

TTA NEWS EXCLUSIVE

Trump Administration Rewrites Rules Of Executive Power, American Dominance

BY: GEOFFREY A. FIELDS



Greenland



The Trump Doctrine Will Reshape American Dominance For The Next 100 Years

(Let's Start In Venezuela) In the opening months of 2026, President Donald Trump's second term has produced one of the most dramatic shifts in American foreign policy since the end of the Cold War. Through a sequence of bold interventions—from the capture of illegitimate Venezuelan leader Nicolás Maduro to escalating military pressure on Iran and negotiations with Cuba—the administration is attempting to redefine American power across both the Western Hemisphere and the Middle East.

At the center of this strategy is what allies describe as a modern revival of the Monroe Doctrine— now revamped and called the “Donroe Doctrine”. The idea is straightforward: the Western Hemisphere must remain firmly within the American sphere of influence while rival powers such as China and Russia are pushed out.

The first—and most dramatic—test of that doctrine came in Venezuela.

Operation Absolute Resolve: The Fall of Maduro

Relations between the United States and Venezuela stretch back nearly two centuries. Diplomatic ties were first established in 1835 following Venezuela's independence from Spain, and for much of the 20th century the countries maintained strong economic relations built around oil. American companies such as Standard Oil played a major role in developing Venezuela's petroleum industry, and the country became one of the United States' key energy suppliers.

That partnership collapsed after the 1999 election of Hugo Chávez, whose Bolivarian Revolution adopted an openly anti-American posture. Chávez nationalized major industries—including seizing the oil sector and US equipment in 2007—and aligned Venezuela with U.S. adversaries such as Cuba, Russia, China, and Iran.

Tensions deepened under Chávez's successor, Nicolás Maduro, who took power in 2013. Washington accused Maduro's government of electoral fraud, corruption, human-rights abuses, and narcotrafficking through networks such as the Cartel of the Suns.

The confrontation reached its climax on January 3, 2026.

In a rapid operation known as Operation Absolute Resolve, U.S. forces conducted a precision mission in Caracas that captured Maduro and his wife, Cilia Flores at the Presidential Palace Miraflores. The pair were quickly extradited to New York to face charges tied to narcoterrorism and corruption.

The entire operation reportedly lasted only hours.

Maduro's former vice president, Delcy Rodríguez, assumed interim leadership, and Washington moved quickly to recognize the transitional government.

Diplomatic relations—severed since 2019—were restored within weeks. By early March 2026, the United States reopened its embassy in Caracas for the first time in seven years.

For the Trump administration, the mission represented what the president described as a “perfect model” of intervention: decapitate adversarial leadership, stabilize the state through transitional authorities, and rapidly secure strategic resources without a prolonged military occupation.

Oil, Gold, and Strategic Resources

Venezuela's strategic value helps explain the urgency behind the operation.

The country holds the world's largest proven oil reserves—over 300 billion barrels— along with vast deposits of gold, rare earth minerals, and other critical resources vital to modern energy systems and advanced technologies.

With sanctions lifted, American energy companies such as Chevron and Shell have vowed to resume operations in the country. A \$2 billion energy agreement has already redirected

hundreds of millions of dollars in Venezuelan oil exports away from China and toward U.S. markets.

Mineral deals are also reshaping global supply chains. Washington recently licensed Venezuela's state mining company Minerven to sell gold doré bars through international trader Trafigura, with the metal refined in the United States. The agreement is expected to move 650–1,000 kilograms of gold into legitimate markets—diverting revenue away from smuggling networks and sanctioned countries such as Russia and Iran.

Beyond economics, the removal of Maduro—long accused of involvement in drug trafficking—also disrupts narcotics flows into North America.

The result is a strategic double win for Washington: energy security and regional stability.

Estimated Chances 5-10 Years Ago and Reflections on the Operation

Calculating retrospective probabilities is inherently subjective, based on historical context, political will, and risks. Five years ago (2020-21, under Biden), chances were low—around 5-10%. Sanctions were in place, but the focus was on diplomacy and negotiations with the opposition, not military action. International backlash and COVID-19 distractions made intervention unlikely. Ten years ago (2015-16, under Obama), odds were even slimmer—1-5%. Maduro had just consolidated power, and US policy emphasized multilateral pressure via the OAS and sanctions, avoiding direct confrontation amid other global priorities like Syria and ISIS.

What a marvel this operation is! Executed with precision in mere hours, it contrasts sharply with past hunts like Saddam Hussein (9 months) or Osama bin Laden (2 years). Trump's decisive leadership turned a long-standing impasse into a swift victory, showcasing American resolve. Locals in Venezuela and Venezuelan communities abroad have celebrated Trump's move, viewing Maduro's ouster as liberation from an illegitimate regime plagued by corruption and ties to drug cartels. Protests and social media reflect widespread relief, with many hailing it as a step toward freedom and prosperity. This bold

action keeps America safe by stemming drug flows and reasserts US dominance, proving that strong leadership can reshape global dynamics overnight.

- **IRAN**

From Caracas to Tehran

The Venezuelan operation quickly became a template for a broader geopolitical strategy.

By late February 2026, the administration’s attention shifted to the Middle East. A joint U.S.–Israeli military campaign, known as Operation Epic Fury, targeted Iran’s leadership structure. Strikes killed Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and several senior officials.

