Cordova for President

Moving Forward Together

www.vincentcordova.com | info@cordova2028.com | (350) 229-1046 | MANTECA, CA 95336

The United States Constitution

Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution imposes only three eligibility requirements on persons serving as president, based on the officeholder's age, time of residency in the U.S., and citizenship status:

U.S. Constitution – Presidential Candidate Eligibility

"No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."

Executive Order [2029-12]

OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

PROTECTING AMERICAN WORKERS FROM AUTOMATED DISPLACEMENT:
MANDATING HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION AS A CONDITION OF COMMERCE,
DECLARING MASS AUTOMATED UNEMPLOYMENT A MATTER OF NATIONAL SECURITY,
PROHIBITING THE WEAPONIZATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AGAINST THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE,
BANNING AUTOMATED DISPLACEMENT IN ALL PRIVATE EQUITY AND INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR PORTFOLIO COMPANIES,
PROHIBITING AI DEPLOYMENT BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED ENTITIES,
ESTABLISHING THREE-TIER NATIONAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK FOR ALL FOREIGN-OWNED AI,
AND ESTABLISHING ABSOLUTE ANTI-CIRCUMVENTION AND ANTI-LANGUAGE-MANIPULATION ENFORCEMENT

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.), the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. § 4501 et seq.), the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act (FIRRMA, 50 U.S.C. § 4565), the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.), the Clayton Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. § 12 et seq.), the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. § 41 et seq.), the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. § 80b et seq.), the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.), the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. § 3101 et seq.), Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. § 157), the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.

§ 301 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. § 2131 et seq.), the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.), the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. § 1361 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.), and Article II of the Constitution of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1 — PREAMBLE

This Order is written without apology and without euphemism. What is happening to the American workforce is not a natural economic evolution. It is a deliberate extraction. The people behind it have names, addresses, and balance sheets. They have chosen returns over humans. This Order chooses humans.

The United States of America was not built by capital alone. It was built by the labor of human beings — people who showed up, built things with their hands and their minds, raised families, paid taxes, served in wars, and trusted that this country had a future that included them. That social contract is being shredded in broad daylight by a class of institutional investors, private equity firms, and corporate boards who have concluded that the only cost worth eliminating is the cost of the human being.

Artificial intelligence is not the enemy. Let that be stated plainly. AI is one of the most powerful tools in human history. When deployed alongside a human being — augmenting judgment, accelerating research, catching errors, expanding access to knowledge — AI is a force of extraordinary good. This Order protects that deployment. What this Order prohibits is the use of AI as a weapon against the very people this government exists to serve.

The data is not abstract. Over 771,000 Americans sleep without a home tonight. Thirty-four to thirty-nine million Americans live in poverty. Prescription drug use for anxiety, depression, and stress-related illness has reached historic levels. Illegal drug use is epidemic. Families are fracturing. Communities are hollowing out. These are not coincidences. These are the downstream consequences of treating human beings as costs to be cut.

The extractive mandate that drives AI-powered workforce displacement does not stop at human workers. It extends, by the same logic and through the same financial structures,

to animals and to the natural world. Factory farming operations deploy algorithmic systems to maximize output per animal without legally binding welfare constraints, producing conditions of systematic suffering that no humane standard would permit. Resource extraction industries deploy AI to identify and access natural systems faster than regulatory frameworks can assess or respond to the damage. Agricultural operations deploy AI to maximize short-term yield while depleting the soil, water, and pollinator populations that future harvests depend on. The natural world — the water, the soil, the ecosystems, the animals — is being fed into the same extraction machine that is consuming the American workforce. This Order addresses both. The principle is the same: life is not a resource to be extracted for financial return. That principle applies to human workers. It applies to animals. It applies to the living systems that sustain all of them.

The private equity model, as currently practiced, does not build businesses. It extracts from them. The institutional investor model does not steward the long-term health of American companies or American communities. It optimizes quarterly returns for entities whose identity is a line in a spreadsheet. AI-driven mass displacement is the next chapter of the same story.

There is a second threat this Order addresses with equal force: the use of foreign capital — including capital from governments and entities that are adversaries of the United States, and from allied governments whose administrations may change — to acquire ownership and operational control of American companies and then deploy AI systems against the American workforce and within American critical infrastructure. A foreign government that controls the AI systems managing American healthcare, American financial services, or American communications infrastructure does not need a military to bring this country to its knees. It needs a board seat and a software update. Governments change. Administrations get captured by financial interests. Leaders are replaced by leaders with different priorities. This Order is written not for today's diplomatic environment but for every administration that follows. The control point is permanent. The relationship is not.

And there is a third threat this Order addresses that has never been adequately confronted in American law: the deliberate manipulation of language, corporate structure, and legal framing to evade accountability. This Order eliminates that game. The standard

of this Order is not what an entity claims to be doing. The standard is what an entity is actually doing, measured by results, not representations.

SECTION 2 — DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Order, the following definitions apply. They are stated precisely and are to be interpreted in the manner most consistent with the protection of American workers. Any ambiguity is resolved in favor of the affected workers, not the regulated entity.

2.1. "AUGMENTATION" means an AI deployment in which: (a) the human workforce in the relevant employment category is maintained at or above its pre-deployment level; and (b) individual workers in that category perform more complex, higher-value, or better-compensated work as a result of AI assistance. Augmentation is not augmentation if the workforce shrinks. An AI system that performs the entirety of a previously human function is not an augmentation tool regardless of what it is called.

2.2. "COMPARABLE ROLE" means employment that satisfies all of the following conditions: (a) at least 95% of the worker's prior annual compensation, adjusted for inflation; (b) at least 95% of prior benefits, including health insurance, retirement contributions, and paid leave; (c) no more than a 10% increase in one-way commuting distance from the worker's primary residence; and (d) equal or higher employment status. A reclassification from W-2 employee to independent contractor is per se non-comparable regardless of stated compensation level. Comparable role determinations are made by HACO, not by the regulated entity.

2.3. "CONTROLLING INTEREST" means, for private equity or institutional investor purposes: (a) ownership of 25% or more of any class of equity, voting rights, or economic interest, measured by beneficial ownership across all affiliated funds and vehicles; or (b) any contractual, structural, or informal right to appoint or remove a majority of the board of directors or equivalent governing body, regardless of ownership percentage.

2.4. "FOREIGN ADVERSARY ENTITY" is defined in Section 6.2. The definition is based on the conduct and structure of the entity, not on the diplomatic classification of the country in which it is incorporated or with which it is affiliated. No list maintained by any government agency is dispositive. No change in diplomatic status, treaty relationship, or government designation affects the applicability of the structural definition.

2.5. "EXTRACTIVE CAPITAL ENTITY" means any entity — regardless of assets under management, number of portfolio companies, fund size, or formal legal classification — whose primary operating purpose is the acquisition of ownership interests in other entities for the purpose of financial return through resale, dividend extraction, fee generation, or value realization, including but not limited to: private equity funds of any size; hedge funds; venture capital funds where the primary purpose is financial return rather than direct operational participation; family offices investing in operating companies for return; holding companies whose primary purpose is investment return rather than direct operation; institutional investors including pension fund managers, endowment managers, and sovereign wealth funds; and any entity in which any of the foregoing holds a controlling, significant, or any ownership interest. The prior $1 billion threshold is eliminated in its entirety. The nature of the operating mandate — not the size of assets under management, not the number of portfolio companies, and not the formal legal structure — is the governing standard. An extractive capital entity with $10 million in assets under management is subject to this Order on identical terms as one with $100 billion. Fragmentation of a fund into smaller vehicles to fall below any threshold is a circumvention under Section 7 and is treated as a single entity for all purposes of this Order.

2.5.1. AGGREGATE ASSETS UNDER COMMON CONTROL. For purposes of determining whether any threshold in this Order applies, assets under management are calculated on an aggregate basis across all funds, vehicles, co-investment vehicles, separately managed accounts, and related entities sharing a common general partner, investment adviser, managing member, key personnel, carried interest arrangement, or coordinated investment decision-making structure. Entities that are formally separate but operationally unified are treated as a single entity. Two or more funds that share any of the foregoing characteristics are treated as one fund for all purposes of this Order.

2.5.2. THE COORDINATION TEST. Any two or more entities that share a general partner, investment adviser, managing member, key investment personnel, carried interest structure, or that coordinate investment decisions through any mechanism — formal or informal, written or unwritten — are treated as a single extractive capital entity under this Order, regardless of their formal legal separation. Coordination is established by evidence of shared decision-making, shared fee structures, shared personnel, or common

beneficial ownership. The absence of a written coordination agreement is not evidence of the absence of coordination.

2.6. "MATERIAL REDUCTION" in human employment means: (a) a reduction of more than 5% of headcount in an affected employment category within 24 months of AI deployment; or (b) an absolute reduction of more than 50 workers in that category within the same period; whichever threshold is reached first. The 24-month window resets with each new AI deployment in the affected category.

2.7. "SIGNIFICANT OWNERSHIP INTEREST" means: (a) for private companies — 15% or more of any class of equity or voting rights; (b) for public companies — 10% or more as reported under SEC beneficial ownership rules; and (c) 5% or more in any entity triggers mandatory disclosure and HACO review, but does not automatically constitute a significant ownership interest triggering the prohibitions of Section 5, absent other indicia of control or influence.

2.8. "SUBSTANCE-OVER-FORM STANDARD" means the interpretive rule established in Section 7.2, under which the question at every enforcement determination is what an entity is actually doing, measured by observable and verifiable outcomes, rather than what the entity calls what it is doing in any document, agreement, certification, or public statement. No contractual label, corporate structure, legal opinion, or definitional argument may defeat the actual economic or operational reality of a deployment.

2.9. "HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION PLAN" means the written plan, approved by HACO, that an entity must file before deploying any AI system in a covered employment category, detailing: the specific functions the AI will perform; the specific human roles that will work alongside the AI; the mechanism by which human workers retain decision authority and override capability; the pre-deployment headcount in each affected category; and the entity's binding commitment to the permanent headcount floor established in Section 4.2(c).

