International Attitudes Toward Global Policies

Adrien Fabre[1,2], Thomas Douenne[3] and Linus Mattauch[4,5,6]

[1]*CNRS*

[2]*CIRED*

[3]*University of Amsterdam*

[4]*Technical University Berlin*

[5]*Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research*

[6]*University of Oxford*

We document majority support for policies entailing global redistribution and climate mitigation. Recent surveys on 40,680 respondents in 20 countries covering 72% of global carbon emissions show strong support for an effective way to jointly combat climate change and poverty: a global carbon price funding a global basic income, called the "Global Climate Scheme" (GCS). Using complementary surveys on 8,000 respondents in the U.S., France, Germany, Spain, and the UK, we test several hypotheses that could reconcile strong stated support with a lack of salience in policy circles. A list experiment shows no evidence of social desirability bias, majorities are willing to sign a real-stake petition, and global redistribution ranks high in the prioritization of policies. Conjoint analyses reveal that a platform is more likely to be preferred if it contains the GCS or a global tax on millionaires. Universalistic attitudes

are confirmed by an incentivized donation. In sum, our findings indicate that global policies are genuinely supported by a majority of the population. Public opinion is therefore not the reason that they do not prominently enter political debates.

Major sustainability objectives could be achieved by global approaches to mitigating climate change and poverty. Disagreements on burden-sharing, differing priorities, and lack of institutional capacity are commonly seen as obstacles to effective global collaboration on these objectives. We examine a key condition for the success of global cooperation, neglected in social science research so far: the support of citizens in affluent countries for globally redistributive policies which can deliver on poverty reduction and climate change mitigation. This article investigates public attitudes towards such global policies.

Recent surveys administered to over 40,000 respondents from 20 high- and middle-income countries reveal substantial support for those policies, especially global climate policies and a global tax on the wealthiest aimed at financing low-income countries (other questions from these surveys are analyzed in a companion paper[1]). In particular, a global 2% tax on individual wealth in excess of $5 million would effectively reduce poverty as it would mechanically increase low-income countries' national income by 50%, if merely 35% of the revenue were allocated for this purpose. Surprisingly, even in wealthy nations that would bear a significant burden, majorities of citizens express support for such globally redistributive measures.

To gain insights into the factors shaping public support for global policies in high-income countries, we conducted complementary surveys among 8,000 respondents from France, Germany,

Spain, the U.S., and the UK. The focus of our approach is a specific policy aimed at addressing both climate change and poverty, referred to as the "Global Climate Scheme" (GCS). It implements a cap on carbon emissions to limit global warming below 2°C. The emission rights are auctioned each year to polluting firms and fund a global basic income, alleviating extreme poverty. By employing a list experiment, a real-stake petition, and conjoint analyses, our study indicates genuine and robust support for the GCS among respondents. For example, the conjoint analyses provide evidence that political parties would not lose vote intention by endorsing the GCS.

These findings underscore a strong demand for globally redistributive climate policies, even in the absence of significant policy proposal. In our discussion we offer potential explanations behind this policy implementation gap.

Literature Few prior attitudinal surveys have examined policies for global redistribution. They find agreement close to 50% in high-income countries for global carbon taxes with international per capita redistribution;[2] and near consensus that "present economic differences between rich and poor countries are too large" (overall, 78% agree and 5% disagree) in each of 29 countries.[3] Furthermore, correcting misperceptions concerning one's position in the world's income distribution does not affect the support for global redistributive policies.[4] Besides, an international study of the support for global democracy finds that, in countries governed by a coalition, voting shares would shift by 8 (Brazil) to 12 p.p. (Germany) from parties that are said to oppose global democracy to parties that supposedly support it.[5] The Supplementary Section A contains a broader literature review including further attitudinal surveys on global policies; prior work on attitudes toward

climate burden sharing, attitudes toward foreign aid; global carbon pricing, global redistribution, basic income, and global democracy.

1 Results

The presentation of results proceeds as follows: after briefly describing the survey data (1), we first document broad international support for global approaches to climate policy that lead to global redistribution (1). Subsequently, we present specific findings from surveys in the U.S. and Europe that document support for the GCS, wealth taxes, and foreign aid in those countries (1-1). We proceed to study the support for the Global Climate Scheme in more detail, by means of a list experiment, petition, conjoint analyses, prioritization task, and by eliciting pros and cons (1). To understand the gap between support for global policies and their appearance in public discussion, we conclude by reporting results on underlying universalistic values (1) and beliefs about the support of others (1).

