

# Acceptance for global redistribution in high-income countries

**Adrien Fabre**

CNRS, CIRED

*October 2025*

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): **69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action** (125 countries).

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

Majorities support increased foreign aid if it really helps the poorest.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

Majorities support increased foreign aid if it really helps the poorest.

Majorities support a “Global Climate Scheme” (GCS), i.e. a cap-and-trade with equal pc emission rights.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

Majorities support increased foreign aid if it really helps the poorest.

Majorities support a “Global Climate Scheme” (GCS), i.e. a cap-and-trade with equal pc emission rights.

No social desirability bias (list experiment). Similar support in a real-stake petition.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

Majorities support increased foreign aid if it really helps the poorest.

Majorities support a “Global Climate Scheme” (GCS), i.e. a cap-and-trade with equal per capita emission rights.

No social desirability bias (list experiment). Similar support in a real-stake petition.

Progressive candidates would not lose vote by endorsing the GCS.

## Literature

ISSP (2019): 78% agree disparities between countries are too large (29 countries).

Carattini et al. (Nature, 2019): ~50% support for a global tax and dividend (U.S., UK, Australia).

UNDP (2024): 79% agree rich countries should help poorer countries address CC (77 countries).

Andre et al. (NCC, 2024): 69% willing to contribute 1% of income for climate action (125 countries).

Ghassim & Pauli (2024): Majority in 16 out of 17 countries for a global democratic government.

Fabre et al. (NHB, 2025): Genuine majority support for global redistribution (20 countries):

Consensus for a global tax on millionaires; median preferred allocation of revenue: 30% to LICs.

Majorities support increased foreign aid if it really helps the poorest.

Majorities support a “Global Climate Scheme” (GCS), i.e. a cap-and-trade with equal per capita emission rights.

No social desirability bias (list experiment). Similar support in a real-stake petition.

Progressive candidates would not lose vote by endorsing the GCS.

A political program is ~10 p.p. more likely to be preferred if it contains the GCS or a global millionaire tax.

## **Is the support for global redistribution overstated?**

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

## **Is the support for global redistribution overstated?**

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.

## **Is the support for global redistribution overstated?**

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.  
⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.

## Is the support for global redistribution overstated?

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.

⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.

⇒ H2: Global issues are given substantial priority ( $> \frac{2}{3}$  average) when allocating a budget.

## Is the support for global redistribution overstated?

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.
  - ⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.
  - ⇒ H2: Global issues are given substantial priority ( $> 2/3$  average) when allocating a budget.
- There may not be majority support for other (more plausible or more radical) policies ⇒ H3.

## Is the support for global redistribution overstated?

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.
  - ⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.
  - ⇒ H2: Global issues are given substantial priority ( $> 2/3$  average) when allocating a budget.
- There may not be majority support for other (more plausible or more radical) policies ⇒ H3.
- There may not be majority support in unsurveyed, conservative countries ⇒ H3.

## Is the support for global redistribution overstated?

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:


- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.
  - ⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.
  - ⇒ H2: Global issues are given substantial priority ( $> \frac{2}{3}$  average) when allocating a budget.
- There may not be majority support for other (more plausible or more radical) policies ⇒ H3.
- There may not be majority support in unsurveyed, conservative countries ⇒ H3.
- Support may drop below 50% if country participation is not universal ⇒ H4.

## Is the support for global redistribution overstated?

Literature results may be weakened unless we confirm some hypotheses:

- Salience of global issues in the surveys may have fostered universalism.
  - ⇒ H1: Global redistribution policies help a political program to be preferred.
  - ⇒ H2: Global issues are given substantial priority ( $> 2/3$  average) when allocating a budget.
- There may not be majority support for other (more plausible or more radical) policies ⇒ H3.
- There may not be majority support in unsurveyed, conservative countries ⇒ H3.
- Support may drop below 50% if country participation is not universal ⇒ H4.
- (Warm glow) Support may decrease with substitute with same more appeal ⇒ H5a or it may hold only for as long as global redistribution seems unlikely ⇒ H5b.

# Data



12,000 respondents (Europe: 5,000; USA: 3,000; Japan: 2,000; Saudi Arabia, Russia: 1,000).

