Available online at http://cadmusjournal.org/
Cadmus
Promoting Leadership in Thought that Leads to Action
Volume 5, Issue 6 - August 2026

The Global Peace Offensive:
A Common Framework for Roll-out

Donato Kiniger-Passigli
Vice President (Social Sciences and Humanities),
World Academy of Art and Science

Charlotte Ørnemark
International consultant in M&E

"I am not only a pacifist but a militant pacifist. I am willing to fight for peace."
– Albert Einstein[1]

Foreword

Since its inception in the midst of the Cold War in 1960, the World Academy of Art and Science has been deeply concerned with controlling the rapid escalation of all forms of conflict and violence among communities, nations, and those divided by perceptions of differences in ideology, religion, ethnicity, class, gender, and social status. Never before has humanity confronted threats to peace and security as imminent and serious as those we face today. The cumulative diplomatic expertise and experience of the last eight decades have not prepared us to effectively deal with the spiralling chain of turbulence circling the globe. It is in this context, with this concern, that WAAS initiated a quest to understand the root causes of turbulence, combined with an effort to seek more effective strategies to manage, control, and resolve its violent manifestations that threaten world peace.

The analytical work conducted during the last two years by Donato Kiniger-Passigli, WAAS Vice President for Social Sciences and Humanities, reflects an institutional research effort toward the enunciation of a clear path to achieving lasting peace. The vision that emerged in the two previous articles published in *Cadmus* Journal on the same subject was adopted by WAAS, the European Academy of Art and Science (EASA), and the Alma Mater Europaea (AMEU), giving birth to a new institution named after the same strategic approach: the Global Peace Offensive Center (GPOC), inaugurated in Maribor, Slovenia, on September 25, 2025. This third article in a series dedicated to the global peace offensive presents a vital and actionable framework to build a global movement for peace.

This is indeed a challenge as great in magnitude as the efforts of our founders to control the threat of nuclear weapons. My deepest appreciation goes to the authors, co-founders of GPOC, partners, and all those joining WAAS in this quest.

Garry Jacobs
President & CEO, World Academy of Art & Science

Abstract

In times of heightened political polarization and violence, there is a great need to provide a concrete way for people in all their diversity to get involved in building and securing peace, based on the principles of de-escalation, multistakeholder engagement, and drawing on local knowledge. This idea of launching a proactive, dialogue-driven peacebuilding strategy, spearheaded by the academic community in collaboration with civil society, has quickly gained ground under the common framework of the Global Peace Offensive. Promoted by the World Academy of Art and Science (WAAS), the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (EASA), and the Alma Mater Europaea University (AMEU), with the active support of the Club of Rome, this initiative has already established the first Global Peace Offensive Center (GPOC) in Maribor, Slovenia. This article defines a common framework for the Global Peace Offensive (GPO) and its implementation. It builds on earlier articles on how symbolic gestures and inclusive dialogue can alleviate hostility and spark cooperative behavior: The Peace Offensive: A New Strategic Framework for Conflict Resolution[2] and Time for a Peace Offensive, both published in Cadmus Journal.[3] In this article, the authors argue that a joint diagnostic approach supported by simple facilitation tools could lower the bar for involvement, ensure adherence to fundamental principles, and increase comparability of lessons learned across different contexts to support peer learning. The proposed approach is based on four key components: (i) understanding the 'here and now' of conflict by applying systems thinking; (ii) focusing on positive pivot points for localized action; (iii) encouraging wide uptake and interpretation of findings; and (iv) using the GPO framework to engage academia, civil society, and policymakers in dialogue on how to mobilize civic forces for peace. In the face of the growing disenchantment with political solutions, this method offers an original and creative system to bring people back into the center of the peace process.

The Global Peace Offensive is not an advocacy movement but a facilitative and impartial process.

1. Introduction

The world faces a surge in political polarization and violence whereby traditional methods often fall short in addressing the complexities of contemporary conflicts. This calls for innovative approaches to peacebuilding that involve a larger number of actors than those who typically negotiate behind closed doors. The Global Peace Offensive (GPO) emerged as a proactive, dialogue-driven strategy, engaging and empowering the academic community and civil society to address these challenges. Championed by WAAS, EASA, AMEU, and the Club of Rome, the initiative established its first Global Peace Offensive Center (GPOC) in Maribor, Slovenia, in 2025 and is expanding through regional consultations. The GPO aims to empower local researchers, civil society groups and individuals to participate in building and securing peace through a process of de-escalation drawing on local knowledge.