2.11. "PERMITTED DEPLOYMENT ENTITY" means any entity that satisfies one or more of the following conditions and that has not been found in violation of this Order within the preceding five years: (a) a worker-owned cooperative in which the workers performing the work are the owners of the enterprise and the direct beneficiaries of any efficiency or productivity gain; (b) a nonprofit organization that is exempt from federal taxation under 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3) or equivalent provision, that distributes no profit to private holders,

and that operates with a genuine public benefit mandate as its primary purpose; (c) a sole proprietor or owner-operated small business in which the owner is actively and primarily engaged in the day-to-day operations, holds no external investor ownership, and employs fewer than fifty workers; (d) a government entity subject to the full requirements of Section 11 of this Order; or (e) a Public Benefit Corporation incorporated under applicable state law with legally binding obligations to workers, communities, and the natural environment that are enforceable by workers and the public and that legally override pure shareholder return maximization. Entities seeking Permitted Deployment Entity status must apply to HACO for certification. HACO shall render a certification determination within sixty (60) days of a complete application. Certification may be revoked at any time upon finding of violation.

2.12. "EXTRACTIVE MANDATE" means the operating purpose, legal obligation, incentive structure, or governance framework of an entity that directs it — whether through fiduciary duty, contractual obligation, performance benchmark, fee structure, or ownership pressure — to maximize financial return to its owners or investors without legally binding obligations to the welfare of workers, communities, animals, or the natural environment. An extractive mandate is present regardless of voluntary ESG commitments, public statements of corporate responsibility, or informal management priorities, where those commitments are not legally enforceable by the affected workers, communities, or public. The presence of an extractive mandate is determined by the legal structure of the entity, not by its stated intentions.

2.10. "UNITED STATES" for all purposes of this Order means the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and all territories and possessions of the United States, including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. All protections, prohibitions, and requirements of this Order apply with full force within each of these jurisdictions. Coverage extends to all workers employed within these jurisdictions regardless of their citizenship or nationality status. With respect to American Samoa, whose residents hold the status of U.S. nationals rather than U.S. citizens under current law, this Order applies to all workers on equal terms — no worker in any U.S. territory or possession is excluded from the protections of this Order on the basis of citizenship or nationality classification.

SECTION 3 — DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

3.1. Pursuant to the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.), the President hereby declares a National Emergency with respect to: (a) AI-driven mass workforce displacement executed for the financial benefit of institutional investors and private equity firms; (b) the use of AI systems to eliminate human employment in critical sectors without accountability or recourse; and (c) the acquisition of operational control over American commercial AI systems and critical infrastructure by entities owned, directed, or materially influenced by foreign governments, regardless of the current diplomatic status of those governments.

3.2. This declaration activates full presidential authority under IEEPA (50 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.) to regulate, restrict, and prohibit any transaction, commercial practice, investment structure, or business operation that constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

3.3. The Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. § 4501 et seq.) is invoked to direct the allocation of human labor in critical infrastructure and essential services sectors, ensuring that AI systems in those sectors function as tools of human workers, not replacements for them.

3.4. FIRRMA (50 U.S.C. § 4565) and IEEPA together authorize the President to block, prohibit, suspend, and unwind any transaction, investment, or commercial arrangement by which any foreign government or foreign government-connected entity obtains or exercises control, influence, or beneficial ownership over AI systems deployed in the United States. That authority is fully invoked by this Order without limitation to entities currently designated as adversaries.

SECTION 4 — THE HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION MANDATE

4.1. Effective sixty (60) days from the date of this Order, no person, corporation, limited liability company, partnership, trust, investment vehicle, or any other legal entity operating under the laws of the United States, or conducting business within the United States or with United States persons, may deploy an artificial intelligence system, autonomous agent, robotic process automation system, or machine-learning-driven decision system for the purpose of, or with the effect of, eliminating, replacing, or substantially reducing a category of human employment, without satisfying the requirements of this Order.

4.2. PERMITTED DEPLOYMENT. AI systems may be lawfully deployed when: (a) the AI system functions alongside a human worker in a collaborative capacity, with the human retaining genuine decision authority and override capability — not nominal oversight of outputs accepted in practice without meaningful review; (b) the deployment increases the capability, productivity, safety, or compensation of human workers rather than substituting for them; (c) the entity maintains or increases its total domestic headcount in the affected employment category permanently from the date of AI deployment — the pre-deployment headcount in every affected category becomes the permanent minimum floor and does not expire; and (d) the entity holds a current, approved Human-AI Collaboration Plan on file with HACO.

4.2.1. PROFIT-THRESHOLD EXCEPTION TO THE PERMANENT HEADCOUNT FLOOR. The permanent headcount floor established in Section 4.2(c) may be temporarily modified only under the following strictly defined and independently verified conditions: (a) the entity has sustained net operating losses — not reduced profits, not below-target returns, but actual net operating losses — for three (3) or more consecutive fiscal quarters, verified by an independent auditor selected by HACO; (b) the entity demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that it has exhausted all other available cost-reduction measures; (c) any reduction permitted must be proportional to the verified losses and may not exceed the percentage reduction in revenue that produced them; (d) every worker affected receives the full protection package of Section 9.3 without reduction; (e) this exception may not be invoked by the same entity more than once in any five-year period; (f) any entity invoking this exception that is owned or controlled by a private equity firm or institutional investor is presumed to have engineered the qualifying loss condition and bears the burden of rebuttal by clear and convincing evidence before any reduction is permitted; and (g) upon return to net operating profitability for two (2) consecutive fiscal quarters, the permanent headcount floor is fully reinstated and the entity must restore all displaced workers to comparable roles within ninety (90) days or satisfy full reinstatement and back-pay obligations under Section 9.2. AI is not a replacement. The floor holds.

4.3. PROHIBITED DEPLOYMENT. AI systems may not be deployed when: (a) the primary purpose is headcount reduction; (b) the deployment results in material reduction in human employment and the entity cannot demonstrate that affected workers were retained in comparable roles as defined in Section 2.2; (c) the deployment decision was

directed, incentivized, or conditioned by an institutional investor, private equity owner, or board directive whose primary motivation was labor cost reduction; or (d) the entity lacks a current, approved Human-AI Collaboration Plan.

4.4. SCOPE. These provisions apply to all employers with fifty (50) or more employees in the United States — as defined in Section 2.10 to include all territories and possessions — to all entities receiving federal contracts, grants, or subsidies regardless of size, and to all entities in which a private equity firm, institutional investor, or foreign-affiliated investment vehicle holds any ownership or governance interest. Workers in Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa are covered on identical terms as workers in the fifty states. No territorial exemption exists under this Order.

4.5. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN WORKER COERCION AND SURVEILLANCE PRESSURE. AI deployed alongside human workers may not be weaponized against those workers. The following practices are prohibited:

(a) ALGORITHMIC PRODUCTIVITY COERCION. No employer may use an AI system to set, enforce, or escalate productivity quotas or work pace targets that exceed what a human being can sustain under safe, humane, and dignified working conditions. Productivity standards must be set by human managers with genuine knowledge of the work, must account for rest and human physical and cognitive limits, and may not be overridden upward by algorithmic recommendation without independent human review and worker notification.

(b) CONSTANT SURVEILLANCE AS COERCION. No employer may deploy AI systems that monitor workers on a continuous, real-time basis in a manner designed to induce anxiety, suppress rest periods, or create a working environment in which a worker feels that every second of their time is under machine judgment. Monitoring that serves legitimate safety purposes is permitted. Monitoring deployed as a coercive productivity instrument is not.

(c) AUTOMATED DISCIPLINE AND TERMINATION. No employer may discipline, demote, or terminate any worker based solely or primarily on the output of an automated monitoring or performance system. Every discipline or termination decision must involve a human supervisor who has directly reviewed the circumstances, heard from the affected

worker, and signed a written determination. An algorithm does not fire a person. A person fires a person, and that person is accountable.

(d) ALGORITHMIC WAGE MANIPULATION. No employer may use AI systems to dynamically reduce effective compensation, alter shift assignments, or diminish the economic terms of a worker's employment based on machine-generated assessments of the worker's replaceability, productivity variance, or behavioral profile. Compensation terms must be set by human decision-makers under negotiated or posted standards.

(e) PSYCHOLOGICAL MANIPULATION OF WORKERS. No employer may deploy AI systems that use behavioral data, psychological profiling, or predictive modeling of worker sentiment to suppress organizing activity, identify workers likely to raise grievances, or target workers for differential treatment based on machine-predicted loyalty or compliance. The use of AI as a union-busting instrument or as a tool of psychological control over the workforce is a violation of this Order and of Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SECTION 5 — COMPLETE PROHIBITION: PRIVATE EQUITY AND INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR PORTFOLIO COMPANIES

5.1. THE CORE FINDING: THE EXTRACTIVE MANDATE IS THE DISQUALIFYING CONDITION. The private equity model, the institutional investor model, and the publicly traded corporate model — as currently practiced in the United States — share a single governing characteristic: the extractive mandate. Each of these structures is legally constructed to maximize financial return to its owners and investors. Each of them treats workers, communities, animals, and the natural environment as inputs to be optimized, costs to be minimized, and resources to be consumed. This is not a failure of individual actors within these systems. It is the design of the systems themselves. An entity whose legal structure compels it to extract — from workers, from communities, from nature, from the future — cannot be trusted to deploy AI in any way that does not serve that extraction. No voluntary commitment, no ESG pledge, no boardroom statement of values overrides the fiduciary obligation, the carried interest calculation, or the quarterly earnings target. The law cannot rely on voluntary compliance from structures built to extract. This Order is built on the recognition that the nature of the operating mandate — not the size of the fund, not the form of corporate organization, not the public or private trading status of the

entity — is the governing standard. A publicly traded corporation is still governed by an extractive mandate. It is simply required to report on its extraction more frequently.

