – BofA resumed share buybacks in 2023, which supports the stock. That said, an important caveat: if the Fed *doesn't* cut and long-term yields stay high or rise, banks could face continued margin pressure. But consensus seems to be mild easing and a soft landing, which is a decent scenario for banks. So we lean positive. We'd specifically say Bank of America's probability of a meaningful rebound is high – it's a well-diversified franchise, and even now some analysts call it undervalued by ~10–15% [94]. If rates behave, that gap can close.

For **regional bank M&A**, we assign an **extremely high probability (≈90%)** that consolidation will continue in 2026. The groundwork is laid: regulators encouraging it, many small banks struggling with tech costs and funding, and buyers available. We expect dozens of mergers. The probability of a *major* regional merger (like two top-30 banks merging) is also significant now that regulators are open – perhaps 50%. Even mega-mergers were hinted (some thought maybe US Bancorp or PNC could buy a rival), though the administration might limit the largest banks from merging with each other. But plenty of mid-tier banks can merge. The net effect: surviving regionals get scale and possibly higher stock valuations, while the weakest simply disappear via acquisition rather than failure – a healthy outcome for the system.

So the panel's predictions in finance appear sound. **One risk**: commercial real estate loans (especially office buildings) on regional bank books could sour if work-from-home keeps offices empty. If that led to big losses, some regionals might fail rather than merge amicably. The IMF did highlight banks' exposures to nonbanks and such [95]. But thus far, losses have been manageable and mostly isolated. Regulators likely prefer mergers to failures, so even if a bank is wobbling, they'll nudge a stronger bank to acquire it (as seen in 2023 with First Republic taken by JPMorgan).

In conclusion, we find the **financial sector outlook** presented – a comeback for big stable banks and a consolidation wave among regionals – to be highly credible and already underway. Investors with a contrarian bent (like Eisman) seem to be leaning into that theme, which bolsters confidence that these predictions have merit. We concur that 2026 should be a better year for bank stocks than 2025 was, making these calls likely to prove accurate.

Overlooked Opportunities: Left-for-Dead Stocks and Private Credit Risks

Statement: The episode touched on **"what's been left for dead"** – implying there are areas of the market that have been severely out of favor but could offer upside. This might include certain beaten-down stocks or sectors outside the tech spotlight (potential examples: small-cap value stocks, certain commodities, or even specific companies like PayPal or Disney that struggled). They also mentioned **private credit** and **fragile market sentiment**. The context suggests: (1) Some asset classes (perhaps high-yield bonds or private loans) have quietly ballooned in recent years (as banks pulled back, private credit funds lent money), which could be a hidden risk if conditions change. (2) Market sentiment in late 2025 was bullish but potentially *fragile*, meaning a negative catalyst could quickly sour the mood given how dependent the rally was on a few themes (AI, etc.). The panel likely warned that while optimism is high, the market could be vulnerable if these left-for-dead parts suddenly cause trouble (for example, if private credit saw a surge in defaults, or if an over-shorted "dead" stock suddenly collapsed further and hit sentiment).

Let's break it down:

- **Left-for-dead stocks:** The panel didn't name specifics in the summary, but examples could be "old" tech like **Intel**, which lagged while Nvidia soared; or consumer stocks like **PayPal** (down heavily in 2025); or even emerging markets or China tech stocks that U.S. investors abandoned. The theme is contrarian plays. In 2025, the dispersion was huge – a handful of stocks drove the S&P, many others were flat or down. For instance, by November 2025 the Magnificent Seven were up massively, but equal-weighted S&P was only up single digits, indicating many stocks went nowhere. Those could be considered "left for dead." Historically, when the market broadens (as we expect in 2026), some of these neglected names jump. We saw glimpses: small-cap indices rallied in late 2025 on hopes that the worst is over. If the economy avoids recession, *cyclical* companies that were priced as though they would fail can rebound sharply. A concrete case: **private credit** itself ties to "left-for-dead" companies – many small/mid companies took loans from private credit funds at high yields. If those companies survive, equity in them or their distressed bonds could rebound. Private equity firms, for example, in 2024–25 started eyeing *distressed public stocks* to take private on the cheap. So there are bargains possibly.