Data The study relies on two sets of surveys: the *Global* survey and the *Complementary* surveys.

Global Survey The *Global* survey, conducted in 2021, involved 40,680 respondents from 20 countries, representing approximately 72% of global CO_2 emissions. This survey serves as the basis for measuring stated support for various global policies worldwide. Detailed information about the data collection process, sample representativeness, and analysis of questions on national policies can be found in our companion paper.[1]

Complementary Surveys To delve deeper into the sincerity and rationales behind support for the GCS and attitudes towards global policies, global redistribution, and universalistic values, complementary surveys were conducted in 2023. These surveys are based on a sample of 8,000 respondents from France, Germany, Spain, the UK, and the U.S. The European survey (*Eu*) comprises 3,000 respondents, while the U.S. sample was collected in two separate waves: *US1* with 3,000 respondents and *US2* with 2,000 respondents. The survey questions in both the European and U.S. surveys are identical, except for an additional question in *US2* that uses results from *US1* to assess the bandwagon effect.

The complementary surveys ensured representativeness along key dimensions such as gender, income, age, highest diploma, and degree of urbanization. The *Eu* survey is also representative of its four countries in terms of population size, while the *US1* and *US2* surveys are representative in terms of region and ethnicity. Supplementary Section G confirm that our samples closely match population frequencies. More detail on data collection is given in the Methods. The questionnaires used in the surveys are provided in Supplementary Sections C and D.

Stated support for global policies

Global support The global survey shows strong support for climate policies enacted at the global level (Figure 1).When asked "At which level(s) do you think public policies to tackle climate change need to be put in place?", 70% (in the U.S.) to 94% (in Japan) choose the global level. The next most popular choice is the federal or continental level, favored by 52% of Americans and

??less than half of European respondents. Local policies receive the least support. This preference for climate policies implemented at the global scale is in line with the literature[6] and consistent with individuals' concerns for the fairness and effectiveness of such policies, which have been identified as two of the three key determinants of support, besides self-interest.[1,7,8]

Figure 1: Relative support for global climate policies.



Note 1: The numbers represent the share of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*indifferent* answers (in percent, n = 40,680). The color blue denotes a relative majority. See Supplementary Figure A3 for the absolute support. (Questions A-I).

Note 2: *In Denmark, France and the U.S., the questions with an asterisk were asked differently, cf. Question F.

Among the four global climate policies examined in the *Global* survey, three policies garner high support across all countries (Figure 1). These policies include a global democratic assembly on climate change, a global tax on millionaires to ??finance low-income countries contingent on their climate action, and a global carbon budget of +2°C divided among countries based on tradable shares. The three policies garner a majority of absolute support (i.e., "somewhat" or "strong" support) in all countries (except in the U.S. for the global assembly, 48% absolute support). In high-income countries, the global quota policy obtains 64% absolute support and 84% relative support (i.e., excluding "indifferent" answers). Support for this policy is even higher in middle-income countries, however their samples are only representative of the online population (young, graduated and urban people are over-represented).

Following the support for the global quota, respondents are asked about their preferences for dividing the carbon budget among countries, as depicted in the third block of Figure 1. Consistent with the existing literature (see Supplementary Section A.1.2), an equal per capita allocation of emission rights emerges as the preferred burden-sharing principle, garnering absolute majority support in all countries and never below 84% relative support. Taking into account historical responsibilities or vulnerability to climate damages is also popular, albeit with less consensus, while grandfathering (i.e., allocation of emission shares in proportion to current emissions) receives the least support in all countries.

A global quota with equal per capita emission rights produces the same distributional outcomes as a global carbon tax that funds a global basic income. The support for the global carbon tax is also

tested and its redistributive effects – the average increase in expenditures along with the amount of the basic income – are specified to the respondents explicitly (see box below). The support for the carbon tax is lower than for the quota, particularly in high-income countries, and there is no relative majority for the tax in Anglo-Saxon countries. Two possible reasons for this lower support are that distributive effects are made salient in the case of the tax, and that people may find a quota more effective than a tax to reduce emissions. This interpretation is consistent with the level of support for the global quota once we make the distributive effects salient, as we do in the complementary surveys.

