

1. THE CASE OF COMPANY TOWNS OF THE BAŤA CONCERN

Ondřej Ševeček

1.1. INTRODUCTION

In the interwar years, the footwear industry was vigorously confronted with revolutionary changes and processes similar to those connected with Henry Ford in the automobile industry. Their major vehicle became the originally very modest enterprise of the Baťa siblings, which, during the first half of the twentieth century, grew into a gigantic concern with global reach. Today, the Baťa concern can undoubtedly be counted – and not just with respect to the forms and method of its expansion – among the textbook examples of a “modern business enterprise,” which (from the perspective of business history) was analyzed and treated in the pioneering work of Alfred D. Chandler.¹ The principles constituting large modern enterprises were applied in the environment of the Baťa concern with unprecedented thoroughness, and thus a very progressive and comprehensive business model gradually took shape there. Its substantive components included not only production, technological, and managerial elements, but (in areas reaching beyond the enterprise sphere) also social rationalization supported by a vision of a new industrial culture which seemed to be inseparably linked to a new concept of organizing human labor.

A substantive part of the concern’s program became the establishment of company towns. These were built starting in the 1930s not only in Czechoslovakia, but also in a range of other countries in Europe, the Americas, and Asia. The Baťa concern’s company towns involved very comprehensive projects, in their time representing the pinnacle of private capitalist planning. The reference model for their development became the city of Zlín; the enterprise was established here in 1894, and until the Second World War (which was a fundamental turning point for the concern’s further development) its main headquarters were located here as well. It was precisely in the space of this inconsequential rural town that a specific model of industrial organization took shape in the first three decades of the twentieth century. This model was closely linked to the construction of model “company towns,” which – like the company’s other products – were exported to a range of countries around the world. Moreover, in the second half of the 1930s, the concern’s needs relating to its accelerated expansion abroad also led to an explicit formulation of its

1 Especially in: Alfred D. Chandler, *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1962); Id., *The Visible Hand. The Managerial Revolution in American Business* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977).

own concept of the “industrial town.” Thus, among others, the concern elaborated the expansive manual *Průmyslové město* [Industrial town] (1939),² which sizes up experience garnered during the transformation of the Zlín space as well as during construction of other company towns. In this conception, the process of planning an “industrial town” is comprehensively interlinked with the development of the factory in question. Thus, it comprises construction designs as well as urban planning, and above all the given locality’s expected economic and social development (here, the planning process is bound by a range of control mechanisms, primarily of an economic nature, which introduce often even fundamental corrections during the process of realization). It is a unique record of the new approach to urban planning, and of course it also documents a significant change in the conception of the work of architects and urban planners integrated into the structure of large industrial organizations.

The case of company towns of the Baťa concern can thus be understood as an experiment (of a sort), in which many significant modernization processes of the first half of the twentieth century and their influence on the urban space and society (from the sphere of housing, to factory work, to new technologies, communication methods, and media) can be modeled. It seems that in investigating this case (and through its specifics) one can grasp and interpret many substantive aspects of the dynamics of the social, economic, and cultural processes which large industrial organizations set into motion during this period. Generally speaking, these also concern, among other things, the highly relevant relationship of the multinational enterprises then taking shape to the urban space, against the backdrop of the developing transnational economy and the changing methods of organizing production.

1.2. REFLECTING ON THE TOPIC OF PERIOD DISCUSSIONS, THEIR SECOND LIFE, AND THE CURRENT STATE OF UNDERSTANDING³

The Baťa concern and its gradually expanding business activities around the world received relatively significant attention already in the interwar years. The Baťa system (commented on and followed throughout very similarly albeit not as intensively as the activities of Henry Ford) became, thanks in part to its economic suc-