The term Global Peace Offensive may appear paradoxical at first, but it was introduced in the 1960s by Charles Egerton Osgood, a pioneering behaviorist and member of the US National Academy of Sciences, known for his cross-cultural research and the Graduated

Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) theory. Osgood's work explored how reciprocal, unilateral gestures could help deescalate hostilities. Revisiting Osgood's theory decades later, the Global Peace Offensive emerges as a strategic campaign for peace rather than war—a deliberate flipping of the logic of confrontation. A Peace Offensive is a concentrated attempt by one nation or group to bring about peace actively, especially by means of conciliatory gestures or proposals (Collins Dictionary).

In this sense, the Global Peace Offensive is not an advocacy movement but a facilitative and impartial process. It aims to transform mindsets rather than prescribe outcomes. The operational points of this initiative for peace are reflected in the Vision for a Global Peace Offensive (October 21, 2024) and the Call for Action (March 14, 2025), co-signed by WAAS, EASA, AMEU, and a growing network of academic and civil society organizations.[4]

This aim is to promote peace globally, allowing science and art, knowledge and experience to converge on finding comprehensive solutions to the most intractable conflicts and existential threats. Its timeliness is compelling given the heightened political polarization and violence, the failure of global leadership to address such challenges at a more official level, and the ongoing surge of social movements, groups and individuals (in particular young people) interested in meaningfully contributing to peace efforts. Moreover, within the academic sphere we seek to harness an interdisciplinary approach as well as an intergenerational and cross-cultural 'coming together', something that few other peacebuilding initiatives currently manage to actualize.

2. The Global Peace Offensive: Core Principles and Strategic Imperatives

Before going any further in the description of the suggested method to address conflicts, both new and recurrent ones, it is helpful to recall that it is the GPO's distinctive feature to focus on issues and solutions; the what, where, and how of a conflict, so as to promote a clearer understanding, based on key facts, narratives, examples, and thus to establish the scope for tension reduction.

The three core principles outlined in the Global Peace Offensive endorsed by the collaborating institutions (and to be shared with those wanting to get involved) are:

- ***A focus on localized initiatives leading to de-escalation***: Focusing on incremental progress toward sustainable solutions for specific problems (as opposed to a focus on grand schemes and agreements that may be less well-anchored among people and interest groups on the ground).
- ***Partnership development and deepened trust-building***: Creating a living repository of interested institutional partners (and pioneering individuals in those institutions), in order to create a sense of joint purpose and a facilitated process of peer learning at all levels (among members of academia, grassroots organizations, civil society organizations, municipalities or local government, other socio-economic actors such as the media, unions, interest-based organizations etc.); momentum building and creating a sense of community, reinforced by effective inter-communal and public communications.

- ***Iterative processes of dialogue facilitation***: Engaging in iterative processes of dialogue facilitation with a cumulative effect towards lasting peace, through cultural, scientific, educational diplomacy, and traditional diplomatic channels.

3. The Need for a Common Diagnostic Framework

While the GPO embraces diversity in how tools are used and findings interpreted for dialogue, a shared diagnostic approach among those involved is crucial for effective implementation. Such a framework offers several advantages:

- ***Facilitates broader participation***: It lowers the bar for getting involved, reducing the need for reinventing methodologies and approaches while still allowing for local adaptation and improvements through iterative testing.
- ***Ensures adherence to shared fundamental principles***: Guarantees that core values and minimum standards are upheld within the framework based on integrity, independence and impartiality of the facilitation process under the GPO umbrella, maintaining a cohesive vision.
- ***Enhances comparability and peer learning***: Improves the ability to compare lessons learned across diverse contexts, fostering peer learning.

A common diagnostic framework ensures fundamental principles are respected and the joint vision is adhered to—in essence, it is what 'binds' the GPO together as a joint initiative. In other words, while there is a certain order of events and fundamental principles that need to be respected in order to develop and operationalize a shared vision under the Global Peace Offensive umbrella, actual interpretation and use of common tools and approaches will vary.

