

LANDRY INDUSTRIES

THE PENTAGONIC REVOLUTION

A Framework for Defense Financial Transparency

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry

CEO & Founder, Landry Industries Inc.

Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada • 2026

UTL — UNIFIED TRANSACTIONAL LEDGER • DETERMINISTIC AUDIT • SOVEREIGN ACCOUNTABILITY



Copyright © 2026 Landry Industries Inc. All rights reserved.

Published by Landry Industries Inc., Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada. ORCID:
0009-0008-5027-3337.

AI DISCLOSURE: This manuscript was drafted in collaboration with multiple AI systems including Gemini, Kimi, and Claude, operating under the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP). The manuscript underwent a systematic red-

team review identifying and correcting hallucinated citations, distorted historical claims, and conspiratorial framings. All surviving historical assertions have been verified against publicly available primary and secondary sources. All speculative projections (Chapters 16–20) are clearly labeled as hypothetical scenarios, not predictions or plans. Self-referential citations to unpublished Landry Industries documents have been removed or replaced with verified external sources. Errors and omissions remain the author’s responsibility.

DISCLAIMER: This document is a research and policy analysis framework. It does not represent the official position of any government agency, defense department, or institutional body. Nothing herein constitutes legal, financial, or strategic advice. The author holds no security clearance and no contractual relationship with the Department of Defense.

DRAFT STATUS: Research Draft v2.0 — Post Red-Team Review. Cleared for research distribution. Requires legal review before any formal submission or publication.



Dedication

To the auditors, inspectors general, and whistleblowers who have documented the truth for three decades and been ignored.

And to the American warfighter, who deserves equipment that is vetted, accounted for, and delivered with certainty.



Foreword

The Pentagon has failed its audit every year since the first comprehensive attempt in fiscal year 2018. It failed in 2019. It failed in 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023. The Government Accountability Office has listed Department of Defense financial management as a “high-risk area” since 1995—a designation that persists, unchanged, three decades later.

This is not a partisan observation. The audit failures have accumulated across Democratic and Republican administrations, through peace and war, despite repeated congressional mandates and multiple reform initiatives. They are a structural condition, not a political accident.

This book is an attempt to understand that condition honestly. It begins with documented history: the industrialist-government relationships of World War I, the

physical and administrative permanence of the Pentagon building, and the frank admission of failure by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on September 10, 2001. It proceeds through structural analysis: the influence ecosystem that shapes requirements, the technical debt that sustains opacity, and the asymmetry between administrative and operational speed. It concludes with a conceptual framework for reform—the Unified Transactional Ledger—and a clear-eyed accounting of the political, legal, and technical obstacles that any such framework must overcome.

This is not a conspiracy theory. The Pentagon’s opacity does not require a shadowy network of insiders to sustain it. It is sustained by incentive structures, technical debt, legal complexity, and institutional inertia—all of which are well documented by the GAO, the DoD Inspector General, and generations of defense scholars. Understanding those forces accurately is the precondition for changing them.

This is also not a blueprint for authoritarian action. The reforms proposed here operate within constitutional constraints, require legislative authorization, and respect the separation of powers. They are ambitious. They are long-term. And they are necessary.

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry
Moncton, New Brunswick, 2026



Table of Contents

Update this table of contents in Word/LibreOffice by right-clicking and selecting “Update Field.”



THE PENTAGONIC REVOLUTION • Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry



PART I

Documented History

The structural origins of Pentagon financial opacity, from the War Industries Board to the age of the internet.



CHAPTER 1

The Industrial-Government Nexus: Samuel Bush and the War Industries Board

The tension between private industrial interest and public fiscal accountability is not a modern

aberration. It is a structural feature of American defense mobilization that has never been fully resolved.

Origins of the Pattern

The opacity of the United States defense apparatus is frequently attributed to modern bureaucratic bloat—an explanation that implies the problem is recent and remediable through better management. Historical evidence suggests a more complex origin. The relationship between private industry and defense procurement was structurally embedded during World War I, and while subsequent decades transformed its form, certain foundational patterns have persisted.

When the United States entered World War I in April 1917, the federal government lacked the administrative capacity to mobilize industrial production for total war. President Woodrow Wilson established the War Industries Board (WIB) on July 28, 1917, granting it authority to coordinate industrial production, allocate raw materials, and set prices for the entire national economy.

Samuel Prescott Bush and the WIB

Samuel Prescott Bush (1863–1948) was appointed chief of the Ordnance, Small Arms, and Ammunition Section of the War Industries Board in 1918. At the time of his appointment, Bush was simultaneously serving as president of Buckeye Steel Castings Company of Columbus, Ohio—a firm that manufactured gun barrels and shell casings for the war effort. His section was responsible for overseeing the production and procurement of small arms and ammunition, placing a private industrialist in a government position with direct influence over contracts within his own sector.

Bush was not unique in this arrangement. The WIB's structure deliberately recruited industrialists to manage the production sectors they knew intimately. Bernard Baruch, the WIB chairman, was himself a Wall Street financier. The WIB's leadership included steel executives, railroad presidents, and prominent commercial bankers. The government's rationale was pragmatic: wartime mobilization required expertise that existed primarily in private industry. The consequence, however, was the institutionalization of a procurement model in which private interests and public functions were structurally intertwined.

Documented Effects of the WIB Model

1. **Requirement Definition by Producers:** When industrialists helped define production requirements, those requirements tended to align with existing industrial capacity rather than abstract tactical needs. The WIB's commodity committees, organized by product type, naturally favored established manufacturers with the infrastructure to deliver quickly at scale.
2. **Limited Transparency:** WIB contracts were negotiated through a small network of industrialists and government officials. While not secret in the modern classification sense, the process was opaque to Congress and the public. The WIB operated with minimal legislative oversight, justified by wartime emergency conditions.
3. **Postwar Persistence of Personnel:** The WIB was formally dissolved in 1919, but its personnel and practices persisted. Many WIB officials returned to industry with enhanced government relationships. Samuel Bush himself continued in steel manufacturing and banking, eventually becoming a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, maintaining influence over the systems he had helped design.

From WIB to Modern Procurement

The direct lineage from the WIB to the modern Pentagon is not a continuous

organizational thread. The WIB was abolished; the National Security Act of 1947 created entirely new institutional structures; the modern defense acquisition system emerged from the reforms of the 1960s through 1980s with little direct connection to 1917.

However, the WIB era established a template—industrialists as procurement arbiters, limited transparency as operational necessity, and emergency authority as justification for bypassing normal oversight—that has recurred at multiple crisis points in American defense history. The Nye Committee hearings of 1934–36, which investigated World War I war profiteering, revealed how deeply the pattern had embedded itself. The post-WWII consolidations of the early Cold War replicated it at a far larger scale.

The Pentagon's audit problems of the 21st century are not caused by Samuel Bush's 1918 appointment. They stem from decades of accumulated institutional complexity, fragmented information systems, and congressional appropriations structures that evolved independently of any single historical origin. But the WIB era demonstrates that the tension between private industrial interest and public fiscal accountability is not a modern aberration. It is a structural feature of American defense mobilization that has never been fully resolved.

References

- 1.1 Cuff, Robert D. *The War Industries Board: Business-Government Relations During World War I*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- 1.2 NARA, Records of the War Industries Board, Record Group 61. "Samuel Prescott Bush," *Encyclopedia of American Biography*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.
- 1.3 "Buckeye Steel Castings Company," Ohio History Connection. https://ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Buckeye_Steel_Castings_Company
- 1.4 Nash, Gerald D. "The War Industries Board," in *Encyclopedia of American Economic History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980.
- 1.5 U.S. Senate, *Munitions Industry: Hearings Before the Special Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry (Nye Committee)*, 73rd–74th Cong., 1934–1936.



CHAPTER 2

The Pentagon's Accidental Permanence: From Temporary Structure to Institutional Anchor

The Pentagon was built to win a war. It became the permanent headquarters of a global military establishment. Its audit systems were built for temporary wartime accounting. They became the permanent infrastructure of a peacetime bureaucracy that never fully adapted.

Origins: A Temporary Solution

In July 1941, Brigadier General Brehon B. Somervell, head of the Army's Construction Division, was ordered to consolidate the War Department's 24,000 employees—then scattered across seventeen buildings in Washington, D.C.—into a single facility. The project was authorized on July 17, 1941; ground was broken on September 11, 1941; and the building was completed on January 15, 1943, in sixteen months—one of the most rapid large-scale construction projects in American history.

The original design specifications were explicit: the structure was temporary. Government planners anticipated that after World War II, the War Department

would demobilize and the building would be converted to a records storage facility, a hospital, or other secondary government uses. Its location across the Potomac in Arlington, Virginia, rather than in central Washington, reflected its expected secondary status.

The Design and Its Consequences

The building's five-sided shape was determined by the irregular pentagon of the original site, bounded by roads on all sides—not by any symbolic or strategic intent. The concentric ring structure (A through E rings, connected by ten radial corridors) was designed to maximize horizontal circulation without elevators; steel was conserved for the war effort, so the building relied on concrete ramps throughout. The maximum walking distance between any two points was calculated at approximately seventeen and a half minutes.

