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**User guide/description (for peer review):**

We coded the assembled data corpus in the following, systematic matter:

1. We divided actors into challengers and incumbents, which we coded separately
   1. Incumbents: Individuals or organizations whose communications clearly endorse fossil fuel expansion, i.e., developing new fields after 2021
   2. Challengers: Individuals or organizations whose communications clearly disprove of fossil fuel expansion, i.e., developing new fields after 2021
2. We distinguished utterances into the following categories representing *beliefs* which actors used to justify (incumbents) or disprove of fossil fuel expansion (challengers).
   1. ***Climate/environmental*** (codes 100)
   2. ***Economic/fiscal*** (codes 200)
   3. ***Political/geopolitical/legal*** (codes 300)
3. We distinguished utterances into the following categories representing *actions* or *strategies* used to achieve the goals of the incumbent/challenger field population:
   1. ***Legal action*** (codes 400)
   2. ***Political lobbying*** (codes 500)
   3. ***Corporate strategy*** (codes 600)
4. We coded the stated goals of each field population in the following way:
   1. ***Goals of the incumbent field***
   2. ***Goals of the challenger field*** (both codes 700)

We coded beliefs and actions with respect to the following question or ‘wedge issue’ studied: do actors endorse fossil fuel expansion after 2021 or disprove of it? To justify respective beliefs or actions, actors draw on the same general categories as stated above. Hence, incumbents were given the 101, 102, 103 when they used climate/environmental arguments *in favor* of fossil fuel expansion in Norway or the U.K. An example of this logic is the argument that the production of fossil fuels is *relatively* cleaner than abroad, supporting the rationale of producing *more* in Norway/the UK. Meanwhile, challengers were given the code 151, 152, 153 when they used climate/environmental arguments *against* expanding fossil fuels in these countries. Here an example is the argument of the global carbon budget, which is being exceeded with new fields, considering their combustion-related (scope 3) emissions.

Finally, we added the category ‘***Joint themes***’ (codes 900) to denote utterances that have no immediate relation in favor or against government licensing policy for new supply fields but still provide relevant insights to the debate (e.g., obstacles, current market trends, technology, political sentiments, historical developments, the effects of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine).

Some complementary remarks regarding the coding procedure:

* To ensure originality of arguments, we did not code utterances where actors (e.g., a challenger) talk about how the respective adversaries (i.e., the incumbent) think or act.
* We do not distinguish ‘judgement validation institutions’ because, with few exceptions, all interviewees, even those representing such institutions, had a clear private opinion on the ‘wedge issue’ of endorsing or disproving of fossil fuel expansion after 2021.