4. Key Components of the Diagnostic Approach: A Solution-Oriented Path

Four main components have been identified within the main diagnostic framework. These are further explained below.

(i). Understanding the 'Here and Now' of Conflict (Applying Systems Thinking)

This part of the analysis largely focuses on the question: *'What'*. This is largely descriptive of the 'system of conflict'—recognizing that any conflict scenario has a series of systemic patterns that enforce or maintain the conflict in a given environment. The overarching approach here is to adopt a systems thinking perspective and to seek early identification of interrelated components and relations in the system to find out how these intersect. However, before that, some descriptive 'what' questions will help establish basic facts about the current situation from a helicopter perspective (using already codified or available data). Based on this helicopter view it will then be possible to do deep dives onto various 'helipads' identified as nodes of localized action.

Key questions will include:

- What are the known facts (geographical scope and locality, origins, current status of conflicts, main characteristics etc.)?
- What are the defining narratives surrounding the conflict?
- What are the documented (or known) points of division or convergence?
- What are some potential areas for tension reduction and de-escalation (to be further validated and explored)?

Competing narratives often represent the main obstacles to peace, making it extremely difficult for parties to arrive at a shared assessment of the situation through argument or persuasion alone.

It is important to note that while this part of the analysis should be evidence-based (using already existing/codified knowledge), it should be brief. The purpose would be to establish a quick snapshot, to crystallize the state and dynamics of the conflict rather than compiling comprehensive documentation of all possible grievances. Instead, time and effort would be spent on identifying openings for possible localized peace action in areas where there is scope for tension reduction and de-escalation through a number of locally driven microsolutions to defined problems. A simple framework has been developed to record the basic facts of the conflict scenario and to set the scene (Table 1).

Table 1: Initial Mapping to set the scene

Variables of the Conflict	Known Facts	Areas for Additional Analysis/Validation
Geographic scope and locality	-Region, sub-region, country/countries, locality	-Areas at risk of being brought into the conflict or where the level of tensions is on the rise
Status of the conflict	-Such as e.g., temporary ceasefire, level of adherence, state of negotiations -Prevention -Mediation	-Different interpretations of conflict status

Key facts	-Brief timeline and evolution of the conflict -Root causes as they have been described and documented -Current holding patterns of conflict -Power dimensions -Key actors	-Civic response and attitudes
Overarching narratives	-Main media narrative -In-country perceptions and testimonials -Prevailing stereotypes that undermine social cohesion	-Voices or opinions that are less present in the overarching narratives to date
Examples of problemsolving and knowledge generation for de-escalation	-Initiatives to increase cultural understanding and peace education, -Youth involvement -Emergent civil society networks working for de-escalation -Available conflict/peace research or other forms of documentation, knowledge generation	-Areas that need further documentation or where there is scope for civic engagement
Potential areas where there is scope for tension reduction	-Areas where there are momentum and ongoing activity that has proven or potential peace effects on the ground -A broad mapping of domains that interlink at macro (socio-cultural/ economic), meso (institutional), and micro (individual or community/ neighborhood levels)	-Areas that need further documentation or where there is scope for civic engagement

Conflicts can be seen as slow-onset, complex events with very specific system dynamics and holding patterns, though they may occasionally emerge from sudden incidents. These are largely relational in nature but are affected by exogenous (external) or endogenous (homegrown or internal) factors.[5] Moreover, existing holding patterns are usually supported by salient facts and narratives about the cause of conflict and other aspects that relate to less tangible features. By deep diving into different system nodes for potential action, the task is therefore to understand the situation as it is currently described, lived, or observed. Describing the current situation 'as is' rather than seeking to establish clear causal patterns acknowledges that conflicts are by default multi-variable and complex (everything is dependent on everything, and therefore unpredictable). Yet competing narratives are typically available and even "cemented" in people's minds and perceptions of what the cause and nature of the conflict is about. These competing narratives often represent the main obstacles to peace, making it extremely difficult for parties to arrive at a shared assessment of the situation through argument or persuasion alone. Such narratives are part of systemic holding patterns and will not shift "from above", but rather when lived realities that matter start to shift them.

