The Sovereign's Dilemma: An In-Depth Analysis of U.S. National Debt, Inflation, and the Politics of Devaluation

Executive Summary

The relationship between the United States national debt and inflation is a complex, bidirectional, and often misunderstood dynamic at the heart of contemporary economic policy debates. This report provides an exhaustive analysis of this relationship, examining the causal channels through which debt and inflation influence each other and rigorously evaluating the hypothesis that a U.S. administration might intentionally pursue an inflationary policy to manage its debt burden.

The analysis reveals that high and rising national debt can exert significant upward pressure on inflation through several mechanisms. These include the direct stimulation of aggregate demand via deficit spending, the long-term "crowding out" of private investment which constrains economic supply, and the risk of "fiscal dominance," where the scale of government debt compromises the central bank's ability to maintain price stability. Conversely, inflation has a multifaceted impact on the government's fiscal position. While an unexpected surge in inflation can act as a "soft default" by reducing the real value of outstanding fixed-rate government bonds—a phenomenon often called the "inflation tax"—this is only one part of a much larger and more complex fiscal picture. Inflation also increases federal tax revenues, partly due to non-indexed elements of the tax code, but simultaneously drives up the cost of major government programs like Social Security, which are indexed to the cost of living.

Crucially, the most potent effect is the inevitable policy response to high inflation: rising interest rates. As the Federal Reserve tightens monetary policy to restore price stability, the government's cost of servicing its debt escalates dramatically. Higher rates on newly issued debt to finance ongoing deficits and roll over maturing securities can quickly overwhelm any fiscal benefit gained from devaluing the old stock of debt. The recent post-pandemic period serves as a stark illustration of this "fiscal whiplash," where massive stimulus led to an inflation surge, which in turn prompted rate hikes that have caused federal net interest costs to soar to

historic levels.

When evaluating the proposition that an administration might "want" inflation, the report concludes that while the economic mechanism of debt devaluation is real, pursuing it as a deliberate strategy is untenable for the United States. The necessary element of "surprise" makes it a non-repeatable trick, and any such attempt would shatter the credibility of U.S. fiscal and monetary policy. The costs—including higher long-term borrowing costs, the erosion of domestic savings, significant social and economic instability, and the potential loss of the U.S. dollar's status as the world's primary reserve currency—would vastly outweigh any short-term fiscal relief. The policy would effectively impose a tax on holders of U.S. debt, which include not only foreign nations but also American retirees, pension funds, and the Social Security and Medicare trust funds themselves, creating immense domestic and international political backlash.

Ultimately, inflation is not a solution to the nation's core fiscal challenge. That challenge stems not from the existing stock of debt, but from the persistent, structural mismatch between projected federal spending and revenues—the primary deficit. This report concludes that sustainable fiscal policy requires addressing this underlying imbalance through deliberate choices about spending and taxation, rather than resorting to the dangerous and ultimately self-defeating path of currency debasement.

Section 1: The Symbiotic Relationship: Defining U.S. Debt and Inflation

To comprehend the intricate dance between U.S. national debt and inflation, one must first establish a precise understanding of the core concepts. These are not monolithic entities but complex phenomena with specific compositions, measurement conventions, and historical contexts. This section provides the foundational vocabulary and framework necessary for the subsequent analysis, defining the anatomy of U.S. debt, the nature of inflation, the critical metric of the debt-to-GDP ratio, and the historical path that has led to the current fiscal landscape.

1.1 The Anatomy of U.S. National Debt: Beyond the Trillions

The U.S. national debt represents the total sum of outstanding borrowing by the U.S. Federal Government accumulated throughout the nation's history.[1] When the government's spending

exceeds its revenues in a given fiscal year, it runs a budget deficit, which it finances by issuing marketable securities to investors. The national debt is the cumulative sum of these annual deficits, plus the interest owed to the holders of these securities.[1] As of late 2023, this figure surpassed $33 trillion.[3] However, to analyze its economic impact, this gross figure must be disaggregated into two fundamentally different components: Debt Held by the Public and Intragovernmental Debt.[1]

Debt Held by the Public is the most economically significant measure. It encompasses all Treasury securities—such as bonds, bills, and notes—that have been sold in credit markets to finance government operations.[1] The holders of this debt are diverse, including individuals, corporations, pension funds, mutual funds, state and local governments, foreign governments, and the U.S. Federal Reserve.[6] This is the portion of the debt that directly affects financial markets, influences interest rates, and competes with private investment for capital.[5] As of March 2025, debt held by the public was approximately $29 trillion, or about 80% of the gross debt.[4]

Intragovernmental Debt, in contrast, represents Treasury securities held in accounts administered by the federal government itself.[3] This is essentially an internal accounting mechanism. It arises when certain government programs, most notably the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, collect more in dedicated revenues (e.g., payroll taxes) than they pay out in benefits in a given year. These surpluses are, by law, invested in special non-marketable Treasury securities.[3] Thus, intragovernmental debt is both an asset to the trust funds and a liability to the U.S. Treasury. While it is a real obligation that must be repaid when these programs need to redeem their securities to pay benefits, it does not represent funds borrowed from private credit markets and therefore does not have the same direct impact on the broader economy as debt held by the public.[5] As of August 2025, this portion of the debt amounted to approximately $7 trillion, with the Social Security trust funds being the largest single holder.[4]

This distinction is not merely an accounting detail; it carries profound implications for any policy aimed at "inflating away the debt." A significant portion of the government's creditors are, in fact, its own trust funds, which are fiduciaries for the retirement and healthcare benefits of the American people. A policy that devalues this debt is not just a transfer of wealth from external bondholders to the Treasury; it is also an internal transfer that erodes the asset base of the nation's most critical social safety net programs. This creates an enormous political constraint, as such a policy would be framed—correctly—as a direct threat to the future solvency of Social Security and Medicare, making it politically toxic.