Data collected from April 15 to July 3, 2025; except in Russia: Sep 19 to Oct 9.

Representative along: gender, age, income, education, urbanicity, region. [► Representativeness tables](#)

Results on control group, weighted using quota variables and aggregated with country population.

Median duration: 17 min. Inattentive or fast respondents excluded.

Analysis and hypotheses pre-registered.

## Open-ended fields

(a) What are your main concerns these days?



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



(b) What are your needs or wishes?



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



# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico	Ensure nationwide access to abortion as a constitutional right	<b>Social issues</b>
-	Cut development aid	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Extend the Trump tax cuts	Extend the Trump tax cuts	<b>Tax system</b>
Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	-	<b>Climate policy</b>
Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour	Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour	<b>Economic issues</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	<b>Tax system</b>
Ensure nationwide access to abortion as a constitutional right	Enhance border security and limit immigration	<b>Social issues</b>
Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour	Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	<b>Economic issues</b>
Cut development aid	International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	Rejoin the Paris Agreement	<b>Climate policy</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries	International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit	<b>Economic issues</b>
Extend the Trump tax cuts	Extend the Trump tax cuts	<b>Tax system</b>
No immunity for crimes committed by a former president	Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico	<b>Social issues</b>
Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	<b>Climate policy</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	-	<b>Economic issues</b>
Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico	Enhance border security and limit immigration	<b>Social issues</b>
Rejoin the Paris Agreement	-	<b>Climate policy</b>
International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries	-	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Repeal all Trump import tariff increases	-	<b>Tax system</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico	-	<b>Social issues</b>
Rejoin the Paris Agreement	Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	<b>Climate policy</b>
-	Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit	<b>Economic issues</b>
-	-	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	-	<b>Tax system</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
-	-	<b>Social issues</b>
-	Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	<b>Tax system</b>
Cut development aid	International tax on millionaires with 30% financing healthcare and education in low-income countries	<b>Foreign policy</b>
Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	-	<b>Climate policy</b>
Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit	Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour	<b>Economic issues</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Rejoin the Paris Agreement	Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	<b>Climate policy</b>
Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	-	<b>Tax system</b>
Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour	Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	<b>Economic issues</b>
Enhance border security and limit immigration	Enhance border security and limit immigration	<b>Social issues</b>
Negotiate an immediate ceasefire in Ukraine, recognize new Russian territories and withdraw support to Ukraine	Cut development aid	<b>Foreign policy</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Rejoin the Paris Agreement	-	<b>Climate policy</b>
-	Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	<b>Economic issues</b>
Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million	Repeal all Trump import tariff increases	<b>Tax system</b>
No immunity for crimes committed by a former president	-	<b>Social issues</b>
Cut development aid	Cut development aid	<b>Foreign policy</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis

Imagine if the two main candidates in the next presidential election campaigned with the following platforms.

Which of these candidates would you vote for?

Candidate A	Candidate B	
Repeal all Trump import tariff increases	Extend the Trump tax cuts	<b>Tax system</b>
Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land	-	<b>Climate policy</b>
Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion	Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit	<b>Economic issues</b>
Negotiate an immediate ceasefire in Ukraine, recognize new Russian territories and withdraw support to Ukraine	-	<b>Foreign policy</b>
-	Enhance border security and limit immigration	<b>Social issues</b>

Candidate A

Candidate B

Neither of them

# Conjoint analysis, in the U.S. ➤ Other countries

## Climate policy:

Rejoin the Paris Agreement

Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land

## Economic issues:

Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion

Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour

Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit

## Foreign policy:

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

Cut development aid

Negotiate an immediate ceasefire in Ukraine, recognize new Russian territories and withdraw support to Ukraine

## Social issues:

Enhance border security and limit immigration

Ensure nationwide access to abortion as a constitutional right

Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico


No immunity for crimes committed by a former president

## Tax system:

Repeal all Trump import tariff increases

Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million


Extend the Trump tax cuts



# Conjoint analysis

Effect on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy


(a) Cut development aid:  $-4$  pp\*\*\*  $\checkmark H1a$




# Conjoint analysis

Effect on the likelihood that a political program is preferred of containing the following policy

(a) Cut development aid:  $-4 \text{ pp}^{***}$  ✓H1a



(b) International tax on millionaires with 30% financing health and education in low-income countries:  $+4 \text{ pp}^{***}$  ✓H1b




