

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
10 June 2025

Original: English

**Letter dated 10 June 2025 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the
Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations
addressed to the President of the Security Council**

I would like to transmit to you a letter from the Ambassador and Representative of the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguía el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO) at the United Nations and Coordinator with the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara, Sidi Omar, addressed to the President of the Security Council concerning recent developments related to Western Sahara (see annex).

I would be grateful if you could have the present letter and its annex issued as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Marthinus **van Schalkwyk**

Chargé d'affaires

Deputy

Permanent Representative of the Republic of South Africa
to the United Nations



Annex to the letter dated 10 June 2025 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I would like first to congratulate you on assuming the presidency of the Security Council for this month and to wish you every success in your mission.

The Security Council recently received a letter from the Moroccan permanent representative to the United Nations in which, as usual, he crosses all boundaries of common sense and decorum not only to make baseless claims about the question of Western Sahara but also to call into question the credibility of the Council and the integrity of its reports.

At its 9927th meeting, held on 30 May 2025, the Security Council considered its draft report to the General Assembly and adopted the draft report without a vote (see [S/2025/336](#)). However, instigated by Morocco, the occupying state, a non-permanent member raised a “point of order” during the meeting, to which the delegation of the Russian Federation, responsible for drafting the introduction to this year’s annual report, gave a clear and cogent answer (see [S/PV.9927](#)), thus showing the irrelevance of the “point” in question and laying bare the ulterior motives of its instigator.

Even though the “document was agreed by consensus” (see [S/PV.9927](#)), in his letter, the representative of Morocco, the occupying state, takes issue with what he calls “the singularization of two parties” in the paragraph relating to Western Sahara in the report of the Security Council and claims that “the Security Council has enshrined the four parties to the political process”. He even goes as far as to state that “no report by the Secretary-General or resolution by the General Assembly singles out two parties to the detriment of the four parties involved in the political process”.

As will be demonstrated below by documented evidence, all these claims are false and deceptive. They are nothing but another insult to the intelligence of Member States.

It is an established fact that the conflict in Western Sahara is an international conflict in which Morocco, the occupying state, and the Frente POLISARIO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Sahrawi people, are recognized by relevant United Nations organs as the two parties to the conflict. Suffice it here to refer to Security Council resolutions [621 \(1988\)](#), [658 \(1990\)](#) and [690 \(1991\)](#); General Assembly resolutions [34/37](#), [35/19](#) and [36/46](#); and other relevant Council and Assembly resolutions.

Regarding the reports of the Secretary-General, suffice it to refer to his report ([S/21360](#)) of 18 June 1990, in which he states that “on 11 August 1988, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Special Envoy of the then Chairman of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) presented, in separate meetings, **to the parties to the conflict in Western Sahara, namely Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro (Frente POLISARIO)**, a document (“the settlement proposals”)...” (para. 1; emphasis added).

Furthermore, in its resolution [690 \(1991\)](#) of 29 April 1991, by which the Security Council established, under its authority, the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO), the Council recalled that “**the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro** gave their agreement” to the United Nations-OAU settlement proposals, and called upon “**the two parties** to cooperate fully with the Secretary-General in the implementation of his plan as described in his report of 18 June 1990 and amplified

in his report of 19 April 1991” (second preambular para. and para. 3, respectively; emphasis added).

Concerning the General Assembly, suffice it to refer to its resolution 40/50 of 2 December 1985, in which the General Assembly “again requests, to that end, **the two parties to the conflict, the Kingdom of Morocco and the Frente Popular para la Liberación de Saguia el-Hamra y de Río de Oro**, to undertake direct negotiations, in the shortest possible time, with a view to bringing about a cease-fire to create the necessary conditions for a peaceful and fair referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara...” (para. 3; emphasis added).

