

Acceptance for International Redistribution in High-Income Countries

Adrien Fabre*

October 20, 2025

[Link to most recent version](#)

Abstract

Through an original survey on 12,000 respondents representative of eleven high-income countries (U.S., Japan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and seven European countries), I study the extent of support for global redistribution and climate policies, and their sensitivity to policy features such as the magnitude of the transfers or country coverage. Though not a salient concern, global inequality is seen as a big injustice. There is majority support for almost all global policies in almost all countries, including for policies that would redistribute 5% of the world income, or that would be costly to the respondents. Global inequality is a vote-determining issue for many people; a political program is more likely to be preferred if it addresses it. Support for international policies decreases only slightly when the country coverage shrinks. These results confirm previous findings and suggest that a broad set of countries could work together for sustainable development.

*CNRS, CIRED. E-mail: adrien.fabre@cnrs.fr.

Contents

Contents	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Data and design	8
3 Salience and prioritization of global solidarity	12
3.1 Top-of-mind considerations	12
3.2 Prioritization of public spending items	16
4 Acceptance of international policies in function of country coverage	18
4.1 International Climate Scheme	18
4.2 Wealth tax funding LICs	22
5 Sincerity of support for global redistribution	22
5.1 Conjoint analysis	23
5.2 Testing warm glow	25
6 Breadth of international policies accepted	28
6.1 Support for currently debated global policies	28
6.2 Support for radical proposals, political action, and broad values	30
6.3 Preferred channels to transfer resources to LICs	34
6.4 Custom global income redistribution	34
7 Conclusion	37
Methods	37
Bibliography	38
A Raw results	41
B Questionnaire	85
C Representativeness of the surveys	107
D Determinants of support	111
E The determination of a custom redistribution	114
F Comparison with other surveys	118
G Attrition analysis	119

H Balance analysis	120
I Placebo tests	121
J Main results on selected demographics, including by vote	122
K Main results weighted by vote	124
L Main results on the extended sample	127
M Influence of the item order on answers	130
Bibliography	131
List of Tables	131
List of Figures	131

1 Introduction

The development gap between the Global North and the Global South is at the heart of international relations, with the question of North-to-South transfers of resources and power at the forefront. This issue permeates negotiations in most areas, be it on debt re-structuration, development assistance, tax cooperation, UN reform, or climate finance. In all international fora, Global South countries demand a more equal world order. Indeed, redirecting a mere 1% of high-income countries' output to low-income countries (LICs) would mechanically double their national income.

Public attitudes in high-income countries (HICs) are key to understand whether globally redistributive policies would be politically feasible. Recent large-scale surveys reveal worldwide support for a globally coordinated tax on billionaires (Cappelen et al. 2025a), a democratic world government on global issues (Ghassim and Pauli 2024), climate action at the global (rather than national) level (Dechezleprêtre et al. 2025), as well as globally redistributive climate or tax policies (Fabre et al. 2025).

Despite strong stated support even in HICs, international redistribution is rarely discussed in public debates, let alone advocated by policymakers. Fabre et al. (2025) run survey experiments in the U.S. and four Western European countries to understand this mismatch, focusing on a “Global Climate Scheme” (GCS) costly to these countries. The authors reject hypotheses that the support for the GCS might be overstated: they find

no social desirability bias in a list experiment, 6 out of 10 respondents prefer a political program that includes the GCS compared to one that does not, and most respondents are willing to sign a petition in favor of the GCS. While the authors find a support reduced by 11 percentage points (p.p.) following a (fictitious) negative media campaign — an effect size similar to the actual decrease in support for the “Green New Deal” after it was publicly debated (Gustafson et al. 2019) — a campaign effect of this magnitude would not engender a majority opposition to policies supported by three-quarters of the population, such as a globally redistributive wealth tax. Therefore, Fabre et al. (2025) conclude that support for global redistribution is genuine, and another hypothesis is needed to explain the lack of prominence of this issue. A promising candidate is “pluralistic ignorance”: the underestimation of public support. Indeed, pluralistic ignorance has been identified relative to the support for costly climate action (Andre et al. 2024a,b), the billionaire tax (Cappelen et al. 2025a), and the GCS (Fabre et al. 2025). Nevertheless, pluralistic ignorance has not prevented climate policies or a national wealth tax to enter public debates, suggesting that other mechanisms may be at play concerning global redistribution.

In this paper, I conduct a pre-registered large-scale survey to test whether global redistribution policies are robustly supported and what can explain their lack of prominence. I test several hypotheses. Surveying eleven HICs, I test whether international policies garner majority support in countries seen as conservative and not yet surveyed on this topic, such as Japan, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Switzerland. As some key countries would probably not participate if tested policies were implemented, I test how support is affected when a climate scheme or a wealth tax is international but not truly global. I also test for pluralistic ignorance. I analyze the salience of global redistribution, and whether it is a vote-determining issue. I test for “warm glow”, whereby people lure themselves into supporting a hypothetical policy in order to ease their conscience, notably by testing whether the support is claimed only for as long as the policy is deemed unlikely. Finally, I explore a variety of international policies, ranging from the plausible to the radical.

The results confirm earlier studies, as I find majority support in every country surveyed for almost all globally redistributive policies tested. Policies currently discussed in international negotiations are supported by large majorities. The most supported one is the 2% tax on billionaire wealth proposed by Zucman (2024), with 81% relative support (in the pooled sample, among non-*Indifferent* responses). Proposals such as debt relief for vulnerable countries, developed countries contributing 0.7% of their GDP in foreign aid, an expansion of the UN Security Council, or the Bridgetown initiative (expanding sus-

tainable investments at low interests rates in LICs) all garner at least 70% relative support overall.

Radical proposals are also largely accepted. In every country, there is majority agreement that “governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century”, and that globally coordinated climate policies are preferable to the status quo even if they entail a complete electrification of cars by 2045 as well as doubling prices on heating fuel, flights, and red meat. Overall, I find 64% relative support for a progressive income tax that would collect 5% of the world income from the global top 3% to finance poverty reduction in the Global South, with tax rates ranging from 15% above \$80,000 per year to 45% above \$1 million. Relatedly, in an interactive task whereby the respondents can draw their preferred redistribution of global incomes, almost half of the respondents choose a redistribution that would make them poorer (*versus* less than 10% choosing one that would make them richer), and the average custom redistribution entails over 5% of the world income in rich-to-poor transfers.

While policies to address global inequality are well accepted, they have low salience. Indeed, this topic is seldom mentioned in open-ended fields at the beginning of the survey where respondents had to write about different considerations. The respondents’ top concern is the cost of living and the most frequent wish is to have more purchasing power. While inequality is most often regarded as the greatest injustice, with some inconclusive indications that these answers relate to inequality at the global level, global inequality almost never appears among issue important to the respondents but neglected in the public debate.

Before respondents could guess the survey’s topic, they also had to complete a budget allocation task and a conjoint experiment. Asked to allocate the revenue from a global wealth tax between five spending items, 87% of the respondents allocate a positive amount to the global item (public services in LICs). This item receives an average preferred share of 17.5% of the revenue, slightly less than the equal split of 20%. This indicates that most people prioritise sustainable development abroad less than they do the average issue, but still consider it worthwhile.

Despite its low salience, the conjoint experiment shows that global redistribution may be a vote-determining issue. In this task, respondents have to select their preference between two political programs, whose policies are selected at random from a pool of policies prominently debated in the country. When it appears in a program, a *global tax on millionaires with 30% of the revenue funding LICs* increases the likelihood that the program

is preferred by 4 p.p., while *cutting development aid* reduces it by 4 p.p. The finding that some voters might change their vote intention if a candidate campaigned on sustainable development is confirmed by a direct question, whereby 36% of the respondents say they would be more likely (*versus* 17% less likely) to vote for a party if it is part of a global movement in favor of climate action, taxes on millionaires, and poverty reduction in LICs. In a related question, 68% of the respondents (and 52% of the 584 millionaires who answered) state they could actively support such a movement (either by signing a petition, demonstrating, going on strike, or donating to a strike fund).

What if a sustainable development policy is international but not global? Support decreases only slightly. In the case of a wealth tax with 30% of revenue financing LICs, the support is reduced from 74% to 68% when the policy is implemented only by some countries (e.g. the EU, the UK, and Brazil) rather than all countries. Likewise, in the case of an International Climate Scheme (ICS), defined as a cap-and-trade with equal per capita allocation of emissions rights, the support decreases from 69% to 65% when participating countries shrink from a set covering 72% of world emissions to a coverage of 33% of emissions.

I identify pluralistic ignorance through an incentivized question that asks respondents for their belief concerning to support for the Global (version of the) Climate Scheme, either among their compatriots or in the U.S. In eight countries, there is majority support for the GCS but most people believe there is not. Overall, the median respondent underestimates support in their own country by 15 p.p. and non-American respondents underestimate support in the U.S. by 24 p.p. Pluralistic ignorance may be an important driver behind the neglect of global solidarity solutions.

To test whether support might drop in case the prospect of global policies materializes, I manipulate the belief that large international transfers are likely in the next fifteen years. More specifically, I inform a random half of the respondents that “countries have agreed to demonstrate some degree of solidarity in addressing global challenges”, providing diverse examples including the recent adoption at the International Maritime Organization of a shipping levy that should partly finance LICs, the commitments of developed countries to finance climate action in developing countries, and the study by the G20 of a common tax on billionaires. The information treatment increases the belief that transfers are likely by 8 p.p. from a baseline of 35 %, and significantly *increases* the share of plausible global policies supported, by 1 p.p. An IV estimation shows that the share of policies supported causally increases by 15 p.p. when people believe that international transfers

are likely, consistent with the non-causal effect estimated by OLS. In other words, I do not find any evidence of *warm glow*. On the contrary, the effect goes in this opposite direction compared to the *warm glow* hypothesis: when people believe that a global policy is likely, they accept it more (which can be interpreted as a *status quo* bias).

Finally, I test broad values of the respondents to check whether they are consistent with global redistribution. A majority of the respondents agree that “helping countries in need in the right thing to do”. However, only a minority is convinced that it is in HICs’ long-term interest to do so, or that it is their historical responsibility. Likewise, there is no majority support for reparations for colonization and slavery (except in Italy). This shows that the support for global solidarity is driven by a sense of empathy and duty, rather than guilt or interest.

Following the works of Enke (2020); Cappelen et al. (2025b), it is interesting to measure the degree of universalism. I use a new question to measure universalism, asking the respondents what group they advocate for when they vote. 45% choose a universalist answer (either “Humans” or “Sentient beings (humans and animals)”), while 32% choose their fellow citizens. Using a variance decomposition, I confirm the findings of Enke et al. (2023) that universalism is a stronger explainer of policy attitudes than sociodemographic variables such as income, country or even vote. Consistent with the difference between countries in the other measures, the share of universalists is lower in Japan and the U.S., and highest in Saudi Arabia. In Europe, Saudi Arabia, as well as among left-wing voters, there is a majority of universalists.

By studying in depth the support for global policies, this paper departs from the usual methodological approach of attitudinal surveys. In general, academic surveys focus on studying effect sizes of some treatment on political attitudes, or the socio-demographic factors that correlate with attitudes (e.g. Kuziemko et al. 2015; Douenne and Fabre 2022; Alesina et al. 2018). The magnitude of support for a given proposal is often regarded as unsuitable for satisfactory estimation, because such attitudes are seen as weakly held, inconsistent, or unstable. The measure of support is usually left to non-academic pollsters, who rarely apply all the academic best practices: transparency, representative sampling, neutral and precise wording of questions, comparison with existing literature, use of multiple questions and complementary methods to correctly interpret the results. Although estimating the extent of support is challenging, this question seems too important not to be addressed using scientific methods. Moreover, Ansolabehere et al. (2008) refutes common perceptions regarding policy attitudes, showing that they are largely stable and

have as good an explanatory power on vote choice as party identification. In this paper, I inquire the support for various policies, approach the question from diverse angles, and run a battery of pre-registered tests to check whether stated support estimates are reliable.

2 Data and design

Samples. I conducted an original survey on 12,007 respondents representative of the adult population in eleven high-income countries (see Figure 1). The countries have been chosen to span the diversity of high-income countries and the sample sizes to be commensurate to these countries' population sizes.¹ The survey was fielded online in 2025 using the companies *Yandex* (for Russia), *Kantar* (for Saudi Arabia), and *Bilendi* (for the other countries).²

In Russia, the questionnaire was curtailed as I could not ask the same questionnaire as in the other countries, for two reasons. First, I could not use the platform *Qualtrics*, which prevented me from asking some question formats (such as constant sum scales) or from embedding Javascript (used to design an interactive question). Second, I had to cut or reword some questions due to preventive censorship by the survey company. In the other countries, the questionnaires are almost identical, though the figures in questions are adapted to the country context (e.g. when informing about the cost of the Global Climate Scheme to the average person of the country). Appendix ?? lists the specificities of the questionnaire in each country.


Representativeness. The samples are stratified to be representative of the country's adult population along the following quota variables (with some exceptions³): gender, age (5 brackets), income (4), diploma (3), region (2 to 5), and urbanicity (2 to 3). Tables S1-S4 in Appendix C show that our samples match the actual population frequencies along these dimensions, except for Saudi Arabia (where non-Saudis and non-high-school-educated people are underrepresented) and Russia (where low-income people are under-

¹The sample sizes are as follows: U.S.: 3,000; Japan: 2,000; Russia: 1,007; Saudi Arabia: 1,000; Europe: 5,000, split in proportion to the countries' adult population size (except for Switzerland), that is France: 798; Germany: 1,048; Italy: 756; Spain: 603; Poland: 500; Switzerland: 469.

²For all countries but Russia, responses were collected between April 15 and July 3, 2025. For Russia, responses were collected between September 19 and October 9, 2025. Each complete response is rewarded around €3 in gift points.

³In the U.S., I also use race (4 categories) as a quota variable. In Saudi Arabia, I do not use urbanicity, but I use citizenship (Saudi vs. non-Saudi). In Russia, I do not use region nor urbanicity.

Figure 1: Country coverage of the survey.



represented). All our results are reweighted to be fully representative of the population along our quotas (with weights trimmed between 0.25 and 4). Results aggregated at the global or European levels weigh each country in proportion to its adult population size.

Appendix Figure S60 shows that 11% to 17% of the variance of our main attitudinal outcomes is explained by sociodemographic variables, and this share falls below 5% after accounting for country and vote. In other words, even though variables such as age or diploma are sometimes significantly correlated with attitudes (see Tables S5-S6), difference in average acceptance of a policy between (say) age groups rarely exceeds a dozen percentage points.

Appendix J shows how our main attitudinal outcomes vary by political leaning. Non-voters exhibit attitudes close to the center of the political spectrum. Besides, attitudes are much less polarized in Japan compared to Europe and the U.S. Appendix Figures S58-S59 show how our samples compare to reality in terms of vote in the last election. While the share of declared non-voters is lower than in reality, votes along the three main political leanings are close to reality. Appendix K shows that our main results are robust to reweighting by vote.

Data quality. The median survey duration is 17 minutes (13 min in Russia). Best practices have been used to ensure top-notch data quality. The questionnaire has been worded in a neutral and informative way;⁴ tested on random people in public spaces to make sure it is correctly understood; translated by professional translators, with figures converted into national currencies, and double-checked by native speakers.

Of all respondents who started the questionnaire, 23% respondents were allowed to pursue the survey (as their quotas were not full). Among them, 17% drop out (including

⁴At the end of the survey, 70% of the respondents find it politically unbiased (Appendix Figure S55).

10% who drop out after the socio-demographic questions). The final sample is obtained after excluding of this extended sample 16% of respondents for suspicion of low quality: 9% for failing an attention test and 13% for answering the questionnaire in less than 6 min (including 5% for both reasons). Appendix G checks for differential attrition and Appendix L shows that our main results replicate on the extended sample.

Whenever possible, the order of question items is randomized. Appendix M studies the effect of item order on answers. The item order generally has a significant but small effect (2 to 10 p.p.). The size of the effect help identify questions for which opinions are strongly held (e.g. the preference of a sustainable scenario over the status quo) *versus* weakly held (e.g. the preferred amount of climate finance).


Appendix F compares the answers of two attitudinal questions asked in other surveys: the overall averages differ by 2 to 4 p.p. and their cross-country correlation is high: .70 (Global Nation 2023) to .86 (Cappelen et al. 2025a).

Incentives. The questionnaire includes three incentivized questions, each awarded with a \$100 prize for one randomly drawn winner. First, a comprehension question on the Global Climate Scheme (GCS) checks whether respondents have understood the policy's cost. Second, a donation lottery where respondents choose what part of the prize they would donate to a reforestation NGO, should they win the lottery. Third, a question on the perception of the actual support for the GCS, which rewards a correct guess.

Survey structure. While Appendix B provides the full questionnaire, Figure 2 depicts the survey flow with all random branches. The various treatments are all independent and uniformly distributed. Whenever there is a treatment, the acceptance levels reported are computed on the control group. Appendix I runs placebo tests to check whether earlier treatments have an effect on unrelated outcomes.

After sociodemographic characteristics, the questionnaire starts with broad questions to grasp the prioritization and salience of global solidarity before the respondents can understand the survey's topic. First, open-ended fields on either their main concerns, wants, issues of interest, or perceived injustices. Second, a conjoint experiment where respondents have to select their preferred political program, or abstain. Both programs are random: each policy (or absence of policy) in five policy domains is taken at random from a pool of policies prominent in the country's public debate. Third, respondents are asked to allocate the revenue of a global wealth tax between five (national or global)

Figure 2: Survey flow.



spending items.

Then come attitudinal questions on the main policies studied: a *Climate Scheme* at the national, global, or international level; an international wealth tax funding low-income countries; and ten plausible global solidarity policies. These questions include treatments that vary the international coverage of policies or test for warm glow.

The last part of the questionnaire explores attitudes towards more radical global redistribution scenarios and include more sophisticated questions, such as an interactive task where respondents can choose their preferred custom redistribution of global incomes by manipulating sliders.

Finally, the survey concludes with a comprehension question, synthetic questions (e.g. on moral circle) and a feedback field.

Pre-registered hypotheses and data availability. The project is approved by the CIRED institutional review board (IRB-CIRED-2025-2) and was preregistered in the Open Science

Foundation registry (osf.io/7mzn4). The study did not deviate from the registration: the questionnaires and the hypotheses tests used are the ones specified *ex ante*. All data and code as well as figures of the paper are available on github.com/bixiou/robustness_global_redistr.

3 Salience and prioritization of global solidarity

In this Section, I analyze the salience of global solidarity in undirected open-ended fields; and the prioritization of global programs in a budget allocation task.

3.1 Top-of-mind considerations

At the beginning of the survey, respondents are randomly assigned one open-ended question among four: their main concerns, their needs or wishes, an issue important to them but neglected in public debate, or the greatest injustice of all. The questions are deliberately broad and vague to let respondents express their top-of-mind considerations without any priming.

To analyze the answers, I automatically translated each field into English.⁵ Then, I used AI and my own reading of a few hundreds answers to identify the most common concepts, from which I selected 27 categories. Then, I classified each answer into one or more of these categories, both manually (Figures S3-S6) and automatically using AI (Figure S2). Finally, I manually defined a list of 47 (conjunction of) keywords and used it to automatically classify all answers.⁶ I report occurrences of the 24 most common keyword matches in Figure S1.

The three different classification methods yield consistent results but differ in accuracy. While the keyword classification allows an exact and reproducible search, the automatic search is not bound to specific words and captures more matching responses. Overall, it seems that the manual classification provides the most accurate results, with a number of matches generally between the two other methods. For example, to the *injustice* question, 1.3% of answers match the keywords for *global inequality* and ChatGPT identifies this category in 8.5% of answers, *versus* 3.7% according to my manual coding.⁷

⁵I used onlinedoctranslator.com, which is powered by *Google Translate*.

⁶The list of keywords is given in Appendix TODO!

⁷The keyword matching searches the regular expression “global poverty—global inequality—hunger—drinking water—starv”, ignoring case. The automatic and manual classification is based on the class definition “Inequality at the international level / Hunger or poverty in poor countries”.

Indeed, the AI incorrectly classifies unspecific answers like “poverty” in this category,⁸ while the keyword search misses answers like “inequality among humans”. Given this observation, I use the manual classification as the benchmark and the two other methods as robustness checks.

While less accurate than the classifications, wordclouds (Figure 3) provide a simple visualization of the most common concepts in each question. By far, the most frequent *concerns* or *wishes* of respondents relate to their purchasing power, with concepts such as “money”, “inflation”, the “cost of living”, or “financial stability” mobilized in 30% of these fields. Within country, the share of people concerned with money decreases with income: it ranges from 21% in the top income decile to 36% in the bottom one. The next most frequent *concerns* are health (or the healthcare system), far right governments (or related concepts such as “Trump” or “trade tariffs”), and war (either in general or a specific one such as the Gaza war). Most *wishes* are personal, with the next frequent ones related to the health or peace of mind of oneself or one’s relatives. Interestingly, almost none of the responses mention relational considerations such as love, friendships, loneliness, intimate life, or the desire to have children (except for Saudi Arabia for the latter). Further research is needed to test whether the predominance of materialistic considerations stems from the context (an impersonal survey) or truly reflects people’s primary thoughts.

Asked about the greatest *injustice*, the most frequent answers relate to “inequality” or “poverty”, with 19% of occurrences (28% in Europe but only 9% in the U.S.). It is unclear whether these respondents think about inequality in their own country or at the global level, as only 13% of them mention a geographical scope. A hint is that 2% mention their own country *versus* 11% the global level (or Global South issues such as “clean water” or “starvation”), with Italians and Poles the most prone to mention the global level and Japanese the least. The next most common answers relate to “discrimination” (based on gender, race, or sexual orientation), “violence” or “wrongful convictions” (many respondents denounce unjustly sentenced innocents), or their country’s “welfare State” (with people either criticizing the lack of public services or excessive welfare for underserving people).

Asking people for “an issue important to them but neglected in the public debate” fails to uncover unusual topics. 20% of respondents are not able to find such an issue. Although “immigration” is the most frequent word according to the wordcloud, only 5%

⁸Interestingly, out of the 45 (one-word) answers “poverty”, ChatGPT-4.1 coded only 42 of them as *global inequality*, showing the lack of consistency of this classifier.

Figure 3: Most common concepts in open-ended fields. (Questions 19-21)

(a) "What are your main concerns these days?"



(c) "What according to you is the greatest injustice of all?"



(b) "What are your needs or wishes?"



(d) "Can you name an issue that is important to you but is neglected in the public debate?"



of respondents refer to this issue, which comes after “public services”, the “cost of living”, or the “environment”. That most topics mentioned are already highly publicized suggests that the public debate either reflects or shapes what people have in mind.

Reading and coding each field one by one took about 30 hours, but it was worth it: not only does it result in an arguably more accurate classification; it also helped me grasp

people's ways of thinking first hand. For example, most people reason from their own perspective (e.g. "my pension is too low", "I want to buy a house") and do not refer to the broader picture or to political reforms. To get a sense of people's own words, a random display of responses can be found on bit.ly/fields2025.