# Revenue split

How should revenue from a global tax on millionaires be allocated? (in %)

✓H2

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




## Revenue split


How should revenue from a global tax on millionaires be allocated? (in %) ✓H2




Domestic: Education and Healthcare




Domestic: Social welfare programs




Domestic: Reduction in the income tax



Domestic: Reduction of the deficit




Global: Education, Healthcare and  
Renewable energy in low-income countries



# International wealth tax

Support for a 2% wealth tax above [\$1 million] with 30% financing public services in LICs, depending on which countries adopt it (random variant).



## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [▶ Question text](#)

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [► Question text](#)

Description incentivized for comprehension (73% get the correct answer).

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [► Question text](#)

Description incentivized for comprehension (73% get the correct answer).

A *global* cap-and-trade financing a *global* basic income of [U.S.: \$35, France: €20]/month (\$95/tCO<sub>2</sub>).

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [▶ Question text](#)

Description incentivized for comprehension (73% get the correct answer).

A *global* cap-and-trade financing a *global* basic income of [U.S.: \$35, France: €20]/month (\$95/tCO<sub>2</sub>).

Salient cost: **“The typical [country] person would lose out financially [U.S.: \$90, UK: £20...] per month (as he or she would face around [U.S.: 2, UK: 1]% in price increases, which is higher than the [U.S.: \$35] per month they would receive.”**

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [► Question text](#)

Description incentivized for comprehension (73% get the correct answer).

A *global* cap-and-trade financing a *global* basic income of [U.S.: \$35, France: €20]/month (\$95/tCO<sub>2</sub>).

Salient cost: **“The typical [country] person would lose out financially [U.S.: \$90, UK: £20...] per month** (as he or she would face around [U.S.: 2, UK: 1]% in price increases, which is higher than the [U.S.: \$35] per month they would receive.”

Belief of support for the GCS. 2 random branches:

In own country.

In the U.S.

## Climate Scheme

3 random branches:

Donation experiment: *In case you win the lottery, what share of the \$100 would you donate to plant trees?*

National Climate Scheme (NCS): a cap-and-trade financing equal cash transfers.

Control group:  $\emptyset$ .

Global Climate Scheme (GCS): [► Question text](#)

Description incentivized for comprehension (73% get the correct answer).

A *global* cap-and-trade financing a *global* basic income of [U.S.: \$35, France: €20]/month (\$95/tCO<sub>2</sub>).

Salient cost: **“The typical [country] person would lose out financially [U.S.: \$90, UK: £20...] per month** (as he or she would face around [U.S.: 2, UK: 1]% in price increases, which is higher than the [U.S.: \$35] per month they would receive.”

Belief of support for the GCS. 2 random branches:

In own country.

In the U.S.

International Climate Scheme (GCS where country participation is specified). 4 random branches:

Country coverage variants: *Low; Mid; High; High color* (color: visible distributive effects).

# Majority support for the GCS and pluralistic ignorance

► Determinants


	All	Europe	France	Germany	Italy	Poland	Spain	United Kingdom	Switzerland	Japan	Russia	Saudi Arabia	USA
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	38	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

# International Climate Scheme

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 the United States joined them, 71% of global emissions would be covered).




Do you support the United States joining the Global Climate Scheme, in case it is adopted by the above countries?

Yes

No


# International Climate Scheme

**Low:** Global South + EU (25-33% of world emissions)




# International Climate Scheme

**Mid** coverage: Global South + China (56% of world emissions)




## International Climate Scheme

**High** coverage: Global South + China + EU + various HICs (64-72% of world emissions)




# International Climate Scheme

High coverage (64-72% of world emissions), color variant




# International Climate Scheme

## High color as shown in the U.S.




# International Climate Scheme

## High color as shown in France




# International Climate Scheme

## High color as shown in Saudi Arabia



# International Climate Scheme


- Supports the National Climate Scheme
- Supports the Global Climate Scheme (GCS)
- Supports the GCS if coverage is **Low**  
Other members: Global South + EU  
(25–33% of world emissions)
- Supports the GCS if coverage is **Mid**  
Global South + China  
(56% of world emissions)
- Supports the GCS if coverage is **High**  
Global South + China + EU + various HICs  
(UK, Japan, Korea, Canada...; 64–72% of emissions)
- Supports the GCS if coverage is **High, color variant**  
Global South + China + EU + various HICs  
+ Distributive effects shown using colors on world map



Majority support for all variants in all countries when participation map is shown.

