### Plan text

#### Resolved: the Islamic Republic of Pakistan will prohibit the production of nuclear power.

### Contention

#### New nuclear power plants are being built near Karachi in Pakistan- high risk of terror attacks causing mass death.

Craig 15 Tim “Outcry and fear as Pakistan builds new nuclear reactors in dangerous Karachi” Washington Post March 5th 2015 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/outcry-and-fear-as-pakistan-builds-new-nuclear-reactors-in-dangerous-karachi/2015/03/05/425e8e70-bc59-11e4-9dfb-03366e719af8_story.html> JW

KARACHI, Pakistan — World leaders have fretted for years that terrorists may try to steal one of Pakistan’s nuclear bombs and detonate it in a foreign country. But some Karachi residents say the real nuclear nightmare is unfolding here in Pakistan’s largest and most volatile city. On the edge of Karachi, on an earthquake-prone seafront vulnerable to tsunamis and not far from where al-Qaeda militants nearly hijacked a Pakistan navy vessel last fall, China is constructing two large nuclear reactors for energy-starved Pakistan. The new reactors, utilizing a cutting-edge design not yet in use anywhere in the world, will each provide 1,100 megawatts to Pakistan’s national energy grid. They are being built next to a much smaller 1970s-era reactor on a popular beach where fishermen still build wooden boats by hand. But the new ACP-1000 reactors will also stand less than 20 miles from downtown Karachi, a dense and rapidly growing metropolis of about 20 million residents. Now, in a rare public challenge to the Islamabad government’s nuclear ambitions, some Pakistanis are pushing back. Of all places to locate a reactor, they argue, who could possibly make a case for this one? “You are talking about a city one-third the population of the United Kingdom,” said Abdul Sattar Pirzada, a Karachi lawyer who is seeking to get the project halted. “If there would be an accident, this would cripple Karachi, and if you cripple Karachi, you cripple Pakistan.” In recommendations pertaining to nuclear plant construction in the United States, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission says a new reactor should be sited away from very densely populated areas, preferably with fewer than 500 people per square mile within a 20-mile radius. That zone around Karachi’s power plant holds about 6,450 people per square mile, Pervez Hoodbhoy, a Pakistani nuclear physicist, wrote in Newsweek Pakistan last year. Some U.S. diplomatic officials have also expressed concern about the initiative, in particular about China’s role in providing nuclear technology to Pakistan. Caught off-guard by the opposition, political leaders have rushed to defend one of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif’s top priorities — addressing the country’s acute energy shortfall. Pakistan, one of the few developing nations still pursuing civilian nuclear energy options since the 2011 Fukushima disaster in Japan, has three operative nuclear power plants, including the Canadian-built reactor in Karachi, but it has turned to China for help in expanding its capacity. Efforts are underway to double the size of the Chashma Nuclear Power Plant in northern Punjab province, as well as to build the new Karachi reactors. “The risks are there. You cannot discount them, but you prepare for them,” said Khawaja Asif, Pakistan’s water, power and defense minister. “We are a nuclear power, so don’t underestimate us.” China developed the ACP-1000 reactor, which costs about $5 billion each to build, after studying and refining the design of a reactor that France built in China in the 1980s. The China National Nuclear Corp. is now supplying the ACP-1000 reactor to Pakistan, despite an international ban on the transfer of nuclear technology to Pakistan because of the country’s refusal to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. “We are going to be the guinea pigs,” said Arif Belgaumi, a Karachi architect who wants the international community to pay closer attention to the government’s plans. A tuk tuk transports students home from school between apartment buildings in the Khadda Market area, one of the oldest and most densely populated neighborhoods of Karachi. (Max Becherer/Polaris Images For The Washington Post) China joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group — whose members agree not to transfer to treaty non-signers any technology that could be used to develop a nuclear weapon — in 2004. But it claims that it had already promised to help Pakistan, allowing it to continue developing the reactors. Beijing is helping Pakistan build reactors at the same time that the Obama administration is trying to implement a 2008 deal that would smooth the way for U.S. companies to invest in new nuclear power plants in India. Pakistan’s chief rival has also balked at signing the nonproliferation treaty. Both President Obama and former president George W. Bush have sought an exception for India. “China’s expanding civilian nuclear cooperation with Pakistan raises concerns and we urge China to be transparent regarding this cooperation,” the U.S. Embassy said in a statement Thursday. Until now, Pakistani leaders have faced little public discontent over the country’s nuclear ad­vances. After all, Pakistan celebrates a national holiday each May marking the anniversary of its first atomic weapons test in 1998. But the country’s progressive movement is evolving, sparking novel protests over environmental and public safety issues. And the prospect of 20-story reactors rising next to a public beach used for swimming, camel rides and picnics is a vivid illustration of what’s at stake. Though international monitors generally give Pakistan satisfactory reviews for safeguarding nuclear materials, industrial accidents causing hundreds of fatalities remain common here. There are concerns that Pakistani technicians won’t be able to operate or maintain the Chinese nuclear technology. Karamat Ali, chairman of the Pakistan Institute of Labor Education and Research, noted that the world has already experienced three major nuclear accidents — at Three Mile Island in the United States in 1979 and Chernobyl in the former Soviet Union in 1986, in addition to the Fukushima disaster. “Those are three highly advanced countries,” Ali said. “This is Pakistan. We don’t live on technology and science. In fact, we are quite allergic to that.” Of particular concern is the threat of terrorism, especially considering Karachi’s long history of head-scratching security lapses­. Terrorists overran a Pakistani naval base in Karachi in 2011, killing five people and setting several aircraft on fire. A similar attack occurred in June, but this time Pakistan Taliban militants stormed a section of Karachi International Airport, killing about two dozen people. And in September, al-Qaeda militants, perhaps with help from renegade sailors, attempted to hijack a heavily armed Pakistan navy frigate docked in Karachi’s port. It took hours for security forces­ to repel the assault. If a major attack or accident were to occur at a nuclear power plant, activists say there would be unimaginable chaos. Karachi, whose population has doubled in just the past two decades, includes vast, packed slums, as well as districts under the thumb of criminal gangs and Islamic militants. And with more than 2.7 million registered cars, buses, rickshaws and motorcycles, it can take hours to cross the city. “You couldn’t even dream of evacuating Karachi,” said Hoodbhoy, the physicist. “The minute an alarm was sounded, everything would be choked up. There would be murder and mayhem because people would be trying to flee. Others would be trying to take over their homes and cars .”