- **Private credit risks:** Private credit (loans made by non-bank lenders) has exploded to over $1.5–2 trillion in assets globally, up from almost nothing pre-2008 [96] [97]. It filled the gap as banks pulled back lending due to regulations, and investors hunted yield. The Boston Fed and IMF have raised questions: do these opaque private loans pose a systemic risk? Banks have indirect exposure – the IMF estimated U.S./EU banks have **$4.5 trillion** exposure to nonbank financial entities including private credit [95]. In October 2025, the IMF's Global Financial Stability report flagged that if defaults spike in private credit portfolios, it could reverberate to traditional banks via these connections [95]. However, a Federal Reserve stress test in June 2025 specifically modeled private credit and hedge

fund stress and concluded they *"do not pose a systemic risk"* – at least not enough to break big banks [98]. That's reassuring but doesn't mean there's no risk to investors. Private credit funds could face losses or gating (limiting withdrawals) in a downturn, which might lead to sentiment issues. Also, private credit often involves leveraged loans to highly indebted companies – if the economy turns or interest stays high, defaults could rise. For now, Goldman Sachs researchers in mid-2025 noted a few "high-profile corporate defaults" occurred but did *not* signal a broad credit crisis [99] – credit markets overall stayed resilient. But that could change; credit tends to lag the cycle. The panel bringing this up likely means they're mindful that credit stress could be a sleeper issue for 2026.

- **Fragile sentiment:** Despite the market hitting record highs in late 2025 [28], there were undercurrents of concern. Volatility (VIX) was relatively low, often a contrarian indicator that complacency is setting in. Crypto's surge to new highs (Bitcoin $126k in Oct 2025 [100]) signaled speculative fever. But then Bitcoin promptly dropped ~30% to the $80Ks by Dec [101], showing how fast sentiment can reverse in one of the riskiest asset classes. That *could* be a canary for broader risk appetite. Furthermore, the market's breadth problem itself was a sign of fragility – if any of the megacaps faltered, the index could fall sharply. RBC's strategist pointed out the growth of the Magnificent Seven's earnings is expected to slow and converge with the rest in 2026 [8]; if those leaders disappoint, overall sentiment could crack quickly. Also, *late in 2025 long-term bond yields spiked* (10-year to ~4.8% by Dec [102]), which started to pressure equities. If yields rise more, stocks could get hit.

Given those, the panel likely implies: **be wary of potential shocks** from corners like private credit or a change in liquidity. One concrete worry: private credit funds often lend at floating rates, so as Fed hiked, borrowers' interest expenses soared. So far defaults haven't surged, but if they do, you might see credit crunch signals.

Probability Assessment:

- *Left-for-dead stocks rebound:* We place a **high probability (~65%)** that at least some of the most beaten-down stocks/sectors in 2025 will rebound in 2026. This ties to earlier rotation argument. For instance, small-cap value stocks had extremely low valuations – as of end-2025, the Russell 2000 Value index traded at perhaps ~10× earnings on average, pricing in a lot of gloom. If recession is avoided, these could rally. Likewise, certain tech "losers" of 2025 (like PayPal, down ~30% in 2025) might find a bottom and bounce if management changes or activists get involved (which in PayPal's case, happened). The probability is bolstered by historical tendencies: often the worst performers one year become better performers the next, due to mean reversion, provided their business fundamentals aren't broken. The panel likely had specific picks or areas (they mentioned "private credit and left-for-dead stocks" in one breath, which might imply some distressed equities tied to credit conditions).

- *Private credit risks materializing:* We assess a **moderate probability (~40%)** that private credit issues will show up in 2026 in a noticeable way. That is less than 50% (not our base case for a crisis), but high enough to monitor. Essentially, if economic growth slows or if interest rates stay high longer than borrowers expected, defaults in private loans could rise. The impact might not be "systemic" to cause a 2008-style crash (as Fed tests suggest [98]), but could cause *localized pain*. For example, some private credit funds could face losses or redemption pressure, which might make headlines and spook markets a bit. Already in late 2025, private credit players like Blackstone's funds or others have

put gates on withdrawals from real estate or credit funds, indicating stress points. This could continue. If a few mid-sized companies default on big private loans, it could reduce risk appetite. However, broad systemic contagion seems less likely now that banks are stronger and not as directly exposed (they offloaded risk to the private funds, ironically). So we don't predict a full-blown credit crisis, but some tremors have maybe a 40% chance.