Interestingly, the topics vary significantly across countries. Here are my impressions of each country's slant. Compared to other countries, the concepts overrepresented in France are: insecurity, holidays or free time, the public deficit, equality, or gender equality; in Germany: old age poverty, immigration, the return of growth or the economic situation, free time, war (in Europe), and bureaucracy; in Italy: health, serenity or peace of mind, war, work stress and free time, world hunger, and feminicides; in Poland: war, inequality, holidays, honesty, and disabled people; in Spain: "health, money and love", housing, corruption, water access, global poverty, and squatters; in the UK: the cost of living, immigration, having a comfortable life, mental health, the holocaust, roads dangerous for driving, being unjustly imprisoned, and cut in winter fuel allowance; in Switzerland: equality, immigration, and gender equality; in Japan: the level of pensions, a cut on the consumption tax, the price of rice, the declining birth rate, childcare support, reducing the number of parliament members, foreigners' preferential treatment, excessive social assistance or the lack of reward for hard work, and stock prices; in Saudi Arabia: hobbies such as sports or soccer, the willingness to become millionaire (or billionaire), one's business project, buying a house, their car, that they are satisfied with their income, "self-injustice" or sin, raising children, Palestine, orphans' oppression, and travels; in the U.S.: the economy, Donald Trump, breaches to the Constitution, abortion, and gun control.

Our topic of interest, *global inequality*, does not emerge as an issue salient to most people. Indeed, most considerations relate to issues that directly affect oneself or one's family, and political considerations (regarding e.g. public services, pensions or taxes) are often framed at the national level. *Global redistribution* almost never appears as a *wish*. Furthermore, *global inequality* is rarely mentioned as a neglected *issue* or as a *concern*, contrary to international issues such as war, climate change, or the rise of the far right. However, it is mentioned as frequently as these other international issues in terms of *injustice*. To sum up, the low salience of global solidarity may explain why this topic fails to mobilize political forces despite it being referred to as a just cause and it being accepted by majorities (as shown below).

3.2 Prioritization of public spending items


[Fabre et al. \(2025\)](#) finds that 58% of US-Americans and 71% of Western Europeans would support a global tax on millionaires funding low-income countries (LICs), with only 26% and 14% opposing it; that around half of them would prefer to allocate half (rather than none) of the revenue from a global wealth tax to LICs; and that, on average, respondents prefer to allocate 33.4% of such revenue to LICs (*versus* domestic healthcare and education). In other words, while most people would prefer a globally redistributive tax to the status quo, the more leeway they are granted to allocate the revenue from such a tax, the less they would allocate to LICs. The greatest leeway tested by [Fabre et al. \(2025\)](#) let the respondents select their preferred share for LICs *versus* one alternative spending item, and the average preference was 33.4%, that is 67% of an equal split. Naturally, one expects respondents to split the revenue between all desirable spending items, so that the revenue allocated to one item depends on the number of items. Therefore, if LICs compete with not one but several national items, the share allocated to LICs is expected to diminish. If this share is less than 67% of the equal split, it would mean that ([Fabre et al. 2025](#)) overestimated the prioritization of LICs, e.g. or due to an excessive salience of LICs when only one alternative is proposed, or due to the domestic alternative –healthcare and education– not being the most desired. Conversely, if several items relate to a global issue, the total of “global spending” should increase. If global spending increases by less than the proportionate amount for the number of global items, it could mean that people view global items as a single entity, but that some domestic issues were missing from the binary version.

To test whether results from ([Fabre et al. 2025](#)) gave an accurate picture of the prioritization of global spending as well as to uncover the prioritization of different global causes, I conduct a revenue allocation task with five spending items. In each of the two variants of this task, respondents use sliders to allocate the revenue of a fictive global tax of wealth (in excess of \$5 million, at a rate of 2%), after being informed of the revenue the tax would collect in their country (from \$1 billion in Poland to \$514 in the U.S.) *versus* in all LICs combined (\$1 billion).

In the variant *Few*, one global item (“Education, Healthcare and Renewable energy in LICs”) competes with four domestic ones. In every country, the most prioritized item is “Domestic: Education and healthcare”, with an average preferred share of 26% (Figures [S24](#), [S25](#)). The global item is the least prioritized overall, at 17.5% (from 14% in Japan to 21% in Saudi Arabia and Spain). However, global spending is the second most pri-

oritized item in Europe (19%) and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, global spending is 31% higher than the expected 13.4% (that is 66.8% of 20%)⁹ and only 13% of the respondents do not allocate any revenue to it (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Preferred split of revenue of an international wealth tax. The first two items are from the variant *Few* with 5 fixed items (the *Global* one and the most preferred one are displayed); the last four items are from the variant *Many* with 5 items taken at random out of 13 (the 4 *Global* ones are displayed). (Questions 24-25)



In the variant *Many*, five items are selected at random among a pool of four global and nine domestic items. While domestic healthcare (27%) and education (23%) are the most prioritized items, global ones obtain an average ranging from 17% for “Forestation and biodiversity projects” to 19% for “Education and Healthcare in LICs” (Figures 4, S26-S27). On average, there are 1.5 global items and they are allocated 26.9% of the revenue, which again corresponds to 17.5% per global item. Interestingly, there is no significant correlation between the number of global items and the average allocation per global item.¹⁰

⁹If one restricts the comparison to the countries surveyed by (Fabre et al. 2025), the global item is allocated 17.8%, that is 34% more than expected. The most credible explanation for outperforming expectations is that the domestic item chosen by (Fabre et al. 2025) was the preferred one. Indeed, the global item is allocated 68% of the “Domestic: Healthcare and Education” share, almost exactly as expected.

¹⁰In Russia, the question could not be asked in the same way due to a different software. Instead, re-

In other words, the revenue allocation tasks validate and confirm the results from (Fabre et al. 2025). Most people would like to use a substantial share of the revenue from a global wealth tax to financing sustainable development in LICs, even though global spending is somewhat less prioritized than domestic spending.

4 Acceptance of international policies in function of country coverage

While acceptance of global climate or redistributive policies is widespread (Cappelen et al. 2025a; Fabre et al. 2025), acceptance may drop if policies are not truly *global* but only *international*, i.e. if key countries such as China, Russia or the U.S. do not participate. Indeed, people may be concerned by a domestic loss of competitiveness that could result from the expatriation of taxpayers to low-tax jurisdictions; or by an unfair burden-sharing if non-cooperating countries free-ride on decarbonization or funding sustainable development. In this Section, I uncover the acceptance of globally redistributive policies depending on the coalition of countries that would implement them. I study in turn a carbon price and a wealth tax.

4.1 International Climate Scheme

Presentation of the schemes. “Cap and dividend” is a reference climate policy, whereby fossil fuel companies at the source of emissions must buy emission permits on a carbon market, with the revenue from carbon pricing rebated equally to individuals. The limited and declining number of emission permits guarantees that emissions are capped according to the climate objective. As polluting companies pass the cost of emission permits down the value chain, the carbon price is ultimately paid by consumers, in proportion to their carbon footprint. Meanwhile, the equal cash transfer (or “dividend”) offsets price increases for the average consumer. Those with a carbon footprint higher than average financially lose and those with a lower carbon footprint (who are on average poorer) financially gain.

spondents had to choose what share of the global tax revenue to allocate to sustainable development in low-income countries. On average, Russians allocate 12.3% to LICs, with a median allocation of just 5%, but with only 12% allocating nothing to LICs.

Using simple Yes/No questions, I test the acceptance of three types of “cap and dividend” (or “Climate Scheme”) policies, that differ by the geographical scope: the National, Global, and International Climate Schemes (Figures 6, S29). While average consumers in a high-income country are financially unaffected by the National Climate Scheme (NCS), they lose out in the Global and International versions, since their carbon footprint is larger than the world (or climate coalition) average.

The National Climate Scheme (NCS) is accepted by 66% of respondents (ranging from 56% in Poland to 88% in Saudi Arabia).

The Global Climate Scheme. Before presenting the Global Climate Scheme (GCS), respondents are prompted to be attentive with the incentive that they may win a \$100 lottery prize if they correctly answer a comprehension question at the end of the survey. When presented the Global Climate Scheme (GCS), respondents are informed that the cash transfer would lift 600 million people out of extreme poverty, and the cost to them is made salient. Respondents are informed of the amount of the cash transfer, as well as the price increases and the net cost to the average person in their country (e.g. 2% price increases and a net cost of \$90 per month in the U.S., or 2% and €45 per month in Germany).¹¹ The GCS is accepted by 57% of respondents (from 48% in Russia to 85% in Saudi Arabia). The salience of costs in the GCS question may explain the somewhat lower support for the GCS compared to the NCS.¹²

Pluralistic ignorance. After the support for the GCS, respondents are asked in an incentivized way about their belief concerning the actual support, either in their country or in the U.S. (Figure S29)¹³ In every country, for any variant of the question, actual support is underestimated. On average, the support in one’s own country is underestimated by 14 p.p. and the support in the U.S. by 18 p.p. In Japan and in European countries, the

¹¹The computations use a carbon price of \$95/tCO₂. For Russia, Saudi Arabia, and the U.S., computations assume universal country coverage and the cash transfer is \$35 per month. For Europe and Japan, the net loss is computed in a non-universal but *High* participation scenario, which implies a lower cash transfer (€20 per month) and a higher net cost (by about \$10 per month) since the coalition’s average carbon footprint is lower than the world average.


¹²Support for the GCS is also around 10 p.p. lower than in (Fabre et al. 2025). There may be different reasons for that: attitudes may have changed in the two years interval; I added the information on the price increases, which allows respondents to make an estimate of the cost to them (rather than to their average fellow citizen).

¹³US-Americans are asked about either their country or the EU. In Russia, I was not allowed to enquire about beliefs in a foreign country.

underestimation is more severe, in the sense that most people wrongly believe that the GCS does not garner majority support in their country. Such pluralistic ignorance might explain why politicians do not dare proposing global climate justice policies.

International Climate Scheme. To test how country coverage influences the support for the International Climate Scheme (ICS), respondents are randomly assigned to one of four variants. Respondents can visualize the country coverage on a map (see examples in Figure 5), where their own country is stripped to denote its potential participation. They are also informed of the number of countries that would participate in the assigned scenario, their share of world emissions, and the list of these countries or world regions.

Figure 5: Example maps of the International Climate Scheme question. (Question 35).




The *Mid* scenario covers 56% of world emissions, with the participation of China and Global South countries. The *Low* replaces China by the EU and covers 33% of emissions. The *High scenario* adds various high-income countries to the *Mid* scenario, including the EU, Japan, Canada, and South Korea; covering 72% of emissions. The last variant, *High color*, combines the *High* participation scenario with a colored map that displays not only the country coverage, but also the net gain or cost for each country, with China appearing as neither gaining nor losing from the policy.¹⁴

As expected, the wider the coverage, the higher the support. However, this effect is relatively small, as the support is only 4 p.p. higher in the *High* compared to the *Low* variant. Interestingly, among Europeans, the support significantly increases when China is added to coalition, but not significantly more when other HICs are also added. Conversely, for US-Americans and Japanese, the participation of the EU or China yield similar

¹⁴In a standard cap and dividend, China should be losing, as its carbon footprint is larger than the world average. However, the Global Climate Scheme slightly departs from the standard policy so that middle-income countries do not lose out (Fabre 2025).

Figure 6: Support for the National, Global, and International Climate Schemes (Yes/No question). (Questions 26-35).



levels of support, and only the combined participation of China, the EU, and other HICs significantly increase the support.

The support is 6.5 p.p. lower in the *High color* compared to the *High* variant. Three reasons may explain this effect. First, some respondents may be concerned by the information (made explicit in the question) that China would neither gain nor lose from the policy. Second, with the colored map, respondents learn how their own country fares compared to other countries. Actually, the effect is 1 p.p. and no longer significant for countries that appear to lose less than 0.5% of their GDP (Spain and Switzerland). Third, the cost may be more salient with the colored map. Interestingly, the support for the GCS is 5 p.p. lower for the 74% of respondents who understand that it would result in increased gasoline prices (after controlling for sociodemographics), but this effect is only 2 p.p. and no longer significant for the *High color* ICS, indicating that the information provided by the map mostly affects those who had not yet understood the policy's consequences.

Notice that the support for the ICS's *Low* coverage is similar to that for the NCS. This suggests that the average respondent is willing to pay the ICS's higher cost for the guarantee of poverty alleviation and decarbonization in the Global South. Finally, the greater support for the ICS compared to the GCS is somewhat puzzling. Perhaps, people view the proposal as more credible when a list of countries is provided, compared to the GCS

that is framed as if all countries might join (or on the contrary, in which the participation of any country is uncertain). Relatedly, support may be stronger for more precise or more visual proposals, either because they are viewed as more advanced or because they induce an experimenter demand bias. The greater support could also be due to costs being less salient in the ICS question (but the support is still greater than in the GCS in the *High color* variant, where costs are visible). Unfortunately, the data does not allow testing these different hypotheses.

4.2 Wealth tax funding LICs

I test the effect of country coverage on the support for an internationally redistributive wealth tax using a simple Yes/No question with three random variants. The policy is described as a 2% tax on wealth above \$1 million, with 30% of its revenue financing public services in LICs. In the *Global* variant, all other countries (i.e. all countries except the respondent's one) are assumed to participate. The *HIC* variant covers all other HICs. The *International* variant covers some countries and not others, with the precise coverage varying by respondent's country but always including Brazil and European countries (or the whole EU) and excluding China and the U.S.¹⁵

Here again, the support increases with the country coverage, but the effect is small. The middle-ground *HIC* variant garners 70% support (from 58% in Switzerland to 81% in Saudi Arabia). Compared to *HIC*, the support is 5 p.p. higher in the *Global* coverage, while it is only 1.5 p.p. and non-significantly lower in the *International* coverage (Figure 7).


Overall, the results indicate that the support for internationally redistributive policies is quite robust to country coverage. This suggests that the issues of competitiveness or free-riding issues are not decisive in public support.

5 Sincerity of support for global redistribution

Skeptics about the public's support for global redistribution would argue that the support is not reflected in real-stake decisions and that it mostly results from *warm glow*. Ac-

¹⁵More precisely, in the U.S., excluded countries differ and are China, Japan, and Canada. As for included countries, on top of Brazil, they are: the EU and the UK for Switzerland, Saudi Arabia, and the U.S.; the EU for Russia and the UK; and France, Germany, Spain, and the UK (except one's own country) for EU countries.

Figure 7: Support for an international wealth tax with 30% of revenue funding LICs, depending on the country coverage (Yes/No question). (Questions 41-43).



cording to the *warm glow* hypothesis, many people would express their support to enjoy moral comfort as long as public support seems harmless since the policy appears out of reach, but support would vanish if (i) the prospect of implementation materialized or if (ii) moral comfort could be obtained from a substitute. In this Section, I test whether global redistribution is a vote-determining issue using a conjoint analysis, and I test both forms of *warm glow* (i and ii) using two other survey experiments.

5.1 Conjoint analysis

I run a conjoint experiment in all countries except Russia and Saudi Arabia. This question is positioned at the beginning of the survey, before respondents can know the survey's topic. Respondents are presented with two random political programs, framed as the fictive programs of the top candidates in the next election, and asked which of the candidate they would vote for (27% of the respondents choose the outside option *Neither of them*). Each program contains a policy or an absence of policy chosen at random for each of five policy domains (the order of which is also randomized). Our domain of interest is *Foreign policy*, whose pool contains three policies: *Cut development aid*, *International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries*, and a country-specific policy. I included both a *pro-* and an *anti-global redistribution* policy to capture a potential status quo bias, or on the contrary, a bias in favor of (any) reform.


Except for these two policies of interest, the policies have been selected from the programs of the main candidates in the country's last election, so as to span the entire political spectrum and cover the most prominent proposals in the country's public debate.

Figure 8 shows the effect of our policies of interest's presence in a program on the likelihood that it is preferred (see Figures S9-S22 for full results country-by-country¹⁶). More specifically, Figure 8 presents the results of the following regression estimated by simple OLS, with standard errors clustered by respondent:

$$\text{Preferred}_{pi} = \beta_1 \text{Cut_aid}_{pi} + \beta_2 \text{Intl_tax}_{pi} + \beta_3 \text{Foreign3}_{pi} + \varepsilon_{pi}$$

where pi denotes either program p faced by respondent i , and each variable is a dummy.

Figure 8: Effect on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy (compared to no foreign policy in the program). (See Figure S8 for effects by vote). (Question 23)



Both policies significantly affects the program choice: the internationally redistributive millionaire tax increases by 4 p.p. the likelihood that a program is preferred, while

¹⁶With some exceptions, raising the minimum wage is among the most popular policies, together with redistributive taxes or transfers, anti-immigration regulations, and abortion rights. Conversely, a ban on new combustion-engine cars is among the least popular ones.

cutting development aid decreases it by 4 p.p. On a single country, the effects are generally non-significant due to lack of power, but when significant, they are of the same sign as the global effect, except for *Cut aid* in Switzerland. Overall, the effects are of comparable size to the effects of other policies, suggesting that global redistribution issues may be as vote-determining as policies prominent in the national debate.

One concern with this type of conjoint analysis is that they involve unrealistic political programs, namely programs that contain both left and far right policies, which distorts the real choice that voters may face. [de la Cuesta et al. \(2022\)](#) showed that to fully address this issue, one should weigh each pair of programs by the probability that such a pair would be proposed in a real election. As such probability cannot be computed, the best practice is to bound the effects by estimating them with extreme probabilities. The results just presented are based one extreme, the uniform distribution. To construct the other extreme, I classify each policy as left, center, or right, and assume that a program is consistent if it does not contain policies from both the left and the right. I then re-estimate the regression after dropping all pairs an inconsistent program (effectively assigning a probability of zero to them). I first classify our policies of interest as *center* (considering them as consistent with any program), in which case 59% of observations are retained, and effects are preserved. This indicates that our results are robust to the critique of [de la Cuesta et al. \(2022\)](#). Interestingly, the effects differ when I classify our policies of interest as *left* (for the tax) and *right* (for cutting aid), in which case only 39% of observations are retained. In that case, the effect of the millionaire tax is preserved, but the effect of cutting aid vanishes to 0 p.p. In other words, the effect of cutting aid disappears when removing left-leaning programs where it is present, while the effect of the tax remains the same when removing right-leaning programs where it is present. Therefore, cutting aid is harmful only for left-leaning programs, while a wealth tax is helpful for any program. Interestingly, this does *not* mean that only left-wing voters oppose cutting aid while an international wealth tax would be vote-determining for right-wing voters. Indeed, the results by vote show that the tax has a negative (though non-significant) effect among right and far right voters, while cutting aid has a significant effect of -2.5 p.p. on *Center-right* or *Right* voters (Figure S8),

5.2 Testing warm glow


Some people might claim they support a policy of global redistribution just to ease their conscience. If support were mainly due to such a psychological mechanism, called

warm glow, it might dissipate when the prospect of the policy materializes or if the policy can be replaced by a substitute with the same moral appeal.


Moral substitute. Following Nunes and Schokkaert (2003), warm glow would be revealed if support for the GCS were reduced after respondents are offered the possibility to express generosity towards the cause of climate change. To test this hypothesis, right before the GCS page, I assign a random subset of the respondents to a donation lottery, while the control group faces no question.¹⁷ In the *Donation* branch, respondents have to decide how much they would donate to the reforestation NGO *Just One Tree*, should they win the question's \$100 lottery. A lower support of the GCS in the treated group would be evidence of warm glow, as it would indicate that the support (at least partially) derives from a moral satisfaction at having recently supported a just cause.

Figure 9: Testing warm glow (negative effects would indicate the presence of warm glow).

(a) Effect of a *Donation lottery* treatment on support for the Global Climate Scheme. (Questions 27-28)



(b) Effect of information about ongoing global redistribution initiatives on the share of plausible global policies supported. (Questions 36-38)



On the contrary, support for the GCS is 3.5 p.p. higher in the *Donation* branch compared to the control group, and the coefficient is positive in every country, though often

¹⁷More precisely, right before the GCS question, the sample is split into three branches: the *Donation* lottery, the NCS question, and the control group. The NCS treatment is excluded from this analysis as it is unrelated to this experiment (it was created to prevent the NCS question from influencing answers on the GCS).

not significant (Figure 9a). While it remains unclear why the effect is positive,¹⁸ the results show no evidence of warm glow.

Realism treatment. To test whether some people express support for global redistribution only for as long as its implementation seems unlikely, I randomly treat half of respondents with information about ongoing negotiations on globally redistributive policies. Among other things, treated respondents are informed that the International Maritime Organization recently adopted a levy on maritime carbon emissions that should partly finance LICs; that the G20 considered the introduction of a global tax on billionaires; that the UN General Assembly recently agreed on the principle of expanding the UN Security Council to new members; and that the UN Secretary General supports reforms to the financial system that would drive resources towards sustainable development. Then, respondents are asked “how likely [it is] that international policies involving significant transfers from HICs to LICs will be introduced in the next 15 years”, right before testing their support for ten plausible global policies, described in Section 6.1. Here, warm glow would be revealed if the information treatment increased the belief that global redistribution is likely but decreased the support for global policies.

Informed respondents are 8 p.p. more likely to believe that global redistribution is likely (with only 35% believing so in the control group, cf. Table 1). With an F-Statistic of 72, this highly significant effect makes for a strong first stage in an instrumental variable (IV) strategy to estimate the effect of believing that global redistribution is likely on the share of global policies supported. As shown in Table 1, the Local Average Treatment Effect estimated by IV is 18 p.p., indicating that believing that global redistribution is likely causally *increases* the share policies supported. This effect is consistent with the non-causal effect estimated by OLS at 15 p.p., and with the direct effect of the treatment on the share of policies supported, estimated at 1 p.p. with a *p*-value of 0.06 (Figure 9b).

Again, the effects go in the opposition direction to warm glow. In this case, increased support may stem from enhanced credibility of policies that are known to be discussed in international organizations. Overall, the results of these two experiments provide no evidence that support for global redistribution is affected by warm glow. On the contrary, they suggest that support is sincere and robust to the prospect of implementation or to the possibility of a moral substitute.

¹⁸Perhaps the *Donation* question triggers thoughts favorable to the GCS, such as the realization that individual actions like donations are ill-suited to address climate change so that we need a global policy, even if imperfect.

Table 1: Effect on support for global redistribution of believing that it is likely.

	Believes global redistr. likely IV 1st Stage (1)	Share of plausible global policies supported IV 2nd Stage (2)	OLS (3)	Direct Effect (4)
Information treatment	0.078*** (0.009)			0.011* (0.006)
Believes global redistribution likely		0.139* (0.080)	0.150*** (0.006)	
(Intercept)	0.331*** (0.006)	0.457*** (0.030)	0.453*** (0.004)	0.503*** (0.004)
Effective F-statistic	65.61			
Observations	12,007	12,007	12,007	12,007
R ²	0.006	0.043	0.043	0.0002

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

6 Breadth of international policies accepted

Knowing that some internationally redistributive policies are sincerely supported and may be vote-determining, I now study the breadth of international policies that may be accepted. In this Section, I analyze in turn the support for global policies currently debated in the international community, for more radical proposals, broader willingness to defend global solidarity, the preferred channels to transfer resources to LICs, and a custom redistribution task that aims to reveal the preferred extent of international transfers.

6.1 Support for currently debated global policies

Plausible global policies. Figure 10 reveals the relative support for plausible global policies, i.e. the share of *Somewhat* or *Strong support* among non-*Indifferent* answers. Almost each policy garners relative majority support in each country. The only exceptions is the support of Japanese for a globally redistributive tax on carbon emissions from aviation, at 46%. This proposal is the one with the most salient cost, which a 30% increase in the price of flights; it is the least support in every country except for Russia. The most supported policies, with above 70% of relative support in every country, are the 2% minimum tax on billionaires' wealth proposed by Zucman (2024) and the expansion of low-interest

rates sustainable investments in LICs ([Bridgetown Initiative 2025](#)).

