PHI CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

Premium Layer Analysis

Gold · Silver · Crude Oil

Signal-to-Noise Decomposition of Commodity Prices

March 11, 2026

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Gold at ~$5,200/oz, silver at ~$85–90/oz, and WTI crude at ~$85–95/bbl each carry dramatically different compositions of structural value versus ephemeral premium — and the March 2026 Strait of Hormuz crisis has inflated the uppermost, most fragile layers of all three simultaneously. This analysis decomposes each commodity's current price into six layers, from the permanent tectonic base to the fear-driven froth that can evaporate in a single session.

Central Finding: Gold's price is the most structurally supported of the three, with roughly 65–75% of its value anchored in layers that won't disappear on any news cycle. Oil is the most precarious, with an estimated $25–40/bbl of war premium sitting atop a fundamental fair value of just $55–60. Silver occupies a fascinating middle ground — its structural base is rising faster than either peer thanks to the solar energy revolution, but its thin market makes it uniquely vulnerable to speculative collapses, as the January 2026 crash from $121 to $74 demonstrated.

GOLD (~$5,200/oz)

The Most Structurally Fortified Commodity

Gold's price has roughly tripled since early 2024, setting **53 new all-time highs in 2025** alone before reaching $5,595 on January 28, 2026. Unlike prior gold rallies (1980, 2011), this one is not built primarily on speculative leverage. Managed money COMEX positioning is at roughly 97,917 net long contracts — elevated but nowhere near extreme relative to the price move. The rally's foundation is structural: central bank buying, de-dollarization, and a fundamental break in gold's traditional inverse correlation with real interest rates.

Layer 1 — Structural/Tectonic Base (~$1,400–$1,700/oz, ~30% of price)

The global all-in sustaining cost (AISC) for gold mining averaged **$1,424/oz in H1 2025**, with major miners ranging from Agnico Eagle at ~$1,250 to Newmont at ~$1,620. This cost floor has risen steadily since 2017, driven by labor, electricity, and royalty inflation. Below this level, mines shut down, recycling collapses, and supply evaporates. The AISC represents the absolute minimum sustainable price — a tectonic floor that has never been permanently breached. In the 2015 bear market trough, gold bottomed at $1,045, approximately the AISC at that time. The cost floor has risen **~35% since then**, providing a dramatically higher base.

Gold's demand breakdown reveals its structural resilience: jewelry accounts for 31% of total demand (1,542 tonnes in 2025), bars and coins 27.5% (1,374 tonnes, a 12-year high), technology 6.5%, and the two most structural demand drivers — central banks and ETFs — together absorbed 33% (1,664 tonnes). Total 2025 demand reached a record **5,002 tonnes**.

Layer 2 — Monetary Premium & Central Bank Demand (~$1,400–$2,100/oz, ~35%)

This is the layer that separates gold from every other commodity. Gold has functioned as money for five millennia, and the post-2022 acceleration in central bank buying has created a new structural price floor. Central banks purchased **1,136 tonnes in 2022** (the most since 1967), followed by ~1,050 tonnes in 2023, ~1,045 tonnes in 2024, and 863

tonnes in 2025. The 2022 freezing of Russia's $300 billion in FX reserves was the catalyst — it demonstrated that dollar-denominated reserves carry political risk, while gold carries none.

A World Gold Council survey found **95% of central banks** expect global gold reserves to increase, and 43% plan to increase their own holdings — with none planning to reduce. Poland added 102 tonnes in 2025 alone, targeting 30% of reserves in gold. China's PBOC officially holds 2,306 tonnes, though actual holdings may exceed 5,000 tonnes. J.P. Morgan projects ~755 tonnes of central bank purchases in 2026; Goldman Sachs forecasts ~720 tonnes.

Regime Change: Gold's traditional inverse correlation with real interest rates has broken down since 2022. The R-squared between gold and 10-year TIPS yields collapsed from **84% (2005–2021) to just 3–7% (2022–present)**. Gold surged even as real yields remained above 2%. Central bank buying has overwhelmed the opportunity-cost signal that previously governed gold pricing. This represents a structural regime change, not a temporary anomaly.

