We Are in Charge: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Claim to Power over Venezuela in CNN Transcripts

[1]**Yongki Saputra,** [1]**Eliza Amalia,** [1]**Firlina Putri Ayu**

[1]**Universitas Nasional Jakarta, Indonesia**

Co-email: yongki_s@yahoo.com

Abstract: In early 2026, the international community witnessed a radical shift in United States foreign policy manifested through military operations and administrative takeover in Venezuela, actions which were legitimized through linguistic constructions disseminated by global media. This study critically examines how the discursive structure of the statement *"we're in charge"* operates textually to construct political legitimacy, and how CNN's narrative practices function socially to reinforce United States hegemony. Employing Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, this qualitative study analyzes a single official CNN transcript dated January 5, 2026. The findings reveal that at the micro level, directive lexical choices and material process verbs (e.g., *"in charge"* and *"run"*) function as performative acts that symbolically erase local legal authority and foreclose contestation through absolute modality. At the meso level, CNN functions as an agent of the manufacturing of consent through intertextual amplification and crisis framing, transforming acts of aggression into a narrative of moral rescue. At the macro level, the analysis identifies a neo-imperialist ideology manifested through the commodification of sovereignty, whereby the state is reduced to an economic asset particularly oil reserves subject to resource-based domination by a global superpower. The study concludes that Donald Trump's use of language constitutes a successful strategy of linguistic hegemony that reconfigures traditional notions of sovereignty into a new form of intervention framed as "global risk management," widely legitimized through discursive power.

Keywords: CNN, Critical Discourse Analysis, Donald Trump, Linguistic Hegemony, Power, Venezuela

I.   INTRODUCTION

Language plays a central role in the production, management, and legitimation of political power, particularly within contexts of international conflict and intervention. In the field of language and politics, language is never neutral; rather, it functions as an instrument of power that actively shapes social and political reality, influences public opinion, and guides the acceptance or rejection of specific policies (Kasman et al., 2025; Dalyan et al., 2025; Thayyib et al., 2020). Within contemporary global politics, military actions and foreign policy decisions are increasingly accompanied and justified by strategic linguistic constructions disseminated through international media. Such discursive practices do not merely report events, but actively frame them in ways that normalize authority, redefine sovereignty, and constrain alternative interpretations (Weda et al., 2021; Youngsun et al., 2024; Tammasse et al., 2025). In this context, the United States' military intervention and subsequent administrative control in Venezuela represents not only a geopolitical event, but also a critical site for examining how power is linguistically articulated and legitimized on the global stage.

Furthermore, language plays a constitutive role in the governance and legitimation of power by structuring relations of domination and exclusion (Karubaba et al., 2024; Sachiya et al., 2025). Rather than merely reflecting political reality, linguistic practices actively participate in producing social hierarchies and defining who is authorized to govern and who is subjected to control. Through mechanisms such as framing, rhetoric, and the institutionalization of meaning, language reinforces the position of dominant actors while marginalizing alternative interpretations. These discursive processes are particularly evident in contexts of legal normativity and state governance, where

authoritative meanings are naturalized and presented as common sense. As a result, language becomes a central tool in shaping collective political identity and stabilizing asymmetrical power relations (Mokoena et al., 2025).

In the arena of international politics and armed conflict, the discursive function of language becomes increasingly critical, as war rhetoric and security narratives are employed to justify coercive actions, shape threat perceptions, and normalize the use of force before a global public. Critical discourse analysis of war rhetoric reveals that language plays a central role in legitimizing military action and policy decisions, as well as shaping their long-term consequences for international relations and regional stability (Chiluwa & Ruzaite, 2025).

On January 5, 2026, during an exclusive interview broadcast by CNN, President Donald Trump delivered a performative statement that drew global attention: "It means we're in charge." This utterance is linguistically significant because it marks a departure from conventional diplomatic rhetoric toward an explicit claim of administrative and political control over another sovereign state. Rather than functioning as a casual remark, the statement operates as a discursive act that asserts authority and dominance. It signals a shift from indirect justification to overt claims of control. This illustrates that power in contemporary geopolitics is produced not only through military force, but also through language circulated in the global public sphere.