Figure 10: Relative support for plausible global redistribution policies (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*Indifferent* responses). (Question 38).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Minimum tax of 2% on billionaires' wealth, in voluntary countries	81	84	87	83	89	79	81	85	77	81	80	86	77
Bridgetown initiative: MDBs expanding sustainable investments in LICs, and at lower interest rates	79	82	81	81	88	72	81	85	75	81	83	87	74
L&D: Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with climate Loss and damage	75	75	72	73	84	72	77	72	67	73	87	89	70
International levy on shipping carbon emissions, returned to countries based on population	70	73	78	70	78	61	74	75	72	59	73	81	67
At least 0.7% of developed countries' GDP in foreign aid	70	69	66	67	79	59	77	65	64	62	83	86	67
Debt relief for vulnerable countries, suspending payments until they are more able to repay	70	70	64	60	81	79	72	72	65	68	75	88	67
Expand Security Council to new permanent members (e.g. India, Brazil, African Union), restrict veto use	69	76	72	76	80	73	76	78	72	68	53	84	67
NCQG: Developing countries providing \$300 bn a year in climate finance for developing countries	68	69	68	69	76	63	73	67	65	59	88	86	61
Raise global minimum tax on profit from 15% to 35%, allocating revenues to countries based on sales	68	75	75	74	85	66	70	74	63	72	50	77	66
International levy on aviation carbon emissions, raising prices by 30%, returned to countries based on population	53	55	62	54	56	53	54	54	51	46	51	70	51

On average, respondents support 51% of the plausible policies and oppose 20% of them, meaning that they support +31 p.p. more policies than they oppose. The most supportive countries, in terms of this average mean difference between support and opposition, are Saudi Arabia (+50 p.p.), Italy (+49) and Spain (+39) while the least supportive are Japan (+20), Switzerland (+24), Poland and the U.S. (+25). We may wonder why the countries leading in support are the Saudi kingdom and right-wing-dominated Italy. Decomposing the support by political leaning and other selected sociodemographics, Figures S64 and S65 shed some light on this question. In Saudi Arabia, half of the adult population is immigrant. However, foreign workers do not drive the results, as Saudi citizens have indistinguishable attitudes from non-Saudis.¹⁹ As for Italy is both the country with the lowest gap in support between left-wing and far right voters (together with Japan, at 33 p.p.), and the highest support among left-wing voters.²⁰

¹⁹Therefore, temptative explanations may rather come from the Saudi society: while Saudis benefit from a generous welfare State, the Islamic principle of *Zakat* (almsgiving) might further foster a culture of generosity.

²⁰While the former point may be linked to the vision of Italy's far right leader of an Africa-Italy partnership (trading off foreign aid with cooperation on fighting immigration), the Italian population might also be influenced by messages in favor of global solidarity from the Vatican.

Climate finance goal. Climate finance is the financing of climate action from developed countries in developing countries. In 2024, countries agreed on a “New Collective Quantified Goal” (NCQG) of climate finance at \$300 billion per year by 2035, tripling the previous goal. However, while developing countries such as India called for \$600 billion in grants (or grant-equivalent funding), the NCQG does not specify which share should be provided as grants, and the current goal is currently met with only \$26 billion in grants (OECD 2024) (and the rest in loans).

I test the preferred amount for the NCQG using two random variants. Both variants inform respondents of the current situation and agreed goal, and express amounts both in absolute terms and in proportion of developed countries’ GDP. The *Short* variant uses qualitative, textual answers, with a middle-point at \$100 billion (namely, “Meet the newly agreed goal by tripling grants and loans (\$100 billion in grants, or 0.15% of GDP.”). The *Long* variant provides more detailed explanations in the question text and then uses numerical answers, with a middle-point at \$300 billion.

In both variants, the median preferred NCQG is \$100 billion, and 19% of respondents choose an amount of \$600 billion or larger. That differently framed variants yield consistent results suggests that the question was well understood, despite its length. The median choice of a climate finance quantum in line with the internationally agreed NCQG may be interpreted in two distinct ways. Either diplomats of HICs currently defend the median generosity of their people, or respondents’ attitudes are anchored in existing agreements (or in their governments’ stance). The results presented below are more in line with the latter interpretation, as they reveal majority acceptance for much larger international transfers.

6.2 Support for radical proposals, political action, and broad values

In the last part of the questionnaire, I ask diverse questions to understand the range of policies, actions or values that people may accept regarding global solidarity (Figure 11).

Sustainable future vs. status quo. Respondents are asked which scenario they would prefer for the next twenty years: a sustainable future or the status quo (note that scenarios were not called that way in the questionnaire, and instead randomly named *A* or *B*). In the sustainable scenario, most countries cooperate to tax millionaires and meet the +2°C target, through an electrification of cars and the doubling of prices of heating fuel or gas, air travel, and beef. Although overall purchasing power is preserved (through a

reduction in sales tax), people change their habits (e.g. flying and eating meat is cut by half). In the status quo, no policy is implemented, people maintain their lifestyles, and global warming reaches +3°C by 2100, causing more severe disasters.

Overall, 68% prefers the sustainable future over the status quo.

Global income redistribution. I test the support for a global tax on top incomes to finance poverty reduction in LICs, with the tax targeting either the global top 1% or top 3%, depending on a random assignment. While the top 1% variant describes an additional 15% tax on income in excess of \$120,000 per year (at Purchasing Power Parity), the top 3% one features additional rates of 15%, 30%, and 45% above \$80,000, \$120,000, and \$1 million, respectively. Each tax is calibrated to finance the poverty gap, with poverty defined using a threshold of \$250 per month in the top 1% variant and \$400 per month in the top 3% one. These taxes entail international transfer of 2% and 5% of the world GDP, respectively. Using two numerical examples, the question explains to the respondents how the tax would affect taxpayers' income. It also states the share of affected taxpayers in the world and in their country, as well as the share of their country's GDP that would be transferred. For example, in the U.S., the top 1% tax would affect the top 8% and transfer 3% of GDP, while the top 3% tax would affect the top 18% and transfer 8% of GDP. These figures are about half as low in Japan and Germany, and about four times lower in France and Spain.

Overall, 56% (resp. 50%) of the respondents support the top 1% (resp. top 3%) tax, and 25% (resp. 28%) oppose it. There relative majority support for the policy in every case except for Switzerland for the top 3% tax (in which 18% case of Swiss people would be affected).

Global convergence. A simple question captures the acceptance for global solidarity: "Should governments actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century?" Overall, 61% answer *Yes* and 25% *No*, with the lowest relative agreement (i.e. excluding people not responding) in the U.S., at 56%.

Willingness to act. Two questions ask the respondents how they would react to a "world-wide movement in favor of a global program to tackle climate change, implement taxes on millionaires and fund poverty reduction in [LICs]".

In a multiple choice question (that was censored in Russia), 29% state they could be

involved the movement by either attending a demonstration (19%), going on strike (7%) or donating \$100 to a strike fund (10%), and this share rises to 68% once counting the 52% of the respondents who “could sign a petition and spread ideas” for the movement (Figure S42). Taken at face value, these results would mean that a successful global solidarity movement could collect up to \$10 billion and gather demonstrations among the largest in history, matching Earth Day mobilizations.²¹

Asked whether they would be more or less likely to vote for the political party they feel closest to if it were part of such a movement, 36% of the respondents state they would be more likely *versus* 17% less likely (Figure S43). Among the 5% of respondents who did not vote in the last election and feel closest to a left-wing party, the share more likely to vote in that case increases to 46% (*versus* 10% who are less likely).

Reasons for helping LICs. In a multiple choice question, I ask respondents which reasons for HICs supporting LICs they agree with, among arguments involving *duty*, *long-term interest*, or *historical responsibility*. With 54%, the reason most chosen in every country (except for France) is *duty*, namely “Helping countries in need is the right thing to do” (Figure S44). Besides, 38% select *interest* and 24% *responsibility*, with only 17% disagreeing with every reason.

Reparations. In former colonial or slave States,²² I ask respondents whether they would support “reparations for colonization and slavery to former colonies and descendants of slaves”, specifying the reparations “could take the form of funding education and facilitating technology transfers”. Consistently with the general disagreement that HICs have a *historical responsibility* to support LICs, only a minority of 35% of respondents support reparations (except in Italy where 56% do), while 42% oppose them. This suggests that framing global solidarity as a decolonial struggle might be counterproductive.

Agreement that own taxes should solve global problems. Overall, 41% agree and 28% disagree that “[Their] taxes should go towards solving global problem”. With 59% relative agreement, there is a relative majority in favor of one’s own taxes financing global solidarity, though a lower one than for specific proposals that would make the richest

²¹On April 22, 1970, 20 million US-Americans (10% of the population) demonstrated for the environment. Since then, Earth Day events regularly mobilize hundreds of million people worldwide.

²²I did not ask this question in Japan or Russia, because these countries’ historiography do not present their past as colonial but as a larger “empire”.


contribute.²³ As explained in Section 2 and shown in Appendix F, the present results replicate well the “Global Solidarity Report” that first asked this question (Global Nation 2023)

Figure 11: Support for broad action or radical proposals of global redistribution. (Questions 44-46, 49-51, 53, 61).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Supports tax on world top 1% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax on income over [\$120k/year in PPP])	70	72	72	72	84	69	74	67	61	69	75	81	62
Supports tax on world top 3% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax over [\$80k], 30% over [\$120k], 45% over [\$1M])	64	65	70	63	70	70	66	67	41	55	75	82	58
Prefers sustainable future	68	70	72	70	76	57	74	68	67	76	69	71	62
“Governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century”	72	77	77	75	87	84	84	66	66	70	77	92	56
Would support a global movement to tackle CC, tax millionaires, and fund LICs (either petition, demonstrate, strike, or donate)	68	72	70	69	82	71	74	68	64	56	NA	73	67
More likely to vote for party if part of worldwide coalition for climate action and global redistribution	68	72	71	71	82	64	77	69	57	56	NA	NA	67
Supports reparations for colonization and slavery in the form of funding education and technology transfers	46	50	44	44	69	NA	51	46	NA	NA	NA	NA	40
“My taxes should go towards solving global problems”	60	61	43	62	76	62	71	58	53	58	57	88	55
“My taxes ... global problems” (Global Nation, 2023)	56	59	43	65	76	58	60	52	NA	76	NA	NA	44

Moral circle. Asked “Which group of people do you advocate for when you vote?”²⁴ 46% choose a universalist answer (“Humans” or “Sentient beings (humans and animals)”), which is more than the most common answer, that refers to one’s fellow citizens (33%). Universalists are fewer in Japan (30%) and the U.S. (43%) but they represent a majority in Europe (50%), Russia and Saudi Arabia (57%), as shown in Figures 12 and S54. Of people who lean on the left, 59% are universalists, compared to 32% on the right or far right.

Figure 12: “Which group of people do you advocate for when you vote?”²⁴ (Question 62).



²³This confirms that the willingness to pay for global solidarity, even through taxes, does not equate to support for global redistribution proposals.

²⁴In Russia and Saudi Arabia, the question was asked differently. It read: “Which group do you advocate for? For example, if you were the richest person on Earth, which group would you predominantly help with your money?”

6.3 Preferred channels to transfer resources to LICs

Asked to evaluate the ways to transfer resources to reduce poverty in LICs on a 4-Likert scale, the most preferred option in every country is “Cash transfers to parents (child allowances), to the disabled and to the elderly”, with 14% selecting it as the *Best way* overall, and 46% as a *Right or Best way* (Figures 13, S39-S40). “Unconditional transfers to the national government” is the only option seen as a *Wrong way* by the majority, but this share falls from 54% down to 22% (and becomes the third most supported option out of seven) when “transfers to the national government [are] conditioned on the use of funds for poverty reduction programs”. Interestingly, “Unconditional cash transfers to each household” are controversial, as they are the second most chosen *Best way* but 36% view them as a *Wrong way*. Conversely, “Transfers to public development aid agencies which then finance suitable projects” is uncontroversial, as only 15% find it a *Wrong way* versus 40% a *Right or Best way*.

Figure 13: “How do you evaluate each of these channels to transfer resources to reduce poverty in LICs?”

Percentage of *Right or Best way* (other options: *Wrong or Acceptable way*). (Question 48).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Targeted cash transfers (child allowances, disability & elderly pensions)	49	48	43	46	57	45	54	44	47	36	65	73	45
Development aid agencies	37	42	42	47	39	32	44	43	44	36	23	57	37
Government, conditional on financing poverty reduction	37	40	39	43	48	33	41	37	35	27	34	62	35
Unconditional cash transfers to each household	34	30	31	27	31	30	34	27	32	24	54	62	31
Local NGOs with democratic processes	29	33	39	33	34	33	33	29	32	22	17	53	29
Local authorities	22	23	25	22	22	30	23	19	19	18	20	47	22
Government, unconditional	18	18	21	14	18	22	21	16	14	14	19	50	18

6.4 Custom global income redistribution

The last task of the questionnaire allowed respondents to play with the shape of the global income distribution. The question text includes the following instructions:

“Below you will find a graph of the world distribution of after-tax income and three sliders that vary it. The current distribution is in red, and your custom

one is in green. The first two sliders control the proportion of winners and the proportion of losers, among all humans. The third slider controls the degree of redistribution from the richest to the poorest. If you do not want new policies to reduce global inequality, you can set the third slider to zero.”

The interactive question is available on bit.ly/custom_redistr and the algorithm to translate sliders’ positions into a redistribution is described in Appendix E. Figure 14 displays what respondents see below the instructions, including the interactive graph and a table summarizing how their custom redistribution would affect five example income levels (including their own, asked right before). To dampen a potential anchoring at sliders’ initial positions,²⁵ the sliders have two random initial positions: either 60% of winners, 20% of losers, and a degree of redistribution of 2 out of 10 (as in Figure 14); or 40%, 10%, and 7/10, respectively. As the task is difficult to understand (and not so handy on phone screens), respondents are instructed that they can skip it.

Overall, 56% are satisfied with their custom redistribution and 43% skip it. While the non-response rate may seem high, it is relatively spread out over the population. Indeed, the share of satisfied respondents is 52% for non-voters, 54% for center-right or right-wing voters, 57% for far right voters and 61% for left-wing voters; while it ranges from 49% for people without a high-school diploma to 57% for those with a post-secondary diploma. The limited heterogeneity in response rates across crucial sociodemographics suggests that the task enabled motivated respondents to make an informed choice regarding their preferred redistribution with little sacrifice in terms of sample representativeness.

Figure S46 shows the median preferred redistribution among satisfied respondents, i.e. the curve obtained by setting the sliders at their median preferred values: 49% of winners, 18% of losers, and a degree of redistribution of 5/10, resulting in a transfer from rich-to-poor at 5.4% of world income and in a minimum income of \$287 per month. Interestingly, 48% choose to lose from their custom redistribution while only 9% choose to win, the median satisfied respondent choosing parameters such that they neither win nor lose. Besides, 10% of satisfied respondents choose the status quo, preserving the current income distribution. Finally, Figure S47 presents the average preferred redistribution among conforming respondents (i.e. the curve obtained by pointwise-averaging custom

²⁵To test for anchoring, I regress responses on the sliders’ initial position. The anchoring effect, defined as the effect size relative to the difference between the two variants’ initial positions, is always significant, at 40% for the share of winners, 55% for the share of losers, and 42% for the degree of redistribution. While anchoring plays a role, the responses converge to a middle point between the two anchors, indicating that the anchors themselves may have been defined by the surveyor (myself) drifting away (in opposite directions) from a shared preference.

Figure 14: Custom global redistribution: screenshot of the bottom of the page. (Question 55).

Examples of income changes after your proposed redistribution:


Now	After
0 \$/year	2 215 \$/year
10 000 \$/year	10 115 \$/year
60 000 \$/year	55 793 \$/year
100 000 \$/year	90 965 \$/year
Your <i>individual</i> income	
40 000 \$/year	38 206 \$/year

Proportion of winners: 60%

Proportion of losers: 20%

Degree of redistribution: 2

— Income after global redistribution — Current income (\$/year)



jChartFX

I am satisfied with my custom redistribution.

I want to skip this question.

curves). The average preferred redistribution transfers 5.4% of world income from the top 27% to the bottom 73%, and entails a minimum income of \$247 per month. As shown

in Figure S62, at the top of the distribution, the average preferred redistribution can be obtained from a 7% marginal income tax rate above \$25,000 and a 16% rate above \$40,000 per year (at Purchasing Power Parity).

[Fabre \(2022\)](#) applied the same method to uncover French preferences regarding national income redistribution, and tested the support for the median and average preferred redistributions on a separate sample. Excluding the 22% to 24% of people not responding, the 51% supported the average redistribution and 67% the median one.²⁶ While one cannot be sure that these results would replicate in the context of a global redistribution, they suggest that the average or median redistributions described above might be accepted by a majority.

7 Conclusion

Methods

Acknowledgements

bla

²⁶[Fabre \(2022\)](#) also tested a redistribution obtained from median parameters and a 5% lower GDP to account for adverse behavioral responses: it was supported by 62% of French respondents.

Bibliography

Alexander W. Cappelen, Morten Støstad, and Bertil Tungodden. Majority in 40 Countries Support Unprecedented Coordinated Billionaire Tax Discussed by G20. 2025a. [3](#), [4](#), [10](#), [18](#), [118](#)

Farsan Ghassim and Markus Pauli. Who on Earth Wants a World Government, What Kind, and Why? An International Survey Experiment. *International Studies Quarterly*, 68(3):sqae105, September 2024. ISSN 0020-8833. doi: 10.1093/isq/sqae105. URL [Link](#). [3](#)

Antoine Dechezleprêtre, Adrien Fabre, Tobias Kruse, Blueberry Planterose, Ana Sanchez Chico, and Stefanie Stantcheva. Fighting Climate Change: International Attitudes toward Climate Policies. *American Economic Review*, 115(4):1258–1300, April 2025. ISSN 0002-8282. doi: 10.1257/aer.20230501. URL [Link](#). [3](#)

Adrien Fabre, Thomas Douenne, and Linus Mattauch. Majority support for global redistributive and climate policies. *Nature Human Behaviour*, pages 1–12, June 2025. ISSN 2397-3374. doi: 10.1038/s41562-025-02175-9. URL [Link](#). [3](#), [4](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#)

Abel Gustafson, Seth A. Rosenthal, Matthew T. Ballew, Matthew H. Goldberg, Parrish Bergquist, John E. Kotcher, Edward W. Maibach, and Anthony Leiserowitz. The development of partisan polarization over the Green New Deal. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(12): 940–944, December 2019. ISSN 1758-6798. doi: 10.1038/s41558-019-0621-7. URL [Link](#). [4](#)

Peter Andre, Teodora Boneva, Felix Chopra, and Armin Falk. Misperceived Social Norms and Willingness to Act Against Climate Change. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 1–46, June 2024a. ISSN 0034-6535. doi: 10.1162/rest_a_01468. URL [Link](#). [4](#)

Peter Andre, Teodora Boneva, Felix Chopra, and Armin Falk. Globally representative evidence on the actual and perceived support for climate action. *Nature Climate Change*, pages 1–7, February 2024b. ISSN 1758-6798. doi: 10.1038/s41558-024-01925-3. URL [Link](#). [4](#)

Gabriel Zucman. A blueprint for a coordinated minimum effective taxation standard for ultra-high-net-worth individuals. 2024. URL [Link](#). [4](#), [28](#)

Benjamin Enke. Moral Values and Voting. *Journal of Political Economy*, page 51, 2020. [7](#)

Alexander W. Cappelen, Benjamin Enke, and Bertil Tungodden. Universalism: Global Evidence. *American Economic Review*, 115(1):43–76, January 2025b. ISSN 0002-8282. doi: 10.1257/aer.20230038. URL [Link](#). ⁷

Benjamin Enke, Ricardo Rodríguez-Padilla, and Florian Zimmermann. Moral universalism and the structure of ideology. *Review of Economic Studies*, 2023. ⁷

Ilyana Kuziemko, Michael I. Norton, Emmanuel Saez, and Stefanie Stantcheva. How Elastic Are Preferences for Redistribution? Evidence from Randomized Survey Experiments. *American Economic Review*, 105(4):1478–1508, April 2015. ISSN 0002-8282. doi: 10.1257/aer.20130360. URL [Link](#). ⁷

Thomas Douenne and Adrien Fabre. Yellow Vests, Pessimistic Beliefs, and Carbon Tax Aversion. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2022. URL [Link](#). ⁷

Alberto Alesina, Stefanie Stantcheva, and Edoardo Teso. Intergenerational Mobility and Preferences for Redistribution. *American Economic Review*, 108(2):521–554, February 2018. ISSN 0002-8282. doi: 10.1257/aer.20162015. URL [Link](#). ⁷

Stephen Ansolabehere, Jonathan Rodden, and James M. Snyder Jr. The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 102(2):215–232, May 2008. ISSN 1537-5943, 0003-0554. doi: 10.1017/S00030554080210. URL [Link](#). ⁷

. Global Nation. Global Solidarity Report 2023, 2023. URL [Link](#). ^{10, 33, 118}

Adrien Fabre. From Global Policies to Phase Out Fossil Fuels To a Sustainable Union. 2025. URL [Link](#). ²⁰

Brandon de la Cuesta, Naoki Egami, and Kosuke Imai. Improving the External Validity of Conjoint Analysis: The Essential Role of Profile Distribution. *Political Analysis*, 30(1): 19–45, January 2022. ISSN 1047-1987, 1476-4989. doi: 10.1017/pan.2020.40. URL [Link](#). ²⁵

Paulo A. L. D Nunes and Erik Schokkaert. Identifying the warm glow effect in contingent valuation. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 45(2):231–245, March 2003. ISSN 0095-0696. doi: 10.1016/S0095-0696(02)00051-7. URL [Link](#). ²⁶

. Bridgetown Initiative. Bridgetown Initiative on the Reform of the International Development and Climate Finance Architecture. 2025. URL [Link](#). ²⁹

OECD. *Climate Finance Provided and Mobilised by Developed Countries in 2013-2022. Climate Finance and the USD 100 Billion Goal*. OECD, May 2024. ISBN 978-92-64-75659-5 978-92-64-46118-5. doi: 10.1787/19150727-en. URL [Link](#). 30

Adrien Fabre. French favored redistributions derived from surveys. *Revue economique*, 73 (1):69–113, March 2022. ISSN 0035-2764. URL [Link](#). 37, 114, 116

A Raw results

Figure S1: Keyword classification of open-ended fields (matches with at least one keyword in a list). (Questions 19-21). [Back to Section 3.1.](#)

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	18	16	15	15	16	17	14	19	15	21	13	16	22
Health; healthcare system	10	13	10	11	15	12	16	14	10	4	9	5	10
Own country referred	9	9	11	9	6	11	8	10	6	8	6	6	10
Family; children; childcare	7	7	5	4	7	8	5	11	4	7	7	10	8
War; peace	6	9	7	11	14	14	6	5	9	4	3	4	5
Work; (un)employment; business	6	6	7	5	8	4	7	5	3	4	5	10	5
Nothing; don't know; empty	5	4	5	4	3	7	3	3	2	13	4	4	2
Economy	4	4	1	4	6	1	5	5	3	4	1	2	7
Government; president	4	3	3	2	2	2	3	5	2	4	0	0	7
International issues	4	5	5	6	5	5	4	4	4	3	2	8	3
Inflation; cost of living	4	4	2	2	5	3	3	8	2	2	1	1	6
Poverty; inequality	4	6	5	7	6	7	6	5	4	3	2	3	2
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	3	3	2	4	3	2	2	3	2	10	0	0	3
Old age; retirement; ageing society	3	3	3	7	1	2	2	3	2	6	5	0	2
Criticism of immigration; national preference	3	5	4	8	3	4	3	9	5	1	0	0	3
Housing	3	3	2	2	2	3	6	3	1	1	6	3	3
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	3	3	2	2	4	1	2	5	2	2	1	1	5
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	6
Environment; climate change	3	4	2	5	7	2	4	5	5	1	0	5	3
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	4	5
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	2	2	0	3	4
Happiness; peace of mind	2	3	2	2	4	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	3
Trump	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	5
Relationships; love; emotions	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	0	2	2	3

Figure S2: AI classification of open-ended fields (using ChatGPT-4.1). (Questions 19-21).
 Back to Section 3.1.

