

Pentagon Financial Management and Accountability (1943–2025)

The Pentagon headquarters – completed in 1943 – symbolizes the vast scope of U.S. military spending. The Department of Defense manages roughly **\$3.8 trillion** in reported assets (and around \$4.0 trillion in liabilities)^[1] and an annual budget on the order of **\$800+ billion**^[2]. Yet it has *never* passed a full financial audit. In fact, as of 2024 the Pentagon had failed **seven consecutive** annual audits (FY2018–FY2024), making it “the only major federal agency that has never been able to achieve an unmodified or ‘clean’ audit opinion” on its consolidated statements^[2]. (By comparison, every other Cabinet department and federal agency has passed audit requirements under the Chief Financial Officers Act.) This chronic audit failure reflects deep-seated accounting problems, controls weaknesses, and cultural resistance across the Pentagon – issues that have drawn sustained criticism and oversight from Congress, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and others^[3]. The scale of the problem is underscored by DoD’s own data: as of late 2023 auditors found **63%** of DoD’s ~\$3.8T in assets could not be properly documented^[4], with billions worth of equipment, supplies and funds unaccounted for or supported only by unsupported adjustments.

Audit Mandates and Historical Efforts

Congress long tried to impose financial transparency on the Pentagon. The **Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990** mandated annual financial statements and audits for all federal agencies^{[5][6]}. From the outset, however, DoD lagged. By 1995 GAO added “DOD financial management” to its High-Risk List, identifying it as prone to fraud, waste and mismanagement^[3]. (It remains on the list today.) Through the 1990s and 2000s Congress repeatedly pressed DoD to modernize accounting and systems. Notably, the **NDAA 2010** (FY2010 defense bill) required the Defense Comptroller to develop a comprehensive *Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation (FIAR)* plan^[7]. This set the stage for a department-wide audit effort, but early progress was slow. It was only in **2014** that Congress mandated a firm deadline: the FY2014 National Defense Authorization Act directed DoD to achieve a full audit of FY2018 financials (and to report results by March 2019)^[8]. This goal was reiterated by the FY2018 NDAA, and by FY2024 Congress added a new milestone: DoD must obtain a clean (unmodified) audit by **December 31, 2028**^{[9][10]}.

Even with mandates in place, Pentagon officials openly acknowledged the difficulty. When the first comprehensive audit began in late 2017, Deputy Secretary Patrick Shanahan warned reporters, “We failed the audit, but we never expected to pass it,” adding that auditing a **\$2.7 trillion** organization was an unprecedented challenge^[11]. Indeed, the inaugural audit (covering FY2018) was released in Nov 2018 with a *disclaimer of opinion* – i.e. a failure to certify – due to pervasive data and internal-control problems.

Key Audit Milestones (2018–2024): DoD conducted its first *required* full financial audit for FY2018 (audit reports issued Nov 2018)^[11]. Subsequent fiscal-year audits were completed annually: FY2019 (report Nov 2019)^[12], FY2020 (report Nov 2020)^[13], FY2021 (report Nov 2021), FY2022 (Nov 2022), FY2023 (Nov 2023)^[14], and FY2024 (Nov 2024)^{[15][2]}. Each of these seven audits produced a “*disclaimer of opinion*” – indicating the auditors could not verify the accuracy of DoD’s books – due to continued deficiencies. For example, the FY2020 audit found that ongoing data and system problems would likely take **years** to resolve, with then-CFO Thomas Harker estimating a clean audit only by *around 2027*^[13]. In November 2024 the FY2024 audit once again failed (the 7th straight failure)^[2], although DoD highlighted incremental gains: nine of 28 component audits received unmodified (clean) opinions, up from seven in the prior year^{[16][17]}.

Chronic Accounting Irregularities and the “Missing” Trillions Myth

A central driver of audit failures has been chronic **accounting irregularities** and unsupported adjustments in DoD’s ledgers. Auditors routinely found DoD reconciling to Treasury through “*forced-balance*” adjustments – blanket entries that make books balance without underlying transactions. GAO found that such adjustments (which totaled tens of trillions of dollars over time) often lacked supporting documentation or explanation^{[18][19]}. For instance, a 2020 GAO report found DoD policies did not define adequate documentation for system-generated entries, increasing the risk of misstatement^[18]. This over-reliance on adjustments – rather than building clean financial transactions – remains a material weakness.

