Why AI Agents Need Their Own Money

Jon Smirl

2026-03-01

The Credit Card Won't Work

Imagine an AI agent that monitors your home security cameras, detects a water leak, contacts a plumber's scheduling agent, negotiates a price, and pays for the repair — all while you sleep. Now multiply that by ten billion agents doing similar tasks across the global economy: ordering cloud compute, purchasing data feeds, settling micro-royalties, bidding on ad slots, rebalancing portfolios.

These agents cannot use credit cards. A credit card requires a human name, a billing address, a credit history, a fraud review process, and a dispute resolution mechanism designed around the assumption that a person is on the other end. Bank transfers are worse: they settle in hours or days, require institutional relationships, and operate only during business hours in specific jurisdictions.

AI agents need money that is programmable (executable by code without human approval), instant (settled in seconds, not days), autonomous (no identity verification beyond a cryptographic key), and global (no currency conversion or correspondent banking chains). The only instrument that currently meets all four requirements is a stablecoin — a digital token pegged to the dollar and backed by dollar-denominated reserves, primarily US Treasury bills.

The Scale Problem

Current stablecoin networks process roughly 1,000 transactions per second at peak capacity. That is adequate for today's volume. It is not adequate for what is coming.

A conservative estimate: 10^{10} autonomous agents, each conducting approximately 10 interactions per minute. That implies roughly 1.7 billion transactions per second — six orders of magnitude beyond current blockchain throughput. Even accounting for batching, netting, and off-chain settlement channels, the infrastructure gap is enormous.

This is not a reason to dismiss the trend. It is a reason to expect the settlement layer to evolve rapidly, driven by the same economic pressure that drives any infrastructure buildout when demand exceeds capacity by a factor of a million. The x402 protocol, already operational in early 2026 with over $600 million in autonomous AI-agent transactions, demonstrates that the demand is real. Coinbase, Google, Cloudflare, Visa, and Mastercard have all integrated with the protocol. This is not speculative. It is happening.

Where the Backing Comes From

A stablecoin pegged to one dollar must hold one dollar's worth of reserves. The largest stablecoin issuers — Tether, Circle — hold those reserves predominantly in US Treasury bills. As of early

2026, Tether alone holds approximately \$100 billion in T-bills, making it one of the largest holders of short-term US government debt on Earth.

This creates a direct link between AI agent activity and US government financing. Every new stablecoin minted to serve an AI agent transaction requires the issuer to purchase additional Treasury bills as backing. The demand chain is mechanical:

$$\text{More agents} \longrightarrow \text{more transactions} \longrightarrow \text{more stablecoins minted} \longrightarrow \text{more T-bill purchases}$$

If the agent population grows to the scale described above, stablecoin reserves could reach into the trillions of dollars. That would make stablecoin issuers collectively one of the largest creditors of the US government — larger than China, larger than Japan, comparable to the Federal Reserve's own holdings.

The Monetary Policy Problem

Here is where the story turns from convenient to consequential.

The Federal Reserve controls the economy by manipulating interest rates, which propagate through the banking system. When the Fed raises rates, banks tighten lending, businesses borrow less, and economic activity slows. When the Fed lowers rates, the reverse occurs. This transmission mechanism depends on a critical assumption: that the major holders of Treasury debt respond to interest rate signals in predictable ways.

Stablecoin issuers do not. A stablecoin issuer buys T-bills not because the yield is attractive but because it needs dollar-denominated backing for tokens already in circulation. When the Fed raises rates, a bank might reduce its Treasury holdings and tighten lending. A stablecoin issuer will keep buying T-bills regardless, because its demand is driven by token issuance, not by portfolio optimization. The demand is inelastic to monetary policy signals.

This is precisely the problem (Gorton2012) identified with historical "private money" systems: when a large share of the money supply operates outside the central bank's transmission mechanism, monetary policy loses traction. The CES framework formalizes this as a bifurcation in the settlement feedback system:

Theorem (Settlement Reproduction Number).

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta \cdot S_0}{\gamma}$$

When $R_0 > 1$ — when stablecoin adoption grows faster than institutional absorption capacity — the system crosses into a regime where traditional monetary tools cannot fully offset the private settlement channel.

The reproduction number R_0 depends on the adoption rate β, the susceptible population S_0 (potential agent-economy transaction volume), and the absorption rate γ (how quickly existing financial infrastructure can integrate stablecoin flows). If AI agent adoption follows the trajectory suggested by x402 volumes and the broader trend toward autonomous economic activity, R_0 will exceed unity well before regulatory frameworks have adapted.

The Self-Undermining Pattern Again

There is a deep irony in the policy response. Several governments, including the United States, are developing Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) — government-issued digital money designed to maintain sovereign control over the payment system. The motivation is partly defensive: if private stablecoins are going to provide programmable money, the government wants its own programmable alternative.

But building CBDC infrastructure means building the digital rails — the wallets, the APIs, the identity systems, the interoperability standards — that private stablecoins also use. Every dollar spent on CBDC infrastructure makes it easier, not harder, for private stablecoins to operate. The pattern is identical to the one described in *big-tech-replacement*: concentrated investment in centralized infrastructure accelerates the distributed alternative.

This is the same self-undermining dynamic that operates at the AI hardware level, now replicated at the monetary level. Hyperscaler investment funds the learning curves that enable distributed AI. Government digital currency investment funds the infrastructure that enables private programmable money. In both cases, the entity trying to maintain control is financing the tools that erode it.

The Four-Level Feedback

The settlement layer does not operate in isolation. It connects to the broader AI transition through a feedback loop that the CES framework models as a four-level hierarchy:

1. **Semiconductors** (decades): Centralized investment drives learning curves, reducing hardware costs.
2. **AI agents** (years): Cheaper hardware enables a distributed mesh of autonomous agents.
3. **Training and capability** (months): The mesh generates data and compute that improve agent capabilities.
4. **Settlement** (days): Agents need programmable money, driving stablecoin demand, which buys Treasuries, which affects monetary policy, which constrains or enables the centralized investment that started the cycle.

The feedback is circular. Level 4 feeds back into Level 1. And the *settlementR0* governs whether the settlement layer amplifies or dampens the overall cycle.

What to Watch

The *test:stablecoin-treasury-absorption* tracks the empirical signature of this process. Three indicators matter:

Stablecoin market capitalization relative to short-term Treasury supply. Currently around 1–2%. If this ratio crosses 10%, stablecoin issuers become a systemically important source of Treasury demand, and the monetary policy transmission problem becomes unavoidable.

Autonomous transaction volume. The x402 protocol provides the first clean measure. Growth from \$600 million to \$6 billion would confirm that agent-driven settlement demand is scaling exponentially rather than linearly.

Federal Reserve response. Watch for changes in how the Fed discusses "non-bank demand for safe assets" in its financial stability reports. The language shift from "monitoring" to "concern" will signal that the bifurcation threshold is approaching.

The ten billion agents are not here yet. But the money they will need is already being built — one Treasury bill at a time (Brunnermeier2019).

References