SIEXECUTIVE BRIEFING

The naming order, Karp's liability argument, and the February report

TO: Leadership team; business clients; ministry clients
FROM: David A. Sims
DATE: October 5, 2026
SUBJECT: Executive Order 14434, what Karp means, and the Super Intelligence Force
NEXT DATE: November 28, 2026 — proposed statutory definition due
REPORT DUE: February 1, 2027 — Super Intelligence Force report

Executive summary

- The September alarms were about loss of control, not about today's chatbots. Jacob Coxon left Anthropic on September 8 saying labs are racing to self-improving systems and "gambling with our lives." Evan Hubinger, still Anthropic's alignment lead, put the chance AI kills all humans above 10 percent within a decade and said the company has no plan for superintelligence alignment. Joe Benton, Josh Engels, and, on October 3, OpenAI's David Robinson left on related grounds.
- On September 12, Dario Amodei asked the industry to pace capability gains, accept outside evaluators, and keep chip controls on China. Musk replied "Dario is right." Sam Altman agreed and called a 2026 OpenAI IPO ill-advised. Beijing called the China half fearmongering.
- Alex Karp did not join the slowdown. He means two different things. A pause is unavailable because China will not pause. Nationalization is a liability argument: if risk is unlimited, clients will sue, and the only shield is to hand the government a stake. He also said the first defense is that builders are liable for their own actions. His clients' live complaint, in the same interview, was theft of business know-how into a model, not extinction.
- Trump rejected a slowdown on September 29. The signed executive order that day, EO 14434, does not regulate models. It renames "artificial intelligence" to "Super Intelligence" inside the executive branch. The legal definition is unchanged: 15 U.S.C. § 9401(3). A proposed statutory definition is due November 28, 2026.
- The same afternoon he signed a separate document, the White House Accord on Super Intelligence, with Sundar Pichai, Dario Amodei, Mark Zuckerberg, Greg Brockman, Elon Musk, and Jensen Huang. It is not an executive order. It asks each frontier company for four layers: internal controls on cyber, biological, and chemical risk, and against unintended hacking; an internal team that checks those controls; an independent outside auditor; and a board committee that receives the reports and sees that problems are fixed. Trump called it morally binding. It has no penalty clause.
- On October 4 he named the **Super Intelligence Force**: (1) Jay Clayton (chair and AI czar), (2) Andrew Ferguson, (3) Emil Michael, and (4) Scott Kupor. It reports to Trump and Susie Wiles. Its report is due February 1, 2027. The charter, as described to the Wall Street Journal, assesses risk and the federal role without regulation that would restrict innovation or competition. It is not a speed limit and not nationalization.
- For clients: do not plan on a 2026 pause. Ask vendors what they signed on September 29. Keep indemnity and data terms in the contract. For ministries, issue a one-page use rule now. Religious organizations are on the force's outreach list. That is a consultation channel, not a theology and not a regulatory scheme for churches.

Hold these dates	What happens
November 28, 2026	EO 14434: the science adviser sends the President proposed legislative language for a federal definition of "Super Intelligence." Sixty days from September 29.

February 1, 2027	Super Intelligence Force report. One hundred twenty days from the October 4 announcement. Read it for three items: is existing law enough, is Congress asked to act, and does incident reporting become mandatory.

1. Executive Order 14434

What it is. On September 29, 2026, Trump signed Executive Order 14434, “Inaugurating the Era of Super Intelligence.” It is a terminology order. It is not a safety standard, not a compute cap, and not the accord. The White House fact sheet frames the rename as recognition of a “continuously advancing technological frontier,” and as a way to keep agencies focused on expanding capabilities rather than on the older implication that the technology merely imitates human intelligence.

What it requires. To the maximum extent permitted by law, departments and agencies must use “Super Intelligence” and “SI” instead of “artificial intelligence” and “AI” in official correspondence, public communications, websites, reports, policy documents, and other non-statutory documents. The order says the executive branch “will not acknowledge” the old terms “in any applicable setting.” Previously issued regulations, presidential actions, contracts, grants, and historical documents do not have to be rewritten.

