



**SPOJENÁ ŠKOLA
PANKÚCHOVA 6
BRATISLAVA**

Spojená škola, Pankúchova 6, 851 04 Bratislava

The impact of expropriation and collectivisation on viticultural property under Communist rule in Czechoslovakia



(Eustory extended competitive essay)

Zuzana Šefčíková

INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE - MYP3

Consultants: doc. Ing. Branislav Vrana, PhD

Mgr. Viliam Sloboda

2025



Abstract:

Šefčíková, Zuzana: The impact of expropriation and collectivisation on viticultural property under communist rule in Czechoslovakia

In the theoretical part the author of the work focuses on viticulture in the Small Carpathian region of Slovakia during WW2 and communist rule. The work illustrates the process of expropriation and collectivisation of property over the years of totalitarian rule and specific legislative measures taken for complete seizure of property.

After the theoretical section the author focuses on a micro-historical example of the Lednár family, who are well known viticulturist in Rača. The family survived WW2 as well as communist rule. The work is centred around Martin Lednár and his achievements, furthermore, the work focuses on the family after his death.

Two members of the Lednár family, Mrs. Ľubica Lednárová and Ing. Alojz Kandl were interviewed by the author in the beginning of the year 2025. They provided detailed insights and emotional accounts from specific times, which were one of the most crucial sources of information.

The work aims to draw more attention to microhistory over the years of WW2 and communist rule, especially Small Carpathian viticulture.

Key words: expropriation, collectivisation, WW2, SVD, Lednár, Kandl, Rača, Communism, Czechoslovakia, viticulture

Abstrakt:

Šefčíková, Zuzana: Vplyv vyvlastňovania a kolektivizácie na vinohradnícky majetok za komunistického režimu v Československu.

V teoretickej časti sa autor práce zameriava na vinohradníctvo v Malokarpatskom regióne na Slovensku počas druhej svetovej vojny a komunistickej vlády. Práca ilustruje proces vyvlastňovania a kolektivizácie majetku počas rokov totalitnej vlády a konkrétne legislatívne opatrenia prijaté na úplné zabavenie majetku.

Po teoretickej časti sa autor zameriava na mikro historický príklad rodiny Lednárovcov, ktorí sú známymi vinohradníkmi v Rači. Rodina prežila druhú svetovú vojnu, ako aj komunistickú vládu. Práca sa zameriava na Martina Lednára a jeho úspechy, ďalej sa zameriava na rodinu po jeho smrti.

Dvaja členovia rodiny Lednárovcov, pani Ľubica Lednárová a Ing. Alojz Kandl, boli autorom rozhovorom začiatkom roka 2025. Poskytli podrobné postrehy a emotívne rozprávania z konkrétnych období, ktoré boli jedným z najdôležitejších zdrojov informácií.

Cieľom práce je upriamiť viac pozornosti na mikro históriu v rokoch druhej svetovej vojny a komunistickej vlády, najmä na vinohradníctvo v Malých Karpatoch.

Kľúčové slová: vyvlastnenie, kolektivizácia, 2. svetová vojna, SVD, Lednár, Kandl, Rača, komunizmus, Československo, vinohradníctvo

Contents

Introduction

1. Historical context	1
1.1 Vineyard region	1
1.1.1 The state of Small Carpathian viticulture and vineyards during the interwar period.....	1
1.1.2 Formation of SVD	2
1.1.3 The progress of viticulture during WW2.....	2
1.1.4 Situation in the winemaking industry and SVD after the end of WW2	4
1.2 Seizure and expropriation of private property.....	4
1.2.1 Political situation after the end of WW2	4
1.2.2 The rise to power of the communist party	5
1.2.3 Accepting new laws and legislative measures	6
1.2.4 Impact of new legislature on viticulture	8
2. The Lednár Family	9
2.1 Martin Lednár and SVD	9
2.2 Family during WW2.....	10
2.3 Situation after WW2	11
2.3.1 Impact of expropriation and collectivisation on the family	12
2.3.2 Years of uncertainty and missed opportunities	14
2.3.3 Restitution of lost property.....	15
2.4 The Lednár family today.....	15

Conclusion

Sources

Introduction

In today's world many consider World War 2 (I will use the shortcut WW2 further on) to be a wide historical event but micropolitics and microhistory are often overlooked. WW2 includes many topics, such as segregation, discrimination, warfare and more. This year we celebrate the 80th anniversary of the end of WW2. It is important to focus on specific examples to remember WW2. In this work I will be describing how WW2 affected viticulture, as well as the fascist regime of Slovakia and the subsequent communist regime relating to expropriation and collectivisation of property in viticulture.

I will also provide an insight on a specific family from Rača (Bratislava) that focuses on viticulture: the Lednár family. They were prominent landowners, and Mr. Martin Lednár, the patriarch and co-founder of SVD (Slovenské vinohradnícke družstvo). The full name of the organization is Slovenské vinohradnícke družstvo, but throughout my writing I will use the shortcut SVD. SVD was later a major organization and competitor and business in the wine market during WW2. Thanks to two family members of this family, Ľubica Lednárová and Alojz Kandl, I gained valuable firsthand accounts of how the family coped with the loss of property.

It is very important to talk about WW2 and specific stories from these times. It helps people create a better understanding of the topic while also providing a sense of empathy for viticulturists who struggled even when they were not involved with the war. This is one of the main reasons why I picked this topic. There have been many atrocities and wars in history, but WW2 was the most recent extremely brutal war in Central Europe.

Another reason why I picked this topic was because WW2 and its impacts are one of the most interesting parts of history for me. The topic's uniqueness, variability and diversity draw me to it. Through interviews and listening to stories of our grandparent's childhood, we can be brought back into hard times and feel the stress and grief woven into families. WW2 was not the first and not the last major war and I find it crucial to speak about it and not let the suffering of older generations fade. For the Lednár family WW2 and later the years of expropriation and collectivisation were the most grieving and difficult years. They went through property loss until the fall of SVD. The war and government steps destroyed communities, and it took many decades to rebuild them.

The easiest way to describe a historical event is through an individual's story. For me the story of the Lednár family is touching, and it illustrates greatly how all viticulturists suffered during communist rule. The story shows how people did not have a choice but to give up their property or face punishments they would not recover from. Thanks to the memories of Mrs. Lednárová and Mr. Kandl, we can imagine what it was like living in such conditions. The story is indeed inspiring, and that is because no matter how much the family lost, they kept taking care of the little they had left, and their small vineyards in Rača are standing and thriving until this day. Their story is a testament to resilience.

