
The alteration of place names and construction of national identity in Soviet Armenia

Arseny SAPAROV



Édition électronique

URL : <https://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/8604>

DOI : 10.4000/monderusse.8604

ISSN : 1777-5388

Éditeur

Éditions de l'EHESS

Édition imprimée

Date de publication : 1 janvier 2003

Pagination : 179-198

ISBN : 2-7132-1812-8

ISSN : 1252-6576

Référence électronique

Arseny SAPAROV, « The alteration of place names and construction of national identity in Soviet Armenia », *Cahiers du monde russe* [En ligne], 44/1 | 2003, mis en ligne le 01 janvier 2007, consulté le 02 septembre 2022. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/monderusse/8604> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/monderusse.8604>

proceeding day. The article was approved by the Executive Committee the next day.¹² The most serious aspect of the crisis was that the Soviet authorities did not seem to believe as they had previously in similar occasions.¹³ Even though the absence of evidence could have been interpreted as Soviet tolerance of the American national anti-Fascist movement, it was however clear that the leadership of the Administration could not give assistance. These events eventually led to the resignation of the First Secretary of the Communist Committee of the Communist Party of America, E. Boudreau in 1946. One of the official reasons for his resignation was: "Boudreau is the ideological head of the party organization and especially with the youth."¹⁴ Thus the case was resolved with Boudreau's removal. In some American communist leadership could make further movements to American authorities to gain popular support. Indeed, the years 1947 and 1948 were marked by a lot of symbolic gestures to nationalist movements.

One of the most visible consequences of the 1967 demonstration was the construction and opening of the memorial to the victims of the genocide in November 1967. This was clearly a commitment to the national and especially anti-Francoist sentiment present in Francoist society. The new First Secretary of the Communist Government Party, L. Buitrago attended the opening ceremony, which serves to highlight the role of the Communist Party and to strengthen the nationalist component of the event. The opening ceremony took place on November 1966 the day of the commemoration of Francisco, instead of April 1966 as one might have expected.¹⁷ This behaviour demonstrates however that the local authorities wanted to balance carefully the two traditions – communist and nationalist, while trying to rapidly soothe them.

The another ceremony was organized in November in 1998. This ceremony was to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Tashkent Treaty of 1988. The treaty became historical image and the following Treaty was signed November: signed by drawing the Treaty address. The first ceremony in Kazakhstan again attended the ceremony to highlight the importance and significance of the event. Again, the day was carefully selected -- May 2000 -- the day the Tashkent Treaty signed, rather than May 2000 -- the day of victory and of the declaration of Kazakhstan

Along with these visible symbolic concessions to Armenian nationalism, a renaming campaign took place in 1967 and 1968. It is in this context that one should view the renamings of 1967-1968, as they were hardly accidental.