

Министерство образования Республики Беларусь  
Учреждение образования  
«Белорусский государственный педагогический университет имени  
Максима Танка»  
Исторический факультет

**БЕЛОРУССКАЯ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОСТЬ:  
ИСТОКИ, СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ, РАЗВИТИЕ  
(IX–XXI вв.)**

Материалы  
Республиканской научно-теоретической конференции  
Минск 29 июня 2017 г.

Минск  
РИВШ  
2017

УДК 323(476)(091)(082)

ББК 66.3(4Бел)я43

Б43

Рекомендовано

советом исторического факультета  
УО «Белорусский государственный педагогический  
университет имени Максима Танка»  
(протокол № 10 от 24 мая 2017 г.)

Редакционная коллегия:

кандидат исторических наук доцент *А. В. Касович* (отв. ред.);  
кандидат исторических наук доцент *С. П. Шупляк*;  
кандидат исторических наук доцент *А. А. Корзюк*;  
кандидат исторических наук доцент *А. Ф. Великий*

Рецензенты:

доктор исторических наук профессор *А. М. Лютый*;  
доктор исторических наук профессор *И. В. Варивончик*

**Белорусская** государственность: истоки, становление,  
Б43 развитие (IX–XXI вв.) : материалы Респ. науч.-теорет. конф.,  
Минск, 29 июня 2017 г. / редкол.: А. В. Касович (отв. ред.)  
[и др.]. – Минск : РИГШ, 2017. – 232 с.  
ISBN 978-985-586-041-0.

В сборнике представлены актуальные материалы исследований,  
посвященные проблемам белорусской государственности в истори-  
ческом, социально-культурном и геополитическом аспектах.

Адресуется преподавателям, аспирантам и студентам вузов.

УДК 323(476)(091)(082)

ББК 66.3(4Бел)я43

ISBN 978-985-586-041-0

© Оформление. ГУО «Республиканский  
институт высшей школы», 2017

## THE MORAVIAN SEPARATISM

*Prohorevich A. (Прохоревич А.А.), 1st Year Student, Faculty of History, BSPU, Minsk Research Supervisor – Prystupa N., Candidate of Sciences in History, Associate Professor, BSPU*

Separatism has become a typical process for European countries, because in the end of XXth century we can see some separate tends in different countries and regions e. g. Catalonia, Scotland, Faroe Islands, Moravia and Silesia. So attempts of small regional groups to separate is considered to be a natural political phenomenon.

Moravian separatism like other ones has been manifesting itself with different strength during its history.

Thus, in 1830–1850 Moravian people tried to create their own language. The scientists founded a grammar of this language. Then in 1945 Moravia got the autonomy at last, but in 1948 lost it. In 1968 in Brno (central Moravian city) the “Community of Moravia and Silesia” was formed. Its aim was the fight for the autonomy for Moravia.

In 1986 Moravian people organized one more community for the autonomy, but after 1990 such organizations started to lose their popularity [1]. Perhaps the main reason of that was Velvet revolution and the reforms followed it. However, it does not mean that Moravian region stopped the attempts to get some autonomy in economic and political life.

Thus, the chairman one of the Moravian party Ivan Dřmal said that they were not anti-Czech, not chauvinists and not separatists, that they did not try to make Moravia an independent state, but on the hand they wanted some political and economic independence. He added that Czechoslovakia was not a mono-national state. Ivan Dřmal also wanted that people abroad should know that there were not only Czechs there [2].

Moravian parties tried to actualize the problem. They are an interesting subject of study for two principal aspects: that of an experiment involving different party and political identities and forms of organization in the period of transition to pluralist democracy in a post-communist environment, and that of a link between ethno-regional political actors and identity mobilization, or a stimulator of a potential nation-building process [3].

As soon as in the initial phase of re-democratization of Czechoslovakia and renewal of political pluralism there were several “Moravist” or Moravian formations active in the post-totalitarian environment of Moravia. In a broader sense, they were pro-Moravian oriented ones trying to achieve political recognition, i.e. to politicize the “Moravian issue” through their demand for the territorial and administrative division of the state to be revised. However, only some of those formations showed signs of transformation into genuine political parties or political movements and of integration in electoral competition, which primarily applied to the Moravian Civic Movement (MOH) and the Movement for Self-Governing Democracy – Association for Moravia and Silesia (HSD–MS) [3].