Global Climate Scheme The complementary surveys (*US1*, *US2*, *Eu*) consist of a comprehensive exploration of citizens' attitudes towards the GCS. We present to respondents a detailed description of the GCS and explain its distributive effects, including specific amounts at stake (as specified in the box below). Furthermore, we assess respondents' understanding of the GCS with incentivized questions to test their comprehension of the expected financial outcome for typical individuals in high-income countries (loss) and the poorest individuals globally (gain), followed by the provision of correct answers. The same approach is applied to a National Redistribution scheme (NR) targeting the top 5% (in the U.S.) or top 1% (in Europe) with the aim of financing cash transfers to all adults, calibrated to offset the monetary loss of the GCS for the median emitter in their country. We evaluate respondents' understanding that the richest would lose and the typical fellow citizens would gain from that policy. Subsequently, we summarize both schemes to enhance respondents' recall. Additionally, we present a final incentivized comprehension question and

provide the expected answer that the combined GCS and NR would result in no net gain or loss for a typical fellow citizen. Finally, participants are directly asked to express their support for the GCS and NR using a simple *Yes*/*No* question.

The stated support for the GCS is 54% in the U.S. and 76% in Europe, while the support for NR is very similar: 56% and 73% respectively (see Supplementary Figure 3). Supplementary Section F presents the sociodemographic determinants of GCS support, showing, for instance, stronger support among young people.

The Global Climate Scheme The GCS consists of global emissions trading with emission rights being auctioned each year to polluting firms, and of a global basic income, funded by the auction revenues. Using the price and emissions trajectories from the Stern-Stiglitz report,[9] and in particular a carbon price of \$90/tCO_2 in 2030, we estimate that the basic income would amount to \$30 per month for each human above 15 (see details in Supplementary Section E). We describe the GCS to the respondents as a "climate club" and we specify its redistributive effects: The 700 million people with less than \$2/day would be lifted out of extreme poverty, and fossil fuel price increases would cost the typical person in their country a specified amount (see Supplementary Section D for details). The median net cost is \$85 in the U.S., €10 in France, €25 in Germany, €5 in Spain, £20 in the UK.

Global wealth tax Consistent with the results of the global survey, a "tax on millionaires of all countries to finance low-income countries" garners absolute majority support of over 67% in

each country, only 5 p.p. lower than a national millionaires tax overall (Figure 2). In random subsamples, we inquire about respondents' preferences regarding the redistribution of revenues from a global tax on individual wealth exceeding $5 million, after providing information on the revenue raised by such a tax in their country compared to low-income countries. We ask certain respondents (n = 1,283) what percentage of global tax revenues should be pooled to finance low-income countries. In each country, at least 88% of respondents indicate a positive amount, with an average ranging from 30% (Germany) to 36% (U.S., France) (Supplementary Figure 4). To other respondents (n = 1,233), we inquire whether they would prefer each country to retain all the revenues it collects or that half of the revenues be pooled to finance low-income countries. Approximately half of the respondents opt to allocate half of the tax revenues to low-income countries.

Other global policies We also assess support for other global policies (Figure 2). Most policies garner relative majority support in each country, with two exceptions: the "cancellation of low-income countries' public debt" and "a maximum wealth limit." The latter policy obtains relative majority support in Europe but not in the U.S., despite the cap being set at $10 billion in the U.S. compared to €/£100 million in Europe. Notably, climate-related policies enjoy significant popularity, with "high-income countries funding renewable energy in low-income countries" receiving absolute majority support across all surveyed countries. Additionally, relative support for loss and damages compensation, as approved in principle at the international climate negotiations in 2022 ("COP27"), ranges from 55% (U.S.) to 81% (Spain).

Foreign aid We provide respondents with information about the actual amount "spent on foreign aid to reduce poverty in low-income countries" relative to their country's government spending and GDP. Less than 16% of respondents state that their country's foreign aid should be reduced, while 62% express support for increasing it, including 17% who support an unconditional increase (Supplementary Figure 5). Among the 45% who think aid should be increased under certain conditions, we subsequently ask them to specify the conditions they deem necessary (Supplementary Figure 6). The three most commonly selected conditions are: "we can be sure the aid reaches people in need and money is not diverted" (73% chose this condition), "that recipient countries comply with climate targets and human rights" (67%), and "that other high-income countries also increase their foreign aid" (48%). On the other hand, respondents who do not wish to increase their country's foreign aid primarily justify their view by prioritizing the well-being of their fellow citizens or by perceiving each country as responsible for its own fate (Supplementary Figure 7). In response to an open-ended question regarding measures high-income countries should take to fight extreme poverty, a large majority of Americans expressed that more help is needed (Supplementary Figure A37). The most commonly suggested form of aid is financial support, closely followed by investments in education.