1.2 The Nature of Inflation: A Tax on Certainty

Inflation is defined as a general and sustained increase in the overall price level of goods and services within an economy.[9] It is not measured by a rise in the cost of a single product, like gasoline, but rather by monitoring broad price indexes that track a representative basket of consumer purchases.[9] The Federal Reserve, the U.S. central bank, primarily tracks the price index for personal consumption expenditures (PCE). Its Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) has established a long-run target of 2% annual inflation, believing this rate is most consistent with its dual mandate of maximum employment and price stability.[9]

Price stability is not a mere technocratic objective; it is a prerequisite for a healthy, functioning economy.[10] When inflation is low, stable, and predictable, households and businesses can make sound long-term decisions about saving, borrowing, and investing. This fosters efficient resource allocation and sustainable growth.[9]

Conversely, high and volatile inflation acts as a "stealth tax on economic certainty".[10] It creates a dual burden for households: it directly erodes the purchasing power of their nominal incomes and savings, and it introduces profound uncertainty about the future.[10] This uncertainty disproportionately harms lower-income households, who spend a larger share of their budget on necessities like food and housing and have fewer means to hedge against rising prices.[10] For businesses, unpredictable inflation makes it difficult to distinguish between changes in relative prices (a signal to reallocate resources) and general economy-wide trends, leading to inefficient investment decisions and a reluctance to commit to long-term projects.[10] This dynamic was starkly visible during the "Great Inflation" of the 1970s, a period characterized by economic stagnation and high uncertainty.[10]

1.3 The Debt-to-GDP Ratio: The Critical Metric of Fiscal Health

While the nominal dollar value of the national debt is a headline-grabbing figure, a more meaningful metric for assessing a country's fiscal situation is the ratio of its debt to its Gross Domestic Product (GDP).[1] GDP represents the total economic output of the country in a given year, serving as a proxy for the nation's capacity to generate income and tax revenue. The debt-to-GDP ratio thus contextualizes the debt burden relative to the size of the economy that supports it, providing a better indicator of the country's ability to service and repay its obligations.[1] A country with a large economy can sustain a larger nominal debt than a smaller economy.

Historically, the U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio has peaked during major wars and recessions, subsequently declining during periods of peace and economic growth.[3] For example, the ratio

reached its highest point in U.S. history in 1946, in the aftermath of World War II, before declining steadily for several decades.[3] However, the current trajectory is alarming. Following the 2008 financial crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic, the debt-to-GDP ratio has surged, surpassing the WWII peak.[10]

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projects that, under current law, the debt held by the public will rise from 99% of GDP in 2024 to 116% by 2034 and continue climbing to 172% by 2054.[3] This trajectory is widely considered unsustainable.[2] The primary drivers of this projected growth are not temporary crises but a structural mismatch between spending and revenues, particularly the rising costs of Social Security and Medicare as the population ages, combined with interest costs that are growing faster than the economy.[3]

1.4 Historical Trajectory: From Revolutionary War Bonds to Pandemic-Era Stimulus

The United States has carried a national debt since its very inception. The debts incurred to finance the American Revolutionary War amounted to over $75 million by 1791.[1] Throughout its history, the debt has followed a clear pattern: it has grown sharply to finance wars and respond to economic crises, and then has been gradually reduced relative to the size of the economy during subsequent periods of growth and stability.[1]

Major inflection points in the debt's history include:

- **The Civil War:** The debt exploded from $65 million in 1860 to nearly $3 billion by 1865, a more than 4,000% increase.[1]
- **World War I and World War II:** The debt grew to $22 billion after WWI and then skyrocketed from $51 billion in 1940 to $260 billion after WWII, pushing the debt-to-GDP ratio to its then-historic peak.[12]
- **The 1980s:** A combination of significant tax cuts and increased military spending under President Reagan caused the debt to more than triple during the decade.[3]
- **The 21st Century:** The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Great Recession of 2008, and most significantly, the massive fiscal response to the COVID-19 pandemic have driven the debt to unprecedented levels.[1] From fiscal year 2019 to 2021 alone, federal spending increased by approximately 50%, largely due to pandemic relief measures.[1]

This historical pattern is crucial because it sets the stage for the central question of how debt reduction is achieved. While past reductions were often accomplished through a combination of fiscal discipline, strong economic growth, and moderate inflation, the current scale of the debt and the projected structural deficits present a challenge of a different magnitude,

prompting the very debate over unconventional solutions like leveraging high inflation.

Section 2: The Causal Arrow from Debt to Inflation

The relationship between national debt and inflation is not a one-way street. While inflation can affect the real value of the debt, the level and growth of the debt itself can be a primary driver of inflationary pressures. This causal arrow operates through several distinct but interconnected channels, ranging from direct impacts on aggregate demand to more subtle, long-term effects on the economy's productive capacity and the credibility of monetary policy. Understanding these mechanisms is essential to appreciating why a high-debt environment is inherently more susceptible to inflation.

2.1 Fiscal Policy and Aggregate Demand: The Keynesian Channel

The most direct and widely understood link between government debt and inflation operates through the channel of aggregate demand. When the federal government runs a budget deficit, it means it is injecting more spending into the economy than it is removing through taxation.[1] This net injection of funds—financed by borrowing (i.e., issuing debt)—directly increases aggregate demand, the total demand for goods and services in the economy.[10]

This stimulus can take the form of direct government purchases (e.g., infrastructure projects, defense spending), transfer payments to households (e.g., stimulus checks, unemployment benefits), or tax cuts that leave more disposable income in the hands of consumers and businesses.[1] According to Keynesian economic theory, when the economy is operating below its full potential (e.g., during a recession with high unemployment), this boost in demand can be beneficial, helping to close the output gap and restore full employment.

However, if the economy is already operating at or near its productive capacity, this additional demand can lead to demand-pull inflation.[14] With more money chasing a relatively fixed supply of goods and services, producers respond by raising prices.[14] The fiscal response to the COVID-19 pandemic provides a powerful recent example. Trillions of dollars in government stimulus, including direct payments to households and enhanced unemployment benefits, fueled a rapid recovery in consumer demand.[1] This demand surge, however, collided with pandemic-related supply chain disruptions, leading to the highest inflation rates in four decades.[11] One comparative study concluded that the marginal fiscal actions taken by the United States in 2020 and 2021 accounted for approximately 3 percentage points of the

inflation observed by the end of 2021.[10]

2.2 Crowding Out and Supply Constraints: The Long-Term Drag on Growth

Beyond the immediate demand-side effects, persistent high levels of government debt can generate inflationary pressure through a more insidious, long-term channel: the "crowding out" of private investment. The market for loanable funds is finite. When the government runs large deficits, it must borrow heavily from this pool of national savings to finance its operations.[10] This large and persistent government demand for capital competes directly with private firms that also need to borrow to fund their investments in new technology, machinery, and infrastructure.[16]

This increased competition for a limited supply of savings puts upward pressure on interest rates. Higher interest rates, in turn, make it more expensive for businesses to undertake new investment projects, causing some to be delayed or canceled altogether. This phenomenon, where government borrowing displaces, or "crowds out," private investment, has significant long-term consequences.[16] Less private investment means a slower rate of capital accumulation, which leads to slower growth in productivity—the efficiency with which goods and services are produced.[16]

A slower-growing, less productive economy is more susceptible to inflation. The supply side of the economy becomes less flexible and less able to expand to meet rising demand. Consequently, any given increase in aggregate demand is more likely to result in higher prices rather than higher output. This creates a long-term structural bias toward inflation. A literature review of 40 academic studies found that 36 showed a statistically significant negative relationship between government debt and economic growth, underscoring this damaging long-run effect.[11]