The main parts of my work are the theoretical part and research, where I focus on facts and a wider approach to my topic. I worked with a wide range of sources, especially from newspapers, books and historical analyses. I also focused on a specific story of a family that had great power within viticulturists. A main part of my work are the testimonies of Mr. Kandl and Mrs. Lednárová. I also worked with statistics and other relevant historical sources such as pictures and letters.

The aim of my work is to draw more attention to the expropriation and collectivisation of property by the communist party in Czechoslovakia. Generally, the severity of these situations is often overlooked, even when it was a part of the immediate years after WW2. My aim is to also show the impact of WW2 on viticulture especially in the Small Carpathian region.

1. Historical context

1.1 Vineyard region

1.1.1 The state of Small Carpathian viticulture and vineyards during the interwar period

After the Phylloxera epidemic and the fall of the Austro-Hungarian empire, wine mainly was only sold within the First Czechoslovak Republic and often at a very low price. Phylloxera was a pest that crippled vineyards during the 19th century. It practically destroyed all European vineyards and viticulturists had to change their ways of planting vineyards so that the root-attacking pest would stop crippling winemaking. Viticulturists had to find new creative ways to sell their wine, such as engaging in more winemaking events and tastings. Some even organized tours for international visitors to boost their sales. This was in the years following the First World War, around 1921. It was the second of the two big crises that impacted Small Carpathian viticulture. The situation improved in 1924, but shortly after the global depression and agricultural crisis impacted Slovakia and wine making.

The Great Depression of the 20th century endorsed a great impact on viticulture. Already in the year 1926 the wine making industry was in rapid decline and the situation was only getting worse. It ended up so badly that most viticulturists in the Small Carpathian region were almost impoverished and unable to sell wine.¹ To get the situation to a somewhat better condition, state aid was required. Smaller viticulturists could not afford to sell goods, because they barely had what they needed themselves. This also slowed down the export of wine to areas like Bohemia. The Small Carpathian region had a very suitable environment to grow wine, and since Bohemia had no such place like this, Slovakia was a big exporter. However, when the Great Depression hit, export was suddenly stopped and there was a big shortage of wine.

Cheap wines were competing with homemade wines, and they were more popular because of their cheaper price. Even when the wines were imported from abroad and had higher tax on them, they were still exponentially cheaper than the ones made within the nation. The imported wines degraded the price of authentic wines. Wines from abroad did not only compete with homemade wines in terms of price, but also quality, since they were often of higher quality. This situation was only solved in 1933 with the plantation of more vineyards and the unification of Small Carpathian viticulturists.²

New plantations were a welcome change. It looked as if the crisis was finally over and viticulture would prosper. However, the new plantations did not help the life expectancy of viticulturists at all. There was an exponential rise in winemaking, however the impact was very slow, and the price of wine exponentially decreased. In 1935, the price of wine dropped to 1,50 Kčs for a Liter.³ This was an alarmingly low price. During these years, the idea of SVD was born and the idea was to protect small viticulturists and limit the import of cheap wine. They also wanted to stabilise the price of wine, so that viticulture would be brought back from extreme poverty.⁴

¹ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 9.

² Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 17.

³ Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946, p. 10.

⁴ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 28 - 31.

1.1.2 Formation of SVD



Examples of wine etiquettes by SVD

SVD (Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo) was created by men who were concerned about the situation in viticulture. The situation was already very serious, and the government wanted to tax them even more in the years 1935 to 1936. There were multiple meetings between viticulturists that were held in the first months of 1936, until everything was resolved in April. The founding meeting of SVD was held on the 25 of April 1936. There were 126 members present, and they entered an astonishing number of properties. Martin Lednár was chosen as the president of the union. SVD took headquarters in Pezinok, especially in the chateau in the city centre. There was the main wine cellar of the union.⁵

SVD was an organisation created in 1936 by many bigger viticulturists who wanted to protect their wine and help each other out. The organisation continued to prosper even during WW2, which many other viticultural associations failed to do.⁶ The main purpose of this organisation was to perfect wine making and take harvest from small viticulturist who did not have heavy machinery available to make wine and/or could not store it. One of their main aims was also to make homeland wine as high quality as possible to gain back customers lost to imported, cheaper wines. With all its members, SVD wanted to gain profit and become a great competitor to cheap wines on the wine market.⁷

1.1.3 The progress of viticulture during WW2

Viticulture under SVD continued to flourish even through WW2. SVD continued spreading its branches into the Danube Lowland and then even further to Bohemia. The number of members rose rapidly, and so did the income and the wine production. During spring of 1938, SVD entered the Bohemian market, and the organisation earned trust everywhere. However, in autumn of 1938 came the establishment of the Slovak state and SVD lost the Danube lowland. Shortly after the borders to the

⁵ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 42

⁶ Bratislavské, Noviny. "35. Výrobné Vinárske Spolky a Družstvá | História | Bratislavské Noviny." *Bratislavskenoviny.sk*, 14 May 2025, www.bratislavskenoviny.sk/historia/4521-35-vyrobnne-vinarske-spolky-a-druzstva. Accessed 14 May 2025.

⁷ Balajová, Lucia. *Úsilie Slovenských Vinohradníkov a Vinárov*. 2018. 2018, p. 200.

Protectorate of Czechia and Moravia closed. This caused that the organisation lost about half of their customers, and with the war approaching and inevitable, they had to rebuild while facing the “inconvenience” of a war. Having lost many of their customers, they turned to the northern regions of Slovakia. There they gained lots of new customers and they managed to rebuild at a blasting speed.⁸

Thanks to their new customers, at the end of the year 1939 SVD managed to purchase the chateau in Pezinok, where they established headquarters and the main wine cellar. The cellar was enormous, and that is where most of the wine from all over was kept. In the year 1941 the organisation was already so big that the enormous wine cellars beneath the chateau did not suffice for all their wine. Therefore, they had to spread their wine cellars. SVD then decided to build more wine cellars. The construction was finished in 1943. One hundred wagons of wine were brought into the new cellar near Pezinok and Modra, which was major new property for the organisation and meant much more profit.⁹