A 'positive pivot' means a turn of events—big or small—based on new relational connections among people (citizens), grassroots groups, academia, or other civic engagements that gradually and incrementally build a foundation for a potential shift in systemic patterns of conflict.

An issue-driven approach focusing on problems and solutions is used to draw the contours of how different problem areas are linked to overall system dynamics, with an analysis of how, in turn, a multitude of micro-solutions could potentially help shift existing patterns. From a systems thinking perspective this means that—while the overall features of the conflict may be known and documented (and easily observed from afar or above, the 'helicopter view')—there are many different realities of what the source of conflict is, a high degree of misalignment of interests, a low level of trust, a sense of 'chaos' etc., while some overarching holding patterns prevent conflict resolution. Sub-systems nested within that overall system may reflect these overall trends, but could also be nodes of localized action, possibly with their own internal dynamics and set of actors. (Visible only when landing on different helipads).

Key questions would relate to *the 'how' and the 'who'* when defining specific problem driven actions where there may be scope for positive contributions and de-escalation. Some suggestions include:

- How can specific problem-solving areas be defined and classified within the bigger system of conflict? (using systems maps and social network mapping if needed)

- How are specific problems interlinked and how could they potentially be shifted based on iterative dialogue, constructive negotiation and problem-solving in a multi-stakeholder setting?
- How can existing efforts by academia and civil society play a role when it comes to trust building and alignment of interests that lead to tension reduction and de-escalation?
- Who needs to be involved? Who is currently excluded?
- How would narratives and storylines have to shift to support peace efforts?

Employing a systems thinking approach, the focus should be on identifying key actors, their interests, and points of connection or contention that either align or fragment relationships. Understanding these dynamics can de-escalate conflict and promote peace.

(ii). Focusing on Positive Pivot Points for Localized Action (Building Trust and De-escalation)

A 'positive pivot' means a turn of events—big or small—based on new *relational connections* among people (citizens), grassroots groups, academia, or other civic engagements that gradually and incrementally build a foundation for a potential shift in systemic patterns of conflict.

The GPO intends to support peace efforts globally, through citizens' diplomacy and peacebuilding initiatives, starting from the most promising localized initiatives. These efforts seek to unleash local capacities and ownership to create momentum for peacebuilding efforts, using cultural, scientific, economic, educational, and environmental diplomacy, engaging political, economic, and media systems. The focus is on what brings actors together in joint problem-solving and understanding in each context, rather than focusing on lofty long-term goals. The idea of localization also means co-creation of a set of principles and ideas that are shared (with sufficient clarity and leadership to form an agreed foundation), while still allowing for local adaptation and dissemination.

It will be enabled by applying an Appreciative Inquiry approach (see section below), both as a means of conducting action research and undertaking facilitation, which is replicable by local researchers and civic groups. This process uses positive psychology as an entry point and focuses on what works. Such positive examples are less sensitive to discuss in a conflict scenario, which in turn opens the way for problem-solving and mobilizing action for tension reduction. Academia (along with civil society networks and the media) can play important roles in validating, further exploring and brokering newly generated knowledge, and connecting it with other existing knowledge streams. There may also be a role for new technology—such as the innovative application of "generous AI"—to help validate and look for culturally appropriate examples of solutions in similar cultural contexts.[6] The idea is that some structured support, along with wide knowledge sharing under the GPO framework, can lead to the emergence of new forms of collaboration, particularly between different civic groups and researchers. It is a trust-based model, focusing on constructive engagement in measures for de-escalation. Whether and how such localized efforts contribute, collectively, to a larger 'peace effect' is something researchers and practitioners can help track over time.

(iii). Encouraging Wide Uptake, Use, and Interpretation of Findings (Promoting Diverse "Truths")

Putting all the information generated under the GPO in the public domain seeks to inspire multiple types of action and avoids processes being ring-fenced by a limited number of actors or interest groups. Communication and wide dissemination of examples, tools, and outcomes are therefore at the heart of the initiative. It is in line with the underlying idea that engaging in peace-building efforts should be accessible to all and not be reserved for specialists and/or activists alone.

Peace agreements should be viewed as starting points for change, not as final solutions.

