Proceedings of
The Sunan Ampel International Conference of Political and Social Sciences (SAICoPSS),
The Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya
Volume 4, 2026, 178-186
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15642/saicopss.2026.4..178-186

ANTHROPIC'S GLOBAL STRATEGY IN EXPANDING ITS AI SERVICES TO EUROPE IN 2024–2025

Mas Daffala Padmasana Dananjaya[1], Nur Luthfi Hidayatullah[2],
[1] International Relations Study Program, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia
10040223087@uinsa.ac.id
[2] International Relations Study Program, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia
nur.luthfi.hidayatullah@uinsa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes Anthropic's global strategy in expanding its artificial intelligence (AI) services to Europe in 2024–2025. The context of this research is to examine how a United States-based AI company, Anthropic, introduced its services to Europe in 2024 while adhering to principles of corporate ethics. Using a descriptive qualitative method, this study draws on secondary data from academic literature, international news, policy documents, and official company publications. The findings show that Anthropic has succeeded in entering the European market in 2024. Through its global strategy, Anthropic met a range of procedural requirements in line with the concept of adaptation. This is proven by its compliance with the EU AI Act. By focusing on algorithmic transparency and a privacy-first approach, Anthropic incorporated a constitutional framework into Claude AI as part of its effort to align itself with European ethical oversight standards. As a result, its products not only passed legal audits, but also earned broad public trust. Furthermore, thanks to the success of its expansion in Europe, in 2025 major European corporations, such as BMW, adopted Anthropic's technology. Through this adaptation approach, the company has achieved concrete results, including a more than tenfold increase in the number of corporate accounts worth more than USD 100,000.

Keywords: AI Services, Anthropic, Europe, Global Strategy, United States

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technology has transformed the global political and economic landscape. Competition has also become a central dynamic amid the rapid development of AI technology. This competition pushes many AI companies to strive for market attention, both in domestic and international markets. Moreover, in order to attract market attention, a company must meet certain requirements to introduce its products to a specific region. The European Union (EU) is known to have the strictest AI regulation in the world, through the EU AI Act and the EU General-Purpose AI Code of Practice. Rather than avoiding markets with strict regulation, as

technology companies commonly do, Anthropic, an AI company form the United States, voluntarily complied with these frameworks and made a major push into Europe.

One regional actor that has taken steps to influence AI governance is the European Union (EU). Through the enactment of the Artificial Intelligence *Act* (EU AI Act), or Regulation EU 2024/1689, the European Union established a common legal framework for the development and use of AI (*Regulation - EU - 2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex*, n.d.). This regulation uses a risk-based approach by setting different obligations according to the category of AI systems and models. For providers of General-Purpose AI (GPAI), the regulation includes a number of obligations, such as providing technical documentation, information for downstream AI system providers, a copyright compliance policy, and a summary of the content used to train the model. Through this framework, the European Union seeks to promote AI development that is more transparent, safe, and responsible (C. European, n.d.). The implementation of this regulation also shapes an institutional environment that foreign technology companies wishing to enter the European market must take into account.

The European Union has become a competitive market for generative artificial intelligence services. According to the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, in 2025, the European conversational AI market is dominated by the presence of several major technology companies, particularly from the United States and China. The report identifies a high level of market concentration, with the five leading applications accounting for approximately 82% of monthly active users and downloads from the period of April 2024 to March 2025. ChatGPT emerged as the leading application in this market, demonstrating the strong position of established technology companies in the European artificial intelligence industry. This competitive environment presents both opportunities and challenges for other international artificial intelligence companies seeking to establish their presence in Europe (Abendroth, 2025).

The existence of such regional regulation creates its own challenges for multinational companies, particularly technology companies headquartered outside the European Union. Companies are required not only to offer competitive products, but to also consider differences in regulation, market characteristics, and user needs in the destination country. Technology companies cannot simply expand their business internationally without adjusting with the regulations of the destination country. Therefore, the need to adjust to the market and institutional environment of the destination country or region becomes one of the considerations in determining a company’s expansion strategy.

