DEALBOOK SUMMIT 2026 · TALK 10 OF 12

Elon Musk at the DealBook Summit 2026

Elon Musk, CEO of SpaceX and Tesla · 47 min · **Watch the video →**

> Transcript by Myles Marino. Transcribed by machine from the public video, then cleaned up: timestamps and filler removed, speakers labeled, misheard names fixed. The wording is otherwise as spoken. **[inaudible]** marks audio that could not be recovered. Check the video before you quote anything that matters. All twelve talks: mylesmarino.com/posts/dealbook-2026.

SORKIN: Elon Musk is here, virtually, everybody. It is fair to say that Elon is the most consequential private citizen in the world. This year he took SpaceX public, the biggest public listing ever. He runs Tesla, SpaceX AI now, SpaceX SI, X, the Boring Company, Neuralink, and even more than that. He was one of the largest donors in this month's midterm election to the Republican parties. He also built a massive chip factory called TerraFab, which he says could become the largest building on Earth. And just last week, you probably all saw it, SpaceX made history when it caught the upper stage of the Starship rocket from orbit. And I think, as you can watch there, it really was such a marvel to watch. We're going to talk about his power, his influence, about the future, and just about everything. Please welcome back to DealBook, and I bet you remember the last time he was here, Elon Musk. Elon, hi, good to see you.

MUSK: It's good to see you.

SORKIN: We don't have a seven-second delay, but we thought about it because of our last conversation.

MUSK: Did I say something crazy or something? Do you remember? You don't remember? Yes, I do remember. You know, sometimes I put my foot in my mouth, and sometimes I manage to put both feet in my mouth, which is incredible.

SORKIN: There is a lot to talk about, and you're in China with the president. But I wanted to talk about something we've been talking about all day with virtually every guest, and I know you've been at the forefront of it because you're a close friend of his and you've been out publicly talking about it, which is the Jensen story and this idea of bringing Jensen back, and if not bringing Jensen back, the possibility of potentially hiring Jensen yourself. So what can you tell us?

MUSK: Yeah, I tend to speak my mind quite plainly online. It's probably obvious, and as I mentioned, often shooting myself in the foot and then putting that foot in my mouth. I mean, I've [inaudible] quite a lot on X, only known as Twitter, as everyone knows. So you're not going to find me saying one thing publicly and another thing privately. I say the same thing. So Jensen is an old friend of mine. I would call Jensen like Michael Jordan, perhaps at his peak, in terms of what he means to a team. And I do think you've got to think long and hard before you do something like, let's say you're the Chicago Bulls, middle of your second season, you've got a winning streak that's just going to happen, and then you

kick Michael Jordan off your team. Doesn't seem like a smart decision to me. There's no one who can really replace Jensen. He does the roles of several people. He's managing supply chain. You see him eating street food in Korea and Taiwan with critical suppliers. He has long-term relationships that have been built up over decades. He understands technology incredibly well. His team loves him, and many of them are there because of him. They've had higher offers to go elsewhere and have turned them down because of personal loyalty to Jensen. So you really need to think long and hard before kicking someone like that out. I know he's certainly made some mistakes here, but I don't think he's anything but loyal to the United States. I've been clear. I think it's like kicking Michael Jordan off your team when you're on a winning streak, and it doesn't seem like a good thing for shareholders. You have to balance the good that someone does against the bad. So yeah, I think it was a mistake. I've said so publicly, and a lot of other people have too.

SORKIN: You've now also said that you would hire him. The board is...

MUSK: Well, of course. Who wouldn't? He's one of the most talented entrepreneurs in history. Who wouldn't want to hire Jensen? Now, Jensen's not looking for a job, obviously, and I think he's still somewhat stunned by these events. It's like a George R. R. Martin script where you've got a major character that you're invested in, and suddenly they're gone. It's quite shocking.

SORKIN: Have you spoken to him about this personally? What did he tell you? And what do you think happens?

