

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 TECHNOLOGICAL SOVEREIGNTY

implicit

Recitals 1-5 + EU competence framing; AI Office establishes EU capacity

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

US · EXECUTIVE ORDER

Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

US-EO-14110

TREATMENT OF TECHNOLOGICAL SOVEREIGNTY

governs

§4.8 + CHIPS Act overlap (BIS export controls, domestic compute)

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: Can mid-sized economies sustain frontier-tier AI capability domestically, or does the compute-cost curve favour US/CN/EU only? Active debate in India, Brazil, ASEAN policy literatures.

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 — Technological Sovereignty](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).