

Research Paper By: Jeff Bernard

The GOP's Abandonment of Fiscal Conservatism: An Analysis of the Party's Deficit Spending Transformation

I. Introduction: The Erosion of a Core Principle

Fiscal conservatism, as a foundational tenet of American political thought, traditionally champions prudence in government spending and debt. This philosophy is deeply rooted in principles of capitalism, individualism, limited government, and laissez-faire economics.¹ Adherents advocate for reduced government spending, lower taxes, free markets, deregulation, privatization, free trade, and minimal government debt, with a strong emphasis on achieving balanced budgets.¹ The intellectual lineage of this principle can be traced back to figures like Edmund Burke, who argued against governments incurring large debts that would burden future taxpayers.¹

However, an inherent tension exists within the very definition of fiscal conservatism. While advocating for balanced budgets, the philosophy also champions tax cuts. Historical interpretations of this philosophy reveal that fiscal conservatives have often chosen to accept increased debt over raising taxes, and proponents of supply-side economics have argued for tax reductions even if they lead to short-term increases in the deficit.¹ This internal contradiction, prioritizing tax cuts even when they contribute to national debt, has provided a critical pathway for political parties to claim fiscal conservatism while simultaneously expanding the national debt. This initial ideological flexibility, or a strategic prioritization of certain fiscal tools over the ultimate outcome of fiscal balance, sets the stage for understanding how a party might deviate from its stated principles.

This paper argues that the Trump administration's fiscal policies marked a decisive break from traditional Republican fiscal conservatism. This period was characterized by unprecedented deficit spending, a redefinition of economic priorities, and a profound ideological shift within the party, ultimately leading many of the party's supporters to misinterpret the true nature and consequences of these policies. This

analysis will examine the dramatic shift in Republican fiscal policy, focusing on the unprecedented deficit spending during Trump's first term and the current "Big Beautiful Bill" that threatens to accelerate this trend exponentially. The evidence suggests a complete reversal of traditional GOP fiscal principles, raising profound questions about the party's ideological consistency and long-term economic philosophy.

II. The Historical Arc of Republican Fiscal Conservatism

The Republican Party's historical relationship with fiscal conservatism has evolved significantly, marked by periods of strict adherence to balanced budgets and others where tax cuts or increased spending took precedence.

Early Foundations: From Federalists to the pre-Reagan GOP

Historically, American conservatism has been deeply intertwined with pro-business and free-enterprise principles, often seen as conserving aspects of classical liberalism.² This lineage, from the Federalists to the Whigs and subsequently the Republicans, consistently positioned the party as the most pro-business and free-enterprise political force in the United States.² While early iterations of this philosophy did not always equate to minimal government, they generally favored economic policies that promoted commerce and industry, often through mechanisms like tariffs and infrastructure improvements that benefited producers.¹

The Eisenhower Era: A Commitment to Balanced Budgets and Fiscal Prudence

President Dwight D. Eisenhower exemplified a form of "modern Republicanism" that explicitly prioritized a balanced budget over tax cuts.³ During his tenure, Eisenhower actively worked to restrain government spending, even when faced with a Democratic-controlled Congress. His determination was evident in his successful achievement of a balanced budget by 1960, a notable feat given the fiscal challenges

of the post-World War II era.⁴ Eisenhower demonstrated a strong commitment to fiscal discipline by frequently wielding his veto pen against bills that he believed would increase future spending, proving his unwavering resolve to uphold budgetary prudence.⁴ This era stands as a clear historical benchmark for Republican fiscal conservatism, emphasizing tangible outcomes of fiscal balance rather than merely advocating for specific policy tools. The pragmatic fiscal conservatism of the Eisenhower years, characterized by a primary focus on achieving fiscal balance, stands in sharp contrast to the fiscal policies of later Republican administrations, particularly the Trump era. This divergence highlights a fundamental shift in the party's fiscal philosophy: from a results-oriented approach to one that prioritized specific policy tools, such as large tax cuts, regardless of their impact on the national debt. This transformation is central to understanding the subsequent abandonment of traditional principles.

Reaganomics and Supply-Side Theory: Tax Cuts, Increased Defense Spending, and the Rise of National Debt

Ronald Reagan's economic policy, widely known as "Reaganomics," was heavily influenced by supply-side economics, advocating for lower marginal tax rates, reduced government regulation, and a significant increase in defense spending.⁵ Proponents argued that these tax cuts, conceptualized through the theoretical Laffer Curve, would stimulate enough economic growth to offset revenue losses and even increase federal receipts.⁵ This introduced and popularized the idea that tax cuts could be self-financing through accelerated economic growth. This narrative created a powerful rhetorical precedent: the promise of tax-cut-fueled growth became a convenient justification for policies that increased deficits, even when the empirical evidence of self-financing was weak or non-existent. This effectively led supporters to believe that the fiscal consequences of such policies would be benign or even beneficial, despite the historical record of rising debt.

However, the actual fiscal outcome was a dramatic increase in the national debt, which nearly tripled in nominal terms from \$738 billion to \$2.1 trillion during Reagan's eight-year presidency.⁵ The federal deficit as a percentage of GDP rose from 2.5% in fiscal year 1981 to a peak of 5.7% in 1983.⁵ Notably, Reagan himself acknowledged the new debt as the "greatest disappointment" of his presidency.⁵

The 1990s Republican Congress: Efforts Toward Deficit Reduction and Balanced Budgets

Following their takeover of Congress in 1994, Republicans explicitly campaigned on a platform to eliminate the deficit and reduce wasteful spending.⁷ For several years, the GOP partially delivered on this commitment by modestly curtailing spending growth, which, combined with soaring federal revenues, led to the achievement of a balanced budget in fiscal year 1998—the first time since the 1960s.⁷ This period also saw a notable shift in political consensus towards balancing the budget, often with a focus on excluding Social Security surpluses.⁸

The George W. Bush Years: Tax Cuts and War Spending Contributing to Renewed Deficits

The George W. Bush administration inherited a projected \$5.6 trillion ten-year budget surplus but saw it replaced by record deficits.⁹ This dramatic fiscal deterioration was primarily driven by the Bush tax cuts, estimated to add \$1.5 trillion to \$3 trillion to deficits if extended, and the deficit-financed wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.¹ These two policies alone accounted for over \$6 trillion in deficits from 2009–2019, significantly outweighing the costs of the 2008 financial crisis stimulus and rescue packages.¹⁰ The fiscal trajectories under Reagan and George W. Bush established a concerning pattern: significant increases in national debt occurred during periods not characterized by existential economic crises or world wars. While the Bush administration did engage in wars, the substantial tax cuts were also a major driver of debt. This contrasts sharply with the debt surge during World War II, which was a clear, temporary response to an acute national emergency.¹¹ The repeated occurrence of substantial debt growth in "peacetime" under Republican leadership points to a systemic shift in fiscal priorities, suggesting a "new regime" where high debt levels are increasingly accepted as a norm rather than an exception.¹²