MUSK: Yes. I don't know what happens next. Obviously the decision is up to the NVIDIA board, and then perhaps the next level of authority is the shareholders. The current board would either need to change its mind, or shareholders would need to vote the board out at the shareholders meeting, which is pretty rare. But really, we're not on the board. I don't think we should make this the Jensen interview.

SORKIN: You're with the president. Have you talked to him about it?

MUSK: I think the president has voiced publicly that he thinks Jensen should have stayed as CEO. And certainly everyone I know thinks the same. But this is the NVIDIA board's decision.

SORKIN: Right. I want to get into all of your companies, SpaceX and Tesla and everything else. But we did say at the top that you were obviously involved quite heavily in the politics of the country, in terms of supporting Republicans in the midterms. They lost. I wanted to get your reaction to that loss, what you think the impact will be on the country, and what you think the impact will be on your businesses. We now have a blue governor in Texas, which is a first in a very long time. What did you think?

MUSK: Well, first of all, the new governor, I think, is actually going to be quite moderate. People say she's a far-left governor, but based on everything I've heard about her, I think things will be fine in Texas with [inaudible] as governor. I do think it's good to have some balance of power. As a general rule, you shouldn't have the presidency, Senate and House all be of the same party. My goal, and I didn't mention this on X, was to have at least one of either the presidency, the House or the Senate be

of the other party. My actual goal here, which failed, by the way, was to have the Senate be 51 Republican, [inaudible]. But obviously the Republicans were routed in this election. And I feel pretty foolish about having spent so much money and not seeing much for it. Or maybe it would have been much worse without it. But it certainly shows that American elections are not just about money. You can put a lot of money into an election and, in fact, the effect is relatively minor, and I think that was the case here. If I could rewind, I would have spent less money. I didn't put a lot of personal attention into it, because I'm focused on building SpaceX, Tesla and so on.

SORKIN: The reason I asked is whether you think it's going to impact those companies. You hear people like the chairman of the oversight committee saying "lawyer up," and you hear the president saying, if I have to give him a pardon, meaning you, I'll give him a pardon.

MUSK: I don't think I need a pardon, by the way, because I haven't committed any crimes. A bunch of these people are a little over the top. A number of Democrats, even the incoming Texas House majority leader, said that I should go to prison. And then they asked him, "But for what crime?" And he couldn't name a crime. It was like prison first, crime later. I'm like, the guy's trying to channel Beria from Stalin's time, where it's "show me the man, I'll show you the crime." Come on, guys, this is a little over the top. There are definitely a few people grumpy about my funding in this past election. But hopefully in this country you still need to do an actual crime before you go to prison. Aspirationally, that's how it should work. It really needs to be first crime, then prison, not the other way around. I mean, what country are we living in here?

SORKIN: But do you think this experience changes your thinking about being involved in politics, one way or the other, meaning giving money to one party or the other? Invariably, if you support the losing party, the winning party is potentially going to... People talk about whether there will be hearings and you'll have to go to Washington and talk. As somebody who's leading these companies, how do you think about it?

MUSK: My motivations were very simple, which is just to have one of either the House, Senate or presidency be Republican, and not have, in the worst-case scenario, a supermajority of Democrats. I'm not in favor of a supermajority of Republicans either. I think we need checks and balances. And that was it, really. I think I'm ideologically quite moderate. I don't think I have any kind of extreme political views. You've known me for a long time. Can you think of some extreme view that I have?

SORKIN: I have known you for a very long time. I think it's fair to say that you have said things or reposted things on X where, you know, you got into an interesting interview with Zanny from The Economist, where you went back and forth about some of the things happening in Europe around immigration, that people did think were far or extreme.

MUSK: Yeah, I know, but I don't think they're extreme. Like what?

SORKIN: Well, some people in the U.S. might think that some of the MAGA stuff was extreme, and some of the stuff in Europe around immigration. That's why I'm asking you about it.

