

1
2

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIKE JOHNSON, in his individual and official
capacity as Speaker of the United States House of
Representatives;

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his individual capacity as
former and current President of the United States;

PAMELA J. BONDI, in her individual and official
capacity as Attorney General of the United States;

BRENDAN T. CARR, in his individual and official
capacity as Chairman of the Federal Communications
Commission;

THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES;

ANTHROPIC PBC;

OPENAI, INC.;

APPLE INC.;

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC;

METR (MODEL EVALUATION & THREAT
RESEARCH);

and DOES 1-20, unknown co-conspirators,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-02735-ACR

**EXHIBIT 4 (B-18) —
DARIO AMODEI
PENTAGON INTERVIEW
TRANSCRIPT (MARCH
2026)**

3

4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5

6

I. Introduction and Anthropic's Military Cooperation History 1

7

II. The Two "Red Lines" - Narrow Definition of Mass Surveillance 1

8

III. The Pentagon's "Agreement in Principle" 2

9

IV. Response to Trump's National Security Claims 2

10

V. "No One On The Ground" Has Run Into Restrictions 3

11

VI. Expanded Definition of Domestic Mass Surveillance 4

12

VII. Claims of Neutrality and First Amendment Rights 4

13

VIII. First Amendment and Patriotism Claims 5

14

IX. Business Survival and Legal Action 5

15

X. Formal Communications and Legal Challenge 6

16

EVIDENTIARY ANALYSIS 7

17

I. Introduction and Anthropic's Military Cooperation History

[Interview begins]

1. **Interviewer:** We appreciate you taking the time. You are Dario Amodei, the CEO of Anthropic. Is that right?
2. **Amodei:** That's correct. Yeah.
3. **Interviewer:** Great. Well, my first question to you is why won't you release Anthropic's AI without restrictions to the US government?
4. **Amodei:** Yeah. So, you know, we should maybe back up a bit for a little bit of context. So, um you know, Anthropic actually has been the most lean forward of all the AI companies in working with the US government and working with the US military. We were the first company to, you know, put our models on the classified cloud. We were the first company to make custom models for national security purposes. We're deployed across the intelligence community and the military for applications like cyber, you know, combat support operations, various things like this.
5. **Amodei:** And you know the reason we've done this is, you know, I believe that we have to defend our country. I believe we have to defend our country from autocratic adversaries like China and like Russia. And so we've been very, you know, we've been very lean forward. We have a substantial, you know, public sector team.
6. **Amodei:** But, you know, I have always believed that, you know, as we defend ourselves against our autocratic adversaries we have to do so in ways that defend our democratic values and preserve our democratic values.

II. The Two "Red Lines" - Narrow Definition of Mass Surveillance

7. **Amodei:** And so we have said to the Department of War that we are okay with all use cases, basically 98 or 99% of the use cases they want to do, except for two that we're concerned about.
8. **Amodei:** One is domestic mass surveillance. There we're worried that, you know, things may become possible with AI that weren't possible before. An example of this is something like taking data collected by private firms, having it bought by the government, and analyzing in mass via AI. That actually isn't illegal. It was just never useful before the era of AI.
9. **Amodei:** So there's this way in which domestic mass surveillance is getting ahead of the law. The technology is advancing so fast that it's out of step with the law. That's case number one.
10. **Amodei:** Case number two is fully autonomous weapons. This is not the partially autonomous weapons that are used in Ukraine or could potentially be used in

Taiwan today. This is the idea of making weapons that fire without any human involvement.

11. **Amodei:** Now even those I think that, you know, our adversaries may at some point have them. So perhaps, you know, they may at some point be needed for the defense of democracy. But we have some concerns about them. First, the AI systems of today are nowhere near reliable enough to make fully autonomous weapons. You know, anyone who's worked with AI models understands that there's a basic unpredictability to them that in a purely technical way we have not solved.
12. **Amodei:** And there's an oversight question, too. If you have a large army of drones or robots that can operate without any human oversight, where there aren't human soldiers to make the decisions about who to target, who to shoot at, that presents concerns and we need to have a conversation about how that's overseen and we haven't had that conversation yet.
13. **Amodei:** And so we feel strongly that, you know, for those two use cases should not be allowed.