Layer 3 — Macro/Cyclical Premium (~$400–$600/oz, ~10%)

The Fed cut rates from their 2024 peak to 3.50–3.75% by March 2026, reducing gold's opportunity cost. The dollar index fell ~10.7% in H1 2025 — the worst six-month performance in over 50 years — providing a powerful tailwind. US fiscal sustainability concerns are mounting, with global public debt surpassing **$100 trillion (93% of GDP)**. The "debasement trade" has become a mainstream allocation thesis, with Morgan Stanley recommending 5–15% precious metals allocation. In historical context, gold delivered +2,300% during 1970s stagflation and +118% from pre-GFC levels to the 2011 peak.

Layer 4 — Geopolitical/Policy Premium (~$500–$800/oz, ~12%)

The March 2026 Iran-Israel conflict and Strait of Hormuz closure have added acute premium, but gold's geopolitical layer was already elevated from the Russia-Ukraine war, US-China trade tensions (effective US tariff on China: ~47%), and BRICS restructuring. BRICS+ nations now settle **85–90% of mutual trade in local currencies**, up from 65% in late 2024. China's CIPS payment system has 1,467 participants across 119 countries. The geopolitical layer is partly structural (de-dollarization trajectory) and partly ephemeral (acute crisis reactions). J.P. Morgan estimates the Iran escalation alone added 5–10% to gold's price.

Layer 5 — Investment/ETF Flow Premium (~$400–$600/oz, ~10%)

Global gold ETFs absorbed a record **801 tonnes in 2025** (versus outflows of 2.9 tonnes in 2024), with total holdings reaching 3,932 tonnes and $530 billion AUM by November 2025. GLD alone saw $21 billion in one-year net inflows. This layer is less permanent than central bank demand — ETF investors can liquidate instantly — but the breadth of institutional participation suggests it is stickier than in 2011–2013 when the ETF collapse drove gold from $1,900 to $1,200.

Layer 6 — Speculative/Fear/Froth (~$200–$400/oz, ~5–8%)

This is gold's thinnest and most vulnerable layer. It includes momentum-driven FOMO, social media narrative amplification, and panic hedging. The January 30, 2026 crash demonstrated its fragility: gold dropped **9.8% in a single session** (the worst since 2013) before recovering. The GLD put/call ratio of 1.38 suggests some hedging activity. A ceasefire could erase $200–400/oz within days.

Historical Case Study: The 2011–2015 Decline

Gold fell from $1,900 to $1,045 (–45% over four years) when the speculative layer collapsed first (taper tantrum, hedge fund liquidation), the ETF layer followed (GLD lost 40%+ of holdings in 2013), the fear/inflation premium evaporated (expected hyperinflation from QE never materialized), and the macro premium reversed (real rates rose 160bps, dollar

strengthened). Central bank buying and the cost floor held — gold bottomed almost exactly at the AISC of the era.

5-Year Projections Through 2030

Base Case ($5,500–$7,000/oz): Central bank buying remains at 700–900 tonnes/year, de-dollarization continues gradually, real rates normalize to ~1%, geopolitical tensions persist without dramatic escalation. Goldman Sachs targets $5,400 by end-2026; J.P. Morgan sees $6,300.

Bull Case ($8,000–$10,000): Accelerating de-dollarization, a Fed independence crisis, or full-blown fiscal emergency forcing QE restart.

Bear Case ($3,500–$4,500): Broad geopolitical détente, real rates above 3%, central bank buying reverting to pre-2022 levels of 400–500 tonnes/year. Even then, the elevated cost floor of $1,400–$1,700 provides a much higher bottom than 2015's $1,045.

SILVER (~$85–90/oz)

The Green Energy Metal with a Volatility Problem

Silver is the most analytically complex of the three commodities because it straddles two worlds — monetary metal and industrial commodity — and its market is roughly **one-tenth the size of gold's**, making it acutely vulnerable to both squeezes and crashes. The January 2026 spike to $121.67 and subsequent crash to the $70s (a 35% single-session decline triggered by CME margin hikes) perfectly illustrates silver's dual personality: structural strength underlying terrifying volatility.

Layer 1 — Production Cost Floor (~$13–$27/oz, ~18–30%)

Silver's AISC exhibits an unusually wide range because **~70–80% of silver is produced as a byproduct** of copper, lead, zinc, and gold mining. When base metal prices are high, byproduct credits push silver AISC as low as $13/oz (Pan American Silver's Q1 2025 figure). For marginal primary silver producers like Endeavour Silver, AISC runs $25–26/oz.

