



Names of large ships as a reflection of the ideological and political differences between the Union of Soviet socialist republics and Polish people's republic

© Pavel A. Novikov^a, Mikhail L. Rybalko^b, Jan Wisniewski^c, Vladislav N. Vorontsov^d

^a Irkutsk National Research Technical University, Irkutsk, Russia

^b Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, Russia

^c Nicolaus Copernicus University, Torun, Poland

^d Irkutsk State Transport University, Irkutsk, Russia

Abstract: The history of the “Soviet bloc” – a significant side of the XX century history. The Bolshevik slogan about the right of nations to self-determination found a response among different peoples who were politically and economically dependent on the “great” powers. In an attempt to implement the idea of a world revolution, the Bolsheviks supported international communist organizations. Relations between Russia and Poland have always been characterized by tension and complexity. Quotes is interesting to us as an example of rhetoric, argumentation, and an illustration of the declared worldview. The apotheosis of Soviet rhetoric – “the process of socialist restructuring of agriculture in Poland takes place in conditions of acute class struggle”. The theme of continuity in the navy development draws the attention of professional historians, popularizers of military-technical problems, authors of historical and journalistic books, novelists in the genre of alternative history. The names of ships and vessels are closely connected with the life of society, represent the state, foster patriotism and national pride. We are interested in the etymology of their names, which clearly reflected the significant turn in the policy and ideology of the USSR in the autumn of 1941. The 68-bis cruisers became the largest series of cruisers in the history of the Russian-Soviet navy. Of the 21 known names, only five belong to prominent Communist Party leaders, also deceased, with two names coming from the unbuilt ships of the previous series. The other names are two monarchs of the past, two national heroes, two land commanders, five admirals – all of pre-revolutionary, pre-Soviet Russia. Three seaside towns were used. In the USSR, it would be unthinkable to name ships in honor of the monarchs of the past. In Poland, the Szczecin Shipyard named built a “royal” series of bulk cargo ships. An interesting page of Polish shipbuilding was the construction of 107 medium-sized and 28 large landing ships for the socialist countries fleets, as well as India, Algeria, Egypt, and Syria.

Keywords: “Socialist camp”, history, ships, ideology, politics, names, fleet, differences, USSR, Poland, XX century

For citation: Novikov P.A., Rybalko M.L., Wisniewski J., Vorontsov V.N. (2021) Names of large ships as a reflection of the ideological and political differences between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Polish People's Republic. *Izvestiya Laboratorii drevnikh tekhnologii = Reports of the Laboratory of Ancient Technologies*. Vol. 17. No. 2. P. 219–227. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.21285/2415-8739-2021-2-219-227>

Названия крупных кораблей как отражение идейно-политических отличий Союза Советских Социалистических Республик и Польской Народной Республики

© П.А. Новиков^a, М.Л. Рыбалко^b, Я. Висьневски^c, В.Н. Воронцов^d

^a Иркутский национальный исследовательский технический университет, г. Иркутск, Россия

^b Иркутский государственный университет, г. Иркутск, Россия

^c Университет Николая Коперника, Торунь, Польша

^d Иркутский государственный университет путей сообщения, г. Иркутск, Россия

Аннотация: История «советского блока» – значимая сторона истории XX века. Большевики пришли к власти под лозунгами интернационализма, мировой революции, солидарности рабочего класса. Лозунг большевиков о праве наций на самоопределение нашел отклик среди разных народов, находящихся в политической и экономической зависимости от «великих» держав. Пытаясь воплотить в жизнь идею мировой революции, большевики поддерживали интернацио-

нальные коммунистические организации. Отношения России и Польши всегда отличались напряженностью и сложностью. Приводятся цитаты, как пример риторики, аргументации, иллюстрация декларируемого мировоззрения. Апофеоз советской риторики – «процесс социалистической перестройки сельского хозяйства в Польше проходит в условиях острой классовой борьбы». Тема преемственности в развитии военно-морского флота привлекает внимание профессиональных историков, популяризаторов военно-технических проблем, авторов историко-публицистических книг, романов жанра альтернативной истории и т. д. Названия кораблей и судов тесно связаны с жизнью общества, представляют государство, воспитывают патриотизм и национальную гордость. Нас в данном случае интересует этимология их названий, ярко отразившая резкий поворот в политике и идеологии СССР, осуществленный осенью 1941 г. Например, крейсера проекта 68-бис – крупнейшая серия в истории флота России – СССР. Из 21 названия только пять принадлежат видным умершим руководителям коммунистической партии. В остальных наименованиях – два монарха прошлого, два национальных героя, два сухопутных военачальника, пять адмиралов – все дореволюционной, досоветской России, а также три приморских города. В СССР была бы немыслима практика названия кораблей в честь монархов прошлого. В Польше же на Щецинской судовой верфи построили «королевскую» серию сухогрузных судов. Интересной страницей польского кораблестроения стало строительство 107 средних и 28 больших десантных кораблей для флотов социалистических стран, а также Индии, Алжира, Египта, Сирии.

