By: Barira Saif

Reforming Money and Banking; How a full-reserve, interest-free system can eliminate government debt, deficits and inflation

From the prices consumers pay for goods and availability of jobs to the taxes citizens contribute to the government, money and banking shapes almost every aspect of a country's economy. Yet despite their central importance, the way money is created and managed remains controversial. The dominant global framework is fractional reserve banking, where commercial banks create most of the money supply by issuing loans and charge interest on those loans. While this system has facilitated economic growth over the past century, many economists and reformers argue that it also creates persistent problems, including rising government debt, budget deficits, and inflation. As a result, alternative proposals have surfaced, including the idea of a full-reserve, interest-free banking system. This article examines whether such an alternative could reduce or eliminate government debt, shrink deficits, and help control inflation, drawing on both academic theory and real data from Pakistan's recent economic challenges.

In most countries today, money is primarily created by commercial banks, not by central banks. When a bank makes a loan, it does not typically transfer funds from someone else's savings. Instead, it credits the borrower's account with a new deposit, effectively creating new money (Wikipedia, Full-reserve banking). This process is called fractional reserve banking because banks are only required to hold a small fraction of deposits as reserves and can lend out the rest. Under this arrangement, loans create deposits, and deposits make up the bulk of the money supply. Critics argue that this means money is created as debt, and because interest must be paid on that debt, the total amount owed in the economy often grows faster than the money supply itself. This inherent debt-creation mechanism is seen by reform advocates as a structural flaw that drives ongoing debt accumulation in both the public and private sectors.

Government borrowing is deeply tied to this system. When a government runs a budget deficit that is, when its spending exceeds its tax revenue it issues bonds to finance the gap. These bonds typically carry interest payments, creating an ongoing obligation for future budgets. In many countries, interest costs absorb a significant share of government revenue. For example, research on Pakistan shows that the government's total public debt reached about Rs80.6 trillion by the end of fiscal year 2025, with the debt-to-GDP ratio rising to around 70 percent (Kiani, 2025). Despite efforts at fiscal discipline, the government continued to rely heavily on domestic borrowing to finance a fiscal deficit of Rs7.1 trillion, illustrating the persistent strain of debt servicing on public finances (Kiani, 2025).

One proposed reform is full-reserve banking, also known as 100 percent reserve banking. In this system, banks would be required to hold the full amount of each customer's demand deposits in reserve, eliminating their ability to create money through lending (Wikipedia, Full-reserve banking). Under a full-reserve system, deposit accounts would become safe storage and payment facilities, while lending would be conducted by separate investment entities using funds that savers have explicitly agreed to invest. This reform effectively transfers the power to create money from private banks to the central bank or treasury. Central authorities would issue new money directly for public needs, such as infrastructure, social services, or economic stimulus.

Proponents argue that a full-reserve system would break the link between money and debt, making money creation a public function rather than a private banking activity. According to some researchers, allowing the central authority to issue debt-free money could permanently reduce consolidated government debt because money creation would no longer be tied to borrowing (Arestis & Sawyer, 2025). In this way, governments might avoid the heavy interest costs associated with traditional borrowing and reduce their reliance on issuing interest-bearing bonds. For countries like Pakistan, which has experienced rapid debt growth, this idea has intuitive appeal.

Interest-free banking complements the full-reserve concept by removing interest charges on loans and government debt. Models of interest-free finance have roots in various economic traditions, including Islamic finance, where charging interest is viewed as morally and socially undesirable. In an interest-free system, financial institutions could generate profit through fee-based services, profit sharing, or equity-like arrangements rather than fixed interest payments. Advocates of interest-free finance argue that removing interest obligations would reduce the long-term debt burden on governments and private borrowers alike.

The argument against interest and debt-based money focuses on the notion that debt servicing itself creates inflationary pressures. Many mainstream economists link inflation to excess growth in the money supply relative to economic output. When central banks or commercial banks expand the money supply through loans or quantitative easing without corresponding increases in productivity or goods production, prices tend to rise. Reform proponents claim that by issuing money only to match real economic needs rather than to support private credit creation, inflationary pressures could be moderated. Some academic analyses suggest that full-reserve banking might deliver similar results to current systems in terms of economic output and employment, but with reduced government debt levels and smoother interest rate responses (Cambridge Journal of Economics, 2025).

Despite the potential advantages, critics of full-reserve and interest-free banking point to several challenges. First, the transition from fractional reserve banking to a full-reserve system would represent a radical overhaul of the financial system. Commercial banks would lose the ability to create money through lending, which could restrict credit availability to businesses and households. Without careful planning, this could slow economic growth, increase the cost of borrowing, or require alternative credit markets to spring up quickly. Research on full-reserve proposals highlights that they do not automatically guarantee greater financial stability, particularly if other financial sectors such as shadow banking remain unregulated (University of Cape Town, 2025). Restricting money creation to central authorities may also shift lending to unregulated areas, potentially introducing new systemic risks.