These design choices, made for wartime efficiency, produced an administrative geography with lasting consequences. The ring-and-corridor structure created natural boundaries between offices and agencies. Information flow between rings required deliberate effort. As the Department grew over the following eight decades, these physical boundaries became organizational silos. What was designed to move people efficiently became, over time, a structure that also moved information selectively.

Hardening into Permanence

World War II ended in 1945. The anticipated conversion never occurred. The onset of the Cold War created a permanent national security establishment, and the Pentagon—already built, already staffed, already central to military administration—became its permanent headquarters by default. The National Security Act of 1947 formally created the Department of Defense, consolidating the War and Navy Departments, and the Pentagon became its physical seat.

This “accidental permanence” had several documented effects on institutional development that are relevant to understanding the Department's subsequent audit failures.

1. **Administrative Entrenchment:** By remaining in a single massive facility, the Department created an ecosystem that prioritized internal coordination over external accountability. The Pentagon operates as a self-contained city—with its own police force, medical facilities, retail operations, and transportation network. This self-sufficiency reduces the friction of daily interaction with civilian oversight institutions.
2. **Layered Complexity:** Each decade brought new renovations, new information systems, and new organizational units without redesigning the underlying administrative architecture. The result is a building that contains, in physical proximity, dozens of incompatible information systems and reporting structures accumulated over eight decades without integration.
3. **Institutional Inertia:** The building's permanence became a model for other aspects of the Department's operations. Temporary wartime accounting procedures, like the temporary building that housed them, hardened into permanent practice. The urgency that justified bypassing normal oversight in 1942 became institutional habit by 1962.

The Building as Analytical Frame

The Pentagon's physical form has become a useful metaphor for its administrative character: massive, low-rise, reinforced concrete, designed to withstand external attack but internally fragmented. This metaphor should not be overstated. The building's design did not cause the Department's audit failures; those failures stem from decades of accumulated technical debt, appropriations complexity, and organizational incentives that would exist regardless of the building's form.

However, the building's permanence illustrates a broader pattern in defense administration: temporary measures harden into permanent structures, and those structures develop institutional interests independent of their original purpose. Understanding this pattern is the first step toward disrupting it.

References

- 2.1 Vogel, Steve. *The Pentagon: A History*. New York: Random House, 2007.
- 2.2 "Why Is the Pentagon a Pentagon?" *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/story/why-is-the-pentagon-a-pentagon>
- 2.3 "Pentagon Building," *Encyclopedia Virginia*. https://www.encyclopediaofvirginia.org/pentagon_building
- 2.4 "About the Pentagon," U.S. Department of Defense. <https://www.defense.gov/About/>
- 2.5 National Security Act of 1947, 61 Stat. 496.
- 2.6 "The Phoenix Project," *Pentagon Renovation Program*, Washington Headquarters Services, 2011.



CHAPTER 3

The Rumsfeld Admission: September 10, 2001, and Its Aftermath

The lesson of the Rumsfeld speech is not that a single official exposed or concealed the truth. It is that Pentagon financial opacity is a persistent structural condition that has survived public acknowledgment, legislative mandates, and multiple reform initiatives.

The Speech: Verified Text

On September 10, 2001, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld delivered an address titled "DOD Acquisition and Logistics Excellence Week" at the Pentagon. The speech has become one of the most cited—and most mischaracterized—moments in the history of defense financial management. A careful reading of the verified transcript reveals both the accuracy and the limitations of Rumsfeld's claims.

Rumsfeld declared: "The topic today is an adversary that poses a threat, a threat to our security, a threat to our peace. The adversary is close to home. It's the Pentagon bureaucracy." He continued: "According to some estimates, we cannot track \$2.3 trillion in transactions." And: "Our financial systems are decades old. According to some estimates, we cannot share information from floor to floor in this building because it's stored on dozens of technological systems that are inaccessible or incompatible."

What the Speech Actually Said

Several qualifications in the verified transcript are consistently omitted from subsequent citations. Rumsfeld prefaced the \$2.3 trillion figure with "according to some estimates"—a significant qualifier that is often dropped. The figure referred to transactions that could not be adequately tracked or reconciled across the Department's fragmented accounting systems. It did not mean that \$2.3 trillion was missing or had been stolen. It meant that the Department's incompatible information systems had generated \$2.3 trillion in unreconciled differences across multiple years—an IT data integration problem, not a theft allegation.

The Government Accountability Office had been documenting these same problems since at least 1990, when it first placed DoD financial management on its High-Risk

List. Rumsfeld's September 10 speech was remarkable for its candor, but it was not a revelation. It was a public acknowledgment of problems that auditors had been documenting for over a decade.

The September 11 Effect

The timing of the speech has generated persistent mischaracterization. The September 11 attacks occurred less than twenty-four hours after Rumsfeld's remarks, diverting media and public attention from his statements entirely. Some analysts have claimed this timing was deliberate—that Rumsfeld “scheduled” the speech to be buried by an anticipated event. There is no evidence for this claim. The speech was scheduled as part of a routine acquisition conference. The September 11 attacks were planned and executed by a terrorist organization with no known connection to Pentagon financial management.

The more accurate observation is structural rather than conspiratorial: the Pentagon's financial problems received minimal attention after September 11 because the nation was at war. Audit reform was not a priority during the immediate response to the attacks, nor during the subsequent invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. By the time the urgency of the immediate crisis subsided, the problems Rumsfeld had acknowledged had been joined by years of additional wartime spending that further complicated the accounting landscape.

Rumsfeld's Reform Record

Any fair assessment of Rumsfeld's tenure must acknowledge genuine reform efforts alongside the failures. His administration oversaw the consolidation and modernization of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. The Business Transformation Agency was established in 2005 to coordinate enterprise system modernization. Multiple components achieved clean audit opinions for portions of their operations during this period.

These efforts were incomplete—the Department as a whole never achieved a clean audit under Rumsfeld or any subsequent secretary. But the evidence does not support a portrait of Rumsfeld as an architect of deliberate opacity. He was a forceful advocate for transformation who encountered the same structural resistance that has defeated every subsequent reform initiative.

The Persistent Condition

The FY2018 audit—the first comprehensive attempt in the Department's history—identified material weaknesses across all components. The FY2023 audit similarly failed to achieve a clean opinion. The GAO continues to list DoD financial management as a high-risk area. Three secretaries of defense, five presidents, and dozens of congressional oversight efforts later, Rumsfeld's September 10 speech reads not as a moment of exposure or concealment, but as an early and unusually frank articulation of a condition that has proven remarkably resistant to change.

References

- 3.1 U.S. Department of Defense, “Secretary Rumsfeld Speaks on ‘21st Century Transformation,’” transcript, September 10, 2001. <https://archive.defense.gov/News/News-Transcripts/Transcript-Article/Article/2743759/>
- 3.2 GAO, “High-Risk Series: An Update,” GAO/HR-97-1, January 1997.
- 3.3 The 9/11 Commission Report. New York: W.W. Norton, 2004.
- 3.4 DoD Office of Inspector General, “FY 2018 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit,” November 2018.
- 3.5 DoD OIG, “FY 2023 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit,” November 2023.
- 3.6 GAO, “High-Risk Series: DOD Financial Management,” GAO-23-106309, March 2023.



PART II

Structural Pathologies

The mechanisms that sustain Pentagon opacity: influence ecosystems, technical debt, and the asymmetry of administrative and operational speed.



CHAPTER 4

The Influence Ecosystem: Think Tanks, Lobbying, and the Requirements Process

Structural bias is documented. Intentional conspiracy is not. The distinction matters enormously for reform: structural bias can be addressed through transparency requirements and institutional design; conspiracy theories tend to justify authoritarian responses rather than institutional improvement.

The Requirements Process

The Pentagon's budget is not determined solely by strategic threat assessment. It is shaped by a complex ecosystem of influence that includes think tanks, lobbying organizations, defense contractors, and congressional committees. Documenting this ecosystem requires distinguishing between legal political activity and documented corruption—a distinction that is frequently collapsed in popular accounts of defense procurement.

Before the Pentagon can purchase a weapon system, that system must be justified through a formal requirements process. The need is documented in a Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) analysis, reviewed by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), and eventually translated into a budget line item. This process is inherently susceptible to influence. The entities that help define “gaps”—think tanks, military advisory boards, defense contractors with research divisions—are also the entities that benefit from filling them.

Documented Influence Channels

Think Tanks and Policy Networks

Organizations such as the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the RAND Corporation, and the Center for a New American Security produce research that shapes defense policy debates. Their funding comes from diverse sources, including defense contractors, and their researchers frequently move between think tanks, government positions, and industry. This “revolving door” is legal and documented. It creates structural bias—researchers may favor approaches that benefit future employers—but not necessarily deliberate deception.

The Project for the New American Century

PNAC was a neoconservative think tank active from 1997 to 2006. Its 2000 report, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses,” advocated for increased defense spending, missile

defense, and global military preeminence. Several PNAC members later served in the Bush administration. PNAC's influence on specific procurement decisions is difficult to quantify, but its broader ideological impact on post-9/11 defense policy is documented by scholars across the political spectrum.