Harvest at the Lednár family vineyards

The continuing war however, greatly impacted the association and the wine market. Constant uncertainty and many bomb attacks forced the headquarters of SVD to be very careful. The association however, held its place even after most German viticulturists left to create their own organised wine cellar. 1944 came and the war was closer with every day. Daily, thousands of planes flew over Rača, and the spreading of disinformation, propaganda and misconceptions even further frightened the civilians in vineyard regions. Nearing the end of the war and the front approaching, SVD decided to send most of their wine into the Protectorate of Czechia and Moravia, and they kept only what they needed to satisfy the local market. Liberating armies came to Pezinok on the 1. of April 1945. The organisation suffered losses, but not as great as was expected. They lost about one-third of their wine, but the most important was that they managed to save their buildings, cellars and wine barrels, so they immediately started rebuilding. The liberation came quite fast, and only two days after the armies passed (3. of April 1945) Pezinok started rebuilding.¹⁰

⁸ Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946, p. 31

⁹ Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946, p. 44-47

¹⁰ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 128

1.1.4 Situation in the winemaking industry and SVD after the end of WW2

Pezinok started with rebuilding very fast. After 10 days, construction workers managed to fix all broken roofs because of shrapnel and then continued to free vineyards of mines. The front passed Small Carpathians very quickly, and because of steps that SVD made to protect their property, they faced damages that were easily fixed and quickly replaced. The organization even returned to its old habits in terms of the market, since on the 28th of April, they made an agreement with the Russian forces to sell wine to them.¹¹ The association returned to normal life after the war very fast, and grape gatherings went as normal in autumn.

SVD renewed their ties to Moravia and Bohemia, as well as they gained back most of their prior customers from the Danube lowland. The profits of the organization were enormous (6 680 101,90 Kčs in 1946)¹², and it started to play a very serious role in the Czechoslovakian wine market. However, the organisation was still burdened by imported cheap wines, which took away some profit. After the war also the black market for wine also started to grow, where dishonest viticulturists tried to sell wine for cheaper, which drove away some customers of SVD.

In the year 1946 SVD had big ambitions of building more wine cellars and repairing the old ones as well as the chateau itself. The organisation invested lots of money into construction to rebuild and expand. After the construction work was completed, the wine cellars of SVD expanded by another 12 000 hectolitres. The added cellars allowed the association to buy all surplus wine from smaller viticulturists. At that time, the main properties of the organisation were the chateau in Pezinok and Hotel Modra in Modra. SVD continued to expand their property, and they were very successful. They managed to buy and gain 187 903,5 tons of grapes and 45 118,24 hectolitres of wine.¹³

1.2 Seizure and expropriation of private property

1.2.1 Political situation after the end of WW2

With the defeat of Nazi Germany in 1945, the Slovak state collapsed. Slovakia was reintegrated into Czechoslovakia, but the experience of collaboration with the Nazis left a lasting impact on the political dynamics of the region.

Czechoslovakia was a multi-ethnic country with the Czechs and the Slovaks, but there were always some tensions within the state, which came back after the war and the reunification. The Slovaks always sought more autonomy within the country and slightly opposed the dominant rule of the Czechs. The war also fuelled Slovak nationalism, as a reaction to the Slovak State collaborationism with the Nazis. Many Slovaks were left confused after Slovakia's strong relations with Nazi Germany.

After the war, the prior Czechoslovak government came back to power under the leadership of Mr. Edvard Beneš, who was president before the war. He was determined to restore democracy and emphasised the strong relations between Czechs and Slovaks. The reintegration of Slovakia into

¹¹ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 128

¹² Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946, p. 103

¹³ Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946, p. 44-78

Czechoslovakia was a long process because of political aspirations and ethnic problems within certain regions.

On the 26. of May 1946, elections took place in Czechoslovakia. In Slovakia, the democratic party (DS) won with 62% of the votes. However, in the Czech part of the country the communist party won the elections with 40%. This impacted Slovakia greatly, since the communist party took over in 1948.¹⁴ On the 2. of July 1946 president E. Beneš named government officials in the leadership of Klement Gottwald. Czechia has always been a great influence on Slovakia. With the elections in 1946, Czechoslovakia started entering the Soviet circle of influence. After the elections (1946), the state of the Slovak democracy worsened until its end in 25. of February¹⁵. On this day the president accepted the demission of ministers and named a new government which was created by Klement Gottwald. This is taken as the communist takeover, after which totalitarian regime was implied.

1.2.2 The rise to power of the communist party

Slovak leaders in the immediate years after the war had decided that it was the time to finally assert more autonomy within the Czechoslovak state. Some politicians who led the Slovak branch of the communist party were determined to strengthen Slovaks under socialism. They told the public what they wanted to hear, especially about nationalism and their “great power” under Nazi influence.

The party also had a very smart strategy to win over citizens. They imposed on to less educated citizens in rural areas and promised them more money, support, reforms in agriculture and more. Czechoslovakia was in desperate need of rebuilding and reforming the agricultural systems, so the socialist system seemed more appealing to peasantry when they promised to tackle these issues through land redistributing and new machinery. The support of peasants was a great help to the party, since peasants were a big group in Slovakia. It helped them gain lots of votes and to some extent also take over the government.¹⁶

The Soviet Union had set an example for how to establish a one-party communist state in Eastern Europe. Leaders like Joseph Stalin demonstrated that the political takeover process could be achieved through a combination of elections and the support of the working class. The KSČ, backed by the Soviets, began to adopt these methods in Czechoslovakia. The Soviets wanted to spread their circle of influence, and Czechoslovakia was one of their main targets. Soviets provided military assistance, economic aid and ideological guidance. By the year 1947 to 1948, the communists were already a crucial part of the government, and it no longer was a party that focused on the Czechoslovak federation but instead had ideologically turned to Moscow.¹⁷

The Communist Party skilfully positioned itself as the defender of the working class and the people. They also played on the fear of a Nazi threat, positioning themselves as the only party capable of preventing fascism from returning to Czechoslovakia. This allowed them to gain popular support. They also began to sabotage other parties within the coalition that were not communist and were slowly

¹⁴ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 151.

¹⁵ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 152

¹⁶ Dunn, Keith A. “STRATEGY, the SOVIET UNION and the 1980s.” *Naval War College Review*, vol. 34, no. 5, 1981, pp. 15–31. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/44642211, <https://doi.org/10.2307/44642211>. 15 May 2025.

¹⁷ ČTK. “V Československu Po Roku 1945 Zmizlo Podnikanie.” *Hnonline.sk*, HNonline.sk, 23 Oct. 2005, hnonline.sk/finweb/ekonomika/189726-v-ceskoslovensku-po-roku-1945-zmizlo-podnikanie. 14 May 2025.

building a one-party state that was steering into totalitarianism. They completely pushed Beneš into the sidelines and created a bad reputation about himself within the people. They through skilled political maneuvering disarmed opposition.

