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Having left the European Union, the UK finds itself at a crossroads. In 2021, it has a choice to become a convener nation, a leader in a collaborative sense, to overcome the global challenges of international disorder, protectionism and the climate crisis. But to do that, the UK must first repair its relationship with the EU. Without this underlying relationship with its nearest and closest ally, the UK risks being set adrift in a stormy global environment.

The long-awaited Integrated Review sought to bring coherence to the UK’s actions on the global stage, tying in trade and development as tools to meet foreign policy objectives. The Review has been well received in many quarters, primarily for its emphasis on bringing countries together to meet global challenges like climate change and strengthening the rules-based international system by leveraging the UK’s assets and legacy position: membership of NATO, membership of G7, the UK’s economic strength and particularly its ‘soft power’. The ultimate aim is to position Global Britain as a “force for good” in the world over the next decade.

But in order to fulfil this potential, a truly Global UK’s foreign policy focus must be longer-term in orientation. Inward-looking policies like cutting the international aid budget may be part of a wider plan to balance the books after the economic damage caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, but doing this “on the backs of the world’s poorest” carries serious reputational repercussions – and should be reversed as soon as possible.

Vaccine protectionism and continued wrangling over the Northern Ireland Protocol have exacerbated an increasingly tense relationship with the EU. This must be overcome if Global Britain is to succeed in its policy objectives – because the international community requires unity and cohesion to enforce the rules-based system that has served both the UK and the EU so well. The Integrated Review labelled Russia as an ‘active threat’ and China as a ‘systemic challenge’; both require the UK and the EU to act in concert with one another. The election of Joe Biden in the United States adds further incentives to pursue cooperation over antagonism.

In the same vein, the Integrated Review emphasised the role of trade as a tool within foreign policy, allowing the UK to take full advantage of its new ability to strike trade deals. But if a truly Global Britain is to emerge, policymakers must avoid being chained to an anti-EU stance.

whilst the importance of Europe, both in its proximity and the magnitude of shared trade, was touted by the Conservative Party as the ‘first pillar’ of its Global Britain strategy in early 2019, this has been recently abandoned. Yet, with prospective bilateral deals offering meagre benefits to the British economy amidst a fractious multilateral trading environment, strengthening the Trade and Cooperation Agreement looks increasingly appealing. Accession to the CPTPP (Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership) will play an important role in the UK’s ‘tilt to the Indo-Pacific',
but this does not prevent the UK improving trading arrangements with its largest trading market, whilst simultaneously initiating a dialogue that builds future regulatory practices in the UK and EU’s mutual favour. Combining this work with efforts to reinvigorate the World Trade Organisation’s (WTO) influence would be an effective way of standing up to China and upholding the rules-based international system which Global Britain advocates.

This must be matched by a real commitment to Global Britain’s ambitions on the world stage, primarily its leadership on the climate agenda. A green and fair recovery, prioritising sustainable jobs, renewable energies and low-carbon industries, has emerged as almost a consensus position in UK politics. Taking this ambition to the world stage, at a time when most countries will be preoccupied with recovering from the pandemic, will be a tough ask – made even more difficult if the UK is unable to practice at home that which it preaches abroad.

Once again, a closer relationship with the EU can support this objective, as well as mitigate the faint, but distinct, tension between the UK and Biden’s administration in the US. Hosting COP26 in November gives the UK a unique and critically important opportunity to act as a convener nation. Mirroring proactive carbon reduction methods deployed by Europe, like a carbon border adjustment mechanism, and working to incentivise green finance, would signal a willingness to cooperate to solve global issues and possibly inject much-needed credibility into the arm of Global Britain. Failing to do so would be a real blow to the idea of a truly Global Britain.
INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS GLOBAL BRITAIN?

What is Global Britain? What does it mean and why is it so important to get right?

Since the 2016 referendum, governments have attempted to define the new role Britain will play in the world and how it will project influence now that it has become independent from the world’s largest trading bloc.

For the most part, those who should know what it means, do not understand it.¹ If policymakers and academics cannot get their heads around this Government’s vision, it is little wonder the public do not understand the concept either. Recent Best for Britain/Number Cruncher Politics (BFB/NCP) polling shows that just 18% of Britons say they understand what is meant by Global Britain. More shockingly, more than two-thirds say they either do not understand the meaning of Global Britain or have not heard of the term at all.²

Britain is no longer a ‘great’ power; at least not in geopolitical terms. The scaling back of its empire in the 20th century, the US’ journey towards being the world’s sole superpower, and the more recent growth of Chinese influence, have long pointed to a future where Britain operates as a medium-sized country with medium-sized influence – albeit with a disproportionately large economy. For some, this fate was confirmed by the referendum vote in 2016. For others, Britain is due a return to the height of its imperial glory.³

Neither of those visions feel right in 2021. Announcing the Integrated Review of foreign policy, defence, security and international development on 16 March, the most detailed articulation yet of the Government’s plans for Global Britain, the Prime Minister emphasised the UK’s “historic mission as a force for good”.⁴ The Review itself, however, appreciates a reality where Global Britain’s leadership

---


² See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).


means “leading by example where we have unique or significant strengths ... and identifying where we are better placed to support others in leading the advance towards our shared goals.”

Britain will not resume a position on top of the global food chain, but its assets and legacy position mean it is uniquely placed to take a leading role in global affairs. The public are on board with this: 67% of British voters think Britain should collaborate with other countries to set global standards rather than impose its own will – just 7% disagree.

A similar figure (68%) say the world’s greatest challenges must be met in cooperation with international partners, including 45% of the least internationalist group defined by Best for Britain’s new Internationalism Index. A medium-sized country, yes, but Global Britain must surely be more ambitious than to settle for medium-sized influence.

Fig. 1 Britain should collaborate with other countries to set global trading standards, not try to impose its will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Leave voters</th>
<th>2016 Remain voters</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. The full question posed was: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Britain should collaborate with other countries to set global trading standards, not try to impose its will. Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March, 2021. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.

A truly Global Britain would understand its strengths, as well as its weaknesses, and leverage these to meet not just its own needs, but truly global challenges. Of course, a truly Global Britain would also understand how these overlap.

The need to reinvigorate the global economy whilst meeting the climate crisis, combined with the growing strategic threat posed by China, has increased the pressure on the UK to get this balance right.