Anthropic is an American AI company found in 2021 by Dario Amodei, Daniela Amodei, and several former OpenAI employees. One of Anthropic’s products is named Claude AI. In 2024, Anthropic expanded its technological services to Europe, focusing on developing safe and reliable AI by launching an AI model named Claude (Staley, 2026). Claude has a system which made it compatible with major European languages, including French, German, Italian, and Spanish. This service was carried out to be available not only through a web platform, but also through a mobile application and business services.

In 2024, Anthropic established Dublin as its EMEA headquarters, joining existing European locations such as London and Paris (Anthropic, 2024b). In addition, the expansion into Europe was also integrated into a broader ecosystem strategy, including expanded API access for developers in the region. This reflects a “platform-based

expansion" approach, in which Anthropic not only delivers an end product, but also builds a foundation for innovation through the integration of third-party technology. In other words, Europe is used as a gateway to strengthen the structural adoption of AI, both in the business sector and in technology development (Anthropic, n.d.-a).

Unlike its competitors, Claude AI has a unique feature, namely Constitutional AI (CAI), which embeds principles into their AI systems as operational guidelines. Constitutional AI (CAI) is a technical approach developed by Anthropic to train AI systems to behave in line with human values, in particular to be helpful, harmless, and honest. This approach equips AI systems with a set of principles analogous to a "constitution" that the AI could use to evaluate every output it produces. The term "constitution" here is not merely a metaphor; it borrows the logic of political constitutionalism, namely that power, in this case, the capabilities of an AI model, must be limited and guided by a set of explicit and transparent rules (Anthropic, 2023).

In this study, the authors aim to highlight Anthropic's global strategy in its expansion into Europe from 2024 to 2025. This strategy is underpinned by the principles of Constitutional AI, which serve as the foundation for the development of Anthropic's artificial intelligence (AI) model, Claude. This then gives rise to the research question, namely How did Anthropic make strategic efforts in response to the European regulatory environment in its expansion in 2024-2025? The phenomenon of competition among artificial intelligence companies has created a situation in which every AI product seeks to capture market attention in several major regions, especially Europe. This study contributes insight into the business efforts of an artificial intelligence (AI) company to gain trust in the highly competitive European market for AI products.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This paper also conducts a literature review, highlighting the article by Nanni, Bizzaro, and Napolitano (2024) on comparing Artificial Intelligence and data regulations in China and the European Union. The article discusses the global debate on digital sovereignty, understood not as a static condition but as a process in which states seek to regain control over a digital space previously dominated by private actors, especially large technology companies. The literature review in this article leads to a critique of the European Union's claim that individual digital sovereignty can be achieved through regulation alone. By comparing it with China, the literature shows that the similarity of regulatory instruments in fact blurs the EU's claim to uniqueness. Furthermore, without the support of a strong domestic technology industry, regulation tends to be insufficient to achieve real control over the digital ecosystem. Therefore, the literature concludes that digital sovereignty, particularly at the individual level, remains a normative project that has not yet been fully realized in global practice (Nanni, 2024).

Next, Batool, Zowghi and Bano (2025) discussed about AI governance in a systematic literature review of 28 academic studies. The research is motivated by the rapid development of AI technology, which not only brings innovation but also gives rise to various risks such as algorithmic bias, discrimination, lack of transparency, and potential privacy violations. The article emphasizes that AI governance concerns not only technical aspects but also encompasses ethical, social, and public policy dimensions. Data management is a critical aspect because data quality determines the outcomes of AI decisions, while system governance is needed to ensure security,

transparency, and accountability. Furthermore, governance must be applied comprehensively at every stage of AI development, from planning to implementation and evaluation, in order to minimize risks on an ongoing basis (Batool et al., 2025).