All code categories represent aggregate categories from more than 200 initial raw codes, that are available from the first author.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Incumbents: Defending fossil fuel expansion*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **General category** | **Code** | | **Sub-category** | | | | | | **Description/rationale** | | | **Semantic descriptors** | | |
| *Beliefs (rhetorical elements used as justifications)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Climate/environmental*** | **100** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 101 | | Relatively clean production and technological progress | | | | | | Domestically produced oil and gas is clean and can substitute dirtier oil and gas from abroad | | | Clean oil and gas, carbon capture and storage, substitutability, use in petrochemicals | | |
|  | 102 | | Gas as a ‘transition fuel’ | | | | | | Gas different than oil; seen as a transition fuel to alternative gases or energy supplies | | | Transition fuel, supposed alignment with 1.5° C scenarios | | |
|  | 103 | | Past achievements and production-related emissions | | | | | | Achievements of reducing (territorial) emissions | | | Electrification, prevention of flaring, reduction of operated scope 1 and 2 emissions, companies as heroes of the transition | | |
| ***Economic/fiscal*** | **200** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 201 | | Contribution to social and economic welfare | | | | | | Fossil fuel expansion ensures energy security, shared prosperity, employment, investment, profitability, and fiscal space | | | Energy prices, supply security, trickle-down effect, fiscal effects, jobs | | |
|  | 202 | | Demand side/market logic | | | | | | Demand should regulate the supply, not vice versa | | | Market-based policies, work, prices, de-regulation | | |
|  | 203 | | Complexity of the transition | | | | | | Cannot stop fossil expansion because of the ‘energy trilemma’ and uncertainty of alternatives | | | Fear, afraid, collapse, overnight, new fields to prevent too steep a decline, complexity, balance, high costs | | |
| ***Political/geopolitical/***  ***legal*** | **300** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 301 | | Need to maintain political mandates | | | | | | Need to ensure energy security at home and/or in Europe | | | Being a stable supplier to Europe, following parliamentary mandates | | |
|  | 302 | | Need to adapt to changing geopolitical contexts | | | | | | Fossil fuel expansion as geopolitical crisis response | | | Russia's invasion of Ukraine, external pressure, independence from authoritarian states | | |
|  | 303 | | Legality of the activity | | | | | | Fossil fuel expansion justified since it is congruent with legal provisions | | | Article 112, constitution, EIA Directive | | |
| *Actions/strategies (non-rhetorical elements to achieve incumbent goals)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Legal action** | **400** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 401 | | Incumbents sue or  appeal against challengers | | | | | | Governments/companies take legal action against challengers | | | Appeals, direct suits, state prosecution, fines, prison, investor-state settlement disputes (ISDS) | | |
|  | 402 | | Adjunct legal actions | | | | | | Strategic actions to support claims in the Court | | | Commissioning of studies, invitation of expert witnesses, evoking legal threats | | |
| **Political action** | **500** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 501 | | Influence actors with political power | | | | | | Lobbying of actors with direct political influence | | | Local MPs, coastal population, European Union, Oslo, Westminster | | |
|  | 502 | | Strengthen the state-industry-labor nexus | | | | | | Strengthening ties with actors that have indirect political power (unions, Equinor etc) | | | Swing doors, revolving doors | | |
| **Corporate strategy** | **600** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 601 | | Strategy re-alignment | | | | | | Strategies/actions aimed to adapt to changing environments (e.g., move abroad if domestic business becomes unattractive) | | | Investing abroad, internationalization, strategic interest purchases, joint ventures, acquisitions | | |
|  | 602 | | Public relation campaigns | | | | | | Advertising, sponsorships, consumer relations | | | Media, advertisements, marketing, sponsorships and donations | | |
| **Goals of the incumbent field** | **700** | |  | | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | 701 | | Keep existing assets in operation & expand near-field | | | | | | Involving already developed infrastructure and near-field expansion | | | Future option value, prioritization, near-field, domestic/abroad | | |
|  | 702 | | Keep existing assets in operation & expand frontier areas | | | | | | Involving already developed infrastructure and frontier are as to maximize value creation | | | Maximized recovery, domestic/abroad | | |
|  | 703 | | Ensure stable political framework | | | | | | Goal of lobbying | | | E.g., concerning the tax regime, licensing regime etc. | | |
| ***Challengers: Disproving of fossil fuel expansion*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **General category** | | **Code** | | **Sub-category** | | | **Description/rationale** | | | **Semantic descriptors** | | |
| *Beliefs (rhetorical elements used as justifications)* | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Climate/environmental*** | | **100** | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | 151 | | Global climate impact | | | Exceeding the global carbon budget leads to risks and impacts of global warming beyond 1.5° C | | | Scope 3 emissions, costs of climate change, international responsibility, climate justice, past inaction, public health | | |
|  | | 152 | | System's perspective and uncertainty | | | How a systemic perspective invalidates incumbents’ arguments | | | Tipping elements in the Earth system (uncertainty), reductionism, precautionary approach | | |
|  | | 153 | | Local environmental degradation | | | Disproval because of local pollution/degradation | | | Harm to fragile areas, including birds or marine life, place-based conservationism, tourism | | |