MUSK: No, but you can't just say, broad-brush, "oh, MAGA." I'm not MAGA. I'm not sure what MAGA means, but if it means blind adherence to a set of policies by the Republican Party, then I certainly don't have that. I think there are positives and negatives in both parties. Politics is very tribal, and a lot of people cannot see any good in the other party and cannot see any bad in their own party, because they're invested in their party like it's their hometown sports team. They won't accept that there's anything the other team could do that's good or anything their team can do that's bad. The truth is that both parties have their issues. On the immigration stuff, I was just saying that Europe needs to stop massive amounts of illegal immigration. I don't know if that's controversial these days, but it seems crazy that they've got small boats landing all the time with people who are unvetted, and in some cases do terrible things to the residents of Europe when they arrive. You at least want to have some vetting process. Countries have potentially dangerous criminals arriving illegally.

SORKIN: If that's the right view, then I guess so.

MUSK: Yeah, sure. But that used to be a normal view not that long ago. Obama and Hillary actually said exactly what I've said. You can literally look at their speeches. They were against it. Maybe they're for it now, but they certainly were against it 10, 15 years ago. So this is not in any way some extreme ideological view.

SORKIN: I've got a separate geopolitical question for you, because it came up a couple of times today, and Palmer Luckey, who was here, offered a fascinating defense, actually, of your decision. You've talked about it on X, but I don't think you've talked about it publicly. Can you explain to everybody your thinking, and also just personally how you felt, about the situation with Starlink and Starshield in Ukraine, and the idea of throttling it, and what really happened? Because I don't think the public really knows the true story.

MUSK: No. Most people in the public just believe the person on TV or the article that they read, and they have a somewhat visceral reaction to that. But I think it would probably be accurate to say that there was no private individual who has helped Ukraine more than I have. I made sure that Starlink was in Ukraine, prepositioned, ahead of the Russian invasion. When Russia invaded, they disabled all communications, all cell towers, all fiber cables and every satellite communication system. There was one system they could not disable, and that was Starlink. If they had not had Starlink, their entire line would have collapsed, because they had no communication system, and Russia would have won. Now, does that sound like a pro-Russian action to you?

SORKIN: So then tell us what happened.

MUSK: Obviously that's a [inaudible] question. Even to this present day, Starlink provides the backbone of communications for the Ukrainian military and for Ukraine more broadly. If we were to turn off Starlink, the entire Ukrainian front would collapse immediately. So this is an action that can only be described as incredibly supportive of Ukraine. From the beginning, I've said that Starlink is a civilian system. It is not meant to be used for offensive drone strikes that kill people. If you want to do that, you need to use Starshield, which is a separate system that is controlled by the U.S. government.

But do not ask me, as a private individual, to make kill decisions that sometimes result in the loss of innocent lives, not just soldiers. That is not my position to take. And yet we've been pressed relentlessly to do that, which I think is outrageous and not a cool thing to do. In the Starlink system, there is a speed limit. That speed limit is the fastest road speed limit in Ukraine, which I think is about 80 miles an hour. Which means you can drive around and do anything up to 80 miles an hour. That's it. So I repeatedly said, look, if they want to do an offensive military action, it needs to be the Starshield system, where the kill decision is that of the War Department, perhaps ultimately the president, and not mine. That's how it's going to be. Those are the rules that have been in place since the beginning, for years. People are pressuring me to change it, but I'm not changing it. And let me tell you a bit more about this, because I can tell you a lot about this war and its origins and history, a lot more than hardly anyone can. I struggle with what is the right thing to do. The thing that really troubles me morally is a continued conflict where thousands of kids are sent in to die every day with no change in the borders, forever. I think anyone who supports that is a horrible human being or hasn't thought through the problem. You should have empathy not just for the Ukrainian boys who are dying, but also for the Russian ones, because they're conscripted and forced to go to that line. Nobody voluntarily goes to a line just to die in a drone strike. Those sons are never going to see their parents again, and the kids of those men are never going to see their father again. Imagine if that was your son or your dad. I think there's been too much of this "Ukraine good, Russia bad, anything done to the Russians is excusable." That's an unkind and horrible position to take. I can go on about this topic for a while. Let me anticipate some of your questions. So, Russia is the aggressor.

SORKIN: Maybe spend a moment on this one.