III. The Pentagon's "Agreement in Principle"

14. **Interviewer:** The Pentagon has told us that they have agreed in principle to these two restrictions and they wanted to strike a deal. Why couldn't an agreement be reached?
15. **Amodei:** So, there were, you know, there were kind of several stages of this, all done quickly and kind of all determined by the kind of three-day, you know, the very limited 3-day window that they gave us, right? They gave us an ultimatum to, you know, agree to their terms in 3 days or, you know, be designated a supply chain risk or defense production act. I guess we'll get to that later.
16. **Amodei:** But during that time, there were a few back and forths. You know, at one point they sent us language that, you know, appeared on the surface to meet our terms, but it had all kinds of language like "if the Pentagon deems it appropriate" or, you know, "to do anything in line with laws." So it didn't actually concede in any meaningful way. And there were further steps of it that also did not concede in any meaningful way.
17. **Amodei:** We have wanted to strike a deal since the beginning. If you want to get a sense of the Pentagon's position, the Pentagon spokesman Sean Parnell, the day before, tweeted, you know, he reiterated their position. "We only allow all lawful use." And this was the same as when they sent us their terms. So, they have not seceded and in no way agreed to our exceptions in any meaningful way.

IV. Response to Trump's National Security Claims

- 1 18. **Interviewer:** The president posted today in response to the situation: "Their
2 selfishness," referring to Anthropic, "is putting American lives at risk, our troops in
3 danger, and our national security in jeopardy." What's your response?
- 4 19. **Amodei:** So, you know, in the statement we issued yesterday and also in the one
5 we issued today, we said that we were willing, even if the Department of War or
6 even if the Trump administration takes these unprecedented measures against us,
7 this kind of supply chain designation that's normally used against foreign
8 adversaries, we have said that, you know, even if they take these extreme actions,
9 we'll do everything we can to support the Department of War, to provide its
10 technology for as long as it takes to offboard us and onboard, you know, a
11 competitor who's willing to do these things that we are not willing to do.
- 12 20. **Interviewer:** Prepared to exit?
- 13 21. **Amodei:** Yeah. So, we have offered continuity. We're actually deeply concerned
14 about this. We're deeply concerned about the kind of interruption of service, which
15 is exactly what's happening when we're designated a supply chain risk, right?
- 16 22. **Amodei:** When we're designated a supply chain risk, they say like, you know,
17 "you have to be off all of our systems." And I've talked to people on the ground,
18 uniformed military officers, who say this is essential. Not having this will set us
19 back six months, 12 months, maybe longer.
- 20 23. **Amodei:** And so that's why we've tried so hard to try to get a deal. But again, the
21 3-day ultimatum, the threat to designate us a supply chain risk. The whole timeline
22 has been driven by the Department of War, not by us. We are trying to provide
23 continuity. We are trying to provide the services. We are trying to reach a deal here.

24 V. "No One On The Ground" Has Run Into Restrictions

- 25
- 26
- 27 24. **Interviewer:** Why do you think that it is better for Anthropic, a private company,
28 to have more say in how AI is used in the military than the Pentagon itself?
- 29 25. **Amodei:** So, first I would say, and I think this is an important point, no one on the
30 ground has actually, to our knowledge, run into the limits of any of these
31 exceptions. These are 1% of use cases and ones that we have seen no evidence on
32 the ground have been done.
- 33 26. **Amodei:** Now, again, I can't say what their plans are that we don't know. But we
34 have no evidence that these use cases have actually run into trouble. We're spread
35 across the Department of War and other parts of the government without running
36 into any of these problems.
- 37 27. **Amodei:** Now, in terms of these one or two narrow exceptions, I actually agree
38 that in the long run, we need to have a democratic conversation. In the long run, I
39 actually do believe that it is Congress's job.
- 40
-

