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Abstract:
Among scholars, there seems to be consensus that borders and relationships between institutions are changing, but in what sense these changes are having influence remains contested. Several voices, both among scholars and in politics, claim that it is necessary or preferable to move from a disciplinary approach towards a more inter-, multi- or even transdisciplinary approach in knowledge production. This also applies to the field of cultural heritage and practice of listing buildings for legal protection. The focus in this paper is on monument declarations in Sweden, where the antiquarian discipline is the discipline concerned with declaring buildings as monuments representing Sweden’s national built heritage. To be able to have a discussion on the knowledge base in monument declarations, it is necessary to get an understanding of argumentations in monument declarations. Therefore, a case study is carried out consisting of all monument declarations in the municipality of Malmö, which are 22 in total.

Following from the argumentation analysis carried out in this paper, one can claim that the knowledge used in the 22 monument declarations is disciplinary and expert based; antiquarian knowledge only is used for setting up the argumentation and backing-up the decision to declare a certain building as monument. That argumentations in monument declarations are (to a large extent) disciplinary is problematic; there seems to be consensus among both politicians and scholars on the importance of stimulating dialogue between disciplines and society. However, the question how to balance disciplinary expertise knowledge and knowledge of other disciplines and lay public remains contested. Uncontested however, is the importance of clear argumentations in monument declarations so other disciplines and society can evaluate the arguments and knowledge used.
Introduction

Our physical environment changes continuously in varying degrees; from conservation to urban renewal, urban transformation or green field development. Several (professional) disciplines work with and influence the development and change of our physical environment. One of these disciplines is the antiquarian. The antiquarian discipline in Sweden is the discipline concerned with the conservation and protection of cultural heritages at the national scale. The focus of this study is the initial stage of legal protection of monumental buildings, in which the antiquarian argues for declaring a building as monument1.

The term monumental building should be understood as a building or group of buildings, which has been selected to be preserved for future generations (Kulturdepartementet 1988)2. A monumental building is legally protected and owned by a private actor or the municipality. If the building is owned by the State, it is listed as „State monumental building“ and not as monumental building. State monumental buildings are not included in this study as they formally are categorised separately3.

To get the status and protection as „monument“, a building has to be nominated. According to the Swedish law, every Swedish citizen has the right to nominate a building. For nomination, an application has to be handed in to the County Administrative Board, which has the mandate to approve or reject it. If approved, the County Administrative Board outlines its motivation in the monument declaration. This monument declaration needs to be approved by the Swedish National Heritage Board and the property owner before the decision of the County Administrative Board is settled (Kulturdepartementet 1988).

Such a declaration is more than a simple text. As Bergström and Boréus (2005, 15) outline, texts “reflect, reproduce or challenge power”. For example, thinking and handling are influenced by texts. Concerning monument declarations, the characteristics of the building, and motivations for protection and guidelines for future management should be included in the texts (Kulturdepartementet 1988). Overall, interventions in the physical environment are initiated from the moment a monument declaration is approved. Two examples of interventions can be given. Firstly, the physical appearance of the building will be safeguarded for future generations. The actors who are concerned with the building are legally bounded to a range of prohibitions. By giving prohibitions, a direction is given to the degree of physical change to happen in the future. Secondly, one could say that not only directives are given to the physical development of the building, but also to the representation of the building; the building gets a new image, meaning, status and function as „monument“. That the status of monument is something that goes beyond the status of ordinary objects is underlined by Henri Lefebvre (1991, pp.223, 225); “Buildings are to monuments as everyday life is to festival” and “Any object […] may be extracted from everyday practice and suffer a displacement which will transform it by transferring it into monumental space”. Both of the above examples outline the interfering impact initiated by a monument declaration and give reason to take a closer look at the arguments for declaring a building as monument. That such a monument declaration is important is also outlined by Thornberg Knutsson, who argues that it is crucial for future management of monumental buildings to clearly motivate the cause of designation in the text (Thornberg Knutsson 2007).

