Eduard Kubů,
Jan Slavíček

Socialist Agricultural Cooperatives in the Bohemian Lands (1948–1989)

INTRODUCTION

The historiography of Czechoslovak cooperativism after the Second World War is surprisingly extensive, especially in the Bohemian Lands.[1] It focuses mainly on the development of agrarian cooperatives.* This was both economically important and of fundamental, if not crucial, political importance in the 1950s. The social and even cultural effects of changing the quality of rural life cannot be overlooked. The literature of the 1950s is characterized by the strong influence of an ideology that emphasized the »connection of the working class with the agricultural countryside.« In some cases, it is outright manipulative of the facts. It completely glosses over the violent course of the so-called »collectivization of the countryside« (i.e., the creation of socialist collective farms), the abundant violations of existing law, and the construction of political processes with the

1 We use the term Bohemian Lands in a common sense, i.e., involving Bohemia, Moravia, and (former Austrian) Silesia.

* Eduard Kubů's research was supported by The Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic [Ministerstvo zemědělství České republiky], Institutional Funding [institucionální podpora] RO0825. Jan Slavíček's research was supported by the University [Univerzita] Hradec Králové.

aim of political control of the countryside. Similarly, it ignores the environmental problems that collectivization has brought about (devastation of the soil stock through chemicalization, over-drying of the soil through excessive land reclamation, etc.).[2] This ideological framework loosened slightly in the second half of the 1960s when a few more critical publications appeared. However, the original interpretive paradigm returned during the so-called »normalization« period (1968–1989), albeit in a more moderate form. This was only disrupted again during the so-called *perestroika* period in the second half of the 1980s when more realistic perspectives and interpretations reappeared.[3] Cooperative historiography developed in a similar way in Slovakia.[4]

In contrast to the regime's literature, the extensive historiographical production after 1989 definitively breaks away from the »Marxist-Leninist class understanding« of the process of collectivization and tries to set the record straight on its distortions and results. It focuses on the methods of managing collectivization from above and the accompanying persecutions, the agricultural policy of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPC), and the resistance to collectivization violence.[5] In the last two decades, however, books and studies have also been published focusing on the legal, economic, and social aspects of the development of socialist agriculture.[6] The actual process of collectivization is mainly dealt with regionally and locally. Several chapters in a collective monograph published by the Slovácko Museum in Uherské Hradiště have been devoted to the topic of agricultural cooperatives in communist Czechoslovakia.[7] Our paper addresses the development of agricultural cooperatives throughout the entire period of communist Czechoslovakia. It is an overview of a synthetic character and summarizes the current state of research.

At the outset, it is necessary to define the basic concept. The »socialist« cooperatives of 1948–1989 differed fundamentally in their goals, tasks, and actual functioning from the classical cooperatives we know from the preceding period (and in the West afterward). The latter functioned as market entities with full decision-making autonomy (or at least a considerable degree of independence) and internal democratic mechanisms. On the other hand, the former were

2 Jech, *Probuzená vesnice*.

3 All four stages of the development of communist cooperative historiography (concerning not only agricultural but all cooperatives) are demonstrated in the works of top cooperative expert Karel Martin Pernica: Šorm, Pernica, and Větvička, *Dějiny družstevního hnutí. III. díl*; Pernica, *Družstevnictví*; Pernica, *Úvod*; Pernica; *Socialistické družstevnictví*.

4 For example, Cambel, *Kapitoly*; Cambel, *Formovanie*.

5 Blažek and Kubálek (eds.), *Kolektivizace*. Boštík, *Venkov bez mezí*. Cihlář, *Vesnice severovýchodních Čech*. Jech, *Kolektivizace*. Rokoský and Svoboda, *Kolektivizace v Československu*.

6 Kopeček, Přední JZD. Urban, *Kolektivizace*. Kuklík, *Znárodněné Československo*. Václavů, *Ke sporům*. Březina and Pernes (eds.), *Závěrečná fáze*. Burešová, The Collectivization.

7 Rašticová (ed.), *Osudy*.

cooperatives, largely only in formal legal terms. They were production and sometimes distribution units of a centrally planned economy. In both their external and internal activities, they were subject to the decisions of the ruling regime. This did not preclude the growth/existence of a specific, minimal degree of autonomy in cooperative activities on occasion. However, this autonomy could be – and mostly was – again restricted.[8]

BASELINE: PRE-WAR, WARTIME, AND THIRD-REPUBLIC AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES (UNTIL 1948)

Cooperativism in the Bohemian Lands had a profound tradition born at the beginning of the second half of the 19th century in credit cooperatives of the Schulze-Delitzsch type. In the 1890s, a boom in the development of Raiffeisen-type cooperatives followed. These were gradually joined by non-credit cooperatives – consumer, traders', artisans', housing, and other cooperatives. Rural areas also benefited from this development, and various agricultural non-credit cooperatives established themselves alongside the credit cooperatives. These included warehouses, purchasing and selling, as well as processing cooperatives (in fact, they were industrial facilities organized as cooperatives, such as dairies, distilleries, chicory drying plants, and starch, fruit, and vegetable processing cooperatives), livestock, land reclamation, and other cooperatives. They played a key role in curbing/suppressing rural usury (credit cooperatives), stabilizing the food market, and linking rural production to higher-level markets (non-credit cooperatives). Rural cooperatives were a mass phenomenon with over 1.5 million members. They were a grassroots movement. Typically, only a minimum of cooperatives were based on joint production or joint work. On the contrary, a vast majority of them were de facto »service organizations« for the homesteads/households of individual members. They operated on the principles of voluntary membership and internal democracy. In most of them (especially the non-credit cooperatives), decision-making was not based on the principle of »one member = one vote«, but the strength of the vote was based on the number of shares held. However, the dominant influence of large shareholders on the running of cooperatives was usually effectively limited by the statutes. This was done in the form of a maximum number of votes per person.

8 This is one of the core theses in Burešová, The Collectivization, 636–41.

From the beginning of the 20th century, political aspects began to play a role in cooperatives alongside their traditional economic, social, and especially in Central Europe, nationalist roles. Political parties in the Bohemian Lands, especially the mass-based ones, expanded and strengthened their base of members, supporters, and, above all, potential voters by binding cooperatives to themselves. However, cooperatives also benefited from this development, gaining lobbying influence. The link was realized mainly through cooperative associations, of which several dozen existed in the interwar period.[9] The typical features of the interwar agricultural cooperatives were, therefore: 1. Mass membership – in 1937, these cooperatives (excluding the Schulze-Delitzsch cooperatives, which also undoubtedly included some rural farmers) had more than 1,270,000 members. The number of people »affected« can be estimated at almost 3.2 million, i.e., most of the rural population. 2. Great economic and financial strength – the assets of the cooperatives (in 1937, excluding cooperatives of the Schulze-Delitzsch type) amounted to approximately 7.7 billion crowns (almost 13% of the Gross National Income of Czechoslovakia).[10] 3. Extreme organizational fragmentation resulting from national and political rivalries.

