

The Forgotten Emigration Governmental Policies towards European Jewish Refugees in Ecuador and Colombia (1933-1945)

La emigración olvidada
Políticas gubernamentales hacia los refugiados judíos europeos en Ecuador y Colombia
(1933-1945)

Michele Migliori
michele.migliori1@gmail.com

Abstract

This article aims to retrace the governmental policies towards Jewish refugees in Ecuador and Colombia in the period between 1933, the year in which Hitler took over power in Germany, and the resulting emigration of the Jewish people from Germany; and 1945 when the Second World War in Europe finally ended. To do so, the article is presented into two main section. The first will analyzes the topic under the point of view of the political debate and the legislative measures towards migration, while the second investigates the work of the diplomatic missions in Europe. To include first-hand experiences in the exploration of the two sections of this work, I use testimonies from those who experienced life in Ecuador and Colombia between 1933 and 1945. For this purpose, I will use the USC Shoah Foundation Visual History Archive (VHA).

Keywords: Jews, Colombia, Ecuador, refugees

Resumen

Este artículo tiene como objetivo rastrear las políticas gubernamentales hacia los refugiados judíos en Ecuador y Colombia en el período comprendido entre 1933, año en que Hitler asumió el poder en Alemania, y la consiguiente emigración del pueblo judío desde Alemania; y 1945 cuando finalmente terminó la Segunda Guerra Mundial en Europa.

Para ello, el artículo se presenta en dos secciones principales. El primero analizará el tema desde el punto de vista del debate político y las medidas legislativas hacia la migración, mientras que el segundo indaga en el trabajo de las misiones diplomáticas en Europa. Para incluir experiencias de primera mano en la exploración de las dos secciones de este trabajo, utilizo testimonios de quienes vivieron en Ecuador y Colombia entre 1933 y 1945. Para ello utilizaré el Archivo de Historia Visual de la Fundación Shoah de la USC (VHA)

Palabras claves: Judíos, Colombia, Ecuador, refugiados

Introduction

This article aims to analyze the governmental policies run by the Ecuadorian and Colombian governments between 1933 and 1945. This article addresses the following research question: what are the main causes behind the different governmental approaches towards Jewish refugees in the two countries? I hypothesize that such difference is mainly attributable to internal causes rather than to external ones and is directly connected to the economic scenario of Ecuador and Colombia at the time. As a matter of fact, both governments were concerned about the potential economic competition that Jewish immigrants could represent, symbolizing a threat to local businesses, while external pressure played a minor role. However, I also hypothesize that, while Ecuador approached Jewish immigration as a resource for its economic growth, the Colombian authorities addressed the phenomenon as a menace towards their labor market. Nevertheless, before going through the analysis of the different policies, it is fundamental to make distinctions *a priori* between the two countries. To better understand the differences in their attitudes, we must underline some essential similarities and dissimilarities between them, particularly, on geographical, political and social grounds.

Ecuador and Colombia share a border, but while the latter has access to both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, Ecuador only has access to the latter. Within this context, until 1914 when the Panama Canal was inaugurated, reaching Ecuador from Europe was possible only via Colombia or circumnavigating the entire South American continent. This is the reason why until 1914, only highly motivated scientists or contracted professionals moved to Ecuador from the Old Continent, and also why Ecuador was not broadly known to Europeans willing to resettle in South America.

Regarding the political situation in the two countries, for over twelve years Ecuador experienced thirteen different governments, with very different political attitudes, including two short dictatorships. Moreover, during this period a new populist movement arose in Ecuador, the so-called Velasquism (*Velasquismo*, in Spanish), from the surname of the charismatic Ecuadorian President José María Velasco Ibarra, who governed the country twice in the period between 1933 and 1945. Meanwhile, during the same period, Colombia had a strong bipartisanship regime with the Liberal Party, which governed for sixteen years from

1930 to 1946, and the Conservative Party. This difference, the continuous power shifts in Ecuador and the stable political situation in Colombia, is key to understand the different policies of the national governments between 1933 and 1945.

Regarding the countries' social aspects, both shared similar characteristics. Both Ecuador and Colombia had a strong stratified society based on ethnic traits. The white class of European origin, those Spanish-descendant individuals born in South America (the so-called *criollos* in Spanish), was dominant in the political and economic arenas, while the middle class was represented by those with a double ethnic identity (the so-called *mestizos* in Spanish, individuals born to a European and an indigenous parent). Finally, the indigenous people and afro-descendants represented the poorest and most marginalized groups of these societies. The social aspects in both countries, but especially in Colombia, particularly impacted the public debate on immigration.

Humanitarianism versus Opportunism. Governmental Policies towards Jewish Refugees in Colombia and Ecuador

In 1819, Ecuador and Colombia gained independence from the Spanish Empire, and along with the nowadays territory of the Republic of Venezuela and British Guyana, became part of the same political entity, the Great Colombia (*Gran Colombia*, in Spanish), until its dissolution in 1831. The first constitution of the Great Colombia in 1819 gave the Jews the right to settle in the country (Hernandez Garcia, 2007). Therefore, a few Ladino-speaking Jewish families of Sephardic origin from the Dutch island of Curaçao immigrated to the Great Colombia, where they established several companies in the trade sector (Hernandez Garcia, 2007).