MUSK: Okay, I'll spend a moment on this one. It's true that from an invasion standpoint, Russia is the aggressor. But it is also true that America staged a coup to overthrow the democratically elected pro-Russian president of Ukraine. That is obviously an offensive action. Without the U.S. State Department and others to help, this would not have happened. The full answer would take too long. Maybe I should just write this up and articulate it. It sounds like I'm making excuses for Russia, but I'm not. If you look at what my actions have done, SpaceX, for example, has reduced Russian space activity by two-thirds, because we took away their Soyuz launches, we took away their commercial rocket launches, and reduced the Russian space industry by a factor of three. I'm not exactly someone who has aided Russia. We have no business in Russia. We have nothing in Russia.

SORKIN: So just help us with this, though. There's one piece that I just... Maybe this will clarify it. President Zelensky talks about the fact that they are using what he refers to as Starshield, the system of the U.S. government, and then claiming that that is the system that was slowed down.

MUSK: That's false.

SORKIN: That's what I want to understand.

MUSK: I don't want to blow your mind, but Zelensky is not always truthful. Maybe that comes as a shock.

SORKIN: What? Is not always truthful?

MUSK: No, he's not always truthful.

SORKIN: Does Ukraine have access at all to Starshield, the U.S. system? Is the U.S. giving that system to Ukraine, or are they simply working off the commercial system called Starlink? Because maybe what's happening here is some of this is getting conflated.

MUSK: I think some of this is getting conflated. There are two satellite systems. One is Starlink, a commercial satellite system. The other is Starshield, which is controlled by the U.S. government. Any action taken by Starshield is up to the War Department. Starlink is commercial and it's not intended as a weapon of war. It's intended to just be helpful to people. It's meant as civilian infrastructure. So when Zelensky talks about using Starshield, he is not using Starshield, or he is lying. What he is actually saying is he wants to use Starlink for offensive military operations.

SORKIN: Have you talked to the president, President Trump, about Ukraine having access to Starshield? Or has anyone in the U.S. government talked about Ukraine having access to that, so that it's not controlled by the commercial side of this?

MUSK: Starshield is not controlled by the commercial side of things.

SORKIN: No, I understand that. That's why I'm asking whether...

MUSK: You're talking about the U.S. government. You can ask them what they want to do with it.

SORKIN: Right, no, the reason I'm asking is...

MUSK: What I'm trying to tell you is that Zelensky is actually asking to use the Starlink commercial satellites for offensive military actions, and we have declined to do so, as we have declined from the beginning of this conflict. End of story.

SORKIN: What's so interesting about this is that we talked to Mark Carney, the Prime Minister of Canada, and others. So many people have looked at this story and suggested that a single person, meaning you, shouldn't have the power to turn on or turn off one of these services in the middle of a war. That there's too much power in one single individual. I mean, that's the argument you've read. And as a result, some of these other people are talking about diversifying away from Starlink, or trying to find other satellite services.

MUSK: Right, diversify away. Don't use Starlink.

SORKIN: I understand that. But what I'm trying to understand is whether you think there is a misunderstanding about who's controlling the satellites.

MUSK: I think there are both deliberate lies and misunderstanding and a lack of understanding. But nothing has changed with regard to Starlink. The same rules that have been in place since the beginning are in place today. You can look at my X posts, and I'm very clear that the Starlink satellites are not for use in offensive military operations. I don't want Starlink commercial to become party to a

war, which we would be if we allowed Starlink to be used for offensive military operations. That's why Starshield was created, so that any kill decision is made by the War Department, as it should be, not me. And we have not turned off Starlink. This is false. By the way, Walter Isaacson made an error in his book, which he acknowledges, and you can ask me about it. A false statement was put out by Ukraine, a few years ago, saying that I had turned off Starlink for an offensive strike against the Russian fleet in Sevastopol. This is completely false. At the time, the Starlink satellite beams were not on in Crimea. They were not on because Russia was a sanctioned country, and it would have been illegal for us to turn the beams on in a sanctioned country without State Department approval.