In the contemporary media environment, international news organizations such as CNN play a crucial role in mediating elite political discourse for global audiences. As argued by Herman and Chomsky (2008), mass media often function as key sites for the manufacturing of consent through selective framing and narrative normalization. News discourse therefore does not merely report political events but actively shapes how they are interpreted and evaluated. Political language in media operates as a discursive practice through which authority, legitimacy, and domination are constructed and stabilized (Fowler, 1991; Zurriyati et al., 2023; Andini et al., 2026).

The use of the statement "we're in charge" by the leader of a global superpower represents a deliberate strategy to legitimize intervention in the affairs of another sovereign state. Such claims are not accidental but are carefully embedded within broader discursive practices of authority construction. As Wodak (2018) explains, political actors employ legitimation strategies to justify actions and establish boundaries between those authorized to act and those subjected to control. Through these strategies, elite interventions are framed as natural, necessary, and morally justified, while alternative interpretations are marginalized.

Theoretically, this study is grounded in Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which conceptualizes discourse as operating across three interrelated dimensions: text, discursive practice, and social practice (Fairclough, 1995). This framework enables an integrated analysis of linguistic features, media mediation, and broader social power relations. At the textual level, the study examines Trump's lexical choices and authoritative modality. At the level of discursive practice, it analyses how CNN mediates and normalizes claims of power. At the level of social practice, the study addresses how such discourse reproduces hegemonic and neo-imperialist relations, a dimension largely overlooked in previous research (Kafi & Degaf, 2021; Rodríguez, 2021).

Consequently, a research gap persists regarding how linguistic strategies are mobilized to justify and legitimize direct military intervention on the international stage. Existing studies have largely examined political rhetoric within electoral contexts, policy debates, or economic discourse, without sufficient attention to explicit claims of administrative and sovereign control following military action. As a result, the discursive mechanisms through which authority is asserted and normalized in post-intervention contexts remain underexplored. This study aims to address this gap by focusing specifically on the discursive production of claims to absolute authority in international media transcripts. By doing so, it contributes to the literature on political discourse, hegemony, and the rhetoric of intervention by foregrounding language as a central mechanism of power.

Given the complexity of contemporary geopolitical discourse, this study aims to examine how claims of political authority are linguistically constructed and legitimized through media representation. Specifically, it analyzes how the discursive structure of the statement "we're in charge" operates at the textual level to assert power, and how CNN's narrative production functions at the level of discursive and social practice to normalize intervention. Employing Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework, the study integrates textual analysis with media mediation and broader social power relations. By doing so, it contributes to Critical Discourse Analysis by highlighting language as a central mechanism through which interventionist authority is exercised and sustained. This focus advances scholarly understanding of how seemingly concise political statements can produce far-reaching effects on perceptions of sovereignty and legitimacy.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Critical Discourse Analysis in Political and Interventionist Rhetoric

Scholarly inquiries into the use of language in political rhetoric demonstrate that words function not merely as tools of communication, but as strategic instruments of political intervention. World leaders frequently deploy language to frame aggressive actions such as the appropriation of sovereignty in ways that render them intelligible as humanitarian missions or efforts to maintain global stability. Within this context, the effectiveness of an intervention is highly contingent upon how such narratives are received, interpreted, and legitimized by the public through international media channels.

1. Theoretical Framework: Norman Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

This study is grounded in Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, which provides a comprehensive framework for linking micro-level linguistic features with macro-level social practices. The model enables an integrated examination of how language functions simultaneously as text, discursive practice, and social practice.

a. Textual Representation (Micro Level)

At the micro level, the analysis focuses on lexical choices, sentence structures, and modality as key linguistic resources for constructing the representation of political actors. The lexical selections employed are evaluative in nature, whereby directive expressions such as *"in charge"* function to personify state authority and relocate it symbolically under the control of the United States. Through such choices, linguistic forms are mobilized to naturalize asymmetrical power relations and to project dominance as a taken-for-granted reality.

b. Discursive Practice (Meso Level)

At the meso level, the study examines how the text is produced, circulated, and consumed through media institutions such as CNN, which operate as mediators of power. Within this process, the media provide immediate legitimacy by framing political statements as historically significant events. This framing practice not only amplifies elite discourse but also shapes interpretative horizons through which audiences understand and internalize claims of authority.

c. Social Practice and Hegemony (Macro Level)

At the macro level, the analysis explores how domination is reinforced through neo-imperialist ideology, wherein control over other states is constructed as legitimate in the name of energy security and regional dominance. Within this dimension, discourse functions as a mechanism for normalizing interventionist practices and embedding them within broader structures of global power and hegemony.