For this paper, the monument declarations of 22 monumental buildings in the municipality of Malmö are selected for a case study (see appendix I for an overview of all monumental buildings included in this study). To place this number in context, there are over 2,000 monumental buildings in Sweden (Swedish National Heritage Board / Riksantikvarieämbetet 2010). This number is relatively small in comparison to other European countries. For example, Denmark has over 9,000 monumental buildings (Heritage Agency of Denmark 2010). However, it should be noted that a comparison between countries is highly problematic due to differences in categorisation and institutionalisation of cultural heritage protection.

---

1. As Jan Rosvall points out, the translation of terms is problematic in the field of cultural heritage (Thornberg Knutsson 2007, p.11). In this paper I will translate byggnadsminne to monumental building, while I could also have translated it to historic or listed building. I choose monumental building, because monumental implies an extra dimensional meaning in comparison to historic or listed (see my quotation of Lefebvre on page 2, paragraph 4).
3. State monumental buildings are not protected by the Cultural Heritage Act (1988: 950), but by a special regulation on state monumental buildings (Riksantikvarieämbetet, 2010).
The aim of this study is twofold; to analyse the argumentations of the antiquarian discipline in favour of the conservation of monumental buildings in Malmö and to discuss the knowledge that the argumentations are based on. As follows, the main question is what knowledge are the arguments in Malmö’s monument declarations based on? In the next section, a short theoretical background is given to how knowledge is produced in a disciplinary, inter-, multi- or transdisciplinary setting. In the third section of this paper, an argumentation analysis is carried out for the 22 monument declarations in Malmö. The fourth section discusses the knowledge giving input to the monument declarations and why it is important to be critical towards this. Finally, a conclusion and recommendation for further research are given.

Knowledge production

It is not easy to give a simple and clear definition of knowledge, but it is possible to outline some characteristics. In traditional philosophy it is believed that knowledge is obtained by either empirical experiences or reasoning. In both cases, knowledge refers to some kind of ‘fact’ or ‘truth’, being either objective or subjective (van den Bersselaar 2003) (Downton 2003, p.57). Knowledge is not something static, as it is produced, transferred, used, tested and recreated in different contexts and by different actors (Downton 2003, pp.55-71). It depends upon the institutional framework (for example national systems) and relationships between intellectual, entrepreneurial and public institutes how knowledge is produced. According to Hessels & van Lente, there seems to be consensus among scholars that the relationships between universities and other societal actors as industries and governments are changing. Universities remain their position as main research centres, but relationships between all actors of society are increasing and / or becoming more complex. The result is that knowledge is produced in a more heterogeneous way, in other words there is a wider variety of collaborations between societal actors (Hessels & van Lente 2008, p.751). Related to this trend, knowledge seems to be increasingly produced in a context of application, meaning that research is made applicable to policies or technological innovations (Hessels & van Lente 2008, pp.755, 758). According to several scholars, the relationships between all domains (the intellectual, economical and political) are changing due to globalisation and breakthroughs in information and communication technologies (Nowotny 2004; Dahlbom 2002). Even while the global network gains importance, Shinn moderates the impact of globalisation by stating that national systems remain important in institutionally framing knowledge production (Shinn 2002, pp.610-611).

To sum up, there is consensus that borders and relationships between institutions are changing, but in what sense these changes are having influence on the way knowledge is produced remains contested. So far, a distinction can be made between four settings of knowledge production: a disciplinary, inter-, multi- and transdisciplinary. First, disciplinary-produced knowledge is produced within one single discipline. A discipline should be understood as an acknowledged academic faculty or profession. For example, disciplines differ from each other concerning the language or methods used. Second, in a multidisciplinary setting, knowledge is produced by several disciplines looking at one and the same topic at the same time. Third, in an interdisciplinary setting, knowledge is produced by the transference of research methods from one discipline to the other (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson 2008). Last, some scholars have argued for a new production of knowledge in which knowledge is produced transdisciplinary (Gibbons et al. 1994). In a transdisciplinary setting knowledge is produced beyond all disciplines; boundaries between disciplines and institutions are transgressed. Hessels & van Lente claim that a change in research methods towards a more transdisciplinary knowledge production is doubtful (Hessels & van Lente 2008, p.756). According to them, evidence for an emerging transdisciplinarity is lacking; there have always been connections between and beyond disciplines. Knowledge production does not occur in isolation (Hessels & van Lente 2008, p.751). Finally, Shinn claims that we should consider each discipline separately and ask the question if the discipline is mainly nationally institutionalised or transgressing boundaries (Shinn 2002, p.611)?

