

WORLD LIBERTY CONGRESS · PLAYBOOK FOR LIBERTY

PILLAR III · PRINCIPLE 10

Domestic Leadership, International Support

Locals lead. International allies protect, equip, amplify, and connect.

A strategic training guide for members of the World Liberty Congress and the World Liberty Academy. Tenth principle of the WLC Adaptations to Counter-Autocracy Strategic Framework (Berlin, November 2025), and the closing principle of Pillar III: Acting Together — Power in Numbers.

The principle, in one sentence. Democratic change must be led from within, but in a globalized authoritarian ecosystem it often cannot succeed alone. The right model is not foreign direction, symbolic solidarity, or donor-driven agendas. It is domestic leadership with calibrated international support: locals lead; internationals protect, equip, amplify, connect, and help raise the cost of repression.

INTRODUCTION

From symbolic solidarity to disciplined interdependence

Principle 8 said that restoring democracy is everyone's job. Principle 9 said that coordination among many actors is possible without unanimity. Principle 10 closes Pillar III with the question that follows from both: how should domestic movements relate to international support so that solidarity becomes power, rather than visibility without power, dependency without legitimacy, or symbolism without consequence?

The answer is straightforward to state and demanding to practice. Domestic legitimacy is non-substitutable. No foreign government, donor, NGO, university, or transnational platform can manufacture legitimate democratic leadership where it does not exist. The political imagination, moral authority, social roots, and

credibility of change must come from within each society. At the same time, when regimes monopolize violence, information, finance, diplomacy, and technology, outside support can materially alter the risk environment for democratic actors. The strategic question is therefore not whether international support is good or bad. The real question is more precise: under what conditions does international support strengthen domestic agency, and under what conditions does it weaken it?

This essay sets out the answer in ten sections. It begins with the strategic context: how authoritarian regimes have learned to sever the connection between domestic movements and the international networks that sustain them. It then introduces the working concepts the WLC has developed for this terrain: the Umbilical Cord between inside and outside, the resignification of exile, the discipline that distinguishes helpful international support from distortive support, the model of Democratic Decentralized Resistance for closed contexts, and the role of freedom technologies as the new bridge. It maps the international ecosystem and offers the Domestic-International Alignment Compact as the practical instrument. It closes with the ten rules WLC members can carry, the role the network itself plays in operationalizing this principle, and the exercises the World Liberty Academy uses to train it.



SECTION I

Why this matters now: how authoritarian regimes sever the link

Authoritarian regimes have developed their own learning curve, the same one Principle 2 of this Playbook described. They have studied past democratic movements, learned how international solidarity works, and designed new methods to break the connection between grassroots resistance and outside support. They no longer rely only on arrests, censorship, and brute force. They use law, bureaucracy, banking systems, propaganda, exile, digital surveillance, foreign-agent narratives, and transnational repression to isolate democratic actors from the international networks that help them survive.

The Berlin Manifesto names this directly. Authoritarianism is now transnational, networked, and coordinated. Meanwhile, democratic actors often remain divided between domestic movements and international supporters, operating on different timelines and with insufficient coordination. Principle 10 is the response to that

strategic asymmetry. The methods regimes use to sever the domestic-international link fall into five recognizable patterns. Each requires a specific democratic answer.

1. Foreign-agent laws and sovereignty narratives

Foreign-agent laws are among the most common tools in the contemporary authoritarian playbook. They weaponize concepts that sound legitimate (transparency, sovereignty, national security, anti-interference, traditional values) while their true function is to stigmatize independent civil society, criminalize international funding, and portray domestic democratic actors as agents of outside powers. Movements must be prepared to answer clearly: international solidarity is not foreign control, support for human rights is not interference, transparency must not become a weapon of repression, civil society is rooted in communities rather than in foreign conspiracies, and the genuine foreign influence in many of our countries is the authoritarian playbook imported from Russia, China, Cuba, or Iran. The most reliable response is not defensive but proactive: showing concretely how civil society serves local communities, protects families, supports political prisoners, defends religious freedom, documents abuses, educates youth, and strengthens national dignity.