- 2 This 616-page handbook is deposited in the State District Archives in Zlín. In addition to this compendius publication, the Baťa, a.s., Zlín fonds contains a range of other documents as well as plans for industrial towns and production units. Among the most important are: Moravský zemský archiv v Brně, Státní okresní archiv ve Zlíně, Baťa, a. s., Zlín (hereinafter ČR-MZA – Brno, SOKA Zlín, Baťa), I/4, rec. no. 69, inv. no. 30, “Politická strategie v administrativním osamostatňování továrních měst – Hugo Vavrečka”; I/4, rec. no. 70, inv. no. 33, “Poznámky šéfa ke knize „Ideální průmyslové město“ ze dne 29. srpna 1939”; V, inv. no. 1–5, 11–23, 25–28, 51, “Různé podklady pro pokusné jednotky a průmyslová města”; XV, rec. no. 21, inv. no. 34, “Ideální průmyslové město budoucnosti.”
- 3 Martin Marek’s study “Stav baťovského bádání: od meziválečných publikací po současné odborné studie,” *Časopis Matice moravské* 128 (2009): 413–443 summarizes in greater detail the

cess, the subject of a range of discussions and polemical debates even in the international context. From the beginning, it managed to polarize the actors of the discussions. On the one hand, in the eyes of many of Baťa's contemporaries, it manifested period views of the ideal of modern industrial organization; on the other hand, for many of its critics (especially among the left-wing intelligentsia, the union movement, and purposefully also Baťa's competitors), it represented the embodiment of capitalist despotism. Also, the method of expansion, involving not merely the sale of Czechoslovak products on foreign markets but increasingly also the relocation of production abroad, provoked in many places tempestuous reactions and was often the target of mass campaigns of various types and aims. Moreover, these did not play out within individual states; rather, in certain moments even in Europe they led to the emergence of an anti-Baťa movement of a transnational character.⁴ Certain more scholarly works dating from the 1930s and 1940s notice the system's ambivalent effect of the lives of workers as well as companies. At the center of attention during this period were often topics concerning the social impacts of the Baťa system on industrial employees, the method of adapting employees to a new conception of work, or their integration into the environment of a rationalized industrial organization.⁵ Discussions thus often related precisely to the social frame-

current state of research and individual authors' approaches to the issue. For supplementary information, one can also consult Marek Tomašík's study "Historie zkoumání fenoménu Baťa," in *Tomáš Baťa, doba a společnost. Sborník příspěvků ze stejnojmenné zlínské konference, pořádané ve dnech 30. 11. – 1. 12. 2006*, ed. Marek Tomašík (Brno 2007), 11–18; or the relevant passages of Ondřej Ševeček's book *Zrození Baťovy průmyslové metropole. Továrna, městský prostor a společnost ve Zlíně v letech 1900–1938* (České Budějovice and Ostrava: Veduta and Ostravská univerzita, 2009), 16–24. A useful research aid for orienting oneself in the large number of publications on the topic is the ever-expanding (currently consisting of approximately one thousand items) bibliography accessible through the website www.tomasbata.com.

- 4 Anne Sudrow demonstrated this in her paper "Fighting 'Slavic Expansionism' in Western Europe: A Transnational European Movement against the Baťa Company during the Interwar Years" presented at the Company Towns of the Baťa Concern conference held in Prague on March 24–25, 2011. Campaigns waged against the Baťa concern in interwar Germany – which are very relevant in this connection due to their nature – are addressed by Eduard Kubů's study "Die Bata-Gefahr: Antibat'ovská propaganda a bojkotové akce v Německu na přelomu 20. a 30. let 20. století," in *Pocta Janu Janákovi, Předsedovi Matice moravské, profesoru Masarykovy univerzity věnují k sedmdesátinám jeho přátelé a žáci*, eds. Bronislav Chocholáč and Jiří Malíř (Brno: Maticе moravská, 2002), 527–539.
- 5 Of these period studies, one can mention e.g.: *Anketa o radu firme „Bata“*. *Jugoslavenke tvornice gume i obuće D. D. Borovo* (Zagreb: Epoha, 1936); Camilla Burstyn-Tauber, *Betriebswirtschaftliche Auswirkungen und Persönlichkeitswert der Berufsausbildung „Jünger Männer und Frauen“ in den Baťa-Werken in Zlín*. (Bern – Leipzig: Verlag Paul Haupt, 1939); Paul Devinat, *Die Arbeitsbedingungen in einem rationalisierten Betrieb. Das System Baťa und seine sozialen Auswirkungen*. (Berlin: Internationale Arbeitsamt Genf-Berlin, 1930); Hyacinthe Dubreuil, *L'exemple de Baťa. La libération des initiatives individuelles dans une entreprise géante* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1936); Hugo von Haan, *Die Arbeitsbedingungen in der rationalisierten Schuhfabrik Baťa in Borovo, Jugoslawien* (Genf: Internationales Arbeitsamt, 1938); Heinrich Huber, *Kritik der Studie des Internationalen Arbeitsamtes über das Unternehmen Baťa*. (Schaffhausen, c. 1930); Stanislav Jandík, *Železni tovaryši. Sociologická reportáž o zro-*

work of Baťa company towns as a specific way of life, which should (or could) – according to the position or worldview of whoever happened to be commenting on the issue – legitimize or repudiate this system.