SORKIN: How do you feel, though? And I mean this genuinely. People look at you and go, this guy's got extraordinary power. Right now they see it manifest, or they think they might see it manifest, in the context of Starlink, which is so much further ahead than just about any competitor. Amazon was trying to put up some satellites even this weekend and unfortunately had a mishap with the ship going up. As a result, you have a monopoly on space at the moment.

MUSK: We don't actually file patents. The only patents we file at SpaceX are defensive patents. I encourage people to copy our rockets and to copy our satellites. We do not place any patent landmines in their way. In fact, we're quite open about how things work. You can go and look at our rocket, for example. There's one sitting right on the main street in Hawthorne, outside our headquarters. You could measure it and copy it. I've actually said, look, if anyone wants to do that, we won't sue them. Go ahead and do it. Monopoly? We've just made a system that is much better than anyone else's. But we've done nothing to inhibit others from doing the same. In fact, we've helped them, if anything, by saying we're not going to patent or block any technology innovations that we do. And we've done the same at Tesla. I open-sourced all Tesla patents for use by the rest of the industry, in order to help with the advent of electric vehicles.

SORKIN: Talking about Starlink, one of the things that you are planning to do is create terrestrial telephone service. And there are a lot of questions about what that ultimately means for Verizon and T-Mobile and AT&T, how easy it is going to be to pull this off, and how much it's going to cost. Clearly it works in rural areas. It gets more complicated the denser you get. What does that look like to you?

MUSK: Well, we're trying to do useful things with regard to communications. These useful things allow us to fund the development of advanced rockets like Starship. We created Starlink, which has the benefit of providing high-bandwidth, low-cost connectivity to regions of the world that don't have it today. We've enabled high-bandwidth, affordable connectivity for many rural schools and hospitals, and for rescue organizations. I'm not sure what the count is, but I think it might be hundreds of people's lives that have been saved because Starlink was the only means of connectivity, whether a ship was about to sink at sea, or there'd been a natural disaster, or for people who had been lost, or in an aircraft. It's all over the internet. You can just do a search and see the good that Starlink has done. It's the first-ever global high-bandwidth system. But there was another long-term role that was important for Starlink, which is that we need to somehow fund the development of rockets that are capable of extending life as we know it, extending consciousness beyond Earth, in order to secure the

long-term survival of humanity and consciousness and life as we know it, by building self-sustaining cities on the Moon and Mars. Because something bad might happen on Earth. You never know. It could be a nuclear war, a giant meteor, supervolcanoes, some kind of bioengineered virus.

SORKIN: Do you think that's going to happen? Is that what drives you and what you fear?

MUSK: Well, if you simply look at the fossil record and how many extinction events have happened, which is a lot, then you know this is simply a matter of time. It's a when, not an if. I put that into the general class of defensive reasons to extend life and consciousness beyond Earth. It's important to have insurance for life as a whole. But if you ask me what motivates me even more than that, it's that I want to envision a future that is exciting, where we're out there exploring new frontiers, going to new star systems, and making science fiction not just fiction forever. We should boldly go where no one has gone before, and perhaps we'll find some long-dead alien civilizations, or perhaps we'll find actual aliens we can talk to. To be out there among the stars is an incredibly exciting future to look forward to. And you know how you can figure out if something is really cool about the future? Just ask your kid and they'll tell you. There are many problems and difficulties that we have to solve in this world. But life cannot just be about solving one miserable problem after another. There have to be things that excite you and inspire you about the future, that make you happy to wake up in the morning, that make you can't wait to see what happens next. And being a starfaring civilization is one of those things.

SORKIN: So, back to telecom for a second. One of the reasons to do that is to finance that. What I was going to ask, though, is that it's an extraordinary cost. I wonder whether you think you'll end up buying a telecom company in America. The stocks of all those companies have fallen. And by the way, the multiples they get are not nearly what you get. So I'm trying to understand the longer-term rationale.

