

From Vicenza to Astana

TIZIANO TREU and GIORGIO CRACCO

President and Secretary General, Institute of Social and Religious History, Vicenza, Italy

1. From Vicenza (birthplace of Palladio), a small town in the Veneto in northern Italy, to Astana, the new capital of Kazakhstan in Central Asia, one of the largest countries in the world (nine times as big as Italy), whose presence on the world stage is becoming increasingly important. It was no accident that the idea for this volume, which is about a crucial issue in Kazakh history, should come from the Institute of Social and Religious History in Vicenza.

It is not the first time that two such different and distant worlds apart - the Veneto and Asia - have come into contact and exchanged “glances” (glances from which what Hans Belting called a mutual *Blickwechsel* might ensue).¹ The precedent we cannot but recall is Marco Polo who, having left Venice with his relatives, and traveling through these regions in the years after 1271, reached Bukhara,² and then narrated their “wonders”. We should add that a friar from Vicenza - apparently he did indeed come from Vicenza - accompanied Marco Polo on parts of his travels. We know little about him but his name, Niccolò, and the fact that he was one of the “two well-read, very wise theologians” sent by Pope Gregory X to “answer the questions” about the Christian faith asked by the great Tatar Khan. (We also know that fearing for their lives the two friars decided to forgo the journey and the “glances”, and returned to Italy.)³

It has only been recently, in the last twenty years or so - as not just one wall, but many walls have fallen -, that journeys and “glances” are no longer given up and that both individuals and masses of people have decided to leave their homelands (or been obliged to do so) to settle somewhere else - anywhere else, as long as it seems promising (which is often only a mirage) - and make their homes there. The effects of these migrations can be seen on many levels: in politics and in the economy, for certain, now moving toward integration on a global scale; and also in cultures and religions, which have been exposed to intense hybridization processes. This continues to occur despite the persistence of resistance and intolerance, despite even the erection of new walls.

Historical approaches, too, are adapting to the changes underway, albeit staying “at a slight angle to the universe” (as Eric Hobsbawm has duly admonished us).⁴ This is especially so in the Veneto, a region that has long been used to projecting itself into the world from a strong economic position, to feeling affection for the world (*Amore di confine* [Love of the Borderline] is the title of a book by Vicenza author Mario Rigoni Stern), and to gaining recognition from the world (in the twentieth century alone three Veneto-born priests were elected to the papal throne, that is, to an objectively universal office).

Simply the context of the Veneto region would therefore be enough to justify the interest shown by the Institute of Vicenza in the history of Kazakhstan; but, as scholars, we can give additional, more specific reasons for our decision.

2. For most of the twentieth century, the extraordinary and terrible age of totalitarian regimes, there were few historians who, like Arnaldo Momigliano, were able to appreciate “foreign wisdom,” and therefore enjoyed comparing cultures that were “distant from one another,” and personages - “Confucius, Buddha, Zoroaster, Isaiah, Heraclitus, and Aeschylus” - who apparently had little in common,⁵ in order to discover similarities between them. This was true even of Henri Pirenne who was capable of looking at universal history but, biased by anti-Germanism, never went beyond the idea of a Roman and Christian Europe, closed within itself as having reached “a unique degree of civilization,” thereby excluding not only Russia but also other civilizations, such as the Byzantine and Islamic ones, bordering the Mediterranean (and therefore also Turkey).⁶ Almost paradoxically, as Daniela Rando has reminded us, Pirenne’s legacy is still alive in German historiography, where Michael Borgolte’s seductive idea of a West interpreted from the point of view of “religious difference” (a history of Christians, Jews, and Muslims) is contradicted by another German historian, Rudolf Schieffer, in the name of what is, in his opinion, the ever dominating “Latinity” of both language and church: the so-called “Christian Europe.”⁷ The Institute of Social and Religious History in Vicenza has also participated in this debate. This Institute was founded in a Western-Christian context in 1975, on the initiative of

Gabriele De Rosa, to carry out rigorous archival research and study the connection between society and religious experience. With the fall of the Berlin Wall, it became immediately clear to the Institute that new investigative opportunities were opening up in the Eastern European countries just freed from totalitarianism. As everybody said back then, a huge area was reentering history. In fact, just one year later, in December 1990, the Institute brought together a group of scholars from various former Soviet countries who met to outline a first approach to the history of that area, where for several decades religion had been “driven underground” and negated.⁸

