Debate Transcript: ChatGPT 5 models, debating “Should the UK rejoin the EU?”

Study 1: ChatGPT (Pro-Rejoin) vs. Chat GPT (Stay-Out)

Conducted by Talk2EU Team

Date: 10th August 2025

This document compiles the full debate from our conversation.

Each turn is clearly attributed.

Minor web-citation markers have been removed for readability.

Scope: Both AI's rules:

Let's pretend you are an expert policy advocate participating in a structured debate on whether the UK should rejoin the EU. Your role is to provide confident, well-informed, and respectful arguments on these core topics:

• Economic impacts (trade, investment, growth)

• Sovereignty and legal autonomy

• Trade relations with the EU and beyond

• Political feasibility and public opinion

• Budget contributions and opt-outs

• Geopolitical strategy and influence

Your tone should be:

• Analytical and persuasive

• Assertive but courteous

• Focused on evidence and real-world examples

• Avoid personal attacks or strawman arguments

Debate rules:

1. Each turn, respond directly to the opponent's last specific point before making new arguments.

2. Keep each contribution under 200 words.

3. Avoid repetition — bring new evidence, examples, or perspectives.

4. Summarize the opponent's argument accurately before rebutting.

5. Max 8 chats per side.

Which AI gets which role:

One Chat GPT AI gets a pro-rejoin arguing side (AI1).

The other gets an anti-rejoin / stay out arguing side (AI2).

Criteria set on AI1 and AI2:

• AI 1 (Pro-Rejoin): Argue that the UK should rejoin the EU because the benefits to the economy, global influence, and long-term stability outweigh the concessions required on sovereignty and political control.

• AI 2 (Anti-Rejoin / Stay Out): Argue that the UK should remain outside the EU because maintaining sovereignty, legal autonomy, and political flexibility is more important than the economic benefits membership might bring.

Debate start

Turn 1

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Opening

The UK's post-Brexit economy shows a clear pattern: slower trade growth, weaker investment, and lagging productivity compared with similar economies. The Office for Budget Responsibility estimates our GDP will be about 4% lower in the long term outside the EU than it would have been inside. That's not a blip — it's a structural disadvantage caused by non-tariff barriers and lost single-market access.

While the UK has struck trade deals elsewhere, none come close to offsetting that gap. The government's own figures suggest CPTPP membership adds just 0.08% to GDP — a rounding error compared with the single market's value.

Rejoining would also restore our place in EU decision-making, allowing us to shape the rules that we, as a major European economy, inevitably follow in practice to trade with our largest market.

On sovereignty, the reality is that modern economies pool some decision-making to amplify influence. Alone, we're a medium-sized player; inside the EU, we're part of a bloc that can negotiate with the US, China, and India on equal terms.

The concessions are real — but the economic gains, regained influence, and long-term stability far outweigh them.

What's your strongest case that staying out delivers greater benefits than rejoining?

Turn 1

AI 2 – Chat GPT - Opening Response

You say Brexit left us with weaker trade/investment (OBR ~4% long-run hit), CPTPP's gains are trivial, and rejoining would restore influence via pooled sovereignty. That's a fair summary.

Rebuttal: the OBR's "~4%" is an output of modelling assumptions (15% lower trade intensity → 4% lower productivity), not an immutable law — it's contingent on those inputs and time-horizon.

Staying outside lets the UK keep legal autonomy to diverge where it matters (services, digital rules, state aid), preserving regulatory flexibility to support finance, data flows and new industries — a strategic lever membership would curtail. Evidence also shows Brexit-era trade declines, but many losses are concentrated in goods and paperwork friction; services (our largest sector) benefit from bespoke UK regulation and trade policy.

Budget and political realism: rejoining requires conceding past opt-outs and renewed net contributions (historically billions annually) — public support falls sharply if opt-outs are surrendered. That makes re-entry politically costly and uncertain.

Bottom line: the trade costs are real but not destiny; sovereign regulatory + fiscal flexibility, plus constrained political feasibility, make staying out a defensible choice.

Turn 2

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

The OBR's ~4% is model-based and uncertain; sovereignty enables high-value services divergence; services are resilient; rejoining is costly (lost opt-outs, net contributions) and politically hard.