During the Nazi occupation (March 1939–May 1945), agricultural cooperatives were severely restricted, but the economic essence of their activities was preserved. However, it was supplemented by the new roles that the cooperatives played in the Nazi-controlled economy in food production and supply. The influence of political parties (which had ceased to exist) was eliminated. The gradual process of reducing the organizational fragmentation of cooperatives, which had already begun in the so-called Second Republic (October 1938–March 1939), was completed in 1942. All agricultural cooperatives became compulsory members of the two top associations (one for Bohemia and one for Moravia), and the existing associations were liquidated.[11]

The post-war economic reconstruction of Czechoslovakia during the so-called Third Republic (May 1945–February 1948) took place in the midst of a highly intense political struggle. The political system of »limited democracy« allowed the existence of three socialist political parties (including the CPC) and only one non-socialist political party in the Bohemian Lands. This, together with the development of the international situation and the USSR's growing influence, led to an almost three-year clash between the two political camps. On one side, there was the CPC and its allies (especially the »left« part of Social Democracy

9 The linkages between cooperatives and politics were recently analyzed in Slavíček and Kubů, *Politika.*

10 Slavíček and Kubů, *Politika*, 57–75. *Historická statistická ročenka*, 831. For the formula used to calculate the ratio between the number of members and the number of people affected by cooperatives, see Slavíček, From Business, 427.

11 *Vládní nařízení č. 242/1942 Sb. z. a n.*

and the trade unions); their opponents were other political parties, which, however, were often loosing energy fighting among themselves.

The political system favored radical left-wing measures. At its core, it was a comprehensive nationalization of industry, trade, and other services, implemented in several phases. This consolidated the traditional influence of the Communists in the urban working class. However, under the postulate of the »union of the working class and the peasantry,« the CPC also needed to establish its influence in the countryside. This was a prerequisite for achieving the future goal of gaining power in the state. The primary means to that became the completion of the land reform (which had been carried out inconsistently in the interwar period) and particularly the so-called second land reform. It was carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture, headed by the communist Július Duriš. The essence of the reform was a small land allocation (8–13 ha) at a very low, even symbolic price. It was an act that went against the logic of modern large-scale agriculture. Land tenure was newly fragmented; agriculture became the domain of small producers. In economic terms, this negative development was a price to be paid for the political gains of the CPC. The latter achieved its goal of winning the countryside over to its side. This was demonstrated in the 1946 elections, when the CPC won 40.2% of the ballots in the Bohemian Lands,[12] and later during the Communist Party's seizure of power in February 1948. At the same time, however, the CPC perceived the economic reality of small-scale rural production as temporary. It was prepared to change it radically after seizing power, despite publicly denying this. In this sense, its actions after February 1948 were a clear repudiation not only of its previous promises but of the political and economic course it had pursued.

The development of agricultural cooperatives differed between the two branches. Credit cooperatives were somewhat stagnating after the slump during the Second World War. On the one hand, they continued to serve their members and were able to retain a significant number of them, even in new political, economic, and social conditions. On the other hand, during 1945–1948, their expansion was relatively slow. While more than 3,000 agricultural credit cooperatives with almost 670,000 members existed in December 1945, two years later, there were about 3,400 of them with approximately 770,000 members – significantly fewer than in 1937.[13] Credit cooperatives could hardly compete with nationalized

12 The other parties' results were following: National–socialist Party 23.7%, People's Party (catholic party) 20.2%, Social–democrats 15.6%. 0.4% of ballots were »empty« – *Statistická příručka Československé republiky 1948*, 105.

13 There were over 4,300 Raiffeisen cooperatives with more than 700,000 members in 1937, plus a significant, however not measurable, part of almost 1,000,000 members of Schulze–Delitzsch cooperatives were agricultural producers – Smrčka et al., *Vývoj*, 209; Slavíček and Kubů, *Politika*, 53, 57.

banks in the new financial system. They lacked both the resources to modernize and the political support to evolve further. The development pattern of non-credit agricultural cooperatives was different. They flourished significantly – from almost 3,000 cooperatives with nearly 640,000 members in 1945 to over 5,700 cooperatives with ca 860,000 members in 1947, vastly surpassing the pre-war numbers.[14]

THE FIRST PHASE OF COLLECTIVIZATION (1949–1953)

February 1948 symbolizes a turning point in Czechoslovak modern history – the establishment of the Communist Party dictatorship. It found its expression not only in the political sphere (the new constitution of May 9, 1948) and the »socialist legislation« that developed from it. It was also reflected in other spheres – the social and cultural ones, and very firmly in the economic sphere. A centrally planned economy was installed. The trend of suppressing the private sector (initiated by the massive nationalization of industrial facilities, banks, and other entities in October 1945) continued, either through the expropriation of smaller enterprises or their merger into communal enterprises. The fundamental issue seemed to be the application of this development in agriculture.

The postulates marking the future long-term direction of the economy of sovietized Czechoslovakia were laid down by the IXth Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in May 1949 in the document called the General Line of Socialist Construction. Its center of gravity laid in the so-called socialist industrialization and »building of socialism« in the countryside. The First Five-Year-Plan (1949–1953), inspired by Soviet models, was derived from the General Line as its medium-term specification. It represented an instrument for adapting the Czechoslovak economy to the needs of the Soviet Union (and the Eastern Bloc it was building). The establishment of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance expressed this. The First Five-Year-Plan implemented a radical restructuring of the Czechoslovak economy. Its characteristic features were the hyper-growth of heavy industry and mining, and the neglect of agriculture, as well as the tertiary sector. A severe structural economic imbalance was born.

Already in the first months after February 1948, a fundamental departure from the agricultural policy of 1945–1948 (which was based on the principle of small-scale, privately owned smallholdings) began – albeit at a decent pace at first. The land newly acquired by the peasants as part of the second land reform

14 In 1937, more than 3,600 non–credit agricultural cooperatives had over 570,000 members – Slavíček and Kubů, *Politika*, 63–75; Smrčka et al., *Vývoj*, 209.

was to be »collectivized« (although this term had not been used yet). In March 1948, six agricultural laws were passed.[15] These measures allowed for the breaking up of larger private homesteads and forced land exchanges (which were disadvantageous to private peasants), but also promised optimistic outlooks of attainable agricultural credits and a flat agricultural tax. The National Insurance Act, which introduced universal sickness and pension insurance for virtually all citizens of the Czechoslovak Republic in May 1948, had a positive effect too (at least temporarily).[16]