✓ H4a

# International Climate Scheme




Majority support for all variants in all countries when participation map is shown.

✓ H4a

+4 p.p. when coverage expanded from **Low** to **High**. ✓ H4b

# International Climate Scheme



Majority support for all variants in all countries when participation map is shown.

✓ H4a

+4 p.p. when coverage expanded from **Low** to **High**. ✓ H4b

–6 p.p. when **distributive effects** are visible.

# Plausible global policies

Share of (somewhat or strong) *support* among non-*indifferent* answers.

✓ H3 ▶ Absolute support

	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

## Testing warm glow

If *warm glow*, support might dissipate when...

(a) **Moral substitute**: ...the policy is replaced a substitute with the same moral appeal

*Donation lottery* treatment: Choose share of \$100 prize to donate to plant trees.

H5a: Support for GCS no lower in the treated group.

## Testing warm glow

If *warm glow*, support might dissipate when...

(a) **Moral substitute**: ...the policy is replaced a substitute with the same moral appeal

*Donation lottery* treatment: Choose share of \$100 prize to donate to plant trees.

H5a: Support for GCS no lower in the treated group.

(b) **Realism**: ...the policy materializes

*Information* treatment: “countries have agreed to demonstrate some degree of solidarity in addressing global challenges. Negotiations are ongoing to implement specific mechanisms for sustainable development.” Examples:

IMO shipping levy

0.7% ODA commitment

Climate finance commitment

Minimum corporate tax

Brazil proposal at G20 of taxing billionaires


UN Pact for the Future foreseeing Security Council reform

Bridgetown initiative to finance sustainable development

H5b: Info increases belief in likelihood of global


# No evidence of warm glow

(a) Effect of a *Donation lottery* treatment on support for the *Global Climate Scheme*: +3p.p.\*\*\* ✓H5a




# No evidence of warm glow

(a) Effect of a *Donation lottery* treatment on support for the *Global Climate Scheme*: +3p.p.\*\*\* ✓ H5a




(b) Effect of *information about ongoing global redistribution initiatives* on the share of plausible *global policies* supported: +1p.p.\* ✓ H5b ▶ 2SLS



# NCQG



## Preferred North-to-South climate grant funding in 2035



# NCQG

■ \$0 ■ \$26 bn ■ \$100 bn ■ \$300 bn ■ \$600 bn ■ \$1,000 bn ■ \$5,000 bn

## Preferred North-to-South climate grant funding in 2035

All

Europe

France

Germany

Italy

Poland

Spain


United Kingdom

Switzerland

Japan

Saudi Arabia

USA




## BAU vs. sustainable future

Sustainable future:


- Worldwide policies to limit global warming to +2°C and reduce inequality.
- Reduced global carbon emissions, in line with climate target.
- Taxes on millionaires funding heat pumps, building insulation, and public transport.
- All cars electric by 2045, priced like today's gasoline cars.
- Heating fuel, air travel, and beef prices gradually double.
- Lower sales tax on non-polluting goods preserves overall purchasing power.

Status quo:

- No additional policies to address climate change or inequality.
- Stable carbon emissions. +3°C warming by 2100, causing more severe natural disasters.
- People maintain the same lifestyles as in 2025, such as driving gasoline cars.



# Why help LICs?



## Preferred means of transfers


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

Share of *Right* or *Best* way (other options: *Wrong* or *Acceptable* way).

	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


## A humanist movement

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)



⇒ 52% of millionaires support the global movement.