Activities under the GPO umbrella in this area include:

- ***Communicating***: Actively maximize the use and wide interpretations of the gathered evidence through processes of further validation and consultation.
- ***Peer-Based Learning***: Share lessons learned and best practices through workshops, conferences, online platforms, and other mechanisms.
- ***Documenting Changes***: Track and visualize progress, documenting changes in attitudes, behaviors, and actions among involved parties, the effects of peer learning, and its influence on the peace trajectory.

Once a common evidence base has been established using a common framework (as laid out in Table 1), and a process of appreciative inquiry has been facilitated to further explore and map the areas and scope for tension reduction and de-escalation, a process of widely communicating and encouraging uptake, validation, and use of this information will be initiated.

This includes, but goes beyond, communicating outcomes of a situation analysis and data gathering process. Additionally, the aim is to actively maximize the use and wide interpretation(s) of the gathered evidence with processes of further validation and consultation. The purpose would be to allow for multiple "truths" to emerge and be used differently by different groups (by the media, civil society groups, academia, official diplomatic channels, etc.), with ownership that extends far beyond a few select institutions or researchers. Combined with peer-based learning (see below), such communications processes would then feed into the action planning and visioning process and could help build momentum for further action, making cycles of inquiry both iterative and multiplicative.

Regarding situation analysis—the 'here and now' of conflict: Conflicts are always complex, depending on a myriad of interconnected variables, historic contexts, individual realities, and often linked to both social/collective and individual traumas. The purpose of any background analysis would not be to fully document or even understand all of these factors (which would be time-consuming, technically impossible, or not necessarily conducive to peace action). Instead, the focus would be on seeking to compile a quick situation analysis (as is now, and based on current perceptions), drawing on available multisectoral knowledge and

stakeholder feedback to best describe the current situation and any openings for increased trust-building and positive change. The approach would not be to understand all (given that we are operating in a domain where solutions are largely "unknowable", relational and constantly negotiated and emerging), but rather to establish a basic minimum common evidence-base among actors and to use such foundations to build momentum for increased trust-building, change, and iterative dialogue.

(iv). Engaging Academia, Civil Society, and Policymakers (Bridging Sectors for Peace)

The GPO initiative should serve as a motivating and unifying "umbrella" where peers can learn from each other and share lessons internationally, drawing on a wider network of institutions and academia. While many localized and global processes for peacebuilding already exist, many do so in parallel, and few make it to the forefront of policy dialogue, which lately tends to focus on rearmament with little attention to civic engagement. The idea behind the GPO is to create a broader common platform and framework where lessons can be shared, and insights can be used for peer learning while also drawing global attention to the positive impacts of civic action.

The GPOC in Maribor is an effort to set up such a hub for practical peacebuilding, enhancing expertise and know-how. It builds on numerous similar peacebuilding initiatives but differs in that it seeks to be a clearinghouse for knowledge exchange for people-driven efforts. It will host workshops, conduct research, provide training, and facilitate dialogue among peacebuilders from different countries.[7] To that end, emphasis should be placed on the importance of non-official mediation, involving academics, NGOs, the business community, youth networks, and individuals, in addressing the deeper causes of conflict. One popular approach is the problem-solving workshop, aiming to improve relationships between conflicting parties and address root causes.

As such, the peer learning component will be central to make sure that localized action is featured and shared at a global level. To support this, regional knowledge hubs in host institutions, such as GPOC in Maribor, can support efforts for peer exchange while linking emerging lessons with other knowledge strands or themes, securing the interdisciplinary approach to problem-solving.

As documented in-depth by, e.g., OECD's Effective Institutions Platform, gathering and featuring peer-based learning examples in a global setting was found to be a motivating drive for actors to engage and track progress, and helped build a sense of community across platform members. The emergence and publication of examples could also help build a community and encourage others to join. The initiative also developed a series of steps and templates for monitoring outcomes from such peer-based learning efforts.[8]

5. Appreciative Inquiry to Harness Positive Micro Solutions

To build momentum for constructive peacebuilding efforts, the GPO will use and adapt 'Appreciative Inquiry' to unpack potentially positive pivot points, enhance what organically works and builds trust, leading to de-escalation. Appreciative Inquiry starts with

the assumption that questions about strengths, successes, values, hopes, and dreams are transformational, aiming to identify what helps strengthen relationships, prevent disorder, and lead to de-escalation.