The topic of Baťa enjoyed and enjoys a very interesting and intense second life in Czechoslovakia (or, since the division of Czechoslovakia in 1993, in the Czech and Slovak Republics, respectively). This is mentioned briefly mainly because the level of its elaboration in Czechoslovak (or Czech and Slovak, respectively) historiography continues to be of fundamental importance for the current state of the topic's understanding.⁶

In connection with the change in societal relations in the period after the Second World War, a current of critical literature emerged on Baťa topics. The illustrious Baťa concern and its business system became a thorn in the eye for the incoming Communist regime. Literary production drawing on so-called “Batism” – which was generally viewed during this period at one of the most refined forms of capitalist exploitation – spanned the fringes of many genres, from “political” novels (e.g. Svatopluk Turek's reworked and republished novel *Botostroj* [The shoe machine], which first came out in 1933 and led to a court case between the author and the Baťa company), to vulgar diatribes against the Baťa family (such as Svatopluk Turek's book-form pamphlet *Zrada rodiny Baťovy* [The betrayal of the Baťa family]), which were used as Communist propaganda to justify the policy of nationalization, to various pseudo-scientific writings dating from the 1950s (e.g. the publications *Batismus v kostce* [Batism in a nutshell] and *Pravá tvář batismu* [The true face of Batism] by the agile Svatopluk Turek, *Batismus – Ideologie sociálfašismu* [Batism – thee ideology of social fascism] by Bohumil Kučera, and *Batismus a baťovci* [Batism and the Baťamen] by Eva Dvořáková).⁷ The period of the 1950s also includes the first historical studies on the history of the Baťa factories from the pen of Bohumil Lehár (articles such as “Příspěvek k revolučnímu hnutí zlínského dělnictva v roce 1918” [A contribution on the revolutionary movement of the Zlín proletariat in 1918] in 1958 and “Ke stávce dělnictva Baťových závodů v dubnu 1919” [On the workers' strike at the Baťa factories in April 1919] in 1959), which culminated in 1960 with the publication of the author's monograph on the history of the Baťa concern from 1894 until 1945. Bohumil Lehár is also the author of a study tracing the company's economic expansion between 1929 and 1938 (“The Economic Ex-

zení nového věku. (Praha: Volná myšlenka, 1938); Albrecht Miesbach, *Die Baťa-Werke: ihre Entstehung und Grundsätze*. (Zlín: Tisk, 1945); Heinz Silbermann, *Aufbau und Arbeitsbedingungen der Schuhfabrik Baťa in Zlín (Tschechoslowakei), sowie die Stellung ihrer Filialleiter nach deutschen Recht*. (Engelsdorf – Leipzig: C. u. E. Vogel, 1934).

6 This is due in particular to the language barrier, among other things. The key documents and relevant literature on the enterprise's development are in Czech, which thus far has posed a significant obstacle to systematic research by foreign scholars.

7 Svatopluk Turek, *Botostroj* (Praha: Svoboda, 1946); Id., *Zrada rodiny Baťovy*. (Gottwaldov: Svít-Tisk, 1949); Id., *Batismus v kostce*. (Gottwaldov: Tisk, 1950); Id., *Pravá tvář batismu*. (Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury, 1959); Bohumil Kučera, *Batismus – ideologie sociálfašismu* (Gottwaldov: Krajské nakladatelství, 1959); Eva Dvořáková, *Batismus a baťovci* (Gottwaldov: Krajské nakladatelství, 1960).