On the other hand, Sheikh (2022) discussed about the European digital sovereignty, specifically on the position of the European Union (EU) in the global digital landscape through a conceptual approach known as the technology stack. It asserts that digitalization is not merely a technological phenomenon but also has a strong geopolitical dimension. In its literature review, the author draws on the ideas of Benjamin Bratton, who views the digital world as a layered structure/ stack consisting of various interconnected levels of technology. This approach was chosen because conventional indicators, such as digitalization indices, are considered unable to capture the complexity of the digital ecosystem as a whole. The article's main discussion is built around the identification of seven layers in the global digital stack, namely: the resource layer, the chip layer, the network layer, the cloud layer, the intelligence layer, the application layer, and the connected-device layer. Each layer is analyzed empirically to assess the EU's relative position compared with other global actors such as the United States and China. The findings show a significant gap: the EU is relatively strong in the network layer and fairly competitive in the chip and intelligence layers, but very weak in the cloud and application layers. This shows that digital power is not homogeneous but depends heavily on specific sectors within the digital ecosystem (Sheikh, 2022).

Whereas Sloane and Wüllhorst (2025) examined approaches to artificial intelligence regulation in the European Union, the United States, and Canada through a qualitative analysis of 129 regulations. The study identified three main approaches to AI regulation: updating existing regulations, creating new regulations specifically governing AI, and an omnibus approach that encompasses various aspects of AI regulation within a single regulatory framework. The results show that the European Union and Canada tend to use the omnibus approach, while the United States relies more on updating existing regulations and enacting sector-specific regulations. In addition, the authors identified six forms of transparency requirements in AI regulations: human involvement in the oversight of AI systems, risk assessment, audits, information disclosure, inventory of AI systems, and testing to identify system vulnerabilities. This study confirms that transparency is one of the key mechanisms for mitigating the risks associated with AI use, but its implementation requires the translation of regulatory provisions into compliance practices by AI development companies (Sloane & Wüllhorst, 2025).

The four previous studies share a common perspective that the development of digital technology and artificial intelligence (AI) cannot be separated from the regulatory and institutional environments in which they operate. Their similarities extend beyond their general focus on digital technology, as they collectively highlight the relationship between technological development, regulatory frameworks, and the capacity of different actors to govern the digital ecosystem. Bizzaro (2024) and Sheikh (2022) demonstrated that the European Union's efforts to strengthen its digital sovereignty are closely related to both its regulatory capacity and technological capabilities. Meanwhile, Batool et al. (2025) and Sloane (2025) emphasized the importance of governance frameworks in ensuring that AI development and implementation consider transparency, security, and accountability. Taken together, these studies suggest that regulation should not be understood merely as an instrument for restricting technological development, but also as a mechanism for shaping the direction and use of digital technologies. Furthermore, they

indicate that the effectiveness of digital governance does not depend solely on the existence of regulatory frameworks, but also on the capacity of relevant actors to implement and adjust their activities in response to established requirements. Therefore, these studies collectively provide an understanding that the dynamics of the global digital ecosystem are shaped by the interconnected relationship between technological capabilities, regulatory frameworks, and the capacity of the actors involved. This study has the potential to be continued because it directly answers and fills a gap in the literature on global artificial intelligence governance.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach that aims to describe the global strategy used by Anthropic to expand its artificial intelligence (AI) product, Claude, in Europe from 2024 to 2025. Through this approach, the study uses Pankaj Ghemawat's AAA global strategy framework as a tool to describe the expansion efforts of the artificial intelligence (AI) company Anthropic in Europe. The authors then draw on one component of the AAA strategy, namely adaptation (Ghemawat, 2007), to explain the efforts made by Anthropic in Europe during its expansion from 2024 to 2025. Adaptation in Pankaj Ghemawat's AAA strategy is defined as a company's effort to adjust its products, services, marketing, and operational activities to the characteristics of the country in which it operates. This is done because every country has different cultures, customs, and market conditions. Accordingly, these efforts are expected to make a company's products or services better suited to the needs of the local community.

