




MARIA REINA MARIANISTAS MODEL
UNITED NATIONS 2025



DIOLG

The Use of Public Funds for Military Spending versus Global Humanitarian Needs



Index

1. Letter from the Secretary General
2. Letter from the Under-Secretary General
3. Letter from the Committee Director
4. Letter from the Assistant Director
5. History of the Committee
6. Introduction to the Topic
7. History of the topic
8. Current Situation
9. Case Studies
10. Bloc Positions
11. QARMAs
12. Position Paper
13. Bibliography



Letter from the Secretary General

It is with immense excitement and great pleasure that I welcome you to the second edition of Maria Reina Model United Nations 2025. My name is Letizia Soria, and I feel deeply honored to be this year's Secretary General of Maria Reina's MUN conference.

When I first joined the world of Model UN in 2023, I never conceptualized how rapidly it would become a fundamental aspect of who I am. From my very first simulation, where I forgot to print all research or even bring a notepad, to now leading my delegation, representing my school, and becoming Secretary-General, the journey has been filled with a plethora of challenges, lessons, and unforgettable memories.

Across more conferences than I could count, I've had the pleasure of meeting amazing individuals, forging strong friendships with my teammates, and deepening both my knowledge on global conflicts, personal perspectives, and essential soft skills. Of course, there's nothing quite like the thrill of winning a Best Delegate gavel, but what I value most is the sense of companionship, support, and family that emerges within a team. In essence, my experience as a delegate has been most defined by the people who encouraged me to prevail, to try, to speak, and to stand up when obstacles made possibilities seem bleak. The mentors who pushed me to improve, and the team that works together to lift each other up. Those moments are the ones that encapsulate what MUN is truly about.

With that same spirit of teamwork and commitment, we've poured ourselves into the preparation of this year's conference: MRMUN 2025. Every detail, from the topics to the logistics, has been a product of a Secretariat that believes in the power this conference has to challenge, inspire, and empower each delegate who walks into committee. I feel deeply grateful to carry forward the legacy of last year's conference, and I'm confident that this dedication will continue to grow in the years to come.

Thank you to the Secretariat, the staff, my teammates, and coaches who made this possible, and most of all, thank you to each delegate reading this, for being the reason this conference exists. On behalf of everyone behind Maria Reina MUN 2025: Raise your placard, speak your mind, challenge ideas, and most importantly, enjoy the process. Let it shape you.

Best of luck,

Letizia Soria.



Letter from the Under-Secretary General

Dear Delegates,

It is a true honor to welcome you to the second edition of Maria Reina Model United Nations. My name is Veronica Paz, and I have the privilege of serving as your Under-Secretary General for this year's conference.

Since I began my MUN journey, I've come to realize that these conferences are so much more than debates and resolutions. They're moments that challenge us, push us out of our comfort zone, and show us what we're capable of when we defend a position, even if it's not our own. Being part of MUN has taught me that sometimes you don't get what you want, and instead of punishing yourself for that, it is more important and worthwhile to learn from your mistakes. What I value most is the feeling of being part of an incredible team. A simple "How are you doing?" during breaks in conferences reflects the partnership and trust we share, making me feel like I belong to a new family.

This year's conference represents not just the continuation of a dream but the result of months of effort, teamwork, and vision from an incredible group of people. I'm beyond grateful to be part of this team and see how far we've come.

To all delegates: take this opportunity to speak, to question, to lead –but above all, to grow. You will meet inspiring people, face unexpected challenges, and walk away with experiences that will shape you far beyond this weekend. Whether this is your first conference or one of many, I hope MRMUN 2025 becomes a special part of your journey.

On behalf of the entire Secretariat, I wish you the best of luck and an unforgettable experience.

Sincerely,

Veronica Paz



Letter from the Committee Director

Dear delegates,

Welcome to the Disarmament and International Security Committee! My name is Alvaro Peña and, alongside Mara and Gaston, I will be your dais for this committee. I couldn't be happier to return to what is steadily becoming one of the most competitive Model UN conferences of the circuit: this year's edition of Maria Reina Model United Nations.