After gaining power, the Communists shortly seemed to follow a specific Czechoslovak path to socialism, which would preserve a large share of small (less than 5 ha) and medium-sized (5–15 ha) private ownership in agriculture.[17] A significant impulse to abandon this strategy and follow the Soviet path instead was the increased pressure from Moscow, particularly the June 1948 Cominform resolution on Yugoslavia. This classified even small private property as »the germ of the future bourgeoisie,« i.e., the class enemy. At the end of the same month, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CC CPC) set »the containment of capitalist elements in the countryside« as its primary objective.[18] A further sharpening followed in November 1948, when the CC CPC adopted the »Conclusions on the Further Path of Czechoslovak Agriculture,« which set the goal of »isolating the rural bourgeoisie«. This was achieved through higher (obligatory) supply, disadvantages associated with using agricultural equipment in the newly established machine and tractor stations (see below), and other administrative measures.[19]

The collectivization process was formally initiated in February 1949 with the enactment of Law No. 69/1949 on Unified Agricultural Cooperatives (UAC).[20] It decreed the merger of all existing agricultural cooperatives in individual municipalities into a single, universal cooperative (collective farm) per municipality, known as the UAC.[21] Until the merger, the existing cooperatives were limited to regular economic activities only. Their members automatically became members of the UAC upon the merger. If they did not want to become members, they had to officially (in a written form) resign within 14 days (although they did not

15 *Zákon č. 43/1948 Sb. Zákon č. 44/1948 Sb. Zákon č. 45/1948 Sb. Zákon č. 46/1948 Sb. Zákon č. 47/1948 Sb. Zákon č. 49/1948 Sb.*

16 *Zákon č. 99/1948 Sb.*

17 This was promised many times, the most famously in the speech of Klement Gottwald on February 28, 1948: »The who scare people with kolkhoses belong to subversives and saboteurs« – *Rudé právo*, March 2, 1948, 2, Klement Gottwald k rolníkům.

18 Pernes, *Velké dějiny*, 202.

19 Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny*, 353. To the Specific Czechoslovakia's way to socialism as it is called and its abandoning, see also: Pernes, Specifická cesta.

20 *Zákon č. 69/1949 Sb.*

21 If only one agricultural cooperative existed in a village, it was transformed into a UAC.

apply to become UAC members at all). The assets and liabilities of the existing cooperatives were transferred to the UACs without liquidation, and the original cooperatives ceased to exist. The Ministry of Agriculture drew up a »model«, binding statutes for UACs. Although these did not prohibit the participation of »village wealthy« farmers in the UACs, they limited their influence in the executive body (board of directors) to a maximum of one-fifth. Similarly, the principle of »one member = one vote« was consistently enshrined, contradicting the previous common practice whereby voting in agricultural cooperatives was usually based on the number of shares owned.[22]

The law's wording did not imply that the UACs would be established based on the Soviet *kolkhozes* model. The essential difference was that the land remained legally in the hands of the original private owners, who (theoretically) regained the land if they withdrew from the UAC. In practice, this was more widely implemented only in the short »intermezzo« of 1953–1955 and then in the economic transformation after 1989. Although the law and the accompanying Ministerial Decree No. 75/1949[23] formally stated that the formation and entry into UACs were voluntary, the practice differed significantly. Members of the existing cooperatives had no alternative to membership in the UACs other than to resign officially. This form of resistance, however, already in early 1949 (and even more so later), required considerable courage, as it was associated with being labeled a *kulak* or an »enemy of the building of socialism« and thus with the risk of repression.

The methods of pressure on private farmers who refused to join the UACs were highly variable but complex and had an adverse synergistic effect. They ranged from political propaganda, persuasion by cooperative organizers, etc., through methods of economic pressure – progressively increased (and year by year increasing) obligatory amount of production, tax discrimination, disadvantages on the regulated market for food and consumer goods, unavailability of resources (seeds, fertilizers, machinery), exclusion of private farmers (as opposed to cooperative farmers) from national insurance, etc., up to methods of illegal coercion like blackmailing and intimidation or staged trials against »enemies of the building of socialism« – often with draconian punishments – to outright brachial violence, including physical liquidations. The culmination of the persecutory pressure was the »*Action Kulak*,« which took place in two waves between 1951 and 1953. During this time, families of the »village wealthy« farmers were forcibly evicted from their homes, their properties were confiscated, and families were not allowed to leave their newly designated residence. They were left with

22 Návrh stanov JZD, 72. Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny,* 354–55.
23 *Nařízení ministra zemědělství č. 75/1949 Sb.*

minimal means of subsistence. More than 4,000 peasant families were evicted (and thus, an equal number of estates were broken up). The *kulaks* were also publicly (and falsely) blamed for severe difficulties in the food supply. This effectively copied the Soviet model used during the collectivization of agriculture in the USSR after 1928.[24]

During the collectivization, four types of UACs gradually emerged. In type 1, some seasonal work was performed collectively (including the joint use of machinery); however, each peasant harvested their own land. This was a form of »neighborhood help« during critical periods of urgent agricultural work, especially harvests. Type 2 was based on removing the bosks between individual properties and creating large cooperative fields. Members' remunerations were based on the size of their share, i.e., the size of their land joined in the UAC. Livestock production continued to be carried out individually. Already, in the first two types, there were attempts to sow nearby plots of land with the same crop to increase production efficiency.[25] Type 3 of UAC was characterized by common crop and livestock production. The members' remunerations were primarily based on the work done and partly (up to a maximum of 15%) on the size of land merged into UAC. In addition, the cooperative members were allowed to have »crofts« (small private plots attached to individual houses) of up to 0.5 ha, together with some livestock. Unlike in the USSR, however, income from »crofts« in Czechoslovakia never formed a key part of the income of peasant households. The last, type 4 of UAC introduced remuneration exclusively according to work done, expressed in so-called »work units«. These were paid in advance on an ongoing basis and supplemented by additional payments after the annual accounting. These were minimal or mostly zero in the 1950s, but from the 1960s onwards, and especially in the 1970s and 1980s, they formed a substantial part of the members' income. Although the four types of UACs existed side by side for a time, the first three were seen from the beginning as merely transitional (types 1 and 2 exclusively until 1951).[26]

24 Recently Blažek (ed.), *Akce »K«*.
25 The joint saw of the nearby plots was rational in essence. See Lacina, Hledání cest.
26 Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny,* 359.