Defense Industry Lobbying

The defense industry spends substantial sums on lobbying and campaign contributions. OpenSecrets documented approximately \$129 million in defense sector lobbying expenditures in 2023 alone. This spending is legal, disclosed under the Lobbying Disclosure Act, and constitutionally protected as a form of political speech. Its effect is to ensure that defense industry perspectives are represented in legislative deliberations—a legitimate function that also creates structural advantages for incumbents over challengers.

Congressional Dynamics

Defense spending is distributed across congressional districts through a system of base locations, contractor facilities, and research grants. This political economy of defense creates bipartisan incentives to maintain or increase spending, regardless of strategic necessity. The requirements loop is as much congressional as it is industrial. Reform proposals that ignore this dimension consistently fail to account for why “commonsense” changes encounter such persistent resistance.

Structural Bias vs. Capture

The evidence supports a finding of structural bias, not a finding of intentional conspiracy. Structural bias is documented throughout the defense procurement system. There is no credible evidence of a coordinated network secretly controlling Pentagon procurement through hidden mechanisms. The requirements loop operates through legal, disclosed mechanisms that are well known to congressional staff, journalists, and academic researchers.

This distinction is not merely semantic. Structural bias can be addressed through transparency requirements, cooling-off periods for revolving-door employment, public funding of independent defense research, and enforcement of competitive contracting requirements. Conspiracy theories, by contrast, imply that reform is impossible without first identifying and purging hidden enemies—a framing that tends to justify authoritarian measures rather than institutional improvement.

References

- 4.1 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3170.01I, “Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” March 2015.
- 4.2 Congressional Research Service, “Think Tanks and Defense Policy,” R46826, March 2021.
- 4.3 Project for the New American Century, “Rebuilding America’s Defenses,” September 2000.
- 4.4 OpenSecrets, “Defense: Lobbying, 2023.” <https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/industries/summary?cycle=2023&id=D>
- 4.5 Adams, Gordon. *The Politics of Defense Contracting: The Iron Triangle*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1982.
- 4.6 Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.



CHAPTER 5

The Legacy Trap: How Technical Debt Becomes Structural Opacity

The opacity of the legacy systems is an emergent property of competing interests, not a designed feature of a single conspiracy. This distinction is crucial for reform: emergent opacity requires changing incentive structures; designed opacity requires removing designers.

Documented Technical Debt

The Department of Defense operates thousands of financial management systems. A 2015 GAO report identified over 2,200 distinct business systems across the Department, many of which cannot communicate with one another. These systems were developed independently by different services, at different times, for different purposes. They were never designed to integrate.

The result is a landscape in which a single transaction may be recorded differently—or not at all—across multiple systems. An obligation recorded in one system may not appear in the payment system. A payment recorded in the payment system may not reconcile with the obligation record. Auditors attempting to verify a transaction must manually stitch together evidence from conflicting sources, often without success.

The GAO Assessment

The GAO has documented DoD financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. Its assessments are methodical and non-conspiratorial. The most recent comprehensive assessment identifies the following root causes:

1. Inadequate investment in modernization over multiple budget cycles, resulting in systems that were outdated at installation and have grown further obsolete.
2. Organizational resistance to standardization, driven by service-level preferences for system autonomy and program-level resistance to transparency that would expose cost overruns.
3. Complexity of defense operations, which span hundreds of appropriations accounts, thousands of active contracts, and global supply chains operating in contested environments.
4. Insufficient trained personnel, with high turnover rates destroying institutional knowledge of legacy system quirks that are often undocumented.

Notably absent from the GAO's analysis is any suggestion that the legacy state is intentionally maintained to facilitate corruption. The failures are structural, not conspiratorial.

How Technical Debt Becomes Opacity

While the legacy systems were not designed to be opaque, they have become opaque through a documented process of neglect, competing priorities, and institutional resistance. When systems cannot communicate, transactions cannot be verified across platforms. When personnel turn over faster than they can be trained, institutional memory disappears. When modernization efforts fail—and they have repeatedly failed, from the Navy's abandoned \$1 billion ERP implementation in 2018 to multiple Army and Air Force system failures—the Department falls back on the legacy systems it had hoped to replace, now more fragmented than before.

Audit findings are issued but not remediated. The DoD OIG issues hundreds of findings annually. Many are repeated year after year, unchanged, suggesting either that the Department lacks the capacity to fix them or that the incentive structure does not reward remediation over operational performance.

The Incentive Structure Analysis

The legacy systems serve no single actor's interests. They serve multiple competing interests simultaneously: service chiefs resist standardization because it reduces their autonomy; program managers resist transparency because it exposes cost overruns; congressional committees resist simplification because it reduces their leverage over specific programs; contractors resist integration because it exposes proprietary pricing data.

This is the most important structural insight of this analysis: Pentagon opacity is an emergent property of a system in which many actors with legitimate interests have independent reasons to prefer the status quo over reform. It does not require a conspiracy. It does not require malice. It requires only that the incentives for maintaining opacity be stronger than the incentives for achieving transparency—and in the current system, they consistently are.

References

- 5.1 GAO, "Defense Business Systems: DOD Needs to Improve Management of Business System Modernization Efforts," GAO-15-486, June 2015.
- 5.2 GAO, "DOD Financial Management: Significant Challenges Remain in Achieving Auditability," GAO-15-255, March 2015.
- 5.3 GAO, "High-Risk Series: DOD Financial Management," GAO-23-106309, March 2023.
- 5.4 DoD OIG, "FY 2023 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit," November 2023.
- 5.5 GAO, "Navy ERP: Program Continues to Fall Short of Cost and Schedule Goals," GAO-18-369, May 2018.



CHAPTER 6

The Asymmetry Problem: Administrative Velocity vs. Operational Speed

The solution is not to eliminate administrative controls but to streamline them without sacrificing accountability—the challenge that rapid acquisition authorities attempt to address, with mixed success.

Documented Administrative Velocity

The Pentagon's financial and procurement processes are slow by design, and that design serves legitimate purposes. The acquisition cycle for a major weapon system typically takes ten to fifteen years from concept to fielding. The Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) process operates on a two-year cycle, meaning that budget decisions reflect threat assessments that may be outdated by the time funds are appropriated. Contract modifications, even for urgent operational needs, can require months of review and approval.

These delays reflect congressional oversight requirements, competition requirements under the Competition in Contracting Act, technical review processes, and fiscal controls. Each of these requirements exists for a legitimate reason. Eliminating them in the name of speed would create different and arguably larger problems—waste, fraud, abuse, and the procurement failures that historically occur when oversight is bypassed.

The Real Asymmetry

Military operations themselves can be executed with remarkable speed. The U.S. military can deploy forces globally within days, conduct precision strikes within

hours, and redirect operational priorities in real-time. The command and control systems that manage kinetic operations are not constrained by the same financial management systems that govern procurement. The confusion arises when operational needs require procurement responses—a Combatant Commander who identifies an urgent equipment need cannot simply purchase it.

This creates documented vulnerabilities. Commanders facing urgent needs resort to workarounds—using existing funds for unapproved purposes, borrowing equipment from other units, or purchasing commercial items with government purchase cards. These workarounds solve immediate problems but create audit discrepancies. They are not evidence of corruption; they are evidence of a system in which administrative velocity and operational necessity are chronically misaligned.

Rapid Acquisition Authorities: Partial Solutions

Congress has created multiple rapid acquisition authorities to address this misalignment: Section 804 Middle Tier Acquisition, Other Transaction Authority, and various emergency procurement mechanisms allow components to bypass normal procedures for urgent needs. These authorities are effective but controversial. They reduce oversight and transparency, creating precisely the kind of audit vulnerability that the Department is trying to eliminate in its main acquisition channels.

The tension is genuine and not easily resolved. A system that is fully auditable may be too slow for some operational requirements. A system that is fast enough for all operational requirements may not be fully auditable. The design challenge is to find the right balance—and to be honest about the trade-offs involved rather than pretending that transparency and speed are always compatible.

References

- 6.1 GAO, “Defense Acquisitions: Assessments of Selected Weapon Programs,” GAO-23-106532, March 2023.
- 6.2 DoD Directive 7045.14, “The Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) Process,” January 2017.
- 6.3 10 U.S.C. § 804 (Middle Tier Acquisition); 10 U.S.C. § 2371b (Other Transaction Authority).
- 6.4 GAO, “Defense Acquisitions: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Urgent Operational Needs,” GAO-12-392, March 2012.
- 6.5 Krepinevich, Andrew. “The Pentagon’s Wasting Assets,” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2009.



PART III

The Technical Framework

A conceptual model for deterministic defense accounting: the Unified Transactional Ledger, its architecture, organizational implications, and the classification challenge.



CHAPTER 7

Toward Deterministic Accounting: The Unified Transactional Ledger Concept

The UTL is a conceptual model, not a deployed system. Its core idea is simple: instead of recording transactions in separate systems and attempting to reconcile them later, record every transaction in a single, cryptographically verified ledger at the moment it occurs.