B. Summary and Critical Discussion of Previous Literature

The body of literature on the discourse analysis of Donald Trump has expanded rapidly; however, the majority of existing studies remain predominantly focused on the domestic political

context. Kafi and Degaf (2021) demonstrate that Trump exhibits a high degree of linguistic effectiveness in influencing audiences through the strategic use of euphemism and dysphemism. In their analysis, euphemism is employed to mitigate or obscure unfavorable facts associated with Trump himself, whereas dysphemism functions as a propagandistic device to assign negative evaluations to political opponents or external actors constructed as adversaries.

The critical discussion in this section emphasizes that Trump's political language should be understood as an evolution of foreign policy doctrine rather than merely a rhetorical style. While Kafi and Degaf's study demonstrates that the use of sharp and evaluative diction was primarily aimed at generating public sympathy during the State of the Union address, the present study extends this line of inquiry by examining how such diction is strategically deployed as a structured mechanism to symbolically and administratively erode the sovereignty of another state.

C. Positioning the Study within the Research Gap

This study addresses a critical gap in the literature concerning the transition of power rhetoric from the campaign phase to the stage of direct physical and administrative takeover.

a. From Domestic Populism to Global Takeover Discourse: There is a discernible shift in focus from a rhetoric of *threat* to a discourse of *sovereignty takeover*. In contrast to earlier analyses of Trump's domestic political style, which emphasize adversarial threats and evaluative language within a national context, this study positions Trump's utterance *"we're in charge"* as linguistically occupying the authority of another sovereign state following a military operation. This represents a transition from political persuasion within domestic populism to the performative legitimization of extraterritorial power projection.

b. Gap in the Analysis of Real Administrative Control: A key gap in the literature lies in the insufficient exploration of claims to real administrative control. Whereas Rodríguez (2021) discusses the Venezuelan crisis primarily from the perspective of political economy, this study introduces a novel focus by analyzing the claim *"We're in charge"* as a discursive mechanism for symbolically negating sovereignty through an official CNN transcript. By doing so, the research extends beyond economic framing to interrogate the linguistic construction of authority and control in a geopolitical crisis an aspect that remains underexamined in prior work.

D. The Relationship between Language and Political Legitimacy

Political actions acquire legitimacy through narratives that are systematically constructed by means of moralization and naturalization strategies. Within political discourse, language functions not merely to describe actions, but to render them ethically acceptable and socially inevitable.

a. Moralization: Moralization operates through the strategic use of value-laden terms such as *"freedom"* and *"democracy"* to cloak military interests in moral and humanitarian rhetoric. By invoking universally endorsed values, political actors reframe coercive actions as ethical obligations, thereby neutralizing potential resistance and moral critique. In this process, military intervention is discursively elevated from an act of force to a moral necessity. b. Naturalization: Naturalization functions by presenting foreign intervention as the only logical and reasonable solution in the name of *"public safety"* or *"the protection of civilians."* Through this strategy, interventionist actions are constructed as common sense and unavoidable, effectively erasing alternative interpretations or policy options. As a result, extraordinary political measures are normalized and internalized as part of an unquestioned reality.

III.   METHODS

This study is designed as a qualitative descriptive inquiry employing Norman Fairclough's (1995) three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. This approach is selected due to its analytical capacity to bridge micro-level textual analysis with complex macro-level socio-political practices. The research focuses on uncovering power relations and ideological structures

embedded in language use, particularly within the context of claims to sovereignty takeover. By examining discourse across textual, discursive, and social dimensions, the study seeks to reveal how linguistic practices function as mechanisms for legitimizing political authority and reconfiguring state sovereignty.

A. Data Collection and Data Source

The data in this study consist of linguistic units, including words, phrases, and sentences that contain expressions of authority claims and political legitimation strategies. The primary data source is a single official CNN transcript dated January 5, 2026, which documents President Donald Trump's statements regarding the success of the U.S. military operation and the administrative takeover in Venezuela. In this context, Trump explicitly asserts that *"we're in charge"* in relation to the governance of Venezuela, underscoring the discursive focus of the analysis.