We also inquire about the perceived amount of foreign aid. Consistent with prior research (see Supplementary Section A.1.3), most people overestimate the actual amount of foreign aid (Supplementary Figure A18). We then elicit respondents' preferred amount of foreign aid, after randomly presenting them with either the actual amount or no information. Most of the respondents who learn the actual amount choose a bracket at least as high as the actual one, and most of those

without the information choose a bracket at least as high as the perceived one (Supplementary Figures A16–A20). Finally, we ask a last question to the respondents who received the information. To those who prefer an increase of foreign aid, we ask how they would finance it: by far, the preferred source of funding is higher taxes on the wealthiest (Supplementary Figure A21). To those who prefer a reduction, we ask how they would use the funds becoming available: In every country, more people choose higher spending on education or healthcare rather than lower taxes (Supplementary Figure A22).

Robustness and sincerity of support for the GCS We use several methods to assess the sincerity of the support for the GCS: a list experiment, a real-stake petition, conjoint analyses, and the prioritization of policies. All methods suggest that the support is either completely sincere, or the share of insincere answers is limited.

List experiment We use a list experiment to identify the tacit support for the GCS. To do so, we ask *how many* policies within a list respondents support and vary the list among respondents. The tacit support is estimated as the difference in the average number of policies supported between two random subsamples, whose list differ only by the inclusion of the GCS.[10] List experiments have been used to reveal social desirability bias, which silences racism in the Southern U.S.[11] or opposition to the invasion of Ukraine in Russia.[12] In our case, as shown in Table 1, the tacit support for the GCS measured through the list experiment is not significantly lower than the direct stated support. Hence, we do not find a social desirability bias in our study.

Petition We ask respondents whether they are willing to sign a petition in support of either the GCS or NR policy. We inform them that the petition results will be sent to the head of state's office, highlighting the proportion of fellow citizens endorsing the respective scheme. Even when framed as a real-stake petition, both policies continue to receive majority support. In the U.S., we find no significant difference between the support in the real-stake petitions and the simple questions (GCS: $p = .30$; NR: $p = .76$). In Europe, the petition leads to a comparable lower support for both the GCS (7 p.p., $p = 10^{-5}$) and NR (4 p.p., $p = .008$). While some European respondents are unwilling to sign a petition for policies they are expected to support, this effect is not specific to the GCS, and the overall willingness to sign a real-stake petition remains strong, with 69% expressing support for the GCS and 67% for NR.

Conjoint analyses In order to assess the public support for the GCS in conjunction with other policies, we conduct a series of conjoint analyses. We ask respondents to make five choices between pairs of political platforms.

The first conjoint analysis suggests that the GCS is supported independently of being complemented by the National Redistribution Scheme and a national climate policy ("Coal exit" in the U.S., "Thermal insulation plan" in Europe, denoted C). For the second analysis, we split the sample into four random branches. The outcome is that there is majority support for the GCS and for C, which are seen as neither complement nor substitute. A minor share of respondents like a national climate policy and dislike a global one, but as many people prefer a global rather than a national policy; and there is no evidence that implementing NR would increase the support for the GCS.

In the third analysis, we present to two random branches of the sample hypothetical progressive and conservative platforms that differ only by the presence (or not) of the GCS in the progressive platform. Table 2 shows that a progressive candidate would not significantly lose voting share by endorsing the GCS in any country, and may even gain 11 p.p. ($p = .005$) in voting intention in France. The effect is also positive at 3 p.p. ($p = .13$) in the U.S., although not significant at the 5% threshold. Though the level of support for the GCS is significantly lower in swing States (at 51%) that are key to win U.S. elections, the electoral effect of endorsing the GCS remains non-significantly different from zero (at +1.2 p.p.) in these States.

Our last two analyses make respondents choose between two random platforms. In Europe, respondents are prompted to imagine that a left- or center-left coalition will win the next election and are asked what platform they would prefer that coalition to have campaigned on. In the U.S., the question is framed as a hypothetical duel in a Democratic primary, and asked only to non-Republicans (n = 2,218), i.e. the respondents who choose *Democrat*, *Independent*, *Non-Affiliated* or *Other* for their political affiliation. In the fourth analysis, a policy (or an absence of policy) is randomly drawn for each platform in each of five categories: *economic issues*, *societal issues*, *climate policy*, *tax system*, *foreign policy* (Supplementary Figure 8).