# Importance on voting



# Moral circle

■ Family and self ■ Community (region, gender...) ■ Fellow citizens ■ Humans ■ Sentient beings

Group defended when voting



# Radical redistribution

	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	84	69	73	67	60	69	75	82	62
Supports tax on world top 3% to finance global poverty reduction (Additional 15% tax over [\$80k], 30% over [\$120k], 45% over [\$1M])	64	66	70	62	71	70	66	67	42	55	76	82	57
"Governments should actively cooperate to have all countries converge in terms of GDP per capita by the end of the century"	70	78	76	76	87	84	84	66	66	70	78	93	56
Supports reparations for colonization and slavery in the form of funding education and technology transfers	45	50	44	44	70	NA	51	46	NA	NA	NA	NA	40
"My taxes should go towards solving global problems"	59	61	43	62	77	62	71	57	54	58	57	89	55

# Custom redistribution

▶ [Video](#)

▶ [bit.ly/custom\\_redistr](http://bit.ly/custom_redistr)

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)




Chart by [Chartkick](#)

I am satisfied with my custom redistribution.

I want to skip this question.

56% satisfied; 43% skipped

56% satisfied; 43% skipped

Share satisfied among:


non-voters: 50%; left: 60%, right: 53%, far right: 58%.

# Custom redistribution

▶ [Video](#)

▶ [bit.ly/custom\\_redistr](http://bit.ly/custom_redistr)

Redistribution with median preferred parameters (among satisfied): winners 49%; losers: 18%; degree: 5.




56% satisfied; 43% skipped

Share satisfied among:

non-voters: 50%; left: 60%, right: 53%, far right: 58%.

**48% lose** from their custom redistribution while only **9% win**.

## Average custom redistribution



Minimal income: \$243/month (i.e. \$8/day)


5% of world income transferred from top 28% to bottom 72%

# Custom redistribution

▶ [Video](#)

▶ [bit.ly/custom\\_redistr](https://bit.ly/custom_redistr)

Tax rates of radical redistribution proposals tested.



## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

Support is genuine. No evidence of warm glow.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

Support is genuine. No evidence of warm glow.

Global redistribution is a vote-determining issue for many people.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

Support is genuine. No evidence of warm glow.

Global redistribution is a vote-determining issue for many people.

Most agree global sustainability is a duty.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

Support is genuine. No evidence of warm glow.

Global redistribution is a vote-determining issue for many people.

Most agree global sustainability is a duty.

Most agree they should contribute themselves.

## Conclusion

Global poverty seen as big injustice but not a salient concern.

Strong majority support for globally redistributive policies.

Support reduces (only) slightly when fewer countries participate.

Support is genuine. No evidence of warm glow.

Global redistribution is a vote-determining issue for many people.

Most agree global sustainability is a duty.

Most agree they should contribute themselves.

**Thank you for your attention!**

Work-in-progress at [bit.ly/support\\_global\\_redistr](http://bit.ly/support_global_redistr)

# Appendix

# Representativeness of pooled samples

[Go back](#)

	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

# Representativeness in EU countries

[▶ Go back](#)

	France			Germany			Italy			Poland			Spain		
	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.
Sample size		798	798		1,048	1,048		756	756		500	500		603	603
Gender: Woman	.52	.52	.52	.51	.49	.51	.52	.52	.51	.52	.53	.52	.51	.51	.51
Gender: Man	.48	.48	.48	.49	.51	.49	.48	.48	.49	.48	.46	.47	.49	.49	.49
Income_quartile: Q1	.25	.26	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.28	.25
Income_quartile: Q2	.25	.26	.25	.25	.27	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.27	.25
Income_quartile: Q3	.25	.23	.25	.25	.20	.25	.25	.22	.25	.25	.23	.25	.25	.21	.25
Income_quartile: Q4	.25	.25	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.26	.25	.25	.25	.24
Age: 18-24	.10	.11	.10	.09	.10	.09	.08	.08	.08	.08	.09	.08	.10	.11	.09
Age: 25-34	.15	.15	.15	.15	.16	.15	.12	.12	.12	.15	.16	.15	.15	.14	.14
Age: 35-49	.23	.23	.23	.23	.25	.23	.23	.23	.23	.30	.29	.30	.30	.27	.31
Age: 50-64	.24	.24	.24	.27	.27	.27	.28	.29	.28	.23	.21	.23	.19	.22	.19
Age: 65+	.27	.27	.27	.27	.22	.27	.29	.28	.29	.24	.24	.24	.26	.26	.26
Diploma_25-64: Below upper secondary	.10	.09	.10	.11	.11	.11	.22	.19	.22	.04	.05	.04	.23	.18	.23
Diploma_25-64: Upper secondary	.26	.26	.26	.32	.32	.32	.28	.28	.28	.38	.34	.38	.15	.15	.15
Diploma_25-64: Post secondary	.26	.27	.26	.22	.24	.21	.14	.17	.14	.26	.28	.26	.27	.29	.26
Urbanity: Cities	.47	.47	.46	.39	.42	.39	.36	.37	.36	.35	.37	.35	.54	.58	.54
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.19	.19	.19	.42	.42	.42	.46	.47	.46	.28	.29	.28	.32	.30	.33
Urbanity: Rural	.34	.33	.34	.19	.17	.19	.18	.16	.18	.37	.34	.37	.13	.12	.13
Region: 1	.18	.19	.18	.17	.19	.17	.66	.70	.65	.47	.41	.47	.15	.16	.15
Region: 2	.22	.23	.22	.29	.32	.29	.34	.29	.34	.53	.59	.53	.28	.25	.28
Region: 3	.11	.11	.11	.54	.48	.54							.14	.16	.14
Region: 4	.21	.22	.21										.18	.19	.18
Region: 5	.28	.26	.28										.25	.24	.25