The selection of a single source (the January 5 interview transcript) is intended to preserve the contextual integrity of the discourse under investigation. Data collection was conducted through documentary methods, involving systematic access to the digital CNN archive, verification of the transcript against the original audio-visual broadcast, and systematic recording of relevant speaking segments. The researcher purposively selected ten key quotations grounded on the frequency of power pronouns, authoritative modality, and evaluative diction that align with the research questions.

Focusing on a single authoritative media transcript allows for analytical depth rather than breadth, thereby enabling a careful and contextualized examination of how hegemonic power is linguistically constructed and mediated in a specific discursive event. In Critical Discourse Analysis, such depth-oriented inquiry is methodologically justified when the selected text represents a critical site of ideological production. Moreover, because the data consist solely of publicly accessible media transcripts, this study does not involve human subjects and therefore does not raise ethical concerns related to consent or confidentiality.

B. Data Analysis Procedures and Techniques

This analysis is grounded in a discursive reality, focusing on how power, authority, and legitimacy are linguistically produced rather than on empirical verification of political or military actions. The data analysis procedures were conducted systematically in accordance with the three stages of Fairclough's model to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

1. First Stage: Description (Micro Level)

At the micro level, in-depth linguistic analysis was conducted on the text. The researcher examined linguistic features such as lexical choices, modality to gauge the speaker's degree of certainty, and pronoun usage to map the polarization between the *"we"* (United States) and *"they"* (the Venezuelan regime). Instances of authoritative modality and directive diction such as Trump's repeated assertion that *"we're in charge"* were identified as key markers of discursive authority.

2. Second Stage: Interpretation (Meso Level)

At the meso level, the analysis focused on discursive practices, examining how the text was produced and consumed. This included a consideration of how the presidential communication team constructed the message and how international media outlets such as CNN acted as mediating institutions that disseminated the discourse to global audiences through news framing techniques. The ways in which the interview and related segments were presented by different anchors and correspondents were analyzed to understand how the narrative of control was reinforced or contested across different contexts.

3. Third Stage: Explanation (Macro Level)

At the macro level, findings from the previous stages were connected to broader social practices. The researcher analyzed how the discourse functions to reproduce neo-imperialist ideology and the United States' efforts to maintain hegemony in the Latin American region. This included interpreting how the constructed narrative aligns with larger political structures and power relations that normalize interventionist actions on the international stage as legitimate and necessary.

The use of this three-stage procedure ensures that each claim of authority is analyzed in a layered manner, from linguistic structures to broader socio-political implications. To enhance analytical rigor, the findings were interpreted through repeated readings and theoretical triangulation with established CDA literature, ensuring consistency across linguistic features, discursive practices, and broader social explanations.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

Following Fairclough's conception of discourse as a form of social practice, the findings of this study are organized to demonstrate how linguistic features at the textual level, media mediation at the discursive level, and ideological formations at the social level operate in conjunction to legitimize political dominance. Rather than treating these dimensions as discrete or isolated layers, the analysis reveals their interdependence in constructing claims of authority and control.

This study examines ten key quotation units extracted from the CNN transcript dated January 5, 2026. To ensure analytical depth and coherence, the discussion is structured according to Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional framework, encompassing textual analysis (micro level), discursive practice (meso level), and social practice (macro level).

Table 1. Classification of Data Based on Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

No	Unit of Analysis (Data)	Fairclough's Dimension	Linguistic Features & Critical Focus
1	*"It means we're in charge."*	Micro (Textual Level)	Directive lexical choice; symbolic erasure of national sovereignty through absolute authority claims.
2	*"We're going to run the country."*	Micro (Textual Level)	Material process verb (*run*); discursive shift from military intervention to administrative control.
3	*"Until a safe, proper, and judicious transition."*	Micro (Textual Level)	Evaluative adjectives functioning as moral euphemisms to legitimize occupation.
4	*"The case against Maduro is infallible."*	Micro (Textual Level)	Absolute modality; foreclosure of legal and diplomatic contestation.
5	*"We built their oil industry."*	Micro (Textual Level)	Historical legitimation strategy; construction of ownership rights through selective historical claims.

