

THE FIRST STONE

What If We Built Something Together?

A Civilian Infrastructure Proposal for Trust, Security and Peace Between Iran, Its Neighbours and the United States

Dearest Brothers and Sisters,

I write to you from very far away, and yet these past days you have not felt very far away at all. I have thought of your families while putting my own children to bed, and wondered about the mothers listening carefully to sounds in the night, the fathers trying to keep fear from reaching their faces because their children are watching, the husbands worrying for their wives and the wives worrying for their husbands. I have thought of grandparents who have already lived through too much history, and of young men and women who would rather be planning marriages, careers, businesses and ordinary Tuesdays than learning the language of missiles, sanctions, borders and war.

And, inevitably, I have thought of the children.

Wherever we are born beneath these stars, children remain wonderfully ordinary. They have favourite foods and ridiculous jokes; blankets they refuse to surrender long after they have supposedly grown too old for them; small treasures whose importance makes sense only inside the family that loves them. Somewhere, in some home, there is a little cup that belongs to one particular child. Their mother knows which one it is. Their father knows too. Someone knows how that child likes to be held when frightened, which song settles them, and how their forehead feels beneath a goodnight kiss.

These things may appear small beside the affairs of nations. I believe they are the affairs of nations, because a civilization is ultimately responsible for protecting the ordinary lives being lived beneath its flag.

So before I speak of Iran or America, nuclear weapons or sanctions, infrastructure or artificial intelligence, I want to say something much simpler.

We see you.

There are people far beyond your borders who grieve when your families suffer. We may never know your names. We may speak different languages, worship differently, carry different histories and live beneath different flags. We may disagree profoundly about politics, religion and government. None of that makes your humanity conditional upon our agreement.

Your children are not statistics to us, and neither are your mothers or fathers, your husbands or wives, your brothers, sisters or grandparents. You are not pieces waiting to be moved across somebody else's geopolitical board. You are human beings, and there are more people standing quietly beside you than you may ever be able to see.

I cannot write this letter pretending to understand everything you have endured. I am not Iranian, Arab, Israeli or Palestinian. I am not a diplomat, and I represent no government, military or political party. I am an American woman living in New Zealand, a mother of four boys, an independent researcher and the founder of a small systems company called Onyx Horizon Systems.

Perhaps my American birth makes this letter more difficult to write. So be it. Citizenship cannot require silence from conscience. When something done by the country of my birth causes innocent people to suffer, I will not protect myself from that knowledge simply because looking at it hurts. Nor do I believe America alone carries every wound in this region. History is far more complicated than that, and pretending otherwise would dishonour the very people I am trying to address.

There has been enough accusation to last several lifetimes, enough inherited hatred, and enough asking children to carry quarrels that began before they were born.

I therefore come with no command, no demand that your societies become copies of mine, and no Western blueprint that I expect you to accept merely because an American wrote it.

I come with an open hand.

For some time I have been developing a family of infrastructure ideas through Onyx Horizon Systems called the Nexus projects. One of them is Terra Nexus. It is not a peace treaty, and it is not a solution to the Middle East. It is certainly not mine to impose upon you.

It is only one stone.

I wondered whether, somewhere among all the stones already being carried by people across your region, it might belong in the bridge.

So, dearest brothers and sisters, I ask only this:

What if we built something together?

TRUST HAS BEEN BROKEN

If we are going to ask what might be built, we must first be honest about the ground beneath us. The difficulty between Iran and the United States cannot be reduced to nuclear enrichment, sanctions, missiles, Israel or oil, because beneath all of those questions sits something much harder to negotiate: trust.

Governments remember, and people remember with them. Iran carries histories of foreign intervention, war, sanctions and broken confidence. Americans carry memories of hostage-taking, attacks, threats and decades of hostility. Israel carries profound security fears. Arab governments carry histories of their own with Iran, America, Israel and one another. Every government therefore arrives at the negotiating table carrying a suitcase packed by history, and then we ask everyone to set those suitcases down and trust the intentions of the people sitting opposite them.