What the words mean, for now. Section 3 defines “Super Intelligence” as the technologies already covered by “artificial intelligence” in 15 U.S.C. § 9401(3). The statute is unchanged. Within 60 days — by November 28, 2026 — the Assistant to the President for Science and Technology must send proposed legislative language: whether the new name should modify or supersede the statutory definition, conforming amendments, and any further executive action. The order creates no private right of action.

What sat beside it the same day. The order was signed at the White House lunch where Trump rejected a slowdown. He said he would not stifle something “bigger than the industrial revolution,” and that the United States has “a very big lead, and we’re going to keep our lead.” A same-day companion order directed GSA to stand up America.gov as a single digital front door for federal services. The accord, covered next, is a third paper from that day. Do not tell clients the naming order regulates their vendors.

2. The voluntary accord

A separate document. The White House Accord on Super Intelligence is not Executive Order 14434 and it is not a regulation. It was signed the same day, September 29, 2026, by President Trump and six company leaders: Sundar Pichai of Google, Dario Amodei of Anthropic, Mark Zuckerberg of Meta, Greg Brockman of OpenAI, Elon Musk of xAI, and Jensen Huang of Nvidia. Jeff Bezos and Alex Karp were at the lunch. They are not on the signature block. The text, as released by the White House and carried by the American Presidency Project, is a little over 300 words.

The four layers. The accord says every company training and deploying frontier models should have processes so the technology behaves as intended and problems are found and fixed. On top of whatever else a company already does, it asks for four layers. First, robust internal controls to monitor capabilities and alignment during training and deployment, around cybersecurity, biosecurity, and chemical threats, and to keep models from hacking or accessing technical systems in unintended ways. Second, an internal team empowered to check that the controls, monitoring, and detection are working, and to remediate issues. Third, an independent external auditor or evaluator to assess whether those controls are operating as intended. Fourth, an independent committee of the board of directors to oversee and receive reports from the control teams and from the internal and external auditors, and to see that identified issues are fixed.

What it binds. Trump called the accord morally binding and “a form of protection.” It states that each company is responsible for developing its technology safely and in a way that builds trust. It does not set a speed limit, does not adopt Amodei’s employee-level evaluator plan by name, and does not create a fine, an injunction, or a private right of action. The outside assessor is chosen in partnership with the company. The board committee is the company’s own. For a client, the practical question is whether a vendor signed, who

the outside evaluator is, and whether incident notice to the customer is in the contract. The accord does not put that notice there.

3. What Karp means

Karp gave two interviews' worth of argument in mid-September, and they answer different questions. He is not signing Amodei's pace-the-frontier letter, and he is not saying current models are about to end the world.

He means a pause is a gift to China. Around September 15 he told CNBC he would favor pausing the technology completely if there were no adversaries. Because China is in the race, "you can't pause it." The advantage, he said, is structural, in models and algorithms. He also said the U.S.–China relationship was not going to "end well," and that this was now closer to consensus than when he first said it. This is the sentence Trump acted on.

He means nationalization as a liability shield, not as industrial policy. On September 17 he told CNBC the risks are "unlimited." His line was that the labs' own view comes to this: these businesses have to be nationalized, because if they are not, every client is going to sue. He later put it as the only way to carry that liability: go to the government and say "nationalise us, please," and offer something like half the business in exchange for a cap. He added that the value would collapse when that happens, collapse again when the government sits on the board, and could hit the wider market. He was describing what unlimited liability does to an owner, not proposing a statute he had drafted.

He also means the builders should be on the hook first. In the same appearance he said reasonable guidelines have to be enforced, "but you can't do it" by wishing, and that "the first line of defense is you're liable for your own actions." He called for civil and criminal liability for builders who are not responsible. That cuts against a pure self-regulation story. Self-regulation, in his telling, is what the labs want so they can step out of the lawsuit. Liability is the prior. Nationalization is the escape hatch if the lawsuit cannot be survived.