Table 1: Unified agricultural cooperatives in 1949–1953 (December 31)

Year	UACs	Agricultural Land (incl. »crofts«)	
		% of all	per UAC (ha)
1949	28	0.2	250
1950	1,389	9.7	321
1951	2,363	15.0	290
1952	4,157	26.0	287
1953	5,215	30.5	261
Year	Workers	Gross agricultural production (n/a for 1949–1952)	
		(% of total, without »crofts«)	Per ha (KČS, stable prices of 1980)
1953	.	23.0	6,692

Source: *Historická statistická ročenka*, 425, 507

The course of the collectivization of the countryside during the first Five-Year-Plan revealed many problems arising from the incompleteness of the whole concept. The owners of small, unproductive farms, often with less fertile land, were willing to join UACs. Unsuccessful farmers were also interested. On the other hand, the owners of more profitable farms generally resisted collectivization because they did not want to give up their land, often acquired under the so-called Second Land Reform (see above). This was even more true for medium-sized farmers. The traditional relationship of the farmer to the land cultivated for generations, as well as to his domestic animals, was not considered by the communist regime. This is why collectivization was more effortless in the border areas, where these traditional ties usually had no place. Most of the agricultural population there was newly settled on land expropriated from former German owners and often lacked the necessary professional skills.

Most cooperatives, not only in border areas, lacked professionally competent leadership. This was an even bigger problem after the former middle peasants, ideologically labeled as »former people,« were repulsed from the UACs' leadership in the early 1950s. Another problem was that, based on ideological and bureaucratic pressure, cooperatives were created »out of obligation« even when conditions were unsuitable. Very often, too-small cooperatives were formed that were primarily composed of peasants who could not compete. Subsidies to UACs were being wasted on a large scale, a fact that the leadership of the CPC was painfully aware of but tolerated because ideological intentions were given preference over economic considerations.[27]

A systemic problem was the general organization of agriculture, which essentially copied the Soviet model. In addition to UACs (similar to Soviet *kolkhozes*),

27 Pernes, *Velké dějiny,* 554.

state farms (Československé státní statky – Czechoslovak State Farms, CSFs) were established. These followed the Soviet sovkhozes as a model even more closely than the UACs. The land of CSFs was state-owned, and the workers were mere employees. The CSFs were mainly established in border areas with lower-grade land. Not enough people were interested in getting farms in these gradually settled territories, as the population density dropped significantly after the forced displacement of the original German population. However, state farms were also established in areas where traditional large-scale farms were already available (and had been expropriated), which the new regime decided to preserve due to their high economic efficiency. This was also one of the reasons for the higher success rate of the CSFs compared to the UACs in the first two decades of the new regime.

The establishment of Machine and Tractor Stations (Strojní a traktorové stanice, MTSs),[28] again following the Soviet model, proved to be another organizational blunder. They acquired agricultural equipment, often forcibly (and at unfavorably lower prices), bought from private owners. New machinery was only allowed to be supplied to the MTSs. With this equipment, they were to serve agricultural producers within the district. Although, in theory, the principle was formulated in such a way that this support should also be given to private small producers, in practice, it was mostly denied to them, and MTSs became one of the instruments of discrimination against private farmers, thus contributing to the pressure for their collectivization. However, the capacity of the MTSs proved insufficient; the system was over-bureaucratized and inefficient. At times of peak agricultural work, moving the equipment between the various cooperatives in the district posed a logistical problem and created considerable delays in its use.

The aforementioned interventions in agriculture resulted in chaos and, naturally, low efficiency, which did not meet the population's food needs. This was the logical outcome of the communist regime's overall systemic approach to the entire agricultural sector during the years of the First Five-Year-Plan. The »hyperindustrialization« allocated most of the investment resources to the secondary sector, mainly to the extensive construction of heavy industry. Agriculture was underinvested in. In addition, considerable labor was siphoned off from it. Purchasing prices of agricultural products that had to be sold to the state were set unreasonably low. All of this, together with the overall ideological class framing of collectivization, created the conditions for the disintegration of agricultural cooperatives, which reached the brink of collapse in early 1953.

28 *Zákon č. 27/1949 Sb. Nařízení vlády č. 83/1951 Sb.*

THE CRISIS INTERMEZZO (1953–1955)

The First Five-Year-Plan was very ambitious. Its goals of post-war economic renewal and quick industrial expansion were too high even in the original 1948 version. Moreover, it was revised, and its goals were significantly increased in 1951. By early 1953, it was obvious that the possibilities for extensive growth had almost been exhausted. Some industries (e.g., metallurgy, metal, and chemical) had met or exceeded the revised 1951 targets. However, most other industrial branches, as well as agriculture, lagged behind expectations (Table 2). Although the formal reason for collectivization was the implementation of modern, highly efficient forms of mass agriculture production, the growth was much slower than expected, and it did not reach the pre-war production level.[29]

Table 2: Major quantitative goals of the First Five-Year-Plan (indexed, 1948 = 100)

	Expected production in 1953, according to		Reality 1953
	1948 plan	1951 plan	
Gross national income	148	170	159
Industrial production	157	198	193
Agriculture	137	153	117
Plant production	111	142	115
Animal production	186	171	118

Source: Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny*, 271

These results, combined with the uncertainty caused by the power shifts in the USSR after the death of J. V. Stalin (followed by the death of K. Gottwald in Czechoslovakia soon afterward), with an adverse, unexpectedly strong public reaction to the monetary reform[30] and the equally unexpected, violent riots in the GDR on June 17, 1953, led the Communist Party leadership to reconsider its existing economic policy. The main principles of the »New Course«[31] were a change in agricultural policy, the postponement of the Second Five-Year-Plan and its temporary replacement by the 1954 and 1955 annual plans, the transfer of significant investments from the productive to the consumer sphere, a reduction in military spending, and a partial return to capitalist international markets.[32]

The situation in agriculture was so unsustainable that a temporary suspension of collectivization took place at the beginning of 1953, even before the official

29 In fact, the pre–war level of agricultural production was not reached for 15–20 years in the Bohemian Lands – see the period of 1960–1975.

30 Jirásek and Šůla, *Velká peněžní loupež.* Petráš, Peněžní reforma 1953.

31 Unlike in the GDR, this term was, however, not officially used in Czechoslovakia.

32 Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny,* 290–92.

start of the »New Course«.[33] In the following period, the pressure on private producers was substantially reduced, as indicated by President A. Zápotocký's speech at the Klíčava dam on August 1, 1953. He said, among other things: »Establishing cooperatives administratively, by order and perhaps by force, will not help. [...] Therefore, we must look into agricultural cooperatives.« He explicitly addressed people interested in leaving the UACs with the following words: »We will not prevent you from that.«[34] A large wave of departures from the UACs followed, and about 1,000 of them even broke up (in the whole of Czechoslovakia). The regime focused on supporting existing cooperatives and partially reassessed its agricultural policy. The existing state-organized purchase of all agricultural production at low prices was changed. The amounts of compulsory deliveries were reduced, and the purchase prices increased. Moreover, the production exceeding the compulsory deliveries was newly purchased at double the price. The state increased investment in agriculture, as well as subsidies to the UACs.[35] Therefore, the imminent breakdown of agriculture was avoided.

The two-year break of the »New Course« allowed the state apparatus to consolidate those cooperatives that could be sustained. At the same time, it bought time to revise procedures and activities where the existing strategy was failing. For private farmers, however, there was no room for joint action or significant improvement in their economic situation. A new phase of the collectivization process began in 1955.