# Representativeness in non-EU countries


[Go back](#)

	United Kingdom			Switzerland			Japan			Russia			Saudi Arabia			USA		
	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Wght. sam.
Sample size	826	826		469	469		2,000	2,000		872	872		1,000	1,000		3,000	3,000	
Gender: Woman	.51	.50	.51	.50	.48	.50	.51	.50	.51	.54	.46	.54				.50	.52	.50
Gender: Man	.49	.50	.49	.50	.52	.50	.49	.50	.49	.46	.54	.46				.50	.48	.50
Income_quartile: Q1	.25	.28	.25	.25	<b>.30</b>	.26	.25	.26	.25	.25	.21	.24	.25	<b>.32</b>	.26	.25	.23	.25
Income_quartile: Q2	.25	.23	.25	.25	.28	.25	.25	.24	.25	.25	<b>.19</b>	.24	.25	.23	.25	.25	.24	.25
Income_quartile: Q3	.25	.21	.25	.25	<b>.17</b>	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.28	.24	.25	.22	.24	.25	.27	.25
Income_quartile: Q4	.25	.27	.25	.25	.25	.24	.25	.25	.25	.25	.29	.24	.25	.23	.24	.25	.26	.25
Age: 18-24	.11	.10	.11	.09	.10	.09	.08	.08	.08	.09	.08	.09	.15	.16	.16	.12	.10	.12
Age: 25-34	.17	.17	.17	.16	.18	.17	.12	.12	.12	.16	<b>.10</b>	.16	.32	.35	.32	.17	.18	.17
Age: 35-49	.24	.25	.25	.26	.27	.25	.22	.23	.22	.30	.31	.30	.36	.37	.37	.25	.24	.25
Age: 50-64	.25	.25	.24	.26	.24	.26	.24	.24	.24	.25	.28	.25	.13	.11	.13	.24	.24	.24
Age: 65+	.24	.24	.23	.23	.22	.24	.34	.34	.34	.21	.24	.21	.04	<b>.00</b>	<b>.02</b>	.23	.24	.23
Diploma_25-64: Below upper secondary	.12	.11	.12	.09	<b>.06</b>	.09				.07	<b>.04</b>	.07	.31	<b>.11</b>	.27	.05	.05	.05
Diploma_25-64: Upper secondary	.19	.17	.19	.27	.29	.27	.26	.25	.26	.44	.46	.44	.15	<b>.23</b>	.16	.27	.27	.27
Diploma_25-64: Post secondary	.35	.38	.35	.31	.33	.31	.32	.33	.32	.20	.18	.20	.35	<b>.50</b>	.39	.33	.34	.33
Urbanity: Cities	.40	.36	.39	.30	.32	.30	.92	.92	.92							.76	.78	.76
Urbanity: Towns and suburbs	.42	.45	.43	.53	.54	.53	.08	.08	.08									
Urbanity: Rural	.18	.19	.18	.17	.14	.17										.24	.22	.24
Region: 1	.13	.14	.13	.70	.70	.70	.17	.17	.17				.14	<b>.06</b>	.12	.17	.18	.17
Region: 2	.31	.33	.31	.26	.26	.26	.17	.18	.17				.34	<b>.45</b>	.35	.21	.21	.21
Region: 3	.21	.17	.21	.04	.04	.04	.34	.35	.34				.36	.36	.36	.38	.40	.38
Region: 4	.24	.25	.24				.11	.11	.11				.16	<b>.12</b>	.16	.24	.21	.24
Region: 5	.11	.10	.11				.20	.19	.20									
Gender_nationality: Woman, Saudi													.24	<b>.31</b>	.25			
Gender_nationality: Woman, non-Saudi													.10	.12	.11			
Gender_nationality: Man, Saudi													.24	<b>.33</b>	.27			
Gender_nationality: Man, non-Saudi													.41	<b>.24</b>	.37			
Race: White only																.58	.56	.58
Race: Hispanic																.20	.21	.19
Race: Black																.14	.15	.14
Race: Other																.08	.07	.08