| ***Economic/fiscal*** | | **200** | |  | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | 251 | | Economic arguments against expansion | | | High lead times (15-20 years) render new projects obsolete, better job security in renewables | | | Stranded assets, approaching depletion, oil price changes, negative externalities, demand reduction, crowding out, skills, labor market | | |
|  | | 252 | | Possibilities and resilience of alternatives | | | Availability of renewable energy technologies which can become economically viable | | | Energy security via renewables, industrial alternatives, state investment, oil fund, managed decline/just transition | | |
|  | | 253 | | Social injustice | | | Current economic/energy model is socially unjust in terms of access to energy, prices, taxes etc. | | | Redistribution, new social contract, public ownership of assets, tax justice, class politics, unjust distribution of climate impacts, occupation of Palestine | | |
| ***Political/geopolitical/legal*** | | | **300** |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | 351 | International reputation | | | | | A licensing ban can increase international reputation of the country | | | Legitimacy, reputation, external views, credibility, BOGA, obstacles of int. climate negotiations | | |
|  | | | 352 | Popular support for just transitions | | | | | A transition away from fossils speak to a growing portion of society | | | Mainstreaming of climate, political consensus | | |
|  | | | 353 | Illegality of the activity | | | | | Fossil fuel expansion unjustified since incongruent with legal provisions | | | Article 112, the constitution, EIA Directive, procedural errors etc. | | |
|  | | |  |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
| *Actions/strategies (non-rhetorical elements to achieve challenger goals)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Legal action** | | | **400** |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | 451 | Challengers sue or appeal against incumbents | | | | | File a suit (e.g., against licensing, environmental assessment and permitting) | | | Lawsuit, grounds, legal strategies, climate litigation | | |
|  | | | 452 | Adjunct legal actions | | | | | Strategic actions to support claims in the Court or raise media attention | | | Commissioning reports, inviting expert witnesses, criminal offences | | |
| **Political action** | | | **500** |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | 551 | Strengthening of actor alliances | | | | | Strategies involving synergies between different actors with common goals | | | Climate-labor nexus, new actors (e.g., Great British Energy or climate commissions) | | |
|  | | | 552 | Influencing actors with political power | | | | | Lobbying of actors with direct political influence, public campaigns to ‘catch voters’ | | | Parliamentarians/political parties/voters around the ‘wedge issue’ of fossil expansion | | |
|  | | | 553 | Civil disobedience/direct action/protests | | | | | Civil resistance, ‘standing in the way’, mobilization | | | Friday-for-futures, general strikes, direct action, demonstrations | | |
| **Corporate strategy** | | | **600** |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | 651 | Shareholder activism | | | | | Strategies aimed to influence board decisions favoring fossil phase-out | | | Shareholder activism, state owners, non-state owners, groups of like-minded | | |
|  | | | 652 | Campaigns targeted at corporate actors (e.g., Equinor Out) | | | | | Diverse campaigning strategies favoring fossil phase-out and strategy re-alignment | | | Social media, international campaigning, synergies | | |
| **Goals of the challenger field** | | | **700** |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | 751 | Stop new licenses & keep existing production | | | | | Involves a stop of new licenses (frontier/near-field) | | | End government licensing, new conservation areas | | |
|  | | | 752 | Stop new licenses & phase out existing production | | | | | Involves a stop of new licenses & a scale-down of existing production | | | End government licensing policy, phase-out, phase-down, terminal decline | | |
|  | | | 753 | Stop new licenses & and transform the industrial structure | | | | | Whole-of-society transformation | | | Transformation, transition, industrial change | | |
|  | | |  |  | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Joint themes*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Code** | | | | | | **Sub-category** | **Description/rationale** | | | | | **Semantic descriptors** | | |
|  | | | **900** | *Shared topics by both challengers and incumbents* | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | 901 | Obstacles to the transition | | | | | How actors frame obstacles to transitioning away from fossil fuels | | | Fiscal/political/geopolitical/economic/administrative/erosion of trust/emotional | | |
|  | | | 902 | Recurrent narratives and contradictions (as perceived by challengers) | | | | | How challengers perceive the incumbent field | | | Narratives / contradictions | | |
|  | | | 903 | Recurrent narratives and contradictions (as perceived by incumbents) | | | | | How incumbents perceive the challenger field | | | Narratives / contradictions | | |
|  | | | 904 | Norwegian specificities | | | | | Specificities to the struggle around O&G in Norway | | | Political/economic/cultural/historic | | |
|  | | | 905 | British specificities | | | | | Specificities to the struggle around O&G in the U.K. | | | Political/economic/cultural/historic | | |
|  | | | 906 | Enablers of the transition | | | | | Which enablers actors perceive to overcome obstacles | | | E.g., social tipping elements, policies etc. | | |
|  | | | 907 | Responsibility and moral questions | | | | | How actors evoke ethics and responsibility | | | Moral question, ethics, responsibility | | |
|  | | | 908 | Relation to judgement validation institutions | | | | | How actors relate to authority | | | Science, the law, parliament, the government | | |
|  | | | 909 | Comparison Norway/UK/international | | | | | How actors compare different national contexts | | | UK/Norway/Denmark/Colombia/United States/etc. | | |
|  | | | 910 | Effects of Russia's invasion of Ukraine | | | | | How the geopolitical crisis affects current pathways (without immediately bearing on the sub-field goals) | | | Russia, war, Ukraine, energy security, price effects, supply crisis | | |