2.3 Fiscal Dominance: When the Treasury Overwhelms the Fed

Perhaps the most serious risk posed by a massive national debt is the potential for "fiscal dominance." This describes a scenario where the government's fiscal policy and debt position become so large and precarious that they constrain the central bank's ability to conduct independent monetary policy, particularly its ability to fight inflation.[10]

The Federal Reserve's primary tool for combating inflation is raising the federal funds rate, which increases borrowing costs throughout the economy, cools demand, and brings inflation down.[17] However, this action also has a direct and significant impact on the federal budget. As the Fed raises interest rates, the interest the Treasury must pay on its newly issued debt also rises. When the national debt is exceptionally large, even a modest increase in interest rates can add hundreds of billions of dollars to the annual deficit.[1]

In a state of fiscal dominance, the central bank faces an impossible choice. If it raises rates to fight inflation as its mandate requires, it risks triggering a fiscal crisis by making the government's debt service costs unsustainable. If it keeps rates low to accommodate the Treasury's borrowing needs, it allows inflation to become entrenched and potentially spiral out of control.[10] The need to ensure the government's solvency can thus "dominate" the Fed's mandate for price stability. This creates a dangerous feedback loop where fiscal imbalances lead to inflation, and the fiscal consequences of fighting that inflation prevent the central bank from acting decisively. While this risk is traditionally associated with emerging market economies, the sheer scale of U.S. debt has made it a subject of increasing concern among economists for advanced economies as well.[10]

2.4 Investor Expectations and the Inflation Premium

Financial markets are forward-looking. Investors who purchase government bonds are making a bet on the future fiscal and monetary credibility of the government. If investors begin to perceive that the national debt is on an unsustainable path, they will start to worry that the government may one day be tempted to resort to printing money or allowing high inflation to erode the real value of that debt.[10]

To protect themselves against this risk, investors will demand a higher yield on the government bonds they purchase. This additional yield is known as an "inflation premium".[10] It is compensation for the expected future loss of purchasing power. The emergence of a significant inflation premium can create a self-fulfilling prophecy. The government's borrowing costs rise, which worsens the deficit and makes the debt trajectory even more unsustainable, further validating investors' fears and potentially pushing the inflation premium even higher.[15]

This dynamic is non-linear and path-dependent. At low to moderate levels of debt, investor confidence in the U.S. government's commitment to low inflation and debt repayment is high, and the inflation premium is negligible. The Federal Reserve has ample credibility and policy space to counteract any temporary inflationary pressures. However, as the debt-to-GDP ratio climbs into unprecedented territory, the calculus changes. The risk of fiscal dominance becomes more tangible, and investor sensitivity to fiscal news increases. At these elevated

debt levels, the same fiscal stimulus that might have been benign in the past can trigger a much stronger reaction in inflation expectations and market interest rates. Studies have shown that for countries with already high public debt, further increases in debt are demonstrably more inflationary, confirming this threshold effect.[15] Therefore, the current high-debt environment makes the U.S. economy inherently more vulnerable to inflationary shocks than it was in previous decades.

Section 3: The Causal Arrow from Inflation to Debt

Just as the national debt influences inflation, the rate of inflation has a profound and multifaceted impact on the government's fiscal position. The relationship is far from simple; inflation triggers a cascade of countervailing effects across the federal budget. It can simultaneously reduce the real burden of past borrowing while increasing the cost of current spending and future financing. A comprehensive understanding requires moving beyond the simplistic notion of "inflating away the debt" to analyze inflation's full impact on revenues, expenditures, and, most critically, the interest rates that determine the cost of debt service.

3.1 The "Inflation Tax": Devaluing the Real Burden of Existing Debt

The central mechanism by which inflation can alleviate a government's debt burden is often referred to as the "inflation tax" or a "soft default".[19] This effect applies specifically to government debt that is issued with a fixed nominal interest rate. The U.S. Treasury borrows a certain number of dollars and promises to pay back a fixed number of dollars in interest and principal in the future.[19]

When an unexpected bout of inflation occurs, the general price level rises, and the purchasing power of each dollar falls. Consequently, the future dollars that the government uses to repay its debt are worth less in real terms than the dollars it originally borrowed.[14] This effectively reduces the real value of the government's outstanding liabilities. It functions as a transfer of real wealth from the holders of government bonds (the creditors) to the government (the debtor).[19]

The magnitude of this effect is determined by two key factors: the maturity of the debt and the degree to which the inflation was unexpected.

- **Maturity:** The longer the duration of the debt, the more potent the inflation tax. A 30-year bond issued at a low interest rate will see its real value eroded by high inflation

for three decades before it matures. In contrast, short-term debt, such as Treasury bills, must be rolled over frequently. If inflation is high, this short-term debt will have to be refinanced at much higher interest rates, quickly negating the benefit of devaluing the principal.[16]

- **Unexpectedness:** This mechanism only works to the extent that the inflation is a surprise. If investors *expect* high inflation, they will demand a higher nominal interest rate on the bonds they purchase from the outset, fully compensating them for the anticipated loss of purchasing power. This is known as the Fisher effect, which posits that nominal interest rates will adjust to reflect expected inflation.[20] Therefore, only an inflation rate that is higher than what was priced into the bond at issuance can deliver a real fiscal benefit to the government.[19]

As of 2021, the vast majority of outstanding U.S. federal debt was fixed in nominal terms, making it theoretically vulnerable to this effect. One analysis by the Penn Wharton Budget Model estimated that a permanent, unexpected increase in the annual inflation target from 2% to 3% would reduce the real obligation of current federal debt by 7% by the year 2051.[19]

3.2 The Complete Fiscal Picture: Inflation's Impact on Federal Revenues and Expenditures

While the inflation tax on old debt is a real phenomenon, it is only one piece of the budgetary puzzle. Inflation affects nearly every line item on both the revenue and expenditure sides of the federal ledger, with many effects offsetting each other.