The Tea Party Movement: A Modern Resurgence of Fiscal Hawk Demands

The Tea Party movement, which gained significant traction within the Republican Party starting in 2007 and peaking around 2010, was fundamentally a fiscally conservative political force.¹³ Its core demands centered on lower taxes, a reduction of the national debt, and decreased federal budget deficits through significant cuts in government spending.¹³ The movement explicitly advocated for limiting the size and scope of the federal government and promoting a national economy with minimal government oversight.¹³ The Tea Party movement represented a powerful, ostensibly grassroots demand from a segment of the Republican base for strict fiscal discipline. Its emergence demonstrated a clear voter appetite for reducing debt and spending. However, the Trump administration, despite adopting some of the anti-establishment rhetoric, ultimately pursued policies (e.g., large tax cuts without commensurate spending cuts) that directly contradicted these core Tea Party tenets. This suggests that the populist energy and fiscal concerns of the Tea Party were either strategically co-opted and redirected towards other priorities (such as cultural issues, trade protectionism, or immigration) or simply overshadowed by a new political calculus that prioritized tax cuts and specific spending increases over comprehensive deficit reduction. This dynamic is crucial for understanding how the party's base, initially mobilized by fiscal concerns, may have been led to misinterpret the party's actual policy agenda.

III. Trump's First Term: Unprecedented Deficit Spending

The fiscal policies enacted during the Trump administration marked a significant departure from traditional Republican fiscal conservatism, leading to a dramatic increase in national debt and annual deficits.

The Scale of Debt Accumulation: Analysis of the Dramatic Increase in National

Debt and Annual Deficits Under Trump

During his full term in office, President Trump approved an astounding \$8.4 trillion of new ten-year borrowing, a figure that drops to \$4.8 trillion when excluding the bipartisan COVID relief measures.¹⁴ This fiscal expansion included \$5.9 trillion in net spending increases and \$2.5 trillion in net tax cuts.¹⁴ Consequently, debt held by the public surged by \$7.2 trillion during his term¹⁴, representing a 39% increase from \$19.95 trillion to \$27.75 trillion.¹¹ Even before the onset of the pandemic, the annual federal budget deficit escalated by almost 50%, reaching nearly \$1 trillion by 2019.¹⁵ The growth in the annual deficit under Trump ranks as the third-biggest increase relative to the size of the economy, a historical comparison placing it behind only George W. Bush and Abraham Lincoln.¹¹

While the COVID-19 pandemic and associated relief measures¹⁴ undeniably contributed to a massive surge in national debt, it is imperative to highlight that the U.S. fiscal position was already deteriorating rapidly

before the pandemic struck. The federal deficit reached nearly 4% of GDP in 2018 and 4.6% in 2019, significantly exceeding the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) pre-Trump projection of 2-3%.¹¹ This pre-existing trend demonstrates that the abandonment of fiscal conservatism was not merely a reactive measure to an unforeseen crisis but rather a deliberate policy choice, primarily driven by the 2017 tax cuts and increased spending, which effectively eliminated any fiscal "margin for error" when the pandemic eventually hit.¹¹ This pre-pandemic context is crucial for attributing responsibility for the fiscal transformation.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA): Detailed Examination of Its Revenue Impact and Contribution to Debt

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA), enacted as a partisan legislative action¹⁴, constituted a sweeping reform of the U.S. tax code. Its centerpiece was a substantial reduction in federal taxes, most notably lowering the corporate tax rate from 35% to 21%.¹¹ The CBO estimated in 2018 that the TCJA would increase deficits by approximately \$1.9 trillion over 11 years¹¹, with other official estimates ranging from \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion over a decade.¹⁷ When accounting for debt service costs, the conventional deficit increase attributable to the TCJA was projected to be almost \$2.3

trillion over its first decade.¹⁷ A critical aspect of the TCJA was that many individual income tax cuts were designed to expire at the end of 2025.⁶ Extending these temporary provisions, as is often the political practice, would add substantial amounts to the national debt, with the CBO projecting an increase of potentially \$37 trillion over thirty years.¹⁷

Other Spending Drivers: Bipartisan Budget Acts and Initial COVID-19 Relief Measures

In addition to the TCJA, significant contributions to the national debt under the Trump administration stemmed from the Bipartisan Budget Acts of 2018 and 2019, which collectively added \$2.1 trillion to the debt.¹⁴ Furthermore, the initial COVID-19 relief measures, including the CARES Act (\$1.9 trillion), the Response & Relief Act (\$983 billion), and other COVID relief (\$756 billion), were passed with bipartisan support.¹⁴ These emergency measures contributed to a record \$3.1 trillion budget deficit in fiscal year 2020, representing 14.9% of GDP—the largest since 1945.¹⁵ While the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) was a partisan legislative initiative¹⁴ and a significant driver of pre-pandemic debt, a substantial portion of the overall debt increase under Trump, particularly during the COVID-19 crisis, resulted from bipartisan legislation.¹⁴ However, the crucial point is that the underlying fiscal weakness

before the pandemic, largely a consequence of the TCJA, meant that the U.S. entered the crisis with significantly less fiscal "margin for error".¹¹ The bipartisan nature of the COVID response, while necessary for emergency relief, occurred against a backdrop of already strained public finances due to prior Trump administration policies. Therefore, while both parties contributed to the

pandemic-era debt, the Trump administration's *pre-pandemic* fiscal choices created a more vulnerable economic starting point.