I myself was a student at Maria Reina, where I started doing Model UN at just 16 years old. I then attended PUCP and graduated from law school as a bachelor of laws, and I am currently specializing in corporate and financial law.

As of now I am working full-time as a paralegal in a private law firm, assisting senior lawyers in financial transactions, corporate restructuring consulting and mergers and acquisitions operations.

As I mentioned, I did Model UN during my last two years of high school and kept debating and coaching as a member of Peruvian Debate Society during my time at university. I coached MR from 2018 to 2023. I have participated in conferences hosted in the United States, Colombia, Mexico, Spain, and the Philippines.

For this committee I expect a heated debate, content-filled speeches and strong negotiation sessions. Do not hesitate to be firm on your ideals and lead your block to success. Remember - the biggest bloc is not always the one that works the best.

I am looking forward to meeting you all this July. Study a lot and come prepared.

Best,

Alvaro Peña.



Letter from the Assistant Director

Dear Delegates,

It is an incredible honor to welcome you to the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) at the second edition of Maria Reina Marianistas Model United Nations.

My name is Mara Podestá, and I am proud to return to MRMUN this year as one of your assistant directors for DISEC. I'm currently studying Business Administration at Universidad del Pacífico, and coming back to this conference means more than I can put into words.

In 2024, alongside an amazing team, we had the privilege of creating and launching the very first edition of MRMUN. It was a dream that we had since entering the team, and with a lot of passion and support, we turned it into a reality. To now see it grow into a second edition, stronger, bolder, and filled with new delegates is a surreal and deeply meaningful experience.

Model UN has shaped my personal and academic journey in countless ways. It taught me resilience, teamwork, leadership, and gave me friendships I will always cherish. But more than anything, it showed me the value of dialogue and empathy in a world that needs both.

As you take on the challenges of DISEC, I encourage you to step out of your comfort zone, speak with conviction, and listen with openness. Whether this is your first or tenth conference, know that every contribution you make matters. You are now part of a legacy we're proud to pass on.

Mara Podestá.



Letter from the Assistant Director

Hi delegates! My name is Gastón Mendoza and I will be your director for this edition of MRMUN alongside Álvaro and Mara. And I am thrilled to be able to return to Maria Reina's Model United Nations as a director.

I am a former student of Maria Reina and had the amazing opportunity to become the Secretary General in our very first edition of this MUN last year. I am currently studying Business at Universidad del Pacífico where I expect to graduate in a few years.

My MUN journey began in 2022 in the Maria Reina team, during that time I met amazing people that became close friends and mentors such as Mara and Álvaro. As of now, I am a member of Peruvian Debate Society (PDS), and had the opportunity to attend WorldMUN in March of this year, which was an amazing experience to develop new skills and meet new people.

Regarding the committee, considering that the DISEC committee is usually the biggest one in the whole conference, I hope to see a lot of debate and argumentation and still always maintain diplomacy and positive leadership.

I am looking forward to meeting you all in the conference.

Gastón Mendoza

History of the Committee

The Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), officially known as the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, was established in 1945 following the end of World War II. Its creation was rooted in the fundamental mission of the newly formed United Nations: to maintain international peace and security in a world recovering from one of the most devastating conflicts in history. DISEC was charged with addressing global disarmament and security challenges and has since become a key forum for international dialogue on threats to peace.



As one of the six main committees of the General Assembly, DISEC brings together all 193 UN Member States, each with an equal vote and voice. In contrast to the Security Council, where a small number of permanent members hold veto power, DISEC operates under the principle of sovereign equality, ensuring that every country, regardless of size or influence, can participate in shaping global security policy. Although its resolutions are non-binding, they hold considerable moral and political weight, often guiding international norms and influencing the decisions of other UN bodies, such as the Security Council or specialized agencies.

Throughout its history, DISEC has been instrumental in addressing a broad range of disarmament and security issues. It has played a pivotal role in early discussions surrounding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and continues to serve as a platform for negotiating arms control treaties and promoting transparency in military affairs. Over time, its agenda has expanded to include matters such as the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, the use of chemical and biological weapons, and the impact of conventional arms in regional conflicts.