Partly fueling public confusion are high-profile but misunderstood figures. A notorious case is former SecDef Donald Rumsfeld’s 2001 remark on \$2.3 trillion. In context, this referred not to missing cash but to **unsupported accounting entries**. As AP and Reuters fact-checkers explained, the Pentagon’s FY1999 books contained \$2.3 trillion in entries “not supported by adequate audit trails” due to archaic systems^[19]. There was never evidence of cash vanishing; rather, it illustrated how outdated IT made reconciling books impossible. Similarly, reports about Pentagon “missing trillions” (e.g. bogus \$6.5 *trillion* claims) typically stem from such entries, not secret disappearances. For example, a 2016 DOD Inspector General report revealed the Army made **\$6.5 trillion** in improper accounting adjustments during FY2015 – half of which were essentially “made up” numbers with no receipts or invoices^[20]. These adjustments were so massive that the IG deemed the Army’s financial statements “materially misstated” and useless for decision-making^[20].

Aside from headline “trillions”, other instances of untracked funds have emerged in audits and investigations. In 2017 DOD’s IG declassified an audit of the Iraq Train-and-Equip Fund (authorized by the FY2015 NDAA) which **could not trace over \$1 billion of equipment shipments** for anti-ISIS operations^[21]. The audit found U.S. and allied officers using multiple unsynchronized spreadsheets instead of a central database to track deliveries, so the Pentagon lacked “accurate, up-to-date records” on equipment worth over \$1B^[21]. Similarly, dozens of OIG reviews and GAO reports have documented billions more in unrecorded costs and overpayments (e.g. food, fuel and logistics contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan), as well as questioned costs in base operations and supply inventories. These deficiencies feed back into the audit failures: if assets and expenditures can’t be traced, the books cannot be certified.

Confirmed Fraud, Corruption and Mismanagement Cases

Beyond bookkeeping gaps, there have been numerous **fraud and corruption cases** involving Pentagon funds. DoD’s own reports cite billions recovered from criminal investigations, though total losses are unknowable. A GAO review covering FY2017–2024 notes DOD reported **\$10.8 billion** in confirmed fraud (e.g. contractor kickbacks, false billing) over that period^[22]. However, GAO warns this is likely just the tip of the iceberg, given systemic controls weaknesses^{[22][23]}.

Notable examples include overcharging and bribery by contractors. In 2004 the Pentagon’s IG launched a criminal probe into KBR/Halliburton fuel contracts in Iraq amid allegations of gross overbilling^[24]. Similarly, humanitarian support and construction contracts have repeatedly turned up fraudulent billing and kickback schemes. More recently (2025), former Iowa businessman Douglas Edelman – whose fuel-supply company won **\$7 billion** in U.S. military contracts in Central Asia – pleaded guilty to a massive tax-evasion conspiracy^[25]. Edelman admitted creating fake paperwork and hiding personal profits tied to those contracts, in what DOJ called one of the nation’s largest ever tax-fraud cases^[25]. Each such case erodes accountability over how defense dollars are spent.

Insider malfeasance has also occurred. DoD IG and Justice Department records show dozens of Pentagon officials, contracting officers, and civilian workers investigated or convicted for fraud or theft of government

money (kickbacks, procurement fraud, embezzlement, etc.). For example, FBI press releases note bribery schemes at the Army Corps of Engineers and Department of Public Works^{[26][27]}. Even at the local base level, auditors regularly report “questioned costs” (unexplained spending) in the hundreds of millions or more. In sum, the combination of willful fraud, wasted procurements and administrative sloppiness contributes to Pentagon programs chronically running over cost and under-performance.