---


6 See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33)
in 2021 and beyond. An overwhelming majority of the public believe the pandemic has demonstrated the need for international cooperation.  

Fig.2 In general, do you believe the world’s greatest challenges in future can be best met by the UK acting by itself or in cooperation with international allies and through international organisations?

In this report, Best for Britain challenges and builds on the UK Government’s vision for Global Britain by examining the interlinking areas of foreign policy, trade and climate change. Public sentiment is built into this analysis via fresh polling and Best for Britain’s new Internationalism Index, which divides the UK into ‘High’, ‘Medium’ and ‘Low’ internationalist groupings. In doing so, policy recommendations are offered that reflect domestic public opinion, modern Britain’s strengths and limitations, and the UK’s overall ambition to be a force for good on the global stage.

Whilst the UK will need a coherent narrative across the board, understanding how to work with the world and maximise its influence in the three key areas examined will be a vital part of building a truly Global Britain.

---

7 See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).

8 For methodology, see Appendix.
Fig. 3 If the Covid-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it’s that countries must work together because no one is safe until everyone is safe.

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. The full question posed was: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: If the Covid-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it’s that countries must work together because no one is safe until everyone is safe. Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March, 2021. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.
TRULY GLOBAL FOREIGN POLICY

Context

On 16 March 2021, the UK Government published its long-awaited Integrated Review of security, defence, development and foreign policy, ‘Global Britain in a Competitive Age’. Setting out the Prime Minister’s vision for the UK’s role in the world over the next decade, the Integrated Review sought to bring coherence to the UK’s actions on the global stage, tying in trade and development as tools to meet foreign policy objectives.

This review was timely, set against a backdrop of the UK’s departure from the EU, a new US President in the White House and growing concerns about the regimes in Russia and China. Global competition has risen, partly due to the rising economic strength and international influence of non-‘Western’ regions of the world, but also representing a battle of competing visions.

Over the last ten years, autocracies have repeatedly challenged the rules and norms that have governed international exchange for decades. Russia, for example, has often appeared militarily aggressive, and in 2014 launched its annexation of Crimea from Ukraine; Crimea remains under Russian occupation today despite almost universal condemnation. China has also sought to bring more and more states under its economic influence using gifts of technology and initiatives like ‘Belt and Road’ to evade challenges in global fora.

The pandemic has now brought these competing visions to the forefront of politics domestically. China was initially castigated for its suppression of information relating to the outbreak of Covid-19 in Wuhan, then later won praise for eliminating the virus in Wuhan after one of the toughest lockdown regimes worldwide, enabling businesses to reopen and the region to resume normal life. Most ‘Western’ nations eventually followed China’s lead in pursuing strict lockdown policies, including of course the UK. There is also evidence that China has exploited global business weakness during the pandemic to position itself strategically.

This is a challenge to the West, which will be called upon to uphold the central tenets of the rules-based international system: democracy, human rights and free trade. In this context, the arrival of Donald Trump as US President in 2016 could not have been more harmful, nudging the world further into a

---

9 House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, A brave new Britain? The future of the UK’s international policy, 13 October 2020, 5-6.

10 Tobias Ellwood, Clubhouse discussion with Tom Tugendhat MP, Tobias Ellwood MP and Andrew Griffiths MP, 16 March 2021.

damaging game of ‘our system’ versus ‘theirs’. The consequence could be that countries are forced to ‘pick a side’, with the early decisions they take becoming increasingly difficult to change and the sunk cost of new technologies embedding the values of one system into the heart of the economy.\textsuperscript{12}

Britain’s withdrawal from the EU, and the ensuing tumultuous relationship (which recently saw the EU ambassador summoned by the Foreign Secretary for a ticking off, in a manner usually reserved for countries committing atrocities, over claims of vaccine exports being blocked), is a further demonstration of the absence of consensus-building leadership among Western powers. It remains to be seen to what degree the election of Joe Biden as US President in November 2020 can reverse this trend.

**The UK response**

In this world of competition, a truly Global Britain does however have the assets and legacy position to bring countries together and strengthen the rules-based international system.

Despite suffering the worst fall in output of any G7 nation in 2020, the UK remains the world’s fifth-largest economy according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), with Gross Domestic Product (GDP) totalling more than £2 trillion.\textsuperscript{13} The UK also holds a permanent seat on the UN security council, whilst its signals-intelligence service, GCHQ, makes it an important member of the Five-Eyes intelligence alliance.

The UK is also a muscular member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), with the highest level of defence spending other than the US – a position strengthened in November last year when the Prime Minister announced an increase in defence spending by £24.1 billion over the next four years (placing it comfortably above NATO’s target of 2% of GDP).\textsuperscript{14} The Prime Minister has also outlined plans to “upgrade our capabilities across the board”, with resources being directed towards cyber and future frontier capabilities to meet the new type of security threat posed by hostile state actors.\textsuperscript{15}

Critics have questioned the decision to move resources away from conventional capabilities.\textsuperscript{16} Power may still be projected, particularly as part of the UK’s quest to ‘establish a greater and more persistent presence than any other European country’ in the Indo-Pacific region over the next decade, with the

\textsuperscript{12} House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, *A brave new Britain? The future of the UK’s international policy*, 13 October 2020, 6.

\textsuperscript{13} The United Kingdom, *International Monetary Fund*.


\textsuperscript{16} Britain needs a post-Brexit foreign policy, *The Economist*, 2 January 2021.
HMS Queen Elizabeth due to make a 20,000 mile voyage to the region later this year in a clear rebuff to China’s ambition for control in its surrounding waters. However, the decision to cut conventional capabilities has not gone unnoticed by NATO allies. Despite the Integrated Review containing a renewed commitment to support the Eastern European neighbourhood, the US has already raised concerns about the number of troops available in the event of Article 5 being triggered.

Nevertheless, the UK’s financial and vocal commitment to an alliance that has, at times, looked unstable over the past decade is welcome. The US will take its responsibility for European defence seriously under President Biden, but the UK leading other NATO allies into meeting their defence spending commitments will help – particularly in resisting the ‘active threat’ posed by Russia.

The Integrated Review also correctly put an emphasis on the UK’s value as a global convenor. Yet it is in this sphere that the UK appears to be making poor use of its comparative advantages. whilst UK cultural exports have heavily contributed towards a ‘Cool Britannia’ moniker, and UK sport enjoys worldwide recognition on the back of the English Premier League’s commercial success and the continued allure of events like Wimbledon, the projection of ‘soft’ power has been considerably damaged in recent years.