THE SECOND PHASE OF COLLECTIVIZATION (1955–1960)

A political turning point in the development of Czechoslovakia's agriculture during this period was the CC CPC's meeting in June 1955. A more deliberate approach replaced the earlier certain spontaneity, or even chaos, in the building of cooperatives. Compared to the first stage, the principal change was a partial retreat from brutal forms of coercion. This was followed by more significant investment in agricultural production, an increase in mechanization, etc. The newly established UACs were larger (Table 3), which allowed for a more rational use of machinery and the introduction/expansion of large-scale production practices. More rational remuneration in UACs also played a role.[36]

Before the beginning of the Second Five-Year-Plan (1956–1960), the UACs farmed 36.6% of the agricultural land, and together with the state farms and

33 Ibid., 290.
34 *Rudé právo*, August 8, 1953, 1, Prezident republiky mezi budovateli Klíčavské přehrady.
35 Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny,* 437–38.
36 Ibid., 426.

other enterprises, the »socialist sector« farmed 47%. Thus, more than half of the total agricultural land remained to be collectivized. It was notable that, in 1956, the UACs still had a relatively small proportion of medium-sized farms with an area of 5–15 ha.[37] In other words, the cooperatives still stood mainly on a group of small peasants or confiscated land.

The year 1957 marked a turning point in the development of socialist agricultural cooperatives, as 537 UACs with approximately 11,000 members were newly established. The average size of member farms in UACs grew to approximately 10 ha. This indicates a significant influx of members with larger land areas, substantially changing the balance of power between the cooperative and non-cooperative peasantry in the village.

During the last three years of the 1950s, a significant number of peasants, including those with medium-sized farms, entered the UACs. In 1960, cooperatives farmed 67.5% of the arable land and accounted for 60.3% of market agricultural production in Czechoslovakia.[38] In the Bohemian Lands, the figures were slightly higher (Table 3). Organizationally, it was an unprecedented success in collectivization for the CPC. It brought agriculture under control, both in terms of production and organization. And, to a large extent, also in terms of personnel (the chairman of the UAC was elected, but in the vast majority of cases, the Communist Party was able to promote/force its candidates).

Table 3: Unified agricultural cooperatives in 1955 and 1960

Year	UACs	Agricultural Land (incl. »crofts«)	
		% of all	per UAC (ha)
1955	5,309	20.3	227
1960	8,133	68.5	381
Year	Workers	Gross agricultural production	
		(% of total, without »crofts«)	Per ha (stable prices of 1980)
1955	222,547	21.1	8,798
1960	610,121	58.3	9,673

Source: *Historická statistická ročenka*, 425, 507

On the other hand, the second half of the 1950s was a failure regarding food security and the implementation of the Second Five-Year-Plan. Agriculture continued to lag far behind industry development. The rapid pace of development of the UACs was not matched by capital inflow, and in real terms, the level of mechanization was even declining. This was addressed by the XIth Congress of

37 *K dějinám*, 272.
38 Ibid., 274. *Historická statistická ročenka*, 225.

the Communist Party (June 1958), which imposed »to complete the socialization of the village and increase agricultural production« as the central task. At the end of 1958, an internal analysis of the top organs of the CPC concluded that the leading economic cause of the unsatisfactory results of agriculture was the lack of workforce and »little material interest of the UACs in the development of joint production« due to the poor system of purchase prices and the low level of mechanization.[39]

In 1959, a series of changes was introduced. Its goals were to make agricultural production more efficient, but – very importantly! – also to increase the incomes of agricultural cooperative members, so that they could catch up with the incomes of other professions. First, the purchasing prices were unified (i.e., the different purchasing prices of compulsory deliveries and production over the limits were canceled). The new level was 12–30% higher. The common machinery was transferred from the Machine and Tractor Stations into UACs (and CSFs as well), and their purchasing prices decreased. The agricultural tax increased (up to now, it was only 1.2%), but it was more differentiated according to natural conditions (above all, the quality of arable land).[40] The qualifications of both cooperative management and members/employees were improving. A new Law on UACs was adopted in 1959 (with the implementing Ministerial Decree the following year).[41] They introduced a new UAC activity. Cooperatives were allowed to carry out an »auxiliary production« in agriculture-related branches, for example, in food processing.[42] While it may appear only as a cosmetic measure at first glance, it paved the way for the future prosperity of UAC, especially in the 1970s and 1980s.

All the changes have not resulted in a drastic increase in agricultural production yet. However, the rural population's living standards were improving: while the incomes of UAC's members/employees were only 62% of the average in 1960 (following a drastic slump from 70% in 1955), by 1968, they had reached 85%. Consequently, the social recognition of the rural population increased, as did the social stability of the countryside.

The CPC declared the year 1960 to be a crucial milestone in the development of Czechoslovak society and the new regime. It stated that a »new social class of cooperative peasants« had been formed, and the political climate of the countryside had changed. From the ruling regime's perspective, collectivization was essentially complete. This was reflected in the wording of the new constitution's preamble in 1960: »Socialism has triumphed in our country! [...] While

39 *K dějinám*, 273–74.

40 Průcha et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny,* 438–39.

41 *Zákon č. 49/1959 Sb. Vyhláška Ministerstva zemědělství, lesního a vodního hospodářství č. 144/1960 Sb.*

42 *Zákon č. 49/1959 Sb.,* § 14. *Ministerská vyhláška č. 144/1960 Sb.*

completing the socialist construction, we are proceeding towards the construction of an advanced socialist society and gathering strength for the transition to communism. [...] We are already practising the socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, each according to his work!"« [43] The name of the state was even changed from the Czechoslovak Republic to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

In reality, however, the situation in agriculture was more complex. Firstly, collectivization was not fully completed – in the Tatra regions of Slovakia, it had not yet taken place at all (and was only quietly done in the 1970s). This was, however, marginal from the regime's point of view, as well as from the perspective of the majority of the population. More important were the persisting problems in agriculture in general and in the functioning of the UACs. However, the measures taken at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s began to bear fruit relatively quickly. This was already evident in the following period.

THE STABILIZATION OF COLLECTIVIZED AGRICULTURE (1960–1975)

The measures adopted by the ruling regime at the end of the 1950s and implemented in the following years began to manifest results relatively quickly in the early 1960s. Agriculture experienced an unprecedented increase in production, so the pre-war level was finally surpassed in market agricultural production in 1960 and gross agricultural output in 1968.[44]

During the 1960s and 1970s, several trends marked the development of UACs. First, their number was decreasing quite rapidly in two waves. Second, the UACs' share of arable land dropped slightly in the first half of the 1960s[45] and remained stable after that. Third, the number of workers was decreasing slowly but constantly. Finally, the level of gross agricultural production per hectar increased steadily. In other words, the UACs became larger (by merging small cooperatives) and simultaneously more efficient (in quantitative terms) despite a decreasing number of workers (Table 4). The labor shortage thesis of the previous period proved incorrect, as further mechanization and massive chemicalization (regardless of the environmental disaster it created) actually allowed for the additional release of workers into the industry.