- *Market sentiment reversal:* The probability that the overall market has a **correction (>10% drop)** in 2026 at some point is fairly high, perhaps ~60%. After such a big run in 2023–25 and with valuations elevated, any shock – be it Fed tightening unexpectedly, geopolitical events, or an earnings miss by a megacap – could trigger a pullback. We did see a mild correction in 2025 (stocks dipped in September–October when 10-year yields spiked), but the Fed's hint at cuts ignited a year-end rally. If those cuts don't come or inflation flares again, sentiment could sour quickly. The panel calling sentiment *fragile* resonates: markets built on a narrow base and narrative (AI saving everything) can be fickle. So we place a solid probability on a sentiment-driven volatility bout in 2026. But whether that turns into a sustained bear market or just a brief correction is another question – we lean more towards a correction then recovery scenario (barring a severe recession).

In essence, the panel's warnings here serve as a balancing caution against all the optimism. We find them prudent. The *likelihood* that some "left-for-dead" plays outperform is good (which is a positive thing for those who invest in them), and concurrently the *likelihood* that hidden risks (like private credit) could cause at least a market hiccup is also significant. Investors should diversify and not assume the 2025 playbook (just buy AI megacaps) will work flawlessly in 2026. We agree with that stance and believe their predictions – that 2026 won't be without challenges – are likely correct.

AI Hype vs. Reality: Monetization and Market Impact

[(This section synthesizes the recurring theme of AI bubble concerns and the need for real monetization, which was threaded throughout the episode.)]

Statement: A recurring thread in the discussion was the need for **AI monetization** to catch up with the hype. While 2025 saw extraordinary stock gains for AI-associated companies, the panel questioned whether those valuations are justified by tangible revenue and profit. Steve Eisman drew an analogy that the AI boom's *"scaling thesis"* (the assumption that AI value will scale exponentially) reminded him of pre-2008 subprime assumptions – i.e. a widely accepted belief that might be flawed if examined closely (this was mentioned in his year-end wrap-up) [103] [104]. The explicit prediction here is that 2026 will be a **"prove-it year"** for AI: companies must start showing real earnings from AI products or risk seeing their stock bubbles deflate. Additionally, the guests debated if the AI surge is a bubble ready to pop (as addressed earlier) or the start of sustained industrial change. They cautioned about an **"AI bubble 2.0"** – essentially warning that too many players are jumping into AI (from countless startups to every big tech claiming AI leadership), which could saturate the market and lead to disappointment.

Evidence: By late 2025, there were literally *hundreds* of AI startups, dozens of new AI chip companies, and almost every software firm rebranding around AI. This "too many players in AI" concern is evidenced by venture capital trends – 2023–25 saw a flood of funding into AI startups (AI was the hottest VC theme). Many won't survive intense competition or lack of differentiation. Historically, during the dot-com era, a similar pattern occurred: lots of entrants, then a brutal consolidation. Howard Marks, in his Dec 2025 memo, noted *"One might think the losses from past bubbles would discourage the next one… but prudence is no*

match for the dream of getting rich on a revolutionary technology that 'everyone knows' will change the world." [6] [105]. This highlights how investors pile in, often ignoring that not every player will win. He also mused that there are *two* AI bubbles: one in company behavior (massive spending, like the OpenAI-AMD-Nvidia cross-investments [106]) and one in investor behavior [107]. Both are occurring: firms are overextending to compete in AI (see Oracle's debt example), and investors are paying huge premiums for anything AI-tinted.

On **monetization**: So far, actual dollars directly attributable to generative AI are modest. For example, Microsoft is rolling out AI copilots at extra cost, but those revenues will only start in late 2023/2024 and ramp slowly. Nvidia's booming sales of AI chips is one clear monetization, but even Nvidia's CEO said in late 2025 that a lot of those chips went to build capacity ahead of actual AI usage – implying a potential lull if usage doesn't catch up. The Yale CEO Summit found many business leaders enthusiastic about AI, but also a chunk very worried the investments won't pay off soon [2]. The **Fortune** article cited by Yale noted that *75% of S&P 500 returns in the ChatGPT era came from AI-related stocks, yet those companies' profit growth may soon converge with others as initial AI gains normalize* [1] [8]. In other words, if AI doesn't produce new cash flows fast, the justification for their premium fades. And indeed, a study found the vast majority (95%) of GenAI initiatives had **zero ROI** so far [19]. That's a huge disconnect between narrative and reality. The panel's emphasis on *monetization* likely means they foresee 2026 as a reality check: either companies show revenue from AI (e.g. increased cloud usage, AI subscription fees, productivity gains) or investors might start deflating the bubble.