Key Structural Implication: Silver supply is largely inelastic to silver prices. Even if silver triples, copper miners won't dramatically increase output — their production decisions follow base metal economics. This supply inelasticity is the single most important structural feature of the silver market.

Layer 2 — Industrial Demand Floor (~$25–$35/oz, ~30–40%)

Industrial fabrication consumed a record **680.5 million ounces** in 2024, representing 58.7% of total demand — up from roughly 50% a decade ago. The solar photovoltaic sector alone consumed an estimated ~211 million ounces in 2024 (18–19% of total demand). While per-panel silver loadings are falling through thrifting (from ~18 mg/W to ~10 mg/W for TOPCon cells), installation volumes are growing faster. A peer-reviewed study projects that by 2030, silver supply may meet only **62–70% of demand**, with solar alone potentially consuming 29–41% of total supply. Electronics, 5G infrastructure, AI/data center buildouts, and EVs (which use 67–79% more silver than ICE vehicles) create additional inelastic demand.

The silver market has been in **deficit for five consecutive years** (2021–2025), with a cumulative shortfall of approximately 820 million ounces. Mine production peaked near 900 Moz in 2016, recovered to only ~835–844 Moz in 2025, and Metals Focus projects a peak of 856 Moz in 2027 before plateau and decline. COMEX registered inventories have fallen ~70% since 2020. Shanghai inventories are at their lowest since 2015. London physical markets experienced backwardation beginning in October 2025 — a signal of acute tightness.

Layer 3 — Monetary/Gold-Beta Premium (~$15–$20/oz, ~18–22%)

Silver's monetary function links its price to gold through the gold-silver ratio, which has compressed from over **100:1 in April 2025** to approximately 55–58:1 currently. Historical mean reversion has been one of the most reliable trades in commodity markets — extreme ratio readings above 90:1 have consistently preceded massive silver outperformance. With gold at $5,200, the ratio implies silver "fair value" of $75–95/oz at a 55–70:1 ratio.

Layer 4 — Geopolitical/Policy Premium (~$5–$10/oz, ~6–11%)

China imposed **silver export restrictions effective January 1, 2026**, potentially removing ~35 million ounces from global supply. The Shanghai premium over London/COMEX reached 10–20% in late 2025, reflecting genuine supply dislocation. Green energy mandates — the IRA, EU Green Deal, China's solar expansion (470 GW installed in just two

years), and India's 280 GW solar target by 2030 — create policy-driven demand that is structurally locked in by legislation and investment commitments.

Layer 5 — Speculative/Positioning (~$0–$5/oz, ~0–6%)

Silver's most counterintuitive data point: **managed money net longs have declined ~90%** since mid-2025, from 44,987 contracts in July 2025 to just 7,766 contracts currently. This is emphatically not the positioning profile of a speculative bubble. The January crash purged most leveraged longs, and current margins of 15–18% (versus 4% at the 2011 peak) structurally limit speculative leverage. The paper-to-physical ratio of approximately 300:1 creates theoretical squeeze vulnerability, but exchange intervention has historically killed silver squeezes.

Layer 6 — Sentiment/Froth (~$0–$5/oz, minimal after crash)

The WallStreetSilver narrative transformed from a meme in 2021 to something with genuine fundamental backing by 2025, as physical deficits, Chinese export controls, and COMEX vault drains validated the thesis. But the January crash brutally purged froth — Silver Eagle premiums retreated from extreme levels, and current sentiment is cautious rather than euphoric. Physical premiums of $8–10 over spot indicate residual retail enthusiasm but not mania.

Historical Case Study: The 2011 Crash

Silver's decline from $49.82 to below $14 (–72%) remains the defining cautionary tale. The CME raised margin requirements **five times in nine days** (April 26 – May 9, 2011), effectively doubling required capital from 4% to 10% of notional value. The forced liquidation cascade erased roughly $20–25/oz of speculative premium within weeks. QE2's end removed the macro tailwind, and rising real rates compressed remaining layers. The January 2026 crash followed an identical playbook (margin hikes triggering forced selling) but started from a much higher structural base.

5-Year Projections Through 2030

Base Case ($80–$120/oz average): Persistent supply deficits, solar installations doubling, gold at $5,000–$7,000, ratio stabilizing at 50–65:1. J.P. Morgan targets $81/oz average for 2026.