#### Karachi reactors have a high risk of meltdown and terrorist attacks are inevitable- they’ll use the waste to create dirty bombs.

Daly 12 John (Dr. John C.K. Daly is the chief analyst for Oilprice.com, Dr. Daly received his Ph.D. in 1986 from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London. While at the Central Asia-Caucasus Institute at Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, where he is currently a non-resident scholar, in 199 he founded The Cyber-Caravan, which continues today under the title, The Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst. He subsequently served as Director of Programs at the Middle East Institute in Washington DC before joining UPI as International Correspondent. ) “Pakistan Nuclear Power Plant in Karachi - Bad Idea” Apr 27, 2012 Oil Price <http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/Pakistan-Nuclear-Power-Plant-in-Karachi-Bad-Idea.html> JW

As for possible seismic activity, Karachi lies approximately 100 miles east of the triple junction between the Arabian, Indian, and Asian plates in the Arabian Sea, and on 19 January panic gripped Karachi when an earthquake measuring 7.3 on the Richter Scale jolted the city and other parts of southwest Pakistan. Last but not least, a new NPP in Pakistan’s teeming tropical city, rife with insurgents, is hardly likely to become anything other than a terrorist magnet, whose interests could range from attacking the reactor complex to simply purloining the nuclear waste as a component for a possible “dirty bomb.” Despite the country’s significant power problems, Islamabad should seriously reconsider placing a NPP in the midst of Karachi’s long suffering populace, as the possibility of a Fukushima type incident in a massive city of 13-15 million inhabitants would overwhelm the municipality’s ability to cope. In the 21st century nuclear world, there are some things worse than power blackouts.