Brexit has undoubtedly played a role in this decline. By breaking away from the EU and heralding its newfound independence, the UK sent a signal that it lacked confidence in institutions promoting shared political values and joined-up approaches to global challenges. particularly damaging at a time when Trump’s administration in the US was articulating the same message, making the West look divided.

Whilst Biden’s administration has already signalled it will take a radically different approach to its predecessor, the UK’s threat to override parts of the Withdrawal Agreement last year via the Internal Market Bill, and specifically its admission to breaching international law in a “very specific and limited way”, seriously undermines its ability to hold other countries to the rules-based international system.

The unilateral extension of customs grace periods with the EU continues this worrying trend of eroding the UK’s existing soft power, with legal action being brought against the UK for an apparent breach of an
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18 Helen Warell, Johnson set to unnerve allies with ‘Global Britain’ defence review, 8 March 2021.


international treaty. Moreover, Biden and other senior Democrats have repeatedly emphasised their support for measures to protect the Good Friday Agreement, which can be seen as a coded warning to the UK not to undermine the Protocol on Northern Ireland when paired with statements last year suggesting a US-UK trade deal could be blocked. The UK stands to alienate its key strategic allies in Europe and the US through any unilateral changes to the Protocol.

Each time the UK appears to backtrack on its international commitments it risks further damaging its stock of soft power. The renewal of the UK’s nuclear warheads is one example, breaching international non-proliferation agreements and making it harder to criticise non-allied states with ambitions for nuclear capabilities.

Another example is the cut to the budget for international aid from 0.7% to 0.5% of Gross National Income (GNI). Whilst the Government has promised to restore the 0.7% level “when the fiscal situation allows”, damage has already been inflicted by the initial reduction. The UK was widely criticised for reducing its contribution to famine-struck Yemen at the same time as continuing arms exports to Saudi Arabia.

Other countries around the world also reduced their contributions towards preventing famine in Yemen – the UN was only able to raise $1.7 billion of its $3.85 billion target – but this fact serves to highlight the missed opportunity for a truly Global UK to take on a position of world leadership. Britain could have sent a strong signal that it understands the enduring value of supporting the international system and countries within it by maintaining its commitment to 0.7% of GNI, even during a crisis. The total value of aid would have fallen with the UK’s economic performance in any case, but a ‘truly’ Global UK must show it understands that a cut internationally is as damaging as a cut domestically.

---


22 Biden says US trade deal hinges on UK ‘respect’ for Good Friday Agreement, 17 September 2020.


25 Patrick Wintour, UK ‘balancing books on backs of Yemen’s starving people’ says UN diplomat, Guardian, 7 March 2021.

26 U.N. chief Guterres says a ‘disappointing’ $1.7billion pledged for Yemen aid in 2021, Reuters, 1 March 2021.
Along with vaccine deployment, the aid budget is a powerful tool in the UK’s arsenal for championing the rules-based international system. A majority of respondents in the BFB/NCP poll said Britain should provide international humanitarian aid, and that Britain has a responsibility to provide financial support to lower-income countries. Nearly three quarters of people agreed the UK should work with other countries to tackle hunger and poverty worldwide.\(^{27}\)

Moreover, as US Secretary of State Antony Blinken recently admitted about the retreat of US liberal democracy under Trump, “where we have pulled back, China has stepped in.” The UK must be at the forefront of efforts to meet this challenge with a truly Global Britain narrative of responsibility and concerted support.

This may well begin with plans to bring together a network of like-minded countries who do uphold the values of the rules-based international system. As Britain hosts the G7 conference this year, the Prime Minister plans to invite the leaders of Australia, India and South Korea to form a ‘Democratic 10’ group of countries, mirroring Biden’s pledge to hold a ‘democracy summit’ in his first year in office. Both plans emphasise the need for democracies to stand together in a world characterised by rising

---

\(^{27}\) See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).
authoritarianism and great power rivalry. This ‘crescent of containment’ will concern China and promises to support Global Britain’s aims in multilateral institutions.28

The values promoted by this group must be reflected in the domestic behaviour of its members: peaceful protests having been met with force in both the US and UK over the last year, and recent reports that the Home Office is considering offshore asylum centres, will worry human rights activists.29 As the UK Government itself admits, “the international order is only as robust, resilient and legitimate as the states that comprise it.”30

More work needs to be done to grow this club of countries beyond 2021 and there is no need to conduct this separately from the EU. The much-touted ‘tilt to the Indo-Pacific’ via trade and power projection will need to be accompanied by a more coordinated response from bigger powers. Such international cooperation has broad public support in the UK. More than three-quarters of voters believe Britain should face the challenge presented by China in concert with other countries, including nearly two-thirds of those in the least internationalist group, according to the Index.31

Beijing’s size and its place in global commerce is too important for isolated action – holding investment, import and export interests in most economies, especially in the wake of Covid-19. The Integrated Review recently cited China as a ‘systemic challenge’, which matches language from the EU’s own assessment.32 The ‘E3’ network with France and Germany, which has continued to meet in 2021 on issues such as the Iran nuclear strategy, provides precedent for continuing coordination in spite of the UK’s rejection of involvement in movement towards a joint EU foreign policy in recent years.33 The Government’s recent move to join coordinated action by the EU, US and Canada in targeting Chinese officials over its government’s treatment of the Uighur Muslims is a promising step in the right direction.34

---

28 Tobias Ellwood, Clubhouse discussion with Tom Tugendhat MP, Tobias Ellwood MP and Andrew Griffiths MP, 16 March 2021.

29 Steven Swinford and Matt Dathan, Asylum seekers sent abroad under plans to deter migrants, The Times, 17 March 2021.

30 Cabinet Office, Global Britain in a competitive age: The Integrated Review of Security, Defence, Development and Foreign Policy, 16 March 2021, 44.

31 See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).

European Commission, EU-China – A strategic outlook, 12 March 2019, 1.

33 Editorial, Hopes grow for the JCPOA, but time is tight, Guardian, 23 February 2021.

34 Uighurs: Western countries sanction China over rights abuses, BBC, 22 March 2021.
Fig. 5 Should the UK work with allies or tackle threats from countries like Russia or China alone?

