

EU AI Act vs Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

Editorial verdict: **asymmetric** — see comparison narrative below.

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF AI-DRIVEN WORKER DISPLACEMENT

silent

EU AIA focuses on AI-in-employment-decisions (Annex III §4); displacement-as-cause not separately addressed

Primary source: [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#)

US · EXECUTIVE ORDER

Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

US-EO-14110

TREATMENT OF AI-DRIVEN WORKER DISPLACEMENT

implicit

§6 workforce + §6(c) future-of-work studies; not operational obligations

Primary source: [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#)

What this comparison shows

One regime addresses the topic explicitly while the other covers it only implicitly or not at all. This is a likely site of regulatory arbitrage and a candidate for comparative-law follow-up.

Contested question: Should displacement governance attach to (a) AI providers (originator liability), (b) AI deployers (use-context liability), or (c) state-level retraining + transition programmes (collectivised response)? Each regime allocates the transition burden differently.

Bibliography

1. [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
2. [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#) — Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI.
3. [Policy Window — AI-Driven Worker Displacement](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).