Impact on Federal Revenues:
Inflation generally causes nominal tax revenues to rise, as wages, profits, and sales increase in dollar terms. However, the effect is often greater than the rate of inflation itself, leading to an increase in real tax revenues. This occurs primarily through aspects of the U.S. tax code that are not fully indexed to inflation 17:

- **"Bracket Creep":** While the main income tax brackets are indexed, other thresholds are not. For example, the income thresholds for the Net Investment Income Tax (NIIT) and for the taxation of Social Security benefits are fixed in nominal dollars. As inflation pushes nominal incomes higher, more households cross these thresholds and become subject to the taxes, or face taxes on a larger portion of their income, even if their real income has not changed.[19]
- **Taxation of Capital Gains:** The tax on capital gains is levied on the difference between an asset's nominal sale price and its original nominal purchase price (the "cost basis"). The cost basis is not adjusted for inflation. Therefore, a portion of any taxable capital gain is often a "phantom" gain that merely reflects the cumulative inflation since the

asset was purchased. This increases the real tax burden on capital.[19]

- **Depreciation Deductions:** Businesses can deduct the cost of capital investments over time. These depreciation allowances are based on the original nominal cost of the asset. Inflation erodes the real value of these future deductions, increasing the firm's real tax liability and discouraging investment.[19]

Impact on Federal Expenditures:
On the spending side, many of the largest federal programs are designed to protect beneficiaries from the effects of inflation. This creates an automatic increase in outlays as the price level rises:

- **Cost-of-Living Adjustments (COLAs):** Major mandatory spending programs, most notably Social Security and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), have their benefits explicitly indexed to inflation. Each year, benefits are adjusted upward via a COLA to maintain the purchasing power of recipients.[17] This means that as inflation rises, so does the government's largest single expenditure item, offsetting a significant portion of the gains on the revenue side.[21]
- **Healthcare Programs:** While not directly indexed in the same way, spending on programs like Medicare and Medicaid also tends to rise with or faster than general inflation due to rising healthcare costs per enrollee.[21]

The following table summarizes the primary effects of higher inflation on the U.S. federal budget:

Budget Component	Primary Effect of Higher Inflation	Mechanism
Revenues		
Individual Income Taxes	Increase in real revenue	"Bracket creep" on non-indexed thresholds (e.g., NIIT, Social Security benefit taxation)
Capital Gains Taxes	Increase in real revenue	Tax is applied to nominal gains; cost basis is not indexed for inflation
Corporate Income Taxes	Increase in real revenue	Real value of depreciation deductions erodes over time

Expenditures		
Net Interest on Debt	Ambiguous / Negative	Reduces real value of old, fixed-rate debt but increases nominal cost of new/rolled-over debt
Social Security	Increase in nominal outlays	Benefits are directly indexed to inflation through annual COLAs
Medicare / Medicaid	Increase in nominal outlays	Healthcare costs tend to rise with or faster than general inflation
Discretionary Spending	Generally neutral	Budgets are set in nominal dollars but are often adjusted in subsequent years to account for inflation

3.3 The Interest Rate Backlash: How Fighting Inflation Increases Debt Service Costs

The most significant and powerful counterforce to the debt-eroding effects of inflation is the monetary policy response it provokes. A central bank with a mandate for price stability, like the Federal Reserve, cannot allow high inflation to persist. Its primary tool to combat rising prices is to increase its policy interest rate, the federal funds rate.[17] This action ripples through the financial system, leading to higher interest rates on all forms of borrowing, including the U.S. Treasury securities that finance the national debt.[1]

This "interest rate backlash" has a devastating effect on the government's finances for two reasons:

1. **Financing New Deficits:** The government must finance its ongoing annual deficits by issuing new debt at the new, higher interest rates.
2. **Rolling Over Maturing Debt:** The U.S. Treasury is constantly refinancing its existing debt as old bonds mature. A significant portion of the debt is short-term, meaning trillions of

dollars must be rolled over each year. This maturing debt must be replaced with new debt issued at the prevailing, higher interest rates.

The result is a rapid and substantial increase in the government's net interest costs. This effect can quickly overwhelm the one-time benefit gained from devaluing the existing stock of long-term debt.[16] The post-pandemic period provides a stark case study. As inflation surged in 2021-2022, the Federal Reserve embarked on one of the most aggressive rate-hiking cycles in its history.[11] Consequently, the average effective interest rate paid on the national debt nearly doubled, and annual net interest costs rose from $352 billion to $881 billion.[11] In 2024, federal interest payments on the debt surpassed spending on national defense and Medicare, becoming one of the largest items in the federal budget.[3]

This dynamic creates a fiscal "whiplash." An initial inflationary surge, perhaps caused by excessive fiscal stimulus, might offer a fleeting fiscal benefit by devaluing old debt and boosting nominal tax receipts. However, the necessary monetary policy response—higher interest rates—creates a severe and much more durable fiscal cost in the form of higher debt service payments. These higher payments become embedded in the budget baseline for years, structurally worsening the long-term deficit outlook long after the initial inflation has subsided.

3.4 Nominal vs. Real Debt: The Crucial Distinction

To synthesize these competing effects, it is essential to distinguish between nominal and real values. While inflation may reduce the *real* value of the government's debt, its net effect on the more commonly cited *nominal* debt is often to increase it. The combination of inflation-indexed spending and, more importantly, higher interest costs on a massive and growing stock of debt means that the total dollar amount the government owes is likely to grow even faster in an inflationary environment.[17]

Furthermore, the U.S. Treasury issues securities that are explicitly designed to protect investors from inflation: Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPS). The principal value of these bonds is adjusted upward with inflation, and the interest payments are calculated based on this adjusted principal.[1] While TIPS constitute a relatively small portion of total debt—around 7.5% in 2021—their existence demonstrates that investors have tools to shield themselves from the inflation tax, and the government has instruments to commit to not using it.[19] The presence of these real bonds in the government's portfolio makes the use of inflation as a tool more costly, as the government must directly compensate these bondholders for rising prices.[22]

Ultimately, while the debt-to-GDP ratio might be temporarily restrained in a high-inflation

scenario because nominal GDP grows rapidly, this is often a statistical illusion that masks a deteriorating underlying fiscal structure.[17] The structural mismatch between spending and revenues persists, and the higher nominal debt and interest costs create a more precarious fiscal position for the future.[17]

Section 4: The Central Hypothesis: Inflation as an Intentional Debt Management Strategy

The preceding analysis establishes the complex mechanics of the debt-inflation relationship. This section now turns to the core of the user's query: the proposition that a U.S. administration might intentionally pursue, or "want," a policy of higher inflation as a deliberate strategy to manage the national debt. This hypothesis, while politically charged, can be evaluated as a serious economic proposition by examining its theoretical appeal, the necessary conditions for its success, its critical limitations, and, most importantly, the identity of those who would ultimately bear the cost.

4.1 The Theoretical Appeal: A "Soft Default" Without Formal Repudiation

The primary appeal of using inflation as a debt-reduction tool lies in its nature as a "soft default".[19] For a government facing a massive and growing debt burden, the traditional policy options are politically painful and economically costly. They include:

- **Significant Spending Cuts:** Reducing popular government programs, from social safety nets to defense.
- **Major Tax Increases:** Raising taxes on individuals and corporations, which can slow economic growth.
- **Formal Default:** Explicitly repudiating the debt and refusing to make interest or principal payments, an action that would destroy the government's creditworthiness and trigger a catastrophic financial crisis.