Ключевые слова: «Социалистический лагерь», история, корабли, идеология, политика, названия, флот, различия, СССР, Польша, XX век

Для цитирования: Новиков П.А., Рыбалко М.Л., Висьневски Я., Воронцов В.Н. Названия крупных кораблей как отражение идейно-политических отличий Союза Советских Социалистических Республик и Польской Народной Республики // *Известия Лаборатории древних технологий*. 2021. Т. 17. № 2. С. 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.21285/2415-8739-2021-2-219-227>

The history of the Socialist camp, the “Soviet bloc”, the “Eastern bloc” – a significant side of the XX century history. In the autumn of 1917, the events occurred in Russia that influenced the course of world history. The Bolsheviks came to power under the slogans of internationalism, world revolution, and working-class solidarity. This key attitude remained until the collapse of the USSR in 1991.

The Bolshevik slogan about the right of nations to self-determination found a response among different peoples who were politically and economically dependent on the “great” powers. In an attempt to implement the idea of a world revolution, the Bolsheviks supported international communist organizations. Thus, on November 22, 1919, the All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East (Orient) was opened in Moscow, and in May – June 1920, the Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East was held. Under the Siberian Bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), a department of national minorities was created with the task was to unite all groups of foreign communists in Siberia. In the summer of 1920, the Korean section of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was formed, subordinate to the Eastern Section of

the Siberian Bureau. In early 1921, the Eastern Bureau of the Communist International (Comintern) was established in Irkutsk. The Comintern was dissolved in 1943. In the fall of 1947, the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties, the Cominformburo, was established to coordinate the activities of the communist parties on an international scale.

The victory of the USSR in the Second World War cost enormous efforts, great human and material losses. The national economy needed to be restored. Therefore, the Soviet leadership sought to avoid a direct military conflict with the capitalist camp led by the United States. The military (“power”) scenario of the world communist revolution in 1945–1946 turned out to be even less likely and expedient than in 1919–1920. However, the possibility of offensive combat operations continued to be the subject of fundamental discussions, both in general Marxist theory and in the development of current state decisions.

Since 1945, the USSR's foreign policy has remained dualistic. On the one hand, the party and state leadership pursued a policy of spreading communist ideas in the world, expanding and strengthening the zone of socialism, and supporting revolutionary and national liberation movements. On the other hand, it

also sought to protect the international interests of its state, to preserve peace.

According to modern Russian historiography, the condemnation of the cult of personality of I.V. Stalin led to a split and crisis of the world communist movement. The Chinese Communists opposed the criticism of Stalin's ideological legacy, and the Chinese Communist Party began to claim the role of the leader of the world communist movement. It was supported by the Communist parties of Albania, Indonesia, North Korea and a number of other countries. An independent position was taken by the Communists of Yugoslavia, Italy and some other countries. In 1956, the Cominformburo was liquidated. In order to overcome the crisis, the Soviet Communists called three international meetings in Moscow (1957, 1960, and 1969), but they failed to restore unity.

The countries that followed the socialist model in the USSR were called the "Socialist camp" or the "Socialist commonwealth". In the United States, they were also called "Communist", contrasting their own democratic model. At various times, socialist affiliation was declared by states located on different continents: in Africa – the Democratic Republic of Somalia, the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of the Congo, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the People's Republic of Benin, the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; in Asia – the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Laos Democratic Republic; in South America – the Republic of Cuba and the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada; in Europe – the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, the Polish People's Republic; Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria, Socialist Republic of Romania, Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

There could be very tense or even hostile relations between the countries of the Socialist camp. For example, there was the political confrontation of the USSR with Yugoslavia, Albania, and China. From the general

context, we will go directly to the subject of the article. Relations between Russia and Poland have always been characterized by tension and complexity (Lyubavskii, 2018; Kakurin, Melikov, 2002; Valetskii et al., 1931; Korotkova, 2019).

The names of ships and vessels are closely connected with the life of society, represent the state, foster patriotism and national pride. Yu.S. Kryuchkov justified the expediency of allocating an auxiliary historical discipline – "caronomics" (from the Greek "karabos" – ship and "onoma" – name). By the end of the USSR's existence, the catalog of marine bulk cargo ships contained about 1,350 ship names, and in total, the books of the USSR Register contained several thousand ship names (Kryuchkov, 1989. P. 3–4).