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	26	21	22	18	24	22	19	24	18	26	27	21	32
Other topic; unclear; vague	19	17	17	17	17	16	14	19	17	17	21	29	22
Own country referred	19	17	14	20	14	15	16	21	14	23	8	8	25
Happiness; peace of mind	17	15	16	11	17	15	14	19	13	12	14	30	20
Poverty; inequality	14	16	16	18	17	16	14	14	17	15	14	12	11
Nothing; don't know; empty	14	11	15	11	7	14	12	10	13	20	27	8	9
International issues	13	16	12	18	19	16	11	18	19	8	4	13	15
Health; healthcare system	13	15	13	12	16	15	18	17	13	7	14	6	13
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	11	11	10	17	9	5	9	14	10	23	6	2	10
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	9	10	14	7	11	5	9	12	7	5	4	8	12
Work; (un)employment; business	8	8	8	8	11	5	9	7	6	8	7	17	8
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	8	8	9	9	8	3	7	10	10	6	3	10	10
Family; children; childcare	8	7	6	5	7	7	6	11	6	9	7	11	9
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	7	6	5	5	6	4	5	8	6	2	3	9	13
Corruption; criticism of the government	7	6	4	4	6	6	10	7	3	5	4	3	10
War; peace	7	10	8	13	14	13	7	6	11	3	4	8	5
Old age; retirement; ageing society	6	5	5	10	2	2	4	7	4	9	6	3	5
Housing	5	4	4	2	3	4	8	6	3	1	7	4	7
Criticism of immigration; national preference	4	6	4	9	3	4	4	11	7	2	0	1	5
Environment; climate change	4	6	4	7	9	3	5	7	7	2	1	4	4
Education	3	3	2	5	2	2	5	4	4	3	4	8	3
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	3	2	2	4	2	1	1	3	2	2	0	0	6
Relationships; love; emotions	3	3	4	2	2	1	2	3	3	1	3	3	5
Global poverty; hunger; global inequality	3	4	4	3	6	3	7	4	3	1	0	3	2
Social division; fake news; (social) media	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	3
Religion; sin; God	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	2
Animal welfare	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1

Figure S3: Manual classification of open-ended fields. (Questions 19-21). [Back to Section 3.1.](#)

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	19	16	17	13	17	18	13	17	12	15	20	22	23
Other topic; unclear; vague	13	10	12	8	11	12	10	11	13	18	15	18	13
Health; healthcare system	12	14	12	11	16	14	16	16	12	6	13	5	12
Nothing; don't know; empty	10	9	10	13	5	11	7	7	12	16	11	8	8
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	7	7	10	7	7	4	5	11	5	16	4	0	6
Poverty; inequality	6	9	8	11	9	10	7	8	12	7	5	4	4
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	6	7	11	4	8	2	6	8	3	2	1	4	8
Family; children; childcare	5	5	5	3	6	5	4	7	3	5	6	8	5
War; peace	5	8	5	11	12	12	5	5	10	2	3	6	3
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	4	2	2	4	2	1	1	3	1	3	0	0	9
Work; (un)employment; business	4	4	5	3	6	3	5	2	2	2	4	13	4
Criticism of immigration; national preference	4	6	4	8	3	4	3	9	5	1	1	1	4
Housing	4	3	2	2	2	3	7	4	3	0	7	3	4
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	4	4	3	0	2	6
Old age; retirement; ageing society	3	3	3	7	1	1	3	3	3	7	5	1	2
Environment; climate change	3	5	4	6	8	2	5	5	6	1	1	4	3
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	4	4	3	1	4	5
International issues	3	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	1	5	3
Happiness; peace of mind	3	3	3	2	5	2	2	6	3	1	3	2	3
Education	2	2	1	4	2	1	4	2	4	2	3	5	2
Relationships; love; emotions	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	5	3
Corruption; criticism of the government	2	3	2	2	1	2	8	3	1	2	1	1	2
Own country referred	2	3	2	5	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
Social division; fake news; (social) media	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	3	1	1
Global poverty; hunger; global inequality	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1
Religion; sin; God	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	1
Animal welfare	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Figure S4: Manual classification of *concerns* fields: “What are your main concerns these days?” (Question 19). [Back to Section 3.1.](#)




Figure S5: Manual classification of *wish* fields: “What are your needs or wishes?” (Question 20). [Back to Section 3.1](#).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	32	26	30	22	30	35	22	20	25	23	39	49	37
Health; healthcare system	21	25	20	33	21	19	26	29	26	10	19	4	22
Other topic; unclear; vague	13	13	17	9	11	24	13	11	10	16	13	10	12
Family; children; childcare	10	8	6	5	8	6	7	16	2	8	9	12	14
Happiness; peace of mind	10	11	9	7	17	6	5	21	8	4	10	5	11
Nothing; don't know; empty	7	10	10	16	6	5	10	10	12	7	6	2	4
Work; (un)employment; business	7	5	4	2	10	4	5	4	3	1	10	22	9
Housing	7	5	3	3	7	10	6	3	3	1	19	9	6
War; peace	5	8	5	17	4	8	6	5	8	8	2	1	4
Relationships; love; emotions	5	5	6	7	4	2	4	4	2	1	2	5	9
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	4	3	3	3	5	3	1	4	5	19	0	0	2
Old age; retirement; ageing society	3	2	2	3	1	0	2	0	2	8	0	2	3
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	3	3	7	3	4	1	1	2	6	3	2	0	3
International issues	2	3	3	4	1	1	2	3	4	3	1	1	2
Poverty; inequality	2	2	3	4	1	2	0	1	4	3	0	1	1
Education	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	3	4	2
Own country referred	1	2	2	3	1	0	0	4	2	4	1	2	1
Environment; climate change	1	2	1	3	0	1	0	2	5	1	0	0	1
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	9	2	0	0	1
Corruption; criticism of the government	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0
Religion; sin; God	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	2
Criticism of immigration; national preference	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	1
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Global poverty; hunger; global inequality	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	1
Social division; fake news; (social) media	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Animal welfare	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Figure S6: Manual classification of *injustice* fields: “What according to you is the greatest injustice of all?” (Question 21). [Back to Section 3.1.](#)


	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Poverty; inequality	19	28	28	32	30	41	23	19	31	23	22	10	9
Other topic; unclear; vague	15	9	10	8	10	5	7	11	15	17	22	26	16
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	9	8	10	5	10	2	6	11	10	9	1	7	14
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	9	9	11	3	12	3	11	15	3	1	1	12	15
Nothing; don't know; empty	8	6	7	7	3	2	7	6	5	14	10	11	7
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	8	9	12	16	4	4	3	12	8	16	3	0	4
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	7	4	4	3	6	1	4	5	4	4	3	16	13
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	5	2	0	2	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	13
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	4	4	2	5	5	3	3	2	5	6	8	3	3
War; peace	4	8	3	4	10	29	10	6	5	1	3	5	1
Health; healthcare system	4	3	8	2	3	5	2	3	5	3	9	2	3
Global poverty; hunger; global inequality	3	6	4	4	11	8	8	4	5	1	0	3	3
International issues	3	6	4	5	8	6	6	6	1	0	0	3	2
Corruption; criticism of the government	3	4	2	4	2	2	10	4	3	3	2	0	2
Criticism of immigration; national preference	3	4	3	6	1	4	3	6	2	3	0	2	3
Family; children; childcare	3	2	3	2	4	1	2	0	5	2	5	3	2
Old age; retirement; ageing society	2	3	2	8	2	0	2	3	3	3	5	0	1
Social division; fake news; (social) media	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	13	2	1
Own country referred	2	2	3	5	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	2
Relationships; love; emotions	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	8	2
Housing	1	2	2	2	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	2
Education	1	1	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	1
Religion; sin; God	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	15	1
Work; (un)employment; business	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	0
Animal welfare	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Environment; climate change	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	0
Happiness; peace of mind	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Figure S7: Manual classification of *issue* fields: “Can you name an issue that is important to you but is neglected in the public debate?” (Question 22). [Back to Section 3.1.](#)

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Nothing; don't know; empty	21	15	14	21	7	32	5	11	19	36	26	19	19
Other topic; unclear; vague	13	11	11	6	13	9	13	14	13	11	21	12	13
Tax system; welfare benefits; public services	12	12	17	7	13	6	14	19	8	19	11	0	10
Money; own income; cost of living; inflation	10	7	6	6	9	7	8	7	4	9	18	11	11
Health; healthcare system	9	10	8	6	18	7	17	11	6	4	8	7	11
Old age; retirement; ageing society	6	7	5	15	1	4	7	5	4	10	13	1	2
Environment; climate change	6	7	4	10	8	2	7	6	10	1	4	10	8
Criticism of immigration; national preference	5	8	8	10	4	6	5	13	8	2	1	1	3
Security; violence; crime; judicial system	5	6	9	4	10	4	4	5	2	3	1	3	5
Education	4	5	2	7	5	3	7	3	10	2	5	4	3
Poverty; inequality	4	5	3	7	5	1	4	5	9	1	1	7	4
Discrimination; gender inequality; racism; LGBT	3	3	2	3	3	1	3	4	4	2	1	3	6
Housing	3	2	2	0	1	1	5	5	2	0	4	1	5
Family; children; childcare	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	4	2	2	5	1	1
Rights; democracy; freedom; slavery	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	4	2	4	1	0	2
Corruption; criticism of the government	2	2	3	1	1	2	5	1	1	2	1	0	2
Work; (un)employment; business	2	2	2	2	7	1	1	1	0	1	1	7	1
War; peace	2	2	2	3	2	2	0	2	1	0	3	11	1
International issues	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	3	1	0	1	12	1
Criticism of far right; Trump; tariffs	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Own country referred	1	2	2	3	2	5	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
Social division; fake news; (social) media	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	0	3	0	1	1	2
Animal welfare	1	2	3	2	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	1
Religion; sin; God	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
Relationships; love; emotions	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Global poverty; hunger; global inequality	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Happiness; peace of mind	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0

Figure S8: Effect by vote at the last election on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy (compared to no foreign policy in the program). (See Figure 8 for the simple figure). (Question 23)

(a) Cut development aid.



(b) Int'l tax on millionaires with 30% financing health and education in low-income countries.




Figure S9: Conjoint analysis in France (Average Marginal Component Effect). Cf. Figure S18 for French. (Question 23).




Figure S10: Conjoint analysis in Germany (Average Marginal Component Effect). Cf. Figure S19 for German. (Question 23).

Climate policy:

- Repeal the heating law that requires renewable energy
- Ban new combustion-engine cars from 2035

Economic issues:

- Lower electricity prices by 12% through tax reductions
- Raise the minimum wage to €15 by 2026
- Invest €500 billion in strategic industries like steel, automotive, and defense

Foreign policy:

- International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries
- Cut development aid
- Support Ukraine militarily and financially

Social issues:

- Use electronic ankle monitors to track violent offenders against women
- Offer a birth grant of €20,000 for newborns
- Restrict the fast-track path to German citizenship

Tax system:

- Exempt from taxes overtime work and work of retired people
- Abolish the inheritance tax
- Fully reinstate the debt brake
- Higher taxes for the richest 1% to finance higher child benefit, citizen's income and minimum pension




Figure S11: Conjoint analysis in Italy (Average Marginal Component Effect). Cf. Figure S20 for Italian. (Question 23).

- Climate policy:
- Cancel the ban on new combustion–engine cars from 2035
 - Double the capacity of renewable energy by 2030
- Economic issues:
- Increase the birth grant to up to €3,600 for newborns
 - Use unspent EU funds to exempt hiring companies from taxes
 - Introduce a legal minimum wage at 10€ per hour
 - Reduce working hours without reducing salaries
- Foreign policy:
- International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low–income countries
 - Cut development aid
 - Develop a common EU defense
- Social issues:
- Legal limit on migration and process asylum requests outside the EU
 - Recognize same–sex marriage
 - Introduce free and mandatory early education (until 3 years old)
- Tax system:
- Reduce the income tax on low–income households
 - Replace the income tax by a 15% flat tax




Figure S12: Conjoint analysis in Poland (Average Marginal Component Effect). Cf. Figure S21 for Polish. (Question 23).

Climate policy:

- Phase out coal by 2035
- Ban the sale of new combustion-engine cars by 2035

Economic issues:

- Expansion of rail production and infrastructure investment
- Allocate 5% of GDP to military expenditures by 2030

Foreign policy:

- International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries
- Cut development aid
- Detention of rejected asylum seekers until they can be deported

Social issues:

- Restoring abortion rights
- Relax restrictions on public assembly and protest
- Extended parental leave, tax benefits for children, and remote work option

Tax system:

- Reduce taxes on low-income households by increasing the tax-free income allowance
- Taxes on the profits of large digital corporations and fossil fuel companies
- Income tax exemption for seniors delaying retirement




Figure S13: Conjoint analysis in Spain (Average Marginal Component Effect). Cf. Figure S22 for Spanish. (Question 23).

Climate policy:

Extend the social electricity voucher

A national investment plan to enhance water management

Economic issues:

Set the minimum wage at 1350€/month

Reduce the workweek to 36 hours by 2030 without salary cut

Promote flexible working hours through a time bank

Foreign policies:

International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries

Cut development aid

Increase support for Ukraine and maintain sanctions on Russia

Social issues:

Strengthen social media regulation for transparency, misinformation control, and verified identity

Free early education (from 0 to 3 years)

Create centers outside the EU to process asylum requests

Tax system:

Lower the income tax on the middle class and increase it on rich households

Abolish the wealth tax and lower corporate tax rates

Reduce taxation in rural areas through the Agricultural Taxation Act




Figure S14: Conjoint analysis in the UK (Average Marginal Component Effect). (Question 23).

Climate policy:

Investment in renewables and nuclear to achieve zero-emissions electricity in 2030

A ban on domestic flights for trips under three hours by train

Economic issues:

30 hours of free childcare per week for working parents

Healthcare plan: more appointments by utilising overtime employment, recruitment in mental care and dentistry coverage

Raising the minimum wage to £15 per hour

A 4-day working week

Foreign policy:

International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries

Cut development aid

Deepen Brexit by removing or reforming EU-inherited laws

Social issues:

Legal limit on migration and deportation to Rwanda

Enforce neighbourhood policing through recruitment and new equipment

Increase the Universal Credit for low-income households

Tax system:

Fight tax avoidance by abolishing the non-domiciled tax status

Abolish the inheritance tax for estates under £2 million

Abolish business rates




Figure S15: Conjoint analysis in Switzerland (Average Marginal Component Effect). (Question 23).




Figure S16: Conjoint analysis in Japan (Average Marginal Component Effect). (Question 23).

Climate policy:

Achieve 50% of electricity from renewable sources by 2030

Invest 150,000 billion yen in the ecological transition

Economic issues:

Raise the minimum wage to ¥1,500 per hour

Provide child allowance of ¥15,000 per month for all children up to age 18

Foreign policy:

International tax on millionaires with 30% financing
healthcare and education in low-income countries

Cut development aid

Demand the complete dismantlement of North
Korea's nuclear and missile programs

Social issues:

Eliminate electoral district mergers (goku kaiketsu)

Recognize same-sex marriage

Expand eligibility for pension coverage to part-time workers

Promote women's empowerment through
reskilling, fair pay, and career continuity

Tax system:

Increase taxes (on income and inheritance) on
the richest and reduce them on the poorest

Introduce a consumption tax refund system
for low- and middle-income households

Restore fiscal balance and achieve a budget surplus by 2025




Figure S17: Conjoint analysis in the U.S. (Average Marginal Component Effect). (Question 23).




Figure S18: Conjoint analysis in France (in French, cf. Figure S9 for English). (Question 23).

Climat:

- Construire 14 nouveaux réacteurs nucléaires
- Supprimer les Zones à Faibles Émissions (ZFE)

Économie:

- Indexer totalement les retraites sur l'inflation
- Augmenter le SMIC à 1600€ net par mois
- Restaurer l'âge légal de départ à la retraite à 62 ans

Politique étrangère:

- Taxe mondiale sur les millionnaires, dont 30 % financerait la santé et l'éducation dans les pays à bas revenus
- Réduire l'aide au développement
- Doubler le budget militaire d'ici 2030

Société:

- Supprimer le droit du sol
- Peines planchers pour les récidivistes et responsabilité pénale à 16 ans
- Instaurer le Référendum d'Initiative Citoyenne (RIC)

Fiscalité:

- Défiscaliser les primes jusqu'à 10 000 € par an
- Exonérer d'impôt sur le revenu les jeunes de moins de 30 ans
- Baisser l'impôt sur le revenu jusqu'à 4000€/mois net et l'augmenter au-delà
- Rétablissement un impôt sur la fortune (ISF) renforcé




Figure S19: Conjoint analysis in Germany (in German, cf. Figure S10 for English). (Question 23).

Klimaschutz:

- Aufhebung des Heizungsgesetzes, das erneuerbare Energien vorschreibt
- Neuwagen mit Verbrennungsmotor ab 2035 verbieten.

Wirtschaftspolitik:

- Strompreise durch Steuersenkungen um 12 % senken
- Mindestlohn bis 2026 auf 15 € erhöhen
- 500 Milliarden Euro in strategische Sektoren wie Stahl, Automobilindustrie und Verteidigung investieren

Außenpolitik:

- Internationale Millionärssteuer mit 30 % zur Finanzierung von Gesundheit und Bildung in Ländern mit niedrigem Einkommen
- Kürzung der Entwicklungshilfe
- Die Ukraine militärisch und finanziell unterstützen

Gesellschaft:

- Einsatz elektronischer Fußfesseln zur Verfolgung von Gewalttätern gegen Frauen
- 20.000 € staatlicher Zuschuss bei Geburt eines Kindes
- Beschleunigte Verfahren zur Erlangung der deutschen Staatsangehörigkeit einschränken

Steuerpolitik:

- Keine Steuern auf Überstunden und Arbeit im Rentenalter
- Abschaffung der Erbschaftssteuer
- Komplette Wiedereinführung der Schuldenbremse
- Höhere Steuern für die reichsten 1% zur Finanzierung von höherem Kindergeld, Bürgergeld und Mindestrente




Figure S20: Conjoint analysis in Italy (in Italian, cf. Figure S11 for English). (Question 23).

Politica climatica:

Annnullare il divieto di nuove auto con motore a combustione a partire dal 2035

Raddoppiare la capacità di energia rinnovabile entro il 2030

Politica economica:

Incrementare l'assegno di nascita fino a 3.600 euro per i neonati

Destinare i fondi UE non utilizzati all'esenzione fiscale per le aziende che assumono

Introdurre un salario minimo a norma di legge di 10€ all'ora

Riduzione dell'orario di lavoro senza ridurre gli stipendi

Politica estera:

Tassa internazionale sui milionari, il cui 30% finanzierebbe l'assistenza sanitaria e l'istruzione nei Paesi a basso reddito

Tagliare gli aiuti allo sviluppo

Sviluppare una difesa militare comune europea

Politica sociale:

Imporre un limite legale della migrazione in Italia e trattare le richieste di asilo al di fuori dell'UE

Riconoscere il matrimonio tra persone dello stesso sesso

Introdurre l'istruzione in età della prima infanzia gratuita e obbligatoria (fino ai 3 anni)

Politica fiscale:

Riduzione dell'imposta sul reddito per i nuclei familiari a basso reddito

Sostituire l'imposta sul reddito con una flat tax del 15%.




Figure S21: Conjoint analysis in Poland (in Polish, cf. Figure S12 for English). (Question 23).

Polityka klimatyczna:

Rezygnacja z węgla do 2035 r.

Zakaz sprzedaży nowych samochodów z silnikiem spalinowym do 2035 r.

Kwestie ekonomiczne:

Rozwój produkcji kolejowej i inwestycje w infrastrukturę

Przeznaczenie 5% PKB na wydatki wojskowe do 2030 r

Polityka zagraniczna:

Miedzynarodowy podatek od milionerów, z 30% finansowaniem opieki zdrowotnej i edukacji w krajach o niskich dochodach

Ograniczenie pomocy rozwojowej

Zatrzymanie osób, którym odmówiono azylu, do czasu ich deportacji

Kwestie społeczne:

Przywrócenie praw reprodukcyjnych, w tym prawa do aborcji

Zlagodzenie restrykcji w zakresie zgromadzeń publicznych i protestów

Wydluzony urlop rodzicielski, ulgi podatkowe na dzieci i możliwość pracy zdalnej

System podatkowy:

Obniżenie podatków dla gospodarstw domowych o niskich dochodach poprzez zwiększenie kwoty wolnej od podatku

Zwiększenie podatków od zysków dużych korporacji cyfrowych oraz firm zajmujących się paliwami kopalnymi

Zwolnienie z podatku dochodowego dla seniorów opóźniających przejście na emerytury




Figure S22: Conjoint analysis in Spain (in Spanish, cf. Figure S13 for English). (Question 23).

Políticas climáticas:

- Ampliar los bonos sociales térmico y eléctrico
- Un plan nacional de inversiones para mejorar la gestión del agua

Asuntos económicos:

- Fijar el salario mínimo en 1350€/mes
- Reducir la semana laboral a 36 horas antes de 2030 sin merma salarial
- Fomentar la flexibilidad horaria mediante un banco de horas

Política exterior:

- Impuesto internacional a los millonarios con un 30% para financiar la sanidad y la educación en países de renta baja
- Reducir la ayuda al desarrollo a los países de renta baja
- Aumentar el apoyo a Ucrania y mantener las sanciones a Rusia

Asuntos sociales:

- Reforzar la regulación de las redes sociales en materia de transparencia, control de la desinformación e identidad verificada
- Educación de 0 a 3 años gratuita
- Crear centros fuera de la UE para tramitar las solicitudes de asilo

Sistema fiscal:

- Bajar el impuesto sobre la renta a la clase media y aumentarlo a los hogares ricos
- Suprimir el impuesto sobre el patrimonio y bajar los tipos del impuesto de sociedades
- Reducir los impuestos en zonas rurales mediante la Ley de Fiscalidad Agraria




Figure S23: Conjoint analysis in Japan (in Japanese, cf. Figure S16 for English). (Question 23).

気候政策:
 2030年までに再生可能エネルギーによる電力50%を達成
 エコロジカル・トランジションに150兆円を投資

経済問題:
 最低賃金を時給1,500円に引き上げる
 18歳までの子ども全員に月額15,000円の子ども手当を支給する

外交政策:
 富裕層への国際課税を実施し、その30%を低所得国の医療・教育に充てる
 政府開発援助を削減する
 北朝鮮の核・ミサイル計画の完全な廃棄を要求する。

社会問題:
 選挙区合併の廃止
 同性婚を認める
 パートタイム労働者への年金受給資格の拡大
 リスキル、公正な賃金、キャリアの継続性を通じて女性のエンパワーメントを促進する

税制:
 最富裕層への(所得税と相続税の)増税と最貧困層への減税
 中低所得世帯への消費税還付制度の導入
 財政均衡を回復し、2025年までに財政黒字を達成する。




Figure S24: Average preferred revenue split for a global wealth tax (variant *few*). (Question 24).