pansion of the Baťa Concern in Czechoslovakia and Abroad, 1929–1938”), which was published in 1963.⁸ Not only in the selection of topics, but also in the historical-materialistic methodology and the overall approach, these studies by Lehár manifested a conception symptomatic of the so-called “history of factories,”⁹ which begins to establish itself in the mid-1950s according to the Soviet model in many Eastern Bloc countries. In this context, it must be mentioned that certain other formerly Baťa (prior to nationalization) companies in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia also saw their history elaborated before the fall of the iron curtain. Of these expositions, however, only the 1971 book *Borovo. Jugoslavenski kombinat gume i obuće*, on the development of the concern’s extraordinarily successful Yugoslav company, approaches Lehár’s abovementioned monograph with respect to the level of its elaboration.¹⁰

After the cannons had silenced in the reality of Normalization¹¹ during the 1970s and 1980s, the topic of Baťa became less interesting in a certain sense, and none of Czechoslovakia’s renowned historians ventured into the highly politicized arena of the Baťa concern’s history. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that the topic never completely disappeared from public or scholarly debates. It surfaced in

- 8 Bohumil Lehár, “Příspěvek k revolučnímu hnutí zlínského dělnictva v roce 1918,” in *Zprávy Krajského vlastivědného ústavu v Gottwaldově*, no. 3–4 (1958): 45–54; Id., “Ke stávkě dělnictva Baťových závodů v dubnu 1919,” in *Zprávy Krajského vlastivědného ústavu v Gottwaldově*, no. 1 (1959): 1–11; Id., *Dějiny Baťova koncernu (1894–1945)* (Praha: Státní nakladatelství politické literatury, 1960); Id., “The Economic Expansion of the Baťa Concern in Czechoslovakia and Abroad, 1929–1938,” *Historica* 5 (1963): 147–188.
- 9 With respect to content, the “history of factories” is basically limited to the history of the workforce (it was even supposed to be written, according to the thesis of writer Maxim Gorky, by the workers themselves with the help of historians). It thus accentuated the social position of the workforce, its political activity, and its role in the social struggle. It also emphasized the function of the Communist Party in organizing class struggles at the factory. On the other hand, it neglected e.g. the personalities of the industrialists, the role of technological development, etc. Despite the fact that Bohumil Lehár’s works bear the substantive characteristics of this ideologically narrowed view of history, his monograph on the history of the Baťa concern is one of only a few works of its time which attempts, within the limits of the possible, to approach the standards of Western European and American historiography of that time. For more on the overall context of the study of business history in Czechoslovakia during this period, see Milan Myška, *Problémy a metody hospodářských dějin. Část 1: Metodické problémy studia dějin sekundárního sektoru* (Ostrava: FF OU, 1995), 136–139.
- 10 Kemal Hrelja and Martin Kaminski, *Borovo. Jugoslavenski kombinat gume i obuće*. (Slavonski Brod: Historijski institut Slavonije, 1971). Among the other publications, which for today’s needs are difficult to use, one could mention e.g. these: for Hungary, Hegedus Kálmán, *Tisza Cipőgyár Martfű* (Szolnok 1974); for Slovakia, Autorský kolektív, *120 rokov garbiarstva v Bošanoch*. (Bošany 1977); for Poland (respectively, Germany, until 1945), Władysław Piechota, ed., *Historyczny zarys powstania i rozwoju Śląskich Zakładów Przemysłu Skórzanego Otmęt w Krapkowicach* (Krapkowitz, 1984).
- 11 In the Czech context, the term “Normalization” in the broader sense is understood as the period following the invasion of Czechoslovakia by Warsaw Pact forces in August 1968 until the fall of Communism at the close of 1989 (i.e. the period of violent suppression of the democratization process initiated by the so-called Prague Spring, and from this point of view of the consolidation – or normalization – of conditions modeled after the Communist regime in the Soviet Union).

particular in discussions on issues and problems of the planned economy and the management of socialist enterprises – e.g. in the second half of the 1980s during the period of perestroika. The fall of the iron curtain and the subsequent transition to a market economy meant a fundamental renaissance for Baťa as a research topic in Czechoslovakia, and thus the number of items in the Baťa bibliography has grown significantly over the past two decades. Unfortunately, however, upon critical scrutiny of the scholarly quality and contribution of these numerous publications, it must be stated that only very few of them truly advance the level of current understanding or relate in a relevant manner to the results of foreign research in one of the substantive areas for the given issue. A distinctive feature of a range of new publications which have emerged in the Czech environment during the last two decades is that they have the character of opinion journalism or border on the genre of literary nonfiction.¹² They thus accommodate the elevated public interest in a previously suppressed set of issues. Moreover, they often take a near-mythological approach to the concern's history and to the personalities of its founders. It is significant for the overall context that the meta-narrative created after the fall of Communism around this national entrepreneurial icon has not yet been corrected by a relevant treatment of the Baťa concern's history – i.e. through systematic elaboration which would meet the standards of contemporary historiography.