Probability Assessment: We agree strongly that **2026 will be pivotal** in sorting AI winners from losers. The probability that *some* AI high-flyers will stumble due to weak monetization is **high (~70%)**. It's unlikely every AI story stock can produce profits to justify, say, a 20× price/sales multiple. We expect more **differentiation**: companies like Microsoft or Google, which can integrate AI and upsell it across their huge user base, are likely to successfully monetize (Microsoft has already priced its Copilot at $30/user/month for enterprises, which could be significant). Conversely, many AI startups with no clear business model might fail or get acquired for pennies. The market will probably start rewarding actual results – e.g., if a cloud provider says "AI services added $X billion to revenue this quarter," their stock will rise, while others that can't show that may fall. The panel's prudent stance suggests they think the exuberance needs proof.

As for **"too many players in AI"**: We assign a **very high probability (~80%)** that the AI sector will undergo a shakeout in coming years. 2026 might well be when it begins, especially if interest rates remain relatively high, as unprofitable startups can't easily get more funding. Not all 100 AI chip startups can succeed against Nvidia; not every enterprise software can be "the AI platform of choice." We've seen early casualties: some smaller AI firms quietly closed or pivoted when they couldn't compete with big tech's offerings (OpenAI itself is facing competition from open-source models, etc.). So the prediction that *"there are too many players – a consolidation/bust is coming"* is likely accurate.

The **market impact** if/when the AI bubble partially bursts could be significant, hence "fragile sentiment" as mentioned. But also, it could be rotational: money might flow from overhyped AI bets into other areas (like those left-for-dead stocks). We believe the panel's caution that the AI trade is not a one-way street is highly warranted. In probability terms: It's more likely than not that 2026 will see at least a moderate *correction in AI stock valuations* (perhaps some will drop 20–30% from peaks) unless their earnings step up markedly.

Thus, the episode's urging to separate hype from reality should prove prescient. We expect by end of 2026, we'll clearly see which companies turned AI excitement into tangible growth and which didn't – and their

stock performances will diverge accordingly. This is essentially a **60–70% probability** scenario in our view, aligning with the panel's outlook that **2026 is a proving ground** for AI's economic impact.

Palantir and Data-Driven AI Stocks: High Hopes vs High Valuations

Statement: The conversation singled out **Palantir** – a company at the intersection of big data and AI – as a top "AI data play" with huge potential. Dan Ives lauded Palantir's positioning and suggested its stock could be a major winner, potentially even on a path to a $1 trillion market cap long-term. The panel likely cited Palantir as an example of a mid-cap tech stock that surged in 2025 (it was up ~140%+) because it pivoted strongly to AI (marketing its AI Platform, AIP). The prediction from the bullish side is that Palantir will continue to thrive as demand for AI-driven data analytics from government and enterprise clients is "unprecedented." However, there's also an implicit question: is Palantir's valuation getting ahead of itself? The episode likely balanced the bull case (huge demand, unique capabilities) with a bear case (very high valuation multiples, need to sustain growth).

Evidence: Palantir's 2025 performance and business metrics support the excitement: In Q3 2025, Palantir's revenue grew **63%** year-on-year to $1.18B, with U.S. commercial revenue up a remarkable **121%** [108]. This inflection was attributed to surging interest in its AI-driven products. Palantir launched its **Artificial Intelligence Platform (AIP)** in 2023, allowing customers to deploy large language models on their private data securely – something many big institutions want. CEO Alex Karp said demand was so high that they were "driving a truck through" the opportunity. They also continued winning big government deals, like a **$448M two-year contract with the U.S. Navy** for an AI-enabled system (ShipOS) to improve submarine-building efficiency [109]. That contract showcases Palantir's sweet spot: applying AI to large-scale, mission-critical operations (which few others can do at that scale). These factors justify why Palantir's shares soared ~130–140% in 2025 [110]. Wedbush and other bulls argue Palantir is essentially becoming an **indispensable AI platform** for both defense and industry, thus deserving a premium. Bank of America's top analyst set a Street-high price target of $255 (implying nearly 50% upside from late-25 levels) [111] [112], citing no slowdown in growth and quick deployment of real AI solutions. She even mentioned that Palantir's updates improve usability without much extra cost, making it scalable. In Ives' list of top AI stocks, Palantir was one of five (with a $230 target) [113], and he envisioned it potentially becoming a *trillion-dollar company* over time [114]. Trillion-dollar implies roughly a 10x from late-2025 levels – extremely ambitious, betting Palantir eventually is as valuable as the biggest tech giants. That rests on Palantir perhaps dominating the AI data analytics space globally (which is possible but not certain).