Perhaps that is too much to ask at the beginning.

Perhaps trust does not have to begin as a feeling at all. Perhaps it can begin as a task: something modest enough to attempt together, useful enough that ordinary people benefit if it succeeds, and concrete enough that everyone can see whether promises were kept.

Before we ask people to trust one another's intentions, perhaps we ask whether they can build something together.

THE FIRST STONE

At its simplest, Terra Nexus begins with an ordinary question: what does a human being need in order to live securely?

The answers are not revolutionary: a home, clean water and sanitation, reliable electricity, food, healthcare, education, communication, transportation, work, community and somewhere safe enough to imagine a future. These are the quiet infrastructures upon which ordinary life rests, and when they fail, everything else becomes harder.

So I wonder what might happen if countries currently spending extraordinary sums preparing for instability also began constructing pieces of stability together.

I do not mean one enormous model city, an American enclave placed inside another country, a military base disguised as humanitarian infrastructure, or a prettier version of a permanent refugee camp. I mean a network of locally governed peace cities and districts, integrated into the communities around them and belonging fully to the countries in which they stand.

An Iranian Terra Nexus would be Iranian. A Jordanian one would be Jordanian; an Iraqi one, Iraqi; a Saudi one, Saudi. Each country would decide whether the idea belonged on its soil at all, and if it did, its own people would shape the architecture, culture, faith, climate response and way of life expressed there.

What could be shared is not a culture but a promise: that participating communities provide secure housing, water and sanitation, resilient energy, schools, healthcare, markets, transport, digital connection, food systems, employment, public space and infrastructure designed to endure emergencies.

Not identical cities, then, but the same promise spoken in different accents.

NOT ONLY FOR REFUGEES

There is an important danger to avoid here. Terra Nexus must never become another mechanism for placing displaced people somewhere tidy and out of sight. A settlement built only for refugees can become a permanent camp even when its architecture is beautiful.

Nor would it be just to ask struggling citizens of a host country to watch new homes, clinics and infrastructure rise for newcomers while their own families remain unable

to afford the same necessities. Resentment grows easily where people believe compassion for one family requires neglect of another.

The better principle is inclusion. A Terra Nexus should benefit displaced people and host communities together while protecting freedom of movement, secure tenure, access to livelihoods and meaningful participation in decisions that affect daily life. An Iranian family struggling economically should be able to benefit from an Iranian Nexus just as a displaced family might. The same should be true in Jordan, Iraq or any other participating country.

Then peace stops being something negotiated in a distant room and becomes something a family can actually touch. It is the school their child attends, the clinic their grandmother visits, the clean water coming from the tap, the business where a parent finds work and the light that comes on when somebody reaches for the switch.

Peace becomes physical.

LET THE REGION LEAD

For this reason, Terra Nexus cannot begin with America arriving in the Middle East carrying another blueprint and announcing what everyone should do. If the idea has any merit, the region itself should be the first to decide so.

I would want Iranian engineers to challenge it, Arab planners to redesign it and Palestinian architects to contribute what outsiders have failed to imagine. I would want women who actually run households to tell us whether the homes work for families, religious communities to examine whether the spaces respect the lives lived within them, environmental scientists to tell us what the land can sustain, and displaced people and host communities to identify every assumption we got wrong.

Local tradespeople should help build it, universities should study it, and young people should be allowed to imagine things their parents' generation never thought to request. International institutions can contribute humanitarian expertise, monitoring and protection frameworks where governments ask for them, but the communities themselves must belong to the societies that build them.

The first exercise in trust, after all, is not agreeing with one another.

It is learning to work beside one another.

TURNING THE SHIELD AROUND

While developing this proposal, I was also examining the extraordinary technological infrastructure America is building around modern warfare: satellites, artificial intelligence, autonomous aircraft, missile systems, sensors, communications networks, command systems and robotics. Some of these technologies exist because governments do have a legitimate responsibility to protect their populations. Defense matters, and deterrence can matter.