By February 1948, the Communist Party had increased its control over the military and police. Tensions between the Communists and non-communist parties were high, especially after 1947, when the Communists had used their influence to push for Soviet-style policies such as collectivisation of agriculture. The Slovak communist party helped the final push of the communists to gain power in all of Czechoslovakia, fully supporting the Czech Communist party. President Beneš, who completely opposed the communist leadership was forced to resign on the 2. June 1948, which gave communism an opportunity to completely seize power within the Czechoslovak federation.

The parliament elected Klement Gottvald as president of the Czechoslovak federation. Shortly after, Gottvald named a completely new communist government under the leadership of Antonín Zápotocký.

1.2.3 Accepting new laws and legislative measures

Everything started in April of 1945, shortly before the official end of WW2 and the defeat of Nazi Germany. The divided Czechoslovak government accepted KVP (Košícký Vládný Program). The Košice Government Program (KVP) was a legal document that guided the legislative activity of Czechoslovakia (Czechoslovakia). It consisted of 16 chapters that dealt with various issues of social, political, economic and cultural life, and the international position of the liberated Czechoslovakia.¹⁸ The government also swore to president Beneš. The KVP concerned the renewal of state-run organs after the war and greatly focused on the reunification of Czechoslovakia. Shortly after, in May, the renewal of state organs started. During this renewal president Beneš issued presidential decrees (laws in this form) and the government issued their individual decrees.

On the 21st of June 1945, the president issued a decree to confiscate the property of Germans, Hungarians, traitors and collaborators. With this targeted confiscation of property, the long process of confiscation and expropriation began. Germans were forced to withdraw back to their own country, especially after the defeat of Germany. Other groups along Germans were discriminated against and denied the right to own property. This presidential decree had the number 12/1945 Sb.¹⁹ Later in August the Slovak National Council issued an order to completely confiscate and accelerate the division of agricultural property of these selected groups. This was order number 104/1945 Sb issued by the National Council. ²⁰ Approximately 3 million Germans were forced to withdraw from Czechoslovakia after the end of the war. ²¹

¹⁸ Vtedy, sk. "Rok 1945: Vláda Prijala Košícký Vládný Program - Fotografie - Vtedy." *Vtedy.sk*, 2016, www.vtedy.sk/kosice-kosicky-vladny-program-prijatie-1945. Accessed 24 May 2025.

¹⁹ *Dekret č. 12/1945 Sb. Dekret Prezidenta Republiky O Konfiskaci a Urychleném Rozdělení Zemědělského Majetku Němců, Maďarů, Jakož i Zrádců a Nepřátel Českého a Slovenského Národa*. 21 June 1945.

²⁰ *Nariadenie č. 104/1945 Zb. SNR Nariadenie Slovenskej Národnej Rady O Konfiškovaní a Urýchlenom Rozdelení Pôdohospodárskeho Majetku Nemcov, Maďarov, Ako Aj Zradcov a Nepriateľov Slovenského Národa*. 23 Aug. 1945.

²¹ Horel, Catherine. "Expulsion of the Germans of Czechoslovakia after the Second World War." *Encyclopédie d'Histoire Numérique de L'Europe*, 2020, ehne.fr/en/encyclopedia/themes/wars-and-memories/judging-atoning-reconciling/expulsion-germans-czechoslovakia-after-second-world-war. Accessed 28 May 2025.

During the following months, especially in October of 1945, new decrees were issued by the president about expropriation concerning banks, factories, gastronomy businesses and private insurance companies. Decrees 100/1945 Sb.²², 101/1945 Sb.²³, 102/1945 Sb.²⁴, 103/1945²⁵ Sb all concerned this subject. There were more than 3000 businesses confiscated in which 61.2% of Czechoslovakia was employed in.²⁶ It was a serious hit for property owners and relations. Czechoslovakia began to face extreme rates of unemployment, since many workers lost their jobs. This also greatly impacted the economy

In May of 1946, elections took place into the National Council.²⁷ In Slovakia, the democratic party won, but in Czechia the communist party won. Since the communists did not want any opposition, they mostly eradicated the rights of the democratic party to change anything about the state of the government. Shortly after Edvard Beneš was elected president once more

On the 29. of October 1946 the Czechoslovakian parliament accepted an act about agricultural plans, which began the process of expropriation and confiscation in agriculture. This was Act No 192/1946 Sb which came into effect 1.1. 1947.²⁸ This law was the first step direct planning and the controlling of agriculture. Czechoslovakia underwent the first steps to a communal agriculture.

On the 9. of May 1948 the process of expropriation continued, and the problem became even more twisted. The Czechoslovak Parliament accepted a new constitution, where expropriation and collectivisation were one of the main points.²⁹ This was a problem because now the confiscation of property was embedded into the constitution and landowners could do little to fight against it.

As the 5. of August 1948 came, so did new laws. The parliament accepted a new act about communal businesses and an act on Municipal Enterprises and people's administration by National Committees. Act No 199/1948 Sb³⁰ clearly stated the rules about expropriation and collectivisation in agriculture. This was one of the most radical steps taken towards the confiscation of property, and the rules were so harsh that civilians could not oppose it. On the 27. of October, the parliament created the first 5-year plan for the economy of ČSR, which was called Act No 241/1948 Sb.³¹ The main plan included expropriation in agriculture. This meant that most viticulturists and other agricultural communities would lose great portions of their property and could be punished if they refused. In January of the following year the new laws and plans came into effect. Concrete moves were enforced by National Committees.

JRD (Jednotné roľnícke družstvo) was a unified place for collected property. The Russian equivalent is Kolkhoz. They were institutions that were used for collecting property from private owners.

²² Dekrét č. 100/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Dolů a Některých Průmyslových Podniků. 24 Oct. 1945.

²³ Dekrét č. 101/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Některých Podniků Průmyslu Potravinářského. 24 Oct. 1945.

²⁴ Dekrét č. 102/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Akciových Bank. 24 Oct. 1945.

²⁵ Dekrét č. 103/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Soukromých Pojišťoven. 24 Oct. 1945.

²⁶ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 151.

²⁷ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 151.

²⁸ Zákon č. 192/1946 Sb. Zákon O Dvouletém Hospodářském Plánu. 25 Oct. 1946.

²⁹ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 153.

³⁰ Zákon č. 199/1948 Sb. Zákon O Komunálních Podnicích. 21 July 1948.