Figure S25: Decomposition of preferred shares for each spending item in the revenue split (All countries together; variant *few*). (Question 24).




Figure S26: Decomposition of preferred shares for each spending item in the revenue split (All countries together; variant *many*). (Question 25).




Figure S27: Average preferred revenue split for a global wealth tax (variant *many*). (Question 25).




Figure S28: "By taking this survey, you will be automatically entered into a lottery to win up to [amount_lottery: \$100].

Should you be selected in the lottery, you will have the option to channel a part of this additional compensation to the charity *Just One Tree* to plant trees.

In case you win the lottery, what share of the [amount_lottery: \$100 prize] would you donate to plant trees?" (Question 27).




Figure S29: Support for the National, Global, and International Climate Schemes, and average belief regarding the support for the GCS. (Questions 26-35).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Supports the National Climate Scheme	68	66	63	63	74	56	69	70	58	68	74	88	64
Supports the Global Climate Scheme (GCS)	55	61	65	53	78	51	68	58	62	57	48	85	49
Belief about GCS support in own country	41	42	44	39	43	39	44	44	46	37	37	55	42
Belief about GCS support in the U.S. (except for the U.S.: support in the EU)	35	28	27	26	30	32	29	29	26	30	NA	46	43
Supports the GCS if its other members* cover 25–33% of world emissions *Low: Global South + EU	65	69	75	63	85	60	71	64	62	67	57	87	60
Supports the GCS if its other members* cover 56% of world emissions *Mid: Global South + China	67	73	76	72	83	54	78	67	64	67	64	87	59
Supports the GCS if its other members* cover 64–72% of world emissions *High: Global South + China + EU + various HICs (UK, Japan, South Korea, Canada...)	69	73	76	77	79	71	74	63	74	71	60	91	64
Supports the GCS if its other members* cover 64–72% of world emissions *High color: High + Distributive effects displayed using colors on world map	62	68	61	68	79	57	77	66	65	63	54	88	56

Figure S30: Absolute support for plausible global redistribution policies (Percentage of *Somewhat or Strongly support*). (Question 38).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Minimum tax of 2% on billionaires' wealth, in voluntary countries	63	70	75	71	73	63	66	70	64	54	57	67	61
Bridgetown initiative: MDBs expanding sustainable investments in LICs, and at lower interest rates	56	60	56	61	72	47	57	63	61	45	58	70	54
L&D: Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with climate Loss and damage	55	58	55	55	68	55	61	56	52	44	61	75	52
Debt relief for vulnerable countries, suspending payments until they are more able to repay	49	52	48	44	64	53	55	54	52	38	52	70	48
At least 0.7% of developed countries' GDP in foreign aid	49	51	50	48	59	42	58	50	51	33	59	69	47
Raise global minimum tax on profit from 15% to 35%, allocating revenues to countries based on sales	49	58	58	57	70	47	50	58	51	42	35	53	46
NCQG: Developing countries providing \$300 bn a year in climate finance for developing countries	48	53	51	54	62	46	54	52	53	32	59	67	44
International levy on shipping carbon emissions, returned to countries based on population	47	54	59	49	62	45	54	53	56	30	46	60	46
Expand Security Council to new permanent members (e.g. India, Brazil, African Union), restrict veto use	46	56	54	54	64	50	55	55	54	35	35	63	44
International levy on aviation carbon emissions, raising prices by 30%, returned to countries based on population	37	43	47	42	45	39	42	41	42	26	34	53	36

Figure S31: Share of plausible global redistribution policies supported (*somewhat or strongly*). (Question 38).




Figure S32: Share of plausible global redistribution policies opposed (*somewhat* or *strongly*). (Question 38).




Figure S33: Preferred North-to-South climate grant funding in 2035, specified in qualitative terms or in terms of who advocates for that amount (NCQG, variant *Short*). (Question 40).




Figure S34: Preferred North-to-South climate grant funding in 2035, specified in money terms (NCQG, variant *Full*). (Question 39).




Figure S35: Support for an international wealth tax with 30% of revenue funding LICs, depending on the country coverage (Yes/No question). (Questions 41-43).




Figure S36: Prefers a *sustainable* rather than a *business-as-usual* future. (Question 44).




Figure S37: Relative support for a global progressive income tax on the richest households to finance poverty reduction in the Global South (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*Indifferent* responses). (Questions 45-46).




Figure S38: Absolute support for a global progressive income tax on the richest households to finance poverty reduction in the Global South (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support*). (Questions 45-46).




Figure S39: "How do you evaluate each of these channels to transfer resources to reduce poverty in LICs?"

Percentage of *Best* way (other options: *Right*, *Wrong* or *Acceptable* way). (Question 48).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Targeted cash transfers (child allowances, disability & elderly pensions)	16	14	8	14	19	14	15	14	12	8	29	36	14
Unconditional cash transfers to each household	12	8	6	9	10	9	10	8	9	7	25	24	10
Government, conditional on financing poverty reduction	8	9	8	10	12	6	9	8	10	2	6	23	9
Development aid agencies	7	7	6	10	6	4	8	9	6	4	4	17	8
Local NGOs with democratic processes	5	6	7	7	5	7	6	6	6	1	3	16	6
Local authorities	5	5	6	4	4	6	5	5	3	2	3	14	5
Government, unconditional	4	4	5	3	3	4	3	4	3	1	3	15	5

Figure S40: "How do you evaluate each of these channels to transfer resources to reduce poverty in LICs?"

Percentage of *Wrong* way (other options: *Best*, *Right* or *Acceptable* way). (Question 48).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Government, unconditional	51	56	49	69	50	42	52	62	65	51	32	18	56
Local authorities	42	44	37	50	44	31	49	49	49	36	34	19	47
Unconditional cash transfers to each household	33	39	32	49	36	32	33	44	46	38	13	8	35
Local NGOs with democratic processes	29	26	23	30	24	20	27	27	27	25	44	16	29
Government, conditional on financing poverty reduction	21	22	24	23	13	20	23	26	28	20	17	8	24
Development aid agencies	16	16	19	14	15	19	17	13	19	12	22	7	16
Targeted cash transfers (child allowances, disability & elderly pensions)	14	15	18	18	8	14	12	17	18	18	6	2	16

Figure S41: "Should governments actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century?" (Question 49).




Figure S42: "If there was a worldwide movement in favor of a global program to tackle climate change, implement taxes on millionaires and fund poverty reduction in low-income countries, to what extent would you be willing to be part of that movement? (Multiple answers possible)" (Question 50).




Figure S43: "Let us call "your political party" the party you voted for in the last election, or the party that represents your views most closely.

Imagine there was a worldwide coalition of political parties in favor of a common program to tackle climate change, implement taxes on millionaires and fund poverty reduction in low-income countries.

Would you be more likely to vote for your party if it were part of that coalition?"
(Question 51).




Figure S44: "Some people think that high-income countries should support low-income countries.

Among the different reasons given, which ones do you agree with? (Multiple answers possible)" (Question 52).




Figure S45: "Some people argue that Western countries owe reparations for colonization and slavery to former colonies and descendants of slaves.

Reparations could take the form of funding education and facilitating technology transfers, to address unequal opportunities passed down from the past.

Do you support or oppose reparations of this kind for colonization and slavery?" (Question 53).




Figure S46: Global redistribution obtained from median custom parameters: 49% of winners; 18% of losers; degree of redistribution of 5 (out of 10). (Question 55).



Figure S47: Average custom global redistribution. (Question 55).




Figure S48: Mean answers to custom redistribution. (Question 55).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Saudi Arabia	USA
Preferred share of winners	47.4	47.9	47.2	46.5	48.7	49.5	49.0	48.4	44.8	46.8	49.9	46.8
Preferred share of losers	17.7	17.7	18.4	17.5	17.2	16.8	18.5	17.4	18.4	17.7	17.5	17.8
Preferred degree of redistribution	4.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	5.2	4.9	5.0	4.8	4.4	4.5	5.0	4.5
Implied minimum income (in PPP \$/month)	243.9	254.8	238.0	245.2	272.4	264.6	266.4	257.7	221.7	232.6	274.3	233.2
Implied transfer (in % of world income)	5.1	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.9	5.9	5.7	5.3	4.7	4.7	5.9	4.9
Loses in own custom redistribution	46.3	41.1	42.5	46.8	35.2	11.4	35.8	54.8	73.6	36.8	40.5	56.5
I am satisfied with my custom redistribution.	55.8	58.2	52.8	56.8	63.3	56.7	62.8	58.7	54.1	39.6	67.6	58.4
I want to skip this question.	42.9	40.0	44.4	41.4	34.8	42.4	35.5	40.0	43.5	59.2	32.4	40.8

Figure S49: Mean answers to custom redistribution among respondents satisfied with their custom redistribution. (Question 55).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Saudi Arabia	USA
Preferred share of winners	47.6	48.4	48.4	47.0	49.3	50.6	48.9	48.8	45.1	45.8	50.0	46.5
Preferred share of losers	18.3	18.2	19.8	17.5	17.0	16.7	19.7	18.4	19.6	18.9	17.6	18.2
Preferred degree of redistribution	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.7	5.3	5.2	5.1	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.9	4.5
Implied minimum income (in PPP \$/month)	249.7	264.7	239.1	246.5	282.2	288.5	276.0	262.6	216.8	224.3	267.5	232.8
Implied transfer (in % of world income)	5.4	5.8	5.3	5.5	6.2	6.6	6.0	5.6	4.7	4.6	5.8	5.1

Figure S50: Median answers to custom redistribution among respondents satisfied with their custom redistribution. (Question 55).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Saudi Arabia	USA
Preferred share of winners	49.0	50.0	50.0	48.0	50.0	51.0	50.0	42.0	48.0	49.0	46.0	
Preferred share of losers	18.0	18.0	20.0	17.0	15.0	17.0	20.0	17.0	14.0	20.0	18.0	16.0
Preferred degree of redistribution	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0
Implied minimum income (in PPP \$/month)	208.3	219.5	184.6	188.3	277.7	267.2	255.6	200.6	184.6	184.6	262.4	184.6
Implied transfer (in % of world income)	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	3.7	4.4	4.5	4.4

Figure S51: “Comprehension question: one respondent with the expected answer will get [amount lottery: \$100].

How would gasoline prices change as a result of the Global Climate Scheme?
Gasoline prices would...” (Correct answer: *increase*) (Question 60).




Figure S52: Relative agreement for: "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "My taxes should go towards solving global problems."'" (Percentage of *Agree* or *Strongly agree* among non-*Neither agree nor disagree* responses). (Question 61).




Figure S53: Absolute agreement for: "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "My taxes should go towards solving global problems."'" (Percentage of *Agree* or *Strongly agree*). (Question 61).




Figure S54: "Which group of people do you advocate for when you vote?"²⁴ (Question 62).




Figure S55: “Do you feel that this survey was politically biased?” (Question 63).




Figure S56: “How likely are you to become a millionaire at some point in your life?” (Question 15).




Figure S57: "Were you or your parents born in a foreign country?" (Question 5).




Figure S58: Vote in the last election, compared to actual results among voters. (Questions 16, 18).





Figure S59: Vote in the last election, compared to actual results on the entire population. (Questions 16, 18).



B Questionnaire

The U.S. version of the questionnaire is presented. Features that vary across countries are put in square brackets within the question text, as follows: [feature_name: U.S. value]. Feature values for each country are given in [this spreadsheet](#). Random branches or conditions for displaying the question are specified in square brackets before the question text (cf. Figure 2 for the survey flow). The question text is followed by square brackets that refer to Figures and Tables presenting the question results, and the variable name(s) corresponding to the question. Finally, response options are displayed in italics. Unless otherwise specified, response is compulsory and a single response must be chosen.

Welcome

1. Welcome to this survey!

This survey is **anonymous** and is conducted **for research** purposes on a representative sample of [sample_size: 3,000] [nationality: American people].

It takes around 20 min to complete.

The survey contains lotteries and awards for those who get the correct answer to some comprehension questions.

If you are attentive and lucky, **you can win up to [amount_lottery: \$100]**.

Please answer every question carefully.

By clicking on the button below, you consent to the terms and conditions.

Socio-demographics

2. What is your gender? [gender]

Woman; Man; Other

3. What is your country? [hidden_country]

4. What is your age? [age_exact, age]

Below 18; 18 to 20; 21 to 24; 25 to 29; 30 to 34; 35 to 39; 40 to 44; 45 to 49; 50 to 54; 55 to

59; 60 to 64; 65 to 69; 70 to 74; 75 to 79; 80 to 84; 85 to 89; 90 to 99; 100 or above

5. Were you or your parents born in a foreign country? [Figure S57; foreign]

Yes, I was born in a foreign country; Not me but both my parents were born in a foreign country; Not me but one of my parents was born in a foreign country; No, I was born in this country and my parents too

6. Do you live with your partner (if you have one)? [couple]

Yes; No

7. How many people are there in your household?

The household includes: **you**, your spouse, **your family members** who live with you, and your dependents (not flatmates). [hh_size]

1; 2; 3; 4; 5 or more

8. How many children under the age of 14 live with you? [Nb_children__14]

0; 1; 2; 3; 4 or more

9. [new page] [Only in: US] What race or ethnicity do you identify with? (Multiple answers are possible) [race]

White; Black or African American; Hispanic; Asian; American Indian or Alaskan Native; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; Other; Prefer not to say

10. What is the [periodicity_text: monthly] [income_type: gross] income of your household, [income_type_long: after taxes and transfers]?

This includes all sources of income: wages, pensions, welfare payments, property income, dividends, self-employment earnings, Social Security benefits, and income from other sources. [income]

[All but RU, US: Custom thresholds, taking into account household composition Questions 6-8, and corresponding to the country's deciles and quartiles of standard of living, cf. the sheet "Income" in this spreadsheet;

RU, US: Items based on household total income deciles and quartiles, namely in US: Less than \$17,000; between \$17,001 and \$30,000; between \$30,001 and \$36,000; between \$36,001 and \$43,000; between \$43,001 and \$56,000; between \$56,001 and \$72,000; between \$72,001 and \$91,000; between \$91,001 and \$115,000; between \$115,001 and \$130,000; between \$130,001 and \$150,000; between \$150,001 and \$213,000; More than \$213,000; I prefer not to answer]

11. What is your highest completed education level? [education]
[Country-specific, usually: 0-1 Primary or less; 2 Medium school; 2 Some high school; 3 High school diploma; 3-4 Vocational training; 5 Short-cycle tertiary; 6 Bachelor's; 7-8 Master's or higher]
12. What is your employment status? [employment_status]
Full-time employed; Part-time employed; Self-employed; Unemployed (searching for a job); Student; Retired; Inactive (not searching for a job)
13. [Only the first digits asked in RU, SA] What is your zipcode?
We ask for the zipcode to balance the sample in terms of degree of urbanization (rural, town or city). The survey will be terminated if your zipcode is not recognized.
[zipcode]
14. Are you a homeowner or a tenant? (Multiple answers are possible) [home_owner]
Tenant; Owner; Landlord renting out property; Hosted free of charge
15. [new page] How likely are you to become a millionaire at some point in your life?
[Figure S56; millionaire]
Very unlikely; Unlikely; Likely; Very likely; I am already a millionaire
16. [Except in: RU, SA] Did you vote in the [election: 2024 presidential election]? [Figures S59-S58; voted]
Yes; No; Prefer not to say; I didn't have the right to vote in [country_name: the United States].

Vote

17. [Only in: SA] What is your nationality?
If you have both the Saudi and a foreign nationality, choose "Saudi". [nationality_SA]
Saudi; India; Bangladesh; Syria; Yemen; Egypt; Pakistan; Indonesia; Philippines; Sudan; Myanmar; Jordan; Sri Lanka; Nepal; Turkey; Somalia; Lebanon; Other
18. [Except in: RU, SA] [If voted: Which candidate did you vote for in the [election: 2024 presidential election]?; Otherwise: Even if you did not vote in the [election: 2024 presidential election], please indicate the candidate that you were most likely to have voted for or who represents your views more closely.] [Figures S59-S58; vote]

[Candidates/parties with at least 1% of votes, e.g. in US: *Harris; Trump; Other; Prefer not to say*. In FR, IT, PL, ES, election is the 2024 European election]

Open-ended field

[Four random branches; Figures 3, S1-S6; Random answers can be found on bit.ly/fields2025; field, variant_field]

19. [Branch: concerns] What are your main concerns these days? [Figure S4; concerns_field]
20. [Branch: wish] What are your needs or wishes? [Figure S5; wish_field]
21. [Branch: injustice] What according to you is the greatest injustice of all? [Figure S6; injustice_field]
22. [Branch: issue] Can you name an issue that is important to you but is neglected in the public debate? [Figure S7; issue_field]

Conjoint analysis

23. [Except in: RU, SA] Imagine if the two top 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	
[Random policy]	[Random policy]	[Policy field in random order]
[Random policy]	[Random policy]	[Policy field in random order]
[Random policy]	[Random policy]	[Policy field in random order]
[Random policy]	[Random policy]	[Policy field in random order]
[Random policy]	[Random policy]	[Policy field in random order]

[Figures 8, S8-S22; conjoint]

Candidate A; Candidate B; Neither of them

Revenue split of global tax

[*Two random branches; field, variant_split*]

24. [Branch: Few] Imagine a wealth tax applied to households with a net worth above [tax_threshold: \$5 million], implemented in every country around the world.

[tax_country_name: In the U.S.], the tax revenues collected would be [tax_revenue: \$514 billion] per year (that is, [tax_revenue_gdp: 2]% of [tax_country_gdp: U.S. GDP]), while it would be [LIC_revenue: \$1 billion] in all low-income countries combined (700 million people live in a low-income country, most of them in Africa). Each country would retain part of the revenues it collects and use it for different domestic purposes. The remaining part would be pooled globally to finance sustainable development in low-income countries.

What percentage of the global wealth tax revenue should be allocated to each category?

The total allocation must sum to 100%.

[*Figures 4, S24-S25; revenue_split_few*]

Domestic: Education and Healthcare; Domestic: Social welfare programs; Domestic: Reduction in the federal income tax; Domestic: Reduction of the deficit; Global: Education, Healthcare and Renewable energy in low-income countries

25. [Branch: Many] Imagine a wealth tax applied to households with net worth above [tax_threshold: \$5 million], implemented in all countries around the world.

[tax_country_name: In the U.S.], the tax revenues collected would be [tax_revenue: \$514 billion] per year (that is, [tax_revenue_gdp: 2]% of [tax_country_gdp: U.S. GDP]), while it would be [LIC_revenue: \$1 billion] in all low-income countries combined (700 million people live in a low-income country, most of them in Africa). Each country would retain part of the revenues it collects and use it for different domestic purposes. The remaining part would be pooled globally to finance sustainable development.

What percentage of the global wealth tax revenue should be allocated to each

category?

The total allocation must sum to 100%.

[*Figures 4, S26-S27; revenue_split_many*]

[Five items are chosen at random among the 13 possible ones: *Domestic: Education and Research; Domestic: Healthcare; Domestic: Defense; Domestic: Deficit reduction; Domestic: Justice and Police; Domestic: Retirement pensions; Domestic: Social welfare programs; Domestic: Infrastructure (public transport, water systems...); Domestic: Income tax reduction; Global: Education and Healthcare in low-income countries; Global: Renewable energy and infrastructure to cope with climate change; Global: Loss and Damage Fund (to rebuild after climate disasters); Global: Forestation and biodiversity projects*]

Warm glow – moral substitute

[*Three random branches: NCS; Donation; control group; variant_warm_glow*]

26. [Branch: NCS] Do you agree with the following policy?

Climate Scheme:

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

The revenues generated by the sale of permits would finance an equal cash transfer. Each [country_adjective: American] would receive [amount_expenses: \$115][periodicity: per month], thereby offsetting price increases for the average [country_adjective: American].

Do you support the Climate Scheme? [*Figures 6, S29; ncs_support*]

Yes; No

27. [Branch: Donation] By taking this survey, you will be automatically entered into a lottery to win up to [amount_lottery: \$100].

Should you be selected in the lottery, you will have the option to channel a part of this additional compensation to the charity *Just One Tree* to plant trees.

In case you win the lottery, what share of the [amount_lottery: \$100 prize] would you donate to plant trees? [Figures 9a, S28 ; donation]

Share to plant trees

Cap & Share

28. Do you support the following policy?

To ensure that you have attentively read the description, we will ask some comprehension questions later in the survey: those who get correct answers can win [amount_lottery: \$100].

Global Climate Scheme:

In 2015, all countries agreed to contain global warming "well below +2 °C". To achieve this, 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 would be issued globally. Polluting firms would be required to buy permits to cover their greenhouse gas emissions. Such a policy would make fossil fuel companies pay for their emissions and gradually 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. Every adult would receive [amount.bi: \$20][periodicity: per month], thereby lifting 600 million people who earn less than \$2 a day out of extreme poverty.

The typical [national: American] would lose out financially [amount.lost: \$105][periodicity: per month] (as he or she would face around [price_increase: 2]% in price increases, which is higher than the [amount.bi: \$20][periodicity: per month] they would receive).

The policy could be implemented as soon as 100 countries agree to 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 program.

Do you support the Global Climate Scheme? [Figures 6, 9a, S29; gcs_support]

Yes; No

[new page] [Two random branches: *own*; *US*; Figure S29; *gcs_belief*, *variant_belief*]

29. [Branch: *US*] According to you, **what percentage of [belief_nationality: All but US: Americans; US: Europeans] would answer Yes to the previous question** (considering that typical [belief_nationality] would lose [belief_loss: \$140] per month from the Global Climate Scheme)?

The respondent who is closest to the correct value will get [amount_lottery: \$100].

Percentage of [belief_nationality] in favor of Global Climate Scheme

30. [Branch: *own*] According to you, **what percentage of [nationality: fellow citizens] would answer Yes to the previous question?**

The respondent who is closest to the correct value will get [amount_lottery: \$100].

Percentage of [nationality: fellow citizens] in favor of Global Climate Scheme

Cap & Share non-universal

[Four random branches: *low*; *mid*; *high*; *high_color*; Figures 6, S29; *ics_support*]

31. [Branch: *low*] Below is a map showing a possible set of countries that would participate in the Global Climate Scheme previously described.

These countries include India, the European Union, as well as all Africa, Latin America, South-Asia and South-East Asia.

Collectively, these [nb_countries_low: 145] countries account for [emissions_low_without: 40]% of global emissions (if [*ics_country*: the U.S.] joined them, [emissions_low_with: 40]% of global emissions would be covered).

32. [Branch: *mid*] Below is a map showing a possible set of countries that would participate in the Global Climate Scheme previously described.

These countries include China, India, as well as all Africa, Latin America, South-Asia and South-East Asia.

Collectively, these 119 countries account for 56% of global emissions (if [ics_country: the U.S.] joined them, [emissions_mid_with: 70]% of global emissions would be covered).

33. [Branch: high] Below is a map showing a possible set of countries that would participate in the Global Climate Scheme previously described.

These countries include China, India, [text_countries_high: the European Union, Japan, the United Kingdom], Canada, South Korea, as well as all Africa, Latin America, South-Asia and South-East Asia.

Collectively, these [nb_countries_high: 153] countries account for [emissions_high_without: 71]% of global emissions (if [ics_country: the U.S.] joined them, [emissions_high_with: 86]% of global emissions would be covered).

34. [Branch: high_color] Below is a map showing a possible set of countries that would participate in the Global Climate Scheme previously described.