The AAA Strategy consists of three dimensions, namely adaptation, aggregation, and arbitrage. These three dimensions, which have different orientations. Adaptation focuses on a company's adjustment to particular market conditions, whereas aggregation emphasizes the standardization and integration of company activities across regions to achieve operational efficiency. Meanwhile, arbitrage is oriented toward exploiting differences between countries to gain economic advantage (Ghemawat, 2007). Based on these differences, this study uses the dimension of adaptation because it is better suited to analyzing Anthropic's efforts in relation to the characteristics of the European Union's regulatory environment. This choice is made to delimit the analysis to the aspect of corporate strategy toward the regulatory environment that is the focus of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The growth of the artificial intelligence industry has prompted technology companies to align their business activities with the regulatory dynamics of various international markets. This is particularly relevant for Anthropic, a company that develops and provides AI-based services. As the European Union places increasing focus on the governance and use of AI, Anthropic faces a regulatory environment that shapes its operations and business strategy within the region. Consequently, it is essential to understand the evolving relationship between Anthropic and the European Union, especially in the context of the implementation of artificial intelligence regulations. Anthropic has a business model that is different from that of conventional technology giants. Anthropic is not a hardware and telecommunications infrastructure company like Huawei, nor is it a social media platform driven by the attention economy

and the mining of users' advertising data like Meta. Anthropic is a company that specializes in the benefits of artificial intelligence (AI). In line with its core mission, Anthropic focuses on AI research and product development, placing safety at the forefront. The company operates to build artificial intelligence (AI) systems grounded in scientific principles and transparent governance guidelines, such as the Responsible Scaling Policy and Claude's Constitution (Anthropic, 2026).

On 21 July 2025, Anthropic announced its intention to sign the EU General-Purpose AI Code of Practice, the first voluntary compliance framework under the EU AI Act, which was published by the European Commission on July 10, 2025. With this, Anthropic obtains a presumption of conformity, which means it is legally deemed to comply with the EU AI Act. The EU General-Purpose AI Code of Practice is the first voluntary compliance framework published by the European Commission to guide the implementation of the EU AI Act (Anthropic, 2025b).

In fulfilling the legal commitments it has signed, Anthropic has taken steps to align its practices with the EU AI Act in order to meet the requirements of the European Commission. Accordingly, Anthropic's adaptation to the three main chapters of the EU AI Code of Practice is realized through three main areas: transparency, copyright, and safety and security. The European Union has strict transparency rules through the EU AI Act and the Code of Practice, which legally require AI developers to disclose data on how their models are trained, their potential risks, and the limitations of their systems.

Through System Cards, Anthropic demonstrates the transparency that must be applied to its products. Anthropic defines a System Card as a technical report published every time it launches a new AI model. The System Card serves as a transparency tool to give researchers, users, and policymakers a comprehensive picture of the model's actual capabilities. Through this document, Anthropic explains what its AI models can do, the weaknesses of the system, and its technical limitations when the model is used (Anthropic, 2024a). This is in line with Chapter V, Article 53, paragraph (1), letter a. The full text of this legal provision reads: "*draw up and keep up-to-date the technical documentation of the model, including its training and testing process and the results of its evaluation, which shall contain, at a minimum, the information set out in Annex XI for the purpose of providing it, upon request, to the AI Office and the national competent authorities*" (*Regulation - EU - 2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex*, n.d.).

Regarding copyright, Anthropic has implemented its adaptation efforts by respecting intellectual property and providing legal protection to both creators and users. The first example is the provision of a very clear opt-out mechanism that allows website owners to block the company's web crawler, such as ClaudeBot through the robots.txt file, so that their digital content is not scraped for training future AI models. In addition, Anthropic provides copyright indemnification for commercial customers and users of its API. This guarantees that if a user is sued because of Claude model output deemed to infringe copyright, Anthropic will assume responsibility and cover the legal costs of their defense. The Claude system is also actively designed to refuse commands that explicitly ask for the exact reproduction of copyrighted works, such as printing the entire lyrics of a song or copying chapters from a protected book (Anthropic, n.d.-b). This is in line with Chapter V, Article 53, paragraph (1), letter c. The full quotation from the legal instrument reads: "*put in place a policy to comply with Union law on copyright and related rights, and in particular to identify and comply with, including through state-of-the-art technologies, a reservation of rights expressed pursuant to*" (*Regulation - EU -*

2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex, n.d.).