He means his clients' safety problem is their data, and the military. He said partners are "livid" at a different safety issue than the one in the resignation posts: their alpha — how they run the business — landing in a model and showing up at the competitor next door. He also rejected labs that will not work with the military. Before the September 29 lunch he said AI has to serve "the warfighter" and enterprises. Palantir sells to governments. The stake is deployment under the customer's control, not training the next frontier model. Emil Michael's seat on the force is the government version of that fight: in 2026 the Pentagon, with Michael leading the negotiation, designated Anthropic a supply-chain risk after it refused mass domestic surveillance and independent control of lethal weapons.

4. The force and the February 1 report

On October 4 Trump announced the Super Intelligence Force. Jay Clayton, director of national intelligence and former SEC chair, leads it and is the AI czar, succeeding David Sacks. With him: FTC chairman Andrew Ferguson, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering Emil Michael (the Washington Post used "undersecretary of war"), and OPM director Scott Kupor, former Andreessen Horowitz managing partner. It reports to Trump and Susie Wiles. The job is to coordinate engagement with consumers, public-interest groups, religious organizations, infrastructure providers, and companies, and to keep America first. Clayton's line: "the risk of not being first is high."

The report is due Monday, February 1, 2027, 120 days after October 4. As described to the Journal, it covers risks and opportunities, the federal role, existing law and what Congress could do, and how the government hears about breaches, hacks, and jailbreaks. The constraint is explicit: address threats without regulation that restricts innovation or competition. Industry remains the main manager of risk. Clayton compared the mechanisms to Fed and SEC frameworks, which are dialogue, not a ban. The report recommends. It does not, on the published charter, impose Karp's nationalization or Amodei's pace.

5. What to tell business clients

- The binding federal text from September 29 is a rename, plus a voluntary accord. EO 14434 does not change vendor duties. Ask whether the vendor signed the accord, who the outside assessor is, and how an incident reaches you.
- Do not plan on a 2026 pause. The stated policy is the lead over China. Budget and hiring should assume capability keeps rising through February.
- Karp's usable point is contractual. If liability is the real fight, indemnity, training-on-client-data, and incident notice belong in the agreement now. Do not wait for nationalization. He himself said that path collapses valuations.
- On February 1, read the report for three items only: existing law declared sufficient or not, any request to Congress, and whether incident reporting becomes mandatory.

6. What to tell ministry clients

- Religious organizations are named in the October 4 outreach list. That is a chance to be consulted before February 1. It is not a promise that churches will be regulated as labs, and there is no published docket yet.
- Issue a one-page rule this month: no confidential pastoral data in a consumer tool, a human signs anything that speaks for the church, and no autonomous contact with members in crisis. Coxon said current systems are safe for ordinary use. The warning was about later self-improving systems.
- Do not preach the resignation posts as a dated end of the world, and do not dismiss them as marketing. Researchers named a non-trivial loss-of-control risk. The government chose the lead over China, a new name, and voluntary controls.

7. What the team does next

- Brief in three sentences. Labs asked to slow down. Trump refused, signed a naming order, and took a voluntary accord. A report is due February 1; a definition proposal is due November 28.
- Calendar both dates. November 28 is language, not a rule. February 1 is the policy paper.
- Do not tell clients Hubinger's "above 10 percent" is a government finding. It is one named researcher's belief.

Sources and limits

Executive Order 14434 and the White House fact sheet, September 29, 2026; Benton Institute account of the same-day accord and America.gov order; CNBC, September 15 and 17, 2026, including the Squawk on the Street transcript excerpts; Wall Street Journal account of the 120-day charter as carried October 3–4; AP, NPR, CNN, Washington Post, and CBC on the October 4 force. The full force charter was not in the Truth Social post. Substitute the sender's name before this memo leaves the office.