These countries include China, India, [text_countries_high: the European Union, Japan, the United Kingdom], Canada, South Korea, as well as all Africa, Latin America, South-Asia and South-East Asia.

Collectively, these [nb_countries_high: 153] countries account for [emissions_high_without: 72]% of global emissions (if [ics_country: the U.S.] joined them, [emissions_high_with: 86]% of global emissions would be covered).

Note that a provision would prevent the Global Climate Scheme from harming low- and middle-income countries: this is why countries like China, Mexico, or Egypt are in white on the map (they would neither win nor lose financially).

35. Do you support [ics_country: the U.S.] joining the Global Climate Scheme, in case it

is adopted by the above countries? [Figures 6, S29; ics_support]

Yes; No

Warm glow – realism

36. [Two random branches: with or without this informational text.] To ensure that you have attentively read the description below, we will ask some comprehension questions later in the survey: those who get correct answers can win \$100.

In several international organizations, **countries have agreed to demonstrate some degree of solidarity in addressing global challenges.**

Negotiations are ongoing to implement specific mechanisms for sustainable development.

Here are a few examples:

- 🚢 In 2025, to reduce carbon emissions from shipping, **the International Maritime Organization adopted an international levy on excess emissions from maritime fuel, that should partly finance low-income countries.**
- ♦ Since 1970, **developed countries have agreed to contribute 0.7% of their GDP in foreign aid and development assistance.**
- In international climate negotiations, **developed countries have committed to finance climate action in developing countries.** In 2009, they committed to provide \$100 billion per year by 2020. In 2023, all countries agreed to set up a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with loss and damage from climate change. In 2024, the \$100 billion goal was increased to \$300 billion per year by 2035.
- ☒ In 2021, 136 countries adopted a minimum tax rate of 15% on multinational profits.
- ♥ In 2024, under the leadership of Brazil, **the G20 considered the introduction of a global tax of 2% on the wealth of billionaires.**
- 🌐 In 2024, the UN General Assembly adopted the Pact for the Future, which foresees a reform of the UN Security Council to limit the power of its five permanent member and expand it to new members.
- 🕒 Led by the Prime Minister of Barbados and supported by the UN Secretary Gen-

eral, the Bridgetown initiative seeks a new financial system that would drive financial resources towards climate action and sustainable development. [Figure 9b; info_solidarity]

37. According to you, how likely is it that international policies involving significant transfers from high-income countries to low-income countries will be introduced in the next 15 years? [Figure 9b; likely_solidarity]

Very unlikely; Unlikely; Likely; Very likely

38. Do you support or oppose the following policies?

[Only in PL, SA: (As some items refer to “developed countries”, note that we consider [Saudi Arabia] to be a developed country in this question.)] [Figures 10, S30-S32; solidarity_support]

[Item order is randomized]

- Institutions like the World Bank investing in many more sustainable projects in lower-income countries, and offering lower interest rates (the Bridgetown initiative)
- Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with loss and damage from climate change
- Expanding the UN Security Council (in charge of peacekeeping) to new permanent members such as India, Brazil, and the African Union, and restricting the use of the veto
- Raising the globally agreed minimum tax rate on profits of multinational firms from 15% to 35%, closing loopholes and allocating revenues to countries where sales are made
- Debt relief for vulnerable countries by suspending repayments until they are better able to repay, promoting their development
- An international levy on carbon emissions from shipping, funding national budgets in proportion to population
- An international levy on carbon emissions from aviation, raising ticket prices by 30% and funding national budgets in proportion to population
- Developed countries providing \$300 billion a year (0.4% of their GDP) to finance climate action in developing countries

- Developed countries contributing at least 0.7% of their GDP in foreign aid and development assistance
- A minimum tax of 2% on the wealth of billionaires, in voluntary countries

Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Indifferent; Somewhat support; Strongly support

NCQG

[Two random branches: Full; Short; ncqg_fusion, variant_ncqg]

39. [Branch: Full] **At international climate negotiations, developing countries call for larger provision of "climate finance": the financing of climate action from developed countries in developing countries.** [developed_note: (Note that we consider Saudi Arabia to be a developed country in this question.)]

There are two kinds of climate finance: grants (that is, donations) and loans. In 2022, \$26 billion was provided as grants and the rest as loans, for a total of \$116 billion.

In 2009, developed countries agreed to mobilize \$100 billion per year in climate finance by 2020. In 2024, they committed to raise this goal to \$300 billion by 2035. None of the goals specify which share should be provided as grants.

Below are different positions on the amount of climate finance that should be provided in 2035, all expressed in grant-equivalent terms (that is, not counting loans):

- \$0: There should be no contributions from developed countries to climate action in developing countries.
- \$26 billion (0.04% of developed countries' GDP): The current amount, consistent with the old (2020) goal.
- \$100 billion (0.14% of GDP): The old (2020) goal, if all climate finance were provided as grants.
- \$300 billion (0.43% of GDP): The new (2035) goal, if all climate finance were provided as grants.
- \$600 billion (0.86% of GDP): The goal called for by India, a position shared by most developing countries.
- \$1,000 billion (1.43% of GDP): The goal called for by Climate Action Network (a

network of NGOs including Greenpeace, Oxfam, and WWF).

- \$5,000 billion (7.14% of GDP): The goal called for by Demand Climate Justice (a network of NGOs including 350.org and the World Council of Churches)

If you could choose the amount of climate finance provided by developed countries to developing countries in 2035, what amount would you choose (in grant-equivalent terms)?

[Figure S34; ncqg_full]

[Item order is randomly reversed or not]

\$0; \$300 billion; \$600 billion; \$26 billion; \$100 billion; \$1,000 billion; \$5,000 billion

40. [Branch: Short] **"Climate finance" designates the financing of climate action from developed countries in developing countries.** [developed_note: (Note that we consider Saudi Arabia to be a developed country in this question.)]

There are two kinds of climate finance: grants (that is, donations) and loans. The large majority is currently provided as loans.

In 2009, developed countries agreed to mobilize \$100 billion per year in climate finance. In 2024, they committed to triple this goal by 2035. None of the goals specify which share should be provided as grants.

At international climate negotiations, developing countries call for larger provision of climate finance, particularly in the form of grants.

If you could choose the level of climate finance provided by developed countries to developing countries in 2035, what would you choose?

[Figure S33; ncqg]

[Item order is randomly flipped or not]

Stop all provision of climate finance.;

Reduce the provision of climate finance.;

Maintain current contributions (\$26 billion per year in grants, that is 0.04% of developed countries' GDP, and \$80 billion in loans, or 0.1% of GDP).;

Meet the newly agreed goal by tripling grants and loans (\$100 billion in grants, or 0.15% of GDP).;

Increase climate finance to a level between what developed countries have agreed and what

*developing countries are asking for (\$300 billion in grants, or 0.45% of GDP).;
Increase climate finance to match what developing countries are asking for (\$600 billion in grants, or 0.9% of GDP).;
Increase climate finance to match what NGOs are asking for (at least \$1,000 billion per year in grants, that is 1.4% of GDP, is what Greenpeace, Oxfam, WWF, and the World Council of Churches ask for).*

Wealth tax depending on sets of countries

[Three random branches: Global; HIC; Int'l; Figures 7, S35; wealth_tax_support, variant_wealth_tax]

41. [Branch: Global] **Imagine an international tax on individuals with net worth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million].**

Only wealth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million] would be taxed, at a rate of 2%. Each country would retain 70% of the revenues it collects, while 30% would be pooled at the global level to finance public services in low-income countries (in particular, access to drinking water, healthcare, and education in Africa).

Say we are in 2030. **Imagine that all other countries in the world adopt this policy. Do you support [country_name: the United States] adopting this international tax on millionaires?**

Yes; No

42. [Branch: HIC] **Imagine an international tax on individuals with net worth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million].**

Only wealth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million] would be taxed, at a rate of 2%. Each country would retain 70% of the revenues it collects, while 30% would be pooled at the global level to finance public services in low-income countries (in particular, access to drinking water, healthcare, and education in Africa).

Say we are in 2030. **[hic_tax: Imagine that all other high-income countries (such as the European Union, Japan, and Canada) adopt this policy and some middle-income countries (such as China) do not.]**

Do you support [country_name: the United States] adopting this international tax on millionaires?

Yes; No

43. [Branch: Int'l] **Imagine an international tax on individuals with net worth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million].**

Only wealth above [wealth_threshold: \$1 million] would be taxed, at a rate of 2%. Each country would retain 70% of the revenues it collects, while 30% would be pooled at the global level to finance public services in low-income countries (in particular, access to drinking water, healthcare, and education in Africa).

Say we are in 2030. **[intl_tax: Imagine that some countries (such as the European Union) adopt this policy and others (such as Japan, Canada, and China) do not.] Do you support [country_name: the United States] adopting this international tax on millionaires?**

Yes; No

Scenarios & radical tax

[Scenario A & B are randomly interverted.]

44. Consider two possible scenarios for the world for the next 20 years.

Scenario A:

Most countries implement coordinated policies to limit global warming to +2°C and reduce inequality. The world greatly reduces greenhouse gas emissions and is on track to meet its climate target. Taxes on millionaires fund the installation of heat pumps, the thermal insulation of buildings, and improved public transportation. Yachts and private jets are phased out worldwide. Cars are all electric by 2045, and they are about the same price as internal combustion cars nowadays. By 2045, environmental regulations gradually double the price heating fuel or gas, air travel, and beef. As a result, people fly half as much, eat half as much meat, and use more public transportation in 2045 than they did in 2025. Despite higher prices for polluting goods, the overall purchasing power is preserved, thanks to a decrease in sales tax that reduces the prices of non-polluting goods.

Scenario B:

Since 2025, no additional policies are implemented to address climate change or inequality. People maintain the same lifestyles as in 2025. For example, most people

continue to drive cars with internal combustion engines. Greenhouse gas emissions are stable. Global warming is expected to reach +3°C by 2100 and higher levels beyond that date. A warmer climate will cause more frequent and more severe droughts, heatwaves, wildfires, and floodings.

Apart from the elements described, the two scenarios are the same (for example, in terms of unemployment or crime).

Which scenario do you prefer for the future? [Figures 11, S36; sustainable_future]
Scenario A; Scenario B

[new page] [Two random branches: top1; top3; Figures 11, S37-S38; top_tax_support, variant_top_tax]

45. [Branch: top1] Currently, 2 billion people live in acute poverty, with less than [lcu_250: \$250][periodicity: per month].

The Sustainable Development Goals, adopted by all countries in 2015, aim to alleviate poverty and give access to healthcare, education, drinking water, and sanitation for all by 2030. Due to lack of funding, the world is not on track to meet these poverty reduction goals.

Poverty reduction could be funded by a global tax on individual income above [lcu_120k: \$120,000][periodicity_tax: per year].

The tax rate would be 15% for every [currency: dollar] over [lcu_120k: \$120,000] of income after existing taxes.

For example, a single person earning [lcu_130k: \$130,000][periodicity_tax: per year] after taxes would pay [lcu_1500: \$1,500] in additional taxes, or 15% of [lcu_10k: \$10,000] = [lcu_130k: \$130,000] –; [lcu_120k: \$120,000]. Meanwhile, a married couple earning [lcu_200k: \$200,000][periodicity_tax: per year], [lcu_100k: \$100,000] for each of them, would go untaxed.

This tax would apply to the richest 1% of the world's population. [tax_country_name: In the United States], it would affect the richest [affected_top1: 8]% and redistribute [transfer_top1: 3]% of GDP to lower-income countries.

Do you support or oppose such a global tax on the richest people to finance global

poverty reduction?

Strongly oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support; Somewhat oppose; Indifferent

46. [Branch: top3] Currently, 3 billion people live in deep poverty, with less than [lcu_400: \$400][periodicity: per month].

The Sustainable Development Goals, adopted by all countries in 2015, aim to alleviate poverty and achieve access to healthcare, education, drinking water, and sanitation for all by 2030. Due to lack of funding, the world is not on track to meet these poverty reduction goals.

Poverty reduction could be funded by a global tax on individual income above [lcu_80k: \$80,000][periodicity_tax: per year].

The tax rate would be 15% for every [currency: dollar] over [lcu_80k: \$80,000] of income after existing taxes, 30% over [lcu_120k: \$120,000], and 45% over [lcu_1M: \$1 million].

For example, a single person earning [lcu_90k: \$90,000][periodicity_tax: per year] after taxes would pay [lcu_1500_top3: \$1,500] in additional taxes, or 15% of [lcu_10k_top3: \$10,000] = [lcu_90k: \$90,000] – [lcu_80k: \$80,000]. Meanwhile, a married couple earning [lcu_150k: \$150,000][periodicity_tax: per year], [lcu_75k: \$75,000] for each of them, would go untaxed.

This tax would apply to the richest 3% of the world's population. [tax_country_name: In the United States], it would affect the richest [affected_top3: 18] and redistribute [transfer_top3: 8] of GDP to lower-income countries.

Do you support or oppose such a global tax on the richest people to finance global poverty reduction?

[Figures 11, S37-S38; top3_tax_support]

Strongly oppose; Somewhat support; Strongly support; Somewhat oppose; Indifferent

47. To show that you are attentive, please select "A little" in the following list: [attention_test]
Not at all; A little; A lot; A great deal

Preferred transfer means to LICs

48. Below are different ways to transfer resources to help reduce poverty in a low-income country.

How do you evaluate each of these options?

[Figures 13, S39-S40; transfer_how] [Item order is randomly flipped or not]

- Transfers to public development aid agencies which then finance suitable projects
- Transfers to the national government conditioned on the use of funds for poverty reduction programs
- Unconditional transfers to the national government
- Unconditional transfers to local authorities (municipality, village chief...)
- Transfers to local NGOs with democratic decision-making processes
- Cash transfers to parents (child allowances), to the disabled and to the elderly
- Unconditional cash transfers to each household

A wrong way; An acceptable way; A right way; The best way

Radical redistribution

49. Should governments actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century? [Figures 11, S41; convergence_support]

Yes; No; I prefer not to answer

50. If there was a worldwide movement in favor of a global program to tackle climate change, implement taxes on millionaires and fund poverty reduction in low-income countries, to what extent would you be willing to be part of that movement? (Multiple answers possible) [Figures 11, S42; global_movement]

I would not support such a movement.; I could sign a petition and spread ideas.; I could attend a demonstration.; I could go on strike.; I could donate [amount_lottery: \$100] to a strike fund.

51. [Except in: RU, SA] Let us call "your political party" the party you voted for in the last election, or the party that represents your views most closely.

Imagine there was a **worldwide coalition** of political parties in favor of a common program **to tackle climate change, implement taxes on millionaires and fund**

poverty reduction in low-income countries.

Would you be more likely to vote for your party if it were part of that coalition?

[Figures 11, S43; vote_intl_coalition] [Item order is randomly flipped or not]

*Yes, I would be **more likely** to vote for my party if it joined that coalition (or to vote for another party if only that other party joined the coalition).;*

*My choice would **not depend** on which parties are part of that coalition.;*

*No, I would be **less likely** to vote for my party if it joined that coalition.*

52. Some people think that high-income countries should support low-income countries.

Among the different reasons given, which ones do you agree with? (Multiple answers possible) [Figure S44; why_hic_help_lic] [Order of the first three items is randomized]

High-income countries have a historical responsibility for the current situation in low-income countries.;

In the long run, it is in the interest of high-income countries to help low-income countries.;

Helping those in need is the right thing to do. This is also true at the international level.;

None of the above.

53. [Only in: FR, DE, IT, ES, GB, US] Some people argue that Western countries owe reparations for colonization and slavery to former colonies and descendants of slaves. Reparations could take the form of funding education and facilitating technology transfers, to address unequal opportunities passed down from the past.

Do you support or oppose reparations of this kind for colonization and slavery?

[Figures 11, S45; reparations_support]

Strongly oppose; Somewhat oppose; Indifferent; Somewhat support; Strongly support

[Except in: RU] Custom redistribution

54. What is the [periodicity_text: yearly] income of your household **after taxes and social benefits?**

This includes all sources of income: salaries, pensions, allowances, welfare benefits, property income, etc.

My household earns ... [text_unit: \$ per year] (answer with no comma, no space, no

period):

[income_exact]

55. [new page] If you could redistribute income at the global level, what would you do? In this question, we let you choose your preferred parameters for a redistribution of income at the world level.

If you prefer to skip this question, check the corresponding box at the bottom of the page.

The worldwide redistribution of income would take the form of additional policies, taxes, and transfers, on top of existing ones.

These policies would lower the income of the richest (the losers from the redistribution) and increase the income of the poorest (the winners).

Below you will find a graph of the world distribution of after-tax income and three sliders that vary it. The current distribution is in red, and your custom one is in green.

The first two sliders control the proportion of winners and the proportion of losers, among all humans. The third slider controls the degree of redistribution from the richest to the poorest.

If you do not want new policies to reduce global inequality, you can set the third slider to zero.

You need to move the sliders (by holding the mouse down on the little squares and moving to the side) to make the green curve evolve: the idea is to move the sliders **until you get a green curve you are satisfied with**.

Examples of income changes after your proposed redistribution:

Now	After
0 [text_unit: \$ per year] [now_10k] [text_unit]	[after_0] [text_unit: \$ per year] [after_10k] [text_unit]
[now_60k] [text_unit]	[after_60k] [text_unit]
[now_100k] [text_unit]	[after_100k] [text_unit]
Your <i>individual</i> income	
[own] [text_unit]	[after_own] [text_unit]

[Figures 14, S47-S50] I am satisfied with my custom redistribution.;
I want to skip this question.

Well-being (for another project)

[Four random branches: gallup_0; gallup_1; wvs_0; wvs_1; well_being, variant_well_being]

56. [Branch: gallup_0] Please imagine a ladder, with steps numbered from 0 at the bottom to 10 at the top. The top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom of the ladder represents the worst possible life for you.

On which step of the ladder would you say you personally feel you stand at this time? [well_being_gallup_0]

Worst possible 0; 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; Best possible 10

57. [Branch: gallup_1] Please imagine a ladder, with steps numbered from 1 at the bottom to 10 at the top. The top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you and the bottom of the ladder represents the worst possible life for you.

On which step of the ladder would you say you personally feel you stand at this time? [well_being_gallup_1]

Worst possible 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; Best possible 10

58. [Branch: wvs_0] All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? [well_being_wvs_0]

Completely dissatisfied 0; 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; Completely satisfied 10

59. [Branch: wvs_1] All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days? [well_being_wvs_1]

Completely dissatisfied 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; Completely satisfied 10

Comprehension

60. *Comprehension question: one respondent with the expected answer will get [amount_lottery: \$100].*

How would gasoline prices change as a result of the Global Climate Scheme?
Gasoline prices would... [Figure S51; gcs_comprehension] [Item order is randomly flipped or not]
increase; not be affected; decrease

Synthetic questions

61. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? "My taxes should go towards solving global problems." [Figures 11, S52-S53; my_tax_global_nation]
Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agree nor disagree; Disagree; Strongly disagree
62. Which group of people do you advocate for when you vote? [Figures 12, S54; group_defended]
Sentient beings (humans and animals); Humans; [country_adjective_plural: Americans]; People from my community (for example my region, my religion, my gender...); My family and myself

Feedback

63. Do you feel that this survey was politically biased? [Figure S55; survey_biased]
Yes, left-wing biased; Yes, right-wing biased; No, I do not feel it was biased
64. The survey is nearing completion. You can now enter any comments, thoughts, or suggestions in the field below. [Random answers can be found on bit.ly/fields2025; comment_field]

C Representativeness of the surveys

Table S1: Sample representativeness overall, in Europe, and in the European Union.

	All			Eu			EU		
	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample
Sample size		12,007	12,007		5,000	5,000		3,705	3,705
Gender: Woman	.51	.50	.51	.51	.51	.51	.52	.51	.52
Gender: Man	.49	.49	.49	.49	.49	.49	.48	.49	.48
Income_quartile: Q1	.25	.26	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.26	.25
Income_quartile: Q2	.25	.24	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.26	.25
Income_quartile: Q3	.25	.24	.25	.25	.21	.25	.25	.22	.25
Income_quartile: Q4	.25	.26	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.26	.25
Age: 18-24	.10	.10	.10	.09	.10	.09	.09	.10	.09
Age: 25-34	.16	.17	.16	.15	.15	.15	.14	.15	.14
Age: 35-49	.26	.26	.26	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
Age: 50-64	.24	.23	.24	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
Age: 65+	.25	.24	.25	.26	.25	.26	.27	.25	.27
Diploma_25-64: Below upper secondary	.09	.08	.09	.13	.12	.13	.14	.13	.14
Diploma_25-64: Upper secondary	.31	.29	.31	.26	.26	.26	.28	.27	.28
Diploma_25-64: Post secondary	.29	.32	.29	.25	.28	.25	.22	.25	.22
Urbanity: Cities	.63	.52	.52	.41	.41	.41	.42	.44	.42
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.15	.17	.15	.36	.38	.36	.35	.34	.34
Urbanity: Rural	.20	.14	.16	.22	.21	.22	.23	.22	.23
Country: FR	.07	.07	.07	.18	.16	.18	.22	.22	.22
Country: DE	.08	.09	.08	.23	.21	.23	.28	.28	.28
Country: IT	.06	.06	.06	.16	.15	.16	.20	.20	.20
Country: PL	.04	.04	.04	.10	.10	.10	.13	.13	.13
Country: ES	.05	.05	.05	.13	.12	.13	.16	.16	.16
Country: GB	.07	.07	.07	.18	.17	.18			
Country: CH	.01	.04	.01	.02	.09	.02			
Country: JP	.13	.17	.13						
Country: RU	.14	.08	.14						
Country: SA	.03	.08	.03						
Country: US	.33	.25	.33						

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside actual population frequencies. Bold cells denote frequencies beyond $\pm 20\%$ of population frequencies. Detailed sources for each variable and country population frequencies, as well as the definitions of regions, diploma, urbanity, employment, and vote are available in [this spreadsheet](#).

Table S2: Sample representativeness in France, Germany, Italy.

	France			Germany			Italy		
	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample	Pop.	Sample	Weighted sample
Sample size		798	798		1,048	1,048		756	756
Gender: Woman	.52	.52	.52	.51	.49	.51	.52	.52	.51
Gender: Man	.48	.48	.48	.49	.51	.49	.48	.48	.49
Income_quartile: Q1	.25	.26	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.26	.25
Income_quartile: Q2	.25	.26	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.26	.25
Income_quartile: Q3	.25	.23	.25	.25	.20	.25	.25	.22	.25
Income_quartile: Q4	.25	.25	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.25	.25
Age: 18-24	.10	.11	.10	.09	.10	.09	.08	.08	.08
Age: 25-34	.15	.15	.15	.15	.16	.15	.12	.12	.12
Age: 35-49	.23	.23	.23	.23	.25	.23	.23	.23	.23
Age: 50-64	.24	.24	.24	.27	.27	.27	.28	.29	.28
Age: 65+	.27	.27	.27	.27	.22	.27	.29	.28	.29
Diploma_25-64: Below upper secondary	.10	.09	.10	.11	.11	.11	.22	.19	.22
Diploma_25-64: Upper secondary	.26	.26	.26	.32	.32	.32	.28	.28	.28
Diploma_25-64: Post secondary	.26	.27	.26	.22	.24	.21	.14	.17	.14
Urbanity: Cities	.47	.47	.46	.39	.42	.39	.36	.37	.36
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.19	.19	.19	.42	.42	.42	.46	.47	.46
Urbanity: Rural	.34	.33	.34	.19	.17	.19	.18	.16	.18
Region: 1	.18	.19	.18	.17	.19	.17	.66	.70	.65
Region: 2	.22	.23	.22	.29	.32	.29	.34	.29	.34
Region: 3	.11	.11	.11	.54	.48	.54			
Region: 4	.21	.22	.21						
Region: 5	.28	.26	.28						

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside actual population frequencies. Bold cells denote frequencies beyond $\pm 20\%$ of population frequencies. Detailed sources for each variable and country population frequencies, as well as the definitions of regions, diploma, urbanity, employment, and vote are available in [this spreadsheet](#).