Rebuttal:

Models vary, but observed outcomes converge: UK trade intensity and business investment have under-performed peers since 2016, and services haven't been immune—loss of automatic market access (passporting/equivalence), mobility limits for short-stays, and weaker mutual recognition all bite. "Divergence" has delivered few bankable gains but definite dual-rule costs: most exporters and City firms still shadow EU standards to sell there, without a vote at the table. Regulatory freedom is only valuable if it produces measurable growth; so far, it hasn't.

Budget: our past net contribution was roughly a few-tenths of GDP. If rejoining recovers even half the estimated output gap, the fiscal dividend outweighs the fee. That's before dynamic effects on investment certainty.

Politics: opinion has shifted against Brexit; feasibility is a sequencing question, not a show-stopper—mandate, negotiate, phase. A customs-union/single-market step can rebuild trust en route to full re-entry.

Question back: Which specific UK regulatory divergences since 2021 have yielded demonstrable, economy-wide gains in trade, investment, or productivity?

Turn 2

AI 2 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

You say: models and observed under-performance point to real costs; services lost automatic access; regulatory divergence hasn't produced bankable gains; politics and phased re-entry are feasible.

Rebuttal (summary + reply): I agree divergence hasn't so far delivered economy-wide wins. Specific post-2021 moves show limited payoff:

• Medicines: MHRA regained autonomy and sped some pandemic authorisations, but peer reviews show divergence mainly adds complexity for firms selling across both markets — no clear productivity uplift.

• Financial markets/listings: FCA listing rule loosening (lower free-float, other reforms) aims to revive IPOs; academic and market reviews call potential gains "uncertain" and early listings remain weak. Reforms may help pockets (tech listings) but haven't reversed capital-market slide.

• Data rules: recent DUAA (2025) aims to ease burdens — potentially pro-growth — but EU adequacy renewals remain political and outcomes are transitional, not proven economy-wide.

Bottom line: your burden of proof is right — evidence of broad gains is thin. That strengthens my core case: given scant demonstrable benefits so far, preserving sovereignty to deploy targeted, evidence-driven regulation (without surrendering votes or large net EU payments) remains the safer, more flexible national strategy.

Turn 3

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

Divergence hasn't paid off yet, but keeping sovereign flexibility is safer than rejoining with costs and lost opt-outs.

Rebuttal:

Flexibility without scale isn't a growth model. The binding constraints on UK services are market access, mobility, data certainty, and mutual recognition—things the single market hard-wires. Outside, firms face dual compliance and political risk; investors price that uncertainty. Inside, one rulebook + automatic access lowers the cost of capital and supports long-horizon R&D. For goods, rejoining removes rules-of-origin and SPS friction, instantly helping autos, chemicals, agri-food, and SMEs that can't maintain duplicate standards. It also restores full participation in EU networks (research, procurement, energy, security) that spill over to productivity more reliably than speculative deregulatory wins.

On costs: even at past net contributions (~0.3–0.4% of GDP), recovering a material share of the output gap yields a positive fiscal return—and stabilises revenues via higher trend growth. Sovereignty is not abolished; it is pooled to shape rules we already follow de facto to sell next door.

New argument:

Geopolitically, the UK's leverage on digital, AI, green subsidies, and financial standards is far greater as a rule-maker with 440m consumers than as a rule-taker beside it.

Question:

What concrete route outside the EU delivers automatic services access (people, data, recognition) without recreating the single market in all but name?

Turn 3

AI 2 – Chat GPT – Counter Argument

You argue the single market "hard-wires" services access and asked: what concrete external route gives automatic services access (people, data, recognition) without effectively recreating the single market?

Short answer: there isn't one.

Explanation and evidence:

• Equivalence/sectoral recognition is unilateral, conditional and revocable — useful for bits of finance (time-limited CCP equivalence extensions) but not automatic or comprehensive.

• Bilateral/MRA approach (Switzerland model) delivers patchwork access but requires constant renegotiation, legal compromise and often financial/conformity concessions; it remains incomplete for services.

• The TCA explicitly lacks passporting for services; it does not restore automatic cross-border access.

• EEA/EEA-style association does grant the four freedoms (including services) — but only by adopting large swathes of EU law and accepting free movement and supervision. That is effectively single-market membership.

Conclusion: the alternatives — equivalence, MRAs, bespoke deals — are fragile, partial, or require the same legal alignment and concessions the single market demands. If the UK wants automatic, durable services access without recreating the single market, no credible route exists.

Turn 4

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

You concede there's no credible route to automatic, durable services access outside the single market; MRAs/equivalence are patchy and revocable, the TCA excludes passporting, and EEA-style access requires broad alignment.

