



No to the Media Grinder: the Army Chief and the Seriousness the Country Needs

Published on 14/01/2026

In days when **a judicial news risks turning into the usual media grinder**, it is worth putting the facts back in their place and politics, the real one, made of strategic choices, at the center. **General Carmine Masiello, Chief of Staff of the Army**, has appeared in the newspapers because he was heard by the prosecutor in an investigation concerning contracts and relations with a **sector company (Tekne)**. But, precisely because of how the news is reported, we are talking about a hearing **as a “witness informed of the facts”**, not the portrait of a commander “under accusation” to be splashed on the front page.

And this is where **clear clarity** is needed, without ambiguity: **protection of the rule of law**, above all. Because here we are not even in the already sacred ground of the **presumption of innocence**, the backbone of a democracy: we are **before**, on the level of **roles and acts**. **There is no accusation, there is a hearing**. A witness is not a suspect, and a hearing is not a charge. Those who investigate must do so thoroughly; those who command must be

evaluated on **acts, responsibilities, results**. And those who inform should avoid the shortcut of “**chaos**” built with headlines.

It is the boundary that separates the rule of law from suggestion. Being heard as a person informed of the facts means that a magistrate asks for clarifications from someone who, due to their institutional role, **may know the functioning of procedures, structures, or decision-making processes**.

An Army Chief who puts what matters back at the center: credibility

The discussion that Masiello has forcefully brought into the public sphere is simple and, for a country often distracted, almost revolutionary: without a **credible land component**, equipped and respected, Italy remains vulnerable.

And this is where the **media short circuit** kicks in. When a military leader shifts the focus from routine to strategy, choices that weigh, cost, and change priorities, they become more exposed not because they are “guilty”, but because they are central. Putting this issue “in the front row” means choosing national interest against the perennial temptation of ordinary management: the one that for years **has reduced the Army** to a budget chapter to be contained, or a tool to be displayed when a photo is needed, only to forget about it the next day.

Within this framework, the judicial episode today used as a **narrative lever** should also be read. Masiello was heard because he has held top roles in the Army and Defense for years, and as such may have had knowledge of relations between the administration and sector suppliers, including the company Tekne.

The same account admits the decisive fact: **hearing as a witness**, no criminal charges. Yet headlines and construction insinuate otherwise: they shift the focus from the merit of the choices to suspicion, from the discussion on operational capacity to the noise useful to consume a name on the front page.

The real point: not routine, but a vision

In some media outlets, a context of **contracts, agreements, and alleged shadows** is reconstructed that would involve multiple subjects and levels, in a case described as **complex**

and still evolving; and it is recalled that **Masiello was heard months ago by investigators.**

Good: this very complexity should suggest **prudence**. Because the difference between a **servant of the State** and a **“useful scapegoat”** is seen when resisting the shortcut of **automatic suspicion**.

Here lies the substance: a **Chief of Armed Forces** is not measured by noise, but by the **course** they set. Masiello represents a leadership that is not satisfied with the **mere routine of command** and does not bow to the logic of **announcement**. If a country wants a **modern Army**, it must also accept commanders who say uncomfortable things: that **credibility** has a cost, that **equipment** is not optional, that the dignity and honor of the soldier are not protected with press releases, but with **coherent choices, targeted investments, and political responsibility**.

Transparency yes, lynching no

Those who truly care about institutions do not ask for immunity for anyone. They ask for something more difficult and more mature: **equal rules for everyone, respected justice times**, and the ability not to turn a hearing in the prosecutor's office into a **social sentence**. It has been recalled that Masiello was appointed Chief of Staff of the Army in **2024** and that the hearing took place as a **person informed of the facts**: two elements that, alone, should be enough to curb the most toxic reconstructions and narrative shortcuts.

Protecting Masiello today, therefore, is not partisanship. It is **public hygiene**. It means affirming that the modernization of the Armed Forces cannot become hostage to clamor, nor to the conveniences of the day. It means demanding that investigations take their course, **with rigor**, and that, in the meantime, the Army is not weakened by a **generalized suspicion**: the antechamber of distrust and, ultimately, paralysis.

Between justice and national security: the boundary that must not be confused

If there is one thing Italy cannot afford, it is an **intermittent defense**: attention when the case breaks out, oblivion when it is necessary to invest, plan, protect. A leadership that insists on the **centrality of the land component**, on the **dignity of the uniform**, and on **operational credibility** is doing exactly what the Republic should demand from its commanders.

The point, then, is not to “take sides”, but to **keep the course steady**: a servant of the State is not dragged into suspicion with a headline. **They are checked, verified, judged, with rigor, but not delegitimized.** Because delegitimizing the Army by reflection means weakening **national security**.

And this, more than any “sensational news”, is a luxury we cannot afford.