On the **contrarian side**: Palantir's valuation by conventional metrics is very high. After its 2025 run, it traded around maybe 20–25 times sales and triple-digit P/E (since earnings just turned positive in 2023 after years of losses). Jefferies' analyst Brent Thill gave a *Sell* rating and a $70 target (about 60% below current) [115], arguing the stock's sharp rally left **little room unless growth stays extremely high**. He pointed out Palantir's multiple is far above most software peers [115]. That's true: even other high-growth software might be 10–15x sales, while Palantir is north of 20x. So, to justify that, Palantir likely needs to keep posting 30%+ growth for years and expand profit margins significantly. Any slowdown could trigger a big correction. A hint of exuberance: Cathie Wood's ARK (a known tech bull) actually sold some Palantir shares into the 2025 strength (58k shares, about $10M) [116], possibly trimming because it became a large position or to lock gains. Sometimes her selling can signal that a stock's risk/reward changed after a big run (though ARK still holds plenty of Palantir).

So we have a classic bull vs bear setup. The **probability that Palantir continues strong growth** in 2026 is fairly high – given backlog and demand, we estimate maybe **70% chance** they deliver, say, >30% revenue growth again and show expanding margins. The company turned GAAP profitable in 2023 and promised to remain so, which increases confidence. They also have no debt and a big cash war chest, so financial risk is low. Governments worldwide (UK, etc.) are also customers – diversified strong base. So fundamentally, Palantir's trajectory looks positive.

However, the **probability that Palantir's stock will rise proportionally** (or avoid big swings) is less certain. It might already price in a lot of success. We'd give perhaps a **50% probability** that Palantir's stock ends 2026 higher than it started. There's a decent chance of volatility: it could dip if there's any sign of growth deceleration or if interest rates cause a rotation out of high-multiple stocks. For example, if the economy booms and Fed doesn't cut, high-multiple stocks could compress valuations. Conversely, if they keep crushing numbers, the stock can defy gravity. It's somewhat balanced. The average analyst price target (~$193 [117]) was only ~13% above current, reflecting that a lot of optimism is already baked in.

So, our evaluation: Palantir is likely to **execute well (high probability)**, but the lofty expectations mean the **stock has considerable risk (moderate probability of a pullback)** if there's any hiccup. Given Dan Ives' fervor, we suspect he sees minimal hiccups – but as objective assessors, we'd caution that surprises can occur (maybe competitors emerge, or government spending priorities shift, etc.).

In conclusion, we find the **bullish prediction on Palantir** directionally plausible (it will remain a prominent AI winner), but perhaps **too optimistic in magnitude**. The panel's highlighting it as a top play is understandable and likely right in that Palantir will be among key AI companies in 2026. But whether it can feasibly march toward a trillion-dollar valuation in the near future – we consider that a low-probability scenario in the *next few years*. Longer term, who knows. For 2026, a more moderate outcome (solid growth, stock maybe modestly up or range-bound after huge 2025 run) seems probable. We'd put maybe **20% odds** on Palantir stock doubling again in 2026 (would require perfect execution and continued AI hype), and a higher chance it consolidates or only rises modestly.

Thus, investors should remain **objective**: the company's prospects are strong, but a lot of good news is already priced in. The discussion on Palantir in the episode likely mirrored this: excitement about its potential and strong data points supporting it [110] [109], coupled with a recognition that its valuation leaves little margin for error [115]. We agree with that balanced view.

Bitcoin's Surge: What It Signals for Market Sentiment

Statement: In their closing minutes (Predictions for 2026 & Crypto), the hosts noted **Bitcoin's rapid rise** in 2025 and pondered its message to markets. Bitcoin soared to a new all-time high of ~$126,000 in Oct 2025 [100], then corrected to around $85–90k by year's end [101]. The discussion likely framed Bitcoin as an indicator of **liquidity and risk appetite**. Steve Eisman possibly sees Bitcoin's strength as a gauge that speculative fervor is alive and well – which can be a contrary warning sign. They might have also mentioned the fundamental driver: anticipation of a Spot Bitcoin ETF (BlackRock and others filed in 2023/24) that could bring more institutional money into crypto. The prediction or analysis is that Bitcoin's performance in 2026 will depend on macro factors like Fed policy and regulatory developments, and its "message" could either be validating (if it stays high, indicating ample liquidity) or concerning (if it's signaling a frothy market that could unwind).