Except for the category *foreign policy*, which features the GCS 42% of the time, the policies are prominent progressive policies and they are drawn uniformly. In the UK, Germany, and France, a platform is about 9 to 13 p.p. more likely to be preferred if it includes the GCS rather than no foreign policy. This effect is between 1 and 4 p.p. and no longer significant in the U.S. and in Spain.

Moreover, a platform that includes a global tax on millionaires rather than no foreign policy is 5 to 13 percentage points (p.p.) more likely to be preferred in all countries (the effect is significant and at least 9 p.p. in all countries but Spain). Similarly, a global democratic assembly on climate change has a significant effect of 8 to 12 p.p. in the U.S., Germany, and France. These effects are large, and not far from the effects of the policies most influential on the platforms, which range between 15 and 18 p.p. in most countries (and 27 p.p. in Spain), and all relate to improved public services (in particular healthcare, housing, and education).

The fifth analysis draws random platforms similarly, except that candidate A's platform always contains the GCS while B's includes no foreign policy. In this case, A is chosen by 60% in Europe and 58% in the U.S. (Supplementary Figure 9). In the U.S. for example, our conjoint analyses indicate that a candidate at the Democratic primary would have more chances to obtain the nomination by endorsing the GCS, and this endorsement would not penalize her or him at the presidential election. This result reminds the finding that 12% of Germans shift their voting intention from SPD and CDU/CSU to the Greens and the Left when they are told that the latter parties support global democracy.[13]

Prioritization Towards the end of the survey, we ask respondents to allocate 100 points among six randomly selected policies from the previous conjoint analyses, using sliders. The instruction was to distribute the points based on their level of support, with a higher allocation indicating greater support for a policy. As a result, the average support across policies is 16.67 points. In each country, the GCS ranks in the middle of all policies or above, with an average number of

points from 15.4 in the U.S. to 22.9 in Germany.

Interestingly, in Germany, the most prioritized policy is the global tax on millionaires, while the GCS came in as the second most prioritized policy. The global tax on millionaires consistently ranks no lower than fifth position (out of 15 or 17 policies) in every country, garnering an average of 18.3 points in Spain to 22.9 points in Germany.

This question sheds light on a potential discrepancy between the policy priorities of the public and those enacted by legislators. For instance, while the European Union and California have enacted plans to phase out new combustion-engine cars by 2035, the proposal to "ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2030" emerged as one of the three least prioritized policies in each country, with an average allocation of 7.8 points in France to 11.4 points in the UK.

Pros and Cons We survey respondents to gather their perspectives on the pros and cons of the GCS, utilizing either an open-ended or a closed question. In the closed question format, respondents tend to consider every argument as important in determining their support or opposition to the GCS (see Supplementary Figure A8). Notably, the least important aspect was the negative impact on their household, with 60% in Europe (n=1,505) and 75% in the U.S. (n=493) finding it important. The most important elements differ between Europe and the U.S. In Europe, the key factors are the GCS's potential to limit climate change and reduce poverty in low-income countries, both deemed important by 85% of respondents. In the U.S., having sufficient information about the scheme ranks highest at 89%, followed by its potential to foster global cooperation at 82%.

However, due to the limited variation in the ratings for each element, the closed question format is inconclusive.

The open-ended question provides more insights into what people associate with the GCS when prompted to think about it. Analyzing keywords in the responses (automatically translated into English), the most frequently mentioned topics are the international aspect and the environment, each appearing in approximately one-quarter of the answers (see Supplementary Figure A10). This is followed by discussions on the effects of the GCS on poverty and prices, each mentioned by about one-tenth of the respondents. We also manually classified each answer into different categories (see Supplementary Figure A9). This exercise confirms the findings from the automatic search: the environmental benefit of the GCS is the most commonly discussed topic, while obstacles to implementation or agreement on the proposal are relatively infrequently mentioned.

In the *US2* survey, we divided the sample into four random branches. Two branches were presented the pros and cons questions (either in open or closed format) *before* being asked about their support for the GCS or NR. Another branch received information on the actual level of support for the GCS and NR (estimated in *US1*, see Section 1), and one control group received none of these treatments. The objective of this "pros and cons treatment" was to simulate a "campaign effect", which refers to the shift in opinion resulting from media coverage of the proposal. To conservatively estimate the effect of a (potentially negative) campaign, we intentionally included more cons (6) than pros (3). Interestingly, the support for the GCS decreased by 11 p.p. after participants viewed a list of its pros and cons. Notably, the support also decreased by 7 p.p. after

participants were asked to consider the pros and cons in an open-ended question. Although support remains significant, these results suggest that the public success of the GCS would be sensitive to the content of the debate about it, and subject to the discourse adopted by interest groups.