By starting from a basis of accepting some coordination with the EU on foreign policy and working to re-establish Britain’s commitment to the values of the rules-based international system, a truly Global UK can emerge from the pandemic. A key priority will be for the UK to wield existing soft power more effectively than it has been doing recently.

But if the UK can manage this at the same time as working with like-minded nations to reinvigorate the multilateral institutions designed to uphold the international system, whilst avoiding undermining its own message via its domestic interests, a truly Global UK can act as a convenor of nations, and in doing so fulfil its desire to be a ‘force for good’ in the world over the next decade.
Best for Britain recommends

1.1 The UK must be more consistent in upholding the international rules-based system, and more broadly in projecting the values of this system, in order to contain the separate threats of Russia and particularly China. In doing so, it will more successfully define a ‘Global Britain’ narrative in foreign policy viewed as a ‘force for good’.

1.2 To carry its message the UK must wield its soft power more effectively. This should include a commitment to restoring the original 0.7% of GNI commitment to international aid as soon as possible. By reducing this without offering a specific timeframe, and not offering a vote in the House of Commons, the UK risks undermining both Parliament at home and the development work it has carried out over decades. The UK must carefully consider its global interventions to ensure ungoverned spaces do not emerge, which dangerous regimes could enter and exploit.

1.3 In containing Russia and China, the UK must seek cooperation with its key allies. The EU remains the UK’s strongest ally other than the US and this should be reflected in coordinated action.
TRULY GLOBAL TRADE

Context

Trade will be a key facet in the UK’s ambition to act as a global convenor and strengthen international rules. Trade will be central to the UK’s ambition to reinvigorate the WTO, bring the EU onside, align against China, and uphold international order.

Government leaders have previously recognised that the trade policy of ‘a truly Global Britain’ must be predicated on a close relationship with Europe. In February 2020, Dominic Raab stated the first pillar of ‘a truly Global Britain’ is “to continue to prove that we are the best possible allies, partners and friends with our European neighbours.” The second and third pillars were the promotion of “open and free trade” worldwide, and positioning the UK as a force for good in the world. However, the competing interests of new trade partners, the reality of global trade and tensions with Europe, have undermined the first pillar of ‘a truly Global Britain’.

Since the end of the transition period, frictional trade and uncertainty has led to a significantly decreased flow of goods and services between the EU and the UK. According to the French customs office, French imports from the UK were down 20% in January compared with the average of the previous six months, and French exports to the UK were down 13%. Italy saw a 38% drop in exports to the UK and a 70% drop in British imports in the same time frame, a much steeper drop in trade than those with other countries. Germany experienced a 30% drop in exports to the UK. ONS figures released in March 2021 have shown trade made a partial recovery in February, but remained well below the rate in the same month last year. Diplomatic tensions, produced by issues like the Internal Market Bill and vaccines disputes, as detailed in the previous section, have compounded the disruption of the EU-UK trade relationship.

This has led to a shift away from EU trade as the ‘central pillar’ of Global Britain, and towards a reliance on bilateral or plurilateral trade agreements to mask economic and diplomatic losses incurred by the UK’s disorderly exit from the EU.


Global Trade Environment

The Global Britain strategy is complicated by the disarray in which the World Trade Organisation finds itself. Notably, the WTO’s Appellate Body has been in deadlock since December 2019. The US continues to block all new appointments in protest of perceived judicial overreach, leaving the body without quorum. The increasingly politicised global trade environment has undermined the WTO’s mediative capabilities, despite the unanimous appointment of Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala as Director-General in March 2021. A senior UK Treasury official noted: “nobody is particularly optimistic about multilateral trade.”

Equally, bilateral trade agreements don’t always offer significant benefits to the UK economy, especially in comparison to the multilateral partnerships the UK benefited from as a member of the EU. For example, the UK-Japan deal, signed in October 2020, has “very limited improvements relative to the EU-Japan Economic Partnership Agreement” according to the UK Trade Policy Observatory. Largely, the UK has replicated the trading terms experienced as an EU member in its new bilateral agreements with New Zealand, Australia and Japan.

Plurilateral trade has therefore been seen as a stepping-stone to significant future multilateral trade, particularly in trade of services. This has been coupled with UK trade policy shifting towards fast-growing markets in the Global South. A senior Downing Street official stated “the UK has the opportunity to take an eyes wide open approach to China with the support of Pacific Rim partners.” This is seen as a way to compensate for the loss of EU trade and sidestep inherent issues in multilateral trading. The UK hopes to use the bilateral deals with New Zealand and Australia to join the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP). The UK’s overarching trade focus will be on the Indo-Pacific territories, as outlined in the March 2021 Integrated Review. The Review centres on the ‘Indo-Pacific’ tilt, citing the economic and security benefits of engagement with Asia. The Integrated Review states Britain must work to “promote open societies and to uphold the international rules and norms that underpin free trade, security and stability” in Indo-Pacific areas.

---

42. Department for International Trade, UK applies to join huge Pacific free trade area CPTPP, 30 January 2021.
The purpose of trade

There have been concerns surrounding membership of the CPTPP, and the Indo-Pacific tilt more generally. The Trade Union Congress warned the CPTPP “has no effective enforcement of labour standards, includes Investor-State Dispute Settlement clauses and exposes public services”, whilst others have raised certain partners’ links to modern slavery. Without membership or support from the EU, UK labour and environmental standards will not be guaranteed by the world’s largest trading bloc. This presents a probable challenge to upholding the third pillar of Global Britain: positioning the UK as a positive force in global trade.

Equally, the UK’s trade policy should reinforce its foreign policy goals, which involve coordinating an internationalist response from bigger powers to the ‘systemic challenge’ presented by China. Ignoring trade with Europe to focus on the tilt to the East would undermine the UK’s wider diplomatic objectives in its relationship with the EU.

Indeed, trade with certain parties will have repercussions with other partners. For example, the Inter-Parliamentary Alliance on China, comprising over 100 MPs from 19 countries, represents just the most vocal strand of international opposition to trade with China, alongside an implicit preference for trade with Anglophone or Commonwealth nations. Trade with China may incur tacit penalties with the US, whilst trade with the US may complicate trade with the EU. The UK will no longer be able to rely on the European Commission to manage complex and simultaneous trade negotiations with these major powers and fast-emerging markets.