But the more I studied them, the more another question followed me: what happens if we turn some of that shield around?

The same sophistication that detects danger could help protect civilian peace infrastructure through early warning, counter-drone defense, cybersecurity, emergency communications, satellite disaster monitoring, search and rescue, medical evacuation, hardened water systems and resilient electrical grids. Machinery developed because humanity fears war can also be used to make ordinary life harder to destroy.

That must not become another form of ownership. America should not become the keeper of another country's security, and Iran should not be asked to exchange dependence upon its own deterrence for dependence upon Washington. That would not resolve the trust problem; it would simply give the problem another uniform.

A more durable arrangement would be negotiated by the participating countries themselves. Host nations would retain sovereignty. Regional partners could help guarantee the peace. International institutions could monitor agreed protections, and outside powers could contribute defensive capabilities only through transparent arrangements accepted by the host country and the other parties concerned.

The principle is simple enough to remember: the region protects the peace, while the wider world helps protect the region's ability to keep it.

THE SAFE HAVEN DOCTRINE

Terra Nexus may therefore need one principle above all others: civilian space must remain civilian.

I have sometimes thought of this as a form of neutrality, not because suffering does not matter, but because human life matters enough that somewhere should remain outside the contest. An Iranian Nexus would remain within Iranian sovereignty, just as an Iraqi Nexus would remain Iraqi and a Jordanian Nexus Jordanian. Nothing about the idea creates territory without a country.

What participating nations could do is make an additional promise about what those communities will never become. They would contain no offensive military installations, weapons stockpiles or military headquarters concealed inside civilian infrastructure. Homes, schools and hospitals would not be used as cover by armed organisations, and humanitarian assistance would never become a doorway through which an outside power quietly acquires political control.

The rule must apply equally, regardless of whose flag or cause is involved.

International humanitarian law already places conditions around the protection of civilian objects, and Terra Nexus cannot simply declare itself magically immune from war. Any additional protected status would have to be negotiated properly, and civilian sites would have to remain genuinely civilian rather than being converted into military objectives.

That legal reality makes the principle more important, not less.

A school should remain a school. A hospital should remain a hospital. A home should remain a home.

Power is not ownership, and stewardship is not domination.

THE NUCLEAR QUESTION

Eventually any serious letter about Iran and regional security reaches the nuclear question.

The United States has made preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon a central policy objective. Iran, meanwhile, has its own security fears and its own reasons for distrusting promises made by foreign powers. Simply telling one side to surrender what makes others afraid does not answer the question waiting on the other side of the table: who protects us from the things that make us afraid of you?

That question deserves more than a threat in response.

Perhaps negotiations can therefore contain not only restrictions, inspections, sanctions relief and verification, but a genuine security proposition. What would the region have to build together so that every country gradually felt less need for extraordinary deterrence?

I cannot answer that question for Iran, and I should not try. Iran must answer for Iran. Saudi Arabia should answer for Saudi Arabia; Israel for Israel; the Gulf states for themselves; and the United States should be willing to answer the same question rather than assigning all the homework to everybody else.

Any durable arrangement would have to be reciprocal and verifiable. Iran's nuclear limits and inspections would have to be real. Security commitments and sanctions milestones offered in return would also have to be real. Regional states would need to consider what mutual non-aggression, infrastructure cooperation and civilian protections they could credibly promise, while institutions such as the IAEA and appropriate humanitarian bodies would need room to verify what falls within their mandates.

Terra Nexus cannot solve the nuclear dispute. It may, however, become one small piece of evidence that relationships beyond the dispute are possible.

THE PEACE DIVIDEND

One reason infrastructure matters is that diplomacy can otherwise feel invisible to the people asked to live beneath its consequences.

Imagine if successful milestones in a peace process gradually produced things ordinary families could see. A ceasefire holds, and a water project begins. An inspection arrangement survives, and another housing district opens. Humanitarian access improves, and a hospital is completed. Trade expands, and a manufacturing district creates work. Another agreement survives another year, and a school opens

its doors.

