Caladan Weekly #33: Feb 25, 2026

Bitcoin Is Trading Like Software Stocks. Here's Why That Matters.

The Question Everyone Is Asking Wrong

Bitcoin is down 50% from its October 6, 2025 all-time high of $126,210. Gold hit its own all-time high of $5,595 on January 29, 2026. Since Bitcoin's peak, gold has rallied over 25% while Bitcoin has been cut in half. The Crypto Fear and Greed Index touched an all-time low of 5 on February 6, a reading more extreme than the COVID crash or the FTX collapse, and has barely recovered to the mid-teens since.

The crypto commentariat has defaulted to the usual framing: Is Bitcoin digital gold, or isn't it? But that question assumes a static identity for an asset that has demonstrably shifted its behavioral profile multiple times across different macro regimes. Bitcoin correlated with gold in 2017, with tech broadly in 2021, and now, since late 2024, it has moved in tight lockstep with software equities.

The more productive question for institutional allocators is simpler and more useful: Under the current liquidity regime, what risk factors dominate Bitcoin's return profile?

The answer, based on the evidence through February 2026, is that Bitcoin is trading as a high-beta software equity proxy.

Whether this represents a temporary alignment driven by shared macro factor sensitivity or a permanent reclassification of what Bitcoin "is" in portfolio construction terms remains an open empirical question. But the data is increasingly difficult to dismiss.

How Tight Is the Correlation, and How Long Has It Lasted?

The relationship between Bitcoin and IGV (iShares Expanded Tech-Software ETF) has strengthened progressively over three distinct periods:

Period	BTC-IGV Correlation	Context

2014-2019	0.0-0.2	Negligible structural linkage
2020-2023	0.4-0.6	Liquidity beta begins emerging during QE era
2024-2026	0.70-0.92	Persistent high alignment across multiple quarters

As of late February 2026, the 30-day rolling correlation sits at approximately 0.73.

More importantly, this elevated correlation has been sustained above 0.5 for over 18 months, which is meaningfully longer than typical short-term regime shifts (which tend to last 3-6 months) but shorter than what would be needed to confirm a full structural reclassification (which would require persistence across an entire liquidity cycle of 4-7 years).

The recent drawdown has made the relationship harder to ignore. Year-to-date through late February 2026, IGV has declined roughly 23%, while Bitcoin has fallen approximately 19-20%. The iShares Expanded Tech-Software ETF is on track for its worst quarterly percentage decline since the 2008 financial crisis. The 1-month and 3-month tracking ratios have hovered near 1.0, meaning Bitcoin has moved almost dollar-for-dollar with the software sector on a percentage basis. The observed beta during drawdown periods sits in the 1.1-1.3x range, which is notably lower than the 2-3x leverage many analysts assume Bitcoin carries relative to equities.

One important caveat: short-window correlations can spike during volatility regimes regardless of underlying structural relationships. Markets tend to become more correlated during stress periods simply because risk appetite contracts uniformly.

The duration of this particular alignment (18+ months and counting) suggests something more substantial than noise, but it does not, on its own, establish causality or permanence.

The 2025 Safe Haven Stress Test

If there was ever a year designed to test whether Bitcoin functions as a monetary debasement hedge, it was 2025. Fiscal expansion accelerated. The dollar weakened. Geopolitical risk escalated. Inflation remained persistently above the Fed's 2% target. Rate cut expectations built throughout the year.

This was the exact environment in which Bitcoin's "digital gold" properties should have manifested. The directional divergence since October 2025 tells the story: gold rose from $4,400 to an all-time high of $5,595, while Bitcoin fell from $126,210 to the mid-$60,000s.

Two assets supposedly serving the same monetary debasement hedge function moved in opposite directions during the most favorable conditions imaginable for that function. Instead:

Asset	2025 Full Year	Asset Class Behavior
Gold	+65%	Safe haven / monetary debasement hedge
Silver	+138%	Safe haven with industrial demand tailwind
IGV	+5.6%	Growth equity, weak
Bitcoin	-5.0%	Growth equity, weaker

Gold surged to a new all-time high of $5,595 on January 29, 2026. Central banks purchased 863 tonnes of gold in 2025, the third consecutive year of aggressive sovereign accumulation. Zero central banks purchased Bitcoin.