Second, inflation is influenced by factors beyond the money supply. Supply chain disruptions, energy prices, agricultural output changes, and fiscal policy decisions all affect price levels. Therefore, even a system that tightly controls money creation may still experience inflationary pressures from external shocks or domestic supply constraints. Central banks in many countries adjust monetary policy to balance inflation and growth, and critics argue that full-reserve systems could weaken monetary policy tools or require entirely new mechanisms.

Third, political and institutional resistance could be significant. Central banks, commercial banks, and governments have established roles in the current system that confers power and influence. Shifting money creation to the public sector would alter these power structures, potentially prompting resistance from stakeholders who benefit from the status quo. Furthermore, full-reserve banking has never been implemented at scale in a modern economy, raising questions about real-world feasibility and transition costs.

The case of Pakistan provides a real-world context for these debates. The country's public debt has risen substantially, with the total reaching over Rs80 trillion in recent years. The debt-to-GDP ratio has climbed to around 70 percent, reflecting persistent deficits and heavy reliance on both domestic and external borrowing to fund government operations (Kiani, 2025; The Friday Times, 2025). Although Pakistan has made some fiscal improvements, including generating a primary surplus in some years, the overall debt burden remains a threat to long-term fiscal stability. These dynamics highlight the difficulties of managing public finances within a debt-based monetary system, especially when interest payments consume a large share of government revenue.

Pakistan's reliance on external financing through international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) further illustrates the constraints of conventional monetary and fiscal frameworks. For example, the IMF has approved significant bailout funds for Pakistan as part of economic stabilization efforts, conditioned on fiscal reforms and macroeconomic adjustments. While this support has helped stabilize reserves and reduce inflation temporarily, it has also reinforced the pattern of borrowing as a response to fiscal pressures. This pattern underscores how debt issuance a core feature of fractional reserve banking economies can become deeply entrenched.

Proponents of full-reserve banking argue that removing the necessity to issue government bonds could free up revenue for productive spending. If governments could issue debt-free money directly for public investment rather than borrowing from investors with interest obligations, budget deficits might shrink or disappear. This could, in theory, allow greater investment in health care, education, infrastructure, and poverty reduction without incurring unsustainable debt burdens. However, opponents note that simply printing money to finance spending, even without interest, could still be inflationary if it is not matched by real increases in economic output.

Another argument for reform is that current banking systems can amplify boom-and-bust cycles. Studies of fractional reserve banking indicate that because banks create money when they lend, credit cycles can expand rapidly during economic upturns and shrink sharply during downturns, contributing to instability. A fully backed system where money creation is controlled by a central authority could smooth these cycles, although evidence from full-reserve simulations is still largely theoretical.

In conclusion, the debate over full-reserve, interest-free monetary systems raises fundamental questions about the nature of money, who should have the authority to create it, and how best to balance economic growth with stability. Supporters argue that such reforms could reduce government debt, lower interest burdens, and help control inflation by aligning money creation with real economic needs rather than private debt expansion. Critics, however, highlight substantial implementation challenges, potential impacts on credit availability, and the fact that inflation can arise from many sources beyond money supply growth.

While full-reserve and interest-free banking remain on the fringe of mainstream economic policy, the challenges faced by economies like Pakistan demonstrate why discussions about reform continue. Whether countries adopt such radical changes remains uncertain, but the conversation contributes valuable perspectives on money, debt, and economic stability.

References

- Cambridge Journal of Economics. (2025). *Money creation under full-reserve banking: A stock–flow consistent model*.
- Kiani, K. (2025, October 2). *Public debt hits Rs80.6tr despite lower interest costs*. Dawn.
- The Friday Times. (2025, December 4). *Fiscal stability improves but rising public debt still threatens Pakistan's economy*.
- University of Cape Town. (2025). *The economics of full reserve banking*.
- Khalilullah, Q. (n.d.). *Full reserve banking: Part I & III*. The News.
- Institute of Policy Studies. (n.d.). *A solution for tackling huge government debt, interest costs, and inflation in Pakistan: Full reserve banking model*. Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Journal of Monetary Economics. (n.d.). *Deficits, money and inflation*. Elsevier.
- Arslan, M. (n.d.). *Reforming money & banking*.
- Mises Institute. (n.d.). *Full reserve banking and path to a single country gold standard*. Auburn, AL: Mises Institute.