In recent decades, the global security landscape has undergone significant evolution. Non-state actors, cyber threats, and the emergence of new technologies with military applications now compound traditional threats posed by state actors. Issues like artificial intelligence in warfare, drones, autonomous weapons, and space militarization have entered the global disarmament discourse, requiring the committee to continually adapt its focus and strategies. DISEC also



works in close collaboration with the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), various treaty-based organizations, regional bodies, and subject-matter experts to ensure informed debate and policy development.

Today, DISEC's relevance is amplified by growing concern over how nations allocate their public funds, particularly the increasing investments in armament amidst escalating global humanitarian needs. The 21st century has been marked by frequent crises, including armed conflicts, pandemics, forced migration, environmental disasters, and more. These challenges have placed immense strain on global resources and raised ethical questions about priorities in public spending.

In this context, DISEC is uniquely positioned to lead crucial discussions on the balance between national defense and humanitarian responsibility. It provides a diplomatic space for exploring how nations can pursue security while also addressing the pressing needs of vulnerable populations worldwide. Through its resolutions, debates, and thematic discussions, DISEC fosters multilateral cooperation, encourages the development of sustainable security policies, and promotes responsible disarmament in the face of complex global threats.

Introduction to the Topic

The Use of Public Funds for Military Spending Versus Global Humanitarian Needs

In an era increasingly characterized by global interdependence, geopolitical tensions, and complex transnational challenges, the question of how nations allocate their public funds has become a matter of international concern. Among the most pressing and controversial aspects of this debate is the disproportionate spending on military armament compared to the resources allocated to global humanitarian needs. This issue lies at the heart of fundamental questions regarding sovereignty, security, ethical responsibility, and the sustainability of international peace.

Military expenditures are frequently justified on the grounds of national defense, particularly in regions plagued by internal conflict, organized crime, or external threats. Governments argue that robust military budgets are essential for maintaining territorial integrity, supporting peacekeeping operations, and deterring aggression. However, the scale of global military spending has raised critical questions about priorities in a world where millions lack access to clean water, food, healthcare, education, and basic safety.



According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), global military spending reached a record USD 2.2 trillion in 2024, marking a continuous upward trend over the last decade. In contrast, funding appeals by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) were only 60% fulfilled, leaving billions of dollars of urgent humanitarian needs unmet. In regions affected by conflict or climate-induced disasters, underfunded humanitarian responses have translated into avoidable suffering, forced displacement, and the collapse of basic services.

This imbalance reflects deeper structural issues in the international system: while nations act swiftly to secure borders and bolster defense mechanisms, humanitarian aid remains reliant on voluntary contributions, often influenced by political interests or donor fatigue. As a result, aid workers, refugees, and vulnerable populations are left waiting for support that may arrive too late, or not at all.

The topic is particularly relevant to the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), which is tasked with addressing the root causes of conflict and instability. Excessive armament, especially when driven by an arms race mentality, can exacerbate regional tensions, fuel proxy wars, and undermine diplomatic solutions. At the same time, underinvestment in conflict prevention, post-war recovery, and humanitarian infrastructure hinders long-term peacebuilding efforts.

Moreover, the misuse or redirection of public funds toward military purposes in fragile states can also weaken democratic institutions, encourage corruption, and create cycles of violence that disproportionately affect civilians. In this sense, how a government chooses to spend its budget is not merely a domestic issue—it has regional and global implications that fall within DISEC's mandate.

History of the Topic

The tension between military spending and humanitarian funding is not a new dilemma. It is a debate that has evolved throughout modern history, shaped by war, ideology, global priorities, and political agendas. Understanding this history is essential to grasping the roots of current budgetary imbalances and guiding more balanced policymaking in the future.



Following the devastation of World War II, governments across the globe dramatically increased their defense budgets to rebuild military infrastructure, secure post-war borders, and prepare for emerging ideological conflicts. The ensuing Cold War era (circa 1947–1991) saw a massive redirection of public funds toward military purposes, particularly in the two dominant superpowers of the time—the United States and the Soviet Union. This period marked the height of the arms race, with billions of dollars funneled into nuclear weapons development, surveillance networks, space militarization, and conventional arms production.