2. Financial repression

Authoritarian regimes increasingly weaponize the banking system. They freeze accounts, criminalize transfers, monitor donor relationships, punish families, close NGOs, and use anti-money-laundering rhetoric against activists. This creates a paradox for international support: funds large enough to be useful may also become large enough to be dangerous. The strategic lesson is broader: international support must become more agile, secure, decentralized, and context-sensitive. The old model of large grants to visible organizations is often no longer viable in closed or closing societies.

3. Transnational repression

Regimes now attack activists abroad. They surveil exiles, threaten families, abuse Interpol notices, deploy spyware, harass critics online, pressure host governments, deny passports, and attempt kidnappings or assassinations. The Berlin Manifesto names this explicitly and pledges WLC support for legislation, protection mechanisms, accountability for enablers, and emergency assistance to exiled activists. The discipline for movements is to treat transnational repression as part of the operating environment rather than as an exception, and to design protection protocols, documentation, rapid response, and international legal advocacy as core capacities rather than emergency measures.

4. Forced exile as a tactic of rule

Authoritarian regimes increasingly use exile not as an accidental consequence of repression, but as a deliberate technology of power. They banish activists, cancel passports, deny reentry, strip citizenship, close borders, revoke party and NGO registration, and push leaders abroad in order to disconnect them from their constituencies. Exile is, in this sense, a wound and a vantage point. The authoritarian intent is to convert displacement into political death. The democratic response is to convert displacement into a frontline. Section III of this essay sets out how.

5. The inside-versus-outside division

Forced exile creates a second danger: it can deepen divisions between those who remain inside and those who left. Regimes exploit this constantly. They portray exiles as disconnected, comfortable, foreign-controlled, or irrelevant. They portray those inside as the only legitimate voices, while simultaneously preventing them from speaking freely. Exile can become a strategic asset or a liability. It becomes a liability when diaspora fragmentation deepens domestic divisions, when exile leaders lose touch with domestic realities, when international attention centers exile figures at the expense of internal voices, or when regime infiltration exploits diaspora divisions. Principle 10 therefore requires a method for keeping inside and outside connected. That method is the Umbilical Cord.



SECTION II

The Umbilical Cord: keeping inside and outside connected

The most successful movements under extreme repression are often those that maintain a living, secure, disciplined connection between internal actors and external advocates. The WLC's Freedom in Exile work calls this the Umbilical Cord Strategy: exile becomes leverage only when it remains tethered to those inside.

The Umbilical Cord approach formalizes a series of operational questions that movements often leave informal until a crisis exposes the cost of doing so. Who decides what inside the country? Who decides what abroad? How does consultation happen? How is risk assessed? Who can authorize high-risk public steps? How does attribution protect sources? How is credit shared? How does the movement avoid personality-driven exile politics? How does international advocacy remain tied to

domestic priorities? These questions cannot be answered improvisationally in the moment. They have to be answered in writing, in advance, and revisited.

A movement without an Umbilical Cord risks becoming performative abroad and disconnected at home. A movement with a functioning Umbilical Cord can turn exile into pressure, protection, evidence, advocacy, and strategic continuity. The WLC recommends inside-outside compacts that set consultation rhythms, red lines, risk thresholds, decision rights, and attribution rules. These compacts should be short, secure, periodically reviewed, and known by everyone they bind.

“Exile becomes leverage only when it remains tethered to those inside.”



SECTION III

Resignifying exile: from displacement to democratic frontline

To resignify exile means to change its political meaning. The authoritarian meaning of exile is: you are gone, you no longer matter. The democratic meaning of exile must be different: we are displaced but not disconnected, we are safer here so that we can serve those at greater risk there. The Berlin Manifesto reframes exile as a frontline rather than a defeat, and the WLC’s Freedom in Exile initiative is the operational instrument for that reframing. Legitimacy in exile rests on a triangle of three commitments that must be present together. Any one of them missing causes the other two to fail.

1. Inside recognition

Exiles must remain accountable to those inside. This means co-authored agendas, consent-based representation, reliable feedback loops, and the discipline of not exposing internal actors. Exile leaders who speak in the name of those inside without genuine inside recognition undermine both their own legitimacy and the safety of the people they claim to represent. Inside recognition is what distinguishes representation from impersonation.

2. Institutional integrity

International partners need credible counterparts: registered organizations, transparent governance, clear bylaws, accountable officers, conflict-of-interest rules, data protection, and financial controls. Exiles should not seek validation from

the regime that expelled them. They should build lawful and trustworthy structures abroad, structures that international allies can engage with confidence and that withstand scrutiny when, inevitably, the regime tries to discredit them.

