

Global Redistribution: Support and Proposals

Adrien Fabre (CNRS, CIRED)

November 2023

Support

International surveys with a focus on the West

Global survey (02/2021–02/2022) by **Dechezleprêtre et al. (2022)**


20 countries; 2,000 respondents per country; median duration: 28 min.

Complementary surveys (01–04/2023) by **Fabre, Douenne & Mattauch (2023)** – bit.ly/Fabre2023

Eu: 3,000 respondents from France, Germany, Spain, UK; 20 min.

US1: 3,000 respondents from the U.S.; 14 min.

US2: 2,000 respondents from the U.S.; 11 min.




Support for the Global Climate Scheme

Stated support

Global survey: Global policies are strongly supported.

Share of support (somewhat or strongly) for the main global policies among non-*indifferent*. ▶ Absolute ▶ National




Level at which climate policies are needed (Multiple choice question)

- Global
- Federal/Continental
- State/National
- Local




Global climate policies (5-Likert scale)

- Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares
- Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries
- Global democratic assembly on climate change
- Global tax on GHG financing a global basic income



Burden sharing preferences for the global carbon budget (5-Likert)

- Emission share should be in proportion to population*
- Countries that have emitted more since 1990 should receive a lower share*
- Countries that will be hurt more by CC should receive a higher share*
- Emission share should be in proportion to current emissions



The Global Climate Scheme (GCS)

Our main policy of interest is the GCS, a **global emissions trading system funding a global basic income**:

At the Paris agreement in 2015, all countries have agreed to contain global warming “well below +2 °C”. To limit global warming to this level, **there is a maximum amount of greenhouse gases we can emit globally**.

To meet the climate target, a limited number of permits to emit greenhouse gases can be created globally. Polluting firms would be required to buy permits to cover their emissions. Such a policy would **make fossil fuel companies pay** for their emissions and progressively raise the price of fossil fuels. **Higher prices would encourage people and companies to use less fossil fuels, reducing greenhouse gas emissions.**


In accordance with the principle that each human has an equal right to pollute, the revenues generated by the sale of permits could finance a global basic income. **Each adult in the world would receive \$30/month**, thereby lifting out of extreme poverty the 700 million people who earn less than \$2/day.

The typical [American] would lose out financially [\$85] per month (as he or she would face [\$115] per month in price increases, which is higher than the \$30 they would receive).

The policy could be put in place as soon as countries totaling more than 60% of global emissions agree on it. Countries that would refuse to take part in the policy could face sanctions (like tariffs) from the rest of the World and would be excluded from the basic income.

The Global Climate Scheme

Do you support the Global climate scheme? Yes/No (Percentage of Yes)



Support for other global policies

Support for other global policies

► Foreign aid

Do you support or oppose...? 5-Likert scale (Percentage of Support among non-Indifferent)

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Payments from high-income countries to compensate low-income countries for climate damages	55	71	72	70	79	70
High-income countries funding renewable energy in low-income countries	68	82	82	82	85	81
High-income countries contributing \$100 billion per year to help low-income countries adapt to climate change	60	76	77	79	79	71
Cancellation of low-income countries' public debt	46	53	53	43	62	61
Democratise international institutions (UN, IMF) by making a country's voting right proportional to its population	58	71	69	69	78	72
Removing tariffs on imports from low-income countries	62	73	58	73	80	83
A minimum wage in all countries at 50% of local median wage	63	80	80	78	81	83
Fight tax evasion by creating a global financial register to record ownership of all assets	62	87	90	86	91	87
A maximum wealth limit of \$10 billion (US) / €100 million (Eu) for each human	46	62	58	62	65	67
National tax on millionaires funding public services	73	85	81	87	89	88
Global tax on millionaires funding low-income countries	69	84	84	84	87	83

Support for a global wealth tax

► Foreign aid


We describe a global tax on wealth in excess of \$/€/£ 5 million and either ask:

Support for a global wealth tax

► Foreign aid

We describe a global tax on wealth in excess of \$/€/£ 5 million and either ask:

Percent of wealth tax that should go to low-income countries (*mean*):




Support for a global wealth tax

► Foreign aid

We describe a global tax on wealth in excess of \$/€/£ 5 million and either ask:

Percent of wealth tax that should go to low-income countries (*mean*):



Preferred share of global tax for low-income countries (in %)

Whether half of the tax revenues should go to low-income countries (vs. none).



Sharing half of global tax with low-income countries

Sincerity of the support for the GCS

Petition

Would you be willing to sign a petition for the [GCS / NR]?

As soon as the survey is complete, we will send the results to the [head of state] (...) Yes/No

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Petition for the GCS	51	69	69	66	78	69
(Comparable) support for the GCS	53	76	81	74	81	74
Petition for NR	57	67	65	66	74	68
(Comparable) support for NR	58	72	76	65	78	75

Willingness to sign a real-stake petition is generally (1 to 7 p.p.) lower than stated support.

But this is not specific to GCS, and majorities are still willing to sign the petition.

List experiment

We ask *Among the policies below, how many do you support?*, randomly varying the list of policies.

The difference in mean number of supported policies for lists with and without the GCS should equal the support for GCS. If the tacit support is lower, it may indicate a social desirability bias.

List experiment

We ask *Among the policies below, how many do you support?*, randomly varying the list of policies.

The difference in mean number of supported policies for lists with and without the GCS should equal the support for GCS. If the tacit support is lower, it may indicate a social desirability bias.

	Number of supported policies		
	All	U.S.	Europe
List contains: GCS	0.624*** (0.028)	0.524*** (0.041)	0.724*** (0.036)
<i>Support for GCS</i>	0.65	0.542	0.757
<i>Social desirability bias</i>	-0.025	-0.019	-0.033
<i>80% C.I. for the bias</i>	[-0.06; 0.01]	[-0.07; 0.04]	[-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

⇒ No (significant) social desirability bias.

Conjoint analyses: influence on electoral prospects

Choice between a conservative platform and a progressive platform with/without the GCS.