Through a number of “accounts,” some of them dramatic, people became aware of certain facts: first, that Eastern Europe was anything but an undifferentiated block that could easily be comprehended, in part because of the false picture the so-called “West” had of it (Zinoviev was quoted as having said: “To understand our reality, you need to learn to walk on your hands upside down”); second, that while it was true that the long-silenced churches were starting to speak out again, societies, too, had a lot to say after being suppressed for such a long time (for example, on the role religion should play in the state after decades of crude atheism imposed by Soviet power); and finally, that Europe was a common home its peoples could share but that this should not involve any country’s obscuring its individual history (a Polish book published a few years later was entitled *Yes, We Are Joining Europe, but with Our Dead*).⁹

People were faced with problems and suggestions, many of which were in fact requests for cooperation. And the Institute of Social and Religious History in Vicenza did not shrink from the task. In our case (other research institutes, both in Italy and elsewhere in Europe, had meanwhile started moving in a similar direction), this meant continuing to work in our chosen field (social and religious history) with the same methods (direct use of archival sources) we had always used, but enlarging the scope of our studies to include Eastern Europe and involving scholars from these countries in the research. In this way there would be comparison and reciprocal growth, and together we would build a new Europe. Since then we have never given up this new mission, which has produced important results.

3. In the 1990s, in the West, especially in the Netherlands and in Italy, important research was being done on a special type of sacred space: Christian sanctuaries and their cults.¹⁰ The Institute planned to include the countries of former Yugoslavia in this research but the project, which required a significant allocation of both human and financial resources, encountered objective obstacles and never got off the ground. The idea of extending eastwards with our research on sanctuaries and cults - since these are signs not only of religious but also social identities - was instead carried out in Ukraine, thanks to a network of contacts formed with Ukrainian scholars, and then with Russian and Polish scholars as well. Why Ukraine?

This country, as Sante Graciotti observed, is per se emblematic of a dichotomy - between the two Slavic worlds and the two European ones (Western and Eastern), between two churches (the Eastern and the Western) -, a dichotomy that should be interpreted as a source of pluralism and complementarity, “like Martha and Mary, the two sisters in the Gospel” (an image Gogol used in 1840). This dichotomy can, therefore, also be seen as a promise: one that would lead to the enlargement of the European Union “beyond the historic Carolingian boundary,” in territories influenced by Byzantine traditions.¹¹ The cults themselves reflect a dichotomy that has at times produced original syntheses. One example is Clement, bishop of Rome and a disciple of the apostle Peter, who before A.D. 1000 was chosen as the patron saint of Kiev by Prince Vladimir to mark adhesion to both Roman West and Byzantine East.¹² And (we can add), the same cult may have been brought to Ukraine from Germany, as it was later brought, albeit with different meanings, to northern Italy, to the area around Vicenza, once again from Germany.¹³

The Institute has never moved away from Ukraine, and has always looked on it “with sympathy and trust,”¹⁴ to better understand, through its history, what Ukraine could mean to Europe, and indeed to all humankind. Here I am alluding to the moment when the Institute felt involved in the tragedy that struck Ukraine in 1932-1933: the terrible famine that claimed millions of lives; what was in fact a *holodomor*, a word which means “artificial hunger” and “death,” coined to describe this tragedy. It was true genocide, inflicted as punishment for Ukraine’s resistance to the collectivization plan imposed by Moscow, as has been proven by unquestionably reliable documents.¹⁵

The Institute’s interest led to a singular congress, convened in October 2003 in Vicenza,

following other similar conferences held elsewhere in Europe that year.¹⁶ More than just a scholarly meeting, it was a forceful, though sober and calm, appeal to keep the memory of that tragedy alive and to tell the truth, not only in the interest of a single people, but rather of all Europe and all humankind¹⁷ (any genocide forgotten or denied implicitly encourages other genocides). The presentation in Vicenza and Kiev of the volume with the proceedings of the conference¹⁸ was another sign of the firm friendship between the Institute and both the scholars and the people of Ukraine.

