Allow me again to express my appreciation for the third reviewer’s positive and constructive critiques of my book, *State of Suspicion*. These are my responses to the reviewer’s comments:

1. **The Kastner Trial** – The reviewer points out that “There are also a few slips: e.g., Kastner was not a defendant, although the libel trial ended up turning against him.” While it is true that I alluded to this point, both in the introduction and in the body of text (chapter seven) – writing “Kastner turned out to be the de-facto defendant” – I understand the need to be more explicit. I will, therefore, add a clarification of this point: Rudolph Kastner was not the defendant in this trial; it was rather the prosecutor, Israel’s Attorney General Haim Cohn, and the defendant, journalist Malkiel Gruenwald, who argued about Kastner’s actions and legacy.
2. **Argument** – The reviewer asks that I clarify my argument. S/he writes that “the one question I have for the author is where he stands on the issue. At times my sense is that he thinks the defendants were treated unfairly by a vindictive and ignorant society in the 1950s; but later on he seems critical of the generalizing attitude toward all Jews in the Holocaust as victim/heroes and the effects of this attitude on current Israeli politics and self-perception.”
This is an important point. At the end of my introduction I write: “I believe it is important that I spell out my view about the appropriateness in the context of the 1950s and 60s of placing these individuals in front of a court to weigh their behavior.” While I focus on the legitimacy of Israel’s authorities putting these alleged collaborators on trial, the reviewer rightly requests that I also spell out my own view on Israeli society’s treatment of collaborators and their trials.

My view, which the reviewer seems to sense, is that in its treatment of collaborators Israeli society had gone from one extreme to another. While it once viewed all Jewish prisoner functionaries as voluntary Nazi collaborators, it would later view all such men and women as purely innocent victims. As I plan to articulate in the introduction or the conclusion (or both), I believe that Israeli society has glossed over the complexity of victimhood. While victimhood surely should not be equated with heroism or innocence (the commonly held view today in Israel and the U.S.), it would be equally misguided to view these victims as willing collaborators comparable to those belonging to other European nations. As the kapo trials point out, victims could and did act, at times, in a questionable manner. And although some Jews were victims, at the same time they could be morally compromised. Exposing the complexities of victimhood is perhaps one of my main goals in writing *State of Suspicion.*

1. **Syntax and Grammar** – As I noted in my response to the other two reviewers, English is not my mother-tongue. Given that the previous two reviewers either did not mention the issue at all or singled out the introduction as requiring copy editing, I will discuss this issue with my editor, Kathleen McDermott, and defer to her opinion.