The UK finds itself in a troubling position, stuck between the established trading powers of the US, the EU and China, without a clear ally or forum. At the same time, the UK seems unwilling or unable to secure substantially new or beneficial bilateral arrangements. Without a strong international mediating force like the WTO or the European Commission, the UK may lose out on opportunities as it is subsumed into existing trade axes or pinballed between opponents.

A ‘truly’ Global Britain should promote multilateral cooperation for its own sake, fulfilling the second and third pillars of a Global Britain. The UK should seek to “reform and strengthen” the WTO, as promised in the Integrated Review. Indeed, the UK should seek to resolve trade tensions between its allies, the US and the EU, through the WTO, and unite NATO against existential threats from China and Russia. This

---


45 Rob Niblett, How to Turn ‘Global Britain’ from a Slogan to Reality, Chatham House, 11 January 2021.

internationalist approach to trade is widely supported by the public. Of those polled, 82% agree the UK should cooperate with international bodies on trade, including 62% of the least internationalist group.\footnote{See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).}

Fig.6 Should the UK cooperate with international bodies in trade?

The EU and the US continue to be in dispute over digital taxation and commercial aircraft subsidies. However, on 18 February 2021, the EU proposed reforms to restrain the WTO’s judicial authority of the WTO’s dispute settlement body.\footnote{David Lawder, EU trade official wants swift engagement with Biden on aircraft, digital taxes, WTO, Reuters, 15 January 2021.} The UK should use this moment of reconciliation to act as a convenor and mediator, drawing the EU and the Biden administration into agreement over trade. This would further the UK’s foreign policy goals and reinvigorate the WTO to assist in the UK’s multilateral trade ambitions. The UK should use its trade policy to positively impact the international rules based system.

But the diplomatic challenges inherent in navigating global trade highlight the need for the first pillar of Global Britain, a stable and prosperous trading relationship with the enormous market on the UK’s doorstep. Over-reliance on new plurilateral trading relationships, especially without a strong WTO, will ultimately relegate the UK’s position, and may undermine the system of global trade and cooperation.
The first pillar of trade

The UK must, as a matter of priority, level-up the EU-UK trade relationship, foster cooperation and invest in new diplomatic infrastructures. Methods of liberalising trade include membership of EU standardisation bodies like the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) or the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA); as well as streamlining non-tariff barriers to trade such as rules of origin checks. Trade in services accounts for nearly half of UK exports to the EU, yet is underrepresented in the provisions of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. A recent report therefore urgently recommends the UK pursues ongoing regulatory dialogue to ensure people and services can continue to be traded. These recommendations include securing the mutual recognition of professional qualifications and securing a data adequacy agreement.49

A pressing example of this can be found in financial services, which contributed £132 billion to the UK economy in 2019, accounting for 6.9% of total economic output and 1 million jobs.50 In January 2021, the City of London lost its position as the largest share trading centre in Europe to Amsterdam.51 Even if financial equivalence is granted by the EU to the UK, it is likely to be in a patchwork fashion, concerning both access to the market and regulatory supervision with some sectors struggling to demonstrate regulatory alignment. To maintain its position as a financial hub, the UK must create an ongoing regulatory dialogue with the EU, pushing for a mutual recognition agreement which could replicate the UK’s previous access to the single market.52 The Memorandum of Understanding, signed on 26 March 2021, showed a willingness on both sides to engage in talks and cooperation in the arena of financial services, but much still remains to be concluded.

In its Integrated Review, the Government expressed an ambition for the UK to become a science and technology superpower, building on Britain’s reputation for innovation and pledging £22 billion for research and development investment.53 The Review pledged to “create an enabling environment” and to “extend our international collaboration, ensuring that the UK’s successful research base translates

49 David Henig, Towards a modern UK-EU trade relationship: Moving beyond the UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement, December 2020, 4.


51 Philip Stafford, Amsterdam ousts London as Europe’s top share trading hub, Financial Times, 10 February 2021.

52 David Henig, Towards a modern UK-EU trade relationship: Moving beyond the UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement, December 2020, 8.

into influence over the critical and emerging technologies.\textsuperscript{54} Indeed, 81% of British people agree the UK should collaborate with international bodies on science and research, including 91% of Conservative voters and 84% of Leave voters. Even 59% of the least internationalist group support this cooperation.\textsuperscript{55}

**Fig. 7 Do you think the UK should or should not cooperate with international bodies in science and research?**

![Survey results graphic]

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. The full question posed was: Do you think the UK should or should not cooperate with international bodies in the following areas: Science and Research. Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.

However, the UK so far has failed to deliver the funding and the international collaboration needed to become a scientific superpower. In March 2021, the Chair and CEO of the Russell Group of universities wrote to the Prime Minister warning of a £1 billion shortfall in research funding if the UK did not pursue further integration with the EU’s Horizon programme.\textsuperscript{56} The letter also stressed full participation in


\textsuperscript{55} See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).

\textsuperscript{56} The Russell Group [to the Prime Ministers, Boris Johnson], 16 March 2021.
Horizon would allow the Government access to the best technology and the best people, as well as the ability for researchers to link up with research teams in Europe and across the globe. Just 6% of those polled by Best for Britain believe the UK should not work with experts from other countries, whilst more than a third (34%) strongly agree.  

**Fig.8 Britain should work with experts from other countries.**

This year, the UK Research and Innovation Agency told universities their budget had been cut from £245m to £125m. The Vice Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge universities warned this would be “a blow to Global Britain”. Bob Ward, policy director at the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment said that the cuts immediately undermined the Chancellor’s budget pledge to make the UK a scientific superpower: “this reckless and shortsighted act could create a gaping hole in the UK’s climate research, just as we prepare to host the crucial COP26 UN summit later this year.”

As explored in the foreign policy section, the UK is not making the most of its inherent strengths as a hub for research, convenor nation and home to the five of the top twenty research universities in the world.

---

57 See Technical Notes, Appendix (p.33).

58 Stephen Toope and Louise Richardson, Slashing research funding is a blow to Global Britain, *The Telegraph* 19 March 2021.