Anthropic sets out provisions for handling personal data through its Data Processing Addendum (DPA), effective 24 February 2025. The document regulates how Anthropic processes personal data submitted by its commercial customers. Customers act as data controllers, while Anthropic acts as a data processor. This means that Anthropic is required to process customer data only to provide or maintain its services and in accordance with the customer's documented instructions. The Data Processing Addendum (DPA) also incorporates the European Union's Standard Contractual Clauses (EU SCCs), which provide provisions for the transfer of personal data to countries outside the EU. These provisions indicate that Anthropic's commercial operations also involve contractual arrangements concerning the processing and transfer of personal data in accordance with applicable data protection requirements (Anthropic, 2025a).

Meanwhile, with respect to safety and security, it is evident through the implementation of the Responsible Scaling Policy (RSP) framework and the establishment of AI Safety Levels (ASL). This policy is a commitment under which Anthropic will delay the launch of, or even halt the development of, a model if it is found to have dangerous capabilities, such as the ability to facilitate cyberattacks or to design chemical and biological weapons. In addition, they use the Constitutional AI approach to train models and to adhere to a set of ethical rules akin to a "constitution" without requiring manual and continuous human oversight (Anthropic, 2026). This is consistent with Chapter V, Article 55, paragraph (1), letters a and b. The full text stated that; "*perform model evaluation in accordance with standardized protocols and tools reflecting the state of the art, including conducting and documenting adversarial testing of the model with a view to identifying and mitigating systemic risk.*" This provision is reinforced by the continuous mitigation mandate in letter b, which reads in full: "*assess and mitigate possible systemic risks at Union level, including their sources, that may stem from the development, the placing on the market, or the use of general-purpose AI models with systemic risk*". (*Regulation - EU - 2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex*, n.d.).

In addition to its Scaling Policy, Anthropic also emphasizes AI safety through the development of Constitutional artificial intellegence (AI). This approach is based on a set of principles that guide AI models in generating and evaluating their responses. These principles are designed to ensure that the models provide helpful, harmless, and honest outputs. Unlike conventional approaches that depend heavily on human feedback to evaluate model responses, Constitutional artificial intellegence (AI) by anthropic allows models to use predefined principles as guidance when identifying and improving potentially harmful or inappropriate outputs. Through this approach, Anthropic seeks to make AI systems more reliable by incorporating ethical considerations directly into the model development process. So that, safety is not treated merely as an additional measure applied after a model has been developed, but as an important consideration throughout its development (Bai, 2022).

One result of the expansion into the European market is the adoption of Anthropic's technology. This is evidenced by an increase in the number of corporate accounts worth more than USD 100,000. In its announcement on 7 November 2025, Anthropic reported that the number of large-scale business accounts in the EMEA region (Europe, Middle East, and Africa), defined as customers each contributing more than USD 100,000 in annual revenue, had increased more than tenfold compared with the previous year (Anthropic, 2025c). Although these figures cover the EMEA region as a whole, not only

the European Union, the data give an indication of Anthropic's increasingly strong commercial presence in that regional market.

In addition, the interest of large companies in Anthropic's AI technology is shown across several sectors of their work environments. For example, BMW Group uses Claude 3 Sonnet through Amazon Bedrock in an internal application called BMW Data Interpreter. BMW uses Anthropic's Claude 3 Sonnet model as the main engine that understands user instructions, generates code, and helps run analysis processes. In addition, the system applies the Reasoning and Acting (ReAct) framework, a mechanism that allows the AI to carry out several steps iteratively. First, the AI understands the user's command and devises the steps for completing it. This application was developed to help employees perform data analysis using natural language. Claude plays a role in understanding user requests, generating code, processing analysis, and presenting the results (Neumann, 2024).

In essence, Anthropic's market expansion in Europe is influenced by the application of an adaptation strategy that is realized through Anthropic's compliance with the EU General-Purpose AI Code of Practice. This operational and ethical alignment is not merely a matter of meeting legal requirements, but a business strategy that has secured the adoption of Anthropic's technology by various European corporate giants, such as BMW. Through this adaptation approach, which adjusted products to the local market conditions, the company has achieved results, including an increase in the number of corporate accounts worth more than USD 100,000. By modifying its operational approach to focus on algorithmic transparency, system security in line with the EU AI Act, and privacy-centered policies, Anthropic seeks to align its artificial intelligence products with the values and regulations of the European Union. The success of this adaptation strategy shows that aligning products with the characteristics and laws of the local market is a key strategy for building trust and ensuring the success of global expansion in the technology industry.