Imagine if the two favorite candidates in your constituency in the next general election campaigned with the following policies in their party's platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B
Windfall tax on oil companies	Cut the burden of tax on business
Ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2030	£100 billion for infrastructures like road and rail
£150 billion to upgrade schools, hospitals, care homes and council houses	Tougher sentencing for the worst offenders and 10,000 more prison places
National redistribution scheme	Strict enforcement of immigration and border legislation
Global climate scheme	

Candidate A

Candidate B

None of them

Imagine if the two favorite candidates in your constituency in the next general election campaigned with the following policies in their party's platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B
Windfall tax on oil companies	Cut the burden of tax on business
Ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2030	£100 billion for infrastructures like road and rail
£150 billion to upgrade schools, hospitals, care homes and council houses	Tougher sentencing for the worst offenders and 10,000 more prison places
National redistribution scheme	Strict enforcement of immigration and border legislation

Candidate A

Candidate B

None of them

Conjoint analyses: influence on electoral prospects

Table 1: Imagine if the [Democratic and Republican presidential candidates in 2024] campaigned with the following policies in their platforms. [Credible Progressive and Conservative platforms]
Which of these candidates would you vote for? *A; B; None of them*
[FR: second round of presidential; DE, ES, UK: two favorite candidates in one's constituency]

	Prefers the Progressive platform					
	All	United States	France	Germany	UK	Spain
GCS in Progressive platform	0.028* (0.014)	0.029 (0.022)	0.112*** (0.041)	0.015 (0.033)	0.008 (0.040)	-0.015 (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* answers have been excluded from the regression samples. GCS has no significant influence on them.

A progressive candidate would not lose votes by endorsing the GCS, and could even gain 11 p.p.*** in France.


Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform

We ask the preference between two progressive platforms, where each measure is taken at random. The GCS is included in one of the platforms.

Imagine that a [Left or Center-left coalition wins the next elections]. Here are two possible platforms on which [the coalition] may campaign (the policies in each platform are randomly drawn from a pool of credible [Left/Center-left] policies).

Even if you do not support the Left, which of these platforms do you prefer?

[FR: Left or center-left; DE: rot-rot-grüne; ES: PSOE; UK: Labour; US: Democratic primary (*not asked to Republican*)]



Random programs: A+GCS preferred to B

58 60 61 59 65 58

⇒ Majorities prefer platforms that include the GCS.

Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform (UK)

► EU ► FR ► U.S.

Imagine that the Labour wins the next elections. Here are two possible platforms on which it may campaign (the policies in each platform are randomly drawn from a pool of credible Labour policies).

(...) which of these platforms do you prefer?

Climate policy:

- Ban of most polluting vehicles in city centers (low-emission zones)
- Thermal insulation plan
- Ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2030

Economic issues:

- £150 billion to upgrade schools, hospitals, care homes and council houses
- Real Living Wage of £11 per hour for all workers aged 16 and over
- Reduce the average full-time weekly working hours to 32
- Re-establish neighbourhood policing and recruit 2,000 more frontline officers

Foreign policy:


- Global climate scheme
- Global tax on millionaires
- Global democratic assembly on climate change
- Doubling foreign aid

Societal issues:

- Strict enforcement of immigration and border legislation
- Legalization of cannabis

Tax system:

- National redistribution scheme
- Wealth tax



Proposals

The Global Climate Plan

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

Gollier & Tirole (2015) synthesize the distributional decision with a *generosity* parameter, from grandfathering to equal per capita.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

Gollier & Tirole (2015) synthesize the distributional decision with a *generosity* parameter, from grandfathering to equal per capita.

Cramton et al. (2015) propose that *average* countries fix the generosity, and to set the tax rate at the minimum price proposed by participating countries.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

Gollier & Tirole (2015) synthesize the distributional decision with a *generosity* parameter, from grandfathering to equal per capita.

Cramton et al. (2015) propose that *average* countries fix the generosity, and to set the tax rate at the minimum price proposed by participating countries.

van den Bergh et al. (2020) propose an expanding climate club and a reorientation of COP negotiations.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

Gollier & Tirole (2015) synthesize the distributional decision with a *generosity* parameter, from grandfathering to equal per capita.

Cramton et al. (2015) propose that *average* countries fix the generosity, and to set the tax rate at the minimum price proposed by participating countries.

van den Bergh et al. (2020) propose an expanding climate club and a reorientation of COP negotiations.

The IMF (2019) propose either differentiated prices among countries or international transfers.

An old idea

Grubb (1990), Agarwal & Narain (1991) and Bertram (1992) were the first advocates of an equal right to emit for each human.

Grubb (1990): “*by far the best combination of long term effectiveness, feasibility, equity, and simplicity, is obtained from a system based upon tradable permits for carbon emission which are allocated on an adult per capita basis*”.

A support renewed ever since: Baer et al. (2000), Jamieson (2001), Rajan (2021).

In Cramton et al. (2015), all agree for a climate club with international transfers.

Gollier & Tirole (2015) synthesize the distributional decision with a *generosity* parameter, from grandfathering to equal per capita.

Cramton et al. (2015) propose that *average* countries fix the generosity, and to set the tax rate at the minimum price proposed by participating countries.


van den Bergh et al. (2020) propose an expanding climate club and a reorientation of COP negotiations.

The IMF (2019) propose either differentiated prices among countries or international transfers.

Carattini et al. (2019) find support of $\approx 80\%$ in India and $\approx 50\%$ in the U.S., UK, Australia for a global tax and dividend.


The trajectories

Global trajectories estimated for the Global Climate Plan (GCP)




The trajectories

Global trajectories estimated for the Global Climate Plan (GCP)



The trajectories

Global trajectories estimated for the Global Climate Plan (GCP)



The principles

- ① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

The principles

- ① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

At their peak, GCP revenues at 2% of world GDP, with 0.6% of world GDP in international transfers.