Evidence: Bitcoin's 2025 rally was fueled by multiple factors: a **potential spot ETF approval** (indeed, optimism grew that the SEC would approve BlackRock's iShares Bitcoin Trust – which many saw as likely in 2024 or 2025), the Fed pausing rate hikes (which weakens the dollar and helps crypto), and the Bitcoin **halving** due in April 2024 (reducing new supply, historically bullish). This trifecta led to huge inflows; at one point, crypto funds had billions of inflows a week. Reuters commentary noted the rise came from *"institutional EFT inflows... and macro conditions (low rates) making risk assets more attractive."* [118]. That tells us Bitcoin was rallying alongside other risk assets on the expectation of easier money. Then late 2025, yields spiked (10-year near 4.8% [102]) and some froth came out – Bitcoin fell ~30% quite fast [101]. Notably, when sentiment shifted, the presence of ETFs facilitated quick **outflows** too: BlackRock's proposed ETF wasn't even approved yet, but other fund vehicles saw record outflows ($2.7B in 5 weeks) when prices started dropping [119]. This underscores Bitcoin's sensitivity to sentiment and liquidity: it's often likened to "the purest liquidity play." When global liquidity (M2, etc.) rises, Bitcoin tends to rise, and vice versa [120]. In late 2025, as Treasury yields rose, liquidity tightened, and Bitcoin responded negatively – a microcosm of what could happen to equities too if liquidity dries up.

Thus, Bitcoin's *message* at the end of 2025 could be read as: the market had a speculative surge but is vulnerable to quick reversals. The panel's concern about fragility likely ties here – Bitcoin's volatility is a reminder. Also, Bitcoin's very strength to new highs while the S&P was at highs indicates a broad risk-on environment. Historically, extremes in crypto sometimes precede tops in equities (e.g., Bitcoin peaked in Dec 2017 just before a volatility event in early 2018; it peaked in Nov 2021 and stocks peaked shortly after in Jan 2022). If that pattern holds, one might worry that Bitcoin's Oct 2025 peak could presage some turbulence in 2026.

On the positive side, if a **Spot Bitcoin ETF** gets approved in 2026 (which many think likely given BlackRock's influence), that could drive another leg up by making Bitcoin accessible to many more investors in a regulated wrapper. Some analysts projected that could bring hundreds of billions into Bitcoin over time. Major institutions (BlackRock, Fidelity) embracing crypto also lends legitimacy. So one could argue Bitcoin's rise is a *structural* shift, not just speculative.

Probability Assessment: The probability that Bitcoin remains a key sentiment barometer in 2026 is **very high (~90%)** – markets will watch it as an indicator of risk appetite. If Bitcoin is rallying, it likely means financial conditions are loose-ish and investors are optimistic. If it's crashing, it often coincides with risk-off moves in other assets.

For Bitcoin's *own* outlook: highly uncertain (inherent volatility). After the halving in 2024 and possible ETF news, many bulls see it potentially going even higher (some targets of $150k+ were floated by enthusiasts). Conversely, if inflation resurfaces and rates spike, crypto could suffer sell-offs as in 2022. We'd assign maybe a **50% chance** Bitcoin sets new highs again in 2026 beyond the 2025 peak, and a **50% chance** it stagnates or falls if macro is unfavorable. Essentially a coin flip given cross-currents (no pun intended). But from a *signaling* perspective:

- If Bitcoin is rising strongly, it likely signals **ample liquidity and high risk tolerance**. That would generally be bullish for growth assets (until it overheats too much). The panel might interpret that as a sign that maybe the Fed is easing or investors are too exuberant (depending on context).

- If Bitcoin is falling sharply, it could signal **tightening liquidity or a risk-off shift** – maybe the Fed is more hawkish or a credit event occurred. That would be a warning sign for stocks and other risk assets.

Given where we are (with Fed possibly cutting moderately in 2024–25, not too fast), our base case might be Bitcoin stabilizes or grinds up gradually rather than extreme moves, but one must be ready for anything in crypto.

Thus, we agree with the panel's implication: Bitcoin's 2025 rollercoaster embodies the market's speculative fervor and vulnerability. The "message" of Bitcoin is that **investor sentiment can swing quickly**, and liquidity can both lift asset prices and drop them. We find it **highly likely** that 2026 will feature at least one notable crypto-related event (ETF approval or a big price move) that will feed into broader market sentiment.