3. Measurable impact

Legitimacy grows when exile produces results: a prisoner's conditions improve, a protection visa is granted, a sanctions dossier advances, a journalist is safely relocated, a remittance channel is preserved, a human-rights case reaches a parliament or court. The deepest practical insight is that dispersion can become design. Diasporas are not a footnote to national history. They are an extension of civic agency. When coordinated, diaspora waves become an ecosystem: fundraising where access is needed, legal filings where accountability is possible, logistics where movement is blocked, and narrative where truth is contested.

Diaspora communities are not homogeneous, and the architecture must reflect that. They include early political exiles, established diasporas, circular workers, second-generation civic heirs, and economically motivated migrants who later politicize. Each cohort plays a different role. Early political exiles often provide testimony and political urgency. Established diasporas can provide fundraising, policy access, and institutional legitimacy. Second-generation leaders can translate the message into host-country media and legal language. Newer migrants can provide turnout, logistics, and community mobilization. Professional networks in technology, law, finance, and communications can provide the technical infrastructure that any serious cross-border democratic effort requires.



SECTION IV

When international support helps, and when it harms

A common misunderstanding of Principle 10 is that domestic leadership means international actors should remain passive. That is wrong. Domestic leadership means international support must be correctly ordered. The proper role of transnational support, named clearly in the WLC Theory of Change, is to protect, equip, connect, and amplify, while leaving strategic agency with domestic actors and respecting differences across regime type and movement phase.

Where support distorts

International support becomes harmful when it:

- Substitutes for domestic leadership rather than reinforcing it.
- Rewards English-speaking intermediaries while ignoring grassroots actors who carry the real social legitimacy.
- Creates dependency on donor priorities that drift away from local realities.
- Funds silos rather than ecosystems, producing competition where coordination was needed.
- Depoliticizes struggles that are inherently political, in the name of neutrality or security.
- Imposes timelines detached from domestic risk.
- Becomes so visible that it feeds regime propaganda.
- Treats exiles as the whole movement.
- Treats formal NGOs as the only legitimate actors, ignoring the religious, youth, rural, women-led, informal, and decentralized networks where most resistance actually lives.

Where support strengthens

International support strengthens domestic agency when it:

- Protects people at acute risk.
- Provides flexible resources that respond to changing conditions.
- Supports secure communications and digital defense.
- Funds independent media and serious documentation.
- Offers emergency visas and safe-harbor pathways.
- Strengthens political prisoner advocacy through coordinated campaigns.
- Builds legal and sanctions capacity over multiple years.
- Supports diaspora-inside coordination rather than substituting for it.
- Invests in youth and women's leadership pipelines.
- Helps movements prepare for governance and transition before the day after arrives.
- Aligns its pressure with domestic timing rather than the calendar of foreign capitals.

The difference between distortive and strengthening support is not small. It is the difference between solidarity that helps and solidarity that quietly undermines the very legitimacy it claims to support. Members of the WLC engaging international allies are encouraged to share this distinction with those allies directly, in writing, as part of any working relationship.



SECTION V

Civic muscle under closed conditions: Democratic Decentralized Resistance and freedom technologies

In highly repressive environments, open political organizing may be impossible. Formal NGOs may be illegal. Parties may be banned. Public meetings may be surveilled. Foreign funding may be criminalized. Leaders may be imprisoned or exiled. In these contexts, the WLC's methodology of Democratic Decentralized Resistance becomes especially important. The Berlin Manifesto names the Decentralized Resistance Program among the operational instruments the WLC has built precisely for this terrain.

Decentralized Resistance is the WLC Academy's operating model for pro-democracy organizing in closed or highly repressive societies. It is designed to keep people safe, lower visibility, and maintain momentum when public, hierarchical activism is impossible. It blends small autonomous cells, risk-aware communications, resilient finance, and a clear ethical and nonviolent framework.

What this principle does not mean. Democratic Decentralized Resistance is not clandestine militarization. It is not violence. It is not reckless conspiracy. It is the preservation of civic life when the dictatorship has criminalized normal civic association. The ethical and nonviolent framework remains intact. Members in any doubt about whether a particular activity falls within the discipline should consult the Regional Secretary before proceeding.