#### Nuclear accidents destroy Karachi which causes Pakistan instability.

Tribune 15 The Express Tribune “Fear grows over new nuclear reactors in Karachi” March 6th 2015 <http://tribune.com.pk/story/848742/fear-grows-as-china-supplies-pakistan-with-nuclear-reactors/> JW

KARACHI: A real nightmare could be unfolding in Karachi as Pakistan will be supplied with two large nuclear reactors from China to aid the country in its energy crisis, The Washington Post reported. There has always been fear among world leaders that terrorists may try to steal one of Pakistan’s nuclear bombs and detonate it in a foreign country, however, some have said that the real nightmare could be unfolding in Karachi after the reactors are supplied. The new power plants which comprise a new design are not yet in use anywhere in the world and will be each supplying 1,100 megawatts to Pakistan’s national energy grid. The reactors are being built next to a much smaller 1970s-era reactor located on a popular beach where fishermen still make wooden boats by hand. The new ACP-1000 reactors will stand less than 20 miles from Karachi’s densely populated metropolis of 20 million residents. Many have come forward in argument against the government’s nuclear ambitions, questioning whether this was the best place to build the nuclear reactor. “You are talking about a city one-third the population of the United Kingdom,” said Abdul Sattar Pirzada, a Karachi lawyer who is seeking to get the project halted. “If there would be an accident, this would cripple Karachi, and if you cripple Karachi, you cripple Pakistan,” he added. Recommendations put forward by the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission pertaining to nuclear power plant construction state that any new reactor should be situated away from a very densely populated area, preferably with fewer than 500 people per square mile within a 20 mile radius. The same zone where the power plants would be constructed holds about 6,450 people per square mile a Pakistani nuclear physicist wrote in Newsweek Pakistan last year.

#### Karachi is key to Pakistani econ.

Ahmed 12 Israr Ahmed Business Recorder, 5-5-2012, "How important is Karachi to Pakistan?," <http://www.brecorder.com/weekend-magazine/0:/1186182:how-important-is-karachi-to-pakistan/?date=2012-05-05> MW

**Karachi is the** largest city and **economic hub of Pakistan**, which is also called revenue engine of the country **owing to its contribution of about 70 percent of the total revenue**. The city, which has two of the three seas ports of the country, has a stunning ethnic diversity, with representation of each and every ethnicity and community living in Pakistan. **Peace in Karachi is considered crucial for economic growth and stability of the country, which accounts for the lion's share of GDP**. **Karachi produces about 42 percent of value added in large scale manufacturing and 25 percent of the GDP of Pakistan**. In 1960s Karachi has been an economic role model for many countries in the world. Many countries sought to emulate Pakistan's economic planning strategy and one of them, South Korea, copied the country's second "Five-Year Plan". The World Financial Center in Seoul is said to be designed and modelled after Karachi. In February 2007, **the World Bank identified Karachi as the most business-friendly city in Pakistan**. According to economists, **Karachi's contribution** to GDP **amounted to around 16 billion rupees a day.**

#### Pakistan stability is key to combat global terrorism.

Smith 11 (Paul J., Prof. of National Security Affairs @ US Naval War College “The China–Pakistan–United States Strategic Triangle: From Cold War to the “War on Terrorism”” Asian Affairs: An American Review 38:4 Taylor and Francis <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00927678.2011.604291> JJH)