5.1.1. THE PERMITTED DEPLOYMENT CLASS. The following entities are Permitted Deployment Entities under this Order and may deploy AI systems in full compliance with Sections 4 and 9 of this Order without the additional restrictions of this Section, provided they maintain current HACO certification and have not been found in violation of this Order within the preceding five years: (a) worker-owned cooperatives in which the workers are the owners and the direct beneficiaries of any efficiency or productivity gain — if the workers benefit, the deployment serves its purpose; (b) nonprofit organizations with genuine public benefit mandates, exempt under 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(3), that distribute no profit to private holders; (c) sole proprietors and owner-operated small businesses in which the owner is actively engaged in day-to-day operations, holds no external investor ownership, and employs fewer than fifty workers; (d) government entities subject to the full requirements of Section 11; and (e) Public Benefit Corporations with legally binding obligations to workers, communities, and the natural environment that are enforceable by those stakeholders and that legally override pure shareholder return maximization. The path to Permitted Deployment status is open to any entity willing to legally bind itself to human and ecological welfare. The restriction is not on innovation. The restriction is on extraction.

5.1.2. THE RESTRICTED DEPLOYMENT CLASS. Every entity not qualifying as a Permitted Deployment Entity under Section 5.1.1 is subject to the full restrictions of this Section. This includes, without limitation: all private equity funds of any size; all hedge funds; all institutional investors regardless of assets under management; all publicly traded corporations, whether or not they have adopted ESG policies or public benefit language, unless and until they have converted to legally binding Public Benefit Corporation status; all entities owned or controlled by any of the foregoing; and all entities operating under an extractive mandate as defined in Section 2.12. The public trading of a corporation's shares does not transform an extractive mandate into a public benefit mandate. The reporting requirements of public markets are not accountability to the public. They are reporting to shareholders. A publicly traded hospital corporation that deploys AI to deny claims and eliminate nursing staff is operating under an extractive mandate. A publicly traded logistics company that deploys AI to eliminate warehouse

workers is operating under an extractive mandate. The stock ticker does not change the nature of the mandate. This Order does.

5.1.3. THE MANDATE TEST IS THE GOVERNING STANDARD. Whether an entity is in the Permitted Deployment Class or the Restricted Deployment Class is determined by the nature of its operating mandate — its legal obligations, governance structure, ownership structure, and incentive architecture — not by its stated intentions, its public communications, its voluntary commitments, or its formal legal classification as public or private. HACO will make mandate determinations on a case-by-case basis upon application or in the course of enforcement. The burden is on the entity seeking Permitted Deployment status to demonstrate that its mandate legally binds it to human and ecological welfare in a manner that overrides extraction. The burden is not on HACO to prove extraction. Extraction is the presumed mandate of every entity that has not demonstrated otherwise.

5.2. PRESUMPTIVE PROHIBITION. Any entity in the Restricted Deployment Class as defined in Section 5.1.2 — including any company, subsidiary, affiliate, division, or business unit owned, controlled, or operating under an extractive mandate — is prohibited from deploying any AI system, automated process, or machine-driven operation that results in a material reduction of human employment in any affected category, any degradation of animal welfare, or any acceleration of ecological harm, unless the entity qualifies for the hardship exemption under Section 5.6. The corporate separateness of any portfolio company, subsidiary, or affiliate from its ultimate beneficial owner is not a defense. The investor, owner, and ultimate beneficial holder own the outcome.

5.3. PROHIBITION ON AUTOMATION CLAUSES IN INVESTMENT AGREEMENTS. Any investment agreement, shareholder agreement, management services agreement, operating agreement, partnership agreement, or any other instrument through which a private equity firm or institutional investor governs or influences a portfolio company is prohibited from containing any term, condition, covenant, performance target, management incentive, earn-out provision, milestone, fee trigger, or governance requirement that: (a) rewards, incentivizes, or conditions any benefit on headcount reduction achieved through AI or automation; (b) penalizes management for maintaining or increasing headcount; (c) requires or encourages replacement of human roles with automated systems as a condition of continued investment or favorable governance treatment; or (d) measures operational efficiency in a manner that treats human workers

primarily as costs to be minimized. Any such provision in any existing or future agreement is void and unenforceable from the date of this Order.

5.4. PORTFOLIO COMPANY AUDIT REQUIREMENT. Within 120 days of this Order, every private equity firm and institutional investor with portfolio company investments in the United States shall submit to HACO a complete audit of every portfolio company's AI deployment status, workforce levels, automation plans, and investment agreement terms. Failure to submit a complete and accurate audit within the required timeframe shall be treated as evidence of willful violation and shall subject the investor to maximum civil penalties under Section 9.2.

5.5. HARDSHIP EXEMPTION. A portfolio company that is genuinely insolvent or has sustained actual net operating losses for three or more consecutive fiscal quarters may apply for a hardship exemption. The exemption is structured as follows, and contains no discretion — only conditions.

(a) REQUIRED HACO PRE-APPROVAL. No portfolio company may invoke the hardship exemption or begin any AI deployment under it without first obtaining pre-approval from HACO. HACO shall render a determination within thirty (30) days of a complete application. In genuine insolvency emergencies, HACO shall render an expedited determination within ten (10) business days upon request. The company bears the burden of demonstrating eligibility. HACO's pre-approval determination shall be based on an independent audit conducted by an auditor selected by HACO, not by the company or its investors.

(b) ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS. To qualify, the company must demonstrate: (1) actual net operating losses — not reduced profits, not below-target returns — for three or more consecutive fiscal quarters as verified by the HACO-selected auditor; (2) that all other available cost-reduction measures have been exhausted; and (3) that AI deployment is strictly necessary to prevent liquidation. A company that became insolvent within 18 months of acquisition by a PE firm with a documented history of AI-driven layoffs is presumed ineligible. A company formed within 18 months of the exemption application is presumed ineligible. Both presumptions may be rebutted only by clear and convincing evidence.

(c) DURATION AND SCOPE. The exemption is valid for 18 months, is non-renewable, and authorizes only those AI deployments strictly necessary to avoid liquidation, as

specified in the approved application. The company must file a quarterly report with HACO detailing headcount, AI usage, and financial condition throughout the exemption period.

(d) WORKER PROTECTIONS REMAIN IN FULL. Workers displaced during the exemption period receive every benefit of Section 9.3 without reduction or exception. The hardship exemption does not waive any worker right.

(e) MANDATORY FULL RESTORATION. Within 12 months after the exemption period ends, the company must restore 100% of displaced workers to comparable roles as defined in Section 2.2. There is no partial restoration floor. Every displaced worker is restored, or the company pays an additional 24 months of full severance to each worker not restored, in addition to all other obligations under Section 9.3.

(f) ANTI-MANIPULATION AND ANTI-TRANSFER PROVISIONS. (1) The company and all affiliated PE entities must certify that, as of the exemption application date, they have no existing plan, agreement, option, or letter of intent to sell, transfer, merge, or take the company public within 24 months. If such a plan arises later, they must notify HACO within 14 days. (2) If the company is sold or goes public within 24 months after the exemption ends, the greater of $5 million or 50% of net proceeds shall be placed in escrow for 36 months to fund worker claims and restoration obligations. (3) Successor liability: any entity that acquires ownership or control of a company that has used this exemption is jointly and severally liable for any violation of this Section by the prior owner. This liability survives any indemnification agreement and any bankruptcy proceeding.

(g) PENALTIES FOR MISUSE. If HACO or a court determines that a company or PE firm knowingly made a false statement in any application or certification under this Section, or structured any transaction to evade the spirit of the exemption: (1) the exemption is void ab initio; (2) the company and all affiliated PE entities are jointly and severally liable for triple the back pay, benefits, and severance owed to every displaced worker; and (3) the PE firm is disqualified from federal contracts and subsidies for five years and shall be referred for criminal prosecution under 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

(h) PUBLIC REGISTRY OF HARDSHIP EXEMPTIONS. HACO shall maintain a public, searchable online registry of all hardship exemption applications and determinations, including the names of the PE firms, the portfolio company, the number of workers

displaced, and any sale or transfer of the company for five years after the exemption ends. The registry shall be updated within seven (7) days of any filing or determination.

5.6. ACQUISITION CERTIFICATION. From the date of this Order, no private equity firm or institutional investor may acquire a controlling or significant ownership interest in any U.S. operating company without first certifying to HACO that: the acquisition will not result in AI-driven workforce reduction; no investment agreement term of the kind prohibited by Section 5.3 will be imposed; and the investor accepts full joint and several liability for any violation of this Order committed by the acquired entity during the period of the investor's ownership. Acquisitions made without such certification are voidable at the election of the Attorney General or upon a civil action brought by a majority of the affected company's workers.

5.7. JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY. Any private equity firm or institutional investor that directs, incentivizes, tolerates, or fails to prevent a violation of this Order by a portfolio company is jointly and severally liable for all penalties, reinstatement obligations, back pay awards, and damages arising from that violation. The corporate separateness of the portfolio company from the investor is not a defense.

SECTION 6 — FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP AND FOREIGN ADVERSARY ENTITIES: NATIONAL SECURITY PROHIBITION AND THREE-TIER FRAMEWORK

6.1. THE THREAT. A foreign government that controls the AI systems managing American healthcare claims does not need a weapon to deny care. A foreign government that controls the algorithmic systems managing American financial services does not need a sanction to freeze credit. A foreign government that controls the automated systems managing American communications infrastructure does not need a jamming device to disrupt coordination. It needs a board seat and a software update. This Order closes that door — and closes it against every foreign government, not only those currently designated as adversaries, because governments change and the control point endures.

6.2. DEFINITION — FOREIGN ADVERSARY ENTITY. The definition of foreign adversary entity under this Order is based on the conduct and structure of the entity, not on the diplomatic status of the country with which it is affiliated, and not on any list maintained by any government agency. No list is dispositive. No diplomatic designation, treaty

relationship, or government classification determines the applicability of this definition. The definition applies in full regardless of any future change in the diplomatic relationship between the United States and any foreign government. "Foreign adversary entity" means any government, financial network, investment vehicle, corporate entity, or individual — regardless of country of formal incorporation or legal domicile — that: (a) operates under the direction, control, or at the material request of a foreign government that has adopted policies, laws, or operational practices that compel the entities and nationals under its jurisdiction to cooperate with its intelligence, surveillance, or economic warfare programs; (b) is part of a transnational financial network whose primary operating purpose is the acquisition of control over foreign economies, critical infrastructure, or strategic industries rather than genuine commercial participation; (c) holds or seeks beneficial ownership, governance rights, or operational access to American AI systems, data infrastructure, or critical sector enterprises while maintaining obligations — legal, contractual, financial, or coercive — to a foreign government or to a financial network answering to foreign government direction; or (d) has engaged in or facilitated the use of economic acquisition as a substitute for military or political means of achieving dominance over American systems. This Order targets structures of control, not people. The people of every nation are potential partners in human growth. The networks that exploit them and us alike are not.