³¹ Zákon č. 241/1948 Sb. Zákon O Prvom Päťročnom Hospodárskom Pláne Rozvoja Československej Republiky (Zákon O Päťročnom Pláne). 27 Oct. 1948.

Agriculturists were forced to put their property into these cooperatives, because they would be punished and displaced if they didn't. The parliament officially created a law (69/1949 Sb)³² about JRD where new assumptions of the socialisation of rural areas were made. The collectivisation of property was very closely connected to it. JRDs and other precautions taken by the government also impacted the Lednár family.

The 9th Congress of the communist party of Czechoslovakia took place of the 29. of May 1949.³³ During this congress the politicians decided upon a need for collectivisation and expropriation. If needed, property was to be forcefully taken away with the help of the criminal code. Based on this congress and its results, there was a chain of events which even further accelerated expropriation of property. Because of the new accepted criminal code later (July 1950), National Committees gained criminal jurisdiction and power to force collectivisation and push agriculturists to enter JRD. These new rules are clearly stated in the criminal code, Act No 86/1950 Sb.³⁴ In July of 1950, the government accepted yet another act (108/1950 Sb)³⁵, which concerned state-owned businesses. By this they eradicated even more private manufacturing businesses in agriculture.

The final hit for agriculturists came with the acceptance of the law 167/1950 Sb³⁶ in December of 1950. The parliament accepted a revised legislation about communal businesses. The enforcement started on the 1. of January the following year. This act included all expropriated property into the ownership of national businesses. The complete manufacture and handling of agricultural communities was integrated into national businesses. By this, the whole process of collectivisation and expropriation ended, because all that was to be collected was collected. All agricultural ground was placed in JRDs, and other businesses were included in state-owned industries.

1.2.4 Impact of new legislature on viticulture

The first decrees, laws and government orders about the confiscation of property of Germans, Hungarians, traitors and collaborators in the years 1945-1947 did not affect SVD or the Lednár family at all. SVD was a highly neutral organisation, and it did not cooperate with the selected groups and little with the government. The family itself was not of German or Hungarian descent, and they were obedient, meaning they also were not affected whatsoever at the start of the process of collecting property. Only the later steps (expropriation of land in agriculture and creation of JRD) started to have a big, direct impact on the family and SVD. Because of these steps SVD dissolved and lost all property and the Lednár family lost most of their property and vineyards.³⁷

SVD put up a fight for their riches and land, but they unfortunately lost because of threats, charges and more complications. The government had to put lots of pressure on such a strong organisation to completely fall apart. SVD was deeply embedded into the structure of the wine market, and it was a big competitor for other organisations. SVD owned lots of property that was divided between lots of rich and major vineyard owners. The struggles of SVD began in 1949. SVD was considered a private

³² Zákon č. 69/1949 Sb. Zákon O Jednotných Poľnohospodárskych Družstvách. 23 Feb. 1949.

³³ Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997, p. 154.

³⁴ Zákon č. 86/1950 Sb. Trestný Zákon. 12 June 1950.

³⁵ Zákon č. 108/1950 Sb. Zákon, Ktorým Sa Menia a Dopĺňujú Predpisy O Znárodnení Niektorých Podnikov Potravinárskeho Priemyslu. 13 June 1950.

³⁶ Zákon č. 167/1950 Zb. Zákon O Komunálnych Podnikoch. 20 Dec. 1950.

³⁷ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

business and therefore it was forcefully integrated into the leadership of national businesses. In no time, SVD was already owned by the state and founders and members could not do much about it. During the following years, property was taken away from SVD's grasps bit by bit. During the whole year in 1950, SVD kept losing more and more property, until the organisation almost completely lost its significance. It still however, managed to exist, even when under government control.³⁸

The breaking point came in 1951, when SVD even after a great fast unfortunately lost the battle with the state. During this year, even the last of SVD's property were confiscated and under government control. The unification lost completely all their properties. In 1951, the property of SVD was taken over by Malokarpatské Vinárske Závody. Because of this the long process of expropriation and confiscation for property of SVD ended. The vineyard and land were taken into JRD, and goods such as the harvest and wine were taken by Malokarpatské Vinárske Závody.³⁹ This state was ongoing until 1990, when the restitution and return of taken property started. While the Lednár family were returned some of their property, SVD completely dissolved in 1952 and never came into function again.

⁴⁰ The property was divided between vineyard owners.

2. The Lednár Family

2.1 Martin Lednár and SVD

Martin Lednár was one of the biggest landowners in terms of viticulture in the Small Carpathian region. He was very successful and had deep social empathy. According to his granddaughter Mrs. Ľubica Lednárová, he was never corrupt and always asked the question: "What can I do for the people?" During his lifetime he helped many smaller vineyard owners while producing top-tier wine. The Lednár brand was one of the most prestigious in the wine industry.⁴¹

Mr Lednár as one of the founders of the viticultural association that was created before SVD. It aimed to stabilize the price of wine and unify Small Carpathian vineyards. This model became the main inspiration to the creation of SVD in 1936. It was a hard political situation, but after a while it got support from the ministry of agriculture. One of the main founders, Mr Štefan Čačko was the ministry's general secretary and he helped and influenced the creation of SVD.



Photo Martin Lednár

³⁸ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 138.

³⁹ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 138.

⁴⁰ 362/1952 Ú.l. VYHLÁŠKA Ministra Výkupu O Znárodnení Družstevných Podniků v Oboru Výkupu Zemědělských Výrobků a Distribuce Zemědělských Potřeb a Jejich Začlenění Do Národních Podniků Výkupních. 19 Dec. 1952.