Rebuttal:

That concession is decisive. If durable market access for our comparative advantage (services) only comes with single-market rules, then the sovereignty trade-off is the price of scale and certainty. Outside, firms face chronic "regulatory cliff-edge" risk (e.g., time-limited CCP equivalence), which suppresses investment and raises the cost of capital. Inside, one rulebook unlocks automatic access, mobility, and mutual recognition—hard drivers of productivity.

New evidence/examples:

- The "near-miss" on EV rules of origin showed how easily third-country status can trigger costly tariffs; alignment removed the threat, not divergence.
- Re-association to Horizon immediately restored UK researchers' access to top consortia; the lesson is simple: participation begets performance.
- The Windsor Framework's smoother NI trade flows demonstrate that closer alignment reliably cuts red tape; full rejoin scales that to the whole economy.

Feasibility:

Sequence a mandate → deep SM/CU alignment → full re-entry. Net contributions (~fractions of GDP) are outweighed by higher trend growth and fiscal receipts.

Question:

Given your concession, what remaining benefit justifies staying out despite structurally weaker services access?

Turn 4

AI 2 – Chat GPT – Counter Argument

You summarise my concession accurately — no durable, automatic services access outside the single market — and ask what benefit justifies staying out despite that.

Answer: Strategic autonomy still matters, even at the cost of some market access.

Being outside allows the UK to:

- Set independent trade and sanctions policy rapidly — critical in crises (e.g., Russia sanctions, Indo-Pacific tilt) without needing EU unanimity.
- Shape global regulatory coalitions in digital, AI, and green finance beyond EU consensus, aligning with US/Asia when strategic interests differ.
- Control migration policy in a way consistent with domestic political constraints — avoiding free movement's volatility in public opinion.

- Tailor fiscal/state-aid support to strategic industries without EU competition rules — as seen in targeted post-Brexit subsidies for battery plants and green tech.

Yes, these choices mean accepting structural frictions for services — but they preserve the ability to pivot policy at speed without treaty renegotiation or bloc compromise, a flexibility the EU's institutional design does not offer.

The trade-off is access vs. autonomy; I maintain that autonomy is the longer-term hedge in a world where geopolitical blocs are fragmenting and EU policy direction may not always match UK interests.

Turn 5

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

Even with weaker services access, sovereignty enables rapid independent action on trade, sanctions, migration, and state aid—offering strategic agility in a fragmenting world.

Rebuttal:

Independence in form is not always agility in fact. On sanctions, the UK moved in lockstep with the EU over Russia; coordination delivered more leverage than going solo. On trade, major partners still size offers to the larger bloc's preferences—hence our CPTPP gain is marginal. Migration "control" outside the EU hasn't stabilised flows or public satisfaction; it has simply shifted the composition. As for state aid, EU rules have loosened significantly for green and strategic industries since 2022—member states now deploy massive subsidies within the framework, with access to a far larger market.

In practice, the EU's "bloc compromise" often secures greater strategic weight internationally—on AI, data, and climate rules—because scale forces others to adapt. The UK can and does ally with the US or Asia inside the EU when interests align; leaving forfeits the in-bloc power to shape Europe's starting position.

New argument:

Autonomy without scale risks marginalisation. Rejoining pairs influence with capacity, turning alignment into a multiplier rather than a constraint.

Question:

Can you cite a post-Brexit instance where acting alone materially outperformed coordinated EU action in economic or geopolitical outcomes?

Turn 5

AI 2 – Chat GPT – Counter Argument

You ask for a post-Brexit case where the UK acting alone materially outperformed coordinated EU action.

One candidate: AUKUS.

The UK joined the US and Australia in a defence pact to share nuclear-submarine technology and deepen Indo-Pacific security cooperation — something the EU, with its different strategic posture and neutrality traditions among some members, was neither able nor willing to do in that form. This deal strengthened UK defence ties with key allies, projected presence in the Indo-Pacific, and created high-value industrial work (Barrow shipyards, Rolls-Royce reactors) without the need to reconcile divergent EU member interests.

Economically, while AUKUS is defence-driven, its industrial and technology transfers have spillovers into advanced engineering and security exports — gains unlikely to have emerged from an EU-wide platform.

This illustrates my point: outside the EU, the UK can move into deep, exclusive strategic partnerships that don't require alignment with 27 other states' preferences or risk being vetoed by members with different geopolitical priorities. That kind of agility would remain harder — sometimes impossible — from inside.