Further integration with Europe, and free trade as whole, is central to boosting British business and levelling-up left behind communities post-Covid-19. The recent ‘Global Britain, local jobs’ report from the Board of Trade demonstrated 6.5 million UK jobs are supported by exports, that those jobs pay 7% more than average and are 21% more productive.\(^{60}\) whilst the report focused on the potential for non-EU trade, it makes little sense to abandon liberalised trade with the largest single market on our doorstep, given the domestic benefits free trade provides. In fact, 66% of business owners and 64% of business leaders recognise the UK should seek cooperation with the EU in areas of mutual benefit.

Global UK can be a leader, but only in collaboration with Europe and the rest of the world.\(^{61}\) How the UK can achieve this balancing act is explored in the next section, the UK’s leading role in the climate response.

---

Best for Britain recommends

2.1 The UK returns its trade policy to the original model of Global Britain, beginning with strong European cooperation, on which prosperous worldwide trading and global influence can be achieved.

2.2 The UK should promote and encourage free trade globally, through invigorating the World Trade Organisation and liberalising trade with the EU. This can be achieved through membership of standardisation bodies, streamlining of non-tariff barriers and improvement of trade in services.

2.3 Any trade deals the UK strikes must not undermine existing British standards and values, must not undermine UK foreign policy objectives and must not damage the UK’s relationship with its closest and most significant ally, Europe.

---

\(^{60}\) Department for International Trade, Global Britain, local jobs, 10 March 2021.

A green recovery?

A green and fair recovery, prioritising sustainable jobs, renewable energies and low-carbon industries, has emerged as almost a consensus position in UK politics. This is reflected in the attitudes of the British people. Leading the international response to climate change was one of the UK’s most important responsibilities for most people polled.

![Fig.9 Which of the UK’s responsibilities are most important to you?](image)

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.

In November 2020, the Government announced the centrepiece of its green agenda, a ten point plan for the Green Industrial Revolution, which would create 250,000 jobs in renewable energy. The plan means to make use of the UK’s green potential, such as off-shore wind power capabilities, rewilding naturally carbon-storing landscapes and technology expertise. The UK is ranked fourth in the Global Innovation Index (2020), attracting significant venture capital. Supporting green innovative research dovetails with the Government's wider ambitions for technology, outlined in the 2021 Integrated

---

62 Prime Minister’s Office, 10 Downing Street, PM outlines his Ten Point Plan for a Green Industrial Revolution for 250,000 jobs, 18 November 2020.
Review, which aims to make the UK a ‘scientific superpower.’ The Clean Growth Strategy has for several years aimed to decarbonise all sectors of the UK whilst embracing the opportunities of a more circular, less wasteful economy. In July 2020, the Government promised to ‘build back greener’, committing £350 million. Clearly, the green recovery is a thread running throughout Government policy and throughout public opinion.

Britain and Europe have committed to net zero carbon emissions by 2050 in accordance with the Paris Climate Accord. The UK has pledged a 68 per cent drop in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, and a 78 per cent drop by 2035 compared to 1990 levels - a more ambitious target than any other major economy.

However, the Government has been repeatedly accused of publicising ambitious green initiatives but failing to deliver. The March 2021 Budget was criticised as having little detail as to how the Government would forward the green agenda. The Government pledged £1.5 billion to a flagship ‘Green Homes’ scheme to insulate homes and provide low-carbon heating. However, delays in implementation meant 95% of the fund was untouched by January 2021, and the scheme has now been scrapped.

The proposed National Infrastructure Bank (NIB) has a remit which includes the delivery of the 2050 net zero target. However, there is little detail on how loans are granted. It is also unclear whether the £12 billion pledged can match low-cost finance previously lent to the UK by the European Investment Bank, which amounts to €118 billion overall. Since the NIB must also prioritise ‘levelling-up’ left behind (and electorally significant) communities, there are concerns the Government’s green agenda could be sidelined in favour of short-term priorities. The proposed construction of a coal mine in West Cumbria, championed by the Northern Research Group, is a glaring example of this tension. It is encouraging the government has launched a public inquiry into the environmental impacts of the mine.

---

65 Prime Minister’s Office, 10 Downing Street, PM commits £350 million to fuel green recovery, 22 July 2020.
66 Fiona Harvey, UK vows to outdo other economies with 68% emissions cuts by 2030, The Guardian, 4 December 2020.
70 Cumbria coal mine: Company ‘disappointed’ by public inquiry move, BBC, 16 March 2021.
The conflict between short-term economic growth and long-term climate action must be resolved if we are to respond properly to the climate emergency. The UK must find a way to balance competitive trade policy with its domestic and international climate obligations.

Cooperative Climate Action

Where possible, the UK should realign its trade policy to complement and further these targets. A crucial first step is to simplify and liberalise trade with Europe. The proximity of Europe means goods can be transported by road, rather than air, with lower associated emissions. As outlined above, this requires consistent dialogue between regulatory bodies, investment in new diplomatic infrastructures and the political goodwill to create a comprehensive regulatory alignment agreement.

In climate policy, the UK has already shown alignment to the EU. The UK’s Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), replacing the UK’s participation in the EU’s ETS on 1 January 2021, operates on very similar principles. But the EU plans to go one step further. Carbon border adjustment (CBA) mechanisms will be introduced by the EU by the end of 2021. CBAs would see tariffs levied proportionate to the carbon content of imported goods. CBAs are designed to prevent ‘carbon leakage’ - when companies transfer economic activity from countries and jurisdictions with strict emission regimes to those with weaker.\(^1\) The levy would apply to all imports unless they originated from a country with an equivalent domestic carbon price to the EU, or are made by a company able to demonstrate that its product is more carbon efficient than the EU average.\(^2\)

If the UK would adopt an equivalent scheme, it could demonstrate a forward-thinking, collaborative approach to hitting international emissions targets. However, with the WTO’s Appellate Body unable to mitigate concerns, some worry the EU’s CBAs may be seen as backdoor protectionism. This could destabilise an already fractious global trade environment, prompting retaliatory tariff measures and further alienating the US from multilateral trading. As Emily Lydgate, deputy director at the UK Trade Policy Observatory, said: “we can tailor trade policy to our environmental goals, but that might involve restrictions, and that might cause diplomatic issues.”\(^3\)

Nevertheless, experts argue a proactive response to CBAs would serve the UK diplomatically and pragmatically. Sam Lowe from the Centre for European Reforms states the risk of trade destabilisation is less than the risk the UK “ignores the topic, and ends up being bounced into adopting an approach designed by others if and when the EU and US introduce their own schemes.”\(^4\) To meet emissions

---

\(^1\) Sam Lowe, EU border carbon adjustment: proposed models and state of play, Centre for European Reform, 8 July 2020.