Metric	Gold	Bitcoin
ATH	$5,595 (Jan 29, 2026)	$126,210 (Oct 6, 2025)
Direction since Oct 2025	+25%	-50%
ETF flows (3 months through Feb 2026)	+$16 billion	-$4.5 billion
Central bank purchases (2025)	863 tonnes	0

The capital flow divergence is the single most damning piece of evidence against the digital gold thesis: when institutional and sovereign allocators sought safety from the exact macro environment Bitcoin was supposedly designed to protect against, they chose gold by a ratio of more than three to one in dollar terms.

This does not mean Bitcoin will never exhibit safe haven characteristics. It means that under the current investor base composition, market structure, and liquidity regime, it does not. Both Bitcoin and software equities posted weak single-digit returns in 2025 while traditional hard assets delivered generational performance.

The behavioral overlap between Bitcoin and growth equities during this stress test is among the strongest evidence for the convergence thesis.

Why This Is Happening: Three Structural Drivers

Institutional Portfolio Plumbing

The ETF wrapper has fundamentally changed how Bitcoin trades at the institutional level.

Metric	Value
Peak spot BTC ETF AUM (mid-2025)	~$170 billion
BlackRock IBIT peak AUM	~$68 billion
Institutional allocators with >5% crypto AUM	59%
ETF holder average cost basis	~$90,200
Current BTC price	~$64,000
ETF complex unrealized loss	25-30%
IBIT 5-week redemptions	>$2.1 billion

The mechanical consequence is that Bitcoin now sits inside the same portfolio construction frameworks as software equities. Risk management systems apply identical treatment. Rebalancing decisions hit both asset classes simultaneously.

Performance attribution runs against technology benchmarks. When a multi-asset fund needs to de-risk its growth allocation, it sells IGV components and Bitcoin in the same trade.

This creates a self-reinforcing correlation loop: institutional classification drives correlated flows, correlated flows reinforce the classification. The average cost basis for U.S. spot Bitcoin ETF holders sits around $90,200 per Investing.com's analysis, meaning the entire institutional ETF complex is roughly 25-30% underwater at current prices near $64,000.

That cost basis gap matters because it transforms what might otherwise be patient institutional capital into a source of persistent selling pressure. Holders who bought the ETF expecting diversification or safe haven properties are instead sitting on deep losses while watching gold ETFs appreciate.

The feedback between ETF redemptions and spot price declines has been visible in real time throughout early 2026, with the longest sustained outflow streak since the ETFs launched. BlackRock's IBIT alone has seen over $2.1 billion in redemptions over the most recent five-week outflow period.

Shared Macro Factor Sensitivity

Bitcoin and software equities respond to the same set of macro inputs: real yield movements, M2 money supply dynamics, Fed balance sheet operations, dollar strength, and risk appetite (proxied by VIX and credit spreads).

Both are long-duration assets. Both rally when real rates decline and sell off when real rates rise. Both benefit from liquidity expansion and suffer during contraction.

The critical interpretation question is whether Bitcoin correlates with software specifically or with the broader category of liquidity-sensitive growth assets. The evidence supports the latter. Bitcoin does not move because software earnings disappoint; it moves because the same liquidity regime that compresses software multiples also drains capital from speculative assets.

The correlation reflects shared macro sensitivity, not intrinsic equivalence.

That said, the transmission mechanism can be startlingly direct. In February 2026 alone, two separate AI product launches cascaded into Bitcoin through the same institutional channels:

Date	AI Catalyst	Software Impact	Bitcoin Transmission
Feb 3-4	Anthropic Claude Cowork plugins	Goldman software basket -6%; $285B cross-sector rout	Immediate BTC ETF outflows on both days
Feb 20	Anthropic Claude Code Security	CrowdStrike -8%, Cloudflare -8-10%, Global X Cyber ETF -9%	BTC declined alongside software sector

Neither event had any connection to Bitcoin's fundamentals. An AI product launch moved Bitcoin's price through the institutional plumbing that now links it to software. That is the correlation mechanism in action.