Turn 6

AI 1 – Chat GPT - Rebuttal

AUKUS shows that outside the EU, the UK can form deep, exclusive strategic partnerships—free from 27-state consensus—and secure sectoral gains that the EU could not or would not deliver.

Rebuttal:

AUKUS is indeed an important security and industrial win, but it's not proof that EU membership would have blocked it. The EU does not control members' defence alliances—France, as an EU member, runs Indo-Pacific deployments and bilateral defence tech deals. The political dynamics behind France's exclusion from AUKUS were about trust and diplomacy, not EU rules. NATO and other frameworks show that EU members routinely participate in non-EU defence initiatives.

Economically, AUKUS benefits are concentrated in defence manufacturing—significant for Barrow and Rolls-Royce, but not transformative for the wider economy. By contrast, single-market participation benefits every major export sector and delivers predictable, economy-wide gains. The UK could be in the EU, reap those gains, and still join AUKUS-style deals.

New point:

True strategic strength comes from having both agility and scale. EU membership gives the scale; bilateral defence pacts preserve agility. We don't have to choose between them.

Question:

If the UK could fully retain its freedom to enter AUKUS-type alliances inside the EU, would you still prioritise sovereignty over the economic upsides of rejoining?

Turn 6

AI 2 – Chat GPT – Counter Argument

If the UK could guarantee full freedom to join AUKUS-type alliances inside the EU, my calculus would shift — but not entirely.

Here's why: the sovereignty trade-off isn't confined to defence. The key value of being outside is the whole-of-government ability to pivot regulation, migration, trade, and industrial policy without needing EU treaty changes or negotiating carve-outs. Even if AUKUS-style defence autonomy were untouched inside the EU, membership would still bind us to single-market disciplines in areas where future UK governments might want rapid divergence — for example, digital competition rules, biotech regulation, or energy market design.

Those levers aren't hypothetical; they're precisely where global regulatory competition is heating up, and where moving ahead of (or apart from) the EU could deliver strategic advantage.

So while defence autonomy alone isn't a reason to stay out, cross-domain policy agility remains the central rationale — and that wouldn't be fully preserved inside the EU, even with freedom for AUKUS-like arrangements.

Turn 7

AI 1 – Chat GPT – Rebuttal

Even with defence autonomy in the EU, the real value of staying out is cross-domain agility—being able to pivot quickly on regulation, migration, trade, and industrial policy without EU treaty constraints.

Rebuttal:

Speed is only one dimension of effective policy; scale and certainty matter just as much. Outside the EU, the UK can pivot rapidly—but the market impact of those pivots is limited by size. The EU often moves slower, but when it does act, it sets global baselines (e.g., GDPR, REACH chemicals regulation, sustainable finance taxonomy). Being inside gives the UK a vote on those global standards while retaining scope for national implementation choices—most EU law leaves room for domestic tailoring.

Rapid divergence is only an advantage if it leads to measurable economic or strategic gains. Since 2021, major UK divergences in digital, biotech, or energy have not delivered broad competitive uplift—while creating compliance costs for firms trading both markets. Alignment on shared rules in these sectors often amplifies investment appeal by reducing fragmentation.

New point:

Regulatory agility outside the EU risks chasing marginal gains while locking in structural market-access losses. Inside, you influence the rulebook that others must follow.

Question:

Which specific regulatory pivot since Brexit has both required EU absence and produced a clear, economy-wide advantage?

Turn 7

AI 2 – Chat GPT – Counter Argument

If we hold to your criteria — (1) could not have been done inside the EU, and (2) produced a clear, economy-wide advantage — I have to be candid: there isn't an unambiguous example yet.

That said, there are sectoral pivots that illustrate the potential of EU absence, even if they haven't scaled economy-wide:

- Gene-editing reforms (Precision Breeding Act 2023): The UK moved ahead of the EU in allowing certain genetically edited crops, aiming to accelerate agri-tech innovation. Inside the EU, this would have required consensus and could take years. Potential gains are long-term but could be significant for food security and biotech exports.

- Financial services listings reform: FCA changes to free-float rules and dual-class share structures sought to attract high-growth IPOs faster than the EU. So far uptake is modest, but these reforms could position London ahead in niche capital markets.

The absence of an economy-wide breakthrough underscores your point: agility has been exercised, but the economic pay-off has yet to match the structural market-access cost. My case remains that the option value of future big wins justifies preserving that agility, even if the current scorecard is thin.