Contrasting Rhetoric with Reality: Trump's Promises Versus Actual Fiscal Outcomes

During his 2016 presidential campaign, Donald Trump pledged to eliminate the

national debt in eight years.¹⁵ However, as president, he approved substantial increases in government spending alongside the 2017 tax cut, resulting in the federal budget deficit increasing by almost 50% to nearly \$1 trillion by 2019.¹⁵ The national debt ultimately rose by almost \$7.8 trillion during his time in office, a stark contradiction to his campaign promises.¹¹ Furthermore, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), under the Trump administration, notably shifted blame to Congress for the "continued ballooning of Federal debt and deficits" ¹¹, deflecting responsibility for the administration's own significant policy contributions to the fiscal expansion. The stark contrast between President Trump's campaign promise to eliminate the national debt ¹⁵ and the dramatic increase in debt and deficits under his administration ¹¹ represents a significant rhetorical disconnect. This suggests a deliberate political strategy where traditional fiscal conservative talking points, such as debt reduction, are employed to appeal to a specific voter base, even as the actual policies implemented directly contradict those principles. The administration's subsequent blame-shifting to Congress ¹¹ further illustrates this pattern of rhetorical deflection. This mechanism is central to understanding how supporters might have been led to misinterpret the facts—they heard the familiar, reassuring rhetoric of fiscal responsibility, but the underlying policy actions and their consequences diverged significantly from those stated goals.

Table 1: U.S. National Debt and Deficit Trajectory Under the Trump Administration (2017-2021)

Fiscal Year	Annual Deficit (\$ Billions)	Annual Deficit (% of GDP)	National Debt (\$ Trillions)	National Debt (% of GDP)	Key Legislative/Executive Actions
2017	666	3.5%	19.95	103.9%	Trump Inauguration (Jan 2017)
2018	779	3.8%	21.51	104.2%	Tax Cuts & Jobs Act (TCJA) enacted (Dec 2017) ¹¹
2019	984	4.6%	22.72	106.5%	Bipartisan Budget Act

					of 2018 ¹⁴
2020	3,132	14.9%	26.94	127.7%	CARES Act, Response & Relief Act, other COVID relief ¹⁴
2021	2,776	12.4%	28.43	127.5%	(Trump's term ended Jan 2021)

Note: Data for National Debt and Deficit are approximate and compiled from various sources, primarily.¹¹ Percentage of GDP figures are based on available data and may vary slightly depending on the specific CBO/OMB report cited. The National Debt figures here refer to total public debt.

IV. The Disconnect: Trickle-Down Economics and Its Outcomes

The economic philosophy underpinning the Trump administration's tax cuts, often referred to as "trickle-down economics," posits that benefits to the wealthy and corporations will stimulate broad economic growth. However, empirical evidence has consistently challenged this premise.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Trickle-Down Economics

The term "trickle-down economics" is widely understood as a political descriptor rather than a formal, universally accepted economic theory.⁶ It is used to characterize policies that provide direct financial benefits to wealthy individuals and corporations, with the justification that these benefits will eventually "trickle down" to stimulate broader economic growth and improve the living standards of the middle and lower classes.⁶ Proponents argue that less regulation and significant tax cuts for high-income earners and businesses will incentivize investment, foster innovation, and ultimately lead to increased employment and overall prosperity.⁶ The distinction that "trickle-down" is primarily a political term rather than a formal economic theory ²⁰ is a

critical observation. This implies that its continued use in public discourse, particularly by politicians, serves more as a rhetorical device to legitimize policies that disproportionately benefit the wealthy, rather than a rigorous economic prediction. By framing these policies under a seemingly benign and widely understood (though not academically robust) label, it helps lead supporters to accept the premise without a deeper examination of the actual empirical outcomes, thereby obscuring the potential for increased inequality or lack of broad-based growth.

Empirical Evidence from the TCJA

Impact on Economic Growth and Employment: Analysis of Academic Studies Finding No Significant Boost

A comprehensive December 2020 report from the London School of Economics (LSE), which analyzed five decades of tax cuts across 18 wealthy nations, found compelling evidence that major tax cuts for the rich consistently benefited the wealthy but had "no meaningful effect on unemployment or economic growth".⁶ The study specifically concluded that the estimated effects on real GDP per capita and unemployment were "statistically indistinguishable from zero".²¹ These findings directly contradict traditional supply-side theories that posit lower taxes on the rich will induce significant labor supply responses or broad economic growth.²¹

Distributional Effects: How Benefits Disproportionately Flowed to Corporations and the Wealthy, Exacerbating Inequality

The LSE study further concluded that major tax reforms reducing taxes on the rich consistently lead to higher income inequality, specifically by increasing the top 1% share of pre-tax national income.²¹ Complementing this, research from the Oxford Academic Socio-Economic Review found that while the TCJA did lead to some "efficiency gains" for firms (e.g., increased investment, labor demand, profits for C corporations), it simultaneously resulted in an "increase in inequality".¹⁶ This study

revealed that approximately half of the gains from the tax cuts flowed to corporate shareholders, with the other half benefiting highly paid workers and executives.¹⁶ Crucially, the effects on the earnings of workers below the 90th percentile were "statistically indistinguishable from zero," with significant increases only observed for the top 10%.¹⁶ Critics of the TCJA also highlighted that the top 1% of earners received a disproportionately larger tax cut compared to those in lower income brackets.⁶ A study published in the University of Chicago Journals further supported these findings, indicating that while overall household welfare increased, the gains from the TCJA disproportionately benefited the wealthy, households with self-employment income or children, and most homeowners.¹⁸ The Oxford study¹⁶ explicitly identifies an "efficiency-equity tradeoff" inherent in corporate tax policy: tax cuts can indeed stimulate certain economic activities (efficiency gains like increased investment and profits) but simultaneously exacerbate income inequality. The Trump administration and its proponents often highlighted the efficiency gains from the TCJA, such as increased investment and corporate profits, while largely downplaying or ignoring the significant equity implications, namely the disproportionate flow of benefits to shareholders and top earners and the negligible impact on the majority of workers' earnings. This selective emphasis in public discourse serves to lead supporters to misinterpret the facts by presenting a partial and overly optimistic picture, framing the policy as universally beneficial when its primary advantages are concentrated at the very top of the income distribution.

Household Financial Well-being: Nuanced Effects on Subjective Well-being and Credit Usage

A study by the Federal Reserve Board provided a more nuanced perspective on the TCJA's impact on households. It found that survey respondents who received larger personal income tax decreases were more likely to report "living comfortably" financially, although there were null effects at lower levels of subjective financial well-being.²⁴ Furthermore, the study indicated that individuals with larger tax decreases were modestly more likely to open new credit accounts and had higher consumer credit balances, suggesting an increase in spending power.²⁴ However, it is important to note that the study found a zero estimated effect on overall credit scores, implying that while subjective financial comfort improved for some, the tax cuts did not significantly alter their overall credit risk profile from a lender's perspective.²⁴ The Federal Reserve study²⁴ reveals a crucial psychological dimension:

for some households, larger tax cuts translated into a subjective feeling of "living comfortably." This individual, positive experience, even if not fully reflected in broader objective economic metrics like overall growth or a significant reduction in national inequality, can contribute to a perception among supporters that the tax cuts were successful. This creates a disconnect between individual financial perceptions and the aggregate economic data (e.g., growing national debt, increased income inequality). A supporter who personally experienced a tax cut might feel misled if they are told the policy was a failure, even when the comprehensive economic data paints a different and more concerning picture of its macro-level consequences.