The theme of continuity in the navy development draws the attention of professional historians (Diskant, 2002; Naumov, Wisniewski, 2021), popularizers of military-technical problems (Shirokorad, 2004), authors of historical and journalistic books (Kalashnikov, 1999), novelists in the genre of alternative history (Batyrsin, 2019), etc. Such contemporary interest is proof of the great scientific and public relevance and importance of naval policy issues. The comparison with the literature of the "Socialist" period (Hero Ships, 1970; Basov, 1985) allows us to see the transformation of the approaches of publishers and authors, to trace the change in rhetoric.

A small example of a Soviet text: On the morning of July 8, 1790, the Turkish fleet consisting of 10 ships, 8 frigates and 36 small vessels approached the Kerch Strait to bombard the Crimean coast and land troops. Ushakov's squadron was anchored in the strait. Ushakov held the flag on the 80-gun battleship "*Christmas of Christ*" (and such names were then in the Russian Navy) (Hero Ships, 1970. P. 30). Thus, even in the military text, an atheistic contempt for religion is written.

In the development of the ship names of the Russian navy, he identified seven periods: 1696–1709 – the dominance of unsteady, random names. 1709–1725 – Peter I created the first Russian system of nominating navy ships based on heroic and patriotic principles. 1725–1860 – the development of the sailing fleet based on Peter I approaches. 1860–1880 – the transition to the steam and armored navy with a departure from the

heroic and patriotic grounds in favor of the Russian-epic nomination, previously unused in the fleet. 1880–1910 – the development of the ironclad and destroyer fleet with the revival of the Peter the Great nomination system and the first attempt to democratize the names. 1910–1917 – the continuation of the previous course. Since 1917, there were the mass renaming of ships, the abolition of monarchical-dynastic names, the creation of the Soviet system... (Kryuchkov, 1989. P. 151–152).

Let us focus on the pre-revolutionary period in more detail: In the Russian Imperial Navy, at the end of the Russian-Japanese war, the following system of choosing names for warships under construction was in effect: The Main Naval Staff presented a list of proposed names for the tsar to choose from. For example, before the laying of the first four Russian dreadnoughts, in May 1909, the following seven variants were presented: “*Prince Suvorov*”, “*Borodino*”, “*Petropavlovsk*”, “*Sevastopol*”, “*Navarin*”, “*Sisoy the Great*” and “*Oslabya*”. Russian battleships, which were lost in the battles of the Russian-Japanese War, were all named after each other, and they showed a clear continuity in the names of the largest warships. However, Emperor Nicholas II selected only “*Petropavlovsk*” and “*Sevastopol*” from the proposed list. The third dreadnought was ordered by the tsar to be called “*Poltava*”, although the squadron battleship with this name was sunk by the Japanese in November 1904 in Port Arthur, was then raised in July 1905 and included in the Japanese navy under the name “*Tango*”. The probable motive for the tsarist decision is the approach of the 200th anniversary of the Poltava victory of Peter I over the Swedish army, which prompted us to forget the fact that the enemy used the battleship with this name (Vinogradov, 1999. P. 393). The first major naval victory of the Russian fleet at Cape Gangut became the name of the fourth Baltic dreadnought. The laying of all four ships took place on June 3 (16), 1909.

Let us use the mention of the Japanese navy to make an important comparison. In the Russian Empire during the XVIII–XX centuries, the names of ships were repeated. Russian cruisers of the Russian-Japanese War period, in particular, almost completely reproduced the names of Russian frigates and clippers of the 1860s and 1880s (Kataev, 2009. P. 12). That was quite a symbolic

explanation of the pro-Japanese and anti-Russian position of the British Empire.

Large Japanese warships of the late XIX – first half of the XX century, on the contrary, had mostly single, unique names mainly in honor of geographical objects – mountains, rivers, provinces. Suggested names (usually two variants per ship) they were also submitted to the Emperor for consideration. After the emperor approved the list as a whole, it was passed to the Minister of the Navy, which already made the final choice of one of the two names. Emperor Meiji did not limit himself to simply sizing up the lists presented to him, but repeatedly chose the most suitable option himself. Since 1921, the monarch determined the names of only battleships and cruisers, the names of the ships of the other classes were given by the minister, who then reported to the emperor. The Japanese navy is also unique in that when choosing a name, more importance was attached to the melodic sound of the name than in other countries.