The next section takes a closer look at the arguments given by the antiquarian discipline in Malmö’s monument declarations. Thereafter, the knowledge on which the arguments are based is discussed.

---

4 In this study, I consider the antiquarian discipline as a distinct discipline as it is in Sweden both academically (at Gothenburg University) and professionally institutionalized (by the Cultural Heritage Act). However, a lot of antiquarians are archeologist by education.
Arguments used in Malmö’s monument declarations

To answer the question which arguments are raised to declare 22 buildings in Malmö as monumental, argumentation analysis has been used\(^5\). According to Bergström et al, the fundamental idea of arguing for or against something is to convince „the other“ of a central thesis. The central thesis in a text is the claim “that other claims in the text are arguing for or against” (Bergström & Boreus 2005, p.96). The central thesis for all 22 monument declarations is the same; “building X should be declared as monumental building” (Kulturmiljöenheten, Länsstyrelsen Malmöhuslän 1993). It is noteworthy that only pro arguments are given in the monument declarations. In all declarations, the main argument is that the building concerned is unique. This claim is followed up by a description of the context in which it is unique. In most cases, the County Administrative Board refers to the context of Malmö („Hedmanska gården“, the „Rosenvingsska and Beijerska‘ houses, the „Sjöbergska‘ house, the „Slottsmöllan‘ and the seven „Djäknegatshusen‘) or Sweden (Malmö’s Central Station, City Theatre and Riberborgs cold-bath house). In the cases of „Jörgen Kocks hus and „Kompanihuset‘ even Scandinavia and in the case of the „Hippodrome theatre‘ Europe are being mentioned.

The arguments could be either pro or contra the central thesis or pro or contra an argument of a higher order. The main argument for the central thesis that the building is unique in a certain context is commonly strengthened by arguments of a lower order. In short, an argument of a lower order argues pro or contra an argument of a higher order (Bergström & Boreus 2005, p.101). A clear example of this is given by a line derived from the monument declaration of the Hippodrome theatre; “because of its size, its magnificent design and its well-preserved condition, the Hippodrome in Malmö is of international importance” (Kulturmiljöenheten, Länsstyrelsen Malmöhuslän 1993)\(^6\). In this line, a hierarchy is given of the arguments; the first three arguments are in favour of the main argument. The main argument is used at several places in the text. Repeatedly, it is stated that the Hippodrome is unique in a Swedish context and only matches its equals on an international scale (for example the Hippodrome theatre in Paris is mentioned).

Overall, four intertwined arguments of a lower order can be distinguished in the monument declarations. In some declarations only one sub argument has been used, while in other declarations a combination has been used. The first sub argument states how well-preserved the original or authentic form, materials and / or functions are. Concerning form and materials, a distinction has been made between the interior and exterior of the building. For example, the forms and materials used in the Hippodrome theatre, city theatre, central station and former „Riksbank‘, and respectively the plot structure and golf coating of the seven „Djäknegatshusen‘ and the „Kompanihuset‘ are well-preserved. The second sub argument declares the architecture as being outstanding (within the context mentioned). This argument is used in the declarations of both theatres. The third sub argument refers to the period and culture represented. For example, certain monumental buildings represent the rise of power of the bourgeoisie in the 16th century, the military architecture of the 17th century, the bathing culture of the upper class in the second half of the 19th century, the rise and development of the railroad administration or the period of functionalism in the first half of the 20th century. The fourth sub argument is closely related to the third one and refers to certain influential persons behind the making of the building, like the architect, a mayor or an influential businessman.

When applying argumentation analysis, one should evaluate the sustainability of claims (a claim being either the central thesis or an argument). The sustainability of a claim depends on its credibility and plausibility (Bergström & Boreus 2005, p.132). Most of the claims in the monument declarations seem to be based on verifiable facts, which is in favour of sustainability. However, words as „traditional‘, „original‘, „legendary‘, „imaginative‘, „magnificent‘ and „monumental‘ clearly point at something that goes beyond verifiable facts. In the following section, it will be discussed who produces the knowledge used in the monument declarations.