## Representativeness of vote (non-EU countries)

[Go back](#)

Left    Center-right or Right    Far right    Non-voter, PNR



## Representativeness of vote (EU countries)


► Go back

■ Left

## ■ Center-right or Right

■ Far right

### Non-voter, PNR or Other



# Conjoint analysis, in France

[» Go back](#)

## Climate policy:

Build 14 new nuclear reactors

Abolish Low Emission Zones (ZFE) that restrict car access in cities

## Economic issues:

Fully index pensions to inflation

Raise the minimum wage to 1,600 euros net per month

Restore the legal retirement age to 62

## Foreign policy:

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

Cut development aid

Double military budget by 2030

## Social issues:

Abolish birthright citizenship

Impose mandatory sentences for repeat offenders, and lower the age of criminal responsibility to 16

Establish the Citizens' Initiative Referendum (RIC)


## Tax system:

Tax-free bonuses of up to €10,000 per year

Exempt individuals under 30 from income tax

Reduce income tax up to €4,000/month net and increase it above that

Reinstate a reinforced wealth tax



# Conjoint analysis, in Germany

[» Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in Italy

[Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in Poland

[Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in Spain

[» Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in the UK

[Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in Switzerland

[► Go back](#)

## Climate policy:

Phase out combustion engine cars by 2040

Substitute fossil fuel heating systems with renewables

## Economic issues:

Stop public sector growth and cut administrative costs

Deregulate and flexibilize the labor market

Cap health insurance premiums at 10% of household income

## Foreign policy:

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

Cut development aid

Join the EU

## Social issues:

Increase pensions by introducing a 13th month of AVS payment

Introduce a tax on immigrants


Reduce cost of childcare for parents through national support

## Tax system:

Abolish rental value taxation to support property ownership

Increase inheritance taxes on large fortunes

Introduce individualized taxation to end marriage penalties



# Conjoint analysis, in Japan

[Go back](#)

## 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



# Conjoint analysis, in the U.S.

[» Go back](#)

## Climate policy:

Rejoin the Paris Agreement

Expedite the process for oil and gas drilling permits on federal land

## Economic issues:

Cut federal spending by \$1 trillion

Raise the federal minimum wage to \$15/hour

Increase the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit

## Foreign policy:

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

Cut development aid

Negotiate an immediate ceasefire in Ukraine, recognize new Russian territories and withdraw support to Ukraine

## Social issues:

Enhance border security and limit immigration

Ensure nationwide access to abortion as a constitutional right

Deploy U.S. troops against drug cartels in Mexico


No immunity for crimes committed by a former president

## Tax system:

Repeal all Trump import tariff increases

Raise the capital gains tax rate to 28% for individuals earning over \$1 million

Extend the Trump tax cuts



# Conjoint analysis, in France

[Go back](#)

## 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



# Global Climate Scheme question (in the U.S.)

[» Go back](#)

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 \$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 \$35 per month**, thereby lifting 600 million people who earn less than \$2 a day out of extreme poverty.

**The typical American would lose out financially \$90 per month** (as he or she would face around 2% in price increases, which is higher than the \$35 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?**

# Plausible global policies . [» Go back](#)

Share of (somewhat or strong) support.