6	*"He killed millions and millions of people."*	Meso (Discursive Practice)	Intertextual amplification; media-assisted moral justification for intervention.
7	*"We are prepared to do a second strike."*	Meso (Discursive Practice)	Crisis framing via urgency and threat narratives in news mediation.
8	*"Take over its vast oil reserves."*	Macro (Social Practice)	Neo-imperialist ideology; commodification of sovereignty and resource-based domination.
9	*"I'll give you an answer... it will be controversial."*	Macro (Social Practice)	Personalization of power; concentration of hegemonic authority in a singular leader figure.
10	*"Denmark is not going to be able to do it (Greenland)."*	Macro (Social Practice)	Global expansionist discourse; erosion of national boundaries in favor of strategic interests.

Table 1 presents the classification of ten selected data units based on Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis. The data are distributed across the micro, meso, and macro levels to illustrate how claims of authority operate simultaneously at the level of linguistic form, media mediation, and broader social practice. At the micro level, the analysis highlights how lexical choices, modality, and evaluative expressions function to assert control and symbolically erode national sovereignty. At the meso level, the table demonstrates the role of media discourse in amplifying moral justification and crisis narratives that normalize intervention. At the macro level, the findings reveal how these discursive patterns reproduce neo-imperialist ideology through the commodification of sovereignty and the personalization of power.

This discussion section interprets the research findings by systematically situating them within Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework and relevant scholarly literature. The analysis focuses on how linguistic features, media discursive practices, and the broader global socio-political context interact dynamically to construct and legitimize claims of United States authority over Venezuela. Accordingly, this section moves beyond a mere restatement of the results and instead positions the findings within a wider theoretical debate on the interrelationship between language, power, and hegemony in contemporary global politics.

B. Discussion

1. Micro-Level Analysis: Linguistics as an Instrument of Domination (The Power of Naming)

At the textual level, the analysis concentrates on how linguistic features in Data 1 to Data 5 are mobilized to construct claims of absolute authority. The first dominant strategy identified is the nominalization of power through the declarative statement *"It means we're in charge"* (Data 1). Here, the directive lexical choice *"in charge"* functions to erase the United States' position as an external actor and reconstitute it discursively as a legitimate internal administrator with unilateral authority. This strategy is reinforced in Data 2 through the use of deontic modality and a material process verb in the phrase *"We're going to run the country."* The verb *run* does not merely denote managerial activity; rather, it marks a discursive shift from military intervention to administrative control, symbolically signaling the comprehensive delegitimation of Venezuela's local political institutions.

These statements operate not as neutral descriptions but as performative acts that unilaterally reconstruct power relations. Within Fairclough's *Language and Power* framework (2015), such

discursive moves exemplify the *naturalization of domination*, whereby claims of control are presented as self-evident realities that require no further justification. The deployment of material processes such as *run*, alongside absolute modality markers such as *infallible* (Data 4), effectively forecloses spaces for legal and diplomatic contestation. Linguistically, this reflects what Fairclough conceptualizes as *power behind discourse*, namely power that operates through shared assumptions and taken-for-granted meanings rather than overt coercion.

Consequently, language ceases to function as a tool of diplomacy and instead becomes a performative mechanism that symbolically enacts the "takeover" of another state's authority. This discursive force is further amplified in Data 3 using moral euphemization, expressed via evaluative adjectives in the phrase *"safe, proper, and judicious transition."*. These lexical choices reframe administrative occupation as a morally necessary and procedurally rational intervention. The culmination of this textual strategy appears in Data 4, where the use of *infallible* represents linguistic absolutism, designed to suppress legal debate and alternative interpretations under international law.

Lastly, Data 5 employs a strategy of historical legitimation through the past-tense construction *"We built their oil industry."*. This formulation constructs a narrative of entitlement, implying ownership rights over another nation's resources based on selectively invoked historical contribution. Through this combination of directive lexical choices, authoritative modality, and temporal framing, the text constructs a coherent micro-level discourse that normalizes domination and renders sovereignty linguistically negotiable.

2. Meso-Level Analysis: CNN and the Manufacturing of Consent

At the level of discursive practice, the analysis highlights the role of international media particularly CNN in producing, mediating, and disseminating the narratives examined in Data 6 and Data 7. CNN functions as a critical intermediary that normalizes and amplifies claims of authority articulated by political elites. The findings reveal a pattern of intertextual amplification in Data 6, where CNN reproduces the hyperbolic claim *"He killed millions and millions of people."* By foregrounding narratives of past suffering, the media provides a media-assisted moral justification for intervention. This process constructs an ethical foundation that renders Trump's subsequent claim of being "in charge" morally intelligible and politically justifiable to the global audience.