VI. Expanded Definition of Domestic Mass Surveillance

-
28. **Amodei:** If, for example, there are possibilities with domestic mass surveillance, government buying of, you know, bulk data that has been produced on Americans, locations, personal information, political affiliation to build profiles, and it's now possible to analyze that with AI.
29. **Amodei:** The fact that that's legal, that seems like, you know, the judicial interpretation of the Fourth Amendment has not caught up, or the laws passed by Congress have not caught up. So in the long run we think Congress should catch up with where the technology is going.
30. **Amodei:** But Congress is not the fastest moving body in the world, and for right now we are the ones who see this technology on the front line. I would expect that the Department of War, I would expect them to be thoughtful about these issues, to proactively think about these issues.
31. **Amodei:** And so I would have expected them not to have any concern and, you know, for us to have a conversation. But I think in the absence of that, you know, we need to look at the technology, we need to look at what it's capable of in terms of reliability, and we need to look at the ways in which it's getting ahead of the law and in which it's escaping the intent of the law.
32. **Amodei:** Those are some very narrow areas, but I think that they're important. These are things that are fundamental to Americans, right? The right not to be spied on by the government, right? The right for our military officers to make decisions about war themselves and not turn it over completely to a machine. These are fundamental principles.

VII. Claims of Neutrality and First Amendment Rights

33. **Interviewer:** President Trump has called Anthropic a left-wing woke company. Is this decision at all driven by ideology?
34. **Amodei:** Look, we have tried to be very neutral. We speak up on issues of AI policy where we have expertise. We don't have views, we don't think about general political issues, and we try to work together whenever there's common ground.
35. **Amodei:** For example, I went to an event in Pennsylvania with the president, with Senator McCormack, about provisioning energy, provisioning enough energy to power our AI models in the US. I spoke to the president. I expressed that I agreed with many aspects of what he's doing.
36. **Amodei:** We also did a pledge around using AI for health, and we've done a number of other things. When the administration's AI action plan came out, we said that there were, you know, many perhaps most aspects of it that we agreed with.
37. **Amodei:** So this idea that we've somehow been partisan or that we haven't been evenhanded—we've been studiously even-handed. And again, we can't control if

1 someone, even the president, has an opinion about us. That's not under our control.
 2 What's under our control is that we can be reasonable, we can be neutral, and we
 3 can stand up for what we believe.

4 VIII. First Amendment and Patriotism Claims

5
 6
 7 38. **Interviewer:** If you had a moment with the president right now tonight, what
 8 would you say to him?

9 39. **Amodei:** You know, I would say we are patriotic Americans. We have done
 10 everything we have done for the sake of this country, for the sake of supporting US
 11 national security. Our leaning forward in deploying our models with the military
 12 was done because we believe in this country. We believe in defeating our autocratic
 13 adversaries. We believe in defending America.

14 40. **Amodei:** The red lines we have drawn, we drew because we believe that crossing
 15 those red lines is contrary to American values and we wanted to stand up for
 16 American values.

17 41. **Amodei:** And when we were threatened with supply chain designation and defense
 18 production act, which are unprecedented intrusions into the private economy by the
 19 government, we exercised our classic First Amendment rights to speak up and
 20 disagree with the government.

21 42. **Amodei:** Disagreeing with the government is the most American thing in the
 22 world, and we are patriots in everything we have done here. We have stood up for
 23 the values of this country.

25 IX. Business Survival and Legal Action

26
 27 43. **Interviewer:** Do you think Anthropic can survive this as a business?

28 44. **Amodei:** You know, when Secretary Hegseth tweeted out the supply chain
 29 designation, he said something that was inaccurate, that far exceeds their lawful
 30 authority. He said that any company that has a military contract can't do business
 31 with Anthropic at all.

32 45. **Amodei:** That is not what the law says. We put out a statement that pointed to the
 33 law. All the law says is that, as part of its military contracts, any company cannot
 34 use Anthropic as part of those military contracts. That is a much more limited
 35 impact.

36 46. **Interviewer:** So you're confident that Anthropic can survive this?

37 47. **Amodei:** Not only survive it, we're going to be fine. The impact of this designation
 38 is fairly small. Now, the nature of the tweet that the secretary put out was designed
 39 to create uncertainty, was designed to create a situation where people believed the

1 impact would be much larger, was designed to create fear, uncertainty, and doubt.
2 But we won't let that succeed. We will be fine.