Bull Case ($150–$250/oz): Solar demand exceeding projections, gold reaching $8,000+, ratio compressing to 40:1, persistent physical shortage. The inflation-adjusted 1980 equivalent is ~$194–200/oz.

Bear Case ($40–$60/oz): Global recession crushing industrial demand, solar thrifting cutting silver loadings by 50%+, gold-silver ratio widening back to 80–90:1.

CRUDE OIL (~$85–95/bbl WTI)

A Crisis Price Atop a Bearish Fundamental Base

Oil presents the starkest contrast between layers. Just weeks ago, WTI traded at $55–60/bbl amid expectations of a 2–3 mb/d structural surplus. The February 28 US-Israeli strikes on Iran and the effective closure of the Strait of Hormuz — through which **~20 mb/d (20% of global consumption)** normally flows — produced the largest supply disruption in oil market history, dwarfing the 1973 Arab embargo (~5 mb/d) and the 1979 Iranian Revolution (~5.6 mb/d). WTI surged **35.6% in a single week**, the largest weekly gain since futures trading began in 1983. Roughly $25–40/bbl of current price is pure geopolitical premium that could evaporate if the Strait reopens.

Layer 1 — Structural Energy Base (~$40–$50/bbl, ~45–55%)

Oil's energy density of ~34 MJ/L is 10–50x greater than current battery technology by volume, making it irreplaceable for aviation, shipping, long-haul trucking, and petrochemical feedstock for decades. Petrochemical demand accounts for ~14% of total oil consumption (~14.5 mb/d) and is projected to reach 16% (~18.4 mb/d) by 2030, becoming the dominant source of demand growth. This demand is essentially non-substitutable — plastics, fertilizers, synthetic rubber, pharmaceuticals, and synthetic fibers have no commercially viable alternative feedstock at scale.

Saudi lifting costs are just $5–15/bbl, but Permian Basin new-well breakevens run **$56–64/bbl**, Bakken $65–70/bbl, and Canadian oil sands $45–65/bbl. The global marginal cost floor to incentivize sufficient investment to offset decline rates is approximately $60–65/bbl for new US shale growth, which effectively sets the long-term equilibrium.

Layer 2 — Supply Constraint/Underinvestment Premium (~$5–$10/bbl, ~6–11%)

Natural decline rates of existing oil fields run **5.6% annually** for conventional post-peak fields, while shale wells decline >35% in their first year. Nearly 90% of annual upstream investment merely offsets natural decline — only ~10% funds growth. Global upstream spending of ~$570 billion in 2025 is down 35% from the 2015 peak of $869 billion. DUC (drilled but uncompleted) well inventories in US shale are at historically low levels, removing a key production buffer. The IEA estimates 45+ mb/d from new conventional fields is needed by 2050 just to maintain current output.

OPEC+ spare capacity stands at roughly 3.5 mb/d, concentrated in Saudi Arabia and the UAE. However, with the Strait of Hormuz effectively closed, only about 2.6 mb/d of total Gulf production can bypass the chokepoint via pipeline — meaning much of this spare capacity is currently stranded. Non-OPEC supply growth continues from Brazil (exceeded 4.0 mb/d in October 2025), Guyana (approaching 1 mb/d, expected to exceed it by 2027), and Argentina's Vaca Muerta (670→810 kb/d by 2026).

Layer 3 — Macro/Cyclical Premium (~–$5 to $0/bbl, currently negative)

This is the crucial nuance: the fundamental macro backdrop for oil was **bearish** entering 2026. The IEA projected global demand growth of only 830–860 kb/d in 2025–2026 — well below OPEC's more optimistic 1.4 mb/d estimate. Global GDP growth of 3.3% (below the 3.7% historical average), China's near-zero inflation signaling weak domestic demand, and the demand-dampening effect of tariffs all pointed to oversupply. The IEA's November 2025 World Energy Outlook projected combustible fuel demand peaking as early as 2027, with EVs displacing 5.4 mb/d by 2030 and >10 mb/d by 2035. Pre-crisis, this macro headwind was pushing fair value toward $50–55/bbl.

Layer 4 — OPEC Management + War Premium (~$30–$50/bbl combined, ~35–55%)

This is the dominant layer in current oil pricing and the most important factor in March 2026. OPEC+ was still withholding 3.24 mb/d entering the crisis, worth roughly $5–10/bbl of cartel pricing power. But the Hormuz crisis has added an unprecedented war premium on top. J.P. Morgan estimates actual shut-ins could exceed 4–6 mb/d if the Strait remains closed. Goldman Sachs models suggest a 30-day full closure adds ~$15/bbl; 60 days pushes to ~$93; 120 days exceeds 2008 and 2022 peaks. Wood Mackenzie warns of $150–200/bbl in an extended conflict scenario.