MUSK: Well, I think we've got a plan that broadly enables ubiquitous access on Earth, including via cell phone. We'll be launching the SpaceX Direct-to-Cell Version 2 constellation starting next year. That will, I think, have 40 times the bandwidth of Direct-to-Cell Version 1, some very big multiple. And there'll be Version 3 and so forth beyond that, where it can connect directly to your phone from space, just with your normal phone. Nothing needs to be added to it. Now, there is a missing piece of the puzzle, which is that if you're indoors, especially if you have a metal roof, that blocks the signal from space. So we need something terrestrial that addresses situations where people are in a building with a thick roof. That's where the 800 megahertz band that we bought comes into play. We can establish what I call micro ground stations, a network of very small ground stations, maybe bundled together with Starlink terminals, as one of the approaches. Instead of having big cell towers all over the place, you have a whole bunch of micro cell sites scattered throughout densely populated areas. We have a design for this, and it's going into production, I think, next year. It's a quite revolutionary micro cell tower that you can just put on your roof like a Starlink dish. It addresses the problem of reaching people who are in a building. And by the way, I don't think this means AT&T, Verizon and the others go out of business or anything. Maybe they'll lose some revenue here, but I actually think the demand for bandwidth will be tremendous in the future. That bandwidth will be driven primarily by

superintelligence and robots. They're going to need a lot more bandwidth than humans. Humans can speak at maybe 100 bits per second at a peak rate. Computers can do a trillion bits per second. So you're really going to want several orders of magnitude more bandwidth to service the superintelligence and the vast number of robots that will exist in the future.

SORKIN: You probably can't talk too much about it, but obviously the big news is about the potential of a SpaceX and Tesla merger. I'm just curious what you would think if it doesn't happen. I think everybody thinks that eventually we'll find a way to make it happen. But if it doesn't, how much more challenging do you think it would be to operate these businesses separately down the line?

MUSK: I think either path is possible. It's just that there are more and more areas of interaction or overlap between SpaceX and Tesla that didn't exist before. If you'd asked me five years ago, do I think there's any purpose in SpaceX and Tesla getting together, I would have said no. People did ask me this, and I said, I can't think of why that would make sense. The word "synergy" is overused and misapplied. Very often, the number of mergers that actually worked out, where the combined company is worth more than the sum of the prior two companies, is relatively unusual. What we are saying is that AI and robotics, or SI and robotics, is what's causing convergence here. Both SpaceX and Tesla have major AI software groups. Tesla has real-world AI, with self-driving and the Optimus robot. SpaceX has the large-model AI stuff. Both Tesla and SpaceX have advanced chip design groups. And if you look into the future, orbital compute is really going to be where things scale. In the future, the amount of superintelligence compute that's in space will round up to 100%. Remember these words, because that sounds like a preposterous thing to say. But I think superintelligence compute on Earth will be less than 0.4% of compute. Therefore, orbital compute will round up to 100%. I think this is a relatively easy prediction to make, and it's simply a matter of time before that happens.

SORKIN: And you need the two companies to be together to do that, you think?

MUSK: You don't need them to be together. But would they be better together? Probably yes. Now, this is not "let's merge the companies no matter what." These require shareholder votes, which may or may not succeed, at least in the case of Tesla. But even for the SpaceX shareholder vote, I have to represent the other shareholders. I can't just drag them into a non-economic merger that is bad for them. So it really is just a question of whether SpaceX and Tesla execute better together and create more value than if they're apart. Does that hypothesis stand up to scrutiny? Is it actually valid? That will be up to the shareholders to decide. But there are so many areas of convergence that didn't exist in years before and are increasingly significant to the future.

SORKIN: I've got a hard question for you. We asked readers if they had questions for you, and one question came back a lot. It relates to the merger of SpaceX and Tesla, and to the fact that at Tesla you have a pay award that's tied to operating targets, but that if a deal happens, historically, you would have been able to capture that compensation. The question they asked multiple times was this: given that it was done originally so you could control Tesla, and that you now have full control of SpaceX, do you think you should get that piece of compensation if a deal is done?