⁴¹ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

2.2 Family during WW2

The Small Carpathian region was not as affected as other regions in Czechoslovakia, since it was not the centre of attacks. However, several bombings occurred in Rača during WW2. For instance, the Slovnaft refinery and the Rača railway station were rather popular sites of bomb attacks. Slovnaft was a major supply of gas and oil in today's Slovakia. Bomb machinery was not as developed during WW2, meaning the weaponry often did not land on its target precisely. Because of this often bombs sharded landed in Rača as well and injured some. There were only two known deaths in the Small Carpathian region due to bombing.⁴²

The Lednár and Kandl families were mostly unaffected by war, but after my interview with Ing. Alojz Kandl, I got to know that when he was about 9, he remembers a situation where he hid in an unventilated wine cellar for 3 days straight with 20 unknown people. At that time, Barónka was full of survival supplies since the families often went into hiding. According to Mr. Kandl, everyone at that time had a small piece of vineyard and a wine cellar, which was mostly used to hide in during frequent bomb attacks.⁴³



The Lednár family (Martin Lednár present on the right)

⁴² Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁴³ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

The Lednár family was extremely lucky, because they did not lose any family members due to immediate acts of war. No man from this family went to war to fight, nor did anyone die. Of course, the men led mandatory military duty, but they were never called to war. The only person who was lost during the years of WW2 was Martin Lednár himself.⁴⁴

Martin Lednár died in December of 1943. He died a very noble death, since just moments before he saved a mother with a child from the railway tracks. He ended up under the train, saving 2 lives for the penalty of his own well-being. The death of the provider of the family deeply affected the Lednár family, as well as it affected deeply the functioning of SVD (where he was president).⁴⁵

These families who were big names in viticulture during these years also felt the Holocaust. While they were not Jews themselves, they saw an exponential decrease in customers. Most of the customers who bought wine from their production were Jews, and since many were deported, the wine went to waste and the needed finances for the family were not present. Conflicts within the community broke out and still happen to this day, since the Lednár family was labelled as antisemitic. They still feel wronged by this label.⁴⁶

At first the German army arrived when the red army was pushing them back. They stayed in Rača from 1944 until the ends of the war when liberation was approaching.

2.3 Situation after WW2

There were multiple problems that the civilians had to battle after the end of WW2. For example, there was a serious shortage in electricity because of the damage to infrastructure. This shortage also affected the Kandl family, since they had electrical lights and a washing machine. They had to completely change their way of living and degrade into “old school” way of getting around. This was a problem in the whole Small Carpathian region since bomb attacks caused this.

Along with the cutoff of electricity, the railway did not function because it was frequently a target of bombing, and it was unsafe. The railroad was the main source of income for many families in Rača, since most of the people who lived there also were employed there. Almost everyone, including some family members of the Kandl and Lednár families were unemployed.⁴⁷

There were a lot of interethnic marriages at that time in Rača, since the Germans stayed there for a longer period. This became a big problem with the forced withdrawal of the Germans ordered by the government, but most times married couples were allowed to stay together. If not, they often fled to Germany together and never returned.

After the unfortunate death of Martin Lednár nearing the end of the war, vast property was divided between 6 children. The remaining children had to decide who took what fragment of Lednár property. The official hereditary proceedings happened in 1944, but the property was being divided continuously in the years immediately after the war. Most of the property fell under Vojtech's care, since he was one of the sons who were educated about agriculture. He studied at an agricultural school in Eberhart

⁴⁴ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁴⁵ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁴⁶ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁴⁷ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

(Malinovo), which was one of the most prestigious and well-ranked at the time. Therefore, he was trusted to take care of the vineyards.⁴⁸

Vojtech Lednár did not return immediately to Rača after the death of Martin Lednár, he stayed at his residence near Nitra and instead the wife of Martin Lednár took care of the lands in the years 1944 and 1945. After he returned, it was decided that Barónka should also be under Vojtech's name. Everyone who inherited a portion of the vineyards cared for their own portion and their wine cellars. This worked until 1949.⁴⁹

Martin Lednár had two wives. The first one was named Antonia Lednárová, but she tragically died many years before the war broke out. After her death Martin Lednár wed her younger sister, because chores had to be done, and the property needed care. The property was also under his second wife's care completely between the years 1944 and 1945, meaning before Vojtech's return to Rača. Vojtech sent his wife and kids ahead of him to take care of the wife and the property, while he himself returned shortly after the end of the war.⁵⁰

In the year 1947 the harvest was weaker, which led SVD to lots of losses. Everything even worsened with the communist party that was gaining influence in the government and greatly restricted the organization. When the communist party seized power in February of 1948, problems started coming for the association. The market and association started to struggle but still managed to buy wine and make profits. However, new legislative measures came into function. This greatly impacted SVD, because it blocked them from buying wine and grapes. The association lost their main function and ability to have influence on the market, and in the later years they were forced to hand in all their property and resources. SVD completely dissolved in 1953⁵¹, losing everything they worked hard on, including their enormous wine cellars and lots of buildings and property. There were some attempts to restore SVD many years later by the daughter of one former president of the organisation, Zora Čáčková. However, she had to go through lawsuits with the government, which she lost and after she got penalized heavily, she had to give up. Her attempts were unsuccessful. All these lawsuits were prior to the switch to democracy in 1989.⁵²

2.3.1 Impact of expropriation and collectivisation on the family

After the end of the war, rumours started to spread in Rača that the government will be taking away property. Noone at first believed that the state would be capable of such an act, but it ended up happening and it affected the Lednár property greatly.

The Kandl and Lednár families did not end up the worst, because they owned no factory or large business. In their case, the first thing that happened was their horses and cows were taken by the state. This was a great loss for the family since horses were used for transportation and for taking care of heavy materials that needed moving. They also faced financial difficulties since they could no longer produce their own dairy products.⁵³

⁴⁸ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁴⁹ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁵⁰ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁵¹ Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020, p. 74.

⁵² Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁵³ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

Mrs. Ľubica Lednárová shared a story with me when I interviewed her. She is the granddaughter of Martin Lednár, and she knew him personally. It shows clearly internal family disputes at times of collectivisation and expropriation. Her father-in-law was working on the property, when men from the state approached him and forced him to go talk to his father and try to persuade him to hand in property to a collectivised farm. He was threatened with being forcibly moved out or sent to a labour camp. When the man went to talk to his father, who disagreed with collectivisation, it resulted in a very serious dispute, the father threatened him. After the failure, the property was forcibly taken away and the family was forced to move to Trnava. After they were displaced, unknown people moved into their home. 2 families were placed there by the state, and therefore the family had no choice but to leave.⁵⁴ In the Kandl family, two families were moved into one of their apartments: One Hungarian and one Slovak. The Hungarians did not speak Slovak, so they could not talk with them to agree on terms, so they were again only forced to leave.⁵⁵

There were a lot of family members who were forcibly moved out, and this was unfortunately the case in many families, not just Kandl and Lednár. For example, Vojtech, who inherited most of the property after Martin Lednár's death was forcibly moved to Smolenice.