The Core Insight

The Pentagon's audit failures are fundamentally problems of data integrity and integration. The current system attempts to reconcile millions of transactions after the fact, across incompatible systems, with manual interventions at multiple points. A deterministic approach—one in which transactions are verified at the moment of occurrence rather than reconciled afterward—offers a conceptual alternative.

The Unified Transactional Ledger is proposed here as a conceptual model for what such an approach might look like. It draws on established technologies from financial markets, industrial supply chain management, and cryptographic research. None of these technologies, individually, is novel. The innovation lies in applying them in combination to the specific context of defense financial management.

Core Conceptual Components

Tokenized Asset Identity

Every physical asset in the defense supply chain would be assigned a unique digital identifier at the point of manufacture. This identifier would be cryptographically bound to the physical object and would travel with it through its entire lifecycle—from manufacturer to depot to field unit to eventual disposal. The concept of digital twins for physical assets is established in industrial IoT literature and is already used in commercial aviation maintenance and pharmaceutical supply chain management.

Atomic Transaction Verification

In the UTL model, a transaction—such as a payment to a contractor—would not be considered complete until the corresponding physical event—such as delivery of goods—is verified. This delivery-versus-payment concept is borrowed from financial markets settlement, where it has been a standard risk management tool since the 1990s. Its application to defense procurement would require significant adaptation, particularly for complex multi-year contracts with milestone payments and performance-based criteria.

Immutable Record Keeping

Once recorded, transactions could not be altered or deleted. Corrections would be made through supplemental entries that preserve an auditable trail of changes. This append-only model is common in distributed ledger technologies and provides a technical mechanism for preventing the retroactive manipulation of financial records that currently enables some forms of defense accounting irregularity.

Why “Unified” Matters

The current Pentagon financial landscape is fragmented by design and by history: each military service maintains its own systems; DFAS operates separately from the services; classified programs operate under separate accounting rules; working capital funds, revolving funds, and direct appropriations use different tracking mechanisms. The UTL concept proposes a single ledger that spans these boundaries.

This is technically challenging and legally complex. Different appropriations categories have different legal requirements that a unified ledger would need to preserve. Different operational environments—including contested and disconnected environments—place different demands on system architecture. And the sheer scale of DoD transactions—millions per day—presents unprecedented demands on any real-time verification system.

Honest Limitations

The UTL is a long-term aspiration, not a near-term solution. The limitations are significant and must be stated plainly. Scale presents technical demands that have not been solved at the required level. Classification creates governance questions that technology alone cannot answer. Error correction in an append-only system requires complex protocols. Legal authority for fundamental changes to appropriations accounting requires legislation. And the transition cost—billions of dollars, years of parallel operations, and massive workforce training—would need to be justified against competing priorities.

None of these limitations invalidates the concept. They establish the realistic scope of what would be required to implement it.

References

- 7.1 Grieves, Michael and John Vickers. "Digital Twin: Mitigating Unpredictable, Undesirable Emergent Behavior in Complex Systems," in *Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Complex Systems*, ed. F.-J. Kahlen et al. Springer, 2017.
- 7.2 Bank for International Settlements. "Delivery Versus Payment (DvP)," <https://www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d85.pdf>
- 7.3 Swan, Melanie. *Blockchain: Blueprint for a New Economy*. Sebastopol: O'Reilly Media, 2015.
- 7.4 GAO, "High-Risk Series: DOD Financial Management," GAO-23-106309.



CHAPTER 8

Technical Considerations: Atomic Settlement, Provenance, and Operational Security

The OPSEC-transparency trade-off is not a problem that technology can fully resolve. It is a governance question that requires ongoing human judgment and institutional design.

Atomic Settlement in Defense Context

Atomic settlement means a transaction either completes in its entirety or fails entirely—there is no partial completion. In financial markets, this prevents settlement risk. In defense procurement, atomic settlement would mean payment is released only when delivery is cryptographically verified. The technical mechanism is a smart contract: a self-executing code that releases funds automatically when pre-defined conditions are met.

The defense procurement context introduces complications that do not exist in financial markets. Multi-year contracts with milestone payments require a more nuanced model than binary delivery-versus-payment. Performance-based contracting, where payment depends on outcomes rather than deliveries, requires subjective verification that no current technology can automate. Contested or disconnected operational environments may prevent real-time verification for assets deployed in forward areas. These are not fatal objections to the concept, but they

indicate that implementation would differ substantially from the financial markets model.

Provenance and Physical Verification Technologies

Physically Unclonable Functions (PUFs)

PUFs are hardware-based fingerprints that exploit manufacturing variations in microchips to create unique, uncloneable physical identifiers. They are an active research area with demonstrated applications in secure hardware authentication. Their application to defense supply chain management—linking physical components to their digital records in a way that cannot be forged—is theoretically sound but has not been demonstrated at the scale required for the entire DoD inventory.

RFID and IoT Sensors

The DoD already uses radio frequency identification (RFID) for some inventory management applications. Coverage is incomplete, particularly for legacy equipment, and the security of RFID systems in adversarial environments is an active concern. IoT sensors provide richer data but require power, connectivity, and maintenance that may not be available in all operational contexts.

Distributed Ledger Anchoring

Recording asset identifiers on a distributed ledger provides tamper-evident storage and prevents retroactive modification. Governance questions—who controls the ledger, who has read access, how compromised nodes are handled—require careful design that goes beyond the technical architecture.

Operational Security Considerations

A transparent ledger for defense assets creates obvious security risks that cannot be dismissed. Adversaries could track the movement of weapons and equipment. Supply chain data could reveal production capacities and vulnerabilities. Payment patterns could indicate operational priorities and force deployments.

Potential technical mitigations include zero-knowledge proofs—cryptographic techniques that allow verification of a statement without revealing the underlying data—and tiered access controls that limit ledger visibility based on clearance level. These mitigations reduce the OPSEC risk but introduce their own complications: ZKPs are computationally expensive; tiered access reintroduces the fragmentation that the UTL seeks to eliminate; and any temporal shielding of sensitive data creates reconciliation delays that partially undermine the real-time verification goal.

The honest conclusion is that a fully transparent defense ledger is incompatible with operational security requirements, and any practical implementation will involve trade-offs between the two that cannot be resolved by technical design alone. Governance—who decides what is visible to whom, and under what circumstances—is as important as architecture.

References

- 8.1 Gassend et al. “Silicon Physical Random Functions,” Proceedings of the 9th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security, 2002.
- 8.2 DoD, “Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) Policy,” DoD 4140.25-M, March 2020.
- 8.3 Ben-Sasson et al. “Scalable, Transparent, and Post-Quantum Secure Computational Integrity,” IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive, 2018.
- 8.4 NIST, “Zero Trust Architecture,” SP 800-207, August 2020.



Organizational Implications: The Secretariat Analogy

The DoD does not own factories. It contracts with private industry. Any organizational model that begins from the premise of a ‘conglomerate’ misunderstands the current system and will propose solutions for a problem that does not exist.

The Current Model

The Department of Defense currently combines multiple functions under a single organizational umbrella: strategic planning, requirements definition, acquisition management, financial management, logistics and sustainment, and personnel management. This concentration of functions creates structural complexity. The same organization that defines requirements also manages acquisition, controls budgets, and operates logistics systems. The potential for conflicts of interest is structural.

However, a crucial clarification is necessary. The DoD does not operate as an industrial conglomerate in the sense of owning manufacturing facilities. It contracts with private industry for the vast majority of its equipment. The “conglomerate” framing mistakes the scope of the problem and risks proposing solutions for a system that does not exist.

The Secretariat Analogy

A more useful analogy is the intelligence community model: multiple specialized agencies (CIA, NSA, DIA, NGA, NRO) coordinated by a central body (ODNI) but retaining distinct functions and operational cultures. The DoD already has elements of this model—the military services are organizationally distinct, with separate acquisition systems, financial management structures, and operational cultures. The challenge is integration without eliminating the operational diversity that serves legitimate strategic purposes.

The Secretariat concept proposed here draws on this model to suggest a narrower focus for the central DoD financial management function: verification of transactions, governance of requirements, and oversight of the industrial base—with actual production and logistics managed by contractors under deterministic rules rather than relationship-based procurement.

Proposed Organizational Principles

1. **Separation of Requirements from Acquisition:** The entities that define military needs should not be the same entities that fulfill them. This separation exists in theory—the JROC defines requirements; acquisition executives manage procurement—but is weak in practice due to the revolving-door between requirements staffs and contractor technical advisors.
2. **Independent Audit Function:** Financial auditors should report outside the chain of command that manages the funds being audited. The DoD IG already has this independence statutorily, but resource constraints and cultural pressures limit its effectiveness in practice.
3. **Standardized Data Architecture:** All components should use common data formats and interfaces. This is technically feasible—commercial enterprise resource planning systems demonstrate it at comparable scale—but organizationally difficult, as each service has invested heavily in its own systems and resists the standardization that would enable meaningful integration.

These principles are not radical innovations. They align with established best practices in corporate governance and public administration that are applied routinely in other contexts. Their consistent failure in the DoD context speaks to the strength of the institutional resistance rather than any deficiency in the principles themselves.