Oversight, Reforms and Accountability Initiatives

Recognizing these problems, Congress and watchdogs have mounted extensive oversight and reform efforts. GAO’s high-risk designation (first in 1995) has anchored this pressure^[3]. Year after year, GAO issues audits and testimonies pinpointing DOD’s weaknesses. For example, GAO testimony to Congress highlights that **without sound financial management, DOD risks being unable to effectively manage its budgets and assets**^[28]. GAO and the DOD Inspector General routinely testify in congressional hearings; lawmakers (e.g. Sen. Chuck Grassley, Rep. Pete Sessions, Rep. Carolyn Maloney) have pressed for accountability. In 2015 Sen. Grassley observed “26 years of hard-core foot-dragging” by DoD on audits^[6]. More recently, the House Oversight Committee held hearings (2022–2023) warning that failure to pass a clean audit by 2028 would be inexcusable given Congress’s clear mandate^[29].

On the reform side, DoD has launched initiatives under its FIAR plan: modernizing IT systems (unifying accounting platforms like Army GFEBS, Navy ERP, etc.), reconciling records to the U.S. Treasury and migrating data (e.g. the Advana analytics platform)^{[9][18]}. The DoD Comptroller and OIG report each year on audit readiness and progress. For instance, DoD’s audited financial statement releases now include plans to remediate “material weaknesses” and track corrective actions. Notably, Marine Corps leadership achieved a clean audit in 2017 (the first U.S. service to do so), setting a “template” that others aim to follow^[30]. DoD has also increased training of financial managers and consolidated audit findings into centralized databases to share lessons across the department^{[31][32]}.

Yet GAO continues to find that reforms are slow. It has urged DoD to “develop and document a comprehensive plan to achieve a clean audit opinion”^[33]. Its recent reviews point to persistent issues in fraud risk management, outdated feeder systems, and incomplete IT acquisitions^{[23][18]}. The 2024 NDAA further tightened requirements, explicitly tying some budget actions to audit progress. As of 2025, DoD reports incremental gains (better reconciliations, fewer manual journals), but GAO and IG both note that critical controls and transparency are still lacking.

Structural and Systemic Causes, and Impacts

Multiple systemic factors underlie these challenges. The **sheer size and complexity** of DoD’s enterprise is often cited. Assets are spread across 4,500+ sites worldwide, including billions of dollars of equipment held under contractor management^{[1][34]}. For example, GAO found that the U.S. owns an estimated **\$220 billion** in F-35 spare parts, yet Lockheed Martin and Pratt & Whitney largely “possess” those parts and control the data on them^[34]. Because critical asset data reside off the Pentagon’s systems, some 60%+ of the inventory cannot be independently verified. Similarly, the budget is split among dozens of appropriation accounts, each with its own rules, making consolidation error-prone.

Cultural issues compound the technical ones. Many DoD leaders have prioritized operations over “bean counting,” viewing audit requirements as burdensome. As one long-time Pentagon IG official put it, decades of insufficient commitment at the top allowed false assumptions (“proposed budgets...are a bunch of garbage”) to persist^[35]. Additionally, certain war-related funds remain classified or outside routine appropriations (e.g. special defense funds, certain CIA-managed budgets), meaning even under audit rules those dollars are not publicly traceable.

This persistent secrecy fuels public skepticism: long-standing myths about “hidden” war chest funds often circulate (even though independent fact-checkers debunk most of them).

The **political impact** of these financial issues is significant. Chronic audit failures erode Congressional and public confidence in Pentagon stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Oversight has become a flashpoint in defense debates, with critics arguing that lack of transparency justifies tighter budget controls or reallocating funding to other priorities. Conversely, proponents of increased defense spending point to wartime needs and classify issues as obstacles beyond immediate fix. In either case, the tension is clear: as Marine Corps auditors note, *“Readiness for the Warfighter means being accountable for our assets... passing an audit makes us more ready to fight when our Nation calls”*^[29]. When Congress allocates hundreds of billions (now over 50% of discretionary spending^[28]), the inability to answer “where did that money go?” can influence public debate on military spending. Economically, inefficiencies and losses in the Pentagon budget translate into larger defense budgets (to compensate for untracked costs) or reductions in other programs. Socially, the image of \$7,600 hammers and other infamous waste items – symptomatic of deeper accounting flaws – has become emblematic of a perceived lack of fiscal discipline in the DoD (as popularized by whistleblowers and media reports)^[36].