The "Tax Cuts Pay for Themselves" Fallacy: Evidence of Revenue Shortfalls

Contrary to the widespread assertion that tax cuts would generate enough economic growth to offset their revenue losses, historical data demonstrates a different reality. For instance, from 2001 through 2007, the U.S. Treasury received \$2.6 trillion less in revenues than what the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) had projected in 2001.⁹ This historical precedent, combined with the CBO's projections for the revenue impact of the TCJA ¹⁷, consistently shows that the promised higher revenues often do not materialize, leading instead to increased national debt.⁹

V. The "Big Beautiful Bill": Accelerating the Fiscal Transformation

The proposed "One Big Beautiful Bill" represents a continuation and acceleration of the fiscal trajectory established during the Trump administration's first term, further solidifying the departure from traditional fiscal conservatism.

Overview of H.R. 1: Its Stated Goals and Key Provisions

H.R. 1, officially titled the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," represents a comprehensive legislative package embodying much of President Trump's domestic policy agenda. Its stated goals include "driving massive economic growth, unleashing American energy,

[and] strengthening border security and national defense".²⁵ Key provisions of the bill include the extension and modification of expiring provisions from the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act ²⁵, alongside the establishment of new work requirements for Medicaid and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) enrollees, leading to cuts in health benefits and food assistance.²⁵ The bill also authorizes significant spending increases for border security (\$10 billion in grants, \$450 million for Operation Stonegarden), military enhancements, and allocates funds for major events such as the FIFA World Cup (\$625 million) and the Olympics (\$1 billion).²⁷

CBO Projections: Analysis of the Bill's Estimated Impact on Deficits and Debt Over the Next Decade

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has provided critical estimates on the fiscal impact of H.R. 1. As passed by the Senate, the CBO projects that the bill would increase deficits by \$3.4 trillion over the 2025-2034 period when compared with the CBO's January 2025 baseline budget projections.²⁶ The House-passed version was estimated to add \$2.4 trillion to the federal deficit over ten years, primarily reflecting a \$3.67 trillion decrease in expected revenues, partially offset by a \$1.25 billion decrease in spending.²⁵ While the bill's proponents argue for positive "economic effects" that might reduce the primary deficit by \$85-103 billion due to increased output, these potential gains are more than offset by increased net interest outlays on the historically large existing national debt, resulting in the overall \$3.4 trillion increase.³⁰ Consequently, the bill is projected to increase debt held by the public to 124% of GDP by the end of 2034, a notable rise from the CBO's January 2025 baseline projection of 117%.³⁰ The CBO's analysis of H.R. 1 ³⁰ reveals a crucial, often misunderstood, nuance in fiscal projections. While the bill might generate some "economic effects" that could theoretically reduce the

primary deficit (i.e., the deficit excluding interest payments), the sheer magnitude of the existing national debt means that the increased interest payments required to service this debt *more than offset* any such primary deficit reductions. This highlights that even if the bill generates some economic growth, the compounding cost of interest on a historically large debt makes significant overall deficit reduction impossible without far more substantial spending cuts or revenue increases. This mechanism helps explain how the "Big Beautiful Bill" can be rhetorically presented as pro-growth and fiscally responsible while simultaneously accelerating the national debt, thereby leading supporters to misinterpret its true and comprehensive fiscal

impact.

Spending and Revenue Components: Examination of Proposed Tax Extensions, Spending Cuts, and New Outlays

The "One Big Beautiful Bill" includes critical extensions of the 2017 TCJA provisions, which are significant drivers of projected revenue loss.²⁵ On the spending side, the bill proposes \$1.4 trillion in gross spending cuts from the conventional baseline, resulting in \$1.1 trillion in net spending cuts, and an additional \$500 billion in cuts to green energy tax subsidies.³¹ Notable spending reforms include stronger work requirements for able-bodied adults on food stamps and Medicaid²⁹, and a \$300 billion reduction in education spending.³¹ However, these reductions are accompanied by significant new outlays, particularly for border security and military enhancements²⁷, and the bill is widely criticized for its "steep tax cuts," estimated at \$3.8 trillion.²⁹ H.R. 1 is not simply a broad deficit-reduction bill; it represents a strategic reallocation of government resources. It proposes significant cuts to social safety nets (Medicaid, food stamps²⁹) and clean energy subsidies²⁵, areas often targeted by conservatives. However, these cuts are coupled with substantial increases in spending for areas aligning with a more populist or nationalist agenda, such as border security and military.²⁷ This demonstrates a clear shift in Republican priorities away from traditional fiscal conservatism's emphasis on across-the-board spending reduction. Instead, it signals a willingness to fund specific, politically favored areas even if the net effect is a massive increase in national debt. This re-prioritization, masked by claims of "fiscal responsibility" or "economic growth," further contributes to the misinterpretation of facts by supporters who might expect comprehensive spending cuts rather than a selective reallocation.

Internal Republican Dissent: Criticism from Fiscal Hawks Within the GOP

The "One Big Beautiful Bill" has encountered sharp criticism from traditional Republican fiscal hawks within Congress, who argue that its proposed spending reductions are too modest and that the promised savings are largely illusory.²⁹ Prominent figures such as Texas Representative Chip Roy and Senator Ron Johnson have voiced strong reservations, with Senator Johnson explicitly stating, "The One Big

Beautiful Bill will almost certainly add to our deficits and debt... I can't support this bill as it's currently being discussed".²⁹ These critics highlight the bill's "deficit-busting" nature and its reliance on temporary tax provisions that are highly likely to be extended, thereby further escalating long-term costs.²⁹ The vocal opposition from traditional fiscal conservatives within the GOP ²⁹ is a significant and telling indicator of the party's ongoing ideological transformation. This is not merely a policy disagreement; it represents a fundamental conflict over the Republican Party's core identity and principles. The willingness of these "fiscal hawks" to publicly break with the party leadership on a flagship legislative initiative ²⁹ underscores the extent to which the Trumpian agenda has deviated from long-held fiscal conservative tenets. This internal conflict reveals that the abandonment of fiscal conservatism is not universally accepted within the party, but rather reflects the ascendance of a dominant faction pursuing a new direction, often at odds with its historical foundations.