Another devastating case of the government moving new people into already inhabited residences was in the Barónka. This is the most shocking case for all, as Barónka was the largest building owned by the Lednár family at that time. 13 families were moved into each room of the Barónka. They did not know each other but had to function together.⁵⁶ The Barónka had one kitchen where food for everyone was being cooked. The Lednár family, who owned the property were responsible for providing food for all the inhabitants. The wife of Martin Lednár with her daughters all had to work to provide for 13 families. It was a nightmare for them, but they refused to give up their biggest property. „We believe the only reason we were allowed to remain in Barónka was out of respect for our grandmother “. Mrs Lednárová referred to this during our interview, and she suggested that the government only let the Lednár family stay in Barónka because they did not want to displace the wife of deceased Martin Lednár.⁵⁷ This is devastating, since fundamental human rights were broken. And if the family tried to protest in any form, they would be threatened or outright displaced to uranium mines in the Czech Republic (e.g. Jáchymov) with truly horrendous working and living conditions. People who lived in Rača at that time preferred to be neglected than to be sent to a work camp.

„Noone was satisfied. We were robbed entirely by the system“ said Mrs. Lednárová who vividly remembers this time as a child. Expropriation and collectivisation had an impact on the children as well. While they did not know what was happening, they felt the tension and rising uncertainty within the family. This was the case for Mrs. Lednárová, who could only watch as her world crumbled around her and the idea of loving, non-conflictive parents faded. She herself was sometimes in the scene when adults argued, and it had a great impact on her mental health. It was traumatising for the children to live in such an environment, and often the traits they saw in their parents passed onto them.⁵⁸

The Kandl family faced a similar problem with kids. The father of Ing. Alojz Kandl refused to hand in his property into collectivised properties, and he was threatened. State officials used manipulation and mental strain to make people agree to hand in property. Old Mr. Kandl was threatened that his children would not be accepted to any school, and that they would be taken into the ever-growing uranium

⁵⁴ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁵⁵ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁵⁶ Kandl, Alojz. *Interview - Expropriation and Collectivisation of the Lednár Property*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁵⁷ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁵⁸ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

mines in Russia. Of course, a father could not agree to such terms and sacrifice children for the sake of property, so he gave up everything with minimal compensation.⁵⁹

The government needed to rebuild and expand as fast as possible after the devastating world war. Since they did not have enough land, they had to take from the people. The land around Barónka was taken and Krasňany were built there. A railroad was built through the lands of Martin Lendár. The government first tried to buy the property from the private owners. They offered approximately 10 pennies (10 haliers) for 1 meter squared, which is such a low sum that there was no way that any landowner agreed to it. If they did not agree, the land was taken away anyway and the whole family was either displaced, moved out or sent into uranium mines.⁶⁰

Expropriation and collectivisation disrupted economic productivity, created inefficiencies, and undermined confidence in national currencies. This led to hyperinflation, devaluation, and the loss of faith in the currency, all of which contributed to the broader economic instability in many parts of the world after WW2. This also happened in Slovakia and affected the Lednár and Kandl families. It was not as serious, because they hardly ever encountered other currencies than Slovak in Rača. Slovakia and especially smaller settlements like Rača did not feel the currency problem as much, because the biggest problems were in Germany and Hungary. The borders were closed, preventing bigger circulation of foreign currencies.⁶¹

2.3.2 Years of uncertainty and missed opportunities

The Lednár family fared quite well during the years of socialism, they managed to care for what they had left well. With the few properties they had left they produced some wine for their own consumption. The dissolution of SVD had a greatly impacted the family, since it was personal for them. Martin Lednár was prior president of SVD. They despised the government, especially when SVD was one of the only living memories of their beloved family member. They were bitter when caring for their vineyards, and the mood reflected on children over the years. Mrs Lednárová was old enough to understand what was happening within the adult world, and she felt bad for her parents and relatives who greatly suffered. She felt a cloud of grief that never left the Lednár family over the years.⁶²

During socialist rule, a family relative of the Lednár family, Zora Čáčková tried to restore SVD to its former state. She was the daughter of one prior president of the association, Stefan Čáčko. She was determined to succeed and continue the legacy of her father and all the other men who worked hard to establish such a strong association. She, however, went through lots of lawsuits with the government, which were at that time impossible to win, because the totalitarian government greatly impacted the judiciary system. She lost the lawsuits and after she was greatly penalised, she had to give up and she had to let SVD lie in its grave.⁶³ Such attempts to restore the organisation were never made by anyone else again, because they were afraid of being penalised, sentenced or deported to uranium mines, which was a real threat looming over the family daily.

⁵⁹ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁶⁰ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁶¹ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

⁶² Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁶³ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

2.3.3 Restitution of lost property

The Lednár family only managed to gain back some of their property after the peaceful switch to democracy in 1989. The new democratic government immediately started to compensate and return lost property; however, it was never returned to its prior state. The Lednár bloodline managed to get back some portion of their vineyards and Barónka was again fully theirs, without the presence of 13 other families. They feel very wronged because they only got a small fraction of their property back, and they also owned some cafes and businesses that were never returned to them, even when asked.

The Lednár family, especially the older generations has strong feelings about this. They feel wronged and stolen from. They say that the state committed property theft, but lawsuits are useless because the corrupt state always wins. The family felt like this before and after the fall of the Berlin Wall. At that time, there was no use in trying to win back property in lawsuits, because the state would always win, and the family would only get penalised and laughed upon. So instead, they picked to stay quiet and lose most of their property, even to great grief of many family members.

2.4 The Lednár family today

The Lednár family only managed to regain a fraction of their property back. However, they are still taking care of their vineyards, and they are prospering. They produce a fresh batch of wine every year, still in very high quality. It is not massively sold or exported, but the wine is given out or sold to close relatives and friends. They are a small business now, but they still work hard every year to produce wine of the highest quality. Since the ends of WW2, they acquired better equipment and storage methods. Despite losing almost all their property, they still organise wine tasting every year and are flooded with positive feedback every time. They are still the owners of Barónka, where they make and store their wine until this day.⁶⁴

Most of the family lives in Rača, but they have branches in the United States as well as Denmark. The Kandl and Lednár families are still very close and meet up on numerous occasions. The family line is still prospering. Many children have been born into the family. There is always someone that cares for the vineyard and they have strong relationships within the family as well as with neighbours and surrounding vineyard owners. Ing. Alojz Kandl and Mrs. Lednárová are alive and well, taking care of their portion of property. There are some courts relating property theft, or illegal use of property.⁶⁵

The family is well, successful, happy and prospering, but the older generation still feels wronged by the actions that happened 80 years ago.

⁶⁴ Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

⁶⁵ Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the legislative measures that I described above were the source of struggle for agriculturists and businesses. Because of this new legislation, SVD had to dissolve, the property was expropriated and the Lednár family lost most of their property. There were numerous laws and presidential decrees that disadvantaged agriculturists greatly.