Since war originates in the minds of people, weapons alone cannot provide lasting solutions to human conflicts.

Appreciative Inquiry "is the study and exploration of what gives life to human systems when they function at their best. This approach is based on the assumption that questions and dialogue about strengths, successes, values, hopes, and dreams are themselves transformational. Appreciative Inquiry suggests that human organizing and change is a relational process of inquiry, grounded in affirmation and appreciation."[9]

A key feature making this method promising for the GPO is that "positive questions lead to positive change," and the inquiry framing can foster incremental nudging and visioning for system transformation. It seeks to identify what strengthens relationships, enabling new relational systemic patterns and preventing disorder/chaos, leading to de-escalation. Starting with problem identification, this process changes the perspective to amplify positive outcomes and behavioral changes. These positive practices inform structured facilitation to imagine alternative futures (the "dream" phase). Involving broader actors and academia allows for a more inclusive evidence base, fitting Appreciative Inquiry's overall philosophy (see Box 1).

Box 1. Original Principles of Appreciative Inquiry

The Constructionist Principle: Words Create Worlds. Reality, as we know it, is a subjective vs. objective state and is socially created through language and conversations.

The Simultaneity Principle: Inquiry Creates Change. Inquiry is an intervention. The moment we ask a question, we begin to create a change. "The questions we ask are fateful."

The Poetic Principle: We Can Choose What We Study. What we choose to study makes a difference. It describes – even creates – the world as we know it.

The Anticipatory Principle: Image Inspires Action. Human systems move in the direction of their images of the future. The more positive and hopeful the image of the future, the more positive the present-day action.

The Positive Principle: Positive Questions Lead to Positive Change. Momentum for [small or] large-scale change requires large amounts of positive effect and social bonding. This momentum is best generated through positive questions that amplify the positive core.

Source: https://centerforappreciativeinquiry.net

Using qualitative feedback and dialogue, 'positive pivot points' would be identified—micro solutions or relational dynamics that, despite overall negative system effects: (i) build trust, (ii) seek enhanced relations, (iii) build collaboration momentum, and (iv) align interests toward common goals. This differs from typical crisis research focusing on understanding crisis phenomena and vulnerabilities, instead seeking to build and reinforce positive relationships. It bridges distance between researcher/facilitator and stakeholders through action research, distinguishing what can be done immediately (by people present) through close proximity/boundary partners and what is structural/systemic, thus breaking down otherwise insurmountable wicked problems.

6. Breaking Cycles and Prioritizing Human Security

Mutual deterrence tends to freeze constructive initiatives, necessitating a deliberate move away from patterns of military escalation. When addressing ongoing conflicts, prioritizing civil peace is essential because it stabilizes society and prevents violence, whereas liberal peace, which promotes political and economic changes, is part of an ongoing peacebuilding process rather than a final achievement. Consequently, peace agreements should be viewed as starting points for change, not as final solutions. We need both a long-term strategic perspective and immediate concrete action, characterized by unwavering firmness paired with sustained patience in the pursuit of benevolent interdependence. Since war originates in the minds of people, weapons alone cannot provide lasting solutions to human conflicts.

There is an urgent need to exercise imagination and creativity in our approaches, while prioritizing dedicated support for the United Nations and its essential role in the maintenance of international peace, sustainable development, and universal human rights, in accordance with the principles established in the UN Charter.

A solution-oriented approach in peacebuilding should be consistently adopted, recognizing that there exists no simple duality of good versus bad actors. In all violent conflict situations, no party can be considered entirely right or entirely wrong, requiring a nuanced understanding and balanced engagement with all stakeholders.

7. Conclusion: A Call to Action

The Global Peace Offensive represents a vital effort to promote sustainable peace in an era increasingly marked by conflict and global division. By adopting a comprehensive common diagnostic framework and implementing its three strategic pillars, the GPO can effectively engage diverse actors, foster meaningful collaboration, and drive transformational change at both local and global levels.