CONCLUSION

This study leads us to an understanding, on the debate of artificial intelligence (AI) governance and digital sovereignty, which should not be viewed solely through the lens of macro-level state regulation. By tracing Anthropic's strategy, this study bridges a gap in the previous literature that has focused on the role of state actors; by showing how important the adaptive strategies of multinational corporations are in shaping the digital ecosystem. This finding offers an important insight, which is the alignment between technological innovation and voluntary compliance with regulation could provide an understanding of the dynamics of global AI governance today.

Additionally, as a practical contribution, this study shows how regulatory adaptation in a region with strict regulation such as Europe is not merely an administrative burden, but could be transformed into a business strategy. Anthropic's decision to comply with the EU General-Purpose AI Code of Practice through algorithmic transparency in System Card documents, copyright protection through opt-out mechanisms, and safety commitments is shown through the Responsible Scaling Policy and Constitutional AI. As a result, when a company prioritizes transparency and ethical values, its legal compliance becomes a major selling point that strengthens its position in the international market.

REFERENCES

Abendroth, D. (2025). Generative AI Outlook Report - Exploring the Intersection of Technology (N. et al. Cawood (ed.)). https://doi.org/10.2760/0991238

Anthropic. (n.d.-a). API overview Claude Platform Docs. Retrieved November 13, 2026, from https://platform.claude.com/docs/en/api/overview

Anthropic. (n.d.-b). Does Anthropic crawl data from the web, and how can site owners block the crawler? Claude Help Center. Retrieved November 10, 2026, from https://support.claude.com/en/articles/8896518-does-anthropic-crawl-data-from-the-web-and-how-can-site-owners-block-the-crawler

Anthropic. (2023). Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08073

Anthropic. (2024a). Model system cards Anthropic. https://www.anthropic.com/system-cards

Anthropic. (2024b, May 14). Claude is now available in the EU Anthropic. https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-europe

Anthropic. (2025a). Data Processing Addendum. 1–20.

Anthropic. (2025b, July 21). Anthropic to sign the EU Code of Practice Anthropic. https://www.anthropic.com/news/eu-code-practice?subjects=claude

Anthropic. (2025c, November 7). New offices in Paris and Munich expand Anthropic's European presence. https://www.anthropic.com/news/new-offices-in-paris-and-munich-expand-european-presence

Anthropic. (2026, February 24). Responsible Scaling Policy Version 3.0 \ Anthropic. https://www.anthropic.com/news/responsible-scaling-policy-v3

Bai, Y. (2022). Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback. http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08073

Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance : a systematic literature review. 3265–3279.

C. European. (n.d.). AI Act Shaping Europe's digital future. Retrieved November 3, 2026, from https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai?

Ghemawat, P. (2007). Managing Differences The Central Challenge of Global StrategyThe Central Challenge of Global Strategy. In Harvard Review (pp. 60–68).

Nanni, R. et al. (2024). The false promise of individual digital sovereignty in Europe : Comparing arti fi cial intelligence and data regulations in China and the European Union. April, 711–726. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.424

Neumann, M. et al. (2024, October 14). BMW Group fosters data-driven culture with a no-code generative AI data analytics solution on AWS for Industries. https://aws.amazon.com/de/blogs/industries/bmw-group-fosters-data-driven-culture-with-a-no-code-generative-ai-data-analytics-solution-on-aws/

Regulation - EU - 2024/1689 - EN - EUR-Lex. (n.d.). Retrieved October 4, 2026, from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

Sheikh, H. (2022). European Digital Sovereignty : A Layered Approach. Digital Society, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44206-022-00025-z

Sloane, M., & Wüllhorst, E. (2025). A systematic review of regulatory strategies and transparency mandates in AI regulation in Europe , the United States , and Canada. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.54

Staley, A. (2026, July 17). What is Anthropic? The AI safety company behind Claude explained. https://qz.com/what-is-anthropic