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

At their peak, GCP revenues at 2% of world GDP, with 0.6% of world GDP in international transfers.

The basic income of $\approx \$50$ per month (in nominal) for each human above 15 would lift out of extreme poverty the 700 million people with less than \$2.15 a day (in PPP).

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

At their peak, GCP revenues at 2% of world GDP, with 0.6% of world GDP in international transfers.

The basic income of $\approx \$50$ per month (in nominal) for each human above 15 would lift out of extreme poverty the 700 million people with less than \$2.15 a day (in PPP).

③ A climate club to foster global cooperation.

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

At their peak, GCP revenues at 2% of world GDP, with 0.6% of world GDP in international transfers.

The basic income of $\approx \$50$ per month (in nominal) for each human above 15 would lift out of extreme poverty the 700 million people with less than \$2.15 a day (in PPP).

③ A climate club to foster global cooperation.

Entry into force when signatories cover 60% of global emissions.

The principles

① A cap on emissions to meet the Paris target.

⇒ Define a carbon budget and an emissions trajectory.

ETSs already cover 17% of global GHG emissions (EU, China, South Korea...), are considered in various countries (India, Brazil, Nigeria).

② A global basic income that eradicates extreme poverty.

At their peak, GCP revenues at 2% of world GDP, with 0.6% of world GDP in international transfers.

The basic income of $\approx \$50$ per month (in nominal) for each human above 15 would lift out of extreme poverty the 700 million people with less than \$2.15 a day (in PPP).


③ A climate club to foster global cooperation.

Entry into force when signatories cover 60% of global emissions.

A carbon border adjustment.

The unadjusted distributive effects

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Scheme in 2030.



Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate *Plan*.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate Plan.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate *Plan*.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

They can opt out from the carbon border adjustment.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate Plan.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

They can opt out from the carbon border adjustment.

They can use their revenues as they please.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate *Plan*.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

They can opt out from the carbon border adjustment.

They can use their revenues as they please.

⇒ The states of California, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts... could join.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate *Plan*.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

They can opt out from the carbon border adjustment.

They can use their revenues as they please.

⇒ The states of California, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts... could join.

A provision to avoid anti-redistributive effects.

Participation mechanisms

An *opt out* provision to account for the ability to pay.

Middle-income countries with higher-than-average carbon footprint can opt out from the mutualization of revenues.

Opting out countries retain the auction revenues they collect.

Full opt out authorized up to 1.5 times world average GDP p.c.

Opt out right is phased out between 1.5 and 2 times world average GDP p.c.

⇒ China, Iran, South Africa... would not lose from the Global Climate Plan.

Provisions to accommodate subnational entities into the club.

They can opt out from the carbon border adjustment.

They can use their revenues as they please.


⇒ The states of California, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts... could join.

A provision to avoid anti-redistributive effects.

High-income countries with a lower-than-average carbon footprint would not receive any revenues.


The distributive effects

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2030. [► More maps](#)



The distributive effects

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan throughout the century. [► More maps](#)



Scenarios with non-universal participation


Table 2: Main features of the different scenarios.

Scenario	Emissions covered	Population covered	Basic income in 2040 (\$/month)	EU loss in 2040 (share of its GDP)
All countries	100%	100%	47	0.8%
All but OPEC	90%	97%	41	0.9%
Optimistic	74%	93%	32	1.1%
Central	67%	90%	25	1.1%
Prudent	63%	88%	22	1.2%
Africa EU	12%	24%	29	1.1%

Scenarios with non-universal participation

Optimistic scenario.


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan throughout the century.



Scenarios with non-universal participation

Generous EU scenario.

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan throughout the century.



Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

In high-income countries, national redistribution can offset the negative incidence on median emitters.

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

In high-income countries, national redistribution can offset the negative incidence on median emitters.

The GCP fosters national climate policies (investments, subsidies, norms):

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

In high-income countries, national redistribution can offset the negative incidence on median emitters.

The GCP fosters national climate policies (investments, subsidies, norms):

Lowering a country's emissions reduces what it pays to the rest of the world.

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

In high-income countries, national redistribution can offset the negative incidence on median emitters.

The GCP fosters national climate policies (investments, subsidies, norms):

Lowering a country's emissions reduces what it pays to the rest of the world.

By mutualizing some decarbonization costs, national climate policies can reduce horizontal inequalities (discrepancies in private costs between individuals with similar income but different carbon footprints).

Complementarity with others policies

The basic income increases the fiscal capacity of low-income countries, which can raise taxes to fund public services and infrastructures.

Other sources of funding (e.g. a global corporate tax) should sustain the basic income in the long run.

A global wealth tax financing (at least in part) low-income countries can address historical responsibilities.

In high-income countries, national redistribution can offset the negative incidence on median emitters.

The GCP fosters national climate policies (investments, subsidies, norms):

Lowering a country's emissions reduces what it pays to the rest of the world.

By mutualizing some decarbonization costs, national climate policies can reduce horizontal inequalities (discrepancies in private costs between individuals with similar income but different carbon footprints).

A global democratic climate assembly would be the ideal forum for climate governance.

Other proposals

The Global Wealth Tax

Among voluntary countries:

The Global Wealth Tax

Among voluntary countries:

Tax individual net wealth.

The Global Wealth Tax

Among voluntary countries:

Tax individual net wealth.

Basic tax schedule: 2% marginal tax rate above \$5 million, 6% above \$100 million, 10% above \$1 billion
⇒ 1.8% of world GDP in revenues.

The Global Wealth Tax

Among voluntary countries:

Tax individual net wealth.

Basic tax schedule: 2% marginal tax rate above \$5 million, 6% above \$100 million, 10% above \$1 billion
⇒ 1.8% of world GDP in revenues.

Each country is free to top this basic tax schedule with a more progressive one.

The Global Wealth Tax

Among voluntary countries:

Tax individual net wealth.

Basic tax schedule: 2% marginal tax rate above \$5 million, 6% above \$100 million, 10% above \$1 billion
⇒ 1.8% of world GDP in revenues.