In addition, CNN performs a process of discursive normalization through crisis framing via urgency and threat narratives in its news packaging of Data 7, namely the threat *"prepared to do a second strike."* By embedding the threat within the dramatic tempo of "breaking news," CNN generates a heightened sense of urgency that shifts audience attention away from questions of legality and international law toward a logic of inevitability. This framing transforms potential legal controversy into an apparently unavoidable response to crisis.

Through such mediation, individual presidential statements are recontextualized as dominant public discourse, while critical or alternative voices are marginalized within the overarching narrative circulated on a global scale. In this sense, CNN does not merely function as a neutral information channel, but as a discursive actor that converts individual executive rhetoric into hegemonic public meaning. This process exemplifies what Fairclough conceptualizes as the manufacturing of consent within the arena of global politics, where media practices actively contribute to the stabilization of elite power.

3. Macro-Level Analysis: Neo-Imperialism and the Commodification of Sovereignty

At the level of social practice, the findings reveal the operation of a neo-imperialist ideology enacted through the commodification of sovereignty. This analysis connects Data 8 through Data 10 to the broader geopolitical configuration of 2026. The central macro-level datum is the claim to *"take over its vast oil reserves"* (Data 8). From a sociolinguistic perspective, this statement exposes the ideological core of resource-based domination, wherein sovereignty is no longer treated as an inviolable legal principle but is reduced to an economic asset subject to external management. The

language employed explicitly reframes Venezuela's statehood as a resource to be administered rather than a right to be respected.

This macro-level analysis also identifies a process of personalization of power in Data 9 (*"I'll give you an answer... it will be controversial"*). This linguistic feature constructs the concentration of hegemonic authority in a singular leader figure, effectively obscuring institutional mechanisms and international legal frameworks. Such personalization reinforces a model of governance centered on individual executive power rather than democratic consensus.

The discourse is further expanded through global expansionist discourse referenced in Data 10 regarding Greenland (*"Denmark is not going to be able to do it"*). These extensions signal the erosion of national boundaries in favor of strategic interests, normalizing expansionist logic beyond Venezuela. Collectively, these findings demonstrate that the language within the CNN transcript functions as a discursive lubricant for global expansionism. By 2026, political language has effectively transformed the face of domination into that of "global risk management," a narrative that renders intervention socially acceptable and widely legitimized through linguistic means.

4. Integrating Micro–Meso–Macro Levels: Language as a Hegemonic Apparatus

Therefore, the discussion demonstrates that the three analytical levels do not operate in isolation but mutually reinforce one another to function as a cohesive hegemonic apparatus. Micro-level linguistic features, such as directive lexical choices (*"in charge"*) and absolute modality, provide the essential textual form through which claims of authority are articulated. However, these features rely on the meso-level discursive practices, where news framing and intertextual amplification ensure that such claims are circulated and normalized as "truth" rather than mere political opinion. Finally, these mediated claims are anchored in the macro-level social context, which supplies the neo-imperialist ideological justification that renders the commodification of sovereignty legitimate in the eyes of the global public.

This integration affirms Fairclough's assertion that discourse constitutes a form of social practice that actively shapes political reality rather than merely reflecting it. Within the context of 2026, Trump's political language mediated by international media successfully reconfigures traditional boundaries of sovereignty and normalizes a new form of administrative intervention. These findings extend Critical Discourse Analysis scholarship by demonstrating that takeover discourse is no longer implicit or euphemized, but openly articulated and legitimized through narratives of "global risk management."

V. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Donald Trump's use of language in the CNN transcript dated January 5, 2026, constitutes a calculated strategy of linguistic hegemony designed to legitimize the takeover of Venezuelan sovereignty. Through the lens of Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework, the findings demonstrate that language has evolved from a tool of diplomacy into an instrument of "global risk management" that normalizes neo-imperialist practices; at the micro level, directive lexical choices (*"in charge"*) and material process verbs (*"run"*) symbolically erase local legal authority, while absolute modality (*"infallible"*) forecloses legal contestation. Simultaneously at the meso level, CNN operates as an agent of the manufacturing of consent by deploying intertextual amplification and crisis framing to transmute military aggression into a morally sanctioned rescue narrative. These discursive practices culminate at the macro level in the consolidation of a Doctrine of Ownership based on the commodification of sovereignty, wherein national statehood is reduced to an economic asset subject to resource-based domination. Ultimately, this research exposes a critical discursive transition in U.S. political rhetoric from threat-based narratives to explicit claims of administrative control, setting a precedent where the boundaries of state sovereignty are rendered fluid and vulnerable to discursive manipulation in the name of global security.