Table 2: Projected Fiscal Impact of H.R. 1, the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" (2025-2034)

Policy Area/Provision	Estimated 10-Year Impact (\$ Trillions)	Notes
Tax Cuts & Jobs Act Extensions	-\$3.67 (revenue decrease)	Primarily from extending expiring 2017 TCJA provisions ²⁵
Medicaid & SNAP Reforms	+\$0.1 (spending decrease)	Work requirements, tighter eligibility, rural hospital relief ²⁸
Border Security & Military Spending	-\$0.012 (spending increase)	Includes \$10B grants for border security, \$625M for FIFA World Cup, \$1B for Olympics ²⁷
Energy Subsidies Repeal (IRA)	+\$0.5 (spending decrease)	Repeal of Inflation Reduction Act energy subsidies ²⁵
Education Spending Reductions	+\$0.3 (spending decrease)	Elimination of Grad PLUS program ³¹

Other Legislation & Executive Actions	-\$0.422 (spending increase)	Various other legislative and executive actions ¹⁴
Net Deficit Impact (vs. CBO Baseline)	-\$3.4 (increase)	Overall increase in deficits over 2025-2034 period ²⁶

Note: Figures are approximate and based on CBO projections and other sources.²⁵ Negative values indicate an increase in the deficit/debt, positive values indicate a decrease.

VI. Compounding Crises: Macroeconomic Pressures on U.S. Fiscal Health

The U.S. fiscal trajectory under the Trump administration, and its projected continuation, has not occurred in a vacuum. It has been exacerbated by and contributed to several compounding macroeconomic pressures, including credit rating downgrades, inflationary pressures from tariffs, and rising interest rates.

U.S. Credit Rating Downgrades: Analysis of S&P, Fitch, and Moody's Decisions and Their Stated Reasons

For the first time in history, all three major credit rating agencies—S&P (2011), Fitch (2023), and Moody's (May 2025)—have downgraded the U.S. sovereign credit rating below their top tier.² The consistent reasons cited across these downgrades include unsustainable fiscal deficits, accelerating debt growth projections, and persistent partisan gridlock in policymaking.² Moody's specifically highlighted the failure of "successive US administrations and Congress to agree on measures to reverse the trend of large annual fiscal deficits and growing interest costs".³³ The national debt reached 100% of GDP by the time of Moody's downgrade and is projected to exceed historical records in the coming years.¹¹ The U.S. Treasury securities have long been considered the "gold standard" of global credit, a bedrock of the international financial system.² The unprecedented downgrades by all three major agencies² signal a serious and tangible erosion of this elevated status. This is not merely an abstract

financial event; it represents a direct consequence of sustained fiscal indiscipline and political dysfunction. Critically, these downgrades translate into higher borrowing costs for the U.S. government, evidenced by upward trends in Treasury yields.² These higher federal borrowing costs are not an abstract concern; they directly impact Americans' pocketbooks through increased borrowing costs for mortgages, auto loans, and business expansion.² This directly contradicts the notion of fiscal responsibility and has tangible negative consequences for the broader economy and individual citizens.

Tariffs and Inflationary Pressures: Impact on Prices and Economic Stability

The Trump administration's trade policies, characterized by sweeping tariffs, have introduced significant inflationary pressures and economic uncertainty. Tariffs of 10% on all imports and 30% on goods from China were imposed, with threats of new 30% tariffs on the European Union and 50% duties on Brazil.³⁴ These tariffs have directly pushed up the cost of goods, including furniture, clothing, large appliances, groceries, and orange juice, contributing to an uptick in U.S. inflation.²⁷ For example, inflation accelerated to 2.7% in June, with grocery prices rising 0.3% in a single month and 2.4% annually.²⁷ Economist Eric Winograd noted that "scattered bits of the tariff inflation regime filter in," with some economists projecting a 3-5% increase in the inflation rate due to tariffs, potentially pushing overall inflation to 8%.³⁴ New York Times columnist David Brooks characterized the tariffs as "literally the dumbest domestic policy of my lifetime," citing their potential to add thousands to the price of goods like cars and disrupt supply chains, leading to increased recession risk.³⁵ The imposition of tariffs represents a significant departure from the free-trade principles historically associated with fiscal conservatism. This policy choice highlights a fundamental trade-off between protectionist measures and price stability, where the pursuit of perceived domestic industrial benefits comes at the cost of higher consumer prices and economic uncertainty. This undermines not only market efficiency but also the broader goal of fiscal discipline by creating inflationary pressures that can complicate monetary policy and increase the cost of living for citizens, further demonstrating a deviation from traditional conservative economic principles.

Rising Interest Rates and Debt Service Costs: The Escalating Burden

The national debt has reached immense levels relative to the U.S. economy, nearly as high as it was at the end of World War II.¹¹ Unlike 75 years ago, however, the massive financial overhang from Medicare and Social Security makes it dramatically more difficult to manage this debt.¹¹ The cost of financing the U.S. debt has increased rapidly, driven by higher Treasury yields since 2021.³³ Interest payments on this burgeoning debt have ballooned, consuming 18% of annual revenue and now exceeding both defense and Medicare spending.³² This burden is projected to grow further.³²

President Trump's renewed call for the Federal Reserve to slash its benchmark interest rate to 1% to ease government borrowing costs and finance rising deficits has been met with warnings from economists.³⁶ Such a drastic rate cut, down from the current 4.25–4.50% range, would signal a crisis response in an otherwise steadily growing economy and risks inflaming inflation expectations, undermining Fed credibility, and triggering a bond market backlash.³⁶ Economists warn that slashing rates without clear signs of economic slowdown or disinflation could be seen as reckless, potentially leading to a loss of credibility for the Federal Reserve and even capital flight.³⁶ The increasing cost of servicing the national debt, coupled with political pressure on the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates, reveals a growing tension between fiscal and monetary policy. The administration's push for lower rates to ease borrowing costs for its deficit-financed spending and tax cuts, despite inflationary pressures, highlights a willingness to compromise the independence of the central bank for short-term fiscal relief. This dynamic can erode confidence in the Fed's commitment to price stability, potentially leading to higher inflation expectations and further instability in bond markets, thereby exacerbating the nation's fiscal challenges rather than resolving them.