6.3. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES. Any entity in which a foreign adversary entity holds any beneficial ownership interest — direct, indirect, or beneficial — is prohibited from the following activities anywhere within the United States as defined in Section 2.10, including all territories and possessions. The strategic importance of U.S. territories — including Puerto Rico's pharmaceutical and healthcare infrastructure, Guam's military and communications significance, and the Virgin Islands' financial sector — makes the application of these prohibitions to territories a matter of equal or greater national security urgency as their application to the fifty states: (a) deploying any AI system within the United States that manages, controls, or has unescorted access to any critical infrastructure category listed in Section 6.4; (b) operating any automated decision-making system that materially affects the eligibility for, denial of, or pricing of healthcare, financial services, housing, or employment for U.S. persons; (c) collecting, retaining, processing, or transmitting data generated by U.S. workers or U.S. consumers to any server or entity under the operational control of a foreign adversary entity; and (d) providing AI-as-a-service, algorithmic services, or automated decision services to any American business,

government entity, or individual. A de minimis ownership interest of less than 1% through a genuinely diversified public index fund is exempt from this prohibition, provided the fund manager certifies in writing to HACO that it exercises no governance rights with respect to AI deployment decisions.

6.4. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE CATEGORIES. Foreign adversary-connected entities are immediately and permanently prohibited from holding any ownership interest, service contract, licensing agreement, or data access arrangement with respect to: (a) healthcare systems, hospital networks, insurance claims processing, and pharmaceutical supply chains; (b) financial systems, banking infrastructure, payment networks, and credit reporting; (c) communications infrastructure, internet backbone, satellite systems, and broadcast networks; (d) electric grid, water systems, and energy infrastructure; (e) transportation networks, including autonomous vehicle systems and air traffic management; (f) defense-adjacent manufacturing, logistics, and supply chains; (g) federal, state, and local government information systems; and (h) educational technology platforms serving K-12 or post-secondary institutions.

6.5. MANDATORY DIVESTITURE. Any existing arrangement prohibited under this Section shall be divested within 180 days of this Order's effective date, or within 270 days if the entity applies for and receives a HACO extension for documented good cause shown. No extension may be granted in critical infrastructure categories listed in Section 6.4(a) through 6.4(d).

6.6. DATA SOVEREIGNTY. The transmission of data generated by American workers, American consumers, or American government operations to any server, system, or entity located in or accessible to a foreign adversary entity is prohibited. This prohibition applies regardless of whether the data is anonymized, aggregated, or encrypted, and regardless of whether the transmission is incidental to or the primary purpose of the relevant system. AI systems trained on American behavioral, economic, medical, or communications data that is transmitted to or accessible by foreign adversary entities constitute an intelligence threat of the highest order and are prohibited.

6.7. CRIMINAL LIABILITY. Any officer, director, manager, or beneficial owner who knowingly conceals foreign adversary ownership, influence, or data access in violation of this Order, or who knowingly facilitates the acquisition of prohibited interests by a foreign adversary entity, is subject to criminal prosecution under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (false statements), 50 U.S.C. § 1705 (IEEPA criminal penalties), and any other applicable

statute. Maximum criminal penalties shall be sought in cases involving critical infrastructure sectors.

6.8. THE THREE-TIER FRAMEWORK FOR ALL FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF AI SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES. Sections 6.1 through 6.7 address entities connected to foreign adversaries. This Section addresses something broader and more strategically consequential: the reality that any foreign government — ally, partner, or neutral — that holds a control point over AI systems deployed within the United States represents a structural national security vulnerability that no current diplomatic relationship can eliminate, because relationships change. This is the generational principle.

6.9. THE PERMANENCE OF CONTROL POINTS. An AI system deployed in the United States — regardless of who built it, who owns it, or what country the owner calls home — can be updated, degraded, manipulated, or disabled by its owner from anywhere in the world at any time. That is a control point. A foreign government that holds a control point inside American healthcare, American financial systems, or American labor management systems does not need a change in military posture to change its relationship with the United States. It needs a change in administration — one captured by financial interests, one facing internal political pressure, one with new leadership that sees the control point differently. The United States has no mechanism to prevent a foreign government from changing. It does have the mechanism of refusing to grant that government a control point in the first place. This Order uses that mechanism, and applies it to every foreign government, not only those currently designated as adversaries. Relationships are temporary. Control points are not.

6.10. TIER ONE — ABSOLUTE PROHIBITION ON FOREIGN GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR CONTROLLED AI DEPLOYMENT. No entity that is owned, controlled, directed, or materially influenced by any foreign government — regardless of that government's current diplomatic relationship with the United States, regardless of alliance status, treaty obligations, or the apparent character of the government's current administration — may deploy any AI system within the United States, operate any automated decision-making system affecting American workers or consumers, or hold any ownership or operational control over AI infrastructure serving American critical sectors. This prohibition is absolute. It contains no allied-nation exception. It contains no trusted-partner exception.

It does not expire. It is absolute because the threat it addresses is not a function of current relationships — it is a function of the nature of control points and the passage of time.

6.11. THE RATIONALE FOR NO ALLIED EXCEPTION. This administration holds no hostility toward any allied nation and seeks the deepest possible collaborative relationships with the democratic governments of the world. The prohibition of Section 6.10 is not a statement about any government's current character. It is a statement about structural risk that exists across time. A foreign government-owned AI company deploying systems in the United States may be a genuine partner today. Under a subsequent administration — one captured by financial interests, one responding to internal political pressure, one operating under new leadership with different priorities — that same system is a control point in different hands. The United States applies this standard consistently: no American government agency holds operational control over AI systems deployed within allied nations' critical infrastructure. Sovereignty is the principle. It applies equally in every direction.

6.12. TIER TWO — MANDATORY US AI DEPLOYMENT LICENSE FOR FOREIGN PRIVATELY-OWNED ENTITIES. Any AI system deployed within the United States that is built, owned, operated, or controlled by a private entity headquartered outside the United States, or in which foreign private persons or entities hold a majority ownership interest, must obtain a US AI Deployment License from HACO before any deployment commences. A license is granted only upon satisfaction of all of the following conditions, verified by HACO through independent audit: (a) US SUBSIDIARY — the deploying entity must establish a fully independent United States subsidiary with its own board, management, legal counsel, and operational decision-making authority — a subsidiary that functions as a pass-through for decisions made by the foreign parent does not satisfy this requirement; (b) MAJORITY AMERICAN BOARD — the board of the US subsidiary must be composed of a majority of United States citizens who hold no financial interest in the foreign parent beyond ordinary public market investments and are not subject to any contractual obligation to the foreign parent that would compromise their independent judgment — board members are personally liable for violations occurring during their tenure if they knew or reasonably should have known; (c) DATA SOVEREIGNTY — all data generated by or processed through the AI system in the United States must be stored exclusively on servers physically located within the United States and must not be transmitted to or accessible by any system or person outside the United States without

the explicit written authorization of HACO for each specific transmission; (d) GOVERNMENT AUDIT AND OVERRIDE — the US subsidiary must grant HACO full, unconditional, and unannounced audit rights over the AI system, including access to source code, training data, model weights, and operational logs, and must maintain a technically functional capability to suspend or permanently disable the AI system within twenty-four (24) hours of a government directive, without requiring any cooperation from the foreign parent; (e) NO FOREIGN PARENT OVERRIDE — the foreign parent must have no authority, technical, contractual, or otherwise, to modify the behavior of the AI system deployed in the United States without the knowledge and consent of the US subsidiary and HACO — any technical architecture that permits such modification is prohibited; and (f) LICENSE RENEWAL — licenses are valid for two (2) years and require full re-verification upon renewal — HACO may revoke a license at any time without advance notice upon finding of any violation, any material change in the foreign parent's ownership or government relationships, or any development HACO determines creates a national security concern.

6.13. TIER THREE — ENHANCED DISCLOSURE AND MONITORING FOR MINORITY FOREIGN PRIVATE OWNERSHIP. Any AI system deployed within the United States by an entity in which foreign private persons or entities hold a minority ownership interest of 5% or more must: (a) register with HACO and disclose the identity, nationality, ownership percentage, and any government affiliations of all foreign minority owners; (b) submit to annual compliance audits covering data handling practices, ownership changes, and AI deployment scope; (c) certify annually that no foreign minority owner has exercised or attempted to exercise operational influence over the AI system's deployment in the United States; and (d) report to HACO within 30 days any material change in foreign ownership or any communication from a foreign owner that touches on the system's operation in the United States.

6.14. THE GENERATIONAL PRINCIPLE. This framework is designed not for the diplomatic environment of this administration but for every administration that follows. The President who signs this Order cannot know who will govern allied nations in twenty years, which governments will remain stable, which will face internal capture by financial interests, or which will change course under new leadership. The Three-Tier Framework is built to protect American workers and American sovereignty across that entire span of time. Tier One is absolute because the future is not knowable. Tier Two provides a path

for foreign private innovation to participate in the American market under conditions that preserve American sovereignty over every control point. Tier Three ensures that minority foreign ownership is transparent and monitored. Together, the three tiers ensure that no foreign interest — government or private, allied or adversarial, present or future — can use AI deployment in the United States as an instrument of extraction, manipulation, or control against the American people.

SECTION 7 — ANTI-CIRCUMVENTION: THE SUBSTANCE MANDATE AND ANTI-LANGUAGE-MANIPULATION PROVISIONS

7.1. THE PROBLEM IS ALREADY IN MOTION. Before the ink is dry on this Order, there are lawyers in offices across this country being paid to find the words that technically comply while achieving the prohibited outcome. They will argue that a system eliminating 80% of a department is not "replacing" workers but "transforming the role." They will create new subsidiary structures to place prohibited activity one legal step from the regulated entity. They will rename workforce reduction plans as "human-capability enhancement initiatives." This Section is the answer to all of it.