The deeper purpose: civic muscle memory

The deeper purpose of this methodology is the preservation of what may be called the muscle memory of civil society. Authoritarianism tries to atomize society. It tries to make people forget how to gather, how to deliberate, how to serve each other, how to trust strangers, how to act in common. Democratic Decentralized Resistance keeps association alive when formal politics is closed.

The forms this takes are deliberately civic, not political in their public expression. Examples include youth arts groups, dance and music circles, painting and creative workshops, sports clubs, reading circles, chess clubs, language exchanges, mutual-aid groups, faith-based service networks, community learning circles, and small civic-education spaces. The point is not deception for its own sake. The point is that authoritarianism tries to make civic life forget itself, and these spaces quietly preserve the trust, the cooperation, the mutual aid, the leadership formation, and

the shared responsibility that democracy requires when it eventually becomes possible again. They must be ethical, nonpolitical in their public wrapper, legitimate in themselves, and never a pretext for illegality.

*“Dictatorships want society to forget how to associate.
Decentralized Resistance is how association survives.”*

Freedom technologies as bridge

Technology is now part of the domestic-international equation. It can either expose activists or protect them. It can either centralize risk or distribute resilience. It can either assist repression or sustain freedom. Freedom technologies in the WLC framework include encrypted communications, decentralized finance, documentation tools, and AI-supported knowledge systems. The Berlin Manifesto explicitly names Bitcoin and related decentralized technologies as part of the freedom toolkit, because, when banking systems are weaponized against dissent, censorship-resistant alternatives become a form of power in themselves.

Tools such as Nostr, Bitchat, Bitcoin, Fedi, encrypted messaging, secure evidence vaults, and AI-supported knowledge systems should be understood as freedom infrastructure, not as gadgets. Their purpose is to protect inside actors, maintain diaspora-inside contact, move small-scale support with accountability, preserve evidence, counter censorship, support political prisoners and their families, maintain civic education under repression, reduce dependence on regime-controlled banking systems, and build resilient channels that survive shutdowns or surveillance.

Nicaragua: Decentralized Democratic Resistance in practice. The WLC’s working partnership with FEDI in Nicaragua illustrates the model in operation. The Ortega-Murillo regime transformed financial architecture into a tool of political repression, using foreign-agents legislation, banking restrictions, and the Financial Analysis Unit (UAF) against civil society. The response has been a system of small, dispersed, privacy-preserving transfers, Bitcoin education, federation-building through Fedi, and relay mechanisms that sustain civic activists and solidarity work while protecting recipients and maintaining donor accountability. Visible large grants to identifiable organizations were no longer viable; agile, decentralized, security-conscious support was.

The principle that holds this work together is short. Technology must serve domestic leadership. It should not replace it, expose it, or centralize it.



SECTION VI

The international ecosystem: who supports, and how

International support is not one actor. It is an ecosystem. For WLC members navigating it, the categories below are useful working distinctions, because each category responds to different incentives, operates on different timelines, and requires different forms of engagement.

Democracy and human-rights organizations

These include organizations such as the Human Rights Foundation, which convenes the Oslo Freedom Forum, Freedom House, the National Endowment for Democracy, the International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict, Front Line Defenders, Access Now, CIVICUS, and Reporters Without Borders. Their contributions include training, advocacy, emergency support, media visibility, research, digital security, political-prisoner campaigns, and access to policymakers.

Democracy forums and convening platforms

Spaces such as the Oslo Freedom Forum, the Copenhagen Democracy Summit, the Geneva Summit for Human Rights and Democracy, the World Movement for Democracy, and the Alliance of Democracies amplify activists, connect movements to policymakers, and help create the transnational legitimacy that domestic actors often cannot generate alone. These forums matter most when they produce follow-up: protection pathways, advocacy coalitions, sanctions work, funding relationships, parliamentary briefings, and sustained media attention. A speech without follow-up is solidarity without consequence.

Democratic governments and parliaments

Governments and legislators can provide targeted sanctions, hearings, resolutions, emergency visas, diplomatic pressure, protective statements, funding for independent media, and recognition of political prisoners and exile structures. The key is alignment. International pressure should be synchronized with domestic strategy, not driven by the calendar of foreign capitals or the news cycles of donor countries.