As reiterated above, the GPO's framework is fundamentally based on three core principles. The first principle emphasizes a concentrated focus on localized initiatives for de-escalation, anchoring progress in sustainable, issue-specific solutions that are carefully tailored to meet the distinct needs of communities and interest groups operating on the ground. The second principle underscores the critical importance of partnership development and trust-building, creating an expansive network of institutional partners and pioneering individuals to cultivate

shared purpose and facilitate cross-sector peer learning. The third principle calls for iterative dialogue processes facilitated through cultural, scientific, and educational diplomacy, complementing traditional diplomatic channels to support lasting peace.

Crucially, the GPO also recognizes the urgent need to break free from the destructive cycle of mutual nuclear deterrence and military build-up, instead prioritizing a broader understanding of human security that reflects people's basic needs, equity, aspirations, and opportunities, while addressing common root causes of conflict and social tensions to anticipate and prevent worse consequences. Social engagement and political participation through deliberative processes foster genuine peace and security in the long run. It is not by coincidence that the visionary former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali called for "an integrated approach to Human Security to address the deepest causes of conflict: economic despair, social injustice and political oppression".[10]

By elevating civil peace over liberal peace and viewing peace agreements as starting points rather than final endpoints, the initiative adopts a long-term perspective firmly rooted in benevolent interdependence. Through empowering citizen-led initiatives, embracing the never-ending nature of peacebuilding, and championing a solution-oriented approach, the GPO offers a systematic path forward toward a more peaceful and just world. As these foundational principles gain traction across diverse stakeholder groups, the critical next step lies in their effective operationalization to transform theoretical frameworks into tangible, measurable peacebuilding outcomes.

Authors' Contact Information
Donato Kiniger-Passigli: *kiniger@worldacademy.org*
Charlotte Ørnemark: *charlotteornemark@gmail.com*

Notes

1. Albert Einstein, "What Life Means to Einstein," interview by George Sylvester Viereck, in *Glimpses of the Great* (New York: Macaulay, 1930).
2. Donato Kiniger-Passigli, "The Peace Offensive: A New Strategic Framework for Conflict Resolution," *Cadmus Journal* 6, no. 1 (July 2025): 12–24, https://cadmusjournal.org/node/1096.
3. Donato Kiniger-Passigli, "Time for a Peace Offensive," *Cadmus Journal* 5, no. 3 (July 2024): 10–13, https://www.cadmusjournal.org/article/volume-5-issue-3-p2/time-peace-offensive.
4. World Academy of Art and Science (WAAS), *Vision for a Global Peace Offensive*, October 21, 2024, https://worldacademy.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Vision-for-the-global-peace-offensive_oct2024.pdf; World Academy of Art and Science (WAAS), *Global Peace Offensive: Call for Action*, March 14, 2025, https://worldacademy.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/GPO_call-for-action_march2025.pdf.
5. Oliver Jütersonke and Donato Kiniger-Passigli, *Fragility Compass* (Geneva: International Labour Organization and The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, 2015).
6. United Nations ESCAP, "Generous AI: Integrating Buddhism to Push the Frontiers of Inclusive Innovation in Cambodia," *ESCAP Blog*, March 14, 2025, https://www.unescap.org/blog/generous-ai-integrating-buddhism-push-frontiers-inclusiveinnovation-cambodia.
7. For a recent example of a workshop addressing these dynamics, see World Academy of Art and Science, "Challenges to Peace in the Black Sea and the Role of the Tatars for a Future Based on Security, Trust & Cooperation," December 5, 2025, https://worldacademy.org/challenges-to-peace-in-the-black-sea-and-the-role-of-the-tatars-for-a-future-based-on-security-trustcooperation/. This event was conducted in collaboration with the Black Sea Universities Network (BSUN) and the Global Peace Offensive Center (GPOC).

8. OECD/EIP (2023). "How to Guide on Peer-to-Peer Learning", EIP, OECD, 2023. https://www.effectiveinstitutions.org/en/publications.html

9. Diana Whitney and Amanda Trosten-Bloom, *The Power of Appreciative Inquiry* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2003), quoted in Anne Garbutt, "Appreciative Inquiry," INTRAC (January 2017): 1 https://www.intrac.org/app/uploads/2017/01/Appreciative-Inquiry.pdf

10. United Nations Secretary-General, "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping," UN Doc. A/47/277-S/24111, June 17, 1992, http://www.un-documents.net/a47-277.htm.