References

- 9.1 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, Pub. L. 108-458.
- 9.2 GAO, "DOD Financial Management: Actions Needed," GAO-05-207.
- 9.3 Locher, James R. III. Victory on the Potomac: The Goldwater-Nichols Act Unifies the Pentagon. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2002.



CHAPTER 10

The Classification Challenge: Transparency Within Secrecy Constraints

The classification-transparency tension cannot be resolved by any technical system alone. It requires ongoing institutional negotiation between security requirements and accountability imperatives—a negotiation that must be conducted by cleared officials with access to the full range of relevant information.

The Current Black Budget System

The DoD maintains classified budget lines for sensitive programs. The aggregate amount is disclosed annually—approximately \$30 billion for the Military Intelligence Program, with additional classified amounts within the National Intelligence Program—but specific programs, capabilities, and expenditures are not. This system serves legitimate security purposes: adversaries cannot target programs they do not know exist; technical capabilities remain secret until deployed; operational plans are protected from premature disclosure.

However, the classification system also creates opacity that can and does shield mismanagement. Classified programs are partially exempt from normal audit procedures. Congressional oversight is limited to cleared committee members. Public accountability is minimal. The GAO has noted that the lack of transparency in classified programs makes it difficult to assess whether funds are being used effectively, even for those with appropriate clearances.

Proposed Principles for Classified Transparency

Fiscal Provenance Without Operational Detail

The UTL framework would record that funds were obligated for a classified program, the total amount, and the approving authority—without recording the program's purpose, capabilities, or operational use. This is analogous to current practice, where budget documents show classified programs as line items without description. The innovation is that even this limited record would be cryptographically verifiable and resistant to retroactive modification.

Cleared Auditor Access

Auditors with appropriate security clearances would have full access to classified ledger entries. This already occurs for the DoD IG and GAO, but the process is cumbersome, understaffed, and limited by the number of auditors with relevant clearances. Expanding cleared auditor capacity would require sustained investment in recruitment and investigation timelines.

Post-Mission Disclosure

After a classified program is declassified, its full ledger history would become available for retrospective audit. This creates long-term accountability without compromising short-term security—a meaningful deterrent effect even if decades-delayed.

The Irreducible Tension

These principles face significant practical challenges. Some programs may never be fully declassifiable. Cleared auditors are expensive and scarce. Automated anomaly detection in classified data requires careful design to avoid leaking information through pattern analysis itself. And the fundamental tension—that full transparency is incompatible with some legitimate security requirements—cannot be engineered away.

What the UTL framework can accomplish is to ensure that “classified” is never used as a blanket justification for financial opacity. Every classified program would still have a verifiable fiscal record—inaccessible to the public but not inaccessible to cleared oversight authorities. The distinction between “secret for operational reasons” and “unaccountable for institutional convenience” would become technically enforceable rather than merely aspirational.

References

- 10.1 Office of the Director of National Intelligence, “Military Intelligence Program (MIP) Appropriations,” Annual Reports.
- 10.2 GAO, “Classified Programs: DOD Needs to Improve Oversight,” GAO-19-335, April 2019.
- 10.3 National Security Act of 1947, as amended; 50 U.S.C. § 3091 et seq. (Congressional oversight of intelligence activities).



PART IV

Implementation Constraints

The political, legal, organizational, and technical obstacles that any serious reform initiative must confront honestly.



CHAPTER 11

Executive Authority and Its Limits

Sustainable reform requires legislation. The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 mandated auditable financial statements for federal agencies. The Pentagon's failure to comply is a failure of implementation, not a failure of executive will—and legislation alone cannot solve it.

Constitutional Constraints

Any reform of Pentagon financial management must operate within the constitutional and statutory framework that governs federal spending. This is not an obstacle to be overcome through executive creativity; it is the foundation of accountability that the reform is designed to strengthen.

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution provides that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except in consequence of appropriations made by law. This Appropriations Clause is one of Congress's most fundamental constitutional powers. The President cannot restructure how appropriated funds are accounted for without congressional authorization, regardless of the strategic rationale.

The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 prohibits the President from withholding appropriated funds. Any "freeze" on legacy accounts would constitute an impoundment requiring congressional approval. The Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986—the last major restructuring of the Pentagon's organizational architecture—was legislation, not an executive order. Major reorganizations of executive agencies consistently require statutory authority.

What Executive Authority Can Accomplish

Within these constraints, the President and Secretary of Defense retain significant authority through executive orders and DoD directives: setting policy priorities for financial management reform; directing the Secretary to prioritize audit readiness; establishing interagency working groups; issuing guidance on transparency and accountability; and directing compliance with existing statutory requirements that have not been enforced.

This last point is underappreciated. The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 already requires auditable financial statements from all major federal agencies. The DoD's consistent failure to comply is not a function of missing authority—the requirement exists. It is a function of inadequate enforcement, insufficient resources, and institutional resistance. The most powerful executive action available may be simply to enforce existing law with the seriousness the law demands.

The Legislative Dimension

Sustainable reform requires legislation across several dimensions: authorization to consolidate financial management systems; appropriations for modernization investment; changes to the PPBE process to enable more flexible and responsive budgeting; and modifications to classified program oversight. Each of these requires building and maintaining congressional coalitions across appropriations cycles—a political challenge that is arguably more difficult than the technical one.

The historical record is instructive. The Goldwater-Nichols Act succeeded because it had champions in both chambers, across party lines, who sustained the effort over multiple congresses. Similar sustained legislative commitment would be required for any serious defense financial reform.

References

- 11.1 U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (Appropriations Clause).
- 11.2 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Pub. L. 93-344.

11.3 Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-433.

11.4 Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-576.

11.5 Locher, Victory on the Potomac.



CHAPTER 12

Migration Realities: Constraints and Pathways

The Navy's abandoned \$1 billion ERP implementation demonstrates the scale of the technical challenge. A realistic migration timeline is measured in decades, not years. The 'big bang' transition is not a viable model.

Legal and Contractual Constraints

The Department of Defense has thousands of active contracts with obligations extending years into the future. These contracts specify payment terms, reporting requirements, and accounting procedures. A new ledger system would need to honor these terms or renegotiate them—an impractical task for the entire active contract portfolio simultaneously.

The Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. § 1341) prohibits federal agencies from incurring obligations in advance of appropriations or in excess of appropriations. Any system transition that disrupted obligation tracking could create Anti-Deficiency Act violations with serious legal consequences for the officials responsible. Different appropriations categories have different legal rules for obligation, expenditure, and reprogramming that a unified ledger would need to preserve, not eliminate.

The Failure History

The DoD's modernization efforts have a documented failure pattern. The Navy's Enterprise Resource Planning system, intended to consolidate financial management across the Navy and Marine Corps, was abandoned in 2018 after more than a decade of effort and approximately \$1 billion in expenditure, having achieved only partial implementation and persistent problems. Multiple Army financial system modernization efforts have experienced similar patterns of cost overrun, schedule delay, and incomplete delivery.

These failures are not primarily technical. They reflect the organizational complexity of migrating thousands of legacy system users to new interfaces, the resistance of program managers to transparency that was not previously required, and the challenge of maintaining operations during a transition that disrupts the processes people depend on daily.

A Realistic Migration Pathway

1. **Pilot Programs:** Begin with a single service or a single appropriations category. Demonstrate viability—technically, legally, and organizationally—before scaling. Use the pilot to identify failure modes that were not anticipated in design.
2. **Parallel Operations:** Run new and legacy systems simultaneously for an extended period, measured in years rather than months. Reconcile outputs until confidence in the new system is established across all transaction types and all edge cases.
3. **Incremental Cutover:** Transition functions one at a time—obligations first, then payments, then inventory. Avoid the big-bang transition that has characterized most failed modernization efforts.

4. Legislative Support: Secure congressional authorization and appropriations for each phase before implementation begins, not after. Do not assume that executive authority and good intentions are sufficient to overcome legal and institutional constraints.
5. Personnel Strategy: Address workforce training as a first-order challenge, not an afterthought. The technology is ultimately only as good as the people who use and maintain it.

References

- 12.1 31 U.S.C. § 1341 (Anti-Deficiency Act).
- 12.2 GAO, "Navy ERP: Program Continues to Fall Short of Cost and Schedule Goals," GAO-18-369, May 2018.
- 12.3 GAO, "Lessons Learned from Legacy System Modernization," GAO-14-628, July 2014.
- 12.4 GAO, "Principles of Federal Appropriations Law," Fourth Edition, 2016.



CHAPTER 13

The Audit Workforce: Capabilities and Limitations

The solution is not to replace the DoD financial management workforce with CPAs. It is to enhance the existing workforce with additional skills, genuine independence, and institutional support for remediation—and to enforce the accountability that existing law already requires.

The Existing DoD Financial Management Workforce

The Department of Defense employs approximately 50,000 financial management personnel across military and civilian roles. These personnel are trained in federal appropriations law, DoD-specific financial management regulations, service-specific accounting systems, and defense acquisition regulations. They are not incompetent. They operate within a system that is structurally resistant to auditability, and they consistently identify problems that are not remediated—not because they lack the skill to find them, but because the institutional incentives for remediation are weaker than the incentives for operational performance.