During these decades, public spending was dominated by concerns over deterrence, containment, and ideological supremacy. Defense budgets were seen as vital tools in maintaining global balance, but the humanitarian consequences of these priorities were often overlooked. Although international institutions like the World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) were established in the post-war years to address global welfare, they were consistently underfunded and forced to operate within limited financial constraints.

As the Cold War came to an end in the early 1990s, there was optimism that this shift in geopolitical dynamics would lead to what was termed a “peace dividend”—the hope that military budgets would be downsized and redirected toward education, healthcare, development, and international aid. However, that vision was short-lived. The Balkan conflicts, Rwandan genocide, and civil wars across Africa demanded new security interventions, while the 1990–91 Gulf War reasserted the role of military force in global affairs.

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks marked a defining moment in modern defense policy. Nations, particularly the United States and its allies, embarked on an expansive campaign of counterterrorism, leading to wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and the reinforcement of global military networks. Defense spending soared once again, justified by national security concerns, while humanitarian aid budgets remained voluntary, fragmented, and often politically conditioned.

Meanwhile, a parallel crisis was unfolding: growing humanitarian disasters demanded urgent attention. The Darfur conflict, the Syrian civil war, Ebola and cholera outbreaks, natural disasters linked to climate change, and the rising refugee population revealed the deep inadequacies of global humanitarian financing. International aid agencies, including OCHA, the World Food Programme (WFP), and Médecins Sans Frontières, frequently reported severe funding shortfalls, limiting their capacity to respond effectively.



The early 21st century has also witnessed the militarization of new domains—cyberspace, outer space, and artificial intelligence—further increasing the demand for defense budgets. This expansion has occurred despite calls from civil society, the UN system, and academic institutions for greater investment in conflict prevention, development assistance, and climate resilience.

The historical evolution of public spending priorities highlights a persistent imbalance: militarization has often prevailed over humanitarianism, even in moments of widespread human suffering. This enduring trend underscores the urgency for reform. Reassessing the past allows policymakers and delegates today to better understand how we arrived at the current situation—and how future strategies might promote peace through people-centered investment, not just deterrence through arms.

In the context of DISEC, reflecting on this history offers valuable insight into the global mechanisms that shape military and humanitarian budgets. It also reminds us that effective disarmament and sustainable peace are deeply connected not only to treaties and weapons control, but also to how we choose to allocate our collective resources.

Current Situation

As of 2025, the international community is confronting a multifaceted and deeply interrelated set of crises. From armed conflicts and geopolitical instability to climate disasters, pandemics, global food insecurity, and mass displacement, the strain on humanitarian systems has never been greater. Yet, paradoxically, global military expenditure continues to rise, reaching a record high of USD 2.2 trillion in 2024, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). This trend has sparked widespread debate over the sustainability, ethical justification, and strategic rationale of current public spending priorities.

The distribution of this spending is highly concentrated: just five countries—the United States, China, Russia, India, and Saudi Arabia—account for over 60% of total global military expenditure. These figures often reflect not only traditional national security concerns but also growing investment in advanced technologies, including cyber defense, autonomous weapon systems, space-based surveillance, and AI-powered warfare. Meanwhile, funding for humanitarian assistance and global development goals continues to fall short.



Organizations such as the World Food Programme (WFP) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) face persistent and growing funding gaps. In recent years, this has forced humanitarian agencies to scale back operations, cut food rations, and reduce access to essential services for millions in crisis zones, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and regions affected by climate-related disasters. For example, due to financial shortfalls, the WFP has reduced aid to vulnerable populations in Sudan, Yemen, and the Sahel region, exacerbating already dire conditions.

While governments argue that defense spending is necessary to safeguard national interests, critics emphasize that the greatest threats to global stability today are not traditional military threats, but rather non-military crises: climate change, infectious diseases, water scarcity, forced displacement, and poverty. These are challenges that cannot be solved with weapons but require collective investment in resilience, healthcare, education, and humanitarian infrastructure.