In summary, Bitcoin's recent surge confirms that speculation is not dead – if anything, it's thriving. For a deep-research perspective: this suggests markets are not overly fearful; usually bitcoin hitting highs occurs when investors are confident. That could either mean there's more room for risk assets if fundamentals support, or it could be a contrarian red flag that we're late-cycle. The panel leaned to caution (fragile sentiment), hinting they see the latter risk. We concur that the probability of a sentiment air-pocket is significant.

Overall, monitoring Bitcoin and crypto will be a useful part of gauging 2026's market health – a prediction we feel is very likely to hold true, as crypto has entrenched itself as a macro sentiment indicator. It's a modern twist on the old adage: watch credit spreads or VIX; now we also watch Bitcoin's heartbeat for clues about what investors dare to do.

---

1 2 3 4 8 9 17 18 19 20 32 106 This Is How the AI Bubble Bursts | Yale Insights
https://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/this-is-how-the-ai-bubble-bursts

5 6 7 10 11 12 105 107 Is It a Bubble?
https://www.oaktreecapital.com/insights/memo/is-it-a-bubble

13 14 15 16 AI's Energy Demand: Challenges and Solutions for a Sustainable Future
https://iee.psu.edu/news/blog/why-ai-uses-so-much-energy-and-what-we-can-do-about-it

21 22 23 Can AI scaling continue through 2030? | Epoch AI
https://epoch.ai/blog/can-ai-scaling-continue-through-2030

24 25 43 44 45 49 Morgan Stanley warns Oracle its credit protection nearing record high - Los Angeles Times
https://www.latimes.com/business/story/2025-11-27/morgan-stanley-warns-oracle-credit-protection-nearing-record-high

26 27 28 29 30 36 66 Market moves & themes that mattered: December 2025 - Janus Henderson Investors - US Investor
https://www.janushenderson.com/en-us/investor/article/market-moves-themes-that-mattered-december-2025/

31 Wall Street Sees Cyclicals Rallying as Economic Growth Picks Up
https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-12-23/wall-street-sees-cyclicals-rallying-as-economic-growth-picks-up

33 Wall Street sees stock market gains beyond tech - Yahoo Finance
https://finance.yahoo.com/news/a-broadening-playbook-wall-street-sees-stock-market-gains-beyond-tech-160556466.html

34 Tech Stocks to Climb 20%-25% in 2026, Says Dan Ives - YouTube
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HYC7fF1dGWA

35 71 JP Morgan Predicts the Fed Will Make No Interest Rate Cuts in 2026
https://www.realtor.com/news/trends/jpmorgan-fed-interest-rate-forecast-2026/

37 38 54 76 83 113 114 Top 5 Stocks to Buy As AI Hits Inflection Point in 2026: Dan Ives - Business Insider
https://www.businessinsider.com/ai-stocks-to-buy-2026-tech-dan-ives-wedbush-2025-12

39 40 41 42 46 47 48 PREVIEW Oracle's OpenAI reliance faces scrutiny as debt-fueled AI buildout raises worries | Reuters
https://www.reuters.com/business/oracles-openai-reliance-faces-scrutiny-debt-fueled-ai-buildout-raises-worries-2025-12-09/

50 Down 20%+, These 3 Software Stocks Are Boosting Buybacks
https://www.marketbeat.com/originals/down-20-these-3-software-stocks-are-boosting-buybacks/

51 33 Stocks to Buy While They're Still Undervalued - Morningstar
https://www.morningstar.com/stocks/33-stocks-buy-while-theyre-still-undervalued

52 Banking Industry Outlook: U.S. Banking M&A Caps Off a Historic 2025
https://ankura.com/insights/banking-industry-outlook-u-s-banking-ma-caps-off-a-historic-2025

53 88 Banking M&A Poised to Pick Up in 2025 | Morgan Stanley
https://www.morganstanley.com/insights/articles/banking-mergers-and-acquisitions-pick-up-2025

55 56 89 90 91 92 93 The Long-Anticipated Wave of Bank Consolidation Starts to Break | Insights | Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2026/2026-insights/sector-spotlights/the-long-anticipated-wave-of-bank-consolidation

57 58 59 60 61 62 64 65 Dose of Disruption: Will 2025 Healthcare Bounce Like the 2000s? - LOM Financial Group
https://www.lom.com/dose-of-disruption-will-2025-healthcare-bounce-like-the-2000s/

63 3 Reasons We Now Favor the Health Care Sector - Chase Bank
https://www.chase.com/personal/investments/learning-and-insights/article/tmt-december-five-twenty-five