43 Constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Preamble, art. I–II. In English in – *Constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.*

44 Related to 1936 and in Bohemian Lands (in the whole Czechoslovakia, the process was a bit quicker) – *Historická statistická ročenka*, 495–96.

45 At the same time, however, the arable land of CSFs increased about the same amount. Some UACs with bad results were transformed into CSFs. It did not impact the share of private owners at all – ibid., 506.

Table 4: Unified agricultural cooperatives in 1960–1975 (December 31)

Year	UACs	Agricultural Land (incl. »crofts«)	
		% of all	per UAC (ha)
1960	8,133	68.5	381
1965	4,472	60.3	602
1970	4,298	60.2	619
1975	1,421	61.1	1,888
Year	Workers	Gross agricultural production	
		(% of total, without »crofts«)	Per ha (stable prices of 1980)
1960	610,121	58.3	9,673
1965	541,398	56.2	10,407
1970	503,722	55.4	12,812
1975	432,372	60.7	14,341

Source: *Historická statistická ročenka,* 425, 507

When the Third Five-Year-Plan collapsed in 1963, industrial production was affected. Agriculture, on the other hand, fulfilled its tasks. The standard of living of the rural population also rose relatively rapidly. Rural and urban living standards began to converge significantly. New »cadres« began to flow into the UACs, but they were no longer just CPC-trusted, but also possessed an increasingly high level of professional qualifications. The structure and organization of agricultural work also changed. During the 1960s and 1970s, the former »universal agricultural worker« gradually disappeared from the countryside, as most activities were already specialized (with the logical consequence of increasing labor productivity).

This development went hand in hand with an increase in the countryside's social and political stability. The satisfaction of the majority of the rural population with the existing regime increased to such an extent that the countryside remained almost unaffected by the events of the so-called Prague Spring in the late 1960s. While the reformist and democratizing changes were borne by the workers, the civil servants, and especially the intellectuals, the countryside proved virtually immune to them and, from the point of view of the »normalizing« Communist Party, remained the bearer of conservative-communist stability. In principle, it then moved smoothly into the »normalization« period, i.e., the return of Czechoslovak society under the tutelage of the conservative forces of the CPC, which once again submitted fully to Soviet influence.

The symbolic culmination of the period was the newly adopted Law on Agricultural Cooperatives of 1975, followed by the Government Regulation on

Model Statutes of UACs.[46] In most parts, they particularized the practice up to date. However, there were two major changes. First, members could become people who did not own any land. While the law of 1949 specified the membership for »agricultural producers« or »persons who could help to achieve the goals of the cooperative,« and the law of 1959 did not specify the membership at all, the new law opened the membership to »any citizen who has finished the compulsory education«.[47] Second, and more importantly, the »auxiliary production« could also be realized in non-agrarian branches of the economy, though the permission of the state authorities bound it.[48] Many UACs utilized this approach to establish thriving productions in the following years and achieved remarkable profits as a result. A door was open for a new, specific form of socialist enterprise.

From the ruling regime's perspective, the period from 1960 to 1975 was a notable success in agriculture. The problems that were beginning to appear on the horizon (see the next section) had been largely ignored so far; the Communist Party was slow and reluctant to acknowledge them. For the time being, it was lulled into a false sense of security by quantitative indicators showing the fulfillment of the five-year plans. Therefore, it looked forward to the next few years with optimism.

THE COLLECTIVIZED AGRICULTURE – A FACTOR IN THE STABILITY OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME (1975–1989)

The years 1975–1989 were the peak of socialist agriculture. On the one hand, it was experiencing unprecedented quantitative development, even a boom, while the economy as a whole was sinking into deep problems and de facto stagnating. Mechanization, specialization of production, and the qualifications of (not only) managers were increasing. The creation of so-called »agro-combines,« i.e., huge collective farms with many thousands of hectares of land and hundreds or thousands of workers, was also a symbol of change. They were formed by merging existing UACs and engaged in various activities beyond livestock and crop production. These activities ranged from processing agricultural production (e.g., slaughterhouses, dairies) to selling products, sometimes even on a wholesale basis.

46 *Zákon č. 122/1975 Sb. Nařízení vlády č. 137/1975 Sb.*
47 *Zákon č. 122/1975 Sb.*, § 15.
48 *Zákon č. 122/1975 Sb.*, § 13.

Table 5: Unified agricultural cooperatives in 1976–1988 (December 31)

Year	UACs	Agricultural Land (incl. »crofts«)	
		% of all	per UAC (ha)
1975	1,421	61.1	1,888
1981	1,072	61.8	2,480
1987	1,025[a]	.	2,578[a]
Year	Workers	Gross agricultural production	
		(% of total, without »crofts«)	Per ha (stable prices of 1980)
1975	432,372	60.7	14,341
1981	396,579	63.5	15,304
1987	405,900[b]	.	17,047[b]

[a] January 1, 1988; [b] January 1, 1987
Source: *Historická statistická ročenka,* 425, 507; Statistické přehledy, I, V

However, a crucial factor in the development of the UACs in this period was the dramatic increase in non-agricultural auxiliary production. In this context, many UACs (later called the »top« ones) established cooperation with industrial enterprises, to which they supplied components, at a significantly higher profit than the one achieved by agricultural production. In addition, UACs often produced final products that were not appealing to large industrial enterprises due to their small scale (such as, for example, cement bags). Some of these cooperatives even expanded into the tertiary sector.

A symbol of this trend was the mammoth »agro-combine« UAC Slušovice, whose evaluation from the point of view of economic history is still highly ambivalent. On the one hand, it was undoubtedly an extremely professionally managed enterprise that achieved phenomenal economic results. It expanded into a wide range of activities (production of tires, IT technology, etc.) and developed acquisitions even in socialist foreign countries, including Asia. On the other hand, however, it is necessary to consider that Slušovice was a company strongly preferred by the regime, its »showcase«. The cooperative had access to incomparably higher and more exclusive resources and could afford activities that other enterprises could not get away with.

It is symptomatic that the attitude of the ruling regime towards the »top« UACs was ambivalent. On the one hand, their prosperity and economic efficiency were appreciated, and the cooperatives were promoted in the media, etc. On the other hand, in the second half of the 1980s, the regime intended to significantly limit the profitability (and, therefore, »enrichment«) of the »top« UACs. It was planned to substantially increase (up to several times) taxation of profits from non-agricultural auxiliary production, i.e., the source of the extraordinary

prosperity of these large enterprises, which were in some cases de facto pseudo-agricultural already.[49]

For decades, the negative consequences of the rapid development of »socialist agriculture« were ignored. For example, the creation of vast cooperative fields contributed to soil depletion. Over-chemicalization (the reason for marvelous productivity per ha) contaminated the soil and water for many years, even decades. The concentration of livestock production was too high. It led not only to diseases spreading but also to a lack of feed, which had to be imported at a very high cost from capitalist countries. These problems became evident in the 1970s, and even more in the 1980s.