This misalignment has especially serious consequences for low- and middle-income countries, where increased defense spending often comes at the expense of social services. In some cases, governments under political or security pressure choose to prioritize military expansion while neglecting critical sectors such as public health systems, primary education, or disaster preparedness.

In addition, unchecked militarization has the potential to fuel regional arms races, divert diplomatic efforts, and undermine multilateral cooperation. Civil society organizations, humanitarian actors, and several Member States have begun to call for more transparent defense budgets, enhanced civil oversight, and accountability in public finance. There is increasing recognition that in an interconnected world, security cannot be achieved solely through armament—it must also include social and economic stability.

The growing momentum toward redefining global priorities is reflected in UN-led initiatives and declarations that stress the need to balance defense spending with commitments to sustainable development, conflict prevention, and human security. For the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), this represents both a challenge and an opportunity: to facilitate meaningful dialogue on public spending practices and to encourage Member States to consider a more integrated and human-centered approach to global security.

In sum, the current situation reveals a stark contrast: while military budgets expand to historic levels, humanitarian appeals remain underfunded, and millions of lives hang in the balance. It is



within DISEC's mandate to question, analyze, and propose alternative frameworks that advance peace, disarmament, and equitable resource distribution in a rapidly changing world.

Case Studies

Case Study 1: The United States of America

The United States has consistently held the position of the world's largest military spender. In 2024, its defense budget surpassed \$877 billion, a figure that accounts for nearly 40% of global military expenditures. The scale of this investment reflects the United States' strategic interest in global military presence, nuclear deterrence, and technological superiority across land, sea, air, and cyberspace.

In parallel, the U.S. remains the largest donor of international humanitarian assistance, contributing over \$50 billion annually to foreign aid programs. However, critics argue that the gap between defense and humanitarian spending is indicative of skewed national priorities. Domestically, challenges such as inadequate healthcare coverage, housing insecurity, student debt, and persistent poverty continue to affect millions of Americans. For instance, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, over 11.5% of the population lived below the poverty line in 2023, raising concerns about the efficacy and equity of public spending allocations.

Another key dimension is the influence of the U.S. defense-industrial complex. Major defense contractors like Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, and Boeing invest billions in lobbying efforts to influence defense policy and secure government contracts. This has cultivated a political ecosystem where military spending is often protected from budget cuts, even during periods of economic downturn or social crises.

The COVID-19 pandemic laid bare the vulnerabilities of the U.S. public health system, with hospitals overwhelmed and supply chains disrupted despite the country's vast resources. This crisis reignited national debates over reallocating defense funds to public welfare programs, under the banner of initiatives like "Build Back Better" and "Reinvest in America." The case of the U.S. demonstrates how military dominance can sometimes come at the expense of internal resilience and global humanitarian commitments.



Case Study 2: The Ukraine Conflict and International Military Support

The ongoing war in Ukraine, which escalated dramatically in February 2022 following Russia's full-scale invasion, has become a defining case in the debate over the use of public funds for military spending versus humanitarian needs. The conflict, rooted in long-standing regional tensions and competing geopolitical interests, has drawn in a wide range of external actors through military aid, arms shipments, and humanitarian assistance.

As of 2024, the war has caused over 500,000 casualties (including military and civilian), displaced millions within Ukraine and across Europe, and severely damaged the country's infrastructure. In response, NATO allies and Western countries have pledged and delivered tens of billions of dollars in military support to Ukraine, including advanced weaponry, training, and logistical support. The United States alone has allocated over \$75 billion in military aid since the start of the invasion, with significant contributions also coming from the United Kingdom, Germany, Poland, and others.

Simultaneously, these same countries have provided humanitarian assistance to Ukraine, supporting refugee resettlement, healthcare, education, and reconstruction efforts. However, the massive scale of military spending has sparked debate in donor countries about long-term sustainability, public accountability, and whether comparable support is being offered to other global humanitarian crises that receive far less attention and funding.

Critics argue that while defending Ukraine's sovereignty is a legitimate international concern, the global focus on arms transfers and defense budgets has overshadowed broader peacebuilding initiatives and diverted resources from other urgent humanitarian priorities. The Ukraine case also raises complex questions about the role of the arms industry, the influence of defense contractors, and the precedent it sets for public spending in future conflicts.