7.2. THE SUBSTANCE-OVER-FORM STANDARD. This Order is governed by a substance-over-form standard with no exceptions. The question at every enforcement determination is not what an entity calls what it is doing. The question is what the entity is actually doing, measured by observable, verifiable outcomes.

(a) If the workforce in an affected category is smaller after an AI deployment than it was before, and the entity cannot demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that every displaced worker was retained in a comparable role as defined in Section 2.2, the deployment is presumed a violation regardless of how it is described.

(b) If an AI system performs functions previously performed by human workers, and those workers are no longer employed in equivalent roles, the AI system is a replacement system regardless of whether it is described as a "co-pilot," "assistant," "decision-support tool," "efficiency platform," "intelligent workflow," or any other term.

(c) If a corporate restructuring, merger, spin-off, divestiture, outsourcing arrangement, or any other transaction has the effect of placing prohibited AI deployment activity outside the formal boundaries of the regulated entity while achieving the same workforce

outcome, the transaction is a circumvention and all parties are liable as if the deployment had occurred directly.

(d) If an ownership threshold is structured — through share classes, convertible instruments, options, side letters, management agreements, or any other mechanism — to fall nominally below the thresholds specified in this Order while preserving the economic interest or operational influence the threshold is designed to capture, the structure is disregarded and the actual economic relationship governs.

(e) Any retroactive corporate restructuring, ownership transfer, entity dissolution, or jurisdictional relocation executed after the date of announcement of this Order, the effect of which is to reduce apparent exposure to enforcement, is presumed evasive and is subject to unwinding without requirement of proof of subjective intent.

7.3. DEFINITIONAL ANTI-GAMING. The following definitional rules are absolute: (a) "Augmentation" is not augmentation if the workforce shrinks; (b) "Collaboration" is not collaboration if the human's role is to approve AI-generated decisions at a rate that does not permit meaningful review — rubber-stamping is not collaboration; (c) "Efficiency gain" is not a justification for workforce reduction — efficiency gained through AI shall be directed to the benefit of existing workers through compensation, reduced hours, or improved conditions; (d) "Retraining" means placement in a comparable role with full employer-funded skills transition support within the same organization — severance and outplacement services are not retraining; (e) "Foreign government control or influence" means any arrangement through which a foreign government entity can access, direct, interrupt, monitor, or extract data from an AI system deployed in the United States, regardless of form.

7.4. REGULATORY CAPTURE PROHIBITION. No enforcement agency charged with implementing this Order may accept as dispositive any legal opinion, compliance certification, audit finding, or regulatory filing prepared by or on behalf of the regulated entity being assessed. Independent verification is required for all material compliance determinations.

7.5. RETROACTIVE RESTRUCTURING PROHIBITION. Any corporate restructuring, ownership transfer, or contractual modification executed after the date of announcement of this Order, the effect of which is to bring an entity outside the scope of this Order or to

reduce its apparent exposure to enforcement, is presumed evasive and subject to unwinding.

7.6. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION AND REWARD. Any person who provides information to HACO, the Department of Justice, the FTC, the SEC, or any other relevant agency regarding a violation of this Order is entitled to: (a) full whistleblower protection under all applicable federal statutes; (b) immunity from civil suit by the reported entity for any disclosure made in good faith; and (c) a financial reward of not less than 15% and not more than 30% of any civil penalty collected as a result of the information provided.

7.7. GOOD FAITH IS NOT A DEFENSE TO STRUCTURAL VIOLATION. An entity that in good faith misclassifies a replacement deployment as an augmentation deployment is not exempt from liability. Good faith may be considered in determining penalty amount. It does not eliminate the violation, the reinstatement obligation, or the back pay requirement. The workers displaced by a good-faith violation are no less displaced. The remedy is the same.

7.8. PROHIBITION ON LEGAL LANGUAGE MANIPULATION. This Order recognizes a specific and documented threat separate from structural circumvention: the deliberate manipulation of language itself. Every major regulatory framework in American history has been subjected to sustained, organized, well-funded campaigns to redefine its terms, narrow its scope, and erode its reach through the incremental manipulation of language in legal opinions, regulatory comment letters, litigation filings, academic papers, and public communications. This Order names that practice and prohibits it.

7.9. PROHIBITION ON DEFINITIONAL ARBITRAGE. No person, entity, law firm, consulting firm, trade association, think tank, or academic institution may, for compensation or in furtherance of the interests of a covered entity, engage in the systematic development, promotion, publication, or submission to any regulatory body or court of legal interpretations, definitional arguments, or linguistic constructions whose primary purpose or reasonably foreseeable effect is to narrow the meaning of any term in this Order in a manner that would permit conduct this Order is designed to prohibit. The test is not whether an argument is legally colorable. The test is whether its adoption would permit the replacement of human workers by AI, the evasion of institutional investor accountability, the concealment of foreign government ownership, or the coercive use of AI against workers.

7.10. LEGAL OPINION LETTERS. No covered entity may rely on a legal opinion letter, compliance memorandum, or regulatory guidance interpretation as a shield against enforcement if: (a) the opinion concludes that conduct is permitted by virtue of a definition that this Order, read in accordance with its stated purpose, would not support; (b) the opinion was prepared without full disclosure of the actual workforce outcomes produced or expected; or (c) the opinion construes any ambiguity in a direction that benefits the covered entity rather than the affected workers. An opinion letter that enables a violation is not a defense. It is evidence of planning.

7.11. REGULATORY COMMENT WEAPONIZATION. The coordinated submission of comments, studies, white papers, and public statements by covered entities and their hired partners for the purpose of introducing narrowing definitions into the regulatory record, creating an artificial appearance of expert consensus, or establishing a record designed to support future litigation is prohibited. HACO shall maintain a public disclosure log of all comment submissions, the identity of all submitting parties, and any financial relationship between submitting parties and covered entities. Coordinated comment campaigns meeting the criteria of this Section shall be referred to the Department of Justice.

7.12. THE PLAIN MEANING STANDARD. When any term of this Order is susceptible to more than one interpretation, the interpretation most consistent with the plain meaning of the words, read in light of the Order's stated purpose of protecting American workers and preventing AI-driven displacement, governs. The interpretation most favorable to the covered entity does not govern. The interpretation most favorable to the affected workers governs. This standard applies in every enforcement proceeding, administrative review, and judicial proceeding arising from this Order.

7.13. EUPHEMISM PROHIBITION AND WATCH LIST. The following terms, when used in any Human-AI Collaboration Plan, compliance certification, or regulatory submission by a covered entity, shall be treated as presumptive evidence of an attempt to disguise prohibited conduct and shall trigger mandatory independent audit within thirty (30) days: "workforce optimization," "human-in-the-loop" where the human exercises no genuine decision authority, "intelligent augmentation" where headcount in the affected category has declined, "role transformation" where the transformed role does not exist or is not filled, "efficiency realization" where efficiency is measured by headcount reduction, and any other term a reasonable person familiar with this Order would understand as a

renaming of a prohibited practice. HACO shall maintain and regularly update a published Euphemism Watch List of terms and phrases identified through enforcement experience as commonly used to disguise prohibited conduct.

7.14. NO PRIVATE REINTERPRETATION. No covered entity, private arbitration panel, or contractually-created dispute resolution mechanism may issue a binding interpretation of the terms of this Order. Any contract clause or arbitration agreement that purports to establish binding definitions of terms used in this Order, or to resolve questions of compliance outside the regulatory and judicial process, is void and unenforceable. The meaning of this Order is a public matter, determined publicly, transparently, and on the record.

7.15. THE EFFECTS TEST — EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION. This Order applies to every AI system, automated process, algorithmic decision system, or machine-learning-driven operation that has a direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect on the employment, compensation, working conditions, displacement, or economic welfare of American workers — regardless of where that system is physically located, regardless of the nationality or domicile of the entity operating it, and regardless of whether the entity has a formal legal presence within the United States. Physical location of the AI system is not the jurisdictional standard. Effect on American workers is the jurisdictional standard. This principle is grounded in the well-established extraterritorial application of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Securities Exchange Act, and IEEPA — all of which apply to foreign conduct producing substantial domestic effects. This Order applies the same principle to AI-driven effects on the American workforce. If the system reaches into the lives of American workers, this Order reaches the system.

7.16. OFFSHORE CIRCUMVENTION PROHIBITION. No U.S. person, U.S.-incorporated entity, entity publicly traded on a U.S. exchange, entity receiving U.S. federal contracts or subsidies, or entity in which a U.S. institutional investor holds a controlling or significant ownership interest may move, transfer, migrate, or re-route any AI system, automated decision process, or algorithmic workforce management operation to servers, infrastructure, or operational control located outside the United States for the purpose of, or with the reasonably foreseeable effect of, placing that system outside the jurisdiction of this Order while continuing to deploy its effects against American workers. The offshore location of a system that functions as a workforce management, productivity monitoring, compensation-setting, discipline, termination, or displacement instrument for American

workers is disregarded for purposes of this Order. The domestic effects govern. The system is treated as deployed within the United States regardless of where its servers physically sit.

7.17. FOREIGN PE FIRM AND INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR EXTRATERRITORIAL ACCOUNTABILITY. Any private equity firm, hedge fund, institutional investor, sovereign wealth fund, or family office incorporated, domiciled, or operating primarily outside the United States that holds a controlling or significant ownership interest in any U.S. operating company is subject to this Order on identical terms as a domestically incorporated investor. The foreign domicile of the investor is not a defense against the requirements of Section 5. The foreign investor that directs, incentivizes, tolerates, or fails to prevent AI-driven workforce displacement in a U.S. portfolio company — whether that direction is issued from London, Singapore, Dubai, or any other location — is jointly and severally liable for all violations, all penalties, all reinstatement obligations, and all back pay awards arising from that direction. Investment decisions made abroad that harm American workers are regulated by the law of the country whose workers are harmed. That country is this one.

7.18. AMERICAN ENTITY OFFSHORE AI PROHIBITION. Any U.S.-incorporated entity, entity publicly traded on a U.S. exchange, or entity with 50 or more U.S. employees that operates AI systems through a foreign subsidiary, a foreign service provider, a foreign cloud computing arrangement, or any other offshore structure, where those systems perform workforce management, productivity monitoring, compensation-setting, scheduling, discipline, termination, or displacement functions for American workers, is subject to this Order as if those systems were physically located within the United States and directly operated by the U.S. entity. No corporate structure, no offshoring arrangement, no managed services agreement, and no cloud computing contract places an AI system's effects on American workers outside the reach of this Order. The U.S. entity is responsible for the compliance of every system that touches its American workforce, regardless of where that system runs.