	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

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

	Believes global redistr. likely	Share of plausible global policies supported		
	IV 1st Stage	IV 2nd Stage	OLS	Direct Effect
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Information treatment	0.080*** (0.009)			0.016** (0.007)
Believes global redistribution likely		0.205** (0.082)	0.149*** (0.007)	
(Intercept)	0.345*** (0.006)	0.428*** (0.031)	0.449*** (0.004)	0.498*** (0.005)
Observations	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
R <sup>2</sup>	0.007	0.037	0.043	0.001
F Statistic (df = 1; 10998)	74.701***		498.125***	6.099**

*Note:*\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01 19/21

# Determinants of support for global redistribution (selected variables)

[▶ Go back](#)

	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 per capita by 2100	Supports an int'l wealth tax funding LICs	Prefers a sustainable future
Mean	0.508	0.554	0.454	0.365	0.61	0.704	0.681
Vote: Center-right or Right	0.017* (0.010)	0.004 (0.015)	-0.084*** (0.015)	0.030** (0.013)	0.039*** (0.014)	-0.025* (0.014)	-0.061*** (0.014)
Vote: Far right	-0.087*** (0.013)	-0.146*** (0.020)	-0.227*** (0.019)	-0.063*** (0.018)	-0.065*** (0.020)	-0.139*** (0.019)	-0.169*** (0.020)
Vote: Left	0.215*** (0.010)	0.168*** (0.014)	0.148*** (0.015)	0.258*** (0.014)	0.189*** (0.014)	0.186*** (0.013)	0.148*** (0.014)
Gender: Man	0.020*** (0.007)	0.032*** (0.010)	-0.033*** (0.010)	0.029*** (0.010)	0.011 (0.010)	0.001 (0.009)	-0.025*** (0.010)
Age: 18-24	0.025* (0.014)	0.173*** (0.021)	0.107*** (0.022)	0.108*** (0.023)	0.119*** (0.021)	0.093*** (0.019)	0.058*** (0.020)
Age: 25-34	0.028*** (0.011)	0.091*** (0.016)	0.068*** (0.016)	0.102*** (0.016)	0.050*** (0.016)	0.048*** (0.014)	0.031** (0.015)
Age: 50-64	-0.016 (0.010)	-0.038*** (0.014)	-0.025* (0.014)	-0.033** (0.014)	-0.027* (0.014)	-0.032** (0.014)	-0.019 (0.014)
Age: 65+	0.037*** (0.013)	-0.011 (0.018)	-0.002 (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	0.017* (0.010)	-0.005 (0.015)	0.007 (0.015)	-0.009 (0.015)	-0.018 (0.015)	-0.024* (0.014)	-0.001 (0.015)
Income quartile: Q4	0.006 (0.012)	-0.037** (0.017)	-0.024 (0.017)	-0.032* (0.017)	-0.072*** (0.017)	-0.080*** (0.016)	-0.006 (0.016)
Diploma: Upper secondary	0.027** (0.010)	-0.011 (0.015)	0.024 (0.015)	0.036** (0.015)	0.035** (0.015)	0.014 (0.014)	0.017 (0.015)
Diploma: Above upper secondary	0.068*** (0.011)	0.022 (0.016)	0.041** (0.016)	0.079*** (0.015)	0.022 (0.016)	0.011 (0.015)	0.047*** (0.015)
Urbanicity: Rural	-0.010 (0.010)	-0.054*** (0.015)	0.015 (0.015)	-0.006 (0.014)	-0.013 (0.015)	-0.021 (0.014)	-0.019 (0.015)
Urbanicity: Towns and suburbs	-0.012 (0.010)	-0.038** (0.015)	-0.024 (0.015)	-0.023 (0.015)	-0.013 (0.015)	-0.024* (0.014)	0.026* (0.014)
Foreign born	0.061 (0.014)	0.089*** (0.020)	0.104*** (0.021)	0.051** (0.022)	0.036* (0.021)	0.041** (0.018)	0.039** (0.019)
Observations	10,998	10,998	10,998	9,998	10,998	10,998	10,998
R <sup>2</sup>	0.161	0.114	0.109	0.115	0.098	0.103	0.078

**Last slide (needed)**