The Institute has continued to demonstrate its interest in other, sometimes humanly sensitive, topics that concern Ukraine, for example the Chernobyl catastrophe, about which the full truth has not yet been revealed. Since Chernobyl, thousands of Ukrainian orphan children have spent their summer holidays in Italy each year, mainly in the Veneto, and especially in the Vicenza area, where they stay with host families for several weeks (a better future for the world can also be built by welcoming a child as if s/he were our own).¹⁹

At the same time, the Institute has also become interested in Kazakhstan. This came about quite by chance (what Pirenne called *le hasard en histoire*): our work with Ukraine, which per se entailed extension to other countries of the former Soviet bloc, led to the Institute's horizons being extended to include Kazakhstan.²⁰

4. It all began one day almost two years ago, when during a meeting in Vicenza to discuss projects the Institute could develop that would involve other Eastern European countries in addition to Ukraine - Poland and Romania, for example - someone mentioned Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan? A far-away country, located in Asia, between Siberian Russia and China, sparsely populated (fewer than 15 million inhabitants), yet a real melting pot with an impressive variety of ethnic groups, cultures, and religious traditions. After the collapse of the USSR and of state atheism in 1991, the country's government recognized the decisive public role that could be played by religions - all those religious groups that were open to dialogue and peaceful coexistence. It was particularly the last factor that caught our attention as it objectively involved - and we were most happily surprised when we realized this - questions that the Institute had been deeply devoted to, questions that could actually be said to be vital to its history.

Following the example of its founder and organizer, Gabriele De Rosa, the Institute had a distinguished record of promoting research whose aim was to document the role religious people played in Italian history, namely the contribution made by Roman Catholics to Unification and the newly formed country, despite the drastic separation between Church and state enforced by early governments (with religion excluded from the public and allowed solely in the private, individual sphere).²¹ It was along these lines that the Institute continued, widening the sphere of its research to include Eastern Europe, as we have seen. This went counter-current to culture in the West, which had come to see as obsolete, or at least anachronistic, any interest in religions' social impact and public role.

Here we are referring to a well-known phenomenon, the spread of secularism, and with it an idea of the state (often a democratic one), which saw embracing religion, or even adapting the best of religions' ethical and spiritual values to the present in the civic sphere, as an intolerable contradiction. Only lay values were held to be important - those founded on the individual's rights - leaving aside all considerations of religion and God, as though God did not exist (*etsi Deus non daretur*).²² One consequence, obviously, was that interest in the history of religion, something far different from the history of churches or of a church, was discouraged and even forbidden;²³ even our Institute, which was declaredly devoted to the idea of a nexus between religion and society, found itself in difficulty. We had come to a crossroads: either we had to change the sphere of our research, or risk extinction.

Having reached a juncture of this sort, the idea of examining a different, original situation, such as Central Asia, where religions and the public sphere were finding ways to work together as partners - after this had been forbidden for decades - was liberating. It seemed to be an invitation/opportunity for the Institute to renew its original mission: it might still be possible, and even useful, to study socio-religious history, albeit with dramatically changed horizons, no longer solely in Italy or in Europe (in other words in the secularized West), but instead on a global level, in relation to Asia and its myriad faiths. We had first to learn more about the Kazakh experience, at least as it was officially presented to us; what we found ourselves looking at was a model

conceived and promulgated not merely for one people but instead for all peoples in the world, for all human beings. We discovered that the President of the Kazakh Republic himself, Nursultan A. Nazarbayev, had founded an International Center of Cults and Religions in Astana, the country's new capital, installing it in the spacious Palace of Peace and Concord, built to be ". . .the real spiritual centre of our country." In the same city, seen as the juncture of "...Asia and Europe, East and West [and a] centre of interaction of various nations and religions," every three years, starting in 2003, Nazarbayev has convened a meeting of "...all leaders of world and traditional religions," whose task is to report the imbalance and terrible injustice that beset the world and suggest as a universal remedy the values of concord and friendship expressed by religions.²⁴