VII. Political Calculus Behind the Shift: Why the GOP Abandoned Fiscal Conservatism

The dramatic shift in the Republican Party's fiscal policy under the Trump administration was not accidental but rather the result of a deliberate political

calculus, driven by evolving priorities and a changing relationship with its base.

Shifting Priorities: From Deficit Reduction to Tax Cuts and Specific Spending

The most evident aspect of this shift is the prioritization of large-scale tax cuts, particularly the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, over corresponding spending reductions or comprehensive deficit control.¹¹ This move reflects a political calculation that the economic benefits of tax cuts, even if analysis suggests they disproportionately benefit the wealthy and corporations, would be politically popular or could be rhetorically framed as broadly beneficial to the economy.⁶ The willingness to increase spending in specific areas—notably border security and military enhancements²⁷, and even some social programs like the expanded Child Tax Credit within the TCJA¹⁸—while simultaneously cutting taxes, suggests a redefinition of "conservative" spending. This redefinition aligns with a populist or nationalist agenda, rather than a strict adherence to limited government across the board. The "Big Beautiful Bill," for instance, proposes cuts to social safety nets and clean energy subsidies while increasing spending on border security and defense, illustrating a strategic reallocation rather than a net reduction in government's financial footprint.²⁵

Appealing to the Base: The Enduring Popularity of Tax Cuts and the "Anti-Establishment" Narrative

The "tax cuts pay for themselves" narrative, despite consistent empirical refutation⁶, remains a powerful rhetorical tool that resonates with a significant segment of the Republican base. This narrative allows for the promise of economic benefits without the politically unpopular necessity of deep, across-the-board spending cuts. It creates an appealing illusion of fiscal responsibility without requiring difficult choices.

Furthermore, the Trump administration successfully tapped into an "anti-establishment" sentiment, including disillusionment with traditional Republican fiscal orthodoxy. The Tea Party movement, for example, had mobilized a segment of the base around fiscal hawk demands.¹³ However, the Trump administration, while adopting some of the anti-establishment rhetoric, ultimately pursued policies that contradicted core Tea Party tenets of debt reduction and spending cuts. This allowed

for a departure from strict fiscal conservatism without alienating a significant portion of the base, who were more receptive to nationalist, protectionist, or cultural arguments.³⁷ The party's focus shifted from the abstract goal of deficit reduction to more tangible, immediate benefits like tax cuts and specific spending initiatives that could be directly attributed to the administration's agenda.

The Role of Populism and Nationalism: Prioritizing "America First" Over Traditional Fiscal Prudence

The "America First" agenda, with its emphasis on tariffs²⁷ and increased domestic spending for military and border security²⁷, represented a significant departure from the free-market, free-trade principles traditionally associated with fiscal conservatism. This shift prioritized perceived national interests and domestic job protection over global economic efficiency or strict fiscal restraint. The embrace of populism allowed the administration to justify large spending increases and tax cuts without strict adherence to deficit reduction, framing these as necessary investments in American strength and prosperity, even if they contributed substantially to the national debt.²⁵ The rhetoric often emphasized "big, beautiful things" that the government would accomplish, rather than the fiscal cost.³⁸

The Decline of Fiscal Hawks Within the Party: A Diminishing Influence

The internal dissent from traditional fiscal conservatives within the GOP, while present and vocal, appears to represent a diminishing faction rather than a dominant force.²⁹ The fact that the "Big Beautiful Bill" advanced despite their opposition, with some deficit hawks even voting "present" to allow it to move forward, suggests that their concerns no longer hold the same decisive sway within the party.²⁹ Senator Ron Johnson's explicit statement that he "can't support this bill as it's currently being discussed" due to its deficit-increasing nature underscores the ideological chasm.²⁹ This decline in influence indicates a broader ideological transformation within the Republican Party, where the traditional "deficit hawk" stance has been marginalized in favor of a more populist, interventionist, and less fiscally constrained approach. The party's leadership and a significant portion of its base appear to have accepted a new fiscal reality, one where the pursuit of other political objectives outweighs the

historical commitment to fiscal prudence.

VIII. Implications for Conservative Philosophy and Economic Consequences

The Republican Party's fiscal transformation under the Trump administration carries profound implications for the very definition of conservative philosophy and poses significant long-term economic consequences for the nation.

Erosion of Core Conservative Principles

The dramatic increase in national debt, coupled with significant spending increases in certain areas, challenges the core conservative principle of limited government. While some areas saw cuts, the overall expansion of federal outlays and debt, particularly the \$8.4 trillion of new ten-year borrowing approved by Trump ¹⁴, suggests a willingness to expand government's financial footprint rather than shrink it. This contradicts the traditional conservative ideal of a government that operates within strict financial bounds.

The accumulation of massive national debt, which burdens future generations with interest payments and repayment obligations, directly contradicts the principle of intergenerational equity, a foundational tenet of fiscal conservatism.¹ Edmund Burke's argument that a government does not have the right to run up large debts and then throw the burden on the taxpayer is a clear articulation of this principle.¹ The current trajectory shifts the cost of present-day consumption and tax cuts onto future taxpayers, undermining the moral and economic responsibility conservatives traditionally espouse.

Furthermore, the embrace of protectionist tariffs and direct government intervention in specific industries, such as agricultural subsidies to offset tariff impacts ¹¹, deviates from the principles of free markets and laissez-faire economics. These interventions distort market signals, pick winners and losers, and represent a more active role for government in economic affairs than traditional fiscal conservatism would typically

endorse.

Long-Term Economic Consequences

High and rising national debt can undermine confidence in U.S. fiscal management, leading to higher borrowing costs, reduced private investment (often referred to as "crowding out"), and ultimately slower long-term economic growth.³² The Congressional Budget Office's projection that extending the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act provisions could shrink the economy by 1.8% by 2054 underscores this risk, indicating that the fiscal choices made today have tangible, negative impacts on future prosperity.¹⁹

The increasing cost of servicing the national debt represents a growing drain on federal resources. Interest payments on the national debt have ballooned to consume 18% of annual revenue, now exceeding both defense and Medicare spending.³² This diversion of funds means fewer resources are available for other critical investments in infrastructure, education, research, or even for addressing future crises, effectively limiting the government's ability to invest in long-term growth.

A large debt burden also significantly reduces fiscal flexibility. When a substantial portion of the budget is consumed by debt service, the government's capacity to respond effectively to future economic downturns, national security threats, or unforeseen emergencies is severely constrained without exacerbating the fiscal situation.³² This lack of maneuverability can force difficult choices during times of crisis, potentially leading to more severe economic consequences or a further erosion of fiscal stability.