7.19. EXTRATERRITORIAL ENFORCEMENT DIRECTIVE. The Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission are directed to use all available legal tools to enforce this Order against offshore circumvention, including: (a) extraterritorial application of the Sherman Antitrust Act and FTC Act to foreign conduct producing substantial effects on U.S. labor markets; (b) asset

freeze and blocking authority under IEEPA against foreign entities that direct prohibited AI deployment against American workers from outside the United States; (c) enforcement through mutual legal assistance treaties and bilateral law enforcement agreements with foreign governments; (d) in personam jurisdiction over foreign entities that avail themselves of U.S. markets, U.S. financial systems, U.S. banking relationships, U.S. dollar-denominated transactions, or U.S. legal infrastructure; and (e) coordination with the Department of the Treasury to identify and freeze U.S.-accessible assets of foreign entities found to be in violation of this Order. No foreign entity may benefit from U.S. markets while using AI to harm the U.S. workers who create the value those markets reflect.

SECTION 8 — HEALTHCARE, ESSENTIAL SERVICES, AND CRITICAL SECTORS

8.1. HEALTHCARE DENIAL PROHIBITION. No insurance company, managed care organization, pharmacy benefit manager, or health plan may deny a claim for medically necessary care based solely or primarily on the output of an automated review system without a licensed physician, employed directly by the plan, reviewing, approving, and signing the denial determination. Algorithmic denial without physician accountability is unlawful from the date of this Order.

8.2. CRITICAL SECTOR MANDATORY REVIEW. In the following sectors, any AI deployment that reduces human headcount or decision authority is subject to mandatory Human-AI Collaboration review and HACO pre-approval prior to implementation: (a) healthcare and health insurance; (b) banking, credit, and public financial services; (c) utilities, energy, and water; (d) transportation and logistics; (e) emergency services and public safety; (f) K-12 and post-secondary education; (g) food production and distribution; (h) housing and residential construction; and (i) federal, state, and local government services.

SECTION 9 — HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION OFFICE AND ENFORCEMENT

9.1. ESTABLISHMENT. Within ninety (90) days of signing, the Secretary of Labor shall establish the Human-AI Collaboration Office (HACO) within the Department of Labor. HACO shall: (a) develop and publish binding Human-AI Collaboration Standards; (b)

receive, review, approve, or reject Human-AI Collaboration Plans; (c) conduct independent audits of covered entities; (d) receive and process foreign ownership disclosure filings; (e) investigate violations and refer findings to DOJ, FTC, SEC, and the Wage and Hour Division; (f) maintain the Corporate AI Violation Registry under Section 13; and (g) publish quarterly public enforcement reports in plain language.

9.2. PENALTIES. Violations of this Order are subject to: (a) civil penalties of not less than $50,000 and not more than $500,000 per affected worker per violation; (b) disqualification from federal contracts and subsidies for not less than three (3) years; (c) mandatory reinstatement with back pay and benefits restoration, with a twenty-four (24) month severance guarantee where reinstatement is not practicable; and (d) criminal referral to DOJ where willful, coordinated, investor-directed, or foreign government-connected violation is present. For violations involving foreign government-connected entities in critical infrastructure, civil penalties shall be not less than $1,000,000 per violation with no statutory maximum.

9.3. WORKER RIGHTS ON DISPLACEMENT. No American worker shall be displaced by an AI system without receiving, in advance: (a) written notice not less than one hundred twenty (120) days prior to displacement; (b) fully employer-funded retraining of not less than twelve (12) months in a field of the worker's choosing; (c) maintained health insurance for the worker and immediate family for not less than twenty-four (24) months following displacement; and (d) a transition stipend equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the worker's most recent annual compensation for months one through twelve and not less than fifty percent (50%) for months thirteen through twenty-four.

9.4. RIGHT TO ORGANIZE AND REFUSE. The right to collectively refuse AI deployment that workers determine harmful to their employment, compensation, or working conditions is affirmed as protected activity under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act. No employer may retaliate against any worker or union for exercising this right.

9.5. NATIONAL AI TRANSITION FUND. The federal government shall establish a National AI Transition Fund, funded by a one percent (1%) assessment on the gross revenue of any covered entity that deploys AI systems in the United States, to provide supplemental assistance to workers displaced in sectors where transition support requirements cannot be immediately enforced.

SECTION 10 — AMERICA IS NOT A FINANCIAL INSTRUMENT

10.1. The President speaks directly here — not to lawyers, not to lobbyists, not to the financial engineers who have spent four decades treating this country as a yield-generating asset class, and not to the foreign governments who have spent two decades treating it as an acquisition target.

This is addressed to every American who has been told that their displacement was inevitable, that automation cannot be stopped, that the market has spoken, that the algorithm decided, that there was no one to appeal to because there was no human being making the decision.

The market has not spoken. A small number of people with enormous concentrations of capital have spoken. They have used that capital to buy influence in Congress, regulatory agencies, and courts. They have used it to install boards of directors who answer to return targets, not to workers or communities. They have used it to deploy AI systems not because those systems serve the public — but because they reduce the only cost that stands between an institutional investor and a better quarter.

And governments that are not our friends — and some that are, for now — have used it to quietly acquire control points in American infrastructure: in our healthcare systems, our data networks, our financial platforms. Waiting. Learning. Mapping the vulnerabilities of a country that was too busy optimizing returns to notice who was buying the controls.

This ends.

A nation that allows its financial class to automate away the economic foundation of its working majority, and that allows foreign governments to purchase operational control of the systems that majority depends on, is not pursuing prosperity. It is consuming itself and surrendering itself simultaneously. The President has noticed. This Order is the response.

AI is a tool. A remarkable one. Deployed alongside a human being, it can help a nurse catch a diagnosis, help a teacher reach a struggling student, help an engineer find a flaw before it becomes a tragedy, help a small business compete with enterprises ten times its size. That is the future this Order is protecting.

Not the future where a boardroom decides a workforce has been successfully replaced, the quarter improves, and the human wreckage is someone else's problem. Not the future

where a foreign government quietly pulls a lever in our healthcare network during a crisis and discovers what it bought.

It is not someone else's problem. It is the President's problem. This Order is the answer.

SECTION 11 — ABSOLUTE PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS AND PROHIBITION ON AI MANIPULATION OF THE PUBLIC

11.1. THE PRINCIPLE. Government is the mechanism through which the American people govern themselves. It is staffed by human beings accountable — directly or through elected officials — to the people they serve. No AI system can be accountable in that way. A machine cannot be voted out. A machine cannot be subpoenaed. A machine cannot take an oath to the Constitution. The replacement of government workers by AI is not merely an employment issue — it is a constitutional and democratic one.

11.2. COMPLETE PROHIBITION ON GOVERNMENT WORKER REPLACEMENT. No AI system, autonomous agent, automated decision platform, or machine-driven process may be used to replace, eliminate, or substitute for any employee of the federal government, any employee of a state government, any employee of a territorial government — including the governments of Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa — or any employee of a local or municipal government within any of these jurisdictions, in the performance of any function that: (a) involves the exercise of discretionary governmental authority; (b) involves direct contact with or service to the American public; (c) involves the administration, enforcement, or interpretation of law, regulation, or policy; (d) involves the custody, safety, or welfare of any person; or (e) involves any function that the Constitution, federal law, or state law assigns to human public servants. AI may assist government workers. It may not replace them.

11.3. FEDERAL CONTRACTOR PROHIBITION. No federal contractor, subcontractor, or vendor providing services to any federal agency may deploy AI systems that: (a) replace human positions performing work on behalf of or in support of any federal agency; (b) perform functions previously performed by federal civilian employees through outsourcing or managed services arrangements designed to place AI-driven displacement one contractual step removed from the prohibitions of this Order; or (c) perform any work involving access to federal data, federal systems, or federal decision-making processes

without continuous human oversight by a federal employee with full authority to override, correct, and reject any AI-generated output.

11.4. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN MANIPULATION OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC. No federal agency, federal contractor, federally funded entity, or any person acting at the direction or request of any federal agency may deploy, commission, or permit the use of any AI system for the purpose of: (a) shaping, influencing, manipulating, or conditioning the beliefs, behaviors, emotions, or political views of the American public; (b) generating, amplifying, or distributing synthetic content designed to simulate authentic public sentiment or organic information; (c) targeting American citizens with algorithmically personalized persuasion content on behalf of any government program or political objective; or (d) monitoring, profiling, or scoring American citizens for the purpose of predicting or influencing their political behavior or civic participation. Government communicates with the public through human officials who are accountable for what they say. That requirement does not change because AI makes manipulation cheaper and faster. It becomes more important.

11.5. NO WORKFORCE REDUCTION AS A CONDITION OF AI ADOPTION. No federal agency may receive approval for AI deployment if that approval is conditioned on, associated with, or results in a reduction in the agency's authorized civilian workforce. AI in government is adopted to serve the public better, not to shrink the government's human capacity to do so. Any proposal to deploy AI that includes workforce reduction as a benefit, a cost-saving, or a goal is rejected on its face.

11.6. STATE, TERRITORIAL, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. The President urges every state legislature, territorial legislature, and local governing body to adopt equivalent protections for their government workers. Federal grant eligibility criteria shall be revised, within one hundred eighty (180) days of this Order, to give preference to states, territories, and localities that have adopted equivalent protections. Territorial governments shall receive dedicated technical assistance from HACO in developing and implementing equivalent worker protection frameworks, recognizing that smaller territorial workforces and economies may require tailored implementation support.

SECTION 12 — CALL FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT: THE RIGHT TO HUMAN LABOR AND HUMAN GOVERNANCE

12.1. THE LIMITS OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER. This Order does what an Executive Order can do. It deploys the full legal authority of the presidency to stop AI-driven workforce displacement, protect government workers, close the financial extraction loop, and guard against foreign government control of American AI systems. It is comprehensive. It is legally grounded. And it is not enough on its own.