> The war premium alone accounts for roughly **$25–40/bbl** above the pre-crisis ~$55–60 fundamental baseline.

Layer 5 — Speculative/Positioning (~$3–$5/bbl, ~3–5%)

Managed money shifted from near-record bearish positioning in late 2025 to aggressively long as the crisis unfolded. Non-commercial net longs reached **172,200 contracts** by early March 2026. The short squeeze component of the price spike was enormous — many speculative shorts were caught flat-footed by the Hormuz closure. Brent front-month futures entered extreme backwardation with a record $14.20 premium over next-month contracts, signaling acute physical market stress.

Layer 6 — Fear/Sentiment Premium (~$5–$8/bbl, ~6–9%)

The VIX surged to 29.49 as the Iran conflict escalated. Options markets are pricing significant right-tail risk, with Brent call skews expanding 19+ points since the start of 2026. The US Strategic Petroleum Reserve holds ~415 million barrels at an average cost of $29.70/bbl, providing a psychological ceiling — the G7 has said it “stands ready” for a coordinated release but has not yet acted. The EIA’s March 10 STEO projects Brent remaining above $95 for two months before falling below $80 in Q3 2026 and to ~$70 by year-end, assuming disruption peaks in early April.

Historical Collapse Case Studies

2014 Crash ($110→$26): Saudi Arabia abandoned its swing producer role, US shale flooded the market with 1+ mb/d annual growth, and China slowed. The supply constraint premium, geopolitical premium, and macro premium all collapsed simultaneously.

2020 COVID Crash ($63→–$37 WTI): All six layers collapsed at once as lockdowns destroyed 20–30 mb/d of demand, the Saudi-Russia price war added 3+ mb/d of supply, storage filled to capacity, and the front-month contract literally went negative.

2008 GFC Crash ($147→$32): Driven by the Global Financial Crisis destroying demand expectations, triggering a speculative liquidation cascade that erased $115/bbl in five months. In all three cases, the cost floor eventually held — prices bottomed near or at the marginal cost of production.

5-Year Projections Through 2030

Base Case (Brent $65–$80 average): Hormuz reopens within weeks, OPEC+ gradually restores production, non-OPEC growth continues, energy transition proceeds moderately. The EIA projects $64/bbl average by 2027. By 2028–2030, structural tightening from decline rates and underinvestment begins to reassert itself.

Bull Case ($90–$120+ average): Extended Hormuz disruption, US shale peaking, and slower-than-expected EV adoption — pushing the “next oil shock” thesis from Rapidan Energy.

Bear Case ($35–$55): Rapid geopolitical normalization, OPEC+ discipline breakdown, a global recession, and accelerating EV displacement, potentially producing a 2014-style price war overlaid with structural demand decline.

CROSS-CUTTING DYNAMICS

Three macro forces simultaneously influence all three commodities but with asymmetric effects.

The Dollar's Decline: The DXY fell ~10.7% in H1 2025, the worst six-month performance in 50+ years. At ~98.9, the dollar remains roughly 15% overvalued on purchasing power parity (RBC estimate), suggesting further structural weakness ahead. A weaker dollar is uniformly bullish for dollar-denominated commodities, reducing the cost for non-USD buyers globally.

Real Interest Rates: The 10-year TIPS yield at ~1.84% is declining from 2.15% in January 2025, supporting gold directly and silver through the gold-beta channel, while having a more muted but positive effect on oil through economic activity.

The Credit Cycle: With $100 trillion in sovereign debt and $4.5 trillion of emerging market bonds maturing in 2025–2027, a credit stress event could trigger a 2008-style liquidation cascade that initially crushes all three commodities before gold recovers as a safe haven (the pattern seen in March 2020).

Energy Transition Divergence: The transition creates a fascinating three-way split — structurally bearish for oil (EV displacement of 5+ mb/d by 2030), structurally bullish for silver (solar demand potentially consuming 29–41% of total supply by 2030), and neutral-to-bullish for gold (fiscal spending on transition creates debt that feeds the debasement narrative). This divergence will likely widen over the next decade, making the three commodities increasingly independent rather than correlated.