Each country is free to top this basic tax schedule with a more progressive one.

Half of the revenues allocated to lower-income countries.

The poorer the country, the more it gets.

The Global Climate Assembly

Among voluntary countries:

The Global Climate Assembly

Among voluntary countries:

Proportional elections on global lists in a single world constituency.

The Global Climate Assembly

Among voluntary countries:

Proportional elections on global lists in a single world constituency.

The Assembly is consultative and drafts treaties on climate change.

The Global Climate Assembly

Among voluntary countries:

Proportional elections on global lists in a single world constituency.

The Assembly is consultative and drafts treaties on climate change.

One-off five-year experiment of global democratic governance.

The Global Climate Assembly

Among voluntary countries:

Proportional elections on global lists in a single world constituency.

The Assembly is consultative and drafts treaties on climate change.

One-off five-year experiment of global democratic governance.

⇒ Fosters a global public debate on climate justice.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

Enforceable tax system: automatic exchange of information, global asset registry, fair corporate tax.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

[Enforceable tax system](#): automatic exchange of information, global asset registry, fair corporate tax.

[Inclusive financial system](#) with the Bridgetown 2.0 initiative: public guarantees on credit and foreign exchange, recapitalization of Multilateral Development Banks, debt restructuration, issuance of SDRs for low-income countries.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

Enforceable tax system: automatic exchange of information, global asset registry, fair corporate tax.

Inclusive financial system with the Bridgetown 2.0 initiative: public guarantees on credit and foreign exchange, recapitalization of Multilateral Development Banks, debt restructuration, issuance of SDRs for low-income countries.

International taxation: ultimately a Global Climate Plan, carbon taxes on shipping and aviation as first steps, Financial Transactions Tax, Global Wealth Tax.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

Enforceable tax system: automatic exchange of information, global asset registry, fair corporate tax.

Inclusive financial system with the Bridgetown 2.0 initiative: public guarantees on credit and foreign exchange, recapitalization of Multilateral Development Banks, debt restructuration, issuance of SDRs for low-income countries.

International taxation: ultimately a Global Climate Plan, carbon taxes on shipping and aviation as first steps, Financial Transactions Tax, Global Wealth Tax.

Democratic global governance: goal of directly elected UN Parliamentary Assembly with binding powers, experiment with consultative global assemblies, proportional representation.

The call for global redistribution

We urge world leaders to enact policies to end poverty, halt global warming, and reduce inequality.

Enforceable tax system: automatic exchange of information, global asset registry, fair corporate tax.

Inclusive financial system with the Bridgetown 2.0 initiative: public guarantees on credit and foreign exchange, recapitalization of Multilateral Development Banks, debt restructuration, issuance of SDRs for low-income countries.

International taxation: ultimately a Global Climate Plan, carbon taxes on shipping and aviation as first steps, Financial Transactions Tax, Global Wealth Tax.

Democratic global governance: goal of directly elected UN Parliamentary Assembly with binding powers, experiment with consultative global assemblies, proportional representation.

“We call on world leaders to examine global redistribution policies such as those outlined above at the UN, G20, and COPs. We urge policymakers to implement global policies redistributing at least \$1 trillion per year (i.e., 1% of global income) from higher-income countries to lower-income countries. This would only be a first step towards a less unequal world.”

The Colombian proposal

Minimum global tax on individual income and corporate income.

The Colombian proposal

Minimum global tax on individual income and corporate income.

Revenues finance an Organization of International Taxation and global public goods (climate action, vaccination, peacebuilding mission...)

The Colombian proposal

Minimum global tax on individual income and corporate income.

Revenues finance an Organization of International Taxation and global public goods (climate action, vaccination, peacebuilding mission...)

The system of votes and vetoes remains to be defined.

Appendix

Additional results

Conditions for increased foreign aid

[» Go back](#)

[Info on actual amount]. Do you support [the U.S.] transferring more money to low-income countries?


■ No, should be reduced ■ No, should remain stable ■ Yes, but at some conditions ■ Yes, should be increased




Conditions for increased foreign aid

[» Go back](#)

[Info on actual amount]. Do you support [the U.S.] transferring more money to low-income countries?




[If *at some conditions*] What conditions should be required for [the U.S.] to increase its foreign aid?




Conditions for increased foreign aid

[» Go back](#)

[Info on actual amount]. Do you support [the U.S.] transferring more money to low-income countries?



[If *at some conditions*] What conditions should be required for [the U.S.] to increase its foreign aid?



People want to help people (not oligarchs) and to foster climate action and human rights.


National preference is the main reason behind not wanting increased foreign aid.

Preferences over public spending

[» Go back](#)

Your previous answer shows that you would like to increase [UK] foreign aid.


How would you like to finance such increase in foreign aid? (Multiple answers possible)



People want better public services and higher taxes on the wealthiest.

Your previous answer shows that you would like to reduce [UK] foreign aid.

How would you like to use the freed budget? (Multiple answers possible)



Support for increased foreign aid

[» Go back](#)

Actual, perceived and preferred amount of foreign aid, with random info (or not) on actual amount. (*Mean*)

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Actual foreign aid (in % of public spending)	0.4	1.1	0.8	1.3	0.5	1.7
Belief about foreign aid	4.7	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.8	3.5
Preferred foreign aid (with info)	1.8	2.7	3.4	2.9	2.1	2.5
Preferred foreign aid (no info)	4	3.9	4.7	4.4	3.1	3.4

Support for increased foreign aid

[» Go back](#)

Actual, perceived and preferred amount of foreign aid, with random info (or not) on actual amount. (*Mean*)

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Actual foreign aid (in % of public spending)	0.4	1.1	0.8	1.3	0.5	1.7
Belief about foreign aid	4.7	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.8	3.5
Preferred foreign aid (with info)	1.8	2.7	3.4	2.9	2.1	2.5
Preferred foreign aid (no info)	4	3.9	4.7	4.4	3.1	3.4

Support for increased foreign aid: from previous question, and directly asked (with info).