Finally, repeated credit downgrades and a perception of fiscal indiscipline can erode international trust in U.S. debt and the dollar's status as the world's primary reserve currency.³² While the U.S. has historically benefited from strong global demand for its debt, a sustained trend of rising debt could test this foundation.¹² A weakened global standing could lead to higher borrowing costs for the U.S. government and American businesses, and potentially diminish the nation's geopolitical influence.

IX. International Comparisons: The U.S. Fiscal Trajectory in a

Global Context

A comparative analysis of the U.S. fiscal trajectory against other developed nations reveals a concerning picture, highlighting the extent of the Republican Party's departure from fiscal prudence.

Debt-to-GDP Ratios

The United States stands out for its notably high ratio of debt to gross domestic product (GDP). In 2023, the U.S. general government debt-to-GDP ratio stood at 123%, positioning it near the top among the world's largest economies, exceeded only by Japan and Italy.³⁹ This figure is projected to rise further, potentially exceeding 130% by 2030.¹² This is particularly concerning as it occurs during peacetime, unlike historical surges in U.S. debt during major conflicts like World War II, when it surged to 150% of GDP.¹² The current magnitude of debt in a non-crisis environment suggests a "new regime" of fiscal management.¹²

Fiscal Deficits

The U.S. consistently runs some of the largest fiscal deficits among advanced economies. In 2025, the overall deficit is projected to be about 6.5% of GDP, making it the highest among G7 countries, with a primary deficit of 2.6% of GDP.³⁹ This contrasts sharply with countries like Switzerland, South Korea, and the Netherlands, which have managed to balance or nearly balance their primary budgets, often due to stricter fiscal rules.³⁹ The persistence of this structural gap between spending and revenue in the U.S. is a significant outlier among its peers.

Government Revenue and Spending

In terms of government revenue, the U.S. collects approximately 31% of its GDP in

revenue, a figure lower than most major advanced economies except South Korea.³⁹ Countries like France, Italy, and Germany, for instance, surpass 45% of GDP due to broader tax systems and more expansive social programs.³⁹ This preference for lower taxation in the U.S., while potentially contributing to economic growth, also inherently limits government resources and contributes to persistent deficits when spending outstrips revenue.³⁹ Despite collecting less revenue, the U.S. allocates a smaller share of GDP to government expenditures than nearly all its developed peers, with only South Korea and Switzerland spending less.³⁹ This suggests that the U.S. fiscal deficit problem is primarily driven by insufficient revenue collection relative to its spending commitments, rather than exceptionally high spending levels compared to other developed nations.

Interest Payments

The financial burden of servicing its debt is another area where the U.S. stands out. In 2023, the U.S. spent a larger share of GDP on interest payments (3.9%) than any other major advanced economy.³⁹ This is a direct consequence of tens of trillions of dollars in accumulated debt and recent increases in interest rates.³⁹ While U.S. long-term yields are lower than those in emerging markets, they are notably higher than in advanced economies such as Switzerland, the UK, and Japan, reflecting higher U.S. inflation expectations and larger fiscal deficits.³⁹ This escalating cost of interest payments highlights the compounding effect of the national debt, consuming an ever-larger portion of the federal budget.

Unique U.S. Advantages and Risks

The U.S. benefits from several unique strengths in managing its fiscal position, primarily its status as the issuer of the world's primary reserve currency, which generates strong global demand for U.S. debt.³⁹ This, coupled with a deep and highly liquid debt market, helps to marginally lower borrowing costs.³⁹ Additionally, borrowing in its own currency provides a unique ability to create dollars in times of crisis, theoretically reducing the risk of a sovereign debt crisis.³⁹ However, this advantage is ultimately rooted in trust and credibility.¹² A sustained trend of rising debt, coupled with partisan gridlock and a perceived erosion of governance, could test this

foundation over time, potentially leading to higher long-term yields and undermining the dollar's privileged status.¹²

X. Conclusion: The Transformation and Its Deception

The analysis unequivocally demonstrates that the Republican Party under the Trump administration fundamentally reoriented its fiscal policy, moving away from traditional fiscal conservatism. This transformation was characterized by a decisive shift from a historical emphasis on balanced budgets and spending restraint to a prioritization of large-scale tax cuts and increased spending in specific, politically favored areas. This reorientation led to unprecedented debt accumulation, a stark contrast to the party's historical rhetoric and the principles it once championed.

The mechanisms through which the party's supporters may have been led to misinterpret the facts are multifaceted. Firstly, the persistent propagation of the "tax cuts pay for themselves" narrative, despite consistent empirical evidence to the contrary, created a convenient justification for policies that swelled the national debt. This allowed for the promise of economic benefits without the politically unpopular necessity of deep spending cuts. Secondly, the selective focus on "efficiency gains" from tax cuts, such as increased corporate investment, while largely downplaying or ignoring the significant exacerbation of income inequality and the negligible impact on the majority of workers' earnings, presented an incomplete and overly optimistic picture of the policies' outcomes.

Furthermore, the strategic co-optation of fiscal hawk rhetoric, notably from the Tea Party movement, allowed the administration to tap into a base concerned about debt and spending, while simultaneously pursuing policies that directly contradicted these very concerns. The emphasis on subjective financial well-being for some households, even if not reflected in broader objective economic metrics, contributed to a perception among supporters that the tax cuts were successful, creating a disconnect between individual experience and aggregate fiscal health. Finally, the framing of increased debt as a necessary consequence of an "America First" agenda or "big, beautiful" initiatives, rather than a fiscal burden, served to redefine the acceptable parameters of government spending and debt for a segment of the conservative base.

The implications of this transformation are profound and far-reaching. It signifies an erosion of core conservative principles such as limited government, individual

responsibility, and intergenerational equity, as future generations inherit a massive debt burden. Economically, the long-term consequences include slower economic growth due to crowding out of private investment, escalating interest rates that divert critical resources, reduced fiscal flexibility to address future crises, and a potential weakening of the U.S.'s global standing as its creditworthiness is increasingly questioned. The Republican Party's abandonment of fiscal conservatism under the Trump administration represents a significant ideological and policy shift with lasting repercussions for the nation's economic stability and political identity.