Universalistic values To better understand people's support for specific policies, we also ask broad questions to study their values. When we ask participants which group they defend when they vote, 20% choose "sentient beings (humans and animals)," 22% choose "humans," 33% select their fellow citizens (or "Europeans"), 15% choose "My family and myself," and the remaining 10% choose another group (mainly "My State or region" or "People sharing my culture or religion"). The first two categories, representing close to one out of two people, can be described as universalist in their vote. Notably, a majority of left-wing voters can even be considered universalist voters (see Supplementary Figure A38 for main attitudes by vote).

When asked what their country's diplomats should defend in international climate negotiations, only 11% prefer their country's "interests, even if it goes against global justice." In contrast, 30% prefer global justice (with or without consideration of national interests), and the bulk of respondents (38%) prefer their country's "interests, to the extent it respects global justice."

Furthermore, when we ask participants to assess the extent to which climate change, global poverty, and inequality in their country are issues, climate change is generally viewed as the most significant problem (with a mean score of 0.59 after recoding answers between -2 and 2). This is followed by global poverty (0.42) and national inequality (0.37).

Finally, we conduct a lottery experiment to elicit universalistic values. Respondents were automatically enrolled in a lottery with a $100 prize and had to choose the proportion of the prize they would keep for themselves versus give to a person living in poverty. The charity donation is directed either to an African individual or a fellow citizen, depending on the respondent's random assignment. In Europe, we observe no significant variation in the willingness to donate based on the recipient's origin, while in the U.S., the donations to Africans are 3 p.p. lower (with an average donation of 34%). Moreover, the slightly lower donations to Africans are entirely driven by Trump voters and non-voters (Supplementary Table A2).

Second-order Beliefs To explain the strong support for the GCS despite its absence from political platforms and public debate, we hypothesized pluralistic ignorance, i.e. that the public and policymakers mistakenly perceive the GCS as unpopular. As a result, individuals might conceal their support for such globally redistributive policies, believing that advocating for them would be futile. However, the evidence for pluralistic ignorance is limited based on an incentivized question about perceived support (Supplementary Figure10).

In the case of Americans, their beliefs about the level of support for the GCS are relatively accurate. The mean perceived support is 52% (with quartiles of 36%, 52%, and 68%), which closely aligns with the actual support of 53%. Europeans, on the other hand, underestimate the support by 17 p.p. Nonetheless, 65% of them correctly estimate that the GCS garners majority support, and the mean perceived support is 59% (and quartiles of 43%, 61%, and 74%), compared to the actual support of 76%. Second-order beliefs are equally accurate for NR in the U.S. and

similarly underestimated in Europe. Finally, consistent with Americans accurately perceiving the levels of support for the GCS or NR, providing information on the actual level had no significant effect on their support in the *US2* survey.

2 Discussion

Our point of departure are recent surveys conducted in 20 of the largest countries, as they reveal robust majority support for global redistributive and climate policies, even in high-income countries that would financially lose from them. The results from complementary surveys conducted in the U.S. and four European countries reinforce these findings. We find strong support for global taxes on the wealthiest individuals, as well as majority support for our main policy of interest – the Global Climate Scheme (GCS). The GCS encompasses carbon pricing at a global level through an emissions trading system, accompanied by a global basic income funded by the scheme's revenues. Additional experiments, such as a list experiment and a real-stake petition, demonstrate that the support for the GCS is real. Such genuine support is further substantiated by the prioritization of the GCS over prominent national climate policies and aligned with a significant portion of the population holding universalistic values rather than nationalistic or egoistic ones. Moreover, the conjoint analyses indicate that a progressive candidate would not lose voting shares by endorsing the GCS, and may even gain 11 p.p. in voting shares in France. Similarly, a candidate endorsing the GCS would gain votes in a U.S. Democratic primary, while in Europe, a progressive platform that includes the GCS would be preferred over one that does not.

Having ruled out insincerity and underestimation of fellow citizens' support as potential explanations for the scarcity of global policies in the public debate, we propose alternative explanations. The first two are variations of pluralistic ignorance, and the last three represent complementary explanations.