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Preferred foreign aid is at least as high as current	70	75	91	76	77	57
Preferred foreign aid is at least as high as perceived	57	74	83	79	77	58
Supports increasing foreign aid (incl. with conditions)	60	64	63	68	69	56


Actual foreign aid is overestimated.

Majorities support more foreign aid.

Perceptions of the Global Climate Scheme

[Go back](#)

When determining your support or opposition to the Global climate scheme, which points are important to you?



Conjoint analyses: interaction with other policies [» Go back](#)

National climate policy (C) is as supported as the GCS, but no substitute for it.

Support for the GCS does not increase when complemented by National Redistribution.


⇒ Confirms that the **monetary loss is not a primary concern** for one's attitude toward the GCS.

Among the two following bundles of policies, which one would you prefer?

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
Global climate scheme (GCS)	54	76	80	71	81	74
NR+GCS preferred to NR	55	77	79	74	79	77
C+NR+GCS preferred to C+NR	55	74	79	71	78	68
NR+C preferred to NR	62	84	88	83	84	82
GCS+NR preferred to C+NR	47	52	53	53	49	52

Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform (Eu) [» Go back](#)

(...) Even if you do not support the Left, which of these platforms do you prefer?



Europeans prefer platforms that include the GCS and without the ban on thermal cars (a planned policy).

The effect of GCS is among the highest (wealth tax, better public services, higher minimum wage).

Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform (France) [▶ Go back](#)

France shows that there can be a **mismatch between preferred policies** (insulation plan, public services, global tax, GCS) **and enacted policies** (higher retirement age and ban on thermal cars: the least preferred).

Imaginez que la gauche ou le centre gauche gagne les prochaines élections en 2027. Voici deux programmes possibles sur lesquels elle pourrait faire campagne (...), lequel de ces programmes préférez-vous ?

Climat:

Interdiction des véhicules les plus polluants dans les centres-villes (ZFE)

Plan pour l'isolation thermique

Interdiction de la vente de voitures thermiques neuves d'ici 2030

Économie:

Versement du RSA aux 18-25 ans sans emploi

SMIC à 1600€ net par mois

Recul de l'âge légal de départ à la retraite à 65 ans

Hausse de 20% du financement de l'hôpital public et de l'Éducation nationale

Politique étrangère:

Plan mondial pour le climat

Taxe mondiale sur les millionnaires

Assemblée démocratique mondiale sur le changement climatique

Doubler l'aide au développement des pays à faibles revenus

Démocratie:


Élection des députés à la proportionnelle

Référendum d'Initiative Citoyenne (RIC)

Fiscalité:

Plan de redistribution nationale

Rétablissement de l'impôt sur la fortune (ISF)



Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform (U.S.)

[Go back](#)

Endorsing the GCS is not determinant to gain the Democratic primary.

[Only on non-Republican] Imagine that at the 2024 Democratic party presidential primaries, the two main candidates campaign with the following key policies in their platforms.

Which of these candidates do you prefer?

Climate policy:

Ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2030

Coal exit

Trillion dollar investment in clean transportation infrastructure and building insulation

Economic issues:

\$15 minimum wage

Funding affordable housing

Student loan forgiveness

Universal childcare/pre-K

Foreign policy:

Doubling foreign aid

Global climate scheme

Global democratic assembly on climate change

Global tax on millionaires

Societal issues:

Expanding the Supreme Court

Handgun ban


Making abortion a right at the federal level

Tax system:

Increase corporate income tax rate from 21% to 28%

National redistribution scheme

Wealth tax



Conjoint analyses: influence on preferred platform (Germany)

[Go back](#)

Endorsing the GCS is not determinant to gain the Democratic primary.

Imagine that a Rot-Rot-Grüne coalition wins the next elections. Here are two possible platforms on which the coalition may campaign (the policies in each platform are randomly drawn from a pool of credible left-wing policies).

(...) Even if you do not support the Left, which of these platforms do you prefer?

Klimaschutz:

Verpflichtende Solaranlagen auf allen geeigneten Dächern

Plan zur Wärmedämmung

Verbot des Verkaufs von Neuwagen mit Verbrennungsmotor bis 2030

Wirtschaftspolitik:

Erhöhung des Regelsatzes des Bürgergelds auf bis zu 600€ pro Monat

Bürgerversicherung als gerechtere Sozialversicherung

Staatsschuldenquote auf unter 60% reduzieren

Investitionen für Gigabit-Netzwerke bereitstellen

Außenpolitik:

Globales Klimaprogramm

Globale Steuer auf Millionäre

Globale demokratische Versammlung zum Klimawandel

Verdoppelung der Mittel für die Entwicklungshilfe in einkommensschwachen Ländern

Gesellschaft:


Volksentscheid auf Bundesebene

Cannabis-Legalisierung

Steuerpolitik:

Nationales Umverteilungsprogramm

Die Vermögenssteuer wieder in Kraft setzen



Endorsing the GCS is not determinant to gain the Democratic primary.

Imagine that the PSOE wins the next elections. Here are two possible platforms on which it may campaign (the policies in each platform are randomly drawn from a pool of credible PSOE policies).

(...) Even if you do not support the PSOE, which of these platforms do you prefer?

Política climática:

- 100% de electricidad producida con energías renovables en 2040
- Plan de aislamiento térmico
- Prohibir la venta de coches nuevos con motor de combustión para 2030

Asuntos económicos:

- Más necesidades sanitarias dentro del sistema público (cuidado dental, gafas, salud mental)
- Ingreso Básico Garantizado de 600€ al mes
- Jornada laboral de 34 horas semanales
- Inversión en el sistema educativo y universalización de la educación preescolar

Política exterior:


- Plan climático global
- Impuesto mundial a los millonarios
- Asamblea democrática mundial sobre el cambio climático
- Duplicar la ayuda exterior a los países de renta baja

Asuntos sociales:

- Reformar la ley electoral para hacer el Senado más proporcional
- Abolición de la prostitución

Sistema fiscal:

- Plan de redistribución nacional
- Aumentar los impuestos sobre las rentas superiores a 100.000 euros anuales



“you have 100 points that you can allocate to different policies. The more you give points to a policy, the more you support it.