Executive Orders can be reversed. Administrations change. Courts interpret. Regulatory agencies can be captured. The rights established in this Order deserve constitutional protection. What is protected only by executive action is vulnerable. What is written into the Constitution endures. This Order is a floor, not a ceiling. The ceiling is the Constitution.

12.2. FORMAL CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION. The President hereby formally calls upon the Congress of the United States to convene hearings on a Constitutional Amendment establishing: (a) the right of every American to be considered for employment in any category of work before that work is assigned to an automated system where such assignment would eliminate human employment opportunity; (b) the right of the American people to be governed at every level by human officials who are individually accountable for the decisions made in their name; (c) the right of American workers not to be subjected to AI-driven surveillance, productivity coercion, algorithmic discipline, or psychological manipulation in the workplace; and (d) the prohibition on any foreign government or transnational extractive entity acquiring operational control over AI systems deployed within the United States against the interests of the American people.

12.3. DIRECTION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. The Attorney General is directed, within one hundred eighty (180) days of this Order, to prepare and transmit to the President and to the relevant committees of Congress proposed constitutional amendment language consistent with the principles of Section 12.2, together with a legal analysis of its scope and the procedural path to ratification.

12.4. THE BROADER PRINCIPLE. The question of what role machines play in human society — who decides, who benefits, who is protected, and who is accountable — is among the most consequential constitutional questions this generation will face. It should be answered by the American people through their representatives, not by boardrooms, not by algorithms, and not by foreign capital. The call for a constitutional amendment is

not a political maneuver. It is a recognition that the stakes are high enough that the answer must be permanent.

SECTION 13 — WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS AND THE CORPORATE AI VIOLATION PUBLIC REGISTRY

13.1. THE PRINCIPLE. The enforcement of this Order depends not only on government agencies but on the people inside these companies — the engineers who build the systems, the managers who implement the mandates, the accountants who see the numbers, the lawyers who draft the compliance documents, and the workers who live the consequences. Those people have rights and protections under this Order that no employer may abridge.

13.2. PROTECTED DISCLOSURES. Any employee, officer, director, contractor, attorney, accountant, compliance professional, or any other person who in good faith reports or provides information regarding: (a) a violation of this Order; (b) a circumvention or language manipulation scheme; (c) a foreign government ownership or influence arrangement; (d) a prohibited investment agreement provision; (e) AI-driven worker coercion or surveillance abuse; or (f) any pattern of conduct reasonably believed to constitute a violation of this Order — is entitled to the full protections of this Section from the date of this Order.

13.3. ANTI-RETALIATION. No covered entity may terminate, demote, reduce the compensation of, alter the working conditions of, threaten, harass, blacklist, or take any adverse action against any person for reporting a violation of this Order or cooperating with any investigation arising from such a report. Retaliation against a whistleblower under this Order is itself a violation subject to the penalties of Section 9.2 applied per affected whistleblower.

13.4. CIVIL IMMUNITY. No covered entity may bring or maintain any civil claim against any person for disclosures made in good faith to HACO, DOJ, FTC, SEC, or any other relevant enforcement agency pursuant to this Order. Non-disclosure agreements, confidentiality clauses, and employment agreements may not be enforced to suppress reporting of violations of this Order.

13.5. FINANCIAL REWARD. Any person whose report leads to a civil penalty collection, criminal conviction, or consent order arising from a violation of this Order is entitled to a

financial reward of not less than 15% and not more than 30% of the total monetary amount recovered by the government as a result of the information provided. HACO shall establish reward determination and payment procedures within ninety (90) days.

13.6. LEGAL REPRESENTATION. Any whistleblower who faces retaliation, civil suit, or criminal referral arising from a disclosure made pursuant to this Order and who cannot afford private legal representation is entitled to representation by the Department of Labor's Office of the Solicitor at no cost, for the purpose of defending against any adverse action taken by the reported entity.

13.7. MANDATORY SELF-REPORTING. Any covered entity that becomes aware of a violation of this Order within its own operations — through internal audit, compliance review, whistleblower disclosure, or management discovery — is required to self-report that violation to the Department of Labor within thirty (30) days of discovery. Failure to self-report a known violation doubles the applicable civil penalty. Self-reporting is a mitigating factor in penalty determination but does not eliminate liability.

13.8. THE CORPORATE AI VIOLATION PUBLIC REGISTRY. The Department of Labor shall establish and maintain, within one hundred twenty (120) days of this Order, a publicly accessible Corporate AI Violation Registry with the following characteristics:

(a) CONTENT. The Registry shall list every corporation, entity, private equity firm, institutional investor, and individual found to have violated this Order, including: the nature of the violation; the number of workers affected; the penalty imposed; the date of the finding; and the current compliance status of the entity.

(b) PERMANENT RECORD. Entries are permanent. Completion of a penalty payment, entry into a consent order, or subsequent compliance does not result in removal from the Registry. The record of violation remains. The public has a right to know which entities have treated American workers as costs to be automated away.

(c) PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY. The Registry shall be available at no cost on a publicly accessible government website, searchable by company name, industry, investor ownership, geographic location, violation type, and date. It shall be updated within thirty (30) days of any new finding, penalty, or compliance determination.

(d) FEDERAL PROCUREMENT INTEGRATION. The Registry shall be integrated into the federal procurement and contracting systems. Any entity listed for an active, unresolved

violation is automatically disqualified from new federal contracts, grants, and subsidies until the violation is resolved and a compliance certification is accepted by HACO.

(e) QUARTERLY PUBLIC REPORT. HACO shall publish a quarterly public report summarizing Registry activity, enforcement trends, industries with the highest violation rates, and the total number of American workers protected or restored under this Order. The report shall be written in plain language accessible to the general public.

13.9. THE PURPOSE OF THE REGISTRY. Sunlight is the most powerful enforcement tool available to a democratic government. When the names of the companies that chose extraction over people are visible to every American consumer, every prospective employee, every pension fund trustee, and every elected official, the market and the democratic process can do what regulation alone cannot. The Registry does not punish. It informs. An informed public is the last line of defense in any democracy, and this Order gives them the information they need.

SECTION 17 — PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN ANIMAL EXPLOITATION AND ECOLOGICAL EXTRACTION

17.1. THE PRINCIPLE. The extractive mandate does not stop at human workers. It has never stopped at human workers. The same logic that treats people as costs to be eliminated treats animals as production units to be optimized and the natural world as a resource to be consumed until it is gone. Artificial intelligence applied to that logic — at the speed and scale AI makes possible — is not merely an environmental concern. It is an extinction accelerator. This Order names that threat and prohibits it with the same force it brings to the protection of American workers. Life is not a resource. Nature is not an asset class. Animals are not inputs. This Order treats those statements as governing principles, not aspirational values.

17.2. LEGAL AUTHORITY. This Section is issued pursuant to the President's authority under the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. § 2131 et seq.), the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.), the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.), the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. § 1361 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. § 701 et seq.), the National Forest Management Act (16 U.S.C. § 1600 et seq.), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. § 1801 et

seq.), and Article II of the Constitution of the United States. The protection of the natural systems upon which American life, American food security, American water security, and American economic stability depend is a matter of national security. AI systems that accelerate the destruction of those systems threaten the United States as surely as any foreign adversary.

17.3. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN ANIMAL EXPLOITATION. No entity subject to this Order may deploy any AI system, algorithmic optimization tool, automated management system, or machine-learning-driven process for the purpose of, or with the direct effect of: (a) increasing the confinement density, reducing the veterinary care, eliminating behavioral enrichment, or otherwise intensifying the suffering of any animal in an agricultural, research, entertainment, or commercial setting, where such intensification serves primarily to reduce costs or increase financial return rather than to advance genuine animal welfare; (b) optimizing factory farming operations in ways that treat animals exclusively as production units, including AI systems that monitor and adjust feed, lighting, space, temperature, or medication solely to maximize output per animal without legally binding animal welfare standards as a co-equal constraint; (c) facilitating, enabling, coordinating, or concealing the illegal capture, trade, transport, or sale of any wild animal or animal product protected under the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, or any applicable international convention; (d) identifying, tracking, or targeting wild animal populations for commercial extraction beyond scientifically established sustainable yield limits; or (e) optimizing livestock breeding, gestation, or production systems in ways that cause systematic physical suffering — including chronic pain, inability to perform natural behaviors, or breeding-induced physical dysfunction — as an acceptable cost of production efficiency.

17.4. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN ECOLOGICAL EXTRACTION. No entity subject to this Order may deploy any AI system for the purpose of, or with the direct effect of: (a) optimizing resource extraction operations — including mining, oil and gas drilling, logging, commercial fishing, or agricultural operations — in ways that exceed scientifically established sustainable yield limits, damage ecosystem integrity, accelerate soil degradation, contaminate water systems, or reduce biodiversity beyond recovery thresholds, where such optimization serves primarily financial return without legally binding ecological sustainability standards as a co-equal constraint; (b) identifying, mapping, or targeting ecologically sensitive areas, protected lands, endangered species

habitats, or indigenous-managed natural territories for commercial extraction or development in circumvention of applicable environmental law; (c) optimizing supply chains or logistics in ways that externalize ecological costs — including carbon emissions, water consumption, chemical runoff, habitat fragmentation, or waste generation — onto natural systems and future generations rather than internalizing those costs in the financial model of the deploying entity; (d) developing or deploying algorithmic pricing of natural resources — water, timber, fisheries, mineral rights, agricultural land — that creates economic incentives for accelerated depletion by treating natural capital as an unlimited supply rather than a finite and irreplaceable system; or (e) operating any AI system in connection with agricultural production that systematically degrades soil health, depletes aquifers, reduces pollinator populations, or eliminates natural habitat at a rate that exceeds the regenerative capacity of the affected ecosystem.

17.5. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN CIRCUMVENTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW. No entity subject to this Order may deploy any AI system for the purpose of, or with the direct effect of, circumventing, evading, outpacing, or rendering ineffective any requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, or any other applicable federal or state environmental law. The use of AI to accelerate project approvals, automate environmental impact assessments in ways that understate actual harm, identify regulatory gaps or enforcement weaknesses for exploitation, or coordinate with other entities to present false or misleading environmental data to regulators is a violation of this Order and of the underlying environmental statutes. AI does not make environmental law optional. It makes compliance with environmental law a technological capability, not an administrative burden.