Table S3: Sample representativeness in Poland, Spain, the UK, Switzerland.

	Poland			Spain			United Kingdom			Switzerland		
	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.
Sample size		500	500		603	603		826	826		469	469
Gender: Woman	.52	.53	.52	.51	.51	.51	.51	.50	.51	.50	.48	.50
Gender: Man	.48	.46	.47	.49	.49	.49	.49	.50	.49	.50	.52	.50
Income quartile: Q1	.25	.26	.25	.25	.28	.25	.25	.28	.25	.25	.30	.26
Income quartile: Q2	.25	.25	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.23	.25	.25	.28	.25
Income quartile: Q3	.25	.23	.25	.25	.21	.25	.25	.21	.25	.25	.17	.25
Income quartile: Q4	.25	.26	.25	.25	.25	.24	.25	.27	.25	.25	.25	.24
Age: 18-24	.08	.09	.08	.10	.11	.09	.11	.10	.11	.09	.10	.09
Age: 25-34	.15	.16	.15	.15	.14	.14	.17	.17	.17	.16	.18	.17
Age: 35-49	.30	.29	.30	.30	.27	.31	.24	.25	.25	.26	.27	.25
Age: 50-64	.23	.21	.23	.19	.22	.19	.25	.25	.24	.26	.24	.26
Age: 65+	.24	.24	.24	.26	.26	.26	.24	.24	.23	.23	.22	.24
Diploma 25-64: Below upper secondary	.04	.05	.04	.23	.18	.23	.12	.11	.12	.09	.06	.09
Diploma 25-64: Upper secondary	.38	.34	.38	.15	.15	.15	.19	.17	.19	.27	.29	.27
Diploma 25-64: Post secondary	.26	.28	.26	.27	.29	.26	.35	.38	.35	.31	.33	.31
Urbanity: Cities	.35	.37	.35	.54	.58	.54	.40	.36	.39	.30	.32	.30
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.28	.29	.28	.32	.30	.33	.42	.45	.43	.53	.54	.53
Urbanity: Rural	.37	.34	.37	.13	.12	.13	.18	.19	.18	.17	.14	.17
Region: 1	.47	.41	.47	.15	.16	.15	.13	.14	.13	.70	.70	.70
Region: 2	.53	.59	.53	.28	.25	.28	.31	.33	.31	.26	.26	.26
Region: 3				.14	.16	.14	.21	.17	.21	.04	.04	.04
Region: 4				.18	.19	.18	.24	.25	.24			
Region: 5				.25	.24	.25	.11	.10	.11			

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside actual population frequencies. Bold cells denote frequencies beyond $\pm 20\%$ of population frequencies. Detailed sources for each variable and country population frequencies, as well as the definitions of regions, diploma, urbanity, employment, and vote are available in [this spreadsheet](#).

Table S4: Sample representativeness in non-European countries.


	Japan			Russia			Saudi Arabia			USA		
	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.
Sample size		2,000	2,000		1,007	1,007		1,000	1,000		3,000	3,000
Gender: Woman	.51	.50	.51	.54	.53	.54				.50	.52	.50
Gender: Man	.49	.50	.49	.46	.47	.46				.50	.48	.50
Income_quartile: Q1	.25	.26	.25	.25	.19	.24	.25	.32	.26	.25	.23	.25
Income_quartile: Q2	.25	.24	.25	.25	.18	.24	.25	.23	.25	.25	.24	.25
Income_quartile: Q3	.25	.25	.25	.25	.27	.24	.25	.22	.24	.25	.27	.25
Income_quartile: Q4	.25	.25	.25	.25	.32	.24	.25	.23	.24	.25	.26	.25
Age: 18-24	.08	.08	.08	.09	.09	.09	.15	.16	.16	.12	.10	.12
Age: 25-34	.12	.12	.12	.16	.15	.16	.32	.35	.32	.17	.18	.17
Age: 35-49	.22	.23	.22	.30	.30	.30	.36	.37	.37	.25	.24	.25
Age: 50-64	.24	.24	.24	.25	.25	.25	.13	.11	.13	.24	.24	.24
Age: 65+	.34	.34	.34	.21	.20	.21	.04	.00	.02	.23	.24	.23
Diploma_25-64: Upper secondary	.26	.25	.26	.62	.62	.62	.15	.23	.16	.27	.27	.27
Diploma_25-64: Post secondary	.32	.33	.32	.28	.32	.28	.35	.50	.39	.33	.34	.33
Diploma_25-64: Below upper secondary				.10	.06	.10	.31	.11	.27	.05	.05	.05
Urbanity: Cities	.92	.92	.92							.76	.78	.76
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.08	.08	.08								.24	.22
Urbanity: Rural												.24
Region: 1	.17	.17	.17				.14	.06	.12	.17	.18	.17
Region: 2	.17	.18	.17				.34	.45	.35	.21	.21	.21
Region: 3	.34	.35	.34				.36	.36	.36	.38	.40	.38
Region: 4	.11	.11	.11				.16	.12	.16	.24	.21	.24
Region: 5	.20	.19	.20							.09	.07	.09
Gender_nationality: Woman, Saudi							.24	.31	.25			
Gender_nationality: Woman, non-Saudi							.10	.12	.11			
Gender_nationality: Man, Saudi							.24	.33	.27			
Gender_nationality: Man, non-Saudi							.41	.24	.37			
Race: White only										.58	.56	.58
Race: Hispanic										.20	.21	.19
Race: Black										.14	.15	.14
Race: Other										.09	.07	.09

Note: This table displays summary statistics of the samples alongside actual population frequencies. Bold cells denote frequencies beyond $\pm 20\%$ of population frequencies. Detailed sources for each variable and country population frequencies, as well as the definitions of regions, diploma, urbanity, employment, and vote are available in [this spreadsheet](#).

D Determinants of support

Figure S60: Variance decomposition: share of the variance explained by each covariate.

(a) Support for the Global Climate Scheme (11% of this variable's variance is explained by that linear model). (Question 28)



(b) Share of plausible global policies supported (17% of this variable's variance is explained by that linear model). (Question 38)




Table S5: Correlates of support for global redistribution (multivariate OLS regressions).

	Share of plausible policies supported	Supports the Global Climate Scheme	Universalist (Group defended: Humans or Sentient beings)	More likely to vote for party in global coalition	Endorses convergence of all countries' GDP p.c. by 2100	Supports an international wealth tax funding LICs	Prefers a sustainable future
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Mean	0.508	0.554	0.454	0.365	0.61	0.704	0.681
Vote: Center-right or Right	0.013 (0.010)	-0.002 (0.015)	-0.091*** (0.014)	0.026* (0.013)	0.037** (0.014)	-0.027** (0.014)	-0.064*** (0.014)
Vote: Far right	-0.090*** (0.013)	-0.151*** (0.020)	-0.232*** (0.019)	-0.065*** (0.018)	-0.067*** (0.020)	-0.141*** (0.019)	-0.171*** (0.020)
Vote: Left	0.211*** (0.010)	0.162*** (0.014)	0.142*** (0.015)	0.254*** (0.014)	0.186*** (0.014)	0.183*** (0.013)	0.145*** (0.014)
Gender: Man	0.019*** (0.007)	0.032*** (0.010)	-0.034*** (0.010)	0.028*** (0.010)	0.011 (0.010)	0.001 (0.009)	-0.025*** (0.010)
Age: 18-24	0.022 (0.014)	0.169*** (0.021)	0.103*** (0.022)	0.106*** (0.023)	0.117*** (0.021)	0.091*** (0.019)	0.056*** (0.020)
Age: 25-34	0.026** (0.011)	0.088*** (0.016)	0.064*** (0.016)	0.100*** (0.016)	0.048*** (0.016)	0.047*** (0.014)	0.029* (0.015)
Age: 50-64	-0.015 (0.010)	-0.038*** (0.014)	-0.024* (0.014)	-0.033** (0.014)	-0.027* (0.014)	-0.031** (0.014)	-0.019 (0.014)
Age: 65+	0.037*** (0.013)	-0.011 (0.018)	-0.001 (0.018)	0.002 (0.017)	-0.014 (0.018)	-0.019 (0.017)	0.007 (0.017)
Income quartile: Q2	0.028*** (0.010)	0.012 (0.015)	-0.021 (0.015)	0.016 (0.015)	-0.007 (0.015)	0.018 (0.013)	0.011 (0.014)
Income quartile: Q3	0.016 (0.010)	-0.006 (0.015)	0.005 (0.015)	-0.010 (0.015)	-0.019 (0.015)	-0.025* (0.014)	-0.002 (0.015)
Income quartile: Q4	0.005 (0.012)	-0.038** (0.017)	-0.026 (0.017)	-0.032* (0.017)	-0.073*** (0.017)	-0.080*** (0.016)	-0.007 (0.016)
Diploma: Upper secondary	0.026** (0.010)	-0.012 (0.015)	0.023 (0.015)	0.036** (0.015)	0.034** (0.015)	0.013 (0.014)	0.016 (0.015)
Diploma: Above upper secondary	0.069*** (0.011)	0.024 (0.016)	0.043*** (0.016)	0.080*** (0.015)	0.022 (0.016)	0.012 (0.015)	0.048*** (0.015)
Urbanicity: Rural	-0.012 (0.010)	-0.057*** (0.015)	0.012 (0.015)	-0.008 (0.014)	-0.014 (0.015)	-0.022 (0.014)	-0.021 (0.015)
Urbanicity: Towns and suburbs	-0.013 (0.010)	-0.039*** (0.015)	-0.025 (0.015)	-0.024 (0.015)	-0.014 (0.015)	-0.024* (0.014)	0.026* (0.014)
Will become millionaire: Likely	0.049*** (0.009)	0.072*** (0.012)	-0.008 (0.013)	0.041*** (0.013)	0.070*** (0.013)	-0.022* (0.012)	-0.023* (0.012)
Will become millionaire: Already	-0.019 (0.017)	-0.038 (0.024)	0.015 (0.024)	-0.058** (0.023)	-0.037 (0.024)	-0.253*** (0.023)	-0.065*** (0.023)
Observations	10,998	10,998	10,998	9,998	10,998	10,998	10,998
R ²	0.159	0.112	0.107	0.115	0.098	0.103	0.078

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Covariates omitted in the Table: *Country; Employment; Couple; Region; Constant*. Omitted variables are: *Vote: Non-voter, PNR or Other; Gender: Woman; Age: 35-49; Income quartile: Q1; Diploma: Below upper secondary; Urbanicity: City*. *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

Table S6: Correlates of answers on custom redistribution (multivariate OLS regressions).

	Custom transfer (in % of world GDP)		Loses from custom redistribution		Satisfied with own custom redistr.	Has not touched the sliders	Touched the sliders and satisfied	
Mean	5.137	5.442	5.808	0.456	0.474	0.559	0.372	0.398
Vote: Center-right or Right	-0.088 (0.138)	0.085 (0.222)	0.122 (0.307)	-0.0002 (0.012)	-0.045** (0.021)	0.051*** (0.014)	-0.009 (0.014)	0.032** (0.013)
Vote: Far right	-0.533*** (0.198)	-0.555* (0.297)	-0.793* (0.407)	-0.015 (0.017)	-0.058** (0.028)	0.050*** (0.019)	-0.006 (0.019)	0.039** (0.019)
Vote: Left	0.846*** (0.150)	1.054*** (0.229)	1.496*** (0.316)	0.040*** (0.012)	0.037* (0.021)	0.105*** (0.014)	-0.028** (0.014)	0.069*** (0.014)
Gender: Man	0.132 (0.103)	0.027 (0.154)	-0.057 (0.216)	0.006 (0.009)	0.013 (0.014)	0.145*** (0.009)	-0.090*** (0.010)	0.125*** (0.010)
Age: 18-24	0.435* (0.229)	0.387 (0.310)	0.362 (0.418)	0.052*** (0.018)	0.042 (0.027)	0.059*** (0.019)	-0.046** (0.019)	0.071*** (0.020)
Age: 25-34	0.083 (0.157)	0.127 (0.216)	0.120 (0.299)	-0.001 (0.013)	0.003 (0.020)	0.012 (0.014)	-0.018 (0.014)	0.022 (0.015)
Age: 50-64	-0.301** (0.142)	-0.503** (0.206)	-0.661** (0.286)	-0.018 (0.012)	-0.057*** (0.020)	-0.084*** (0.014)	0.058*** (0.014)	-0.069*** (0.014)
Age: 65+	-0.070 (0.179)	0.140 (0.296)	0.286 (0.423)	-0.012 (0.015)	-0.042 (0.027)	-0.129*** (0.017)	0.116*** (0.018)	-0.118*** (0.017)
Income quartile: Q2	-0.293** (0.148)	-0.343 (0.225)	-0.524* (0.317)	0.241*** (0.011)	0.251*** (0.020)	0.012 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.014)	0.011 (0.013)
Income quartile: Q3	-0.396** (0.157)	-0.543** (0.235)	-0.818** (0.330)	0.415*** (0.012)	0.359*** (0.021)	-0.012 (0.014)	-0.008 (0.014)	0.002 (0.014)
Income quartile: Q4	-0.905*** (0.168)	-1.015*** (0.252)	-1.484*** (0.356)	0.559*** (0.014)	0.478*** (0.023)	0.007 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	0.016 (0.016)
Diploma: Upper secondary	-0.030 (0.154)	0.006 (0.244)	-0.020 (0.353)	0.001 (0.012)	-0.025 (0.022)	0.041*** (0.015)	-0.008 (0.015)	0.032** (0.014)
Diploma: Above upper secondary	0.069 (0.161)	0.070 (0.253)	0.045 (0.367)	0.027** (0.013)	0.013 (0.024)	0.043*** (0.015)	-0.038** (0.016)	0.056*** (0.015)
Urbanicity: Rural	-0.273* (0.161)	-0.201 (0.245)	-0.231 (0.337)	0.010 (0.013)	0.014 (0.021)	-0.030** (0.015)	-0.020 (0.015)	-0.029** (0.015)
Urbanicity: Towns and suburbs	-0.196 (0.171)	-0.087 (0.255)	-0.069 (0.358)	0.011 (0.013)	0.003 (0.022)	-0.006 (0.015)	0.001 (0.015)	-0.013 (0.015)
Will become millionaire: Likely	0.237* (0.130)	0.388** (0.186)	0.674*** (0.260)	0.019* (0.011)	0.013 (0.017)	0.062*** (0.012)	-0.001 (0.012)	0.018 (0.012)
Will become millionaire: Already	0.390 (0.257)	0.319 (0.390)	0.507 (0.561)	0.047** (0.020)	-0.030 (0.035)	-0.006 (0.022)	0.051** (0.023)	-0.037 (0.023)
Subsample: Satisfied		✓						
Subsample: Touched & Satisfied			✓		✓			
Observations	10,998	6,152	4,378	10,998	4,378	10,998	10,998	10,998
R ²	0.023	0.030	0.042	0.265	0.195	0.092	0.037	0.059

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Covariates omitted in the Table: *Country; Employment; Couple; Region; Constant*. Omitted variables are: *Vote: Non-voter, PNR or Other; Gender: Woman; Age: 35-49; Income quartile: Q1; Diploma: Below upper secondary; Urbanicity: City*. *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

E The determination of a custom redistribution

In Question 55, respondents are asked for their preferred redistribution of the world's post-tax income. This custom redistribution is determined by modifying the current distribution using the respondent's three input parameters:

- The *proportion of winners*, i.e. the share of people (at the bottom of the distribution) advantaged by the custom redistribution;
- The *proportion of losers*, i.e. the share of people (at the top) disadvantaged by the redistribution;
- The *degree of redistribution*, ranging from 0/10 (no redistribution) to 10/10 (maximal redistribution).

The determination of the custom distribution given these parameters relies on the algorithm *Dis/adv* introduced by [Fabre \(2022\)](#). In that paper, [Fabre \(2022\)](#) surveyed two representative samples of French respondents. The first survey uncovered the median preferred parameters for a national income redistribution.²⁷ The second survey showed that 52% supported the income redistribution defined using these parameters while only 26% opposed it. Furthermore, a majority among the French respondents who expressed an opinion agreed that it is a good idea to "determine the citizens' preferred tax schedule from a survey and then submit the proposal that would emerge from the survey to a referendum." Therefore, the algorithm *Dis/adv* applied to median preferred parameters has been validated both through the support for the resulting redistribution and through the support for such democratic method of preference aggregation to determine an income redistribution. Nonetheless, the algorithm *Dis/adv* is just a first attempt to adjust the tax schedule by aggregating citizens' preferences, and more appropriate methods may be proposed. Although [Fabre \(2022\)](#) finds that the algorithm *Dis/adv* fares better than another algorithm tested, the method still suffers from some limitations. In particular, the current method is difficult to understand for the users, and it only allows for redistribution from the rich to the poor (it would thus be inappropriate if the level of inequality were considered too low). Below, I describe the algorithm *Dis/adv*, available for use at


²⁷The median preferred proportions of winners and losers were 50% and 10%, respectively. The median preferred degree of redistribution was defined indirectly, using the median preferred demogrant: €800/month. The resulting redistribution entailed 12% of GDP redistributed from the top 10% to the bottom 50%.

bit.ly/custom_redistr, and implemented in the R function `compute_custom_redistr` on github.com/bixiou/robustness_global_redistr/raw/main/code_robustness/2_prepare.R.

Algorithm Dis/Adv It is worth reminding that on a range of income (concerning people that are neither winner nor loser from the reform), both current and custom distributions coincide. The algorithm proceeds as follows:

1. Define the *extreme distribution* as the current distribution bounded by the income thresholds of winners and losers. In other words, draw two horizontal lines at each end of the distribution, by setting the incomes of winners to the income of the richest winner, and those of losers to income of the poorest loser.
2. Compute what can be redistributed on either side as the area between the extreme and current distributions: what can be given to winners on the left side (L) or taken on the right side (R). If and only if what can be given is lower than what can be taken ($L < R$, as in Figure S61), the left side is binding, and it determines the *amount transferred* from the rich to the poor: $\min\{L; R\} \cdot \text{degree}$.
3. On the binding side, define the custom distribution as a linear mixture between the current and extreme distributions, with the mixture parameter set by the *degree of redistribution*. In other words, starting from the current distribution, narrow the gap with the extreme distribution by a factor *degree*.

Figure S61: Algorithm for the custom redistribution, with parameters *winners*: 60%, *losers*: 20%, *degree*: 4/10.




4. Adjust the non-binding side by narrowing the gap with the extreme distribution, using the unique mixture parameter that preserves aggregate income (so that the amount transferred is the same on both sides).²⁸
5. [Optional step, used in the survey.] To increase the demigrant (i.e. the lowest income) and make the reform more progressive on the left side, try to replace the left side by a straight line. In other words, find the demigrant and the straight line between the demigrant and the threshold of winners that respects the amount transferred. If this straight line crosses the current distribution or if it implies a regressive redistribution (in that some income would increase less than a higher income), abandon the straight line and keep the custom redistribution as is.

Once the custom redistribution has been determined, it is straightforward to compute the additional tax schedule required to attain it.²⁹ Figure S62 presents the tax schedule required to attain the average custom redistribution (weighted over all respondents). Figure S62 shows that (on the losers' side) this redistribution can be approximated by additional marginal tax rates of 7% above \$25,000 per year, and 16% above \$40,000. Figure S62 also compares this tax schedule with those associated with the radical income redistribution tested in Questions 45-46: While the average custom redistribution features a much larger tax base than the radical tax targeting the top 3% (as it taxes the top 28%), its top tax rate is three times lower, so that the two redistributions entail similar transfers from the rich to the poor, at 5.1% of the world's income.

²⁸While we do not account for behavioral responses, one can adjust the algorithm to account for them. It suffices to define a post-reform aggregate income, which can be lower than the pre-reform one if the reform disincentivizes economic activity.

²⁹For a sophisticated calculation of the required tax schedule, which allows for behavioral responses and a gradual implementation, see Appendix IX of [Fabre \(2022\)](#).


Figure S62: Additional tax schedule associated with the radical and custom redistributions. Questions 45-46, 55.




F Comparison with other surveys

Figure S63: Comparison with similar questions in other surveys.

(a) Absolute support for an international 2% tax on billionaire wealth (cross-country correlation between this survey and [Cappelen et al. \(2025\)](#): .86). (Question 38)



(b) Relative agreement that “My taxes should go towards solving global problems” (cross-country correlation with [Global Nation \(2023\)](#): .70). (Question 61)



G Attrition analysis

Table S7: Attrition analysis.

	Dropped out	Dropped out after socio-eco	Failed attention test	Duration (in min)	Duration below 6 min
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mean	0.166	0.102	0.088	53.896	0.087
Vote: Center-right or Right	-0.042*** (0.008)	-0.040*** (0.008)	-0.008 (0.007)	-7.194 (10.597)	-0.025*** (0.008)
Vote: Far right	-0.051*** (0.010)	-0.050*** (0.010)	-0.012 (0.009)	-18.804 (15.429)	-0.021** (0.009)
Vote: Left	-0.029*** (0.008)	-0.027*** (0.008)	-0.013* (0.007)	-16.126 (10.494)	-0.041*** (0.008)
Gender: Man	-0.043*** (0.005)	-0.042*** (0.005)	0.026*** (0.005)	-14.234** (7.063)	0.004 (0.005)
Age: 18-24	-0.030*** (0.010)	-0.030*** (0.010)	0.028** (0.012)	-19.220*** (6.900)	0.089*** (0.013)
Age: 25-34	-0.031*** (0.007)	-0.031*** (0.007)	0.018** (0.009)	-4.123 (8.929)	0.051*** (0.009)
Age: 50-64	0.011 (0.008)	0.011 (0.008)	-0.033*** (0.007)	9.254 (10.045)	-0.059*** (0.007)
Age: 65+	0.039*** (0.010)	0.039*** (0.010)	-0.058*** (0.008)	28.229* (15.380)	-0.105*** (0.008)
Income quartile: Q2	-0.029*** (0.008)	-0.029*** (0.008)	-0.040*** (0.008)	-0.384 (8.336)	-0.012 (0.008)
Income quartile: Q3	-0.028*** (0.008)	-0.030*** (0.008)	-0.056*** (0.008)	-13.405** (6.818)	-0.017** (0.008)
Income quartile: Q4	-0.032*** (0.009)	-0.032*** (0.009)	-0.060*** (0.009)	16.509 (13.757)	-0.029*** (0.008)
Diploma: Upper secondary	-0.018** (0.009)	-0.018** (0.009)	-0.052*** (0.009)	7.862 (9.883)	-0.004 (0.008)
Diploma: Above upper secondary	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.043*** (0.009)	-0.065*** (0.009)	1.479 (10.935)	-0.017** (0.008)
Urbanicity: Rural	-0.004 (0.008)	-0.005 (0.008)	-0.008 (0.007)	-4.275 (8.305)	-0.003 (0.007)
Urbanicity: Towns and suburbs	0.007 (0.008)	0.007 (0.008)	-0.016** (0.007)	5.311 (16.323)	0.001 (0.007)
Country: Germany	-0.353 (0.263)	-0.352 (0.263)	-0.679** (0.329)	25.812 (30.763)	-0.211*** (0.025)
Country: Italy	-0.123 (0.318)	-0.121 (0.319)	-0.675** (0.329)	688.464 (604.750)	-0.207*** (0.033)
Country: Japan	-0.320 (0.262)	-0.317 (0.263)	-0.707** (0.329)	5.073 (27.025)	0.206 (0.196)
Country: Poland	-0.258 (0.261)	-0.257 (0.262)	-0.735** (0.329)	-27.152 (26.191)	0.770*** (0.025)
Country: Saudi Arabia	-0.072 (0.280)	-0.069 (0.281)	-0.260 (0.354)	18.800 (31.927)	-0.320*** (0.038)
Country: Spain	-0.299 (0.262)	-0.296 (0.262)	-0.704** (0.329)	95.626*** (26.178)	-0.323*** (0.026)
Country: Switzerland	0.001 (0.025)	0.001 (0.025)	-0.001 (0.020)	2.543 (13.928)	-0.004 (0.020)
Country: United Kingdom	-0.262 (0.262)	-0.261 (0.262)	-0.839** (0.329)	65.461** (28.897)	-0.383*** (0.029)
Country: USA	-0.024 (0.023)	-0.021 (0.023)	-0.134*** (0.020)	-2.372 (18.225)	-0.147*** (0.020)
Observations	15,013	15,013	13,261	12,031	12,031
R ²	0.037	0.037	0.079	0.012	0.089

Note: Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

H Balance analysis

Table S8: Balance analysis.