This case illustrates the ethical tension faced by donor states: how to support a nation under attack without reinforcing militarization as the default solution to conflict. It also brings to light the issue of unequal attention in global humanitarian responses, where some crises receive overwhelming support while others, such as those in the Sahel, Syria, or Afghanistan, remain drastically underfunded.



Case Study 3: Sweden's Balanced Spending Approach

In contrast to the previous cases, Sweden represents a country that has prioritized human development and multilateralism while maintaining a modest but effective defense capability. In 2024, Sweden allocated around 1.3% of its GDP to defense spending, in line with NATO expectations, yet continues to devote substantial public funds to education, universal healthcare, climate action, and foreign aid.

Sweden consistently ranks among the top countries in the Human Development Index (HDI) and contributes over 1% of its Gross National Income (GNI) to Official Development Assistance (ODA), a benchmark set by the United Nations but rarely achieved by most developed countries. Swedish aid focuses not only on emergency response but also on long-term development, gender equality, governance, and environmental protection in low-income and conflict-affected countries.

While Sweden maintains a domestic arms industry, led by companies such as Saab, it operates under strict export controls and transparency requirements. The government's arms export policy prohibits sales to countries involved in armed conflict or where there is a risk of human rights violations, although this principle has been challenged in some cases. Nonetheless, Sweden's approach remains widely seen as a model for integrating ethical foreign policy with fiscal responsibility.

The Swedish model suggests that military readiness and humanitarian commitment need not be mutually exclusive. Instead, through transparent governance, clear policy priorities, and international cooperation, states can pursue a more holistic and sustainable approach to security—one that includes human security as a core pillar.

Bloc Positions

Western and NATO-Aligned Bloc

This bloc generally supports high levels of military spending, citing national security, international peacekeeping responsibilities, and strategic alliances. Defense is often seen as a core pillar of foreign policy, with significant investments in advanced military technologies and global military presence. At the same time, these countries are among the largest donors to



humanitarian aid and global development efforts, contributing to UN agencies and crisis response operations. Internally, there is growing debate over the ethical implications of arms exports and the opportunity cost of military budgets in the face of social and economic needs. While prioritizing defense readiness, this bloc often promotes multilateral cooperation, transparency in arms trade, and a rules-based international order.

BRICS and Strategic Autonomy Bloc

Members of this bloc prioritize sovereignty, national development, and strategic independence. Military spending is viewed as a necessary component of regional influence, deterrence, and self-reliance, particularly in the context of perceived geopolitical imbalance. These countries tend to resist external pressure to reduce defense budgets or impose arms control frameworks seen as favoring dominant powers. While they may support humanitarian initiatives, such efforts are often secondary to domestic development and national security objectives. This bloc advocates for a multipolar world and frequently emphasizes the need for reforms in global governance to better represent emerging powers and non-Western perspectives.

Non-Aligned and Global South Development Bloc

This bloc emphasizes the urgent need to redirect global financial priorities from militarization toward sustainable development, poverty reduction, and humanitarian assistance. Defense budgets in these countries are often limited by economic constraints, and any increase in military spending tends to come at the expense of essential public services. Delegates from this bloc typically advocate for greater international investment in infrastructure, healthcare, education, and climate adaptation, arguing that human security should take precedence over military power. There is also strong support for arms trade transparency, demilitarization in conflict zones, and international cooperation in addressing the root causes of instability.

Conflict-Affected and Security-Dependent Bloc

Countries in this bloc face ongoing or recent internal and regional conflicts, which heavily shape their public spending priorities. Military budgets are often justified as essential for maintaining



internal order, securing borders, or responding to terrorism and insurgency. However, these nations also experience severe humanitarian crises, ranging from forced displacement to food insecurity, and often rely on international aid to meet civilian needs. This bloc walks a difficult line between the necessity of security investment and the moral and practical imperative to address humanitarian suffering. Many of these countries call for increased global assistance, reconstruction funding, and more equitable treatment in arms export regulations and peacebuilding efforts.