The most attention during the last two decades has evidently been devoted to the study of Baťa architecture and urbanism. This perspective has been accentuated at several international conferences¹³ and exhibition projects.¹⁴ On the topic of Baťa architecture, there exists, among others, an extensive monograph by Pavel Novák

- 12 For example: Miroslav Ivanov, *Sága o životě a smrti Jana Bati a jeho bratra Tomáše* (Vizovice: Lípa, 1998); Jaroslav Pospíšil, *Světla a stíny v životě Baťova ředitele Ing. Františka Maloty* (Zlín: Kniha Zlín, 2011); Pavel Hajný, *Marie Baťová, první dáma Zlína* (Zlín: Nadace Tomáše Bati, 2010).
- 13 Publications from international conferences: *Zlínský funkcionalismus – Funktionalismus von Zlín: sborník příspěvků sympózia pořádaného u příležitosti 100. výročí narození Františka Lydie Gahury a 90. narozenin Vladimíra Karfíka* (Zlín: Státní galerie ve Zlíně, 1991); *Kulturní fenomén funkcionalismu: sborník příspěvků konference – The cultural phenomenon of functionalism: the conference proceedings*. (Zlín: Státní galerie, 1995); Katrin Klingan and Kerstin Gust, eds., *A Utopia of Modernity – Zlín: revisiting Baťa's functional city*. (Berlin: Jovis Verlag, 2009).
- 14 They include in particular the following catalogs and publications accompanying exhibitions: Vladimír Šlapeta, *Baťa: architektura a urbanismus 1910–1950* (Zlín: Státní galerie ve Zlíně, 1991); *Die Bata-Kolonie in Mählin* (Basel: Architekturmuseum in Basel, 1992); Rostislav Švácha, ed., *Miroslav Lorenc, Jaromír Krejcar: zlínská moderní architektura a pražská avantgarda*. (Zlín: Státní galerie, 1995); Ludvík Ševeček and Ladislava Horňáková, *Satelity funkcionalistického Zlína: projekty a realizace ideálních průmyslových měst – továrních celků firmy Baťa / Satellites of the functionalist Zlín: projects and construction of ideal industrial towns – Baťa company's factory complexes and residential quarters* (Zlín: Státní galerie, 1998); *Zlín 1900–1950: une ville industrielle modèle – model industriálního města* (Creusot – Montceau: Ecomusée du Creusot-Montceau, 2002); *Partizánske: réinventer la ville fonctionnelle – znovobjavenie funkčného mesta* (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Spolku architektov Slovenska, 2005); Ladislava Horňáková, *František Lýdie Gahura 1891–1958: projekty, realizace a sochařské dílo* (Zlín: Krajská galerie výtvarného umění, 2006); Ladislava Horňáková, ed., *The Baťa phe-*

entitled *Zlínská architektura 1900–1950* [Zlín architecture 1900–1950],¹⁵ the contribution of which can be seen rather in its documentary value (in the organization and publication of period photographs and blueprints), however, rather than in the area of the author’s treatment of the topic or its interpretation. For partial studies of Zlín urbanism and architecture, it is important that their conclusions can be confronted with expositions which place certain aspects of the topic in a qualified manner into the general framework of the development of modern architecture – and not only in the Central European context (such as in the 1998 Czech synthesis *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění (IV/1) 1890/1938* [History of Czech fine arts (IV/1) 1890–1938]), but in the global context as well (Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History*, 2004).¹⁶ It is certainly significant that Baťa Zlín was conceived by a leading theoretician of modern architecture, Jean-Louis Cohen, in the concept of an exhibition tracing American influences in European architecture between 1893 and 1960. The exhibition was accompanied by a voluminous publication bearing the name *Scenes of the World to Come: European Architecture and the American Challenge 1893–1960* (1995). The Zlín topic was also treated in an interesting context in the synthetic work *Factory* by British opinion journalist and historian Gillian Darley which came out in London in 2003. The book, which addresses the architecture of factory buildings and approaches to their construction in the broader context from the first examples in the early industrialization period to the present day, describes Baťa Zlín as a noteworthy case of the development of a modern model of a factory, and places it alongside such colossal works of the modern industrial era as the Highland Park Ford Plant in Detroit and the Fiat Lingotto factory in Turin, Italy. British historian Helen Meller also devotes a chapter to Zlín in her book on European cities between 1890 and 1930 *European cities 1890–1930s: history, culture, and the built environment* (2001). In the book – which approaches the material from the perspective of Planning History – the town is treated as a quite extraordinary example of a modern repercussion of the garden cities movement.¹⁷