After the “Kronshtadsky mutiny”, the authorities' priority was given to the indoctrination of sailors. “Tainted” by the participation in the uprising, the names of the battleships were decided to be replaced with new, “revolutionary” ones. On March 31, 1921, at a general meeting of sailors, the *Sevastopol* was renamed the *Paris Commune*, and the *Petropavlovsk* was renamed the *Marat*. The naming of *Marat* looks very strange. There is a theory that the French navy had a ship named after the murder of Marat aristocrat Charlotte Corday, and the sailors gave their battleship a new name as an indignant response. However, there was never the *Corde* ship! According to S. Balakin, the “Paris bias” is caused by the desire to “annoy” the French, primarily associated with whom the support for the counterrevolutionary forces – Wrangel and the Poles. Thus, the flagship battleship of the Red Baltic Fleet was named in honor of the figure of the French bourgeois revolution, and the names “*Lenin*”, “*Karl Marx*” and “*Engels*”, went only to the destroyers (Balakin, 1995).

In November 1922, V.I. Lenin wrote to I.V. Stalin: “I think that the fleet in its present size, although it is a small fleet, according to the fair remark of Comrade Sklyansky, is still an exorbitant luxury for us. The *Nakhimov* cruiser needs to be completed, because we will sell it at a profit, but otherwise I am convinced that

our naval specialists are still carried away excessively. We don't need the navy, and we need an increase in spending on schools absolutely." It is noteworthy that in 1922, the "founder of the Soviet state" named the navy forces as a "flotilla" consisting of 4 dreadnoughts and 9 battleships, unfinished, but launched 4 super-dreadnoughts and one dreadnought, one dreadnought and two battleships to be recovered after sinking, 2 deprecated battleships, a total of 23 battleships, despite the fact that the USSR by 1941 had retained only three battleships, without completing any and not building any independently.

As long as the USSR and its Navy existed, the actual materials about the ships were classified. It was only with the collapse of the USSR that reference publications appeared that made it possible to form an idea of the ship's composition in general, and the complete system of names in particular. Referring to the publication of S.S. Berezhnoi (Berezhnoi, 1995), you can get a basic idea of the names of large surface ships of the Soviet navy that entered service after 1945.

Even before the beginning of the Second World War, the construction of 17 (according to other sources, 26) type 68 cruisers was planned, of which from August 1939 to January 1941 only 7 were laid (started construction): "Zheleznyakov", "Kuibyshev", "Chapaev", "Valery Chkalov" (when "Chkalov" entered service), "Frunze", "Ordzhonikidze", "Sverdlov". The last two were never launched, and in August 1941 were blown up on the slipways in Nikolaev when it was captured by the Germans. The remaining five were completed after the Great Patriotic War according to the revised project 68-K, entering service in 1950. In the names of all the cruisers, we see the glorification of four prominent Bolsheviks-figures of the Soviet state, two heroes of the Civil War and the most famous Soviet pilot. It is characteristic that all those named were no longer alive, and the series of cruisers can be considered a memorial. The ships served until 1963–1979, and the "Chkalov" became a training ship in 1958 and was renamed the "Komsomolets".

The development of the project 68-K cruisers was the project 68-bis. In total, it was planned to build 25 units, but only 21 were laid, of which only 14 entered service: "Sverdlov", "Dzerzhinsky", "Ordzhonikidze",

"Zhdanov", "Alexander Nevsky", "Admiral Nakhimov", "Admiral Ushakov", "Admiral Lazarev", "Alexander Suvorov", "Admiral Sinyavin", "Molotovsk" (since August 3, 1957 "October Revolution"), "Mikhail Kutuzov", "Dmitry Pozharsky", "Murmansk". In addition, in 1953–1956, they were launched, suspended by completion, and in 1959. 7 cruisers were withdrawn from construction: "Shcherbakov", "Admiral Kornilov", "Kronstadt", "Tallinn", "Varyag", "Kozma Minin" (from September 25, 1953 "Arkhangelsk"), "Dmitry Donskoy" ("Vladivostok"). Even without taking into account the unfinished cruisers, the 68-bis became the largest series of cruisers in the history of the Russian-Soviet navy. In this case, we are interested in the etymology of their names, which clearly reflected the significant turn in the policy and ideology of the USSR, carried out by I.V. Stalin in the autumn of 1941 (Sinitsyn, 2018).

Of the 21 known names, only five belong to prominent Communist Party leaders, also deceased, with two names coming from the unbuilt ships of the previous series. The other names are two monarchs of the past, two national heroes, two land commanders, five admirals – all of pre-revolutionary, pre-Soviet Russia. Three seaside towns were used. Especially characteristic is the turn of the autumn of 1953, when, after the death of I.V. Stalin a little more than six months have passed since Stalin's death – the "Kozma Minin" and "Dmitry Donskoy" were renamed "Arkhangelsk" and "Vladivostok", marking an unspoken revenge of the communist, anti-traditionalist ideology both in the USSR as a whole and in its fleet in particular.