The VIX, which sat around 19-20 for much of February before spiking above 21 on sticky inflation data, provides additional context for the risk-on/risk-off channel. Both Bitcoin and software equities respond negatively to VIX elevation, but the sensitivity is asymmetric: neither asset benefits meaningfully when the VIX declines from already-low levels.

This is consistent with high-beta growth asset behavior, not safe haven characteristics.

This distinction matters for forward-looking analysis. If correlation derives from shared macro factor exposure, Bitcoin could decouple from software when macro conditions shift, even without any Bitcoin-specific catalyst.

Historical precedent supports this: Bitcoin's prior correlations with gold (2017), broad tech (2021), and now software have all emerged and dissolved as macro regimes changed.

The MicroStrategy Reflexive Loop

Strategy (formerly MicroStrategy) is the largest corporate Bitcoin holder in the world, classified within the software/technology sector on the Nasdaq.

This creates a direct mechanical linkage between software sector performance and Bitcoin sentiment.

Metric	Value

Total BTC held	717,131
Aggregate purchase cost	~$54.5 billion
Average cost basis per BTC	$76,027
Current market value (~$64K)	~$45.9 billion
Unrealized loss	~$5.7 billion (-10.6%)
Stock decline from late-2025 highs	~67%
mNAV (market cap / BTC holdings value)	~0.81
% of total BTC supply	3.4%

The reflexive loop operates in both directions. Software sector weakness pushes Strategy's stock lower. Strategy declines amplify Bitcoin bearish sentiment and, to a lesser degree, actual selling pressure.

During drawdowns, this loop intensifies the correlation between Bitcoin and software indices. Strategy's stock has declined roughly 67% from its late-2025 highs, substantially worse than both IGV and Bitcoin outright. The company's market-cap-to-net-asset-value ratio (mNAV) has fallen to approximately 0.81, meaning the stock now trades at a discount to the Bitcoin it holds.

This suggests company-specific amplification effects layered on top of the underlying correlation.

The MSCI review in January 2026, which proposed excluding companies with greater than 50% digital asset holdings from certain indices (potentially triggering an estimated $8.8 billion in forced outflows according to JPMorgan), underscored the vulnerability of the Bitcoin treasury model to traditional finance classification decisions.

MSCI maintained current treatment but signaled future review, leaving the risk live.

Three Competing Frameworks for What Comes Next

Framework 1: Bitcoin Has Become Levered Software Exposure (Structural Identity)

The case for permanent reclassification rests on the 0.73 correlation, the 0.82 YTD tracking ratio, synchronized ETF flows, and the shared institutional investor base.

Under this framework, the ETF era has permanently altered Bitcoin's risk profile by embedding it within technology portfolio sleeves. The correlation would be expected to persist across liquidity cycles.

The problem with this framework is historical. Bitcoin's protocol has not changed. The same asset exhibited near-zero correlation with software from 2014 through 2019. Previous high-correlation episodes (with alt-tech in 2017-2018, with Nasdaq broadly in 2021-2022) proved temporary.

Permanent structural reclassification would need to be demonstrated through persistence across an entire Fed easing-tightening cycle, which has not yet occurred.

Framework 2: Both Assets Are Expressions of Global Liquidity (Regime Convergence)

The more parsimonious explanation.

Both Bitcoin and software equities are high-duration, liquidity-sensitive assets that happen to correlate strongly under the current tight-liquidity macro regime. The correlation emerged during 2020's quantitative easing, intensified during 2022's quantitative tightening, and has remained elevated through the 2024-2026 period of constrained conditions.

Under this framework, correlation could break during the next easing cycle if capital flows shift. Bitcoin has historically rallied 1-3 months ahead of software during Fed policy pivots, and supply dynamics (the April 2024 halving effect, with historical precedent for price appreciation 12-18 months post-event) could create divergent return profiles in late 2026.

Framework 3: Bitcoin Converges With Equities During Stress (Behavioral Convergence)

Bitcoin behaves as a high-volatility risk asset that aligns with equities during drawdowns, regardless of fundamental characteristics. Risk-on/risk-off flows dominate short-term price action. VIX spikes compress both asset classes.