\(^2\) Sam Lowe, Britain must find a way to be competitive whilst cutting carbon emissions, Centre for European Reform, 12 February 2021.

\(^3\) Anna Isaac, Britain’s climate dilemma as it navigates post-Brexit trade, Politico, 28 February 2021.

\(^4\) Sam Lowe, Britain must find a way to be competitive whilst cutting carbon emissions, Centre for European Reform, 12 February 2021.
targets, the UK will have to make hard choices. And if the Government was to lead on the CBAs, and implement a scheme in line with the EU’s mechanism, it could position itself as a credible proponent of multilateral cooperation and meaningful climate action.

**Climate Policy as Foreign Policy**

In 2021, Britain has the perfect platform to leverage diplomatic cache from international climate response leadership. In November, the UK will be hosting the COP26 in Glasgow, the most significant climate conference since Paris 2015. The UK will also act as president of the G7, held in Cornwall in June. The Government seems to already be positioning itself as a leader on climate issues. In February 2021, the Prime Minister chaired a meeting with the UN Secretary Council to discuss climate change’s impact on global peace and prosperity.

The UK can use COP26 and the G7 Summit to establish itself as a confident and collaborative actor on the world stage. CBAs are just one example of climate action the UK could champion at these international summits. Britain could ask to join the Agreement on Climate Change, Trade and Sustainability led by New Zealand. The group aims to find ways forward on three central trade and climate issues: removing fossil fuel subsidies, climate-related labelling, and promoting trade in climate-friendly goods and services. The UK should also work within the WTO to lead the charge for other member states to give their assent to a WTO Ministerial Statement on environmental sustainability and trade.

Building on the Prime Minister’s ‘five point plan’ announced to the UN in September 2020, the Integrated Review outlines pandemic preparedness as a key factor in the UK’s global stewardship. Covid-19 has not only shown the interconnectedness of the world, but the need for nations to work together. 77% of British people said Covid-19 shows that countries must work together, whilst only 5% disagree. UK action will include increasing WHO funding by 30% to £340 million over the next four years, exploring a WHO-led pandemic preparedness international treaty and investing in genomic sequencing research and zoonotic link assessment. Leveraging the UK’s reputation for innovation and research, Britain could position itself as a leader in health science, a global convenor and a champion of

---
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international bodies like WHO. Indeed, nearly three quarters (74%) of British people agree or strongly agree that international organisations are helpful in solving global issues, whilst 78% believe health crises are better solved in collaboration with other countries.

**Fig.9 In general, do you believe the world’s greatest challenges in future can be best met by the UK acting by itself or in cooperation with international allies and through international organisations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Internationalism</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Internationalism</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Internationalism</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. The full question posed was: In general, do you believe the world’s greatest challenges in future can be best met by the UK acting by itself or in cooperation with international allies and through international organisations like the United Nations? Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March, 2021. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.

Similarly, 79% agree the UK should work with international bodies to solve climate change, including 53% of the least internationalist group. 80

Currently, the Biden administration presents a diplomatic challenge to the UK Government. The Prime Minister’s closeness to Trump, the threat to Northern Irish stability posed by the Internal Market Bill, and the Brexit project as a whole, have reportedly made President Biden wary of the Government. 81 A bilateral trade deal with the US, which seemed likely under the Trump administration, now seems more distant. Biden has positioned his administration in opposition to Trump’s climate scepticism, rejoining the Paris climate accord within hours of his inauguration. 82 British leadership on climate action would signal distance between the Government and the Trump administration, whilst demonstrating support for Biden’s multilateral approach to diplomacy. In this way, the G7 Summit and COP26 could prove

---
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important in overcoming tension with the Biden administration, and potentially opening up a profitable avenue of bilateral trade.

**Fig. 10 Do you think the UK should or should not cooperate with international bodies to tackle climate change?**

![Survey Results](image)

Source: Number Cruncher Analytics. The full question posed was: Do you think the UK should or should not cooperate with international bodies in the following areas: Climate change. Sample size was 3,004 UK adults. Fieldwork was conducted between 18 February and 8 March. This poll was commissioned by Best for Britain.

As outlined in the trade policy section, the UK finds itself in a precarious position on the world stage. Britain is caught between the competing interests of America and China, without the support of the EU to leverage their position and broker contentious areas of trade. But with the domestic and international consensus emerging around a green recovery from Covid-19, the UK’s roles in COP26 and G7 are a unique opportunity to lead on climate issues, and to reassert Britain’s scientific and diplomatic credentials after a damaging year.

Just as the UK must maintain a blameless record on human rights in order to legitimately castigate China and uphold the rules-based international system, obvious inconsistencies between the UK’s domestic agenda and climate leadership will not go unnoticed by the allies we hope to influence. On 12 March 2021, John Kerry, the United States Special Presidential Envoy for Climate, commented on the UK’s proposed coal mine in Cumbria, saying: “the marketplace has made a decision that coal is not the future”.

Equally, as the UK’s trade and foreign policy ambitions hinge on the ‘tilt to the Indo-Pacific’, including the requested accession to CPTPP, the Government must be mindful that trade policy does not contradict its

---

Roger Harrabin, *Climate change: Kerry urges top polluters to cut emissions now*, BBC 8 March 2021.
climate rhetoric. China is central to the Integrated Review’s ambitions in Asia, yet is also the biggest carbon emitter in the world. China’s pledge to reach “peak carbon” by 2030 and virtual net zero by 2060 was welcomed by the international community, but there was scepticism as to whether it could transition from such a heavy reliance on coal. The targets also remain out of step with the Paris Climate Accord’s recommendations, which are required to prevent catastrophic global heating. The UK must balance the benefits of the ‘Indo-Pacific tilt’ with its domestic and international responsibilities, and consider whether European trade would better complement their foreign policy and climate goals.

In 2021, Britain should demonstrate to its global partners not only a domestic commitment, but a multilateral approach to solving the climate crisis. This will help fulfil the second and third pillars of the Global Britain strategy, freeing trade and establishing the UK as a force for good on the global stage. The UK must use its position to meet global challenges, not merely to respond to the climate crisis but to establish itself as a leader in trade, science and world stewardship.