The following series of Soviet large surface ships had names: project 58 – "Grozny", "Steregushchy" (before the completion of the completion was renamed "Admiral Fokin"), "Valiant" ("Admiral Golovko"), "Smart" ("Varyag"), project 1123 – "Moscow" and "Leningrad", project 1163 – "Glory", "Admiral of the Fleet Lobov" (since 1986 "Marshal Ustinov"), "Chervona Ukraine", project 1144 – "Kirov", "Frunze", "Kalinin", "Yuri Andropov", etc. After the collapse of the USSR, the last five ships in 1992–1995 were renamed "Varyag", "Admiral Ushakov", "Admiral Lazarev", "Admiral Nakhimov", "Peter the Great", respectively.

It is interesting that the cruisers of the project 68-bis that served in the Baltic and Northern Fleets of the

USSR repeatedly visited Gdynia with friendly visits: “Chkalov” on October 15–18, 1953, “Zhdanov”, July 30 – August 5, 1957, “Sverdlov”, June 26 – July 1, 1975, “The October Revolution”, July 20–24, 1978, June 26 – July 1, 1980 (Aristovich, 2001. P. 51–52). Again, it is symbolic that the communist names (the mentioned visitors plus “Ordzhonikidze”, transferred in 1962 Indonesia) went to the ships that served in the west of the USSR, while “Admiral Lazarev”, “Alexander Suvorov”, “Admiral Sinyavin”, “Dmitry Pozharsky” were sent to the Pacific Fleet (Muratov, 2017). Obviously, the USSR decided not to disturb the members of the Socialist bloc with the memory of 1612 and 1794.

A peculiar symbol of the late USSR was the death of the passenger liner “Admiral Nakhimov” on August 31, 1986 near Novorossiysk after a collision with the bulk cargo ship “Peter Vasev”, which delivered a cargo of Canadian barley to the USSR. The terrible tragedy – the death of 423 people – combined the agricultural “successes” of the Bolsheviks, the established labor “stormtrooper”, and the long-term operation of the former German steamship “Berlin”, built in 1925, which became a trophy of the USSR and was restored in the GDR in 1949–1957.

Let us turn to the political situation in Poland, and then turn to the issues of shipbuilding, to the national practice of naming ships. Employee of the Research Conjunction Institute of the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the USSR in 1956. Zolotarev wrote with pathos and ideological precision that the construction of socialism in the European countries of people's democracy took place in the environment of a powerful rise in the national economy, major successes of all progressive forces in the struggle for lasting peace and security of the peoples... The peaceful aspirations of the working people of the Socialist camp countries are manifested in their creative work. In 1955, these countries achieved great achievements in economic and cultural construction, as well as the improvement of the material well-being of workers. Socialism went beyond one country and became a world system. “This immutable fact is, as the XX Congress of the CPSU noted, this is the main feature of our era and socialism has the world-historical significance. The world socialist system, which accounts for 25 % of the world's territory, more than 35 % of the

population and about 30 % of world industrial production, is developing at a faster pace than the system of capitalism, thereby demonstrating the fundamental advantages of socialism over capitalism” (Economic development, 1956. P. 3–4). It was claimed that the industrial production in the countries of the socialist camp increased by 95% in 1950–1955, and in the capitalist countries only by 31 %. We will not analyze the correctness of the calculations, but only mention the recognized problem of attribution of communist statistics. This quote is interesting to us as an example of rhetoric, argumentation, and an illustration of the declared worldview.

The Soviet assessments of the Polish economy, especially the development of its shipbuilding (named in the list of industries created after 1945, along with the automotive industry, tractor construction, heavy machine tool construction and defense enterprises) and agriculture, are of particular interest to the topic of this article. The employee of the aforementioned Institute, R.M. Zorin, emphasized: “Poland is turning into a country of large-scale shipbuilding. The first-born Polish shipbuilder was the Soldek coal carrier with a capacity of 2,540 tons, launched in 1949. Since that time (until 1955), 194 naval vessels have been launched from the Polish slipways, not counting a large number of fishing and auxiliary vessels. Last year (1954), the first hull of a 10,000-ton vessel was built at the Gdansk shipyard and the second vessel of the same type was laid down. According to the newspaper “Glos Pratsy” of December 16, 1955, among the countries that build ships, Poland already holds the 11th place in terms of tonnage and the 8th in terms of the number of ships launched. Ships are becoming one of the most important items of Polish exports, second only in value to coal. The entire Polish industry helps to develop the domestic shipbuilding industry. Almost 200 industrial enterprises of the country supply equipment, various devices and mechanisms for shipyards in Gdansk, Gdynia, Szczecin and Ustka. Polish industry is developing the production of new types of ship equipment, as a result of which its import is sharply reduced...” (Economic development, 1956. P. 24).