Timeline of Key Events

- **1990:** Congress enacts the Chief Financial Officers Act, mandating agency financial statements and audits. DoD does not produce auditable books.^{[5][3]}
- **1995:** GAO adds “DOD financial management” to its High-Risk List due to longstanding problems^[3].
- **2001:** SecDef Donald Rumsfeld publicly cites \$2.3 trillion in unsupported accounting entries (IG analysis of FY1999 data)^[19]. The remark sparks “missing trillions” rumors, though no cash was actually lost.
- **2010:** FY2010 NDAA requires DoD Comptroller to prepare a Financial Improvement & Audit Remediation (FIAR) plan^[7].
- **2014:** FY2014 NDAA mandates a DoD-wide financial audit by FY2018^[8]. (Prior to this, the last fragmented DoD audits occurred in mid-2000s.)
- **Dec 2017:** DoD launches its first department-wide audit (covering FY2018) with 1,200+ auditors across the globe^[37].
- **Nov 2018:** Results of FY2018 audit released – *failed* (disclaimer of opinion). Deputy Sec Shanahan admits “we failed... [but] we never expected to pass”^[11].
- **Nov 2019:** FY2019 audit (2nd audit) fails. DoD reports “progress” but re-affirms shortcomings^[12]. Assets audited: ~\$2.9T.
- **Nov 2020:** FY2020 audit (3rd year) fails again^[13]. Undersecretary Harker warns clean audit may not come until ~2027. Audit cost ~\$203M with 1,400 auditors deployed^{[13][38]}.
- **Nov 2021:** FY2021 audit (4th) results released – fail. DoD continues to resolve prior audit findings (over 530 issues addressed in prior year)^[32].
- **Nov 2022:** FY2022 audit (5th) fails; only 7 subaudits clean (unchanged from FY2021).
- **Nov 2023:** FY2023 audit (6th) fails^[14]. DoD highlights incremental improvements; still only 7 subaudits clean out of ~30.

- **Dec 2023:** FY2024 NDAA enacted, reaffirming a full audit requirement and **mandating a clean audit by Dec. 31, 2028**^{[9][10]}.
- **Nov 2024:** FY2024 audit (7th) fails^[2]. Comptroller McCord notes that 9 of 28 entities received clean opinions (up from 7)^{[16][17]}.
- **2025: Whistleblower and investigative developments:** In May 2025, a federal court convicts defense contractor Douglas Edelman of tax evasion tied to \$7B in DoD fuel contracts^[25], illustrating oversight gaps. Meanwhile, Congress and GAO continue hearings and reports in 2024–25 highlighting DoD’s need to meet its 2028 audit goal.

Footnotes

1. defensenews.com ↑
2. econofact.org ↑
3. congress.gov ↑
4. responsiblestatecraft.org ↑
5. reuters.com ↑
6. grassley.senate.gov ↑
7. gao.gov ↑
8. gao.gov ↑
9. defense.gov ↑
10. econofact.org ↑
11. reuters.com ↑
12. defense.gov ↑
13. reuters.com ↑
14. defensenews.com ↑
15. breakingdefense.com ↑
16. econofact.org ↑
17. breakingdefense.com ↑
18. gao.gov ↑
19. apnews.com ↑
20. reuters.com ↑
21. pogo.org ↑
22. files.gao.gov ↑
23. files.gao.gov ↑
24. icij.org ↑

25. [icij.org](https://www.icij.org) ↑
26. [justice.gov](https://www.justice.gov) ↑
27. [fbi.gov](https://www.fbi.gov) ↑
28. oversight.house.gov ↑
29. oversight.house.gov ↑
30. oversight.house.gov ↑
31. govexec.com ↑
32. [defense.gov](https://www.defense.gov) ↑
33. [gao.gov](https://www.gao.gov) ↑
34. responsiblestatecraft.org ↑
35. thenation.com ↑
36. pogo.org ↑
37. govexec.com ↑
38. [reuters.com](https://www.reuters.com) ↑