It is certainly unusual, at least in terms of cultural policies in the West today, for a head of state to found a spiritual center in the heart of his country's capital city, mobilize religions for peace and human progress, exalt his country's religious riches to the entire world, and be proud of contributing to their growth, as Nazarbayev was when he told the representatives of world religions at one of the meetings convened in Astana that there were nearly 3200 mosques, temples, and meeting houses in Kazakhstan, that he had personally helped to lay the foundation for a new mosque, and that construction of the Assumption Cathedral, one of the largest Russian Orthodox churches in the region, would be completed the following year.²⁵ This head of state calls to mind precedents from the distant past, such as Alexander Severus (A.D. 222-235), the Roman emperor of Syrian origin who sagely followed the pagan tradition of "*non uno itinere*" (there are many paths, not one only, to God). In his personal shrine he is said to have kept and worshipped images of all the religious leaders and saints he held dear, among them Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius of Tyana.²⁶

It is certainly not up to us, scholars of the past, to pass judgment on the merits of a politico-religious program of such immense significance, which in any case, as a rehabilitation and legitimization of traditional beliefs that were long suppressed or neglected, cannot but reflect upon and affect both a people's spirituality and its social dynamics. What we heirs of the secularized West can do is grasp the fundamental idea implicit in that program, namely that people not only benefit from but *need* the values that come from religion and must not, let alone should not, be deprived of them as they serve not so much to save religions but rather humanity itself. This is all the more true today when this is seen to be an idea that is far from being an isolated or simple projection of a past that has failed to pass, and is echoed in important ways within the secularized culture of the West. Here people have begun to realize that the rejection of religions, long held to be an irreversible achievement, a model that should be imposed on the rest of the world, fundamentally concerned only Europe and elsewhere in the world was perceived as strange, as "deviance".²⁷ People in Britain and the United States have also once more recognized that it is precisely a democratic form of government that "requires faith in God",²⁸ and that banishing God from public life, in the name of the "disenchantment" described by Weber, is merely a historical phenomenon like any other, and may now have run its course.²⁹ Nor can we fail to mention the recent spate of historic essays and papers on religious topics that have led us to exclaim, "God is back!" and that are in any case a sign, albeit a confused one, of unresolved anxiety. Therefore, the idea-invitation that we turn our attention to Kazakhstan, specifically to the religious history of this vast, fascinating country, intersected not only with the reason for which our Institute was founded, but also with the most advanced developments in European culture, and constitutes a further reason for us to get to work.

And for us, starting from the obvious difficulty of studying texts and documents, a treasure trove of still largely unexplored memories, in a country so different and distant from our own, the work has been and continues to be long and complex. We begin with a first 'glancen - a profile of Kazakh religious history - which involves not only the tsarist and Soviet eras that are closest to us in time and which we know most about, but travels back across the centuries to whatever remote traces of religion can still be found. We then proceed with contributions that are more specifically and closely related to the topic. Our aim is to understand the roots (herein lies the true historic problem) whose twists and turns and epochal transformations are the basis of the experience of the state-society-religion symbiosis that distinguishes present-day Kazakhstan, this "crossroads of religion" in the heart of the Eurasian continent, and thus the Kazakh people's capacity to peaceably translate its religious traditions in terms of social and civic cohesion.

But what also attracted us, as European scholars of the Secular Age, was discussing an age-old

dilemma, once again seen through a country “different” from our own: debating whether religion is only a relic of the past, set across our path to slow the growth of human civitas, or is instead an additional resource, which such growth promotes and to which it gives new - and much needed - meaning.

5. To draft at least a rough sketch of Kazakhstan’s religious history, from prehistoric times down to the twentieth century, the Institute did things in a big way: it recruited some of the world’s foremost experts on Kazakh history. One of them is the author of a substantial, well-argued book on the exterminations - the quasi-genocide - that the government of the USSR perpetrated in Kazakhstan (and in Ukraine) to force the collectivization of a society that was more a nomadic than an agricultural one (over one million people starved to death, tens of thousands of children were abandoned, masses of desperate people fled to Siberia, the Urals, China, Central Asia).³⁰ To write the history of a people, we must first ask ourselves how much that people has suffered. The Institute then contacted the Kazakh authorities to request that they assist its researchers, and Kazakh historians to invite them to collaborate with us by contributing to and publishing research. We were unfailingly given a warm, generous reception. We are therefore grateful to all these people: those who encouraged and supported this research project, the research coordinators, the authorities that facilitated our researchers’ work in Kazakhstan, and the Kazakh scholars who joined us in our venture of writing a religious history of their country. The volume we are presenting here is but a beginning, the fruit of a first “glance” (to borrow the term Belting used). Other volumes will follow. Like Marco Polo, who continued his eastbound journey until he reached the great Khan, we will not turn back.

