

EU AI Act vs UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper)

Editorial verdict: **asymmetric** — see comparison narrative below.

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY CARVEOUTS IN AI REGULATION

governs

Art. 2(3) explicitly excludes AI systems used exclusively for military, defence, or national-security purposes

Primary source: [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#)

UK · POLICY STATEMENT

UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper)

UK-WHITEPAPER-2023

TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY CARVEOUTS IN AI REGULATION

implicit

Defence + intelligence excluded via sectoral-regulator scope; carveout via omission rather than explicit clause

Primary source: [CP 815 \(2023\)](#)

What this comparison shows

One regime addresses the topic explicitly while the other covers it only implicitly or not at all. This is a likely site of regulatory arbitrage and a candidate for comparative-law follow-up.

Contested question: Whether the carveout should be (a) categorical exclusion of national-security AI, (b) parallel governance track with sui generis rules, or (c) full civilian-track compliance with national-security override. Most instruments choose (a); the field debates whether this leaves a dangerous gap.

Bibliography

- [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
- [CP 815 \(2023\)](#) — UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper).
- [Policy Window — National Security Carveouts in AI Regulation](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).