The epilogue of agricultural cooperative farming in communist Czechoslovakia was, in fact, the new Law on Agricultural Cooperative Farming (in force since July 1, 1988).[50] It loosened the grip of control of cooperatives by the Communist Party (although it did not remove it!) and greatly liberalized the principles of cooperative activities. The democracy of inner procedures increased in cooperatives. UACs were given considerably greater scope for autonomous business activities. In addition to primary agricultural production, they could also almost freely engage in manufacturing and services – in this sense, the law legitimized an already widespread trend. It also opened the way to direct economic relations with companies in foreign countries, including non-socialist ones. A major innovation was that UACs could claim compensation for injuries caused by interference by non-cooperative bodies. For the lagging cooperatives, it was bad news that reaching subsidies or rehabilitations was now more difficult. For the first time, the law made it obligatory for UACs to protect the environment and set aside funds for this purpose. All of this was an expression of the state's move away from cooperatives. Finally, the possibility of a member leaving the UAC re-entered public discourse. The law now, for the first time, explicitly mentioned that it was possible to leave a cooperative without giving any reason and request the return of the land, provided a one-year notice period was given.[51] All these rational changes, however, came too late. The end of Communist Czechoslovakia was already on the horizon.

49 Kopeček, Přední JZD, 108–10, 117–18.

50 *Zákon č. 90/1988 Sb.*

51 *Zákon č. 90/1988 Sb.* This did not materialize. The request could be made only at the end of any year after a one–year–long period of notice. Therefore, the first time this could have happened was December 31, 1989. At that time, the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia was already over.

CONCLUSION

Cooperatives, especially those in agriculture, have repeatedly played extremely important political roles in the 20th century. They were used (in the First Republic) or abused (in the Communist period) for political purposes. In the first phase of collectivization (1949–1953), the Unified Agricultural Cooperatives (UACs) became a field of organized, often ruthless violence with the assistance of the state authorities. The goal of the regime was the so-called »socialization of the village«, which denied traditional private ownership, reduced (or even eliminated) private ownership of land, and introduced the UAC system. These objectives remained in force during the following period, but were no longer implemented using the brutal methods employed previously. The ruling regime's approach became more sophisticated, its methods of coercion more subtle. The new approach ultimately yielded the desired results. In the second half of the 1950s, the Communist Party successfully collectivized a significant portion of the agricultural land and production.

From the late 1950s to the late 1980s, the Communist Party's approach to the countryside was consistent. It was characterized by increasing investment, financial measures to support the UACs (e.g., in the form of higher purchase prices), the gradual expansion of the UACs' business beyond purely agricultural activities (the so-called auxiliary production), the improvement of workers' qualifications, the expansion of mechanization and chemicization, etc. As a result, the rural population's standard of living increased and began to close in on that of the urban population during the 1960s. Subsequently, however, in the mid-1970s, this level was surpassed, and the higher rate of income growth was maintained until the end of the communist regime. This resulted, among other things, in increased building activity in the countryside, both public (shops, cultural centers, etc.) and private.

The social stability of the countryside was increasing, and it became one of the regime's mainstays. It is significant that agriculture as a whole – and agricultural cooperatives within it – were marginal issues in all four attempts at systemic economic reform (1958–1960, 1967–1968, 1978–1980, and since 1988). If, in the first case, the regime could not address this issue in any significant way (the so-called »Rozsypal« reform focused primarily, and almost exclusively, on industry), in all the other cases, this was because agricultural cooperatives were largely stabilized, fulfilled their stated tasks, and thus did not require significant changes in the regime's optics.

At first glance, it may seem that collectivization was entirely successful. In reality, however, the structural problems of the agricultural sector have been

growing all along. Although crop yields and labor productivity (as well as living standards) were rising, the long-term unsustainability and unreformability of the centrally planned economic system became increasingly obvious from the early 1980s at the latest. Agriculture was facing the limits of further development, and new problems were emerging (especially in livestock production). The gap between Czechoslovakia and the Western developed countries was widening. It was becoming more and more apparent that it would be impossible to maintain, let alone raise, the current standard of living in the long term, given the current state of the economy as a whole (and agriculture within it). Economic development was at an impasse. Social unrest and, logically, the following fall of the regime were to be expected.

In the long term, the farming methods implemented in socialist agriculture have led to very negative consequences, burdening the landscape and its inhabitants for generations. In the material sphere, the environment and the soil have been devastated. In the spiritual sphere, the paradigm in the relationship between the farmer and the land underwent a fundamental shift. The latter remained a means of production, but no longer the farmer's own, but a social one. Thus, the close relationship of human to the land was lost.

REFERENCES

Published sources

Nařízení ministra zemědělství č. 75/1949 Sb. ze dne 17. března 1949, kterým se provádí zákon o jednotných zemědělských družstvech.

Nařízení vlády č. 83/1951 Sb. ze dne 9. října 1951 o organisaci strojních a traktorových stanic.

Nařízení vlády č. 137/1975 Sb. ze dne 4. prosince 1975, kterým se vydávají Vzorové stanovy jednotných zemědělských družstev a upravuje postup při vypracování a schvalování stanov družstva, jejich změn a doplňků.

Vládní nařízení č. 242/1942 Sb. z. a n. ze dne 3. července 1942 o svazech výdělkových a hospodářských společenstev.

Vyhláška Ministerstva zemědělství, lesního a vodního hospodářství č. 144/1960 Sb. ze dne 26. září 1960 o provozování pomocné a přidružené výroby v jednotných zemědělských družstvech a o jejich vzájemné spolupráci.

Zákon č. 27/1949 Sb. ze dne 2. února 1949 o mechanisaci zemědělství.

Zákon č. 43/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, o zemědělském úvěru.

Zákon č. 44/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, kterým se mění a doplňuje zákon o revisi první pozemkové reformy.

Zákon č. 45/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, kterým se mění a doplňuje zákon ze dne 3. července 1947, č. 139 Sb., o rozdělení pozůstalostí se zemědělskými podniky a o zamezení drobení zemědělské půdy.

Zákon č. 46/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, o nové pozemkové reformě (trvalé úpravě vlastnictví k zemědělské a lesní půdě).

Zákon č. 47/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, o některých technicko-hospodářských úpravách pozemků (zcelovací zákon).

Zákon č. 49/1948 Sb. ze dne ze dne 21. března 1948, o zemědělské dani.