Universities and research centers

Universities can host exiled scholars, document repression, run human-rights clinics, train activists, produce policy briefs, and connect practitioner experience

with rigorous research. Partnerships such as the work emerging among Harvard's Nonviolent Action Lab, Stanford's Hoover Institution, and the WLC point to the future of international support. Not only solidarity, but learning infrastructure that compounds knowledge across cases over time.

Technology partners

Technology actors can provide secure communications, anti-surveillance support, circumvention tools, decentralized finance, emergency hosting, AI safety frameworks, and digital-rights advocacy. The relationship requires honest engagement on the obligations technology companies have to maintain access during crises, protect encryption, publish transparency reports, and provide priority support to at-risk communities, especially given that some of those same companies have at times sold tools to the regimes their other customers are resisting.

Philanthropy and donors

Donors can help or harm. They help when they provide flexible, long-term, security-conscious, locally informed support. They harm when they impose artificial outputs, short timelines, rigid reporting that exposes people, or funding streams that reward fragmentation. A serious donor should ask one question repeatedly: does this funding strengthen domestic agency, protect people, and build durable capacity, or does it create visibility without power?

Cities, professional associations, faith networks, labor, and the private sector

Not all support comes from national governments. Cities can create safe-harbor pathways. Bar associations can support political prisoners. Medical networks can help torture survivors. Universities can host fellows. Unions can support labor activists. Faith communities can protect conscience and refugees. Companies can refuse complicity with surveillance and adopt democracy due-diligence practices. The WLC's Make Freedom Investable initiative is an explicit attempt to align this category with democratic outcomes rather than authoritarian stability.

When governmental, multilateral, and societal lanes move together, policy text and public narrative begin to rhyme. The discipline is to engage all three lanes together rather than treating them as alternatives.



SECTION VII

The Domestic-International Alignment Compact

Every movement receiving international support should have a written compact with its main international partners, clarifying decision rights, risk boundaries, communications discipline, and review mechanisms. The compact is not a substitute for trust. It is the document that allows trust to be built deliberately rather than informally, and that allows misunderstandings to be resolved by reference to commitments made at moments of clarity rather than to memories distorted by crisis. The seven domains below are the working agenda of any serious compact.

DOMESTIC-INTERNATIONAL ALIGNMENT COMPACT · TEMPLATE

1. Domestic leadership

Who sets priorities? Who has legitimacy inside? Who must be consulted on what kind of decision? Who is at acute risk? Who cannot be named publicly under any circumstances?

2. International roles

Who provides protection? Who provides funding? Who provides legal support? Who provides media amplification? Who provides technology? Who provides research? Who provides diplomatic access?

3. Risk boundaries

What actions could endanger people inside? What information cannot be public? What names cannot be shared? What support would feed regime propaganda? What visible foreign involvement would be harmful, even when it is well-intentioned?

4. Timing

What domestic calendar matters? What international calendar matters? Where can pressure be synchronized? What should wait, even when international partners are eager to act?

5. Accountability

How will support be tracked without exposing recipients? How will donors receive credible reports? How will beneficiaries be protected? How will the movement avoid corruption and personal capture?

6. Communications

Who speaks publicly? Who speaks privately? When should exiles speak? When should internal voices lead? How are messages cleared? Who does the regime's narrative attempt to make speak in the movement's name?

7. Review

When will the compact be reviewed? What metrics will show whether international support is strengthening or distorting domestic agency? Who has authority to change the compact, and on what basis?

The compact should be short, in the language the leadership group actually uses among itself, secure, and reviewed at fixed intervals. Movements operating across multiple international relationships will find that several compacts begin to look similar over time. That convergence is a feature, not a problem. It is how movements build the internal discipline that allows them to engage international support without being shaped by it.



SECTION VIII

Ten practical rules for WLC members

Rule 1. Locals lead, but locals should not be abandoned.

Domestic leadership is not an excuse for international passivity. It means outside actors should strengthen domestic agency, not replace it, and should not retreat at the first sign that the work is hard.

Rule 2. Exile is a frontline only if it remains connected.

Exile becomes useful when it serves those inside. It becomes harmful when it becomes self-referential. The Umbilical Cord is the test.

Rule 3. International support must be calibrated by regime type.