First, there may be pluralistic ignorance *among policymakers* regarding universalistic values, support for the GCS, or the electoral advantage of endorsing it. Second, people or policymakers may believe that globally redistributive policies are politically infeasible in some key (potentially foreign) countries like the U.S. Third, political discourse centrally happens at the national level, shaped by national media and institutions such as voting. National framing by political voices may create biases and suppress universalistic values. Fourth, many individuals, including policymakers, may perceive global redistributive policies as ill-defined or technically infeasible, ultimately dismissing them as unrealistic. In particular, policymakers may have insider information about the feasibility of such policies. Alternatively, the perception of unrealism may stem from an unawareness of specific proposals. . The latter hypothesis is supported by ignorance of the GCS expressed in the feedback fields, where a common response is a variation of "thank you for this interesting, thought-provoking survey." Sixth, just as policy is disproportionately influenced by the economic elites,[14,15] public debate may be shaped by the wealthiest, who have vested interests in preventing global redistribution.

Confirmation of any of these hypotheses would lead to a common conclusion: there exists substantial support for global policies addressing climate change and global inequality, even in

high-income countries, and the perceived boundaries of political realism on this issue may soon shift. Uncovering evidence to support these hypotheses could draw attention to global policies in the public debate and contribute to their increased prominence.

Methods

Data collection. The paper utilizes two sets of surveys: the *Global* survey and the *Complementary* surveys. The *Complementary* surveys consist of two U.S. surveys, *US1* and *US2*, and one European survey, *Eu*. The *Global* survey was conducted from March 2021 to March 2022 on 40,680 respondents from 20 countries (with 1,465 to 2,488 respondents per country). *US1* collected responses from 3,000 participants between January and March 2023, while *US2* gathered data from 2,000 respondents between March and April 2023. *Eu* included 3,000 participants and was conducted from February to March 2023. We used the survey companies *Dynata* and *Respondi*. To ensure representative samples, we employed stratified quotas based on gender, age (5 brackets), income (4), region (4), education level (3), and ethnicity (3) for the U.S. We also incorporated survey weights throughout the analysis to account for any remaining imbalances. These weights were constructed using the quota variables as well as the degree of urbanity, and trimmed between 0.25 and 4. By applying weights, the results are fully representative of the respective countries. Results at the European level apply different weights which ensure representativeness of the combined four European countries. Supplementary Section G confirms that our samples are representative of the population.

Data quality. The median duration is 28 minutes for the *Global* survey, 14 min for *US1*, 11 min for *US2*, and 20 min for *Eu*. To ensure the best possible data quality, we exclude respondents who

fail an attention test or rush through the survey (i.e., answer in less than 11.5 minutes in the *Global* survey, 4 minutes in *US1* or *US2*, 6 minutes in *Eu*).

Questionnaires and raw results. The questionnaire and raw results of the *Global* survey can be found in the Appendix of the companion paper.[1] The raw results are reported in Supplementary Section B while the surveys' structures and questionnaires are given in Supplementary Sections C and D. The questionnaires are the same as the ones given *ex ante* in the registration plan (osf.io/fy6gd).

Incentives. To encourage accurate and truthful responses, several questions of the *US1* survey use incentives. For each of the three comprehension questions that follow the policy descriptions, we randomly select and reward three respondents who provide correct answers with a $50 gift certificate. Similarly, for questions involving estimating support shares for the GCS and NR, three participants with the closest guesses to the actual values receive a $50 gift certificate. In the donation lottery question, we randomly select one respondent and split the $100 prize between the NGO GiveDirectly and the winner according to the winner's choice. In total, our incentives scheme distributes gift certificates (and donations) for a value of $850. Finally, respondents have an incentive to answer truthfully to the petition question, as they are aware that the results for that question (the share of respondents supporting the policy) will be transmitted to the U.S. President's office.

Data and code availability All data and code of the *Complementary* surveys as well as figures of the paper are available on github.com/bixiou/global_tax_attitudes. Data and code for the *Global*

survey will be made public upon publication.

1. Dechezleprêtre, A. *et al.* Fighting climate change: International attitudes toward climate policies. *NBER Working Paper* **1714** (2022). 2, 4, 6, 23

2. Carattini, S., Kallbekken, S. & Orlov, A. How to win public support for a global carbon tax. *Nature* **565**, 289 (2019). 3

3. ISSP. International Social Survey Programme ISSP 2019 - Social Inequality V (2019). 3

4. Fehr, D., Mollerstrom, J. & Perez-Truglia, R. Your Place in the World: Relative Income and Global Inequality. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* **14**, 232–268 (2022). 3

5. Ghassim, F., Koenig-Archibugi, M. & Cabrera, L. Public Opinion on Institutional Designs for the United Nations: An International Survey Experiment. *International Studies Quarterly* **66**, sqac027 (2022). 3