The process of expropriation and collectivisation of property was started by the Democratic political party. However, the communists managed to finish it and bring it to another level. During the whole time of totalitarian rule in Czechoslovakia, all businesses were communal.

The aim of my work was to draw more attention to communism in Czechoslovakia, especially from the side of expropriation and collectivisation of property. The struggles of regular civilians during these times are very often overlooked, and my mission was to highlight the struggle in Small Carpathian viticulture.

I wrote about a wide range of topics such as WW2, politics, communism, the Soviet Union and fascism. All these topics and terms were crucial to properly explain the ties of broader concepts to viticulture in the Small Carpathians. With the help of wider concepts, I managed to explain my topic and fulfil my aim quite well.

The Lednár family struggled greatly during the second half of the 20st century. First, they experienced the threat of a worldwide war, which crippled their income and winemaking. They went through the death of their most important family member and later the complete expropriation and collectivisation of property. They suffered when SVD completely fell apart, since it was a living memory of their late family member. Later they went through almost half a century of communist totalitarian rule, until the peaceful switch to democracy in 1989. Later, they only recovered a small portion of their property.

During my interview with Mr. Kandl and Mrs. Lednárová, I got a different point of view on the whole situation, and they provided insights that I would not have been able to have if I had just done research on the internet and through books. They provided their personal experiences with war and the situation that their parents tried to resolve to their best abilities. I am very thankful I got to interview them.

Sources

According to the MLA 8 format

1. Balajová, Lucia. *Úsilie Slovenských Vinohradníkov a Vinárov*. 2018. 2018
2. Bartl, Július, et al. *Lexikón Slovenských Dejín*. 1997. 1st ed., vol. 1, Sasinkova 5, Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo, 1997
3. Bratislavské, Noviny. "35. Výrobné Vinárske Spolky a Družstvá | História | Bratislavské Noviny." *Bratislavskenoviny.sk*, 14 May 2025, www.bratislavskenoviny.sk/historia/4521-35-vyrobne-vinarske-spolky-a-druzstva. Accessed 14 May 2025.
4. ČTK. "V Československu Po Roku 1945 Zmizlo Podnikanie." *Hnonline.sk*, HNonline.sk, 23 Oct. 2005, hnonline.sk/finweb/ekonomika/189726-v-ceskoslovensku-po-roku-1945-zmizlo-podnikanie. Accessed 14 May 2025.
5. Dunn, Keith A. "STRATEGY, the SOVIET UNION and the 1980s." *Naval War College Review*, vol. 34, no. 5, 1981 *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/44642211, <https://doi.org/10.2307/44642211>. Accessed 15 May 2025.
6. Franko, Michal. *Vznik a Pôsobenie Slovenského Vinohradníckeho Družstva*. 2020. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, VEDA, vydavateľstvo SAV, 2020
7. Milov, M.J. *Slovenské Vinohradnícke Družstvo*. 1946. 1st ed., vol. 1, Bratislava, Slovenská Grafia, 1946
8. Vtedy, sk. "Rok 1945: Vláda Prijala Košický Vládny Program - Fotografie - Vtedy." *Vtedy.sk*, 2016, www.vtedy.sk/kosice-kosicky-vladny-program-prijatie-1945. Accessed 14 May 2025.
9. Horel, Catherine. "Expulsion of the Germans of Czechoslovakia after the Second World War." *Encyclopédie d'Histoire Numérique de L'Europe*, 2020, ehne.fr/en/encyclopedia/themes/wars-and-memories/judging-atoning-reconciling/expulsion-germans-czechoslovakia-after-second-world-war. Accessed 28 May 2025.

Interview

11. Kandl, Alojz. *Interview - Expropriation and Collectivisation of the Lednár Property*. 14 Jan. 2025.
12. Kandl, Alojz, and Ľubica Lednárová. *Interview - Lednár Family and the History of Their Viticulture*. 14 Jan. 2025.
13. Lednárová, Ľubica. *Interview - State of the Lednár Family under Communism*. 21 Jan. 2025.

Legislation

14. Dekrét č. 12/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Konfiskaci a Urychleném Rozdělení Zemědělského Majetku Němců, Maďarů, Jakož i Zrádců a Nepřátel Českého a Slovenského Národa. 21 June 1945.
15. Dekrét č. 100/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Dolů a Některých Průmyslových Podniků. 24 Oct. 1945.
16. Dekrét č. 101/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Některých Podniků Průmyslu Potravinářského. 24 Oct. 1945.
17. Dekrét č. 102/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Akciových Bank. 24 Oct. 1945.
18. Dekrét č. 103/1945 Sb. Dekret Presidenta Republiky O Znárodnění Soukromých Pojišťoven. 24 Oct. 1945.
19. Nariadenie č.104/1945 Zb. SNR Nariadenie Slovenskej Národnej Rady O Konfiškovaní a Urýchlenom Rozdelení Pôdohospodárskeho Majetku Nemcov, Maďarov, Ako Aj Zradcov a Nepriateľov Slovenského Národa. 23 Aug. 1945.
20. Vyhláška č. 362/1952 Sb. Vyhláška Ministra Výkupu O Znárodnění Družstevních Podniků v Oboru Výkupu Zemědělských Výrobků a Distribuce Zemědělských Potřeb a Jejich Začlenění Do Národních Podniků Výkupních. 19 Dec. 1952.
21. Zákon č. 69/1949 Zb. Zákon O Jednotných Poľnohospodárskych Družstvách. 23 Feb. 1949.
22. Zákon č. 86/1950 Zb. Trestný Zákon. 12 June 1950.
23. Zákon č. 108/1950 Zb. Zákon, Ktorým Sa Menia a Dopĺňujú Predpisy O Znárodnení Niektorých Podnikov Potravinárskeho Priemyslu. 13 June 1950.
24. Zákon č. 167/1950 Zb. Zákon O Komunálnych Podnikoch. 20 Dec. 1950.
25. Zákon č. 192/1946 Sb. Zákon O Dvouletém Hospodářském Plánu. 25 Oct. 1946.
26. Zákon č. 199/1948 Sb. Zákon O Komunálních Podnicích. 21 July 1948.
27. Zákon č. 241/1948 Zb. Zákon O Prvom Päťročnom Hospodárskom Pláne Rozvoja Československej Republiky (Zákon O Päťročnom Pláne). 27 Oct. 1948.