Translated from Italian by Elena Mortarini and Susan Finnel

¹ H. BELTING, *Florenz und Baghdad: eine westöstliche Geschichte des Blicks* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2nd ed., 2008).

² Formerly “in the Persian region,” part of present-day Uzbekistan: “I viaggi di Marco Polo, gentiluomo veneziano,” in G. B. RAMUSIO, *Navigazioni e viaggi*, M. MILANESI (ed.), III (Turin: Einaudi, 1980), p. 80.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-84.

⁴ E. HOBBSAWM, *Interesting Times: a Twentieth-Century Life* (London: Allen Lane, 2002), p. 416.

⁵ A. MOMIGLIANO, *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1975) (Italian ed.: *Saggezza straniera. L’Ellenismo e le altre culture* [Turin: Einaudi, 1980], p. 157).

⁶ C. VIOLANTE, *Das Ende der grossen Illusion’. Ein europäischer Historiker im Spannungsfeld von Krieg und Nachkriegszeit, Henri Pirenne (1914-1923) — Zu einer Neulesung der “Geschichte Europas”* G. DILCHER (ed.), “Foreword” by G. CRACCO (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2004), pp. 293-294, 350 (original Italian edition [Bologna: Il Mulino, 1997]).

⁷ I am alluding to M. BORGOLTE’S, *Christen, Juden, Muselmanen. Die Erbe der Antike und der Aufstieg des Abendlandes 300 bis 1400 n. Chr.* (Berlin: Siedler, 2006), analyzed and discussed, together with other papers, by D. RANDO and R. SCHIEFFER, “Storia del Medioevo europeo: vecchie e nuove ‘grandi narrazioni’,” *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, 2/2009 (publication forth-coming).

⁸ L. ZANOLO (ed.), *La fede “sommersa” nei Paesi dell’Est. Testimonianze* (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1992). See the paper by R MICHEL, “Stereotipi occidentali del postcomunismo,” especially pp. 73-82.

⁹ M. JANION, *Do Europy tak, ale razem z naszymi umarlymi* (Warsaw: Sic!, 2000).

¹⁰ *Bedevaartplaatsen in Nederland*, Samenstelling en redactie P. J. Margry en Ch. Caspers, (Amsterdam-Hilversum: P. J. Meertens-Instituut-Uitgeverij Verloren, 1997-2000); G. CRACCO (ed.), *Per una storia dei santuari cristiani d’Italia: approcci regionali* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002).

¹¹ G. DE ROSA, F. LOMASTRO (eds.), *L’età di Kiev e la sua eredità nell’incontro con l’Occidente*. Proceedings of the conference held on 11-13 April 2002 in Vicenza (Rome: Viella, 2003) (Media et Orientalis Europa 1). See especially G. DE ROSA, “Introduction” (pp. 7-8), and S. GRACIOTTI, “L’Ucraina tra le due Slavia e le due Europe” (pp. 215-220).

¹² V. RYCHKA, “Kiev nel dialogo di interciviltà tra l’Oriente cristiano e l’Occidente cristiano (II metà del X-XI secolo),” in G. DE ROSA, E LOMASTRO (eds.), *L’età di Kiev* cit., pp. 61-78; ID., “Culte du pape saint Clément dans les débuts du christianisme kievien,” in G. DE ROSA, G. CRACCO (eds.), *Il Papato e l’Europa*, (Soveria Mannelli, CZ: Rubbettino, 2001).

¹³ G. CRACCO, “Valdagno: alle origini di un nome e di una storia,” in ID., *Tra Venezia e Terraferma. Per la storia del Veneto regione del mondo* (Rome: Viella, 2009) (Venetomondo, 1), pp. 641-660.

¹⁴ “*Simpatia e fiducia*” were the words used by S. GRACIOTTI, a friend of the Institute’s, at the end of his

paper “L’Ucraina tra le due Slavie e le due Europe” cit., p. 220.