Compared to these stark choices, engineering a surprise burst of inflation can appear to be a more subtle and politically palatable alternative.[19] The government can continue to meet all of its *nominal* obligations, paying every dollar of interest and principal on time. There is no formal default. However, by devaluing the currency in which those payments are made, the

government reduces the *real* cost of its obligations.[19] It is a way of defaulting on the *value* of the debt without defaulting on the debt itself. This strategy effectively transfers wealth from the government's creditors to the government, functioning as an implicit tax on bondholders.[19]

4.2 Necessary Conditions: The Role of Debt Maturity and Composition

The effectiveness of an inflationary debt-reduction strategy is not guaranteed; it is highly contingent on the specific structure of the government's outstanding liabilities. For the strategy to have a meaningful impact, the majority of the national debt must possess three key characteristics [16]:

1. **Nominal Denomination:** The debt must be denominated in nominal terms, meaning its principal and interest payments are fixed in dollars. Debt that is indexed to inflation, such as TIPS, is immune to this strategy, as its value automatically adjusts with the price level.[14]
2. **Fixed Interest Rate:** The interest rate on the debt must be fixed at the time of issuance. Floating-rate notes, whose interest payments adjust periodically based on prevailing market rates, offer little opportunity for devaluation.
3. **Long-Term Maturity:** This is perhaps the most critical factor. The longer the average maturity of the government's debt portfolio, the more effective an inflation surprise will be. If the government has a large stock of 10-, 20-, and 30-year bonds, a surge in inflation can erode their real value for many years before they need to be refinanced.[16] Conversely, if the debt is predominantly short-term, it must be rolled over frequently. Any inflation surprise would be quickly incorporated into the interest rates on the new debt, neutralizing the strategy and simply increasing borrowing costs.[16]

An analysis of the U.S. Treasury's debt portfolio shows a mixed picture. While a large portion of the debt is nominal and fixed-rate, the Treasury has historically maintained a significant amount of short-term debt to minimize interest costs in a low-rate environment. This structure provides a partial, but not complete, vulnerability to an inflation-based strategy.

4.3 The Critical Difference: Expected vs. Unexpected Inflation

The entire premise of an effective inflation tax rests on a single, crucial element: surprise. The strategy works only if the inflation that occurs is higher than the inflation that was *expected* by investors when they purchased the bonds.[19]

Well-functioning financial markets are forward-looking. When investors lend money to the

government for a period of years, they form expectations about the future path of inflation. They will demand a nominal interest rate that compensates them for both the real return they require and the expected loss of purchasing power due to inflation.[20] For example, if an investor desires a 2% real return and expects 3% annual inflation, they will demand a nominal interest rate of approximately 5%.

If the government then engineers an inflation rate of 6%, the investor's real return becomes negative (), and the government benefits. However, if investors had anticipated 6% inflation from the start, they would have demanded an 8% nominal yield, and the government would have gained nothing.

This reality means that inflation cannot be an overt, sustainable, long-term policy for debt reduction. A government cannot simply announce its intention to run high inflation to solve its fiscal problems. The moment it did so, market expectations would adjust, and interest rates on all new government debt would soar to reflect the new inflation target, completely offsetting the strategy's effect.[19] Therefore, the policy must rely on deception—on "tricking" savers and investors. And as the Penn Wharton Budget Model notes, "Savers and investors cannot be repeatedly 'tricked' with surprise inflation each year, so surprise inflation is not a long-term policy tool".[19]

4.4 The Holders of the Debt: Identifying Who Pays the Price of Devaluation

The concept of an "inflation tax" can seem abstract, but its impact is concrete and falls upon specific individuals and institutions. Devaluing the national debt is not a victimless act; it is a direct expropriation of wealth from the government's creditors. A detailed look at who owns the U.S. national debt reveals that the victims of such a policy would be a diverse group encompassing American citizens, critical domestic institutions, and key international partners.[4]

The table below provides a breakdown of the major holders of U.S. federal debt, illustrating the wide-ranging impact of debt devaluation.

Category	Holder	Amount Held (Approx. March 2025)	Percentage of Public Debt (Approx.)

Domestic Holders	**($19.9 Trillion)**		
	Federal Reserve System	$4.6 Trillion	16%
	Mutual Funds	$4.4 Trillion	15%
	Depository Institutions (Banks)	$1.9 Trillion	6%
	State and Local Governments	$1.7 Trillion	6%
	Pension Funds (Public & Private)	$1.0 Trillion	3%
	Insurance Companies	$0.6 Trillion	2%
	Other Domestic (Individuals, etc.)	$5.7 Trillion	20%
Foreign Holders	**($9.1 Trillion)**		
	Japan	$1.1 Trillion	4%
	United Kingdom	$0.8 Trillion	3%
	China	$0.8 Trillion	3%
	30+ Other Countries	$6.4 Trillion	22%
Intragovernmental	**($7.0 Trillion)**		**N/A**
	Social Security Trust Funds	$2.6 Trillion	N/A

	Federal Employee Retirement Funds	$1.1 Trillion	N/A
	Medicare Trust Funds	$0.4 Trillion	N/A
Source: Data compiled and synthesized from U.S. Department of the Treasury reports.[4] Figures are approximate and rounded for clarity.			

This table reveals the profound political and economic challenges of an inflation strategy. The "inflation tax" would be levied upon:

- **American Savers and Retirees:** Through their holdings in mutual funds, pension funds, and insurance policies, tens of millions of Americans are indirect holders of Treasury debt. An inflation policy would directly erode the value of their retirement savings.
- **The Federal Reserve:** While devaluing the Fed's holdings might seem like a wash, it has complex implications for monetary policy and the profits the Fed remits to the Treasury.
- **Key Geopolitical Allies:** Japan and the United Kingdom are two of the largest foreign holders of U.S. debt. Intentionally devaluing their assets would be a major diplomatic affront, damaging key alliances and undermining trust in the U.S. as a steward of the global financial system.[5]
- **Social Security and Medicare:** As previously noted, the largest single holder of intragovernmental debt is the Social Security trust fund. Devaluing these assets would accelerate the timeline to insolvency for the nation's primary retirement and disability programs, a politically catastrophic outcome.

In short, a policy of inflating away the debt is not a clever financial maneuver against faceless foreign creditors; it is a direct tax on the savings of Americans and the stability of the global financial system.

Section 5: Constraints, Perils, and Unintended Consequences

While the theoretical case for using inflation to manage debt can be articulated, a sober analysis reveals that for the United States, such a strategy is not merely imprudent but actively self-destructive. The constraints are immense, the economic perils are severe, and the unintended consequences could permanently damage America's economic standing in the world. This section details the powerful forces that render an intentional inflation strategy unviable and exceedingly dangerous.