QARMA_s

1. To what extent should public military spending be reallocated to address global humanitarian crises, and what mechanisms can ensure such redistribution is transparent and effective?
2. How can the international community hold states accountable for arms exports that contribute to humanitarian disasters, such as in the Yemen conflict, without infringing on national sovereignty?
3. Should there be internationally agreed-upon benchmarks or limits for the proportion of public budgets spent on defense versus humanitarian aid, especially for major military powers?
4. How can DISEC encourage or support transparency in national defense budgets while respecting each country's security needs and strategic autonomy?
5. In what ways can military investment be redirected or dual-purposed to strengthen civilian infrastructure, such as healthcare systems or disaster preparedness, especially in post-conflict or fragile states?
6. How should the committee approach the ethical contradiction of states that serve as both arms exporters and humanitarian donors? Can these roles coexist responsibly, or do they undermine each other?
7. How can less militarized countries influence the global discourse on spending priorities when most decision-making power lies with major military states?



Position Paper

A Position Paper is a policy statement in which delegates analyze and present their country's view on the issue being discussed, focusing on past national and international actions and the development of viable proposals for the topic.

Your position paper should always include a heading with the title ("Position Paper"), your delegation (the country you are representing), your committee (full name), the topic you are discussing (as stated in your study guide), your full name and the name of your school.

Additionally, a standard position paper is comprised of three paragraphs:

1. Your first paragraph should include a brief introduction to the topic, always connecting the issue to your country. Try to include statistics, data and phrases that may apply. Always bear in mind that you should be focusing on answering the question "Why is the issue relevant to my country?" and explain your country's situation and policy about the issue.
2. Your second paragraph should include a summary of past actions taken by the international community related to the topic. Explain your country's involvement, comment on the effectiveness of the measures, and state how they can be improved.
3. Your third paragraph should focus on proposing solutions, always according to your country's policy. Try to be creative and propose original ideas that will help other delegates (and your dais) remember your contribution to the debate. Finally, do not forget to write a strong closing sentence.

The format for the position paper is the following:

- Font: Times New Roman
- Font Size: 12
- Spacing: 1.15
- Bibliography: APA 7th edition
- Margins: Standard



Each delegation is responsible for submitting a Position Paper by Thursday, July 3rd (11:59 pm) to the mail disec@mariarcinamarianistas.net. It is important to mention that delegates who do not present the position paper would NOT be eligible for awards.

Bibliography

1. Naciones Unidas. (s. f.). *Disarmament and International Security (First Committee)*. Recuperado de la ONU (un.org)
2. United Nations Department of Public Information. (2024, abril 8). “*Present Perilous Moment in World History ‘No Less Decisive Than in 1945 ...’ First Committee Hears in General Debate*”. Comunicados de prensa de la ONU. (press.un.org)
3. IMUNA (National High School MUN). (s. f.). *DISEC: Disarmament & International Security Committee*. (imuna.org)
4. Case Western Reserve University (Dhruv Raman). (2024, diciembre). *Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) Background Guide*. (ccwa.org)
5. SIPRI. (2025, abril). *Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2024* (Hoja informativa). (sipri.org)
6. SIPRI. (2025, abril 28). *Unprecedented rise in global military expenditure as European and Middle East spending surges*. Comunicado de prensa. (reliefweb.int)
7. SIPRI. (2025). *SIPRI Military Expenditure Database* [Base de datos]. (sipri.org)
8. IPB (International Peace Bureau). (2025, abril 28). *The world spent 2.71 trillion \$ in the military in 2024, according to SIPRI*. (ipb.org)
9. Centro di Ateneo per i Diritti Umani (Università di Padova). (2025, junio 7). *SIPRI Institute: World Military Expenditure Trends 2024*. (unipd-centrodirittiumani.it)
10. TASS. (2025, abril 28). *World military spending in 2024 up by 9.4 % to \$2.718 trillion — SIPRI*. (tass.com)



11. SIPRI. (2024, abril 22). *Global military spending surges amid war, rising tensions and insecurity* [Comunicado de prensa]. ([sipri.org](https://www.sipri.org))