Zákon č. 49/1959 Sb. ze dne 9. července 1959 o jednotných zemědělských družstvech.

Zákon č. 69/1949 Sb. ze dne 23. února 1949 o jednotných zemědělských družstvech.

Zákon č. 90/1988 Sb. ze dne 15. června 1988 o zemědělském družstevnictví.

Zákon č. 99/1948 Sb. ze dne 15. dubna 1948 o národním pojištění.

Zákon č. 122/1975 Sb. ze dne 13. listopadu 1975 o zemědělském družstevnictví.

Periodicals

Rudé právo, 1948, 1953.

Literature

Blažek, Petr (ed.). *Akce »K«: vyhnání sedláků a jejich rodin z usedlostí v padesátých letech. Studie, seznamy a dokumenty*. Prague: Pulchra, 2022.

Blažek, Petr and Michal Kubálek (eds.). *Kolektivizace venkova v Československu 1948–1960 a středoevropské souvislosti*. Prague: Česká zemědělská univerzita – Dokořán, 2008.

Boštík, Pavel. *Venkov bez mezí: kolektivizace zemědělství v Pardubickém kraji v letech 1949–1960.* Prague: Národní zemědělské muzeum, 2020.

Březina, Vladimír and Jiří Pernes (eds.). *Závěrečná fáze kolektivizace zemědělství v Československu 1957–1960: sborník příspěvků*. Brno: Stilus, 2009.

Burešová, Jana. The Collectivization of Agriculture in Czechoslovakia: the Imposition of the Soviet Communist Model of Czechoslovak Agriculture after Second World War. In: Kubů, Eduard, Torsten Lorenz, Uwe Müller, and Jiří Šouša (eds.). *Agrarismus und Agrareliten in Ostmitteleuropa*, 621–45. Prague, Berlin: Dokořán, Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2013.

Cambel, Samuel. *Formovanie triedy družstevného roľníctva v Československu: kapitoly z dejín socialistického poľnohospodárstva v Československu.* Bratislava: Pravda, 1984.

Cambel, Samuel. *Kapitoly z dejín socialistického pol'nohospodárstva v Československu.* Bratislava: Pravda, 1982.

Cihlář, Jiří. *Vesnice severovýchodních Čech v období kolektivizace 1948–1960.* Prague: Národní zemědělské muzeum, 2016.

Constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Prague: Orbis, 1961.

Historická statistická ročenka ČSSR. Prague, Bratislava: SNTL – Alfa, 1985.

Jech, Karel. *Kolektivizace a vyhánění sedláků z půdy.* Prague: Vyšehrad, 2008.

Jech, Karel. *Probuzená vesnice: k dějinám revoluce na našem venkově v letech 1945–1948.* Prague: NPL, 1963.

Jirásek, Zdeněk and Jaroslav Šůla. *Velká peněžní loupež v Československu 1953 aneb 50:1.* Prague: Svítání, 1992.

K dějinám socialistického Československa. Prague: Svoboda, 1986.

Kopeček, Martin. Přední JZD v období přestavby k Československu. *Prameny a studie* 64 (2019): 105–20.

Kuklík, Jan. *Znárodněné Československo: od znárodnění k privatizaci – státní zásahy do vlastnických a dalších majetkových práv v Československu a jinde v Evropě.* Prague: Auditorium, 2010.

Lacina, Vlastislav. Hledání cest a první kroky združstevňování československé vesnice. *Sborník historický* 14 (1966): 95–134.

Návrh stanov JZD vypracovaný ministrem zemědělství pro předsednicto ÚV KSČ, projednaný kolegiem ministra zemědělství dne 28. února a 3. března 1949. In: Pšeničková, Jana and Jiřina Juněcová (eds.). *Kolektivizace zemědělství: Vznik JZD 1948–1949*, 72–73. Prague: Státní ústřední archiv, 1995.

Pernes, Jiří. Specifická cesta KSČ k socialismu: Fikce, nebo realita?. *Soudobé dějiny* 23, No. 1–2 (2016): 11–76.

Pernes, Jiří. *Velké dějiny zemí Koruny české, Sv. XVII (1948–1956).* Prague: Paseka, 2022.

Pernica, Karel Martin. *Družstevnictví.* Prague: Ústřední rada družstev, 1968.

Pernica, Karel Martin. *Socialistické družstevnictví v ČSSR.* Prague: Svoboda, 1988.

Pernica, Karel Martin. *Úvod do družstevnictví.* Prague: SPN, 1976.

Petráš, Jiří. Peněžní reforma 1953. In: *Sborník Archivu Ministerstva vnitra*. Prague: Odbor archivní a spisové služby Ministerstva vnitra ČR, 2005, 141–71.

Průcha, Václav, Jana Geršlová, Alena Hadrabová, Lenka Kalinová, František Vencovský, and Zdislav Šulc. *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny Československa 1918–1992, 2. díl.* Brno: Doplněk, 2009.

Rašticová, Blanka (ed). *Osudy zemědělského družstevnictví ve 20. století: sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 15.–16. května 2002 věnovaný Lubomíru Slezákovi k 70. narozeninám*. Uherské Hradiště: Slovácké muzeum, 2002.

Rokoský, Jaroslav and Libor Svoboda. *Kolektivizace v Československu.* Prague: Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů, 2013.

Slavíček, Jan. From Business to Central Planning: Cooperatives in Czechoslovakia in 1918–1938 and 1948–1960. *Hungarian Historical Review* 10, no. 3 (2021): 423–443.

Slavíček, Jan and Eduard Kubů. *Politika v družstvech – družstva v politice: Analýza komplikovaného vztahu v českých zemích (1918–1938).* Prague: Academia, 2024.

Smrčka, Ladislav, Alfred Sporka, Alois Jonák, Václav Levora, Július Petráš, Oto Virsík, Jindřich Jech et al. *Vývoj družstevnictví na území ČSFR.* Prague: Svépomoc, 1992.

Statistické přehledy o čs. zemědělsko-potravinářském komplexu: Vývoj základních ukazatelů JZD. *Zemědělská ekonomika* 35, No. 5, příloha (1989): I–X.

Statistická příručka Československé republiky 1948. Prague: Státní úřad statistický, 1948.

Šorm, Vladimír, Karel Martin Pernica, and Miloš Větvička. *Dějiny družstevního hnutí. III. díl Dějiny spotřebního družstevnictví u nás. II. část, Historie a úloha bytového družstevnictví.* Prague: Svépomoc, 1961.

Urban, Jiří. *Kolektivizace venkova v Horním Polabí: od fenoménů k aktérům a jejich motivacím.* Prague: Karolinum, 2016.

Václavů, Antonín. *Ke sporům o zemědělské družstevnictví a kolektivizaci v Československu.* Prague: Vysoká škola ekonomická, 1999.