How do you allocate the points among the following policies?”
[6 policies taken at random]

GCS is as prioritized as the average policy, or even more in France and Germany.

It is more prioritized than some planned climate policies, like the ban on thermal cars.

The global tax on millionaires is among the most prioritized measures. It is prioritized as a national wealth tax, if not more.

Most prioritized are better public services and a higher minimum wage.

Prioritization

[Go back](#)


Mean number of points

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
econ1	13	21	10	14	35	31
econ2: [Higher minimum wage] (DE: Bürgerversicherung)	23	22	25	21	22	23
econ3	21	15	13	18	17	13
econ4	28	22	27	17	24	20
soc1	10	17	13	17	12	21
soc2	13	9	14	8	10	8
climate1	14	15	11	18	20	12
climate2: Thermal insulation plan (US: also transport)	20	18	22	19	15	17
climate3: Ban the sale of new combustion–engine cars by 2030	11	9	8	8	9	11
tax1: National redistribution scheme	14	15	16	15	15	15
tax2: Wealth tax (ES: raise tax on top incomes)	19	19	21	18	17	19
foreign1: Global climate scheme	15	20	20	23	16	17
foreign2: Global tax on millionaires	21	20	20	23	19	20
foreign3: Global democratic assembly on climate change	15	15	15	17	14	13
foreign4: Doubling foreign aid	9	11	13	14	9	8

International climate negotiations

[» Go back](#)

In international climate negotiations, would you prefer [U.S.] diplomats to defend [U.S.] interests or global justice?




The typical answer is to defend one's country's "interests, to the extent it respects global justice."
Only one eighth wants to defend one's country's "interests, even if it goes against global justice."

Group defended

[Go back](#)

What group do you defend when you vote?




The most defended group is one's fellow citizens.

40% are universalist, i.e. defend all humans or sentient beings.

Biggest issues

[Go back](#)

To what extent do you think the following issues are a problem? *5-Likert scale*
(Mean of answers recoded in [-2, +2])




People rank these the importance of these 3 issues as follows:

1. Climate change
2. Global poverty
3. Income inequality in their country

Eu questionnaire

[Go back](#)



Descriptive statistics

Main attitudes by vote

[Go back](#)


Main attitudes by vote (“Right” spans from Center-right to Far right). (Relative support in percent)

	Europe Left	Europe PNR/Non-voter	Europe Right	U.S. Left	U.S. PNR/Non-voter	U.S. Right
Support for the GCS	85	72	71	74	53	26
Global tax on millionaires	94	83	76	85	71	40
Sharing half of global tax with low-income countries	61	52	45	55	67	41
A maximum wealth limit of \$10 billion (US) / €100 million (Eu) for each human	73	65	52	62	49	23
High-income countries funding renewable energy in low-income countries	93	79	74	87	70	38
[Country]'s foreign aid should be increased	93	83	72	92	81	48
Universalist	56	48	26	53	49	23

Main attitudes by vote

[Go back](#)


Main attitudes by vote in France



Main attitudes by vote

[» Go back](#)


Main attitudes by vote in Germany



Main attitudes by vote

[» Go back](#)


Main attitudes by vote in Spain



Main attitudes by vote

[Go back](#)

Main attitudes by vote in the UK




Comprehension of the policies

Correct answers to comprehension questions (in percent). [▶ Go back](#)

	United States	Europe	France	Germany	Spain	United Kingdom
With NR, typical [country] people win and richest lose	68	73	76	73	73	70
With GCS, typical [country] people lose and poorest humans win	60	68	62	72	67	67
With GCS+NR, typical [country] people neither win nor lose	54	60	63	59	57	61

Comprehension of the policies

Number of correct answers to comprehension questions (mean). [► Go back](#)



Number of correct answers to understanding questions

1.8

2

2

2

2


2

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2030.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2040.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2050.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2060.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2070.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2080.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2030.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2040.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2050.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2060.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2070.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan in 2080.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[Go back](#)


Distributive effects of the Global Climate Scheme.



Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan

[» Go back](#)

Distributive effects of the Global Climate Plan.



OECD

Relative support for national policies

[Go back](#)

High-income	Australia	Canada	Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine
-------------	-----------	--------	---------	--------	---------	-------	-------	--------	-------------	-------	----------------	---------------	---------------	--------	-------	-------	-----------	--------	--------------	--------	---------

Support for Main Climate Policies

Green infrastructure program

Ban on combustion-engine cars

Carbon tax with cash transfers

79	68	77	76	77	58	94	78	82	95	86	78	71	93	90	98	91	97	94	89	92	87
56	50	61	49	39	40	74	59	56	73	62	60	55	81	77	95	86	88	76	70	83	70
56	50	60	45	45	39	72	60	55	79	59	55	52	79	70	90	85	89	71	73	73	63

Support for Other Climate Policies

Subsidies to low-carbon technologies

Mandatory and subsidized insulation of buildings

Ban on polluting cars in city centers

Funding clean energy in low-income countries

Ban on combustion-engine cars w. alternatives available

Tax on flying (+20%)

Tax on fossil fuels (\$45/tCO2)

87	82	86	89	76	84	96	91	91	93	87	90	78	90	86	94	84	94	87	93	90	90	
84	86	83	84	81	77	90	83	88	95	86	89	71	90	98						91	87	83
75	70	76	78	69	67	89	85	78	71	73	80	65	85	78	93	87	96	85	82	72	78	

Support for Carbon Tax With:

Subsidies to low-carbon tech.