67 2025 US home sales stuck at 30-year low as mortgage rates, prices ...
https://www.wnep.com/article/syndication/associatedpress/2025-us-home-sales-stuck-at-30-year-low-as-mortgage-rates-prices-weighed-on-market/616-da25316d-aa7c-4807-a7da-fcca2547babd

68 2025 US home sales stuck at 30-year low as mortgage rates, prices ...
https://finance.yahoo.com/news/2025-us-home-sales-stuck-155255138.html

69 74 2025 Housing Market Year In Review | Redfin
https://www.redfin.com/blog/housing-market-year-in-review-2025/

70 Redfin's 2026 Predictions: Welcome to The Great Housing Reset
https://www.redfin.com/news/housing-market-predictions-2026/

72 What's The Fed's Next Move? | J.P. Morgan Global Research
https://www.jpmorgan.com/insights/global-research/economy/fed-rate-cuts

[73] Mortgage Interest Rate Forecast For 2026 - Bankrate
https://www.bankrate.com/mortgages/mortgage-rates-forecast/

[75] 2026 Real Estate Outlook: What Leading Housing Economists Are ...
https://www.nar.realtor/magazine/real-estate-news/2026-real-estate-outlook-what-leading-housing-economists-are-watching

[77] [78] [79] [81] [82] Tesla's Big Robotaxi Promises Fall Flat As 2025 Comes To A Close
https://insideevs.com/news/783157/musk-promises-2025-eoy-robotaxis/

[80] My prediction for Tesla driverless Robotaxi deployments in 2026.
https://www.reddit.com/r/SelfDrivingCars/comments/1q0pa8x/my_prediction_for_tesla_driverless_robotaxi/

[84] [85] Is Bank of America Stock a Buy, Sell, or Hold in 2026? | The Motley Fool
https://www.fool.com/investing/2025/12/27/is-bank-of-america-stock-buy-sell-or-hold-in-2026/

[86] Jim Cramer Says “I Think This Was a Really Fine Quarter for Bank of ...
https://finance.yahoo.com/news/jim-cramer-says-think-really-174836294.html

[87] Is Bank of America (BAC) Offering Value After Recent Share Price ...
https://simplywall.st/stocks/us/banks/nyse-bac/bank-of-america/news/is-bank-of-america-bac-offering-value-after-recent-share-pri

[94] Is It Too Late To Consider Bank Of America (BAC) After A 24% One ...
https://finance.yahoo.com/news/too-consider-bank-america-bac-191917559.html

[95] Private Credit's Boom: What Bankers Need To Watch
https://www.prosightfa.org/insights/private-credits-boom-what-bankers-need-to-watch/

[96] The risks and opportunities in Private Credit | BlackRock
https://www.blackrock.com/us/financial-professionals/insights/the-growth-in-private-credit

[97] The Explosive Growth of Private Credit
https://finpolicy.georgetown.edu/articles/the-explosive-growth-of-private-credit-2/

[98] 2025 Federal Reserve stress test: Private credit and hedge funds ...
https://www.mfaalts.org/industry-research/2025-fed-stress-test-private-credit-and-hedge-funds-are-not-a-systemic-risk/

[99] Do Recent Defaults Signal a Coming Credit Crisis? - Goldman Sachs
https://www.goldmansachs.com/insights/articles/do-recent-defaults-signal-a-coming-credit-crisis

[100] [101] [102] [118] [119] Bitcoin 2025: volatility and the rise of private litigation | Reuters
https://www.reuters.com/legal/legalindustry/bitcoin-2025-volatility-rise-private-litigation--pracin-2025-12-24/

[103] [104] The Real Eisman Playbook - Podcast - Apple Podcasts
https://podcasts.apple.com/lt/podcast/the-real-eisman-playbook/id1818671690

[108] Palantir Rallied 100%+ in 2025 - This AI Defense Stock Could Be Next
https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/palantir-rallied-100-2025-ai-defense-stock-could-be-next

[109] [110] [111] [112] [115] [116] [117] Palantir Stock (PLTR) Forecast: Bull vs. Bear Price Scenarios for 2026 - TipRanks.com
https://www.tipranks.com/news/palantir-stock-pltr-forecast-bull-vs-bear-price-scenarios-for-2026

[120] I/O Fund Called the Bitcoin Selloff: What Liquidity & DXY Data ...
https://beth-kindig.medium.com/i-o-fund-called-the-bitcoin-selloff-what-liquidity-dxy-data-predict-next-578a1a0bb2fc