Financing

The authors did not receive financing for the development of this research.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Andini, C., Youngsun, K., Sunnuraini, S., & Warouw, D. S. (2026). Developing a Chunk-Based Learning Model to Improve Korean Speaking Skills for Beginner Learners. *International Journal of L2CT*, *1*(2), 156-172.

2. CNN Transcripts. (2026, January 5). CNN Newsroom: President Trump Addresses the Nation on Venezuela Operations and Transition. Cable News Network. Retrieved from https://transcripts.cnn.com/show/cnr/date/2026-01-05/segment/01

3. Chiluwa, I., & Ruzaite, J. (2025). *Analysing the language of political conflict: A study of war rhetoric of Vladimir Putin and Volodymyr Zelensky*. Critical Discourse Studies. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2024.2331186

4. Dalyan, M., Rahman, F. & Fitriani. (2025). Etnolinguistic Study of Healing Discourse in Buginese Traditional Healthcare. *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 31-38.

5. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman Group Limited.

6. Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

7. Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (2008). *Manufacturing Consent The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. The Bodley Head.

8. Juidah, I., Pratiwi, V. U. (2025). CNN Indonesia's Framing Strategy in Influencing Public Opinion. J-LELC: Journal of Language Education, Linguistics, and Culture, 5(1), 21–33. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25299/jlelc.2025.21607

9. Kafi, L. N., & Degaf, A. (2021). Euphemism and dysphemism strategies in Donald Trump's speech at SOTU 2020. *International Journal of Humanity Studies, 4*(2), 194–207. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v4i2.3205

10. Karubaba, S., Machmoed, H., Rahman, F., & Kamzinah, K. (2024, May). Comparison of Pronominal Systems in Yapen Languages. In *4th International Conference on Linguistics and Culture (ICLC-4 2023)* (pp. 360-374). Atlantis Press.

11. Kasman, N., Hanafi, M., Aswadi, & Kasman, R. (2025). *Bahasa dan politik dalam wacana global: Analisis kritis terhadap framing, retorika, dan kekuasaan*. Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia.

12. Mokoena, T., De Smet, A., & Chenier, S. (2025). *Language, law, and power: The politics of official languages in multilingual states*. Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics.

13. Rodríguez, F. (2021). *Toxic conflict: Understanding Venezuela's economic collapse* (446; Kellogg Institute Working Paper).

14. Tammasse, Jumraini, & Rahman, F. (2025). The Influence of Neurolinguistic Intervention on the Development of Reading Ability in Children With Dyslexia: A Case Study Approach. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies (TPLS)*, *15*(7).

15. Thayyib, M., Arafah, B., Manda, M. L., & Rahman, F. (2020). Ideological Dimension in Bunga'lalang: An Anthropological Linguistic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies*

in Humanities, *3*(3), 467-475.

16. Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

17. Wodak, R. (2018). *Discourse and European integration* (KFG Working Paper Series No. 86). Freie Universität Berlin, FB Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften, Otto-Suhr-Institut für Politikwissenschaft, Kolleg-Forschergruppe "The Transformative Power of Europe." https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-57625-7

18. Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Linguistic aspects in intercultural communication (IC) practices at a higher education institution in Indonesia. *Eroupean Language Scientific Journal*, *14*(2), 76-91.

19. Youngsun, K., Sosrohadi, S., Andini, C., Adinda, R., Jae, P. K., Yookyung, K., & Jung, S. (2024). Beyond the Korean Wave: Understanding the Motivation of Among Indonesian Gen Z to Learn Korean in the K-Pop Trend. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, *7*(06).

20. Zurriyati, Rahman, F., & Alaqad, M. H. (2023). Language and power: How news media construct a biased structure of information in public discourse during the presidential election. *Malikussaleh Social & Political Reviews,* *4*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29103/mspr.v%vi%i.11031