With regard to the latest Security Council resolutions, one may refer, for example, to resolution [2756 \(2024\)](#) of 31 October 2024. In this resolution, the Council, among other things, “emphasizes the importance of a renewed commitment **by the parties** to advancing the political process in preparation for further negotiations [and] encourages **the neighbouring countries** to make important, active contributions to this process” (para. 9; emphasis added).

The question here is why does the Security Council refer to the parties and the neighbouring countries separately in one sentence if they are all the “parties”, as the representative of the occupying state claims? Obviously, no one can expect a reliable answer from this same representative, who brazenly misrepresented General Assembly resolution [3458 \(XXX\)](#) B of 10 December 1975, claiming falsely that it “endorsed” the “Madrid Agreement” of 1975, whereas the resolution explicitly states that the Assembly only “took note” of that agreement (see [S/2024/520](#)).

After all, the undisputable fact that can neither be concealed by the mendacious propaganda of the occupying state nor obfuscated by “destructive ambiguity” formulations is this: Morocco has been illegally occupying parts of Western Sahara for almost five decades, and the Sahrawi people, led by their sole and legitimate representative, the Frente POLISARIO, have been engaged in a legitimate liberation struggle to resist Moroccan occupation and defend the sovereignty of their homeland.

The representative of the occupying state refers to the Moroccan colonialist “proposal” of 2007, which, in reality, is no more than a travesty through which the occupying state tries to “legitimize” its illegal occupation of the United Nations-listed Non-Self-Governing Territory of Western Sahara and to deprive its people of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

To conceal its failure in obtaining international legitimacy for its illegal occupation of Western Sahara, Morocco, the occupying state, attempts to “buttress its support base” through the unilateral and transaction-based positions taken by some countries. However, self-respecting countries that are genuinely committed to upholding the core principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law can never accept, let alone endorse, this colonialist “proposal”, which must be vehemently condemned.

Moreover, countries that are concerned about stability of North Africa should know that peace and stability in our region can never be ensured by rewarding the expansionism on which the Moroccan regime has always relied as the main tool to shore up the shaky foundations of its rule and threaten the security of its neighbours and the entire region. Rather, enduring peace can only be achieved by defending the fundamental principles of international law, including the sacrosanct right of peoples to self-determination and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

It is well known that, by propagating its colonialist “proposal”, Morocco, the occupying state, tries to conceal its continued opposition to the self-determination

referendum that it formally accepted in August 1988 by agreeing to the United Nations-OAU “settlement proposals” that constitute the core of the mandate of MINURSO.

The representative of the occupying state cannot deny that his former king committed his country to the referendum and solemnly undertook to accept its results (A/38/PV.8, para. 26). He cannot deny either that, afterwards, his country reneged on its commitment and “expressed unwillingness to go forward with the settlement plan” (S/2002/178, para. 48), as reported by the Secretary-General himself in 2002.

The former United States Secretary of State, James A. Baker III, who served as the Personal Envoy of the Secretary-General for Western Sahara from 1997 to 2004, explained why Morocco, the occupying state, had backtracked on its commitment to the referendum. In an interview with the Public Broadcasting Service on 19 August 2004, Mr. Baker stated that “the closer we got to implementing the settlement plan ... the more nervous I think the Moroccans got about whether they might not win that referendum.”

In a commentary published by *The Washington Times* on 28 May 2025, the former National Security Adviser to President Donald Trump and former Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, John Bolton, affirmed that “Morocco began obstructing U.N. efforts to implement the resolution almost from the moment it passed, fearing that in a truly free and fair referendum, Sahrawis would choose independence”.

The testimonies by two recognized authorities on the subject are just two cases in point that confirm the obvious: the self-determination referendum in Western Sahara has not yet been held not because of any “voter registration” issues but only because Morocco, the occupying state, fears the outcome of the referendum. It is as simple as that.

I would be most grateful if you would bring the present letter to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) Sidi M. Omar
Ambassador
Representative of the Frente POLISARIO at the United Nations
Coordinator with the United Nations Mission for
the Referendum in Western Sahara