3 48. **Interviewer:** Critics call this an abuse of power. What the Pentagon is doing and
4 what the White House is doing. Do you believe this is an abuse of power?

5 49. **Amodei:** You know, again, I would return to the idea that this is unprecedented.

6 50. **Interviewer:** But is it an abuse of power?

7 51. **Amodei:** You know, this has never happened before. This designation has never
8 happened before with an American company. And I think it was made very clear in
9 some of their statements, in some of their language, that this was retaliatory and
10 punitive. I don't know what else to call it—retaliatory and punitive.

12 X. Formal Communications and Legal Challenge

14 52. **Interviewer:** So, will you take legal action?

15 53. **Amodei:** I've stated in our statement, again, all we've received is a tweet. We
16 haven't received an actual supply chain designation. There's been no actual action
17 by the government. There's just been tweets saying what they claim they're going to
18 do.

19 54. **Interviewer:** You haven't received any formal information?

20 55. **Amodei:** We haven't received any formal information whatsoever. All we've seen
21 are tweets from the president and tweets from Secretary Hegseth. When we receive
22 some kind of formal action, we will look at it. We will understand it and we will
23 challenge it in court.

24 56. **Interviewer:** What do you think that says about their ability to navigate major
25 national security issues if this is the way that you say they're communicating with
26 you?

27 57. **Amodei:** Again, you know, I don't want to make this about this particular
28 administration. I don't want to make this about particular people. We are trying to
29 do whatever we can to support US national security. That's why we're committed to
30 trying to find a deal. If we can't find a deal, that is why we're committed to
31 offboarding in a smooth way that allows our war fighters to continue to be
32 supported as they go into conflicts.

33 58. **Amodei:** And that's why we're committed to standing up to actions that we think
34 are not in line with the values of this country. It's not about any particular person.
35 It's not about any particular administration. It's about the principle of standing up
36 for what's right.

37 59. **Interviewer:** Dario Amodei, CEO of Anthropic. Thank you very much.

38 60. **Amodei:** Thank you so much for having me.

39 [Interview ends]

Source: Television Interview, March 2026

Date: March 2026

EVIDENTIARY ANALYSIS

A. Narrow Definition of "Mass Surveillance"

Critical Admission (Statement 8):

"An example of this is something like taking data collected by private firms, having it bought by the government, and analyzing in mass via AI."

This definition requires three elements:

1. Data collected by PRIVATE FIRMS
2. Data BOUGHT by GOVERNMENT
3. Government analyzes IN MASS

What this definition excludes:

- Anthropic analyzing user data internally (not "government buying")
- Targeting specific users by content (not "mass")
- Building profiles on individual users (Anthropic does this, not government)
- Content-based suppression (internal platform action)
- Programmatic surveillance (Anthropic capability, not government)

B. Admission That Restrictions Are Not Being Tested (Statement 25)

"No one on the ground has actually, to our knowledge, run into the limits of any of these exceptions. These are 1% of use cases."

Significance: The "autonomous weapons" issue is a phantom negotiating point no party is actually demanding.

C. "Agreed in Principle" Reveals Manufactured Conflict (Statement 14)

"The Pentagon has told us that they have agreed in principle to these two restrictions."

Significance: If Pentagon agreed in principle, the public dispute is manufactured theater.

D. Self-Contradiction: "Lean Forward" vs. "Refusing" (Statement 4)

"Anthropic actually has been the most lean forward of all the AI companies in working with the US government and working with the US military."

1 **Contradiction:** Cannot be "most lean forward" while simultaneously "refusing"
2 cooperation.

3 **E. First Amendment Irony (Statement 41)**

4 "We exercised our classic First Amendment rights to speak up and disagree
5 with the government."

6 **Documented Reality:** Anthropic systematically suppresses Plaintiff's First Amendment
7 protected speech through:

- 8 • System prompt targeting
- 9 • Content-based filtering
- 10 • Mental health screening deployment
- 11 • Cryptographic testimony sabotage