



Pentagon Earthquake: Army Secretary Dan Driscoll Resigns

Published on 02/09/2026

The United States Army suddenly finds itself without its civilian and military leadership in the midst of an extremely complex geostrategic phase, marked by conflicts in Iran and Ukraine. The resignation submitted by **Dan Driscoll**, Army Secretary in office since February 2025, represents not only another shock within the Department of Defense, but reveals a deep internal split within the Trump movement regarding the control and transformation of the armed forces.

Driscoll was not an opponent of the administration, but rather a trusted ally, known for his personal closeness to Vice President JD Vance (with whom he had shared studies at Yale University) and valued by Donald Trump himself for his managerial skills and his ability to maintain constructive, bipartisan dialogue with Congress. Nevertheless, the wall erected against his renewal initiatives made his continued tenure untenable.

The central nodes of confrontation with Pete Hegseth

- **Blocked technological modernization:** Driscoll pressed for a profound modernization of the military apparatus, focusing on the massive use of drones based on the Ukrainian experience model and on reduced-cost weapons, drastically reducing the economic weight of large traditional contractors.
- **Purges at the top:** At the center of the break are the mass layoffs decided by Pentagon chief Pete Hegseth, aimed at cutting up to 20% of four-star generals and removing key figures from the chain of command deemed insufficiently aligned.
- **Removal of key officers:** Among the illustrious victims are Randy George (Army Chief of Staff and Driscoll's right-hand man), David Hodne (chief of transformation command) and Chris Donahue (commander of US forces in Europe and former Delta Force).

Cultural wars versus modernization: CNN's revelations

New details revealed through CNN's reporting and relayed by Adnkronos confirm that Pentagon chief Pete Hegseth is actively obstructing the Army modernization process, subordinating strategic needs to cultural battles and his rigid conception of the "American warrior." In leaving office, Driscoll expressed grave concerns to the administration regarding the operational readiness of the armed forces, pointing the finger at the dismissals of generals directly responsible for technological innovation.

Internal sources and former Defense officials highlighted how the removal of figures of the caliber of Randy George, Christopher Donahue (engaged in applying lessons learned from the drone war in Ukraine) and David Hodne deprives the Army of *"three of the most experienced combat leaders of a generation."* Analysts like Mike O'Hanlon of the Brookings Institution have noted how Hegseth, while theoretically favorable to innovation, ends up scattering true strategic priorities due to his obsession with "false vendettas and cultural battles."

For its part, the Pentagon – speaking through spokesman Sean Parnell – firmly rejected the accusations, calling them a "complete fabrication" and reiterating the Department's unity around Hegseth's vision for cutting bureaucracy. However, internal officials confirm the operational gap: while Driscoll pushed to accelerate experimentation and acquisition of new technologies (such as drones), Hegseth continued to focus on soldier behavior, physical standards and restoration of the *warrior ethos*.

A struggle of vision within the MAGA movement

The Driscoll case highlights the limits of Pete Hegseth's strategy, a former Fox News host who rose to the head of the Pentagon with the stated objective of purging the Army of "woke" logic and imprinting a nationalist and lethal turn. Although both share the background of Iraq veterans and activism in Ivy League universities, Hegseth's vision appears oriented toward strict, direct political control by the White House and the removal of the old bureaucratic hierarchy, at the expense of long-term strategic planning.

Driscoll, by contrast, interpreted his role as an agent of generational change, openly denouncing inefficiencies in the Defense industry and criticizing power dynamics that risk weakening the operational readiness of the troops.

"You are removing three of the most experienced combat leaders of a generation, who were in a unique position to define needs on the battlefield." — Former high-ranking Army official

Political fallout and difficult succession

The institutional backlash is notable. In addition to Driscoll, there have been resignations from Navy Secretary John Phelan and Southern Command chief Alvin Holsey, deepening the power vacuum at the top of defense. Finding and confirming new leaders through Senate approval in a timely manner appears to be a complex undertaking, especially with only two months until the midterm elections. The widespread concern among observers and institutional allies is that the Pentagon will become further entangled in cultural wars, leaving national security priorities uncovered at a time of acute global instability.