QUANTITATIVE LAYER DECOMPOSITION

Layer	Gold (~$5,200/oz)	Silver (~$87/oz)	Crude Oil WTI (~$90/bbl)
1. Cost/Structural Floor	$1,400–$1,700 (30%)	$13–$27 (18–30%)	$40–$50 (45–55%)
2. Structural Demand/Supply	$1,400–$2,100 (35%)	$25–$35 (30–40%)	$5–$10 (6–11%)
3. Macro/Cyclical	$400–$600 (10%)	$15–$20 (18–22%)	–$5 to $0 (neg.)
4. Geopolitical/Policy	$500–$800 (12%)	$5–$10 (6–11%)	$30–$50 (35–55%)
5. Speculative/Positioning	$200–$400 (5–8%)	$0–$5 (0–6%)	$3–$5 (3–5%)
6. Sentiment/Fear/Froth	$100–$300 (3–5%)	$0–$5 (0–6%)	$5–$8 (6–9%)
Layers 4–6 (Ephemeral)	$800–$1,500 (20%)	$5–$20 (6–23%)	$38–$63 (44–69%)

Gold's ephemeral layers constitute roughly 20% of its price, while oil's constitute approximately 44–69%. Silver sits between them at 6–23%, with its ephemeral layers having been largely purged by the January crash. Oil is the commodity most at risk of a dramatic price collapse if the geopolitical situation resolves — a return to pre-crisis fundamentals implies $55–65/bbl, a potential decline of 30–40% from current levels.

STRUCTURAL RISK ASSESSMENT

What Could Shatter Each Commodity's Price Structure

Gold: The primary risk is a reversal of central bank buying — if the ~800–1,000 tonnes/year of demand that underpins Layer 2 reverted to pre-2022 levels, the structural premium would compress $500–800/oz. This could be triggered by a decisive BRICS failure, a strong dollar rally from US economic outperformance, or real rates rising sharply above 3%. The 2011–2015 playbook — where ETF liquidation cascaded into a four-year bear market — remains possible but less likely given that current positioning is far less speculative. Bitcoin's emerging role as "digital gold" among younger investors is a wild card that could gradually erode gold's monetary premium, though central banks show no interest in Bitcoin as a reserve asset.

Silver: Solar thrifting is the existential risk. If next-generation solar cells reduce silver loadings by 50%+ (from ~10 mg/W toward ~5 mg/W), the industrial demand growth thesis weakens dramatically. A Chinese hard landing that simultaneously crushes industrial demand and floods the market with previously restricted silver exports could trigger a 2011-style collapse. Exchange intervention via margin hikes remains a permanent threat — the CME has demonstrated in 1980, 2011, and 2026 that it will crush speculative rallies when volatility threatens market integrity.

Crude Oil: The bull risk is that Hormuz stays closed for months, potentially pushing prices above $150/bbl and triggering a global recession. The bear risk is that a swift resolution — combined with OPEC+ flooding 3+ mb/d of spare capacity into an already oversupplied market — could send prices crashing toward $40–50/bbl, replaying the 2014 scenario. Over a 5–10 year horizon, the energy transition is oil's structural bear case: EVs displacing >10 mb/d by 2035 while petrochemical demand growth of 2–3 mb/d cannot fully offset transport losses.

CONCLUSION

Gold is a structural story temporarily amplified by crisis. Its price is anchored by the most durable combination of factors — a rising cost floor, a generational shift in central bank behavior, and a monetary premium accumulated over millennia. Even a severe correction would likely find support at $3,500–$4,000, roughly 30–35% below current levels.

Silver is an industrial transformation story wrapped in monetary metal packaging, with the solar revolution providing the most compelling structural bull case of any commodity — but its thin market means the path upward will be violently non-linear, with 30%+ corrections a recurring feature.

Oil is the outlier: a crisis-premium-dominated price sitting atop weak fundamentals, with the widest outcome distribution in market history. The resolution of the Strait of Hormuz situation will determine whether oil trades at $55 or $150 — a range that makes meaningful analysis of the upper layers almost impossible until the geopolitical fog clears. What is certain is that oil's structural base is eroding decade by decade as the energy transition advances, while gold's and silver's bases are strengthening — a divergence that will define commodity markets through 2030 and beyond.

DISCLAIMER