Funding environmental infrastructures

Reduction in personal income taxes

Reduction in the public deficit

Cash transfers to the poorest households

Tax rebates for the most affected firms

Cash transfers to constrained households

Reduction in corporate income taxes

Equal cash transfers to all households

85	80	67	84	83	88	94	92	89	97	86	87	75	92	93	98	87	97	91	92	88	89
85	80	68	83	88	83	92	90	87	94	88	85	77	92	92	96	89	96	92	94	89	90
79	73	66	60	80	80	92	88	87	88	83	76	69	87	86	95	84	91	86	85	85	87

Support for Cattle-Related Policies

Subsidies on organic and local vegetables

Ban of intensive cattle farming

Removal of subsidies for cattle farming

A high tax on cattle products, doubling beef prices


75	59	69	72	73	74	90	72	89	84	78	70	64	82	77	96		90	72	72	91	69
57	44	56	40	69	66	81	31	60	66	54	66	51	51	49	80		61	59	36	42	31
49	44	51	43	41	61	65	26	50	52	52	54	55	54	60	78		71	65	38	36	31

Support in high-income countries: Global tax and dividend \lesssim National tax and dividend < Global quota and dividend

Absolute support for global policies


[Go back](#)

Share of support (somewhat or strongly) for the main global policies among non-indifferent.



Level at which climate policies are needed (Multiple choice question)

Global



Global climate policies (5-Likert scale)

Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries

Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares

Global democratic assembly on climate change

Global tax on GHG financing a global basic income


Burden sharing preferences for the global carbon budget (5-Likert)

Emission share should be in proportion to population*

Countries that have emitted more since 1990 should receive a lower share*


Countries that will be hurt more by CC should receive a higher share*

Emission share should be in proportion to current emissions



Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “[country] should take measures to fight climate change.”

[Go back](#)




At which level(s) do you think public policies to tackle climate change need to be put in place? (Multiple answers are possible) [► Go back](#)

	High-income Australia	Canada	Denmark	France	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine	
Level of climate policies needed: global	85	78	87	81	85	88	92	94	88	86	88	88	70	85	88	87	78	86	88	90	82	76
Level of climate policies needed: federal/continental	46	67	58	48	37	48	30	NA	40	NA	40	47	52	48	48	61	67	50	41	42	41	24
Level of climate policies needed: state/national	44	54	50	45	27	45	28	50	38	65	34	53	41	42	36	32	59	35	26	53	58	35
Level of climate policies needed: local	36	48	45	33	26	37	24	35	37	41	30	43	35	35	35	29	50	24	28	42	41	27


How should [country] climate policies depend on what other countries do?

If other countries do more, [country] should do... [▶ Go back](#)




How should [country] climate policies depend on what other countries do?

If other countries do less, [country] should do... [► Go back](#)



[Question non posée aux U.S., au Danemark et en France] All countries have signed the Paris agreement that aims to contain global warming “well below +2 °C”. To limit global warming to this level, there is a maximum amount of greenhouse gases we can emit globally, called the carbon budget. Each country could aim to emit less than a share of the carbon budget. To respect the global carbon budget, countries that emit more than their national share would pay a fee to countries that emit less than their share.

Do you support such a policy? [► Go back](#)



[*Question not asked in the U.S., Denmark and France, answers to a similar question are displayed]


Suppose the above policy is in place. How should the carbon budget be divided among countries?

The emission share of a country should be proportional to its population, so that each human has an equal right to emit.; The emission share of a country should be proportional to its current emissions, so that those who already emit more have more rights to emit.; Countries that have emitted more over the past decades (from 1990 onwards) should receive a lower emission share, because they have already used some of their fair share.; Countries that will be hurt more by climate change should receive a higher emission share, to compensate them for the damages.

Percentage of support (somewhat or strong) among: *Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Neither support nor oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support* ▶ [Go back](#)


	High-income	Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	63	62	59	55	71	55	68	53	65	66	66	62	67	72	65	76	75	73	71	75	71	63
Emission share should be in proportion to current emissions	35	35	35	NA	NA	29	33	39	37	42	35	30	NA	50	41	65	60	62	40	38	55	3135 / 43

Do you support or oppose establishing a global democratic assembly whose role would be to draft international treaties against climate change? Each adult across the world would have one vote to elect members of the assembly. [► Go back](#)




Imagine the following policy: a global tax on greenhouse gas emissions funding a global basic income. Such a policy would progressively raise the price of fossil fuels (for example, the price of gasoline would increase by [40 cents per gallon] in the first years). Higher prices would encourage people and companies to use less fossil fuels, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Revenues from the tax would be used to finance a basic income of [\$30] per month to each human adult, thereby lifting the 700 million people who earn less than \$2/day out of extreme poverty. The average British person would lose a bit from this policy as they would face [\$130] per month in price increases, which is higher than the [\$30] they would receive.

Do you support or oppose such a policy? [► Go back](#)



Do you support or oppose a tax on all millionaires around the world to finance low-income countries that comply with international standards regarding climate action? This would finance infrastructure and public services such as access to drinking water, healthcare, and education. ▶ Go back



Synthèse : Pourcentage de réponses positive (e.g. Plutôt/Très favorable). ▶ Go back