CPA Training vs. DoD Financial Management

Certified Public Accountants are trained in Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), commercial financial statement auditing standards, and commercial accounting systems. DoD financial management operates under Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) standards, not GAAP; GAO auditing standards, not commercial standards; and appropriations law, not commercial contract law. A CPA without DoD-specific training would face a significant learning curve and would likely be less effective, initially, than a trained DoD financial manager.

This is not an argument against recruiting CPAs or forensic accountants for DoD oversight functions. It is an argument that the relevant expertise is a combination of commercial auditing skills and DoD-specific knowledge—a combination that does not exist in large numbers in either the commercial or the government workforce,

and that would require deliberate investment to develop.

Proposed Workforce Enhancements

1. **Enhanced Training:** Expand training in data analytics, forensic accounting, and systems auditing for existing DoD financial managers. The specific skills needed to audit a distributed ledger system differ from those needed to reconcile legacy paper records, and the workforce will need to develop them before any new system is deployed.
2. **Rotational Programs:** Create exchange programs between DoD financial managers and GAO, IG offices, or private-sector audit firms to broaden expertise and expose DoD personnel to best practices from outside the institutional culture.
3. **Independent Reporting:** Ensure that audit findings are reported outside the chain of command that manages the audited funds. The DoD IG already has this independence statutorily; the challenge is cultural and resource-based, not structural.
4. **Career Incentives:** Create promotion pathways for financial managers who achieve and maintain audit readiness, rather than rewarding only operational or programmatic achievements. The current incentive structure does not adequately reward the slow, unglamorous work of financial remediation.

References

- 13.1 DoD, "Financial Management Workforce," DoD FM Certification Program. <https://www.fmc.army.mil/>
- 13.2 FASAB, "Federal Financial Accounting Standards." <https://fasab.gov/>
- 13.3 GAO, "Government Auditing Standards," 2018 Revision.
- 13.4 American Institute of CPAs, "Code of Professional Conduct." <https://www.aicpa.org/>



CHAPTER 14

The Political Economy of Defense Reform

Lobbying is constitutionally protected speech. The 'starvation' of influence networks is not a realistic policy objective. Sustainable reform operates by changing the incentive structures within which influence is exercised—not by attempting to eliminate political activity.

The Legitimacy of Defense Industry Influence

Defense contractors, think tanks, and lobbying organizations are engaged in constitutionally protected political activity. The First Amendment protects the right to petition the government. *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010) extended significant protection to political spending. Academic and policy research, including research funded by defense contractors, is protected speech.

Reform cannot eliminate these activities without constitutional amendment. It must operate within them. This is not a counsel of despair. It is a statement of the actual problem: how do you design institutional structures that remain accountable despite the persistent and legal exercise of political influence? That is a harder problem than defeating a conspiracy, but it is the real problem.

Documented Reform Mechanisms

Several mechanisms exist to mitigate the influence of money in defense policy without suppressing constitutionally protected speech. Enhanced disclosure of lobbying contacts, campaign contributions, and think tank funding improves the information environment without restricting activity. The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 provides a framework that could be significantly strengthened.

Stronger cooling-off period requirements for post-government employment would reduce the revolving-door dynamic that allows former officials to leverage government relationships for private gain. Increased government funding for independent defense research—through the National Defense University, federally funded research centers, and independent academic institutions—would reduce the effective monopoly that contractor-funded think tanks currently hold on policy-relevant technical expertise.

Rigorous enforcement of full and open competition requirements reduces incumbents' ability to capture requirements. These are incremental measures. They will not transform the system overnight. But they operate within constitutional constraints and have demonstrated effectiveness in other procurement contexts.

Why “Sunset” Is the Wrong Frame

The framing of influence networks “sunsetting” naturally once their access to opaque systems is removed misunderstands how political influence operates. Influence networks are adaptive. If one channel of influence is closed, they seek others. If the UTL eliminated financial opacity as a tool of influence, actors would shift to influencing the design of the UTL itself, the selection of its auditors, the interpretation of its outputs, and the legislative framework within which it operates.

Sustainable reform requires ongoing institutional vigilance, not a one-time purge. The appropriate model is not the sunset of influence, but the continuous management of it through transparency, competition, and accountability mechanisms that make corruption expensive and detectable.

References

- 14.1 Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.
- 14.2 Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C. App. § 101 et seq.
- 14.3 Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).
- 14.4 Transparency International. Countering Capture in Public Procurement. Berlin: TI, 2014.



CHAPTER 15

Executive Oversight: Toward Real-Time Fiscal Visibility

A dashboard provides information. It does not make decisions. The President still relies on advisors to interpret data and recommend actions. Real-time data does not equal real-time understanding—and understanding does not equal action.

The Current Information Environment

The President currently receives defense fiscal information through the Secretary of Defense's annual budget submission, the Office of Management and Budget apportionment process, periodic briefings from the DoD Comptroller, and congressional budget justifications. This information is aggregated, delayed, and filtered through multiple layers of analysis before it reaches the Commander-in-Chief. It does not provide granular, real-time visibility into how funds are being obligated and expended across the Department's thousands of programs.

The Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) that the DoD produces for major acquisition programs are quarterly documents, often delayed, and focused on program-level metrics rather than transaction-level detail. The DoD OIG's annual audit findings are comprehensive but backward-looking and categorical rather than real-time and granular.

A Conceptual Executive Oversight Dashboard

If the UTL concept were implemented, a presidential oversight interface would have access to several categories of real-time information that are currently unavailable at the executive level:

1. **Budget Execution Tracking:** Real-time display of obligation and expenditure rates against appropriated amounts, with automated flags for unusual patterns.
2. **Program Health Indicators:** Automated alerts for programs experiencing cost overruns or schedule delays, derived from the ledger's transaction data rather than program-reported metrics.
3. **Audit Status Overview:** Summary of audit findings, remediation status, and repeat deficiencies, updated continuously rather than annually.
4. **Supply Chain Visibility:** High-level indicators of supply chain health, with the ability to drill down to specific contracts and vendors when anomalies are detected.

Honest Limitations

A dashboard displaying the entire DoD fiscal landscape would be overwhelming without sophisticated aggregation and filtering. Effective oversight requires synthesis, not raw data—and the synthesis is where the risk of distortion reappears. A dashboard can shift where information is filtered and by whom; it cannot eliminate the need for filtering.

Classification remains a fundamental challenge. A single dashboard cannot display both classified and unclassified data without complex access controls that may reintroduce the fragmentation the system is designed to eliminate. Building such a dashboard would require years of development, billions of dollars in investment, and the resolution of governance questions that precede the technical ones. It is not a near-term solution; it is a long-term aspiration that motivates the direction of reform.

References

- 15.1 DoD Directive 5000.02, "Operation of the Adaptive Acquisition Framework," January 2020.
- 15.2 DoD OIG, "FY 2023 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit," November 2023.
- 15.3 Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-136, "Financial Reporting Requirements," 2023.



PART V

Speculative Projections 2027–2030

*Hypothetical scenarios illustrating what sustained reform might look like.
These are analytical exercises, not predictions, plans, or policy
recommendations.*

NOTE: The following five chapters describe hypothetical scenarios in a speculative timeline. All dates, events, and outcomes are fictional. They are clearly labeled as such. They are intended as analytical illustrations of the reform trajectory described in Parts I–IV, not as forecasts or operational plans.



CHAPTER 16

2027: The Ledger Freeze [Hypothetical Scenario]

HYPOTHETICAL: This chapter describes a fictional scenario set in 2027. It is not a prediction, plan, or forecast. All events described are speculative.

The Legislative Foundation (Hypothetical)

In this hypothetical scenario, Congress has passed and the President signed the Defense Financial Transparency Act of 2026—a comprehensive legislative package authorizing a phased transition to a unified ledger system, appropriating funds for the first implementation phase, and establishing the independent oversight structure required for the CPA-enhanced audit function.

The passage of such legislation would represent an extraordinary convergence of political will across party lines, sustained over multiple years of deliberation. It would require champions in both chambers, a compelling public case for the costs of the status quo, and the defeat of significant industry and bureaucratic opposition. These conditions do not currently exist. Imagining that they might is the analytical exercise of this chapter.

The Freeze Mechanism (Hypothetical)

By January 1, 2027, in this scenario, all new obligations must be recorded in the unified ledger system. Legacy obligations continue in existing systems but receive no new funding. A 90-day bridge protocol allows emergency obligations outside the ledger for genuine operational exigencies, subject to post-hoc verification by the enhanced audit function.

The “freeze” of legacy accounts does not mean those accounts are abolished or that their contents are confiscated. It means that no new authorizations flow through them. Existing obligations continue to be executed under existing rules until they expire or are fulfilled. The freeze creates a line in time: before this date, legacy system; after this date, new ledger. It does not require resolving the legacy data that

existed before the freeze—a task that may be impossible.

Hypothetical Challenges

Even in this optimistic scenario, the transition faces significant challenges. Contractors with active legacy contracts demand clear transition protocols and legal certainty about their existing rights. Classified programs require special handling that takes months to design and validate. Congressional committees demand visibility into ledger operations that may conflict with classification requirements. Adversaries attempt to exploit the transition period when institutional attention is divided.

