

The University gives no credence to the recent allegations of anti-Zionism but cannot ignore such allegations due to their factual inaccuracies and the reality that the misrepresentation is a deliberate and calculated action to portray the University in a bad light.

"A startling picture of anti-Israel bias and outright racism towards Jewish staff and students at Rhodes emerged in a report after a six-person Jewish leadership delegation went to Grahamstown in April to investigate complaints from the campus.....Likud's Leon Reich sent MyShtetl a copy of a comprehensive report by David Saks".

The rule of natural justice enshrines the maxim *audi alteram partem*, literally, 'hear the other side'. This delegation failed to contact the leadership of the University or present their concerns. The University indicated that it would be happy to meet with the South African Jewish Board of Deputies. Despite being invited to do so on 3 June and again on 18 June 2013, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies is yet to furnish any report of its so called 'fact-finding team' and specifically factual evidence of the nature, forms and extent of "anti-Israel bias and intimidation at Rhodes". It is also yet to indicate whether or not those who allege such 'bias and intimidation' have raised this with the University authorities and with what outcomes.

"Larissa Klazinga's story is about an almost two-year-long saga that speaks to the anti-Israeli culture that pervades the hallowed halls of Rhodes University".

Rhodes University has a suite of policies to deal with allegations such as are being alleged by Ms Klazinga. There is a grievance procedure at the University and she was one of the authors of the Policy on the Elimination of Unfair Discrimination and Harassment policy (Harassment policy), yet one has to question why she never chose to exercise her rights in terms of these policies. At no point did Ms Klazinga attempt to exhaust the internal mechanisms available to her at the University.

"Rhodes was quoted as being devastated that their plans to prosecute Larissa's partner for displaying pro-Israeli posters during IAW had failed".

Rhodes has a recently revised student disciplinary policy. In terms of this policy the Prosecutors followed the same procedure as they would do in investigating any complaint. It became apparent to the Prosecutors that there were issues involving freedom of expression and thus as is provided for in the Harassment Policy, referred the matter to a Fairness Forum. This Policy, as co-authored by Ms Klazinga, is designed to deal with exactly this kind of issue. The ultimate decision of whether there is a *prima facie* case to be answered remains that of the Prosecutors. The Prosecutors and the Fairness Forum were satisfied that the posters did not extend beyond the parameters of robust academic discourse. It should be noted however, that not all the posters were made available to the Prosecutors and the Fairness Forum, and thus this decision was reached on what was before them.

"Rhodes threat to disband Fairness Forum.... Mabizela also said Rhodes was going to review "the role and purpose of (their own) Fairness Forum in due course".

The revised Rhodes Student Disciplinary Code came into effect on 1 January 2013. In terms of the policies and procedures of the University all new procedures are reviewed. There is nothing different about this policy and in line with this the policy shall be reviewed in 2014.

Ms Klazinga's Legal Team has been disingenuous in their portrayal of what transpired prior to Ms Klazinga's exit from Rhodes University.

"It's been a great victory, said Bags who represented Larissa together with advocate Izak Smuts SC. The University had raised a laundry list of disciplinary charges, but says Bags, all of them came to naught" "The litigation was 100% successful".

The Dean of Students sought to sanction Ms Klazinga on good disciplinary grounds but certain of the charges were unacceptable. As Mr Bagraim has correctly stated *"a charge sheet must specify the details of the charge so the accused can prepare a defence"*.

As soon as the Office of the Vice-Chancellor had sight of the charge sheet a meeting was held. The Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director of Special Projects had strong in principle objections to the charge sheet that had been served on Ms Klazinga. The Vice-Chancellor immediately made the decision to withdraw the charges in their totality. Ms Klazinga was called in and this was communicated to her.

There was no litigation and the disciplinary charges were never tested. The sad reality was the breakdown of relations between Ms Klazinga, the Dean of Students and Deputy Dean of Students which unfortunately entered the realm of personal antagonism. Ms Klazinga of her own free volition chose to enter settlement negotiations as she recognised that the working relationship with the University had broken down. The allegation that *"shut up money"* was offered is a blatant fabrication as is the allegation that Ms Klazinga was *"forced out for being Jewish"*.

Rhodes University espouses itself to the Constitution in which we value human dignity, the achievement of equality and the advancement of non-sexism and non-racialism and the human rights and freedoms that the Bill of Rights proclaims. Thus the University shall be approaching the Human Rights Commission to investigate these bizarre claims against the University. Those who claim that their human rights have been violated at Rhodes may place their allegations before the Human Rights Commission.