	High-income	Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine
Level of climate policies needed: global	85	78	87	81	85	88	92	94	88	86	88	88	70	85	88	87	78	86	88	90	82	76
Level of climate policies needed: federal/continental	46	67	58	48	37	48	30	NA	40	NA	40	47	52	48	48	61	67	50	41	42	41	24
Level of climate policies needed: state/national	44	54	50	45	27	45	28	50	38	65	34	53	41	42	36	32	59	35	26	53	58	35
Level of climate policies needed: local	36	48	45	33	26	37	24	35	37	41	30	43	35	35	35	29	50	24	28	42	41	27
If other do more, [country] should do more	46	50	53	40	37	42	52	59	36	35	44	49	55	63	65	67	73	71	57	60	71	32
If other do less, [country] should do more	56	55	57	54	47	51	74	62	57	44	64	53	58	76	74	69	75	82	80	78	79	60
Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares	62	57	64	NA	NA	52	69	50	59	71	71	66	NA	74	69	78	78	77	76	71	68	76
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	63	62	59	55	71	55	68	53	65	66	66	62	67	72	65	76	75	73	71	75	71	63
Emission share should be in proportion to current emissions	35	35	35	NA	NA	29	33	39	37	42	35	30	NA	50	41	65	60	62	40	38	55	31
Countries that have emitted more since 1990 should receive a lower share*	44	42	45	28	54	45	51	42	44	48	48	42	41	58	56	65	67	63	47	53	58	52
Countries that will be hurt more by CC should receive a higher share*	44	42	39	41	51	37	42	51	53	43	48	38	41	63	58	74	72	70	54	61	60	47
Global democratic assembly on climate change	57	52	54	51	55	56	68	61	63	57	68	53	48	75	64	86	77	78	76	70	72	73
Global tax on GHG financing a global basic income	34	29	32	41	34	36	34	32	31	33	42	29	34	61	54	74	72	70	68	40	44	62
Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries	64	58	67	55	65	65	72	64	62	65	75	65	53	78	73	86	80	83	78	71	73	83

Synthèse : Pourcentage de réponses positive (e.g. *Plutôt/Très favorable*) parmi les non *indifférents*. [▶ Go back](#)

	High-income	Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine
Level of climate policies needed: global	85	78	87	81	85	88	92	94	88	86	88	70	85	88	87	78	86	88	90	82	76	
Level of climate policies needed: federal/continental	46	67	58	48	37	48	30	NA	40	NA	40	47	52	48	48	61	67	50	41	42	41	24
Level of climate policies needed: state/national	44	54	50	45	27	45	28	50	38	65	34	53	41	42	36	32	59	35	26	53	58	35
Level of climate policies needed: local	36	48	45	33	26	37	24	35	37	41	30	43	35	35	35	29	50	24	28	42	41	27
If other do more, [country] should do more	88	84	91	87	88	82	91	92	82	90	89	90	87	91	89	95	86	94	92	89	93	80
If other do less, [country] should do more	88	82	86	91	87	82	95	91	89	90	91	85	86	93	93	93	89	96	97	93	92	87
Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares	84	79	85	NA	NA	74	89	82	81	92	85	90	NA	90	82	95	89	95	92	90	88	88
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	88	87	87	90	90	85	91	84	89	91	89	88	87	91	84	96	91	94	92	93	90	85
Emission share should be in proportion to current emissions	54	55	53	NA	NA	47	46	63	57	68	49	48	NA	69	53	86	77	88	56	55	77	46
Countries that have emitted more since 1990 should receive a lower share*	72	69	73	57	80	76	80	69	71	75	74	72	68	82	79	92	86	91	75	73	81	74
Countries that will be hurt more by CC should receive a higher share*	71	71	68	62	74	67	71	84	80	72	75	68	59	84	78	95	90	91	77	81	83	69
Global democratic assembly on climate change	81	74	80	77	82	76	90	88	85	85	88	77	71	91	84	97	88	96	94	89	87	93
Global tax on GHG financing a global basic income	49	41	44	57	51	52	55	53	47	53	50	40	49	79	76	92	88	91	83	54	60	77
Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries	82	74	84	72	86	83	90	88	80	89	86	85	73	92	86	98	92	97	93	89	87	94

Principales des attitudes sur les politiques mondiales

Pourcentage de réponses positive (e.g. Plutôt/Très favorable). [► Go back](#)

	High-income	Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine
Level of climate policies needed: global	85	78	87	81	85	88	92	94	88	86	88	88	70	85	88	87	78	86	88	90	82	76
Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares	62	57	64	NA	NA	52	69	50	59	71	71	66	NA	74	69	78	78	77	76	71	68	76
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	63	62	59	55	71	55	68	53	65	66	66	62	67	72	65	76	75	73	71	75	71	63
Global democratic assembly on climate change	57	52	54	51	55	56	68	61	63	57	68	53	48	75	64	86	77	78	76	70	72	73
Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries	64	58	67	55	65	65	72	64	62	65	75	65	53	78	73	86	80	83	78	71	73	83

Principales attitudes sur les politiques mondiales

Pourcentage de réponses positive (e.g. *Plutôt/Très favorable*) parmi les non *indifférents*. [► Go back](#)

	High-income Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine	
Level of climate policies needed: global	85	78	87	81	85	88	92	94	88	86	88	70	85	88	87	78	86	88	90	82	76	
Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares	84	79	85	NA	NA	74	89	82	81	92	85	90	NA	90	82	95	89	95	92	90	88	88
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	88	87	87	90	90	85	91	84	89	91	89	88	87	91	84	96	91	94	92	93	90	85
Global democratic assembly on climate change	81	74	80	77	82	76	90	88	85	85	88	77	71	91	84	97	88	96	94	89	87	93
Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries	82	74	84	72	86	83	90	88	80	89	86	85	73	92	86	98	92	97	93	89	87	94

Principales attitudes sur les politiques mondiales

Moyennes des réponses, recodées en [-2; +2]. [► Go back](#)

	High-income Australia	Canada	Denmark*	France*	Germany	Italy	Japan	Poland	South Korea	Spain	United Kingdom	United States*	Middle-income	Brazil	China	India	Indonesia	Mexico	South Africa	Turkey	Ukraine	
Level of climate policies needed: global	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	
Global carbon budget (+2°C) divided in tradable country shares	0.7	0.6	0.7	NA	NA	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	NA	1	0.9	1	1.1	1.2	1	1	0.9	0.9
Emission share should be in proportion to population*	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	1	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8	1	0.7	0.9	1.1	1.1	0.9	1	1	0.7
Global democratic assembly on climate change	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.3	1	0.8	1.1	1	1.2	1	0.9	1	0.9
Global tax on millionaires to finance low-income countries	0.8	0.5	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.8	1	0.8	0.6	0.8	1	0.8	0.5	1.1	1	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.1	1	1.1	1.2