A competitive authoritarian context may need election observation and media support. A closed dictatorship may need protection, secure communications, sanctions, and exile coordination. A post-coup context may need international isolation and security-sector strategy. The same support delivered into the wrong context can do harm.

Rule 4. Do not let foreign-agent narratives define the terms.

Civil society must proactively communicate its local roots, its public value, and its community service. The answer to foreign-agent smears is not silence. It is transparency where safe, demonstrated relevance to ordinary life, and a confident civic patriotism that the regime cannot match.

Rule 5. Build trust through delivery.

Inside actors trust exiles when exiles deliver: protection, resources, visibility, advocacy, legal help, and disciplined representation. Symbolic gestures alone, however well-intentioned, do not build the working trust the movement actually needs.

Rule 6. Separate visibility from usefulness.

The most visible international action is not always the most useful. Sometimes a private visa pathway matters more than a public statement. The discipline is to choose support by what it does, not by how it looks.

Rule 7. Use technology with restraint and purpose.

Freedom technologies should reduce risk, not create new vulnerabilities. No tool replaces trust, discipline, and good judgment. A movement that adopts technology without operational discipline is a movement that has multiplied its surface area for surveillance.

Rule 8. International allies should support ecosystems, not favorites.

Funding only one faction, one party, or one visible leader can deepen fragmentation. Support should strengthen coordination, security, learning, and shared infrastructure across the ecosystem rather than picking winners.

Rule 9. Diasporas must be segmented by function, not treated as one bloc.

Exile communities include different cohorts with distinct strengths and risks. Mapping these roles allows movements to turn dispersion into design.

Rule 10. Every act of support should answer one question: who inside benefits?

If the answer is unclear, the support may be symbolic rather than strategic. If the answer is clear, the support is doing its work.



SECTION IX

How the World Liberty Congress operationalizes Principle 10

The WLC is especially well positioned to operationalize this principle because it is neither a donor, a party, a government, nor a conventional think tank. It is activist-led connective infrastructure designed to help actors separated by geography, profession, ideology, and institutional culture work together with greater coherence. The Berlin Manifesto defines the network's job as a catalyst and connector ensuring that no freedom fighter ever stands alone.

Under Principle 10, the WLC can do work that no single national movement and no single international actor can do alone:

- Connect domestic movements with international allies in ways that respect domestic decision rights through Regional Secretaries.
- Help exiles remain accountable to inside actors through the Freedom in Exile initiative.
- Build secure coordination channels through the Decentralized Resistance Program.
- Develop diaspora mapping and segmentation tools across the network's sixty-plus countries.
- Train members in the disciplines of international advocacy through the World Liberty Academy.
- Coordinate political-prisoner campaigns through Free Them and the Pathway to Freedom Handbook.
- Provide rapid response to transnational repression through the network's protection capacity.
- Advise donors on do-no-harm support, drawing on the working experience of activists who have lived the consequences of bad support.
- Build freedom-technology partnerships that protect rather than expose.
- Help convert exile into strategic leverage rather than political loss.
- Create learning loops across countries through the Academy and the Playbook.
- Coordinate with platforms such as HRF, Oslo Freedom Forum, Copenhagen Democracy Summit, Geneva Summit, Freedom House, NED, universities, and digital-rights organizations, in ways that respect domestic priorities.

The WLC should be a bridge, not a substitute. A connector, not a commander. A protective infrastructure, not a gatekeeper. Members are encouraged to engage the relevant Regional Secretary at the earliest stage of any major international engagement, both to draw on the network's comparative experience and to ensure that the work being done in any one country reinforces, rather than competes with, work being done in others.



SECTION X

Practical exercises for the World Liberty Academy

The seven exercises below are used in WLC Academy workshops on international advocacy, exile-inside coordination, and donor relationships. They can be adapted for any leadership retreat, coalition strategy meeting, or diaspora training session.

Exercise 1. Domestic-International Alignment map

Participants map domestic actors, exile actors, diaspora groups, donors, international NGOs, governments, media, and technology partners. They identify who leads, who supports, who amplifies, who protects, and who may accidentally distort the strategy. The output is a working map for the next year of international engagement.