5.1 The Credibility Trap: The Impossibility of Repeatedly "Tricking" Markets

The entire efficacy of an inflation-based debt reduction strategy hinges on the element of surprise.[19] Once a government and its central bank demonstrate a willingness to tolerate or engineer high inflation to devalue their liabilities, their credibility is fundamentally compromised. Financial markets learn from experience. Having been "tricked" once, investors will not allow it to happen again.[19]

This leads to a "credibility trap." After an initial episode of surprise inflation, investors will permanently adjust their expectations. They will demand a significantly higher "inflation premium" on all future debt issued by the government to compensate for the newly revealed risk that their investment could be devalued again.[16] This has several disastrous consequences:

- **Permanently Higher Borrowing Costs:** The government's cost of borrowing would be structurally higher for the foreseeable future, even if inflation returns to normal levels. The loss of credibility means the Treasury would have to pay more to attract lenders, worsening the long-term fiscal outlook.[16]
- **Loss of Monetary Policy Effectiveness:** A central bank that is seen as complicit in an inflationary default loses its most valuable asset: its inflation-fighting credibility. Its pronouncements and targets will no longer be trusted, making it much harder and more costly (in terms of lost output and higher unemployment) to bring future inflation under control.
- **Increased Financial Instability:** The uncertainty created by a government willing to debase its own debt would lead to higher volatility in bond markets and the broader financial system.

In essence, the short-term gain from a one-time inflation surprise would be paid for with the long-term pain of permanently higher interest rates and a loss of policy credibility, likely

leaving the nation in a worse fiscal position than when it started.

5.2 The Economic Fallout: Distorted Investment, Eroded Savings, and Social Costs

Beyond the financial market consequences, a policy of high and volatile inflation inflicts severe damage on the real economy and the well-being of citizens. Price stability is a public good, and its absence leads to widespread economic and social harm.[10]

- **Erosion of Savings and Purchasing Power:** Inflation is a direct tax on anyone holding cash or fixed-income assets. It systematically erodes the value of household savings, particularly harming retirees and those on fixed incomes.[11] The recent inflation spike demonstrated this clearly, with rising prices for essentials like food and rent significantly reducing real incomes and causing widespread economic anxiety.[11]
- **Distortion of Economic Decisions:** In a high-inflation environment, price signals become noisy and unreliable. Businesses find it difficult to plan for the long term, leading them to shorten their investment horizons and shy away from productivity-enhancing projects.[10] Households may be induced to hoard goods or speculate in hard assets rather than engage in productive saving and investment.[10]
- **Negative Impact on Growth:** The Penn Wharton Budget Model provides a quantitative estimate of this damage. Their analysis shows that while higher inflation reduces real debt, the negative effects from the increased real tax burden on capital and heightened uncertainty dominate. They project that permanently increasing the inflation target from 2% to 3% would ultimately reduce the long-term capital stock by 1% and lower real GDP by 0.3%. A higher inflation target of 5% would cause the capital stock to fall by 3% and GDP by 1%.[19] This demonstrates that attempting to inflate away the debt is a negative-sum game for the economy as a whole.

5.3 The Global Reserve Currency Paradox: Why the U.S. Faces Unique Constraints

The United States occupies a unique position in the global financial system. The U.S. dollar is the world's primary reserve currency, and U.S. Treasury securities are considered the ultimate "safe asset" for global investors, central banks, and corporations.[4] This status confers what has been termed an "exorbitant privilege," creating a deep and consistent global demand for U.S. debt. This demand allows the U.S. government to borrow at lower interest rates than it

otherwise could, a significant and ongoing economic advantage.

An intentional policy of devaluing Treasury securities via inflation would be a direct and catastrophic betrayal of this global trust. It would signal to the world that the "safe asset" is, in fact, not safe from expropriation by its issuer. This would shatter the foundation of the dollar's reserve currency status and could trigger a global shift away from U.S. assets.[5]

This creates a paradox: the very factor that makes U.S. debt so easy to finance (its perceived safety) is what makes a policy of inflationary default so uniquely self-destructive. While a smaller country might attempt such a strategy with primarily domestic consequences, for the U.S., it would mean dismantling the architecture of the post-WWII global financial system from which it derives immense economic and geopolitical power. The long-term strategic loss from forfeiting the dollar's role would dwarf any conceivable short-term fiscal gain.

5.4 The Limits of the Strategy: Why Inflation is Not a Panacea for Primary Deficits

This is the final, dispositive argument against the inflation strategy. The fundamental source of the United States' long-term fiscal problem is not the existing *stock* of debt accumulated from past crises. Rather, it is the ongoing *flow* of projected annual deficits, driven by a structural gap between spending commitments and revenue collections.[16]

This gap is known as the "primary deficit"—the deficit that exists even before accounting for interest payments on the debt. The CBO projects large and growing primary deficits for decades to come, primarily due to rising healthcare costs and the demographics of an aging population driving up spending on Social Security and Medicare.[3]

Inflation does nothing to solve this underlying structural problem. Even in the fantastical scenario where inflation could eliminate 100% of the currently outstanding debt, the government would, under current law, immediately begin running large primary deficits the very next year, setting the nation on a new path to an unsustainable debt load.[16] The engine of debt accumulation would still be running at full speed. Therefore, focusing on inflation as a solution is a dangerous distraction from the real task of fiscal reform, which requires policymakers to make difficult choices about the future size and scope of government spending and taxation.

Section 6: Historical Case Studies: Theory Meets

Reality

Economic theory provides a framework for understanding the debt-inflation nexus, but history provides the empirical evidence. By examining key periods in U.S. history when the nation grappled with high debt or high inflation, we can test the validity of these theories and draw crucial lessons. The post-World War II era, the "Great Inflation" of the 1960s and 1970s, and the recent post-pandemic period each offer a unique lens through which to view the real-world consequences of fiscal and monetary policy choices.

6.1 The Post-WWII "Great Debt Reduction": A Misleading Precedent?

The period following World War II is often cited by those who are less concerned about current debt levels. After the war, the U.S. debt-to-GDP ratio stood at an unprecedented peak of over 100%.[3] Yet, over the next three decades, this ratio fell dramatically, reaching a low point in the mid-1970s.[3] This successful deleveraging has led some to believe that the U.S. can simply "grow its way out" of its current debt predicament. However, a closer look reveals that the conditions of that era are largely unrepeatable, making it a poor and potentially misleading guide for today's policymakers.