Nevertheless, in Jly 2010, the newly elected British Prime Minister David Cameron made several blunt remarks regarding Pakistan’s relationship to terrorism. Specifically, he asserted that Pakistan should not be allowed to “promote the export of terror, whether to India, Afghanistan or anywhere else in the world.”87 Cameron’s statement, while controversial in Pakistan, captured sentiments that can be quietly heard within police and intelligence agencies in Europe and North America, particularly as an alarmingly high percentage of major terrorist plots uncovered in Europe or the United States have some linkage to Pakistan.88 Moreover, Pakistan itself is a victim of terrorist violence perpetrated by various domestic militant groups. From January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2010, Pakistan experienced 1,032 terrorist attacks (with 1,680 persons killed and 3,561 persons wounded), placing it third globally (after Afghanistan and Iraq) on the list of countries with the highest incidences of terrorist violence.89 Admiral Mike Mullen stated that “the border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan is the epicenter of global terrorism.”90 Similarly, a U.S. Congressional Research Service report highlighted the fact that the “increase in Islamist extremism and militancy in Pakistan is a central U.S. foreign policy concern.”91 Few events highlight the severity of the terrorism challenge emanating from Pakistan as well as the November 2008 attacks in Mumbai, in which a ten-man terrorist squad launched a nighttime maritime attack on the city, killing more than 179 people over a two-day period. Subsequent investigations indicated that the attack had been coordinated from Pakistan using satellite telephones. When U.S. officials detained Pakistani-American David Headley in a routine immigration inspection at the Chicago airport, they unwittingly unraveled a key part of the Mumbai attack. Headley had conducted surveillance in India on behalf of Lashkare-Taiba, the group believed to have directed the attacks.92 Even more disturbing were subsequent press reports that appeared to implicate Pakistani intelligence officials in the plot. Headley reported attending “dozens of meetings” with officials from the ISI and representatives from Lashkar-e-Taiba.93 Headley also reported carrying two memory sticks for his digital camera that were used to conduct surveillance in India on future targets. He allegedly provided one stick to his Lashkar-e-Taiba handlers and the other to the ISI representative.94 The Headley revelations appeared to confirm what many scholars had asserted for years: official (albeit clandestine) support for Islamist militancy is ingrained in Pakistan’s military and intelligence culture.95 Husain Haqqani, Pakistan’s current ambassador to the United States, wrote in 2004 (prior to his current post) that “Pakistan has looked upon militant Islam as a strategic option for at least three decades, going back to the Bangladesh war with India in 1971.”96 Such an option was apparently being exercised in the July 7, 2008, bombing of the Indian embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan, an attack that was later attributed by the U.S. government to Pakistan’s intelligence service.97 U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Anne Patterson reportedly stated that there was “no chance” that Pakistan’s military would withdraw its covert support for militant groups targeting Afghanistan and India, despite the provision of billions of dollars in U.S. aid to Islamabad.98

#### Terrorism is the most likely existential threat.

Rhodes 9 Richard (a visiting scholar at Harvard and MIT, and currently he is an affiliate of the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University. Rhodes is the author of The Making of the Atomic Bomb (1986), which won the Pulitzer Prize in Nonfiction, National Book Award, and National Book Critics Circle Award) “Reducing the nuclear threat: The argument for public safety” December 14th 2009 JW

The response was very different among nuclear and national security experts when Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar surveyed PDF them in 2005. This group of 85 experts judged that the possibility of a WMD attack against a city or other target somewhere in the world is real and increasing over time. The median estimate of the risk of a nuclear attack somewhere in the world by 2010 was 10 percent. The risk of an attack by 2015 doubled to 20 percent median. There was strong, though not universal, agreement that a nuclear attack is more likely to be carried out by a terrorist organization than by a government. The group was split 45 to 55 percent on whether terrorists were more likely to obtain an intact working nuclear weapon or manufacture one after obtaining weapon-grade nuclear material. "The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is not just a security problem," Lugar wrote in the report's introduction. "It is the economic dilemma and the moral challenge of the current age. On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the destructive potential of international terrorism. But the September 11 attacks do not come close to approximating the destruction that would be unleashed by a nuclear weapon. Weapons of mass destruction have made it possible for a small nation, or even a sub-national group, to kill as many innocent people in a day as national armies killed in months of fighting during World War II. "The bottom line is this," Lugar concluded: "For the foreseeable future, the United States and other nations will face an existential threat from the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." It's paradoxical that a diminished threat of a superpower nuclear exchange should somehow have resulted in a world where the danger of at least a single nuclear explosion in a major city has increased (and that city is as likely, or likelier, to be Moscow as it is to be Washington or New York). We tend to think that a terrorist nuclear attack would lead us to drive for the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think the opposite case is at least equally likely: A terrorist nuclear attack would almost certainly be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike on whatever country we believed to be sheltering the perpetrators. That response would surely initiate a new round of nuclear armament and rearmament in the name of deterrence, however illogical. Think of how much 9/11 frightened us; think of how desperate our leaders were to prevent any further such attacks; think of the fact that we invaded and occupied a country, Iraq, that had nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.