President Trump has demanded “unconditional surrender,” declaring in a March 6 Truth Social post that negotiations would occur only after Iran capitulates and a new leadership structure emerges.

The White House estimates the campaign currently costs roughly \$1 billion per day, but officials believe the war could conclude within weeks if Iran’s leadership collapses.

A transitional government—potentially involving figures such as exiled crown prince Reza Pahlavi—has been floated as a possible outcome.

Expanding the Abraham Accords

If Iran’s regime ultimately falls, the geopolitical impact could be enormous.

The removal of Tehran as a regional power would accelerate expansion of the Abraham Accords, the normalization agreements originally signed in 2020 between Israel and several Arab states.

The framework has already expanded beyond the Middle East. In November 2025, Kazakhstan joined the accords during a White House visit that included roughly \$17 billion in U.S. investment deals.

Additional candidates include Saudi Arabia, Syria, Lebanon, and other states seeking greater security cooperation with Washington.

A weakened Iran would remove the main obstacle to broader regional integration by dismantling Tehran's proxy network—including Hezbollah, the Houthis, and various Iraqi militias.

10 years ago, it would have been deemed ridiculous if someone predicted Syria would be free from Assad. That is now a reality as well.

The CRINK Axis Under Pressure

The combined pressure on Venezuela and Iran also targets a wider geopolitical alignment sometimes referred to as the "CRINK" axis—China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea.

Both Caracas and Tehran have served as important energy partners for Beijing and Moscow. Their destabilization threatens Chinese access to discounted oil and weakens Russian military and intelligence partnerships.

For Washington, the strategic implications are global. The removal of two key nodes in that network could significantly weaken the geopolitical leverage of America's major rivals.

- CUBA

The Next Test

The doctrine is also being applied closer to home.

In late February 2026, Trump floated the possibility of a "friendly takeover" of Cuba as the island faces its worst economic crisis in decades. The country is struggling with widespread blackouts, fuel shortages, and food scarcity—conditions exacerbated by the loss of subsidized Venezuelan oil following Maduro's removal.

On March 13, 2026, Cuban President Miguel Díaz-Canel confirmed that talks with U.S. officials were underway.

While Havana insists that any agreement must respect Cuban sovereignty, the Trump administration views the island's geographic position—just 90 miles from Florida—as strategically critical.

A cooperative Cuban government could reshape regional security, reduce migration pressures, and open major economic opportunities in tourism, agriculture, and biotechnology.

Yet the idea remains controversial, with critics warning of nationalist backlash across Latin America.

Toward a "Fortress America"

Taken together, these developments reveal the outlines of a broader strategic vision.

If Venezuela remains aligned with Washington, Cuba moves toward normalization, the United States expands Arctic access through Greenland with new NATO defense agreements, and Iran's regional power collapses, the United States could emerge with unprecedented strategic depth.

Such a system would reinforce energy independence, secure critical mineral supply chains, and establish a security architecture stretching from the Arctic to the Persian Gulf.

President Trump often has stated Greenland is needed for America's new Golden Dome system. In the event Russia and China are in direct conflict with the United States, missiles would fly directly over Greenland to reach the U.S. homeland.

Supporters describe the approach as a "Fortress America" strategy—one built on hemispheric dominance, resource security, and decisive action against adversaries.

Critics warn it risks repeating the mistakes of past regime-change efforts, from Iraq to Afghanistan, where military victories failed to produce stable political outcomes.

The Gamble

What makes the moment remarkable is how improbable such developments once seemed.

A decade ago, the idea of U.S. forces capturing Venezuela's president would have appeared almost unimaginable. Even five years ago, when Washington relied largely on sanctions and diplomacy, the probability seemed remote.

Yet in early 2026, the geopolitical landscape is shifting rapidly.

Whether Trump's strategy ultimately produces a new era of stability—or triggers fresh conflicts—remains uncertain.

But the scope of the ambition is unmistakable: a sweeping attempt to reassert American primacy across the Western Hemisphere while reshaping the global balance of power for the next century.

Expansion of Executive Power

In his second term, President Donald Trump has dramatically expanded executive power through an unprecedented surge of Executive Orders—over 225 in 2025 alone—combined with strong political will, a supportive Republican Congress (at least initially), and a favorable Supreme Court majority that has bolstered unitary executive theory and presidential authority over agencies. This approach has enabled rapid, unilateral actions to bypass legislative gridlock, including the creation of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) via EO on January 20, 2025, to slash federal spending and bureaucracy; the effective dismantling of USAID through massive foreign aid rescissions; and the defunding of PBS and NPR via EO 14290 and subsequent congressional clawbacks of over \$1 billion in Corporation for Public Broadcasting funds, citing bias and waste.

These moves demonstrate Trump's effectiveness in swiftly implementing "America First" priorities—deregulation, resource redirection, and agency restructuring—often framing them as national security or emergency measures. A future Democratic administration

post-2028 could inherit and potentially amplify these tools, using similar executive authority to reverse Trump policies (e.g., restoring global aid, public media funding, or advancing progressive agendas) while facing risks of judicial pushback, congressional resistance, or accusations of perpetuating an "imperial presidency."