	Random branch:							
	Wealth tax coverage: Global	Wealth tax coverage: Int'l	Int'l CS coverage: Low	Int'l CS coverage: High	Int'l CS coverage: High color	National CS asked	Warm glow substitute: Control	Warm glow realism: Info treatment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Mean	0.331	0.336	0.253	0.256	0.252	0.348	0.345	0.487
Vote: Center-right or Right	0.001 (0.013)	0.018 (0.013)	-0.009 (0.013)	-0.004 (0.012)	0.012 (0.012)	-0.014 (0.013)	0.004 (0.013)	-0.011 (0.014)
Vote: Far right	-0.025 (0.018)	0.015 (0.018)	-0.014 (0.017)	0.022 (0.017)	0.019 (0.017)	-0.009 (0.018)	0.020 (0.019)	-0.010 (0.020)
Vote: Left	-0.003 (0.014)	-0.001 (0.014)	-0.003 (0.013)	-0.010 (0.013)	0.002 (0.012)	-0.005 (0.014)	-0.003 (0.013)	-0.012 (0.014)
Gender: Man	0.0002 (0.009)	-0.018* (0.009)	-0.016* (0.009)	0.008 (0.009)	-0.003 (0.009)	-0.0005 (0.009)	-0.006 (0.009)	0.011 (0.010)
Age: 18-24	-0.008 (0.019)	0.009 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.018)	0.007 (0.018)	0.008 (0.018)	0.012 (0.020)	-0.025 (0.019)	-0.004 (0.020)
Age: 25-34	-0.027* (0.014)	0.025* (0.014)	-0.005 (0.013)	0.018 (0.013)	0.002 (0.013)	-0.005 (0.014)	0.0001 (0.014)	-0.008 (0.015)
Age: 50-64	-0.014 (0.013)	0.010 (0.013)	0.009 (0.012)	0.012 (0.012)	-0.001 (0.012)	0.010 (0.013)	0.002 (0.013)	-0.011 (0.014)
Age: 65+	-0.013 (0.017)	0.031* (0.017)	0.010 (0.016)	0.031** (0.016)	-0.021 (0.015)	-0.007 (0.017)	0.013 (0.017)	-0.004 (0.018)
Income quartile: Q2	-0.009 (0.013)	0.002 (0.013)	-0.0001 (0.012)	-0.012 (0.012)	-0.006 (0.012)	-0.002 (0.013)	-0.013 (0.013)	-0.008 (0.014)
Income quartile: Q3	0.00001 (0.014)	-0.00001 (0.014)	0.004 (0.013)	-0.008 (0.013)	0.002 (0.013)	-0.013 (0.014)	-0.012 (0.014)	0.007 (0.015)
Income quartile: Q4	-0.010 (0.016)	0.007 (0.016)	-0.006 (0.014)	0.008 (0.014)	0.007 (0.014)	-0.015 (0.016)	0.004 (0.016)	-0.001 (0.016)
Diploma: Upper secondary	0.008 (0.014)	-0.0004 (0.014)	-0.0004 (0.013)	-0.008 (0.013)	0.014 (0.013)	-0.011 (0.014)	0.016 (0.014)	-0.019 (0.015)
Diploma: Above upper secondary	0.026* (0.015)	-0.004 (0.015)	0.001 (0.014)	-0.017 (0.014)	0.026* (0.014)	-0.003 (0.015)	0.0003 (0.015)	-0.005 (0.016)
Urbanicity: Rural	0.011 (0.014)	0.012 (0.014)	0.009 (0.013)	-0.014 (0.013)	-0.005 (0.013)	-0.004 (0.014)	0.013 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.015)
Urbanicity: Towns and suburbs	0.023 (0.015)	-0.015 (0.015)	0.009 (0.014)	-0.004 (0.013)	0.003 (0.013)	0.011 (0.015)	-0.015 (0.015)	0.004 (0.016)
Will become millionaire: Likely	0.012 (0.012)	-0.017 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.011)	0.019* (0.011)	-0.015 (0.011)	0.005 (0.012)	0.0004 (0.012)	0.005 (0.012)
Will become millionaire: Already	0.0005 (0.022)	-0.004 (0.023)	-0.001 (0.021)	-0.006 (0.021)	-0.014 (0.021)	0.030 (0.023)	-0.005 (0.022)	-0.036 (0.024)
Observations	10,998	10,998	10,992	10,992	10,992	10,998	10,998	10,998
R ²	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.015	0.017	0.006

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. CS: Climate Scheme. *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

I Placebo tests

Table S9: Placebo tests of treatments on unrelated outcomes (simple OLS regressions).

	Supports the Global Climate Scheme (1)	Supports the Int'l Clim. Sch. (2)	Share of policies supported (3)		Supports the int'l wealth tax (5)	
Open-ended field variant: Injustice	0.002 (0.013)					
Open-ended field variant: Issue	0.019 (0.013)					
Open-ended field variant: Wish	0.031** (0.013)					
Revenue split variant: Many		0.006 (0.010)				
GCS belief variant: U.S.		−0.071*** (0.014)				
Warm glow variant: National CS			0.021** (0.009)			
Warm glow variant: Donation				0.009 (0.007)		
Int'l CS variant: High color				0.008 (0.008)		
Int'l CS variant: Low					−0.019** (0.009)	−0.010 (0.012)
Int'l CS variant: Mid					0.007 (0.009)	0.004 (0.012)
(Intercept)					0.008 (0.009)	0.019 (0.012)
Constant	0.542*** (0.009)	0.561*** (0.007)	0.647*** (0.006)	0.503*** (0.005)	0.509*** (0.006)	0.701*** (0.008)
Observations	11,844	12,007	12,007	12,007	11,999	11,999
R ²	0.001	0.003	0.0005	0.0001	0.001	0.001

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

J Main results on selected demographics, including by vote

Figure S64: [On selected demographics] Support for global redistribution action/policies.

	All	Millionaires	Japan Non-voters	Japan Left	Japan Center/Right	Saudi Arabia	Saudi citizens	U.S. Non-voters	U.S. Harris	U.S. Trump
Supports the National Climate Scheme	68	58	69	69	70	88	91	64	79	50
Global climate scheme (GCS)	55	45	48	61	57	85	85	54	58	35
Supports int'l climate scheme (any variant)	66	58	61	75	69	88	91	63	75	43
Supports int'l tax on millionaires with 30% funding LICs (any variant)	70	43	60	74	68	83	83	69	79	50
Supports tax on world top 1% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax on income over [\$120k/year in PPP])	56	39	36	51	45	68	74	50	64	37
Supports tax on world top 3% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax over [\$80k], 30% over [\$120k], 45% over [\$1M])	50	32	34	46	31	67	74	46	57	34
Prefers sustainable future	68	62	74	81	76	71	70	67	78	43
"Governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century"	61	46	53	62	58	76	82	53	58	39
Would support a global movement to tackle CC, tax millionaires, and fund LICs (either petition, demonstrate, strike, or donate)	68	52	43	70	58	73	74	64	83	47
More likely to vote for party if part of worldwide coalition for climate action and global redistribution	36	30	16	31	22	NA	NA	28	52	27
Supports reparations for colonization and slavery in the form of funding education and technology transfers	35	26	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31	45	17
"My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	41	39	28	38	33	66	70	36	54	27

Figure S65: [On selected demographics] Relative support for plausible global redistribution policies (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*Indifferent* responses).

	All	Millionaires	Japan Non-voters	Japan Left	Japan Center/Right	Saudi Arabia	Saudi citizens	U.S. Non-voters	U.S. Harris	U.S. Trump
Minimum tax of 2% on billionaires' wealth, in voluntary countries	81	64	82	87	77	86	85	81	93	56
Bridgetown initiative: MDBs expanding sustainable investments in LICs, and at lower interest rates	79	74	77	86	80	87	87	78	92	52
L&D: Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with climate Loss and damage	75	64	72	77	72	89	90	75	88	45
International levy on shipping carbon emissions, returned to countries based on population	70	60	57	64	59	81	84	68	86	47
At least 0.7% of developed countries' GDP in foreign aid	70	63	56	66	66	86	87	68	84	46
Debt relief for vulnerable countries, suspending payments until they are more able to repay	70	55	69	74	66	88	90	74	81	47
Expand Security Council to new permanent members (e.g. India, Brazil, African Union), restrict veto use	69	62	64	72	68	84	85	70	86	45
NCQG: Developing countries providing \$300 bn a year in climate finance for developing countries	68	55	51	66	60	86	87	67	83	34
Raise global minimum tax on profit from 15% to 35%, allocating revenues to countries based on sales	68	61	70	77	71	77	76	66	84	45
International levy on aviation carbon emissions, raising prices by 30%, returned to countries based on population	53	46	43	49	47	70	73	48	67	34

K Main results weighted by vote

Figure S66: [Weighted by vote] Support for the National, Global, and International Climate Schemes (Yes/No question). (Questions 26-35).




Figure S67: [Weighted by vote] Support for an international wealth tax with 30% of revenue funding LICs, depending on the country coverage (Yes/No question). (Questions 41-43).




Figure S68: [Weighted by vote] Effect on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy (compared to no foreign policy in the program). (Question 23)




Figure S69: [Weighted by vote] Testing warm glow (negative effects would indicate the presence of warm glow).




Figure S70: [Weighted by vote] Relative support for plausible global redistribution policies (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*Indifferent* responses). (Question 38).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Minimum tax of 2% on billionaires' wealth, in voluntary countries	81	84	85	82	87	80	82	86	79	81	80	86	76
Bridgetown initiative: MDBs expanding sustainable investments in LICs, and at lower interest rates	79	82	79	80	86	71	80	84	75	80	83	87	73
L&D: Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with climate Loss and damage	75	75	70	72	81	71	78	72	66	73	87	89	68
International levy on shipping carbon emissions, returned to countries based on population	70	73	75	69	75	61	75	74	71	58	73	81	65
At least 0.7% of developed countries' GDP in foreign aid	70	69	64	66	77	59	77	68	65	61	83	86	64
Debt relief for vulnerable countries, suspending payments until they are more able to repay	70	70	64	58	80	79	72	74	64	68	75	88	66
Expand Security Council to new permanent members (e.g. India, Brazil, African Union), restrict veto use	69	76	72	75	76	70	76	80	70	67	53	84	65
NCQG: Developing countries providing \$300 bn a year in climate finance for developing countries	68	69	67	68	72	64	73	68	64	58	88	86	59
Raise global minimum tax on profit from 15% to 35%, allocating revenues to countries based on sales	68	75	73	73	85	67	69	74	63	73	50	77	63
International levy on aviation carbon emissions, raising prices by 30%, returned to countries based on population	53	55	61	54	52	48	51	51	50	46	51	70	48

Figure S71: [Weighted by vote] Support for broad action or radical proposals of global redistribution. (Questions 44-46, 49-51, 53, 61).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Supports tax on world top 1% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax on income over [\$120k/year in PPP])	69	73	71	72	83	70	70	67	60	68	75	82	60
Supports tax on world top 3% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax over [\$80k], 30% over [\$120k], 45% over [\$1M])	64	66	67	61	66	68	66	67	44	56	76	82	57
Prefers sustainable future*	68	70	71	70	74	55	72	67	65	75	69	71	61
"Governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century"	70	78	76	75	87	82	83	66	67	70	78	93	54
Would support a global movement to tackle CC, tax millionaires, and fund LICs (either petition, demonstrate, strike, or donate)	68	72	68	68	79	68	75	67	65	53	NA	73	65
More likely to vote for party if part of worldwide coalition for climate action and global redistribution	68	72	69	69	75	55	74	68	58	52	NA	NA	63
Supports reparations for colonization and slavery in the form of funding education and technology transfers	45	50	46	43	69	NA	50	48	NA	NA	NA	NA	38
"My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	59	61	42	62	74	61	69	57	54	58	57	89	53

L Main results on the extended sample

Figure S72: [Extended sample] Support for the National, Global, and International Climate Schemes (Yes/No question). (Questions 26-35).




Figure S73: [Extended sample] Support for an international wealth tax with 30% of revenue funding LICs, depending on the country coverage (Yes/No question). (Questions 41-43).




Figure S74: [Extended sample] Effect on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy (compared to no foreign policy in the program). (Question 23)




Figure S75: [Extended sample] Testing warm glow (negative effects would indicate the presence of warm glow).




Figure S76: [Extended sample] Relative support for plausible global redistribution policies (Percentage of *Somewhat* or *Strongly support* among non-*Indifferent* responses). (Question 38).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Minimum tax of 2% on billionaires' wealth, in voluntary countries	80	83	86	82	86	77	82	83	77	77	79	81	76
Bridgetown initiative: MDBs expanding sustainable investments in LICs, and at lower interest rates	77	80	79	78	86	70	82	82	75	73	82	85	72
L&D: Developed countries financing a fund to help vulnerable countries cope with climate Loss and damage	74	74	71	72	83	71	78	72	65	68	85	85	68
Expand Security Council to new permanent members (e.g. India, Brazil, African Union), restrict veto use	70	75	72	75	80	72	78	76	69	62	54	79	66
Debt relief for vulnerable countries, suspending payments until they are more able to repay	70	69	63	60	80	77	73	71	63	65	74	85	65
International levy on shipping carbon emissions, returned to countries based on population	69	72	77	69	77	62	75	74	70	55	72	79	66
At least 0.7% of developed countries' GDP in foreign aid	69	68	65	67	77	57	78	66	62	60	81	84	65
Raise global minimum tax on profit from 15% to 35%, allocating revenues to countries based on sales	68	72	75	72	82	66	72	73	59	66	48	76	65
NCQG: Developing countries providing \$300 bn a year in climate finance for developing countries	68	68	67	69	75	63	74	66	63	56	86	82	61
International levy on aviation carbon emissions, raising prices by 30%, returned to countries based on population	55	55	60	54	56	53	57	55	51	46	51	70	52

Figure S77: [Extended sample] Support for broad action or radical proposals of global redistribution. (Questions 44-46, 49-51, 53, 61).

	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
Supports tax on world top 1% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax on income over [\$120k/year in PPP])	69	71	69	72	82	69	73	68	61	67	73	82	61
Supports tax on world top 3% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax over [\$80k], 30% over [\$120k], 45% over [\$1M])	65	65	70	63	71	70	67	69	41	55	75	82	59
Prefers sustainable future*	66	68	70	69	73	57	73	67	65	71	69	67	60
"Governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century"	71	76	76	74	86	82	83	65	66	66	77	91	55
Would support a global movement to tackle CC, tax millionaires, and fund LICs (either petition, demonstrate, strike, or donate)	61	67	67	67	74	66	72	65	60	51	NA	55	61
More likely to vote for party if part of worldwide coalition for climate action and global redistribution	66	71	71	71	80	65	77	70	59	52	NA	NA	67
Supports reparations for colonization and slavery in the form of funding education and technology transfers	46	50	44	44	69	NA	51	46	NA	NA	NA	NA	40
"My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	62	61	44	64	77	65	71	58	53	60	58	88	56

M Influence of the item order on answers

Table S10: Influence of the item order on answers.

	Prefers Sustain. future	Finds Uncond. cash transfers Right	Agrees it is HIC's duty to help LICs	Understood Global Clim. Sch.	Preferred NCQG $\geq \$100$ bn	Pref. NCQG $\geq \$100$ bn (variant <i>Short</i>)	Supports a plausible policy	Allocates $\geq 15\%$ to spending item
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Scenario A = Sustainable	0.036*** (0.009)							
Cash transfers first item		-0.140*** (0.009)						
Duty last item			-0.049*** (0.010)					
Correct answer first item				0.050*** (0.008)				
Variant: <i>Short</i>					-0.076*** (0.009)			
Items in increasing order						-0.092*** (0.013)		
That item is the first one							-0.024*** (0.005)	
Order of the item: 2								-0.020** (0.008)
Order of the item: 3								-0.040*** (0.008)
Order of the item: 4								-0.064*** (0.008)
Order of the item: 5								-0.071*** (0.008)
Constant	0.663*** (0.006)	0.396*** (0.006)	0.554*** (0.006)	0.713*** (0.006)	0.638*** (0.007)	0.608*** (0.009)	0.511*** (0.002)	0.592*** (0.006)
Observations	12,007	12,007	11,000	12,007	11,000	5,476	110,000	37,088
R ²	0.001	0.021	0.002	0.003	0.006	0.009	0.0002	0.003

Note:

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Bibliography

- A. W. Cappelen, M. Støstad, & B. Tungodden. Majority in 40 Countries Support Unprecedented Coordinated Billionaire Tax Discussed by G20. 2025. [3](#), [4](#), [10](#), [18](#), [118](#)
- A. Fabre. French favored redistributions derived from surveys. *Revue economique*, 2022. [Link](#). [37](#), [114](#), [116](#)
- . Global Nation. Global Solidarity Report 2023, 2023. [Link](#). [10](#), [33](#), [118](#)

List of Tables

1	Effect on support for global redistribution of believing that it is likely	28
S1	Sample representativeness in All, Eu, EU	107
S2	Sample representativeness in FR, DE, IT	108
S3	Sample representativeness in PL, ES, GB, CH	109
S4	Sample representativeness in JP, RU, SA, US	110
S5	Correlates of support for global redistribution	112
S6	Correlates of answers on custom redistribution	113
S7	Attrition analysis	119
S8	Balance analysis	120
S9	Placebo tests of treatments on unrelated outcomes (simple OLS regressions).	121
S10	Influence of the item order on answers	130

List of Figures

1	Country coverage	9
2	Survey flow	11
3	Wordcloud of open-ended field, per variant	14
4	Preferred split of revenue of an international wealth tax	17
5	Example maps of the International Climate Scheme	20
6	Support for the NCS, GCS, ICS	21
7	Support for an international wealth tax depending on country coverage	23
8	Conjoint analysis: effect of development aid and millionaire tax	24
9	Testing warm glow	26
10	Relative support for plausible global redistribution policies	29

11	Support for broad or radical global redistribution	33
12	Moral circle	33
13	<i>Right or Best way</i> to transfer resources to LICs (global average)	34
14	Custom redistribution task screenshot	36
S1	Keyword classification of open-ended fields	41
S2	AI classification of open-ended fields	42
S3	Manual classification of open-ended fields	43
S4	Manual classification of <i>concerns</i> fields	44
S5	Manual classification of <i>wish</i> fields	45
S6	Manual classification of <i>injustice</i> fields	46
S7	Manual classification of <i>issue</i> fields	47
S8	Conjoint analysis: effect of development aid and millionaire tax by vote . .	48
S9	Conjoint analysis in France	49
S10	Conjoint analysis in Germany	50
S11	Conjoint analysis in Italy	51
S12	Conjoint analysis in Poland	52
S13	Conjoint analysis in Spain	53
S14	Conjoint analysis in the UK	54
S15	Conjoint analysis in Switzerland	55
S16	Conjoint analysis in Japan	56
S17	Conjoint analysis in the U.S.	57
S18	Conjoint analysis in France (French)	58
S19	Conjoint analysis in Germany (German)	59
S20	Conjoint analysis in Italy (Italian)	60
S21	Conjoint analysis in Poland (Polish)	61
S22	Conjoint analysis in Spain (Spanish)	62
S23	Conjoint analysis in Japan (Japanese)	63
S24	Average preferred revenue split (<i>few</i>)	64
S25	Decomposition of preferred spendings in revenue split	65
S26	Decomposition of preferred spendings in revenue split	66
S27	Average preferred revenue split (<i>many</i>)	66
S28	Amounts donated to plant trees.	67
S29	Support for the NCS, GCS, ICS, and belief of support for GCS	67
S30	Absolute support for plausible global redistribution policies	68

S31 Share of plausible global policies supported	68
S32 Share of plausible global policies opposed	69
S33 Preferred NCQG, variant <i>Short</i>	69
S34 Preferred NCQG, variant <i>Full</i>	70
S35 Support for an international wealth depending on country coverage	70
S36 Prefers a sustainable future	71
S37 Relative support for a global income tax on the richest to fund LICs	71
S38 Absolute support for an income tax on top 1% to fund LICs	71
S39 <i>Best</i> way to transfer resources to LICs	72
S40 <i>Wrong</i> way to transfer resources to LICs	72
S41 Support for making all countries' GDP p.c. converge by 2100	73
S42 Willingness to participate in a global movement for sustainable development	73
S43 Would vote for a party in a global coalition for sustainable development . .	74
S44 Agreement with rationales for global redistribution	75
S45 Support for reparations for colonization and slavery	75
S46 Median custom redistribution	76
S47 Average custom redistribution	77
S48 Average answers to custom redistribution	78
S49 Average answers to custom redistribution among satisfied	78
S50 Median answers to custom redistribution among satisfied	79
S51 Comprehension question on GCS	79
S52 Relative agreement: "My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	80
S53 Absolute agreement: "My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	80
S54 Moral circle	80
S55 Feeling that the survey was politically biased	81
S56 Likelihood of becoming a millionaire	81
S57 Foreign origin	82
S58 Vote in the last election compared to actual results (among voters)	83
S59 Vote in the last election compared to actual results (entire population) . . .	84
S60 Variance decomposition	111
S61 Algorithm for the custom redistribution	115
S62 Tax schedule of radical and custom redistributions	117
S63 Comparison with other surveys	118
S64 [On selected demographics] Support for broad or radical global redistribution	122

S65	[On selected demographics] Relative support for plausible global policies	123
S66	[Weighted by vote] Support for the NCS, GCS, ICS	124
S67	[Weighted by vote] Support for an int'l wealth tax depending on coverage	124
S68	[Weighted by vote] Conjoint analysis	125
S69	[Weighted by vote] Testing warm glow	125
S70	[Weighted by vote] Relative support for plausible global policies	126
S71	[Weighted by vote] Support for broad or radical global redistribution	126
S72	[Extended sample] Support for the NCS, GCS, ICS	127
S73	[Extended sample] Support for an int'l wealth tax depending on coverage	127
S74	[Extended sample] Conjoint analysis	128
S75	[Extended sample] Testing warm glow	128
S76	[Extended sample] Relative support for plausible global policies	129
S77	[Extended sample] Support for broad or radical global redistribution	129