While moderate inflation did play a role in this reduction—the debt's growth after the war closely matched the rate of inflation, meaning its real value fell—it was far from the primary driver.[12] The "Great Debt Reduction" was primarily accomplished through a unique and powerful confluence of factors:

- **Exceptional Real Economic Growth:** The U.S. emerged from WWII as the world's undisputed industrial and economic superpower. Its manufacturing base was intact while its major competitors' were in ruins. This unleashed a multi-decade boom in productivity and real GDP growth, causing the denominator of the debt-to-GDP ratio to grow much faster than the numerator.
- **Financial Repression:** For much of this period, the government, in coordination with the Federal Reserve, maintained a policy of "financial repression." Interest rates were kept artificially low, often below the rate of inflation, resulting in negative real interest rates. Regulations effectively forced domestic financial institutions, like banks and insurance companies, to hold a significant portion of their assets in these low-yield government bonds. This created a captive source of cheap financing for the government.
- **Primary Surpluses:** For many of these years, the government ran primary budget surpluses, meaning that revenues exceeded non-interest spending. This fiscal discipline ensured that the nominal stock of debt grew slowly or not at all.

None of these conditions exist today. Real GDP growth is projected to be modest, not explosive. Globalized financial markets make financial repression on the scale of the 1950s impossible without triggering massive capital flight. And the government is projected to run large and growing primary *deficits*, not surpluses, for the foreseeable future. Therefore, relying on the post-WWII precedent as a model for current debt reduction is a historical fallacy.

6.2 The "Great Inflation" of 1965-1982: A Cautionary Tale of Fiscal Imbalance and Monetary Policy

If the post-war era shows the benefits of growth, the period from 1965 to 1982 serves as a stark cautionary tale about the dangers of losing control of inflation. The "Great Inflation" was the defining macroeconomic event of the second half of the 20th century, a nearly two-decade period during which inflation, which had been stable at just over 1% in the early 1960s, ratcheted upward to a peak of over 14% in 1980.[24]

The roots of this inflationary spiral were complex, but fiscal pressures played a key role. The Johnson administration's simultaneous pursuit of the Vietnam War and major "Great Society" domestic spending programs created significant fiscal imbalances that complicated monetary policy.[24] Policymakers at the time were also influenced by a belief in a stable "Phillips Curve" trade-off, thinking they could accept slightly higher inflation in exchange for permanently lower unemployment—a theory that later proved to be flawed.[24]

This period vividly demonstrates the immense social and economic costs of unanchored inflation expectations. The economic environment was characterized by uncertainty, poor investment, slow growth, and four separate recessions—a phenomenon dubbed "stagflation".[10] It took the deep and painful recessions induced by Federal Reserve Chair Paul Volcker's aggressive monetary tightening in the early 1980s to finally break the back of inflation and restore the central bank's credibility. The lesson of the Great Inflation is clear: allowing inflation to become entrenched is a policy failure with severe consequences, and the process of restoring price stability is arduous and costly. It stands as a powerful historical argument against any temptation to view inflation as a benign policy tool.

6.3 The Post-Pandemic Era: A Modern Test of the Debt-Inflation Nexus

The period following the COVID-19 pandemic provides the most recent and relevant case

study of the intricate relationship between fiscal stimulus, debt accumulation, inflation, and interest rates. In response to the economic shutdown, the U.S. government enacted trillions of dollars in fiscal support, including stimulus checks, enhanced unemployment benefits, and loans to businesses.[1] This response, while cushioning the economy from a deeper collapse, led to the largest single-year increase in the national debt since WWII.[1]

The events that followed played out like a textbook example of the causal channels discussed in this report:

1. **Demand-Pull Inflation:** The massive injection of fiscal support fueled a surge in consumer demand that quickly outstripped the capacity of pandemic-disrupted supply chains, triggering the highest inflation in 40 years.[10] Peak inflation reached 9.0%.[11]
2. **Monetary Policy Response:** In response to this inflation surge, the Federal Reserve embarked on an aggressive campaign of interest rate hikes, raising its policy rate 11 times between March 2022 and July 2023.[11]
3. **Explosion in Debt Service Costs:** This rapid tightening of monetary policy led to a dramatic increase in the Treasury's borrowing costs. The yield on 10-year Treasury securities rose from 1.1% to a high of 5.0%.[11] As a result, the average effective interest rate paid on the national debt doubled, and annual net interest costs soared, rising from $352 billion to $881 billion and surpassing defense spending.[3]

This episode is a perfect real-world illustration of the "fiscal whiplash" effect. A short-term policy of massive deficit spending provided immediate economic relief but led directly to an inflation problem. The necessary cure for that inflation—higher interest rates—then created a severe and long-lasting fiscal wound in the form of structurally higher debt service costs. This modern test case powerfully validates the argument that in a high-debt environment, the fiscal costs of the fight against inflation can easily outweigh any temporary benefits that inflation might provide.

Historical Period	Key Fiscal/Monetary Event	Primary Outcome for Debt/Inflation	Key Lesson
Post-WWII (1946-1974)	High initial debt (>100% of GDP)	Debt-to-GDP ratio fell dramatically	High real GDP growth and financial repression, not inflation, were the primary drivers of debt reduction. Conditions are not replicable.

Great Inflation (1965-1982)	Fiscal expansion (Vietnam/Great Society)	Inflation spiraled to double digits	Unanchored inflation expectations cause severe economic pain and require costly recessions to correct.
Post-Pandemic (2020-Present)	Massive fiscal stimulus	Surge in inflation followed by aggressive rate hikes	In a high-debt environment, the interest rate backlash from fighting inflation can create a structural increase in debt service costs that worsens the long-term fiscal outlook.

Section 7: Synthesis and Concluding Analysis

The preceding sections have dissected the multifaceted relationship between U.S. national debt and inflation, moving from foundational concepts to causal mechanisms, strategic considerations, and historical precedents. This concluding section synthesizes these threads to provide a definitive assessment of the user's core query, clarifying the plausibility of using inflation as a debt strategy and refocusing on the true nature of the nation's fiscal challenge.

7.1 Reassessing the "Wanting Inflation" Hypothesis: Plausibility vs. Prudence

The analysis confirms that the *economic mechanism* for reducing the real burden of the national debt via unexpected inflation is valid. A government with large, long-term, fixed-rate nominal liabilities can indeed benefit from a surprise debasement of its currency. However, the

conclusion of this report is that for the United States, the notion of an administration *intentionally and strategically* pursuing such a policy is not plausible. The gap between theoretical possibility and practical viability is a chasm filled with unacceptable risks.