The same author, R.M. Zorin, gives an assessment of the development of agriculture in the Polish People's Republic, describing with obvious disapproval the

dominant individual economy and the insignificant share (6 %) of the coverage of their production cooperation. A priori, considering the collective farm system of the USSR as the highest achievement, there was almost no disguised criticism: A fragmented peasant economy cannot use the latest machines and make full use of the achievements of modern agricultural science. The possibilities of increasing the productivity and marketability of peasant farms in comparison with collective farms are limited. Without the transfer of millions of small peasant farms to the rails of large-scale collective mechanized agriculture, it is impossible to completely and firmly solve the grain problem, to meet the growing needs of the city and the entire population of the country, to achieve a constant increase in the production of raw materials for the light and food industries. And the apotheosis of Soviet rhetoric – “the process of socialist restructuring of agriculture in Poland takes place in conditions of acute class struggle” (Economic development, 1956. P. 33).

In the USSR, it would be unthinkable to name ships in honor of the monarchs of the past, including the founder of the old Russian state – Prince Rurik. In Poland, the Szczecin Shipyard named after Adolf Warski built a “royal” series of bulk cargo ships with a capacity of 7,710 registered tons for the Polish oceanic (East African, South American) lines. They could transport liquid cargo in containers and grain in bulk. One of her vessels was named “*Mieszko I*” (Kattser, 1980. P. 47). Mieszko I – son of Zemomysl, grandson of Leszek, the first historically reliable Polish prince, representative of the Piast dynasty. His years of life are 935–992.

In 1968, Poland purchased a cargo and passenger ship “*Maasdam*” with a capacity of 15,000 registered tons and up to 800 passengers from the Dutch company “Holland-America Line”. The ship was renamed “*Stefan Batory*” and sent on voyages on the Gdynia-Montreal line (Kattser, 1980. P. 53). It is named after the King (from 1576 to 1586) of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania. We will also mention the bulk cargo ship “*Boginka*” (translated into Russian as Nymph) with a capacity of 660 tons, built in 1964.

References

Aristovich Yu.Yu. (2001) Division of surface ships. Kaliningrad: Yantarny skaz, 2001. 94 p.

An interesting page of Polish shipbuilding was the construction of 107 medium – sized (KFOR project 770, 771 and 773, according to the NATO classification – Polnocny) and 28 large (BBK project 775, according to the NATO codification – Ropucha, in Polish “toad”) landing ships for the socialist countries fleets, as well as India, Algeria, Egypt, and Syria. The Polish fleet consisted of 28 KFOR units.

The large amphibious ships of project 775 had a displacement of 4,400 tons and were built exclusively for the USSR, only one was transferred to Yemen. The design of the BDK was carried out in Poland under the supervision of the shipbuilder engineer O. Vysotsky. Between 1974 and 1985, 28 units were built at the Bohaterow Westerplatte Stocznia Polotzna Shipyard (Northern Shipyard named after the Heroes of Westerplatte) in Gdansk. The ships could carry 10 tanks and 340 people and were called by numbers (Shcherbakov, 2014). After 1998, the ships that remained in the Russian fleet received separate names, including the geographical names “*Kondopoga*”, “*Kotlas*”, etc., and the traditional Russian fleet “*Oslyabya*”, “*Peresvet*”, “*George the Victorious*”, as well as the personalities of the XX century.

A few words about the Polish company “*Severnaya Verf*” (Northern wharf). Since 1951, it started building fishing boats. From the mid-1950s until the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the shipyard built mainly amphibious, hydrographic, rescue and training ships for the fleets of the USSR, Poland, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and the GDR. At the same time, the shipyard produced specialized fishing vessels. In the 1990s, with the termination of military orders, the shipyard experienced significant difficulties. Since June 2003, Remontowa S.A. became the main shareholder of the shipyard, and in 2011 the shipyard was renamed “*Remontowa Shipbuilding*”.

Continuity is the most valuable public resource, which must be carefully protected and creatively developed. Only historical knowledge can develop a clear and clear understanding of the enormous value of the national efforts of the past.

Библиографический список

Аристович Ю.Ю. Дивизия надводных кораблей. Калининград: Янтарный сказ, 2001. 94 с.