Exercise 2. Foreign-agent narrative response

Participants design a proactive narrative explaining why international support strengthens local communities rather than undermining sovereignty. The message must connect to daily life: prisoners, families, faith, education, jobs, security, dignity, and national future. The exercise builds the capacity to defend the work in language ordinary citizens recognize.

Exercise 3. Umbilical Cord compact

Inside and exile actors draft a two-page compact defining consultation rhythms, risk thresholds, attribution rules, and decision rights. The exercise is most effective when conducted with both inside and exile participants in the same secure setting.

Exercise 4. Resignifying exile

Participants map how their exile community can move from denunciation to delivery. They must identify three tangible outcomes the exile structure can produce in ninety days for people inside the country, with clear attribution rules and communication discipline.

Exercise 5. Decentralized civic muscle

Participants design an ethical civic-presence plan for closed contexts. The plan uses arts, sports, learning, faith, service, mutual aid, or cultural spaces that preserve civic association without exposing people unnecessarily. The exercise builds the imagination required to keep civic life alive when formal politics is closed.

Exercise 6. International support audit

Participants review their current international relationships and classify each as helpful, symbolic, distortive, or risky. They then redesign each relationship around domestic priorities, with the discipline of writing what they would say to the partner if they could be honest.

Exercise 7. Technology risk review

Participants assess which tools they use for communication, finance, evidence, and coordination. They identify what reduces risk and what may create exposure, with attention to the difference between convenience and security. The output is a technology hygiene plan for the next quarter.



CONCLUSION

Rightly ordered solidarity

Principle 10 is a doctrine of rightly ordered solidarity. Domestic leadership gives the struggle legitimacy. International support gives the struggle protection, leverage, and reach. Exile gives the struggle a new frontline, but only if it remains tethered to those inside. Technology gives the struggle resilience, but only if it serves people rather than exposing them. Donors give the struggle resources, but only if they strengthen agency rather than impose agendas. Global forums give the struggle visibility, but only if visibility produces outcomes.

The authoritarian learning curve is real. Dictators have learned to criminalize support, stigmatize civil society, force leaders into exile, surveil transnational networks, and divide those inside from those abroad. Democratic movements must now learn faster. The answer is not isolation. The answer is not dependency. The answer is disciplined interdependence.

Locals lead.

Exiles serve and connect.

International allies protect, equip, amplify, and align.

Technology sustains secure civic life.

The WLC connects the ecosystem.

That is how domestic legitimacy and global solidarity become strategic power. Pillar III closes here. Pillar IV begins with the next principle, which addresses the multi-layered, sequenced, timed strategies that turn coordinated power into political change.

SOURCES CITED

World Liberty Congress, *Berlin Manifesto* (Berlin Parliament, November 10, 2025), the doctrinal foundation referenced throughout this essay.

World Liberty Congress, *Theory of Change* (2026), and *Adaptations to Counter-Autocracy Strategic Framework* (Berlin, November 2025). Principle 10: Domestic Leadership, International Support.

World Liberty Congress, *Exile as the Democratic Frontline*, and the operational documents of the Freedom in Exile initiative, including the Umbilical Cord Strategy and the diaspora segmentation framework.

World Liberty Congress, *Pathway to Freedom: Handbook for the Liberation of Political Prisoners* (Vilnius, 2023).

On transnational repression, see Freedom House, *Out of Sight, Not Out of Reach: The Global Scale and Scope of Transnational Repression*, and subsequent annual reports. Available at freedomhouse.org.

On foreign-agent legislation and its uses, see CIVICUS, the European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL), and the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL) for comparative analysis of restrictive civil-society laws. civicus.org.

On democratic transitions and the role of international actors, see Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe C. Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), and Larry Diamond, *The Spirit of Democracy* (Times Books, 2008).

On freedom technologies, decentralized resistance, and digital security for activists, see the Berlin Manifesto's section on Bitcoin and Freedom Technologies, the WLC Decentralized Resistance Program documentation, and the resources cited in the Playbook training document for Principle 6: Know the Enemy.

CONTINUE TO PILLAR IV

Pillar IV of the Playbook for Liberty is Winning and Defending the Future: The Path to Victory. It covers Principles 11, 12, and 13 of the WLC framework: No Silver Bullets (Multi-Layered, Sequenced, and Timed Strategies Win), Understand Repression as Inevitable and Make It Backfire, and Prepare for the Future to Win the Present.