Best for Britain recommends

3.1 Britain must use trade policy to further its own domestic green agenda, and hit emissions targets.

3.2 Establishing its own carbon border adjustment mechanisms alongside the UK ETS, or equivalent carbon-reducing trade measures, would complement Britain’s commitment to climate leadership, and signal to Europe a willingness to cooperate to tackle the global issues.

3.3 Britain should use COP26 and G7 to further its diplomatic position, endorse free trade and promote the UK as a force for good in the world - in other words, to further the Global Britain agenda.

3.4 Britain should use its diplomatic and climate leadership position to make the most of bilateral deals and alleviate some of the UK’s vulnerability on the global stage.

---
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CONCLUSION

The UK must seek to strengthen the international rules-based system through trade, foreign policy and climate leadership. Only then can Britain be truly global: a confident economic partner and a force for good on the world stage. Championing organisations such as the WHO, the UN and the WTO, will allow the UK to navigate the choppy waters of international trade and diplomacy, whilst fostering a spirit of global cooperation. The UK should convene its allies to present a united response to the threat posed by China and Russia, whilst fostering the central tenets of the rules-based international system: democracy, human rights and free trade. Venturing alone may compromise the UK’s high domestic standards and climate targets, alienate vital allies or further degrade global cooperation.

The UK must improve relations with its nearest, largest and strategically most significant trading partner, the EU, as a starting point. In 2019, a strong relationship with Europe was touted as the keystone of ‘a truly Global Britain’. The Government should not let temporary tensions with the EU shape their vision of the UK’s foreign policy for the next decade. The shared values, diplomatic interests and volume of trade with the Continent are clear incentives for closer cooperation. Therefore, the UK must improve upon the Trade and Cooperation Agreement through ongoing regulatory dialogues, membership of standardisation bodies and building diplomatic infrastructures between the newly separate entities.

The UK will host COP26 in 2021, giving Britain a unique opportunity to leverage its green credentials and research acumen. The Government could dispel accusations of over-publicising and under-delivering green initiatives through the adoption of innovative, proactive methods of green financing and international carbon control. Building on the EU’s proposed carbon border adjustment schemes, as the UK already has with the Emissions Trading Scheme, would signal a willingness to cooperate with the rest of the world and establish the UK as a leader in the climate response.

The UK should not pursue a quixotic foreign policy, rooted in twentieth century notions of influence. Britain, through its legacy roles and internal assets, can be a leader, but only as conduit of cooperation and allyship.
Appendix: Internationalism Index Technical Note

Technical Note on Best For Britain Internationalism Index

22nd April 2021

Summary

The Best For Britain internationalism index is a segmentation of UK adults based on the extent to which they hold internationalist attitudes. The measure is calculated at individual level, and by extension can also provide a measure for groups within the population (such as demographic, geographic or political subsets).

Polling results are often analysed by various breakdowns, with election and EU referendum votes, together with age and education, often acting as proxies for attitudes. This can often lead to wrong conclusions, because these proxies, while useful, are usually far from perfectly correlated with how people feel about any particular issue (or set of issues).

Put simply, people decide how to vote for a variety of reasons, and neither groups of voters nor demographic groups are homogenous. In order to understand best how opinions differ between people with different attitudes, then it makes sense to measure those attitudes directly.

Segmentation of the type made possible by the index enables us to do this. The index combines answers to a battery of questions with statistical modelling to determine how internationalist an individual (or group) is. The segments derived from the index provide the tools with which to analyse how views on things like voting, topical issues, fundamental values in other areas, and so on, vary between those who are more and less internationalist.

Subtopics

In order to construct a broad measure of internationalism, questions probed the public's attitudes to the following subtopics:

- Supranational organisations (such as the WHO, UN and World Bank)
- Learning about and having exposure to other cultures and languages
- Multiple identities
- Humanitarian aid
- Cooperation in general
- Cooperation on the Covid-19 pandemic
- Cooperation on trading standards
- Freedom of movement
- Asylum and refuge
Questions

The questions take the form of agree/disagree statements (listed below), with the following a five-point response scale:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Data collection

The initial data collection for the index was conducted by Number Cruncher Politics via a nationally representative poll of 3,004 UK adults between 8th and 18th March 2021.

Modelling process

To construct the index, the categorical responses were converted into five-point numerical scales, from the most internationalist to the most anti-internationalist answer, with the "don't know" option coded as the mid or neutral response.

In order to normalise the responses, each of the variables was Box-Cox transformed, using lambda parameters automatically selected by iteration for each variable. The transformed variables were then analysed by principal components analysis (PCA) to identify the common internationalism factor, with the nine variables selected based on their correlations with the candidate factors, from which the final index was derived using PCA.

The correlations of the transformed variables with the final index ranged between approximately r=0.65 and r=0.77.

Finally, to convert the scale back into categorical segments, respondents were classified into “high”, “medium” and “low” terciles, which are used as segments for the analysis.

Results

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

International organisations like the World Health Organisation, the UN and the World Bank, have an important role to play in helping to solve global issues such as pandemics, climate change, famine

| Strongly agree | 36 |
| Agree          | 38 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 16 |
Disagree 3
Strongly disagree 2
Don’t know 4

Learning about and having exposure to other cultures and languages is important

Strongly agree 30
Agree 40
Neither agree nor disagree 21
Disagree 3
Strongly disagree 2
Don’t know 3

People can have multiple identities. For example, they can simultaneously be both British and European

Strongly agree 25
Agree 33
Neither agree nor disagree 24
Disagree 9
Strongly disagree 4
Don’t know 4

Britain should support international humanitarian aid to help develop economies around the world

Strongly agree 20
Agree 32
Neither agree nor disagree 29
Disagree 9
Strongly disagree 5
Don’t know 4

Britain alone can never have all the answers, it’s only right that we work with experts from other countries

Strongly agree 34
Agree 38
Neither agree nor disagree 20
Disagree 4
Strongly disagree 2
Don’t know 3
If the covid-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it’s that countries must work together because no one is safe until everyone is safe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Britain should collaborate with other countries to set global trading standards, not try to impose its will

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

British people should have the right to live, work and study in other European countries (and Europeans the right to live, work and study in the UK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Britain should offer refuge to those fleeing from war, torture, famine and other problems in their own country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>