

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

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

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY CARVEOUTS IN AI REGULATION

governs

Art. 2(3) explicitly excludes AI systems used exclusively for military, defence, or national-security purposes

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

US · EXECUTIVE ORDER

Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

US-EO-14110

TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY CARVEOUTS IN AI REGULATION

governs

§11 national-security exemption; NSM-10 parallel-track governance for national-security AI

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

What this comparison shows

The two regimes take the same position. This is a candidate for cross-jurisdictional alignment in industry guidance, voluntary codes, and harmonisation tracks.

Contested question: Whether the carveout should be (a) categorical exclusion of national-security AI, (b) parallel governance track with sui generis rules, or (c) full civilian-track compliance with national-security override. Most instruments choose (a); the field debates whether this leaves a dangerous gap.

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 — National Security Carveouts in AI Regulation](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).