This must never become payment for obedience, nor a system in which America rewards countries for behaving themselves. It should be understood as something much more dignified: a dividend created by cooperation.

Every participating government should be able to return to its people without pretending it surrendered its country. It should be able to say: we negotiated, we protected what was ours to protect, and together we built something useful.

Here it is.

BUILD SOMETHING YOU WOULD HESITATE TO DESTROY

Perhaps the most valuable part of Terra Nexus would not be the buildings at all.

Imagine Iranian engineers working beside Arab engineers, American specialists working beside regional specialists, universities collaborating, construction companies forming partnerships, water scientists sharing research, young architects competing to design better neighbourhoods, farmers exchanging methods and doctors developing emergency systems together.

Eventually people acquire telephone numbers in countries they once knew primarily through headlines.

Then something wonderfully inconvenient for war begins to happen.

Relationships form.

It becomes harder to reduce another country to an abstraction when somebody there has become your colleague. Harder to cheer the destruction of infrastructure when your own hands helped build it. Harder to imagine an entire population as an enemy when families have eaten together, researchers have solved problems together and children have grown up knowing one another as people rather than warnings.

None of this makes disagreement disappear. Human beings will continue to disagree, governments will compete and countries will protect their interests. Peace does not require pretending otherwise.

Perhaps it only requires building enough shared interests that destroying one another becomes progressively more irrational.

THE CHILDREN ARE THE MEASURE

There is one standard I would place above every agreement, security architecture and infrastructure plan described in this letter.

Look at the children.

A peace agreement should ultimately be measured by whether they became genuinely safer beneath it, not merely by the ceremony, the signatures, the speeches, which government appeared to win, or even whether the missiles stopped flying for a

while.

Can the children sleep without explosions? Can they drink the water and eat enough food? Can they go to school while their parents have a reasonable chance of finding work? Can they practise their faith without fear, grow without being taught that another child across a border is their natural enemy, and imagine an adulthood larger than the conflict they inherited?

When they eventually inherit their countries, will we have left them fewer reasons to begin another war than we inherited ourselves?

That is the test.

A peace treaty that protects governments while leaving children frightened, displaced, hungry or simply waiting for the next war has not yet produced peace. It has produced an interval. Real peace becomes visible in ordinary life: a playground where there was rubble, a classroom where there was displacement, clean water where there was scarcity, a family returning home, and a generation learning its neighbours through trade, study, friendship and cooperation rather than only through military briefings.

Perhaps decades from now nobody will remember which diplomat won which argument around the negotiating table. I would be quite happy with that.

Let them forget the argument if Iranian children are safe, Israeli children are safe, Palestinian children are safe, Arab children are safe and American children are safe. Let them forget it if the children of the region inherit functioning homes, schools, hospitals and water systems, along with relationships sturdy enough to survive political disagreement.

The children are the measure.

If they became safer, we moved toward peace. If they did not, we still have work to do.

THE INVITATION EXTENDS BEYOND THE WEST

Much of my recent work has been addressed toward institutions in the United States and New Zealand, but the work itself does not belong to either country.

I was born in America and live in New Zealand. My family also carries Chinese ancestry; my great-grandfather on my father's side was Chinese and was adopted into the Stowers family. I would be honoured one day to work alongside people in his homeland on systems that make ordinary life safer and more abundant. The same invitation extends to Iran, the wider Middle East and anywhere else people are willing to build toward human flourishing.

That is not an invitation to replace one contest with another. I do not want America to defeat China or China to defeat America, and I do not want the Middle East to remain a board upon which larger powers move their pieces. I want something less theatrical

and considerably harder: people everywhere becoming more capable of building their own futures.

Artificial intelligence has shortened the distance between an idea and the tools required to develop it. Corporate literacy, technology literacy, AI literacy, governance literacy and systems thinking no longer need to remain concentrated within a handful of powerful institutions. They can travel.