17.6. MANDATORY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR AI IN EXTRACTION INDUSTRIES. Any entity in the Restricted Deployment Class as defined in Section 5.1.2 that deploys any AI system in connection with agricultural production, mining, oil and gas extraction, commercial fishing, logging, or any other natural resource extraction industry must submit to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and HACO, prior to deployment, a complete Environmental and Animal Welfare Impact Assessment demonstrating: (a) the projected effects of the AI deployment on animal welfare in any affected agricultural or wildlife context; (b) the projected effects on soil health, water quality, air quality, biodiversity, and ecosystem integrity in the geographic

area of operation; (c) the mechanism by which the entity's sustainable yield limits and animal welfare standards are legally binding constraints on the AI system's optimization function — not merely considerations to be weighed but hard limits that the AI system cannot optimize around; and (d) the human oversight structure ensuring that no AI-generated recommendation to exceed sustainable yield limits or reduce animal welfare standards is implemented without explicit human review and rejection capability. CEQ and HACO will render a joint determination on the assessment within sixty (60) days of a complete submission.

17.7. THE INTERCONNECTION PRINCIPLE. The protection of American workers, the protection of American animals, and the protection of American ecosystems are not separate policy concerns addressed by separate regulatory frameworks. They are expressions of a single principle: life is not a resource to be extracted for financial return. The same extractive mandate that drives the deployment of AI to eliminate human workers drives the deployment of AI to intensify animal confinement and accelerate ecological depletion. This Order addresses all three expressions of that mandate simultaneously because they cannot be separated. A world in which workers are protected but nature is consumed is not a world in which workers are ultimately secure. A world in which animals are protected but ecosystems are depleted is not a world in which animals ultimately survive. The extractive mandate threatens everything it touches. This Order names everything it touches.

17.8. ENFORCEMENT. Violations of this Section are subject to: (a) civil penalties of not less than $100,000 and not more than $1,000,000 per violation, per day of continuing violation; (b) mandatory restoration obligations — any entity that deploys AI in violation of this Section must fund restoration of the affected ecosystem, animal population, or habitat to pre-violation baseline conditions, at the entity's full expense; (c) criminal referral to the Department of Justice Environmental and Natural Resources Division for willful violations; (d) disqualification from federal natural resource leases, federal agricultural subsidies, and federal contracts for not less than five years; and (e) public listing in the Corporate AI Violation Public Registry under Section 13, with the nature and ecological scope of the violation permanently recorded. The natural world cannot speak in a regulatory proceeding. This Order speaks for it.

SECTION 15 — PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN FINANCIAL MARKET EXPLOITATION AND ALGORITHMIC ENSLAVEMENT

15.1. THE CORE FINDING. Artificial intelligence in the hands of financial markets — unregulated, unconstrained, and directed by entities whose only obligation is to maximize return — is not a productivity tool. It is the most efficient extraction machine ever built. The history of American financial markets over the past four decades is the history of progressively more sophisticated tools being used to transfer wealth upward, from workers and communities to capital holders, at scale and speed that outpaces the regulatory capacity of democratic government. AI is the final and most powerful iteration of that toolset. It can process more data, move faster, identify more vulnerabilities, and extract more efficiently than any human trader, any human analyst, or any human risk manager. In the hands of private equity firms and institutional investors with no accountability to the people they extract from, it will do exactly that — unless this Order stops it. The President finds that unconstrained AI deployment in financial markets constitutes a systemic threat to the economic sovereignty of the American people and to the stability of the democratic system that economic sovereignty makes possible.

15.2. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN PREDATORY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS. No financial institution, investment vehicle, hedge fund, private equity firm, insurance company, bank, lender, payment processor, or any other entity participating in U.S. financial markets may deploy any AI system, algorithmic trading system, automated pricing system, or machine-learning-driven financial instrument for the purpose of, or with the direct effect of: (a) extracting value from retail investors, pension holders, or ordinary American consumers through information asymmetries created or amplified by AI systems inaccessible to those investors or consumers; (b) manipulating the pricing of financial instruments, insurance products, credit products, housing, food, energy, or any other essential good or service through coordinated algorithmic pricing that operates as a price-fixing conspiracy regardless of whether the coordination is explicit or emergent from shared AI training data or shared algorithmic architectures; (c) identifying and targeting financially vulnerable American individuals, families, or communities for predatory financial products, usurious credit terms, or fraudulent investment schemes through AI-driven behavioral profiling; or (d) using AI systems to circumvent, outpace, or render ineffective the regulatory oversight of the Securities and Exchange Commission,

the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or any other financial regulatory agency.

15.3. PROHIBITION ON ALGORITHMIC RENT AND ESSENTIAL GOODS PRICE COORDINATION. The use of AI systems, shared algorithmic pricing platforms, or common pricing software by competing landlords, food producers, energy companies, healthcare providers, insurers, or any other providers of essential goods and services, where the AI system produces pricing outcomes functionally equivalent to cartel price-fixing, is hereby declared an unfair method of competition under Section 5 of the FTC Act and a per se violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The fact that the coordination is achieved algorithmically rather than through explicit human communication is not a defense. Two competing landlords using the same AI pricing platform to set rents are engaged in price coordination. Two competing grocery chains using the same AI system to set food prices are engaged in price coordination. The algorithm is the conspiracy. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are directed to prosecute AI-driven pricing coordination in essential goods markets as a priority antitrust enforcement matter.

15.4. PROHIBITION ON AI-DRIVEN PENSION AND RETIREMENT FUND EXTRACTION. Any AI system deployed by a pension fund manager, 401(k) plan administrator, endowment manager, or any other fiduciary managing retirement assets on behalf of American workers that: (a) generates fee structures, trading patterns, or portfolio decisions whose primary effect is to increase management compensation at the expense of beneficiary returns; (b) executes high-frequency trading strategies that extract value from the retirement assets of American workers for the benefit of the managing entity or its affiliated parties; or (c) directs retirement assets into PE fund structures or other high-fee vehicles based on AI-generated recommendations where the AI system was trained on data provided by or beneficial to the recommended fund — is hereby declared a breach of ERISA fiduciary duty and is subject to civil enforcement action by the Department of Labor. American workers' retirement savings exist to fund their retirement. They do not exist to be optimized by AI for the benefit of the financial institutions managing them.

15.5. PE FIRM AND INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR AI FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DISCLOSURE. Every private equity firm, hedge fund, and institutional investor with assets under management exceeding $1 billion that deploys any AI system in connection

with: investment decisions affecting U.S. portfolio companies; trading in U.S. financial markets; pricing of financial products offered to U.S. consumers or investors; or management of U.S. pension, retirement, or endowment assets — must register that AI system with HACO and the SEC within 90 days of this Order, disclosing: the system's functions and the decisions it makes or influences; the training data used; any foreign ownership interests in the AI vendor; and the mechanism by which human fiduciaries exercise genuine oversight of the system's outputs. AI systems in financial markets that operate without meaningful human oversight — that execute trades, set prices, or make allocation decisions faster than any human being can meaningfully review — are presumed to be operating without the human accountability that fiduciary law requires.

15.6. THE SOVEREIGNTY PRINCIPLE. American financial markets exist because American law creates and sustains them. American contract law makes financial instruments enforceable. American courts resolve financial disputes. American regulatory agencies maintain market integrity. American workers create the economic value that financial markets reflect and trade. No financial actor — domestic or foreign, human or algorithmic — has a right to participate in American financial markets that supersedes the right of the American people to govern those markets in their own interest. The deployment of AI systems in American financial markets is governed by American law, accountable to American regulators, and subject to the democratic will of the American people through their elected government. Financial actors that cannot accept that condition are not entitled to the benefits of American market participation. The President will enforce this condition.

SECTION 16 — GENERAL PROVISIONS

16.1. SEVERABILITY. If any provision of this Order or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Order and the application of its provisions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

16.2. CONSTRUCTION. This Order shall be construed broadly in favor of protecting the American workforce, broadly in favor of national security, and narrowly in favor of any exception or exemption claimed by a regulated entity. Any ambiguity in scope, definition, or application shall be resolved in the direction of broader protection and broader prohibition, not narrower.

16.3. ANTI-PREEMPTION. No state or local law, ordinance, or regulation that provides greater protection to workers from AI displacement, greater restriction on private equity or institutional investor conduct, or greater restriction on foreign government AI investment than this Order shall be preempted by this Order. States and localities may exceed, but not fall below, the standards established herein.

16.4. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS. This Order shall be applied consistent with applicable international agreements. Where trade agreement obligations are cited as a basis for non-compliance, the relevant regulatory authority shall treat such citation as a basis for renegotiation of the applicable agreement, not as a shield against enforcement of this Order.

16.5. PHASED EFFECTIVE DATES. (a) Day 1 — upon signature: Sections 1, 2, 3, 6 (foreign government and foreign adversary prohibitions), 7 (anti-circumvention), 10, and 14 take effect immediately. (b) Day 180: Section 8.1 (healthcare automated denial prohibition) takes effect. (c) Day 365: HACO shall be fully operational. Human-AI Collaboration Plans are required for all new AI deployments after this date. (d) Day 730: Full compliance required for all existing AI deployments. No deployment that causes material reduction in human employment may continue after this date unless it satisfies Section 4 or qualifies for the hardship exemption under Section 5.5.

16.6. CONGRESSIONAL TRANSMITTAL. The President shall transmit this Order to the relevant committees of Congress within thirty (30) days as a proposed bill and shall formally request expedited legislative action. This Order does not expire pending congressional action. The executive authority underlying this Order is independent of and does not require congressional ratification.

16.7. REVIEW. HACO shall conduct comprehensive review of this Order's implementation and impact every twelve (12) months and submit findings and recommendations to the President.

16.8. EFFECTIVE DATE. Except as otherwise provided in Section 16.5, this Order is effective upon signature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this **twentieth day of January**, in the year **two thousand and twenty-nine**, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fifty-third.

Signed,

Vincent Cordova,
48th President of the United States