A deliberate inflation strategy is fundamentally a strategy of deception, and one that can only work once. The immediate consequences of such a betrayal of trust would be catastrophic:

- **Domestically,** it would impose a direct and regressive tax on the savings of American households, retirees, and pension funds, while also devaluing the assets of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, creating a political firestorm.
- **Internationally,** it would expropriate the wealth of allies and other nations that have placed their faith in U.S. Treasury securities as the world's safe asset, jeopardizing key geopolitical relationships.
- **Economically,** it would shatter the credibility of both the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve, leading to permanently higher borrowing costs, lower investment, slower long-term growth, and the potential loss of the dollar's coveted reserve currency status.

The economic, political, and geopolitical costs so vastly outweigh the temporary fiscal benefits that no prudent administration would choose this path. It is more accurate to view the recent inflation not as a deliberate policy choice, but as the predictable and unintended *consequence* of a massive fiscal response to a crisis in a high-debt environment. The "benefit" of debt erosion was an accidental byproduct of policies chosen for other reasons, and it has been more than paid for by the subsequent and ongoing pain of higher interest costs.

7.2 The Unsustainable Trajectory: The Primacy of Structural Deficits

Ultimately, the debate over using inflation to manage the existing stock of debt is a dangerous distraction from the far more pressing issue facing the United States. The core of the nation's fiscal challenge is not the debt we have already accumulated, but the debt we are projected to accumulate in the future. This is driven by a fundamental, structural mismatch between projected government spending and projected revenues—the primary deficit.[16]

As projected by the CBO and other non-partisan analysts, spending on major entitlement programs, particularly Medicare and Social Security, is set to grow significantly faster than the economy and the tax base that supports them, largely due to the retirement of the baby boom generation and rising healthcare costs.[3] This is the engine driving the unsustainable debt trajectory.

Inflation does nothing to fix this underlying structural imbalance. It cannot reduce the number of retirees claiming benefits, nor can it control the rising cost of medical procedures. It is a

tool that, at best, can only affect past obligations, while leaving the drivers of future obligations untouched. Focusing on financial maneuvers to manage the stock of debt is akin to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic while ignoring the iceberg of primary deficits dead ahead.

7.3 Recommendations and Forward Outlook: Navigating the Path to Fiscal Sustainability

There are no easy or magical solutions to the U.S. fiscal challenge. The path to a sustainable fiscal future requires confronting the primary deficit through deliberate and often difficult policy choices. The available options fall into three broad categories:

1. **Revenue Increases:** Reforming the tax code to generate more revenue. This could involve raising rates, broadening the tax base, or introducing new taxes.
2. **Spending Reductions:** Reforming major spending programs to slow their rate of growth. This would require addressing the long-term cost drivers in Social Security and, especially, federal healthcare programs.
3. **Pro-Growth Policies:** Implementing policies that increase the long-term potential growth rate of the U.S. economy. Faster economic growth expands the tax base and makes any given level of debt more manageable.

A durable solution will likely require some combination of all three approaches. Navigating this path will require political courage and a willingness to make trade-offs. What is certain is that resorting to the siren song of inflation as an easy way out would be a profound policy error. It would fail to solve the fundamental problem while simultaneously inflicting immense damage on the U.S. economy, its citizens, and its standing in the world. The sovereign's dilemma can only be resolved through fiscal prudence, not monetary artifice.

Works cited

1. Understanding the National Debt | U.S. Treasury Fiscal Data, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/national-debt/
2. What is the US national debt and how has it grown over time? - USAFacts, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://usafacts.org/articles/what-is-the-us-national-debt-and-how-has-it-grown-over-time/
3. National debt of the United States - Wikipedia, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_debt_of_the_United_States
4. The Federal Government Has Borrowed Trillions. Who Owns All that Debt?, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.pgpf.org/article/the-federal-government-has-borrowed-trillions-but

-who-owns-all-that-debt/
5. Foreign Holdings of Federal Debt | Congress.gov, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/RS22331
6. Key facts about the U.S. national debt | Pew Research Center, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/08/12/key-facts-about-the-us-national-debt/
7. United States National Debt, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.nationalpriorities.org/campaigns/us-federal-debt-who/
8. Who holds US national debt? - FRED Blog, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://fredblog.stlouisfed.org/2025/03/who-holds-us-national-debt/
9. The Fed - What is inflation, and how does the Federal Reserve evaluate changes in the rate of inflation?, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.federalreserve.gov/faqs/economy_14419.htm
10. The Inflationary Risks of Rising Federal Deficits and Debt | The Budget Lab at Yale, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://budgetlab.yale.edu/research/inflationary-risks-rising-federal-deficits-and-debt
11. The Consequences of Debt | The U.S. House Committee on the Budget, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://budget.house.gov/press-release/the-consequences-of-debt
12. History of the Debt - TreasuryDirect, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://treasurydirect.gov/government/historical-debt-outstanding/
13. National Deficit | U.S. Treasury Fiscal Data, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://fiscaldata.treasury.gov/americas-finance-guide/national-deficit/
14. Bonds 102: Inflation's Impact on Bond Performance - PIMCO, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.pimco.com/us/en/resources/education/bonds-102-inflations-impact-on-bond-performance
15. Inflation and Public Debt - CEMLA, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.cemla.org/PDF/monetaria/PUB-MON-V-01-02.pdf
16. What are the risks of a rising federal debt? | Brookings, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/what-are-the-risks-of-a-rising-federal-debt/
17. How Does Inflation Affect the Federal Budget?, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.pgpf.org/article/how-does-inflation-affect-the-federal-budget/
18. Bonds, Interest Rates, and the Impact of Inflation | Wealth and Investments | Rockland Trust, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.rocklandtrust.com/wealth-and-investments/bonds--interest-rates--and-the-impact-of-inflation
19. Can Higher Inflation Help Offset the Effects of Larger Government ..., accessed on October 14, 2025, https://budgetmodel.wharton.upenn.edu/issues/2021/10/21/can-inflation-offset-government-debt
20. 9 Effects of Inflation on Measurement of Fiscal Deficits: Conventional Versus

Operational Measures in - IMF eLibrary, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.elibrary.imf.org/display/book/9781557751928/ch009.xml
21. Deficit Tracker | Bipartisan Policy Center, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/deficit-tracker/
22. Government Debt Management and Inflation with Real and Nominal Bonds - LSE, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.lse.ac.uk/CFM/assets/pdf/CFM-Discussion-Papers-2024/CFMDP2024-13-Paper.pdf
23. Which countries own the most US debt? - USAFacts, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://usafacts.org/articles/which-countries-own-the-most-us-debt/
24. The Great Inflation | Federal Reserve History, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.federalreservehistory.org/essays/great-inflation
25. History of the Debt — TreasuryDirect, accessed on October 14, 2025, https://www.treasurydirect.gov/government/historical-debt-outstanding/