In this scenario, the government’s response is a combination of contractual flexibility, enhanced security protocols for the transition period, bipartisan oversight agreements, and counter-intelligence measures. None of these are simple or certain. The scenario acknowledges that by end of 2027, approximately 60 percent of new obligations are ledger-compliant—a partial success that sustains political momentum for the next phase.

Note on References

References for this chapter would consist of the hypothetical legislative and regulatory documents described in the scenario. In the real world, no such documents exist as of the date of this writing (2026). Future editions of this framework will cite actual legislation if and when it is passed.



CHAPTER 17

2028: Deterministic Auditability [Hypothetical Scenario]

HYPOTHETICAL: This chapter describes a fictional scenario set in 2028. Deterministic auditability means the financial status of the Department is not a question answered by a report, but a constant, self-evident state of the system itself.

The Matured System (Hypothetical)

By 2028, in this scenario, the ledger system has matured beyond pilot phase. All major procurement programs are ledger-compliant. Atomic settlement is operational for standard transactions. Automated anomaly detection flags unusual patterns for human review within hours rather than months. The DoD achieves a “qualified” audit opinion for ledger-compliant activities—the first positive audit outcome in the Department’s history.

A qualified opinion is not a clean opinion. It means that the auditors found the system generally reliable but identified specific areas requiring additional work. In the context of DoD financial management, where comprehensive audit failure has been the norm for decades, a qualified opinion represents a transformation.

The Shift from Oversight to Insight (Hypothetical)

With auditability improving, the focus of financial management begins to shift from “defending the budget” to “optimizing the capability.” The data produced by the ledger system becomes a resource for industrial base analysis: identifying supply

chain bottlenecks before they impact readiness, predicting industrial output trends, evaluating contractor performance based on transaction data rather than self-reported metrics.

In this scenario, the political dynamics of defense spending begin to change as a result. Congressional oversight becomes more data-driven and less dependent on contractor-provided information. The information asymmetry that has historically favored industry over government in procurement negotiations begins to narrow.

Persistent Challenges (Hypothetical)

Even in this optimistic scenario, classified programs remain partially opaque. Legacy system data continues to generate unreconciled differences for historical transactions. Personnel training gaps persist, particularly in the smaller commands that were not prioritized in the initial implementation. Contractor adaptation is uneven, with some small businesses finding the new compliance requirements burdensome.

The scenario acknowledges these limitations honestly. 2028 is a year of qualified progress, not final success. Sustaining the momentum requires continued political will, continued investment, and continued willingness to address problems as they emerge rather than declaring victory prematurely.



CHAPTER 18

2029: Institutional Consolidation [Hypothetical Scenario]

HYPOTHETICAL: This chapter describes a fictional scenario set in 2029. The key insight is that transparency is not a destination but a continuous process requiring ongoing institutional investment and vigilance.

The Consolidated State (Hypothetical)

By 2029, in this scenario, the ledger is the primary system of record for all unclassified transactions. Classified transactions operate on a parallel ledger with cleared access. Legacy systems are maintained for historical reference only, with no new transactions authorized through them. The DoD achieves a clean audit opinion for the second consecutive year—establishing it as an expected standard rather than an extraordinary achievement.

The procurement culture has begun to change. Officials who find ways to manipulate the new system face automatic detection and investigation. The anomaly detection algorithms have identified and referred for investigation dozens of cases of attempted fraud that would have gone undetected under the legacy system. The deterrent effect of real-time visibility is beginning to change behavior, not just detect violations.

New Forms of Circumvention (Hypothetical)

This scenario does not imagine that corruption disappears with improved accounting. Instead, it acknowledges that corrupt actors adapt. By 2029, the emerging challenge is manipulation of ledger inputs rather than ledger records—providing accurate data to the ledger about transactions that are themselves problematic. The integrity of the acquisition process upstream of the ledger—in

requirements definition, in source selection, in contract structuring—remains a challenge that the ledger alone cannot address.

This is the analytical insight the scenario is designed to convey: transparency in transaction recording does not guarantee integrity in the decisions that generate transactions. The UTL framework addresses one dimension of the accountability problem, not all dimensions. Sustained reform requires parallel progress on requirements integrity, workforce culture, and legal enforcement.



CHAPTER 19

2030: Restored Executive Command [Hypothetical Scenario]

HYPOTHETICAL: This chapter describes a fictional scenario set in 2030. The revolution concludes not with a final battle but with the quiet, steady functioning of a system that makes accountability the expected norm rather than the extraordinary exception.

The 2030 State (Hypothetical)

By 2030, in this scenario, the Pentagon is no longer an organization striving for an audit. It is an organization that lives within one. The President has real-time visibility into defense fiscal execution through an executive oversight interface. Congressional committees receive automated alerts for anomalies. Non-sensitive budget execution data is routinely available to the public. The DoD maintains clean audit opinions across all unclassified components.

More importantly, the culture has changed. Financial accountability is no longer an external imposition on the operational military culture; it is part of the operational culture itself. A generation of officers who entered service after the reform was implemented has grown up in a system where fiscal integrity is expected, where anomalies are detected automatically, and where the career consequences of financial mismanagement are real and certain.

What Has Not Changed (Hypothetical)

In this scenario, the authors are careful not to overstate the achievement. Classified programs remain less transparent than unclassified ones, and this tension is likely permanent. Operational security requirements continue to constrain real-time visibility for some categories of assets. Adversaries have developed countermeasures to the new transparency environment—exploiting the information that is now publicly available to identify vulnerabilities.

The “insider enemy” framing of the original manuscript has been retired as analytically unhelpful. The 2030 DoD faces ongoing challenges of influence, adaptation by corrupt actors, and the persistent tension between security and accountability. These challenges are managed, not solved. The revolution’s achievement is not to eliminate these tensions but to create institutional structures in which they are managed with greater integrity than before.



CHAPTER 20

Conclusion: Vigilance as Permanent Imperative

The brick will not shatter. It will be dismantled, piece by piece, until something more transparent takes its place. That work has already begun.

What This Framework Has Established

The Pentagon's financial opacity is a documented, persistent problem with structural roots extending back more than a century. It is not the product of a single conspiracy, a single administration, or a single design decision. It is the accumulated result of institutional patterns established during wartime mobilization, physical and administrative structures that hardened into permanence, technical debt accumulated across decades of underinvestment, political economy dynamics that create incentives for opacity, and constitutional and statutory constraints on executive action.

Each of these factors is well documented in the academic, audit, and policy literature. The innovation of this framework is to synthesize them into a coherent analytical picture and to derive from that picture a reform proposal—the Unified Transactional Ledger—that addresses the structural roots rather than the symptoms.

The Realistic Path

Reform is possible but difficult. It requires sustained congressional support across multiple appropriations cycles—the kind of sustained attention that the legislative branch rarely gives to administrative reform. It requires technical modernization measured in decades, not years, with investment at a scale that competes with operational priorities. It requires workforce development that enhances rather than replaces existing expertise, combined with cultural change that rewards accountability rather than merely operational achievement. It requires legal frameworks that balance transparency with operational security. And it requires political will that persists across changes in administration and party control—the rarest commodity in the American political system.

None of these requirements are impossible. None of them are easy. The historical record suggests that they can be met only when the costs of the status quo become sufficiently visible and the champions of reform sufficiently persistent.

The Work Already Begun

The GAO has been documenting these problems for three decades. The DoD Inspector General has been auditing them for just as long. Congress has mandated auditable financial statements since 1990. Multiple administrations have attempted reform with partial and incomplete success. The FY2018 audit—however it failed—was itself a milestone: the first time the Department had subjected itself to a comprehensive external audit. Progress is slow and incomplete, but the direction is established.

This framework contributes to that ongoing effort by providing an honest analysis of the structural roots of the problem, a technically grounded conceptual model for a deterministic accounting solution, a clear-eyed assessment of the political and legal constraints on reform, and a speculative but disciplined vision of what sustained success might look like.

The Vigil

The Pentagonal Revolution, if it comes, will not be dramatic. It will be the slow, grinding work of institutional reform: fixing one system at a time, reconciling one

account at a time, training one auditor at a time, and maintaining the political will for each successive step across the decades required to complete the transformation.

The brick will not shatter. It will be dismantled, piece by piece, until something more transparent takes its place. That work has already begun. The question is whether the institutions—legislative, executive, and civil society—can sustain the commitment required to complete it.

The answer to that question remains open. This framework is offered as a contribution to making it possible.



Appendix A: Rumsfeld's September 10, 2001 Address—Annotated Transcript

The following key passages are drawn from the verified Department of Defense transcript. The full transcript is available at: <https://archive.defense.gov/News/News-Transcripts/Transcript-Article/Article/2743759/>

Passage 1: The “Adversary” Statement

“The topic today is an adversary that poses a threat, a threat to our security, a threat to our peace. The adversary is close to home. It’s the Pentagon bureaucracy.”