---

\(^5\) The focus in argumentation analysis is on the ‘logos‘ or in another word ‘rationale‘ in argumentations. A rhetoric analysis goes a step further and includes ‘ethos‘ and ‘pathos‘ in arguing for or against something. Ethos means that the author appeals to his own credibility to gain trust of the receiver. Pathos refers to the use of feelings and emotions in convincing others (Bergström and Boreus, 2005: 89).

\(^6\) All translations from Swedish to English are carried out by the author of this paper.
Discussing knowledge production by the antiquarian discipline

Following from the argumentation analysis above, one can claim that the knowledge used in the 22 monument declarations is disciplinary and expert based; the arguments have been set out by representatives of the antiquarian discipline only. Antiquarian knowledge is used for setting up the argumentation and backing-up the decision to declare a certain building as monument. This statement is underlined by Mats Burström. According to Burström, the antiquarian discipline made use of transdisciplinary knowledge far into the 19th century. However, influenced by the archeological discipline and the disciplination of society during the industrial revolution, the antiquarian discipline made a shift from transdisciplinary to disciplinary knowledge (Burström 1997). An example of contemporary antiquarian knowledge production and usage forms the work by Axel Unnerbäck et al. on “cultural-historical evaluation of buildings”. Unnerbäck states that his book is written for professionals “who in their everyday work need to be able to argue for or against decisions that concern conservation” (Unnerbäck & Lierud 2002, preface, my translation). Unnerbäck’s book gives guidelines for antiquarians in Sweden on how to set up an argumentation based on basic arguments, such as construction-, architectural- and person-historical values, and fortifying and overall arguments, such as the originality and authenticity, the educational value and the rareness and uniqueness (in a certain context) of the building (Unnerbäck & Lierud 2002, pp.21-27).

That arguments in monument declarations are (to a large extent) disciplinary is problematic; several voices speak in favor of a multi-, inter-, or even transdisciplinary approach. Four of these voices are outlined in this paragraph. Firstly, a disciplinary approach is in conflict with contemporary political objectives. Beginning in the 1990’s, objectives of the Swedish State and Swedish National Heritage Board aim at stimulating dialogue with, participation of and accessibility to all Swedish citizens (Aronsson 2004, pp.143-162; Thornberg Knutsson 2007, p.242). For example, Operation Heritage can be mentioned. The project Operation Heritage was launched by the Swedish state government at the start of the twentieth century to modernize the Swedish cultural heritage sector to contemporary trends and culture-political objectives, such as to democratize and to contribute to sustainable development (Riksantikvarieämbetet 2004). Secondly and in line with contemporary political objectives, several scholars point out that a more inter-, multi- or even transdisciplinary approach is favorable, because of democratic reasons. Burström concludes in his article that it is time for the antiquarian discipline to re-open “a dialogue with the general public”. He argues that this dialogue will “enhance the monuments’ cultural value” (Burström 1997, p.46). The same conclusion is made by Håkan Karlsson, who argues for citizens to be participants in a democratic dialogue about cultural heritage selection instead of to be “passive receivers of the antiquarian discipline’s monologue” (Karlsson 2008, p.94). Thirdly, several scholars point out that a disciplinary approach is problematic because of institutional reasons as outlined earlier in this paper in the section on knowledge production. On a general level and not specific to the antiquarian discipline, Nowotny advocates for disciplines to produce ‘socially robust knowledge’ and to open up for dialogue. Nowotny’s reasoning is based on the assumption that borders and relationships between institutions and disciplines are changing. The dialogue Nowotny refers to will not take place in traditionally institutionalised forms, but “requires the management of complexity in a public space, which is neither state, nor market, neither public, nor private, but all of this in different configurations” (Nowotny 2004, p.17). With socially robust knowledge, Nowotny refers to quality control of knowledge production carried out in the above quoted setting of dialogue instead of carried out by members of the knowledge producing discipline itself. Fourthly and lastly, another argument is given by David Lowenthal, who points out that the field of cultural heritage touches upon a wide variety of disciplines. According to Lowenthal, three sources of knowledge about or links to the past can be distinguished; memory, history and relics. Lowenthal outlines that all three domains are claimed by different specialist disciplines; respectively psychology, history and archaeology. Considering the domain of relics, a distinction can be made between man-made relics, which also are called artefacts, and natural relics (Lowenthal 1985, p.187). Considering monumental buildings as artefacts, the discipline of architecture can be added to the list of cultural heritage related disciplines. The statement by Lowenthal that “knowing the past embraces wider perspectives than these disciplines [psychology, history and archaeology] treat” is in favour of a multi-, inter- or even transdisciplinary approach (Lowenthal 1985, p.187).