Imagine what international cooperation might look like if that knowledge travelled laterally rather than always descending from a superpower. Iranian engineers could teach outsiders what we do not understand about Iran. Chinese researchers could share what they have learned. Arab planners could bring the knowledge of their own cities, Pacific communities generations of environmental understanding, and American engineers their own expertise without assuming ownership of the room.

No country needs to become another country's copy, and no country should have to exchange dependence upon one great power for dependence upon another. The healthier goal is capability distributed widely enough that nations and communities can meet one another with something closer to dignity.

My allegiance in that work is not to East or West, but to human life. That is why the invitation remains open.

THIS IS ONLY THE FIRST STONE

I do not imagine for a moment that Terra Nexus will create peace in the Middle East. No single project could carry that weight. The region holds wounds far older and deeper than anything described here: territorial disputes, religious histories, political rivalries, security dilemmas, economic interests, trauma, grief, power and memory.

People far more knowledgeable than I am will find problems in this proposal that I cannot presently see. I hope they do. An idea offered with an open hand must also remain open to correction.

I am not presenting a finished peace plan. I am placing one stone on the ground.

Someone in Iran may see another. Someone in Qatar, Pakistan or Oman may see another; perhaps someone in Saudi Arabia, Israel, Palestine or America will too. Somewhere, a young engineer reading this may see twenty stones none of us have imagined yet.

If enough people begin carrying them, we may eventually discover that we have been building the same bridge from opposite shores.

WHAT IF WE BUILT SOMETHING TOGETHER?

Humanity has spent thousands of years becoming extraordinarily sophisticated at preparing for war. We know how to build armies, missiles and bunkers; autonomous weapons that move with less human intervention; satellites capable of watching the Earth from above; and systems capable of destroying infrastructure faster than earlier generations could have imagined.

Surely we can become equally sophisticated at building the conditions that make destroying one another less necessary.

Not because everyone will suddenly become good, governments will stop competing or history will disappear. Peace cannot depend upon miracles of personality. It can, however, be strengthened when interests change, relationships deepen and people discover that they have something valuable to lose together.

One city may lead to another. An infrastructure project may become a trade corridor; the corridor a research partnership; the research partnership a water agreement; the water agreement something none of us can yet name.

We do not need to know where the bridge ends before we carry the first stone.

Nor does peace have to begin with everyone trusting everyone.

Perhaps it begins when two people who do not trust each other agree, for one afternoon, to carry the same stone.

Then they carry another.

And one day, if we are very fortunate, their children may look up and discover that somewhere along the way, while the adults were learning how to work beside one another, they built a bridge.

EVIDENCE & LIMITATIONS NOTE

Terra Nexus is a conceptual proposal, not an existing programme or negotiated agreement. Its legal, security, environmental, financing, land-tenure, refugee-protection and diplomatic implications require specialist and local review.

Current UNHCR guidance generally favours inclusion of displaced people within existing communities and national development systems over isolated camps; where planned settlements are necessary, it emphasizes host-government leadership, freedom of movement, livelihoods, secure tenure, participation by displaced and host communities, and integration with local services. Those principles should constrain any future Terra Nexus design.

The United States currently maintains that Iran must not obtain a nuclear weapon. At the same time, diplomacy has continued through regional mediation. Qatar and Pakistan have publicly described a U.S.-Iran negotiating framework that produced a memorandum of understanding, a high-level committee, technical working groups

and talks in Switzerland; Qatar has also continued consultations with Oman and other regional states. This essay does not claim Terra Nexus can resolve those disputes. It asks whether shared civilian infrastructure could become one trust-building instrument within that much larger peace process.

The displacement component also requires strict safeguards. UNHCR treats camps as a last resort and emphasizes host-government responsibility, freedom of movement, livelihoods, secure tenure, integration with local services, and participation by displaced people and host communities. Any Terra Nexus pilot should be tested against those principles before land is selected or construction begins.

Pearl Stowers

Founder, Onyx Horizon Systems

Independent Anthropologist & Theologian Researcher