- Balakin S. (1995) "Parisian secrets" of the Red Fleet. *Modelist-konstruktor = Modelist-constructor*. No. 12. P. 27–28. (In Russ.)
- Basov A.V. (1985) The Soviet Fleet in the defense of socialism. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 224 p. (In Russ.)
- Batyrshin B. (2019) Stand by the turn! Moscow: T8. 292 p. (In Russ.)
- Berezhnoi S.S. (1995) Soviet Navy 1945–1995. Cruisers, large anti-submarine ships, destroyers. *Morskaya kolleksiya = Marine Collection*. No. 1. 32 p. (In Russ.)
- Valetskii M., Zorkii A., Barkov A., Zak A., Budkevich S. (1931) Poland. *Malaya Sovetskaya enciklopediya = Small Soviet Encyclopedia*. Moscow: OGIz RSFSR. Vol. 6. P. 705–731. (In Russ.)
- Vinogradov S.E. (1999) The Last Giants of the Russian Imperial Fleet: Battleships with 16-inch artillery in Fleet development programs, 1914–1917. St. Petersburg: Galeya Print. 408 p. (In Russ.)
- Diskant Yu.V. (2002) Port-Arthur, 1904. Translation from Polish. Moscow: AST. 368 p. (In Russ.)
- Kakurin N., Melikov V. (2002) Civil War in Russia: The War with the White Poles. Moscow: AST; St. Petersburg: Terra Fantastica. 730 p. (In Russ.)
- Kalashnikov M. (1999) The Broken Sword of the Empire. Moscow: Krymskii most-9D. 560 p. (In Russ.)
- Kataev V.I. (2009) Cruising operations of the Russian Fleet. Moscow: Morkniga. 328 p. (In Russ.)
- Kattser S. (1980) Fleet in the palm of your hand. (Translated from Polish). Leningrad: Sudostroenie. 112 p. (In Russ.)
- Elkin A.S. (1970) Hero Ships: A book about hero ships, about commanders, captains and sailors who did not turn off the course, about loyalty to the flag. Collection. Moscow: Dosaaf Publishing House. 264 p. (In Russ.)
- Korotkova D.A. (2019) Belarusian lands in Soviet-Polish relations. A bargaining chip in the confrontation between the two powers. 1918–1921. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf. 222 p. (In Russ.)
- Kryuchkov Yu.S. (1989) Name on board. Moscow: Transport. 159 p. (In Russ.)
- Lyubavskii M.K. (2018) History of the Western Slavs. Moscow: Veche. 496 p. (In Russ.)
- Muratov V.N. (2017) Pacific Fleet. Chronicles of 1946–1961. *Morskaya kolleksiya = Marine Collection*. No. 2. (209). 32 p. (In Russ.)
- Naumov I.V., Wisniewski J. (2021) The development of navy skill in the Russian-Japanese War of 1904–1905: concise description. *Izvestiya Laboratorii drevnikh tekhnologii = Reports of the Laboratory of Ancient Technologies*. Vol. 17. No. 1. P. 205–213. (In Russ.)
- (1956) Economic development of the European countries of People's democracy (Review for 1955). Moscow: Vneshtorgizdat. 271 p. (In Russ.)
- Балакин С. «Парижские тайны» Красного флота // *Моделист-конструктор*. 1995. № 12. С. 27–28.
- Басов А.В. Советский флот на защите социализма. М.: Просвещение, 1985. 224 с.
- Батыршин Б. К повороту стоять! М.: Т8, 2019. 292 с.
- Бережной С.С. Советский ВМФ 1945–1995. Крейсера, большие противолодочные корабли, эсминцы // *Морская коллекция*. 1995. № 1. 32 с.
- Валецкий М., Зоркий А., Барков А., Зак А., Будкевич С. Польша // *Малая Советская энциклопедия*. М.: ОГИЗ РСФСР, 1931. Т. 6. С. 705–731.
- Виноградов С.Е. Последние исполины Российского Императорского флота: Линейные корабли с 16-дюймовой артиллерией в программах развития флота, 1914–1917 гг. СПб.: Галея Принт, 1999. 408 с.
- Дискант Ю.В. Порт-Артур, 1904 / пер. с польск. М.: АСТ, 2002. 368 с.
- Какурин Н., Меликов В. Гражданская война в России: Война с белополяками. М.: АСТ; СПб.: Terra Fantastica, 2002. 730 с.
- Калашников М. Сломанный меч империи. М.: Крымский мост-9Д, 1999. 560 с.
- Катаев В.И. Крейсерские операции Российского флота. М.: Мorkniga, 2009. 328 с.
- Катцер С. Флот на ладони / пер. с польского). Л.: Судостроение, 1980. 112 с.
- Корабли-герои: Книга о кораблях-героях, о командирах, капитанах и матросах, не свернувших с курса, о верности флагу : сборник / ред.-сост. А.С. Елкин; вступ. статьи адм., Героя Советского Союза С.Г. Горшкова и вице-адм., Героя Советского Союза В.Н. Алексеева. Москва : Изд-во ДОСААФ, 1970. 264 с.
- Короткова Д.А. Белорусские земли в советско-польских отношениях. Разменная карта в противостоянии двух держав. 1918–1921 гг. М.: Центрполиграф, 2019. 222 с.
- Крючков Ю.С. Имя на борту. М.: Транспорт, 1989. 159 с.
- Любавский М.К. История западных славян. М.: Вече, 2018. 496 с.
- Муратов В.Н. Тихоокеанский флот. Хроники 1946–1961 гг. // *Морская коллекция*. 2017. № 2 (209). 32 с.
- Наумов И.В., Висьневски Я. Развитие военноморского искусства в Русско-японской войне 1904–1905 гг.: краткое описание // *Известия Лаборатории древних технологий*. 2021. Т. 17. № 1. С. 205–213.
- Развитие экономики европейских стран народной демократии (Обзор за 1955 г.). М.: Внешторгиздат, 1956. 271 с.

