

STALIN – A VISIT

Two Vectors of History: Intention and Outcome

Narrator: Lev Neymotin

STALIN — A VISIT

An Experiment in Historical Extrapolation

Lev Neymotin

Introduction — Why This Visit Exists

Narrator

This project is not a trial, a defense, or a spectacle.

It is an experiment.

After listening to George Orwell and Ayn Rand diagnose modern systems collapsing through language decay, moral inversion, and the quiet withdrawal of confidence, a harder question emerged—one that could not be answered abstractly:

What happens when belief is not weak, but absolute?

To test that question, this visit invites **Joseph Stalin**, accompanied by his teachers, comrades, and successors, to move forward through history—not to revisit intentions, and not to argue motivations, but to observe outcomes.

Throughout the visit, two vectors remain in constant comparison:

1. What theory required
2. What reality delivered

This is not a moral exercise.

It is an empirical one.

A Personal Note (Placed Up Front, Then Left Alone)

Narrator

Before proceeding, one personal note is necessary.

My grandfather was arrested in August 1937, sentenced to death by a Stalin-era *Troika*—three signatures, no trial, no appeal—and executed twenty-one days later.

In my family, this is not history.

It is a wound.

That fact does not sharpen judgment here. On the contrary, it imposes restraint.

I. Marx — The Olympian

Setting: A high room. No maps. No files. Shelves of books.

Karl Marx stands apart, irritated.

Marx (opening)

“I am constantly accused of crimes committed in my name,” he says. “I described a structure. I did not issue orders.”

He looks toward Lenin and Stalin.

“You confuse analysis with instruction.”

Narrator

Marx’s framework is explicit and unforgiving: history is governed by material relations; class antagonism is irreconcilable; the state is an instrument of class domination; the ruling class never relinquishes power voluntarily.

Marx (quoting himself)

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

He continues, impatient with moralizing.

"Men make their own history—but not under circumstances of their own choosing."

When the question of force arises, Marx does not retreat.

Marx

"Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one."

He emphasizes the word *midwife*.

"A midwife appears when birth is already underway. She does not invent the child."

Lenin (from the side)

"Midwives do not ask for consent."

Marx turns sharply.

Marx

"And they do not strangle the child."

Narrator

Marx never specifies limits to force. He defines no thresholds, no exit mechanisms, no non-coercive transition. He assumes history will *move* once contradictions sharpen.

When confronted with what followed, Marx insists this was not what he meant. The visit forces a recognition he resists:

Once Marx's theory enters **state power**, coercion is not incidental. It is structural.

Marx is not malicious.

He is Olympian—and blind to extrapolation.

II. Lenin — The Architect

Setting: Smolny Institute, 1918. Papers, telegrams, orders.

Vladimir Lenin does not debate. He issues.

Lenin

"The revolution is not a dinner party."

He opens a folder and reads without hesitation.

Lenin (Telegram, Penza, August 1918)

"Hang (hang without fail, so the people see) no fewer than one hundred known kulaks...

Publish their names...

Seize all grain...

Do it in such a fashion that for hundreds of versts around the people see, tremble, know, shout."

Silence.

Marx (quietly)

"You are not analyzing class. You are terrorizing it."

Lenin

"Class does not dissolve through persuasion."

He opens another document.

Lenin (Letter to Kursky, 1922)

"The court must not eliminate terror—to promise that would be self-deception—but must substantiate and legitimize it."

Narrator

This is not excess. It is design.

Lenin

"Revolutionary justice is not justice in the bourgeois sense. It is the suppression of enemies."

He looks directly at Marx.

"Your theory leaves no other path."

Marx does not answer.

Narrator

Lenin introduces **concentration camps** explicitly and early.

Lenin (Decree, 1918–1919)

"It is necessary to safeguard the Soviet Republic from class enemies by isolating them in concentration camps."

No provisional language. No apology.

Lenin's terror is colder than Stalin's—ideological, not personal; abstract, not reactive. Compared to this, Tsarist repression—exile and dispersal—appears restrained.

Lenin abolishes restraint entirely.

He dies in 1924, not before acting brutally, but before **scaling** what he designed.

III. Stalin — Lenin, Squared

Setting: Late 1920s. Maps replace books.

Stalin speaks less, but more decisively.

Stalin

"Vladimir Ilyich gave us direction. I gave it scale."

He does not apologize.

Stalin (1931 speech)

"We are fifty to a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or they crush us."

Narrator

Stalin inherits Lenin's legitimacy of terror, Lenin's camps, and Lenin's rejection of due process. He adds quotas, industrial discipline, and administrative terror.

Stalin

"Personnel decide everything."

Felix Dzerzhinsky nods.

Dzerzhinsky

"The Cheka exists not to judge, but to destroy."

Narrator

Under Stalin, Lenin's blueprint is industrialized. This is not deviation. It is execution.

Stalin is not Marx's betrayer.

He is Lenin's executor.

IV. Terror as System, Not Excess

Setting: 1937. Lists. Forms. Quotas.

Vyacheslav Molotov speaks calmly.

Molotov

"Consistency prevents chaos. Chaos invites mercy."

Lavrentiy Beria adds without emotion:

Beria

"Belief is expensive. Control is not."

Narrator

At this stage, terror no longer needs ideology. It runs on procedures, paperwork, and precedent.

The system no longer asks *why*.

It asks *how many*.

This is not madness.
It is administration.

V. Apology Without Dismantling

Setting: 1956. A hall.

Nikita Khrushchev steps forward.

Khrushchev (Secret Speech)

“The cult of personality led to serious violations of socialist legality.”

He pauses.

“This is not a rejection of socialism.”

Stalin (aside)

“He isolates me to preserve Lenin.”

Narrator

Apology is introduced—not to dismantle terror, but to contain it. Stalin becomes deviation; Lenin remains icon; Marx remains sanctified.

The camps shrink.

The logic remains.

VI. Fatigue and Expiration

Setting: 1970s–1980s.

Belief drains. Ritual replaces conviction.

Mikhail Gorbachev speaks quietly.

Gorbachev

“We cannot continue like this.”

Stalin

“You remove fear without restoring belief.”

Narrator

The USSR does not collapse in revolt. It **expires**.

VII. Inheritance

Setting: 1990s Russia.

Boris Yeltsin declares:

Yeltsin

“We are free.”

Marx

“You redistributed power, not dismantled it.”

Lenin

“Authority migrates.”

VIII. Putin — The Polished Synthesis

Vladimir Putin enters without ideology.

Putin

“Stability is the precondition for everything else.”

Stalin (observing)

“Refinement lasts longer.”

Narrator

Putin combines Lenin’s elimination logic, Stalin’s operational discipline, and Marx’s structural inevitability—without manifestos, without camps.

Just management.

IX. The Warning

Narrator

This visit exposes a fatal illusion: that Marxism failed because it was implemented incorrectly.

The documents show the opposite.

It failed because it was implemented **correctly**.

Violence was not an accident. Terror was not excess. Camps were not deviation.

They were unavoidable extrapolation.

Conclusion — What This Visit Leaves Behind

Narrator

This visit is not about the past.

It is about extrapolation—the belief that theory can be scaled without consequence, that force can substitute for time, that intention overrides structure.

The Soviet experiment proves this belief fatally wrong.

History does not punish ideas.

It tests what happens when they are taken seriously.

The visit ends here.

Nothing is resolved.