

Christina Petterson

*History as Heritage, Heritage as History*

This paper explores whether there is a tension between the constitutive notion of the nation-state in the UNESCO charter and 1. the transnational inscription of the Moravian settlements, and 2. the global Moravian experiment of the eighteenth century.

In its description of world heritage, the cultural and educational arm of the United Nations, UNESCO, defines world heritage as "our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations. Our cultural and natural heritage are both irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration." In order to safeguard this heritage, UNESCO has outlined an eight-point mission statement which runs from encouraging countries to ratify the convention (States Parties) and nominate sites within their national territories, to encouraging local and international participation in the preservation of cultural and natural heritage. As is well known, and as the above demonstrates, the nation-state is foundational to this heritage scheme, despite the international focus of sites as contributing to world heritage. If, as Immanuel Wallerstein argued decades ago, history arose as a means for national unification and nation-building of the liberal state, then it follows that there is a specific understanding of history underlying the World Heritage Convention, its understanding of cultural heritage and the manifestation of these in the State Parties.

In light of these points, how, then, are we to understand the inscription of the four Moravian settlements of Herrnhut, Bethlehem, Gracehill, and Christiansfeld? Are they subject to this framework, or does this inscription bring something else to the table? If so, is this "something else" apparent from the nomination documents, and how is it defined? In previous work, I have argued for the resistance to liberal ideology in the Moravian community of the eighteenth century, and its emphasis on communal history, present in the lived experience of the Moravian members, a fellowship which is regarded as the work of God, manifest across continents through various documentary means (daily watchwords, diaries, correspondence, *Gemeinnachrichten*, etc.). The question in this paper is, whether the lived, communal, and global history of the *Unitas Fratrum* is recognisable in the nomination documents, and how does this align with the national focus of UNESCO?