Even in this area, however, a range of “blank spots” and research challenges can be found. In addition to a multitude of unaddressed topics of a component nature (such as the designs of certain architects working for the Baťa concern, and the architecture and urbanism of certain localities, etc.), these concern first and foremost the absence of a systematic and comprehensive view of Baťa architecture and urbanism – a view which would be able to cope with the aesthetics as well as building and technical aspects of the given issue on the one hand, but would also include

nomenon: *Zlín architecture 1910–1960* (Zlín: Regional Gallery of Fine Arts in Zlín, 2009); Winfried Nerdinger, Ladislava Hornáková, and Radomíra Sedláková, eds., *Zlín: Modellstadt der Moderne* (Berlin: Jovis Verlag, 2009).

15 Pavel Novák, *Zlínská architektura 1. 1900–1950* (Zlín: Pozimos, 2008).

16 *Dějiny českého výtvarného umění (IV/1) 1890/1938* (Praha: Academia, 1998); Kenneth Frampton, *Moderní architektura: kritické dějiny* (Praha: Academia, 2004).

17 Jean Louis Cohen, *Scenes of the World to Come: European Architecture and the American Challenge 1893–1960* (Montreal: 1995); Gillian Darley, *Factory* (London: Reaktion Books, 2003); Helen Meller, *European cities 1890–1930s: history, culture, and the built environment* (Chichester: John Wiley, 2001).

the broader contexts of the concern's program in its substantive technological, economic, and social coordinates on the other. It seems that to meet such a challenge would necessarily mean attempting to reinterpret research results in this area in at least a few historical disciplines and specializations.

In recent years, there has been increased interest in studying the Baťa factory localities abroad as well. Investigations of these entities are stimulated by current questions relating to the issue of monument preservation and protection of industrial heritage, among other things.¹⁸ In many countries, these localities are under monument conservation, or such protection is under consideration. In the context of discussions on the possibility of contemporary use of the Baťa concern's standardized residential units, of interest is the sociological research of Barbora Vacková and Lucie Galčanová, which they conducted in Zlín's residential districts.¹⁹

A very inspirational perspective on the problem is offered by Annett Steinführer's paper "Stadt und Utopie. Das Experiment Zlín 1920–1938" (2002), which, using the example of Zlín, attempts to interpret the Baťa concern's settlement program in the context of the history of utopian thought. After conducting an analysis which the author was forced to perform due to the lack of studies which would have enabled her to anchor her theses empirically in the urban social reality, it is rather through theoretical reflection on the phenomenon that she conceives Zlín as a "social" experiment which emerged during a period when the intellectual climate was strongly affected by collectivist ideologies of various provenience. A particularly important role in its composition is played by the fact that it emerged in a place where societal influences (i.e. strong representation of various interest groups, urbanity as the embodiment of typically urban opportunities of choice, a critical public, etc.) usually functioning as a corrective (an agent equilibrating the extremes) lacked a tradition, and where the forceful jump to modernization together with the Baťa company's activities resulted in pressure to accommodate as well as increasing collective prosperity. For Steinführer, Zlín is thus something more than just a town, but at the same time also something less. It was initially an unintended – and later intentionally planned – attempt to realize the vision of one man in economic, social, and political respects, as well as with regard to the planning and building of the town.²⁰ Among the more recent works which can be mentioned in this context is, for example, Henrieta Moravčíková's paper "Social and Architectural Phenomenon of the Batism in Slovakia. (The example of the community Šimonovany –

18 Of the range of such documents, one can mention, for example, these: *Analýza a vyhodnocení vybraných částí městské památkové zóny Zlín* (Zlín: Odbor strategického rozvoje, Útvar hlavního architekta města Zlína, 2001); Anna Hudecová and Mária Dvončová, *Funkcionalistický urbanisticko – architektonický celok. Územie Baťovej architektúry v meste Partizánske. Návrh na vyhlásenie za pamätihodnosť mesta* (Partizánske: 2004); Joanna Smith, *East Tilbury, Essex. Historic Area Appraisal. Research Department Report Series no. 21* (2007).