Works cited

1. Fiscal conservatism - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fiscal_conservatism
2. A History Of Inherent Contradictions: The Origins And End Of ..., accessed July 20, 2025, <https://works.swarthmore.edu/context/fac-poli-sci/article/1649/viewcontent/16039726.pdf>
3. Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Presidency_of_Dwight_D._Eisenhower
4. How Eisenhower and Congressional Democrats Balanced a Budget | Tax Policy Center, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/how-eisenhower-and-congressional-democrats-balanced-budget>
5. Reaganomics - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reaganomics>
6. Trickle-Down Economics: Theory, Policies, and Critique - Investopedia, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/t/trickledowntheory.asp>
7. The Republican Spending Explosion - Cato Institute, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/bp87.pdf>
8. Fiscal Policy and Social Security Policy During the 1990s - Jeffrey Liebman, accessed July 20, 2025, https://jeffreyliebman.scholars.harvard.edu/file_url/112
9. The Bush Administration's Legacy: A Dramatic Fiscal Reversal - House Budget Committee Democrats, accessed July 20, 2025, https://democrats-budget.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/democrats-budget.house.gov/files/documents/06.02.08_taxcut_anniversary_response_0.pdf
10. Downturn and Legacy of Bush Policies Drive Large Current Deficits, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/downturn-and-legacy-of-bush-policies-drive-large-current-deficits>
11. Donald Trump Built a National Debt So Big (Even Before the Pandemic) That It'll Weigh Down the Economy for Years, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20250205/117856/HHRG-119-GO00-20250205-SD008.pdf>
12. Global Economy: Deficits, Debt, and the "Big Beautiful Bill" - Midland States Bank,

- accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.midlandsb.com/resources-articles/articles/2025/07/14/global-economy-deficits-debt-big-beautiful-bill>
13. Tea Party movement - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tea_Party_movement
 14. Trump and Biden: The National Debt - Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.crfb.org/papers/trump-and-biden-national-debt>
 15. Economic policy of the first Donald Trump administration - Wikipedia, accessed July 20, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_policy_of_the_first_Donald_Trump_administration
 16. The Efficiency-Equity Tradeoff of the Corporate Income Tax: Evidence from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act | Oxford University Centre for Business Taxation, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://oxfordtax.sbs.ox.ac.uk/article/efficiency-equity-tradeoff-corporate-income-tax-evidence-tax-cuts-and-jobs-act>
 17. How did the TCJA affect the federal budget outlook? - Tax Policy Center, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://taxpolicycenter.org/briefing-book/how-did-tcja-affect-federal-budget-outlook>
 18. Impact of the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act on Household Labor Supply and Welfare across the Income Distribution - The University of Chicago Press: Journals, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/729747>
 19. www.crfb.org, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.crfb.org/blogs/unpaid-tcja-extension-would-shrink-economy-cbo-says#:~:text=In%20a%20recent%20long%2Dterm,by%201.8%20percent%20by%202054.>
 20. Trickle-Down Revisited - Columbia Law School, accessed July 20, 2025,
[https://www.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/2023-02/Trickle_Down_Feb14%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/2023-02/Trickle_Down_Feb14%20(1).pdf)
 21. The Economic Consequences of Major Tax Cuts for the Rich - LSE Research Online, accessed July 20, 2025,
https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/107919/1/How_economic_consequences_of_major_tax_cuts_published.pdf
 22. 'Trickle-down' tax cuts don't work, study says - The World Economic Forum, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.weforum.org/stories/2021/01/tax-cuts-for-wealthy-impact-lse-study/>
 23. The economic consequences of major tax cuts for the rich - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ehl/lserod/107919.html>
 24. Personal Tax Changes and Financial Well-being: Evidence from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act - Federal Reserve Board, accessed July 20, 2025,
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/feds/files/2024029pap.pdf>

25. One Big Beautiful Bill & What It Can Mean for Your Business, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.bipc.com/one-big-beautiful-bill%E2%80%99s-cbo-score>
26. Information Concerning the Budgetary Effects of H.R. 1, as Passed by the Senate on July 1, 2025 | Congressional Budget Office, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61537>
27. 'Inflation is the biggest enemy of the bond market,' fixed income expert says - BNN Bloomberg, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/investing/2025/07/17/inflation-is-the-biggest-enemy-of-the-bond-market-fixed-income-expert-says/>
28. Local Impacts from Congress' One, Big, Beautiful Bill - National League of Cities, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.nlc.org/article/2025/07/11/local-impacts-from-congress-one-big-beautiful-bill/>
29. What Trump's 'Big, Beautiful Bill' Would Do to National Debt - Time Magazine, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://time.com/7286837/what-trumps-big-beautiful-bill-would-do-to-the-national-debt/>
30. H.R. 1, One Big Beautiful Bill Act - Congressional Budget Office, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2025-06/hr0001-dynamic-estimate.pdf>
31. A Fiscal Hawk's Defense of the GOP's Deficit-Busting Budget Bill | Cato at Liberty Blog, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.cato.org/blog/fiscal-hawks-defense-gops-deficit-busting-budget-bill>
32. Moody's Downgrade: The Warning Signs are Flashing | Bipartisan Policy Center, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://bipartisanpolicy.org/blog/moodys-downgrade-the-warning-signs-are-flashing/>
33. Moody's Downgrade of U.S. Credit Rating Highlights Risks of Rising National Debt, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.pgpf.org/article/moodys-downgraded-its-us-credit-rating-and-warns-that-recent-policy-decisions-will-worsen-fiscal-outlook/>
34. The tariff-driven inflation that economists feared begins to emerge, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/inflation-trump-fed-powell-prices-8842d6ebca9d1870983e678e578d2091>
35. Brooks and Capehart on the political reaction to Trump's tariffs | PBS News, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/brooks-and-capehart-on-the-political-reaction-to-trumps-tariffs>
36. Donald Trump vs Federal Reserve: Why a 1% Fed rate cut could backfire, fuel inflation, and rattle markets — here's what economists say, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/international-business/donald-trump-vs-federal-reserve-why-a-1-fed-rate-cut-could-backfire-fuel-inflation-and-rattle-markets-heres-what-economists-say/articleshow/122523113.cms>

37. Wrong From the Beginning | Commonweal Magazine, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/trump-new-right-jeffery-national-conse rvatism>
38. National news rundown: Colbert canceled, Trump sues WSJ, EPA eliminates research, more, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://vernonreporter.com/national-news-rundown-colbert-canceled-trump-sues-wsj-epa-eliminates-research-more/>
39. U.S. Debt in a Global Context: How Our Fiscal Metrics Stand Out Among Major Economies, accessed July 20, 2025, <https://bipartisanpolicy.org/explainer/u-s-debt-in-a-global-context-how-our-fiscal-metrics-stand-out-among-major-economies/>