Sinityn F.L. (2018) The Soviet Nation and the War. The national question in the USSR. 1933–1945. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf. 543 p. (In Russ.)

Shirokorad A.B. (2004) The fleet that Khrushchev destroyed. Moscow: AST; VZOI. 440 p. (In Russ.)

Shcherbakov V. (2014) Landing ships of the Russian Navy. Pt. 2. *Tekhnika i vooruzhenie = Technique and armament*. No. 1. P. 4–7. (In Russ.)

Синицын Ф.Л. Советская нация и война. Национальный вопрос в СССР. 1933–1945. М.: Центрполиграф, 2018. 543 с.

Широкоград А.Б. Флот, который уничтожил Хрущев. М.: АСТ; ВЗОИ, 2004. 440 с.

Щербаков В. Десантные корабли ВМФ России. Ч. 2 // *Техника и вооружение*. 2014. № 1. С. 4–7.

Information about the authors

Pavel A. Novikov,

Dr. Sci. (History), Professor, Head of Chair of the History and Philosophy,

Irkutsk National Research Technical University,
83, Lermontov street, Irkutsk 664074, Russia,

✉ e-mail: novikov710@yandex.ru

Mikhail L. Rybalko,

Cand. Sci. (History), Associate Professor of the Department of Political Science, History and Regional Studies,

Irkutsk State University,
1, K. Marx street, Irkutsk 664003, Russia,

✉ e-mail: mikhail.rybalko@gmail.com

Jan Wisniewski,

Cand. Sci. (History), Associate Professor, Researcher, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun (Poland),

11, Gagarin street, 87-100 Torun, Poland,

✉ e-mail: jawili@wp.pl

Vladislav N. Vorontsov,

Cand. Sci. (History), Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences and Humanities,

Irkutsk State Transport University,
15, Chernyshevsky street, Irkutsk 664074, Russia,

✉ e-mail: woronzow@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах

Новиков Павел Александрович,

доктор исторических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой истории и философии,

Иркутский национальный исследовательский технический университет,
664074, г. Иркутск, ул. Лермонтова, 83, Россия,

✉ e-mail: novikov710@yandex.ru

Рыбалко Михаил Леонидович,

кандидат исторических наук, доцент кафедры политологии, истории и регионоведения,

Иркутский государственный университет,
664003, г. Иркутск, ул. Карла Маркса, 1, Россия,

✉ e-mail: mikhail.rybalko@gmail.com

Висьневски Ян,

кандидат исторических наук, доцент, научный сотрудник,

Университет Николая Коперника в Торуне (Польша),
ул. Гагарина 11, 87-100 Торунь, Польша,

✉ e-mail: jawili@wp.pl

Воронцов Владислав Николаевич,

кандидат исторических наук, доцент кафедры философии и социально-гуманитарных наук,

Иркутский государственный университет путей сообщения,
664074, г. Иркутск, ул. Чернышевского, 15, Россия,

✉ e-mail: woronzow@mail.ru

Contribution of the authors

The authors contributed equally to this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

The authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Article info

Received March 12, 2021.

Received April 9, 2021.

Accepted April 19, 2021.

Заявленный вклад авторов

Все авторы сделали эквивалентный вклад в подготовку публикации.

Конфликт интересов

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Все авторы прочитали и одобрили окончательный вариант рукописи.

Информация о статье

Поступила в редакцию 12 марта 2021 г.

Поступила после рецензирования и доработки
9 апреля 2021 г.

Принята к публикации 19 апреля 2021 г.