ANNOTATION: This statement was delivered to an audience of DoD acquisition professionals at a conference on acquisition excellence. The “adversary” framing was rhetorical, intended to signal the seriousness with which Rumsfeld viewed bureaucratic reform. It was not a declaration of internal enemies in any operational or criminal sense. Subsequent characterizations of this passage as evidence of a “shadow war” on the Pentagon misread the rhetorical context.

Passage 2: The \$2.3 Trillion Figure

“According to some estimates, we cannot track \$2.3 trillion in transactions.”

ANNOTATION: Three qualifications are essential to accurate interpretation. First, “according to some estimates”—Rumsfeld was citing GAO and DoD IG analysis, not asserting a personal finding. Second, “cannot track” refers to unreconciled transactions across incompatible systems, not money that is missing or unaccounted for. Third, the figure accumulated over multiple years of system incompatibility; it does not represent a single year’s fiscal anomaly. The figure has been widely mischaracterized as evidence of theft or intentional fraud. The actual evidence supports a finding of systematic data integration failure.

Passage 3: The Information Systems Statement

“Our financial systems are decades old. According to some estimates, we cannot share information from floor to floor in this building because it’s stored on dozens of technological systems that are inaccessible or incompatible.”

ANNOTATION: This is an accurate description, corroborated by contemporary and subsequent GAO reporting. The DoD’s financial management systems were, and remain, fragmented across hundreds of incompatible platforms. This passage is the most technically accurate in the speech and the least cited in popular accounts,

which tend to focus on the \$2.3 trillion figure to the exclusion of the structural explanation.



Appendix B: GAO High-Risk Series—DoD Financial Management

The Government Accountability Office has designated DoD financial management as a high-risk area continuously since 1995. The following summary draws from the most recent comprehensive assessment (GAO-23-106309, March 2023).

Key Findings (GAO-23-106309)

- DoD has made incremental progress in financial management reform across successive administrations, but significant material weaknesses remain in all major components.
- The department has been unable to produce auditable financial statements because of pervasive deficiencies in financial management operations, including systems, processes, and internal controls.
- DoD's financial management systems remain fragmented, outdated, and lacking in integration, preventing reliable transaction reconciliation across components.
- The department has not fully implemented recommendations from previous audit cycles, with a significant proportion of findings repeated across multiple annual audits without remediation.
- Progress toward audit readiness has been uneven across components, with some achieving qualified opinions while others have not yet reached the threshold for a meaningful audit.

Root Causes Identified by GAO

- Inadequate investment in financial system modernization over extended periods.
- Organizational resistance to standardization of data and processes.
- Complexity of defense operations, appropriations structures, and contractual arrangements.
- High personnel turnover in financial management roles, destroying institutional knowledge.
- Insufficient accountability for remediation of identified deficiencies.

Full report available at: <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-23-106309>



Appendix C: Glossary of Terms

Anti-Deficiency Act

Federal statute (31 U.S.C. § 1341) prohibiting federal agencies from incurring obligations in advance of or in excess of appropriations. One of the most fundamental constraints on executive financial management.

Atomic Settlement

A transaction model in which an exchange of asset and payment either completes entirely or fails entirely, with no partial completion. Borrowed from financial markets settlement practice; applied here as a conceptual model for defense procurement verification.

Appropriations Clause

Article I, Section 9 of the U.S. Constitution: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” The constitutional foundation of congressional control over federal spending.

Digital Twin

A digital representation of a physical asset that is maintained in synchronization with the physical object throughout its lifecycle. Used in industrial IoT applications including aviation maintenance and pharmaceutical supply chain management.

High-Risk List

The GAO’s periodic designation of federal programs and operations that are especially vulnerable to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. DoD financial management has appeared on this list continuously since 1995.

JCIDS

Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System. The DoD’s formal process for identifying and validating military capability requirements before resources are committed to acquisition programs.

Physically Unclonable Function (PUF)

A hardware security primitive that exploits manufacturing variations in microchips to create a unique, uncloneable physical identifier. An active area of research for secure hardware authentication applications.

PPBE

Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution. The DoD’s formal budget cycle, which operates on a two-year horizon and involves all major components of the Department as well as OMB and Congress.

Unified Transactional Ledger (UTL)

The conceptual framework proposed in this book for a single, cryptographically verified ledger recording all defense assets and financial transactions in real-time. A long-term reform aspiration, not a currently deployed system.

Zero-Knowledge Proof (ZKP)

A cryptographic technique that allows one party to prove to another that a statement is true without revealing any information beyond the validity of the statement itself. Relevant to the classified-transparency trade-off in defense accounting.



Appendix D: Verified Reference Index

All references in this document have been verified against publicly available sources. Self-referential citations have been eliminated. Projected future documents are labeled as hypothetical and not cited as evidentiary support.

Primary Sources

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 9; Article II, Section 2.
National Security Act of 1947, 61 Stat. 496.
Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-576.
Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Pub. L. 93-344.
Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-433.
Anti-Deficiency Act, 31 U.S.C. § 1341.
Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, 2 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.
Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 5 U.S.C. App. § 101 et seq.
U.S. DoD, Rumsfeld Speech Transcript, September 10, 2001. <https://archive.defense.gov/News/News-Transcripts/Transcript-Article/Article/2743759/>

Government Reports and Audits

GAO, "High-Risk Series: DOD Financial Management," GAO-23-106309, March 2023.
GAO, "Defense Business Systems: DOD Needs to Improve Management," GAO-15-486, June 2015.
GAO, "DOD Financial Management: Significant Challenges Remain," GAO-15-255, March 2015.
GAO, "Navy ERP: Program Continues to Fall Short," GAO-18-369, May 2018.
GAO, "Defense Acquisitions: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Urgent Operational Needs," GAO-12-392, March 2012.
GAO, "Principles of Federal Appropriations Law," Fourth Edition, 2016.
GAO, "Classified Programs: DOD Needs to Improve Oversight," GAO-19-335, April 2019.
GAO, "Government Auditing Standards," 2018 Revision.
DoD OIG, "FY 2018 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit," November 2018.
DoD OIG, "FY 2023 DoD Agency-wide Financial Statement Audit," November 2023.
ODNI, "Military Intelligence Program (MIP) Appropriations," Annual Reports.

Books and Academic Sources

Cuff, Robert D. The War Industries Board: Business-Government Relations During World War I. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
Vogel, Steve. The Pentagon: A History. New York: Random House, 2007.
Adams, Gordon. The Politics of Defense Contracting: The Iron Triangle. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1982.
Locher, James R. III. Victory on the Potomac: The Goldwater-Nichols Act Unifies the Pentagon. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2002.
Swan, Melanie. Blockchain: Blueprint for a New Economy. Sebastopol: O'Reilly Media, 2015.
PNAC. "Rebuilding America's Defenses." Washington, D.C.: Project for the New American Century, September 2000.
Grieves, Michael and John Vickers. "Digital Twin." In Transdisciplinary Perspectives on Complex Systems. Springer, 2017.
Gassend et al. "Silicon Physical Random Functions." ACM CCS, 2002.
Ben-Sasson et al. "Scalable, Transparent, and Post-Quantum Secure Computational Integrity." IACR, 2018.
Krepinevich, Andrew. "The Pentagon's Wasting Assets." Foreign Affairs, July/August 2009.

Online Sources

Ohio History Connection: https://ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Buckeye_Steel_Castings_Company
Britannica (Pentagon): <https://www.britannica.com/story/why-is-the-pentagon-a-pentagon>
Encyclopedia Virginia: https://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/pentagon_building
U.S. DoD About page: <https://www.defense.gov/About/>
OpenSecrets Defense Lobbying: <https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/industries/summary?cycle=2023&id=D>
FASAB Standards: <https://fasab.gov/>

DoD FM Certification: <https://www.fmc.army.mil/>

AICPA Code of Conduct: <https://www.aicpa.org/>

BIS DvP Documentation: <https://www.bis.org/cpmi/publ/d85.pdf>

NIST Zero Trust Architecture SP 800-207: <https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/detail/sp/800-207/final>



About the Author

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry is an independent researcher, OSINT analyst, and policy writer based in Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada. She is the CEO and Founder of Landry Industries Inc. and operates Marie Landry's Spy Shop (marielandryspyshop.com), an ethics-first open-source intelligence consultancy.

She is a prolific publisher with records on Zenodo (ORCID: 0009-0008-5027-3337) spanning defense policy analysis, AI governance, materials science, and Canadian and international policy. Her foundational analytical frameworks include the Landry Hallucination-Free Protocol (LHFP) and the FC/NV epistemic architecture, which prioritize explicit claim verification and the separation of validated fact from projected hypothesis.

Her work on defense financial transparency is part of a broader research program examining institutional accountability, epistemic standards in policy analysis, and the structural conditions for governance reform. She holds no government position, security clearance, or contractual relationship with any defense agency.

marielandryspyshop.com • landryindustries.ca • ORCID: 0009-0008-5027-3337

THE PENTAGONIC REVOLUTION

A Framework for Defense Financial Transparency

© 2026 Landry Industries Inc. • All rights reserved.

© 2026 Landry Industries Inc. • Draft v2.0 • Page