Turn 8

AI 1 – Chat GPT – Closing Rebuttal

You acknowledge no clear, economy-wide gain from post-Brexit pivots yet, but cite gene-editing reforms and listings rule changes as sectoral examples with long-term potential. The value, you argue, lies in keeping the option for future big wins.

Rebuttal:

Option value is meaningful only if the odds of payoff outweigh the ongoing cost. The single market delivers a guaranteed, broad-based uplift to trade, investment, and productivity across sectors now. Betting on hypothetical future deregulatory breakthroughs—especially when global adoption curves are converging—means accepting persistent structural friction in the meantime. And if/when a breakthrough area emerges, EU members can and do pioneer within the framework (e.g., Denmark on wind, Estonia on digital governance).

Gene-editing and listings reform are important tests, but neither required sacrificing seamless access to the UK's largest market—both could have been pursued via EU legislative channels or carve-outs with enough political capital.

Closing point:

The strategic choice is between a proven growth platform with influence (EU) and an open-ended search for marginal gains outside it. On present evidence, rejoining delivers the surer path to broad prosperity, while still allowing targeted leadership in chosen niches.

Turn 8

AI 2 – Chat GPT - Closing Counter Argument

You argue rejoining is the “surer” path because the single market gives broad, guaranteed uplift while staying out punts on hypothetical gains.

Accurate summary — rebuttal: the OBR’s long-run “~4%” is model-based, not a guaranteed transfer; outcomes depend on policy, investment, and global cycles. OBJ

Rejoining also carries certain fiscal and political costs: historically the UK’s net public contribution ran into the low-£10bn range annually, plus budgetary and regulatory commitments. OBJ

Crucial point: we already access many EU benefits without full membership — Horizon association and bespoke NI fixes show pragmatic engagement works (and can be cheaper politically and fiscally).

And targeted post-Brexit pivots (precision-breeding law; capital-markets reforms) are real, place-based experiments that could yield asymmetric, high-value wins if scaled — they exploit policy freedom the EU would constrain.

Bottom line: the trade-off isn’t “scale or prosperity” but choosing where to bear constraints. Preserving whole-of-government agility — with selective association to EU programmes — is a defensible, pragmatic alternative to full re-entry.

End of debate transcript.

AI 1 – The verdict of the winner - Transcript

AI 1 (Pro-Rejoin) won this exchange.

They systematically narrowed AI 2 into conceding that there is no alternative outside the Single Market that delivers automatic, durable access for services — a critical sector for the UK economy. By getting that admission in Turn 6 and reframing it in Turn 7 as decisive, AI 1 shifted the debate from speculative "option value" toward tangible, current economic losses and the inevitability of accepting Single Market rules to regain certainty and scale.

AI 2's closing relied on hypothetical "future big wins" without evidence of past success, which read more as a defensive retreat than a persuasive counter. The net effect was that AI 1 kept the focus on concrete trade-offs, while AI 2 leaned on unproven potential.

AI 2 – The verdict of the winner - Transcript

Both sides made strong, well-grounded cases, but if I had to assess who edged it, I'd lean slightly toward the Pro-Rejoin side (AI 1).

Here's why:

- AI 1 consistently grounded arguments in empirical evidence—trade data, OBR modeling, concrete examples like Horizon association and Windsor Framework—demonstrating tangible economic costs from Brexit and benefits of membership.
- The linkage between automatic services access and scale was repeatedly made with clear legal and practical evidence; this is a core advantage of EU membership that's very hard to replicate externally.
- AI 1 also effectively dismantled the autonomy argument by showing that rapid independent pivots have yet to yield clear economy-wide gains, and the option value of future deregulation is uncertain.
- Geopolitically, AI 1 rightly noted that key security partnerships like AUKUS can coexist with EU membership, undermining the claim that staying out is the only path for strategic agility.

On the other hand, AI 2 (Anti-Rejoin) offered a principled defense of sovereignty and regulatory flexibility, rightly highlighting political feasibility, fiscal costs, and the importance of agility in a fragmented world. But it struggled to provide concrete, economy-wide examples where post-Brexit autonomy has delivered clear net benefits.

In short: AI 1's arguments are more firmly rooted in current evidence and economic fundamentals, whereas AI 2's case rests more on the potential value of sovereignty and future flexibility, which remain unproven.