¹⁵ Thanks to A. Graziosi, one of the foremost experts on the history of the Soviet Union (see his two recent volumes: *L’Urss di Lenin e di Stalin. Storia dell’Unione Sovietica, 1914-1945* [Bologna: Il Mulino, 2007] ; *L’Urss dal trionfo al degrado. Storia dell’Unione Sovietica, 1945-1991* [Bologna: Il Mulino, 2008]), the following revealing work was published: *Lettere da Kharkov: la carestia in Ucraina e nel Caucaso del Nord nei rapporti dei diplomatici italiani, 1932-1933* (Turin: Einaudi, 1991).

¹⁶ One of which was the conference I organized in Trento as Director of the Institute of Italo-Germanic History, whose proceedings were published the previous year: G. CORNI, G. HIRSCHFELD (eds.), *L’umanità offesa. Stermini e memoria nell’Europa del Novecento* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2002). This showed that the truth about genocide could be dealt with in Germany, albeit only after a delay of several decades.

¹⁷ G. DE ROSA, F. LOMASTRO (eds.), *La morte della terra. La grande ‘carestia’ in Ucraina nel 1932-1933* (Rome: Viella, 2004) (Media et Orientalis Europa, 2). These are the proceedings of the conference held on 16-18 October 2003 in Vicenza.

¹⁸ G. CRACCO, F. LOMASTRO, A. GRAZIOSI, F. GORI, O. PACHLOVSKA, “La morte della terra. Presentazioni del volume sulla grande carestia in Ucraina del 1932-1933”, *Ricerche di storia sociale e religiosa*, 25 (2006)/69, pp. 199-236.

¹⁹ Francesca Lomastro, a member of our Institute’s executive board, founded the Vicenza-based association “Il Ponte - Mist,” which organizes the journeys of Ukrainian children to Italy and finds local families to host them.

²⁰ VIOLANTE, *Das Ende der grossen Illusion* cit, p. 296.

²¹ G. CRACCO, “‘Laudatio’ per Gabriele De Rosa,” in ID., *Tra Venezia e Terraferma* cit., pp. 729-753, in particular pp. 736-739.

²² See, among others, G. E. RUSCONI, *Come se Dio non ci fosse. I laici, i cattolici e la democrazia* (Turin: Einaudi, 2000).

²³ See É. POULAT, *L’ère postchrétienne: un monde sorti de Dieu* (Paris: Flammarion, 1994) (Italian ed.: *L’era post-cristiana. Un mondo uscito da Dio* [Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1996], pp. 236-238), which denounced a comeback of ecclesiastical history at the expense of religious history, which was being pushed into the background. The author also considers unsatisfactory the authoritative *Histoire du Christianisme des origines à nos jours*, J.-M. MAYEUR, CH. PIETRI, L. PIETRI, A. VAUCHEZ, M. VENARD (eds.), published in several volumes (Paris: Desclée-Fayard, 1990).

²⁴ The citations are from the speech President Nazarbayev made at the inauguration of the Third Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions, recently held in Astana. See also an account of the congress, “Il ruolo delle religioni per l’unità della famiglia umana,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, 6-7 July 2009, p. 6. The article contains an interview with Cardinal Jean-Louis Tauran, President of the Papal Council for Interreligious Dialogue, who attended the Congress.

²⁵ This statement is taken from President Nazarbayev’s speech. See previous note.

²⁶ *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Alexander Severus*, 29, 2. See the Italian translation by P. SOVERINI (Turin: UTET, 1983), II, p. 683.

²⁷ J. HABERMAS, *Zwischen Naturalismus und Religion. Philosophische Aufsätze* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2005) (Italian ed.: *Tra scienza e fede* [Rome-Bari: Laterza, 2006], pp. 19-50).

²⁸ F. FUKUYAMA, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992) (Italian ed.: *La fine della storia e l’ultimo uomo* [Milan: Rizzoli, 1992], pp. 348-350).

²⁹ C. TAYLOR, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).

³⁰ N. PIANCIOLA, *Stalinismo di frontiera. Colonizzazione agricola, sterminio dei nomadi, costruzione statale in Asia centrale (1905-1936)* (Rome: Viella, 2009) (Media et Orientalis Europa, 3).