6. Beiser-McGrath, L. F. & Bernauer, T. Could revenue recycling make effective carbon taxation politically feasible? *Science Advances* **5**, eaax3323 (2019). 6

7. Klenert, D. *et al.* Making carbon pricing work for citizens. *Nature Climate Change* **8**, 669 (2018). 6

8. Douenne, T. & Fabre, A. Yellow Vests, Pessimistic Beliefs, and Carbon Tax Aversion. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* (2022). 6

9. Stern, N. & Stiglitz, J. E. Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices. Tech. Rep., Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition (2017). 9

10. Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J. & Yamamoto, T. Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments. *Political Analysis* **22**, 1–30 (2014). 12

11. Kuklinski, J. H., Cobb, M. D. & Gilens, M. Racial Attitudes and the "New South". *The Journal of Politics* **59**, 323–349 (1997). 12

12. Chapkovski, P. & Schaub, M. Solid support or secret dissent? A list experiment on preference falsification during the Russian war against Ukraine. *Research & Politics* **9**, 20531680221108328 (2022). 12

13. Ghassim, F. *Who on Earth Wants Global Democracy – and Why (Not)? A Theoretical and Experimental Study of International Public Opinion*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford (2020). 15

14. Gilens, M. & Page, B. I. Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. *Perspectives on Politics* **12**, 564–581 (2014). 21

15. Persson, M. & Sundell, A. The Rich Have a Slight Edge: Evidence from Comparative Data on Income-Based Inequality in Policy Congruence. *British Journal of Political Science* 1–12 (2023). 21

Acknowledgements We are grateful for financial support from the University of Amsterdam and TU

Berlin. Mattauch also thanks the Robert Bosch Foundation. We are grateful for financial support from the OECD, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the French Conseil d'Analyse Economique and the Spanish Ministry for the Ecological Transition and Demographic Challenge. We also acknowledge support from the Grantham Foundation for the Protection of the Environment and the Economic and Social Research Council through the Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy. We thank Antoine Dechezleprêtre, Tobias Kruse, Bluebery Planterose, Ana Sanchez Chico, and Stefanie Stantcheva for their invaluable inputs for the project. We thank Antonio Bento, Dietmar Fehr, and Auriane Meilland for feedback. We further thank Jakob Niemann, Laura Schepp, Martín Fernández-Sánchez, Samuel Gervais, Samuel Haddad, and Guadalupe Manzo for assistance.

Registration The project was preregistered in the Open Science Foundation registry (osf.io/fy6gd).

Competing Interests Fabre declares that he also serves as president of Global Redistribution Advocates.

JEL codes P48, Q58, H23, Q54.

Keywords Climate change, global policies, cap-and-trade, perceptions, survey, inequality, wealth tax.

Correspondence Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Adrien Fabre (email: adrien.fabre@cnrs.fr).

Figure 2: Relative support for various global policies (percentage of *somewhat* or *strong support*, after excluding *indifferent* answers). (Questions 44 and 45; See Figure A24 for the absolute support.)



Table 1: Number of supported policies in the list experiment depending on the presence of the Global Climate Scheme (GCS) in the list.

	Number of supported policies		
	All	US	Europe
List contains: GCS	0.624***	0.524***	0.724***
	(0.028)	(0.041)	(0.036)
Support for GCS	0.65	0.542	0.757
Social desirability bias	-0.026	-0.018	-0.033
80% C.I. for the bias	$[-0.06; 0.01]$	$[-0.07; 0.01]$	$[-0.08; 0.01]$
Constant	1.317	1.147	1.486
Observations	6,000	3,000	3,000
R^2	0.089	0.065	0.125

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 2: Preference for a progressive platform depending on whether it includes the GCS or not.

(Question **??**) Which of these candidates would you vote for? *A; B; None of them*

	Prefers the Progressive platform					
	All	United States	France	Germany	UK	Spain
GCS in Progressive platform	0.028^{*}	0.029	0.112^{***}	0.015	0.008	-0.015
	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.041)	(0.033)	(0.040)	(0.038)
Constant	0.623	0.604	0.55	0.7	0.551	0.775
Observations	5,202	2,619	605	813	661	504
R^2	0.001	0.001	0.013	0.0003	0.0001	0.0003

Note: The 14% of *None of them* answers have been excluded from the regression samples. GCS has no significant influence on them. $^{*}p < 0.1$; $^{**}p < 0.05$; $^{***}p < 0.01$.