The narrative component (AI disruption fears hitting both software valuations and risk appetite simultaneously) creates additional synchronization. The Crypto Fear and Greed Index reaching an all-time low of 5 on February 6, deeper than readings during the FTX collapse or the COVID crash, occurred not because of any crypto-specific disaster but because of a broad growth-asset selloff driven by macro and sector-level forces.

Bitcoin's worst sentiment reading in history was caused by the same factors dragging software stocks.

The current evidence most strongly supports Framework 2, with Framework 1 mechanisms (particularly the institutional portfolio plumbing) contributing to correlation persistence within the current regime.

Framework	Core Claim	Strongest Evidence	Key Weakness
Structural Identity	Bitcoin has permanently become levered software exposure	0.73 correlation, 0.82 tracking ratio, synchronized ETF flows	Same asset was uncorrelated 2014-2019; prior correlations proved temporary
Regime Convergence	Both assets express global liquidity conditions	Correlation emerged/intensified with Fed policy regimes; Bitcoin's correlation partner has changed repeatedly	Cannot explain why correlation persists during non-crisis periods
Behavioral Convergence	Bitcoin aligns with equities during stress regardless of fundamentals	Fear & Greed at all-time low driven by non-crypto factors; VIX sensitivity	Does not fully explain 18+ months of sustained correlation outside acute stress

Scenario Analysis: What Resolves the Question

The honest answer is that we do not yet have enough data to assign credible probabilities to any of these outcomes.

What we can do is define the scenarios clearly and identify the signals that would confirm or rule out each one.

Scenario 1: Correlation persists (base case)

The liquidity regime remains tight through 2026. Bitcoin continues trading as a high-beta growth asset in the 0.5-0.8 correlation range with IGV.

No definitive resolution to the identity question. This is the default outcome if nothing structurally changes in Fed policy, institutional positioning, or Bitcoin-specific demand dynamics.

Scenario 2: Decoupling

Fed easing plus supply-side dynamics from the 2024 halving plus reduced AI disruption fears allow Bitcoin to outperform IGV materially in the second half of 2026. Correlation declines to the 0.3-0.5 range.

This outcome would validate the regime convergence interpretation and suggest the current alignment was always temporary.

Scenario 3: Permanent convergence

Correlation increases further above 0.8 and persists through the next full easing cycle. Bitcoin becomes formally reclassified as technology sector exposure by major index providers. This outcome would confirm a structural identity shift.

The critical tests are straightforward. If correlation breaks during Fed easing, regime convergence is confirmed. If it persists through a full cycle, structural reclassification becomes the leading interpretation.

Scenario	Confirmation Signal	Timeline
Correlation persists	BTC-IGV remains 0.5-0.8 through tight liquidity	Through 2026
Decoupling	BTC outperforms IGV during Fed easing; correlation drops to 0.3-0.5	H2 2026 into 2027
Permanent convergence	Correlation stays above 0.8 through full easing cycle; index providers reclassify BTC	2026-2028

Until the 2026-2027 easing cycle provides that evidence, the question remains genuinely open.

Conclusion

Bitcoin's identity has never been fixed. It has been whatever the dominant marginal buyer needed it to be, and right now, the dominant marginal buyers are institutional allocators who treat it as growth equity. That may change. The asset's underlying properties have not. But markets price assets based on who holds them and why, not on what they were designed to do. Until the next liquidity regime provides a natural experiment, the correlation is the reality, and the reality is what matters for anyone trying to understand what Bitcoin actually does in a portfolio today.

Data Sources and Methodology Notes

Correlation analysis uses Pearson coefficients on daily log returns with rolling 30-day windows. Performance data sourced from Bloomberg, iShares/BlackRock, CoinGecko, and the CME Bitcoin Reference Rate. ETF flow data from SoSoValue and Bloomberg Intelligence. Institutional positioning data from public 13F filings and industry surveys.

Limitations worth noting: short-term correlations may overstate structural relationships; the private credit linkage to both asset classes remains partially inferential; institutional classification data from public filings is incomplete; and causality is difficult to establish definitively in multi-factor macro environments.