In short, both in politics as among several scholars, voices call for stimulating a dialogue that goes beyond the antiquarian discipline. According to Aronsson, there is consensus among the political and academic domain on the democracy objective (Aronsson 2004). However, as argumentation analysis of

---

7 ‘Agenda Kulturarv’ in Swedish
the case study in this paper and the study by Thornberg Knutsson point out, there is a lack of dialogue in the argumentation for a building to be declared as monument (Thornberg Knutsson 2007). There seems to be a friction between how the declaration is carried out in practice and how it ought to be carried out according to theory and policy. Aronsson is critical towards the objective of stimulating democratic principles and states that both the political and academic domain to easily agree with and have consensus on the objective; who would claim that he or she is against stimulating a dialogue? Aronsson questions how to respect and balance both the expertise knowledge of the antiquarian discipline and the knowledge input of other disciplines and society in general (Aronsson 2004, p.156)? Several studies show that evaluations of buildings differ between experts and lay public. For example Thornberg Knutsson mentions that the Swedish lay public is more engaged with everyday life environments and artefacts embedded in local histories than with castles, defence structures or land houses, which are evaluated more by the antiquarian discipline. It remains to be seen how to balance arguments based on disciplinary knowledge and arguments put forward by other disciplines or lay public in declaring a building as monument. Another concern is the lack of clear argumentations in contemporary monument declarations (Thornberg Knutsson 2007). A clear motivation will enhance the possibilities for other disciplines and society in general to evaluate the arguments put forward by the antiquarian discipline. Clear motivations will increase the sustainability and the social robustness of arguments and underlying knowledge used in monument declarations.

Conclusion and further research

The case study carried out in this study shows that the main argument for a building to be declared as monument is its uniqueness in a certain context. The argumentation in the 22 monument declarations of Malmö turns out to be (or at least to a high degree) based on disciplinary knowledge. It has explicitly not been the aim of this paper to criticize the work of the antiquarian discipline, but to open up a discussion on possibilities and impossibilities of a more multi-, inter- or transdisciplinary approach in the declaration process of monumental buildings. There seems to be consensus among both politicians and several scholars on the need for stimulating dialogue, which is currently lacking in practice. However, the question how to balance disciplinary expertise knowledge and knowledge of other disciplines and lay public remains contested. Uncontested however, is the importance of clear argumentations in monument declarations so other disciplines and society can evaluate the arguments and knowledge used. After all, a monument declaration will initiate interventions in the physical environment.

Finally, a point for further research is that the argumentation analysis carried out in this paper did not cover the whole debate or context. The focus was on the argumentation in Malmö’s monument declarations. For further research, it would be interesting to place the arguments given in the declarations in a wider debate by including other voices and contra arguments, such as protests against declarations, rejected nominations and actors consulted by the antiquarian discipline.
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It is important to keep in mind that monumental buildings represent the national cultural heritage and not local heritages.


Appendix I: the list over Malmö’s monumental buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monumental building</th>
<th>Year of declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralposthuset</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralstationen</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 33)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 34)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 36)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 37)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 38)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 47)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djäknegatshusen (von Conow 67, former part of 47)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flensburgska gården</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedmanska gården</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippodromteatern</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovrätten</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jörgen Kocks hus</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kommendanthuset</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kompanihuset</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribersborgs kallbadhus</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riksbankshuset</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenvingska, Beijerska husen</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjöbergska huset</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slottsmöllan</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadsteatern</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>