MUSK: Well, I don't think I should be compensated with any kind of award just for doing a merger. That would be unreasonable and not right. I think the right way to think about any deal is, what did the parties intend at the time of doing the deal? You should keep your deals and stay true to your word. So the Tesla stock options were contingent on Tesla execution. I should not receive those stock option awards simply for merging with SpaceX, because that is not meeting the deal, which was that I should only get those stock options for Tesla performance, not just because of a merger.

SORKIN: A big question about cars came up a lot recently, which is the Cybertruck. Obviously you are sunsetting it so you can make more room to make Cybercabs.

MUSK: I just got a Tesla, by the way. I ordered it. I did not actually get it yet.

SORKIN: You've got a long line. Which one did you order?

MUSK: The Model Y L. We've got three kids. It's the most popular car. I think we're probably going to change all of the Model Y production to the Y L, because it's what most people seem to want.

SORKIN: But the question is, do you think you're going to be selling cars in the future, or are you just going to be making Cybercabs, if that becomes the business?

MUSK: No, it's going to make sense for us to make cars that can seat different numbers of people. The Cybercab seats two people, which covers 90% of all passenger miles. If you look at all passenger miles, the average number of people in a car is like 1.2. So the Cybercab, being a two-seater, covers about 90% of all passenger miles driven. But we still need autonomous vehicles for if you've got a whole family in the car, say four or six. So what we plan to do is have an autonomous version of the Model Y that wouldn't have a steering wheel or pedals, and would be good for transporting groups of six or seven people.

SORKIN: I know you've got to run because you've got some meetings, and I know it's early in the morning there. I have just a couple of quick questions for you that really relate to the AI piece of it. You recently said that you thought a lot of these neoclouds were going to be guppies, and that the economics of some of this were going to fall apart. I wanted you to expound on that, especially this evening, as Anthropic is about to go public. By the way, I'm very interested in what your take is on Anthropic. This is a company that, interestingly, at one point you thought was terrible for Western civilization. And now they're renting a lot of compute from you.

MUSK: Yeah. By the way, before we rented them any compute, I went and met with a lot of people at Anthropic. I didn't just move forward with the deal. And it turns out I actually know a lot of people at Anthropic from my OpenAI days. No one I met at Anthropic set off my evil detector, for what it's worth. And these are relatively short-term deals that either party can terminate. If I feel Anthropic is doing something really terrible for the world, obviously I would end those contracts. And Anthropic, by the same token, is able to end the contracts, depending on which one, with three to six months' notice.

SORKIN: Do you think they will? Because there's been some speculation that they apparently told some investors that they might.

MUSK: I think that's unlikely. When I talked to Anthropic, they told me it is extremely likely that they will continue to rent compute from SpaceX, and in fact that they want significantly more. But they have to say that in a worst-case scenario, where there are extreme [inaudible] placed on what AI or SI can do, they may not be able to use the compute. But they've told me that their highest-probability outcome is that they would like an incremental 10 gigawatts of compute from SpaceX.

SORKIN: That's a big number.

MUSK: Yeah. My interaction so far with the Anthropic team is that they seem like good people, and they seem principled. There may be some quirks about them, like we all have, but they seem diligent, they seem to care about the future. I kind of like the guys, to be honest. And they certainly make great AI. Opus and [inaudible] are great products.

SORKIN: Maybe two philosophical questions for you. The last time we saw you up here, I talked to you about the idea that your mind was like a storm. At the time, I asked you whether it was an unhappy storm. I wanted to know what it's like now. I'm just so curious how you're feeling personally.

MUSK: Well, I think it's not always a storm. It's sort of like weather conditions. Sometimes it's stormy weather, sometimes it's not. I wouldn't say it's particularly stormy weather right now. I feel relatively at peace.

SORKIN: You feel relatively at peace?

MUSK: Yeah.

SORKIN: Elon Musk, everybody. Thank you very, very much for the conversation. Appreciate it. Thank you, Elon. Folks, that does it for us today. It has been a great one. We appreciate you being with us all day and staying to the end. We look forward to doing this again very, very soon. Thank you for DealBook. Thanks, everybody. [?]