The Moravian Civic Movement (leader – Miroslav Richter) was formed in 1989 and was a traditionalist, anti-communist and Christian oriented movement with a background in Moravian cultural associations whose original ambition had been to form an influential pro-Moravian pressure group within a relevant party or political movement. After the failure of negotiations with the Civic Forum, MOH made up a pre-electoral coalition with the Christian Democratic Union, in the position of a junior partner. However, the result was far from satisfactory: in 1990 MOH only gained one mandate in the Czech National Council (it was Zdeněk Smělik). A split followed (with part of the members leaving for the Moravian National Party), as well as the loss of any political potential [3].

Unlike the Moravian Civic Movement, the Movement for Self-Governing Democracy – Association for Moravia and Silesia was not exclusively anti-communist but rather aspired to become a catch-all Moravian movement. It was formed by Boleslav Bárta in 1989/1990. The HSD–MS platform was outlined in the Moravian-Silesian declaration calling for the establishment of a self-government form of the Czechoslovak state based on “self-financing and natural geomorphologic units”, i.e. the Czech, Moravian and Silesian lands (with their national) or ethnic communities on the one hand and Slovakia on the other, unified in a federal republic of three

countries. The association of the “rehabilitation of Moravia” with separatism or nationalism in this context was a priori rejected (which was even easier because the concept of Moravians and Silesians was rather vague and did not explicitly mean nations). The main issue for HSD–MS was fiscal federalism and the central entity was Czechoslovakia. In case of disagreement of the Slovak establishment to change the binary federation into a federate state of three entities, the HSD–MS would have been ready to solve the “Moravian issue” within the Czech Republic provided the status of the lands – the constitutive units of the state – were conferred to Bohemia, Moravia, but also to Prague and Silesia [3].

It is worth to note that the Moravian parties repeatedly were part of the government. However they were presented by a small number of members – from one to two percent of mandates were assigned to them. But since 1996 there have been no Moravian party in the parliament [4]. We have observed the decline of separatism in Czech.

As for nowadays the popularity of separate movement in Moravia has been lost. One of the reasons is their nationalist persistence. Some political scientists think if they got rid of separatism, chauvinism and hatred and transformed into a classic political party Moravians and Silesians have their representatives in the parliament today.

Besides we can analyze the achievements and perspectives of Moravian separatism, with the scheme created by famous Czech scientist Miroslav Hroch. He defined three chronological stages in the creation of a nation:

- Phase A means that activists strive to lay the foundation for a national identity. They research the cultural, linguistic, social and sometimes historical attributes of a non-dominant group in order to raise awareness of the common traits;
- Phase B means a new range of activists emerged, who sought to win over as many of their ethnic group as possible to the project of creating a future nation;
- Phase C starts when the majority of the population joins a mass movement and a full social movement comes into conservative-clerical, neutral and democratic wings, each with its own program [5].

I think that the Moravian separate movement past it's phase A and phase B. And probably it will never cross to the phase C because this movement has not become mass and all the demands such as liberty, equality etc. have been already satisfied. That's why national interests have no base to catch and develop.

### Literature

1. Неменский, О. Региональные и сепаратистские движения в странах Центральной Европы [Электронный ресурс] / О. Неменский // Агентство политических новостей. – 23.04.2008. – Режим доступа: <http://www.apn.ru/publications/article19819.htm> – Дата доступа: 04.06.2017.
2. Rocks, D. Moravian nationalists are seeking further Czech fracturing [Electronic resource] // D. Rocks. – The Baltimore Sun [Electronic resource]. – 07.07.1993. – Access mode: [http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1993-07-07/news/1993188079\\_1\\_czech-republic-moravia-and-silesia-moravia](http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1993-07-07/news/1993188079_1_czech-republic-moravia-and-silesia-moravia) – Date of access: 04.06.2017.
3. Štrmiska, M. Rise and Fall of Moravian Regionalist Parties [Electronic resource] / M. Štrmiska // Středoevropské politické studie (The Central European Political Studies Review). – 2000. – K. II. – Č. 4. – Access mode: <http://www.cepsr.com/clanek.php?ID=101>. – Date of access: 04.06.2017.
4. Navrátil, B. Moravskoslezský stát nakonec nevznikl [Electronic resource] / B. Navrátil // Moravskoslezský deník. – 30.06.2013. – Access mode: [http://moravskoslezsky.denik.cz/zpravy\\_region/moravskoslezsky-stat-nakonec-nevznikl-20130630.html](http://moravskoslezsky.denik.cz/zpravy_region/moravskoslezsky-stat-nakonec-nevznikl-20130630.html). – Date of access: 04.06.2017