19 Barbora Vacková and Lucie Galčanová, "The Project Zlín. Everyday Life in a Materialized Utopia," *Lidé města/Urban People* 11, no. 2 (2009), URL: <http://lidemesta.cz/index.php?id=605>.

20 Annett Steinführer, "Stadt und Utopie. Das Experiment Zlín 1920–1938," *Bohemia* 43/1 (2002): 33–73.

Baťovany – Partizánske),” published in 2004, which is devoted to urbanism, architecture and the social environment of the Slovak company town of Baťovany (now Partizánske). The same locality is also the subject of Slovak architectural historian Mária Topolčanská’s 2005 paper “Consistency of Serial City: Batovany (Slovakia) designed by Architects of Bata Co.”²¹ French syndicalist and historian Alain Gatti, in his voluminous book *Chausser Les Hommes Qui Vont Pieds Nus. Bata-Hellocourt, 1931–2001* (2004), sizes up the Baťa system with the example of the Lorraine company town Hellocourt, which the concern operated in France for exactly seventy years.²²

Various aspects of the Baťa concern’s international expansion have also been addressed recently in several historically-focused works. An eminent position among them is occupied by the extensive monograph *Der Schuh im Nationalsozialismus. Eine Produktgeschichte im deutsch-britisch-amerikanischen Vergleich* (2010) by German historian Anne Sudrow, which addressed the history of footwear (production as well as consumption) during the era of National Socialism in broad contexts and comparative perspective. This book is not only important because it explicitly treats the development of the Baťa concern in several passages and in substantive contexts, but also (and in particular) because it is the first work to systematically capture many substantive processes forming the footwear sector in the first half of the twentieth century.²³ A significant and hitherto unelaborated chapter in the concern’s history is the subject of Tobias Ehrenbold’s book *Bata. Schuhe für die Welt, Geschichten aus der Schweiz* (2012). In it, the author traces the concern’s activities in Switzerland, although contexts narrowly transcending the scope of Switzerland and in many regards determinative for the development of the concern as a whole do not escape his attention either.²⁴ An interesting context of the company’s expansion into France is the paper “La «famille» du cuir contre Bata: malthusianisme, corporatisme, xénophobie et antisémitisme dans le monde de la chaussure en France, 1930–1950” (2005) by French historian Florent Le Bot, which addresses the reactions of the French environment to the Baťa concern’s penetration onto local markets during the unsettled period impacted by the Second World War.²⁵

Among the most recent production of Czech historiography, it is necessary to mention works by three authors who have contributed to the understanding of the

21 Henrieta Moravčíková, “Social and Architectural Phenomenon of the Bataism in Slovakia. (The example of the community Šimonovany – Baťovany – Partizánske),” *Sociológia. Slovak sociological review* 36, no. 6 (2004): 519–543; Mária Topolčanská, “Consistency of Serial City: Batovany (Slovakia) designed by Architects of Bata Co.,” *DC. Revista de crítica arquitectonica*, núm. 13–14 (2005): 182–191.

22 Alain Gatti, *Chausser les hommes qui vont pieds nus : Bata-Hellocourt, 1931–2001: Enquete sur la memoire industrielle et sociale* (Metz: Serpenoise, 2004).

23 Anne Sudrow, *Der Schuh im Nationalsozialismus. Eine Produktgeschichte im deutsch-britisch-amerikanischen Vergleich*. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2010).

24 Tobias Ehrenbold, *Bata. Schuhe für die Welt, Geschichten aus der Schweiz*. (Baden: hier + jetzt, 2012).

25 Florent Le Bot, “La « famille » du cuir contre Bata: malthusianisme, corporatisme, xénophobie et antisémitisme dans le monde de la chaussure en France, 1930–1950,” *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 52–4 octobre-décembre (2005): 131–152.