

The Honorable Roger Wicker
Senate Armed Services Committee
425 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Jack Reed
Senate Armed Services Committee
723 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Mike Rogers
House Armed Services Committee
2469 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Adam Smith
House Armed Services Committee
2264 Rayburn Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

March 5, 2026

Dear Chairman Wicker, Ranking Member Reed, Chairman Rogers, and Ranking Member Smith:

We write as leaders in national security, business, civil society, and technology— across parties and perspectives — to express serious concern about the Pentagon's threatened designation of Anthropic as a supply chain risk under 10 U.S.C. § 3252.

The use of this authority against a domestic American company is a profound departure from its intended purpose and sets a dangerous precedent. Supply chain risk designations exist to protect the United States from infiltration by foreign adversaries — from companies beholden to Beijing or Moscow, not from American innovators operating transparently under the rule of law. Applying this tool to penalize a U.S. firm for declining to remove safeguards against mass domestic surveillance and fully autonomous weapons is a category error with consequences that extend far beyond this dispute.

We note that the two principles at the center of this dispute, that AI should not power fully autonomous weapons systems that select and engage targets without human oversight, and that AI should not be used for mass domestic surveillance of American civilians, command broad support among the American public and have been endorsed by lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

They are not fringe positions. The prohibition on fully autonomous lethal weapons is consistent with the laws of armed conflict, including principles of distinction and proportionality codified in the Geneva Conventions. The prohibition on mass domestic surveillance is grounded in the Fourth Amendment and in binding U.S. treaty obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Despite the need for Congressional action to close loopholes and update these policies in light of recent AI advancements, even the Pentagon's own published policies and declarations by the US government leading a broad coalition of states echo the sentiment of these positions. Members from both parties have already expressed concern that the Pentagon's demands in

this dispute would erode those protections when instead what is needed is the hardening of them into U.S. law. We share that concern.

We are also concerned about DoD's actions on three additional grounds:

For American business and innovation, this action signals to every technology company — large and small — that government contracts come with the risk of existential retaliation if a company declines to comply with demands that conflict with its own judgment about the safety of its products. That is not a marketplace any serious entrepreneur or investor can build around.

For national security, the United States is in an AI race it cannot afford to lose. Blacklisting one of America's leading AI companies — and requiring its thousands of contractors and partners to sever ties as well — does not strengthen our competitive position. It weakens it. Our adversaries are not similarly handicapped.

For constitutional principles, allowing a military department to coerce a private American company into accepting terms it objects to under threat of commercial destruction raises profound First Amendment concerns.

We recognize the critical importance of giving our warfighters every advantage. But how the red lines at issue are defined, maintained, and enforced should be the responsibility of Congress, not the outcome of a contract dispute between a military department and a private company.

We urge Congress to establish clear statutory policy governing the use of artificial intelligence for domestic surveillance and autonomous lethal weapons systems: setting the boundaries, the oversight mechanisms, and the accountability structures that these technologies demand. These are among the most consequential questions the United States will face in the coming decade. They deserve a proper democratic debate.

We further urge Congress to exercise its oversight authority against this inappropriate use of executive authority against Anthropic, and to consider legislative guardrails ensuring that such designations are reserved for their intended purpose: protecting the United States from foreign threats, not disciplining American companies for disagreeing with the executive branch.

The future of American innovation in AI, the rule of law, and the constitutional boundaries of executive power are all on the line, and they are yours to defend.

Sincerely,

Donald Arthur, *Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)*

Diana Banks Thompson, *Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense*

Ian Bassin, *Executive Director, Protect Democracy*

Brad Carson, *President, Americans for Responsible Innovation and Former Under Secretary of the Army*

Mark Dalton, *Senior Director of Technology and Innovation, R Street Institute*

Richard Danzig, *Former Secretary of the Navy*

Carlos Del Toro, *Former Secretary of the Navy*

Kat Duffy, *Senior Fellow for Digital and Cyberspace Policy, Council on Foreign Relations**

Robert Felderman, *Brigadier General, U.S. Army (Ret.)*

Steve Feldstein, *Senior Fellow, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**

Alexandra Givens, *CEO, Center for Democracy & Technology*

Donald Guter, *Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)*

Samuel Hammond, *Chief Economist, Foundation for American Innovation*

Charles Harr, *Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)*

Michael Hayden, *General, U.S. Air Force (Ret.); Former Director, CIA*

Eli Lehrer, *President, R Street Institute*

Lawrence Lessig, *Roy L. Furman Professor of Law and Leadership, Harvard Law School*

Greg Lukianoff, *President, Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE)**

Randy Manner, *Major General, U.S. Army (Ret.)*

Mark Montgomery, *Foundation For Defense of Democracies, Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)*

John O'Farrell, *Former General Partner, Andreessen Horowitz*

William Owens, *Admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)*

Eli Pariser, *Author and Entrepreneur*

F. Whitten Peters, *Former Secretary of the Air Force*

Morgan Plummer, *Former Managing Director, National Security Innovation Network*

Jason Pye, *Former Vice President of Legislative Affairs, FreedomWorks*

Philip Reiner, *Former Senior Director for South Asia, National Security Council*

Paul Rosenzweig, *Former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Department of Homeland Security*

Daniel Schuman, *CEO, American Governance Institute*

Oliver Stephenson, *Associate Director of AI and Emerging Technology Policy, Federation of American Scientists*

Chris Stewart, *Former Congressman, Utah's Second Congressional District*

Sean Vitka, *Executive Director, Demand Progress*

Randi Weingarten, *President, American Federation of Teachers*

Robert Weissman, *Co-President, Public Citizen*

Sean White, *CEO, Inflection AI*

*Signing in individual capacity. Affiliation for identification purposes only.