While the Republic of Colombia maintained this policy in its constitution even after the dissolution of the Great Colombia, this policy of openness towards Jews was not confirmed by the first constitution of the independent Republic of Ecuador. Ecuador gained its independence from the Great Colombia in 1830, and in that same year, the National Assembly ratified the new Constitution (Grubel Rosenthal, 2010). In that Constitution, and until 1906, Roman Catholicism was declared as the only religion of the State, and to acquire citizenship and to immigrate into the country, being Catholic was the main requisite (Grubel Rosenthal, 2010). For this reason, the few Sephardic Jews from Curaçao who inhabited the country before the independence converted to Christianity (Chiriboga, 2005). As a result of this approach towards

religion, Ecuador never experienced a Jewish immigration inflow before the 1930s, contrary to its neighboring country, Colombia, which at that time already had a well-established Jewish community.

Colombia

Both Colombia and Ecuador started to address immigration policies only from the 1920s and 1930s seriously. In Colombia, for instance, the decade of the 1920s was characterized by a strong political debate on the European migration to the country. Interestingly, the goal of the *Criollo* class ruling the country was to promote immigration from Europe for racial reasons since according to them most Colombians were unproductive because of their afro-descent roots and indigenous racial characteristics. Therefore, to make the Colombian population smarter and improve their quality of work, the Colombian government decided to facilitate the arrival of European workers into the country (Leal Villamizar, 2011).

In 1920, the first Colombian immigration law was enacted. According to law No. 48, the government officially opened the country to every kind of immigrant, except people with mental, contagious or severe diseases, those with criminal records and those who were “lazy.” Moreover, the law also mentioned the fact that immigration would be forbidden to those whose ethnic condition was “inconvenient for the positive development of the [Colombian] race” (Leal Villamizar, 2011: 25). Although the law did not mention which were these ethnic conditions, assumptions can be made since the purpose of the government was to make the population “whiter.”

However, with the second immigration law No. 114 issued in 1922, the Colombian government specified the reasons why the country opened its borders for immigrants, and who these immigrants should be. The law directly mentioned that the purpose of immigration was the intellectual and economic development of the country, together with the improvement of the ethnic, physical and moral conditions of its population. The law openly stated that “the government will support only those individuals or families, whose ethnic conditions do not need precautionary measures” (Leal Villamizar, 2011: 25). To confirm the fact that the Colombian authorities only wanted to open the borders to white and Christian Europeans, there is also a booklet made by then-president Jiménez López in 1929 with the title “The Yellow

migration to Colombia” (*La inmigración amarilla a Colombia*, in Spanish), after which the Asian migration to the country was officially banned (Leal Villamizar, 2011).

Concerning the Jewish immigration, starting from 1928, Colombia welcomed more than 1.000 Jews from Poland, who fled for economic reasons, rather than for racial causes (García Hernández, 2007). Their integration in Colombia was hard, the opposite of the one experienced by the Sephardic Jews from Curaçao and Antilles, whose language, the Ladino, was similar to the Spanish dialect spoken in Colombia. On the contrary, Polish Jews, whose language was Yiddish and Polish, had great difficulties learning the local language. Moreover, since they were mainly dedicated to small-trade, they represented a threat to the Colombian-owned businesses in the big cities (Leal Villamizar, 2011). For these reasons, the government issued law No. 1194 and banned immigration to a large number of nationalities, namely Bulgarians, Chinese, Egyptians, Estonians, Greeks, Indians, Latvians, Lebanese, Lithuanians, Moroccans, Palestinians, Polish, Romanians, Russians, Syrians, Turks, and Yugoslavs. Moreover, in order to acquire a Colombian visa, men with other nationalities had to pay 1.000 pesos (around 2.850 euros today), women 500 pesos, and families 250 pesos for every child between 11 and 20 years old, and 100 pesos for minors below 11 years of age (Leal Villamizar, 2011).

The ban on the immigration of Polish citizens was inevitably a hostile act against Jews. Interestingly, in Colombia, the adjective “Polish” was used as a synonym for Jew since almost all Jews in the country came from Poland. Additional decrees affirmed the anti-Jewish attitude of the Colombian government. In 1938, they banned the immigration of German Jews escaping from Hitler’s power. Moreover, between 1939 to 1947 all Jewish immigration to Colombia was officially banned “for severe economic reasons” (Hernandez Garcia, 2007).

After a few years, slowly but coherently, the Colombian authorities declared the Jewish migration to the country illegal, and neither the influence of the US, which on the 27th November 1943 brought Colombia, to declare war to Germany nor the news coming from Europe influenced this attitude of the government. Some Jews still living in Europe with the intention of emigration directly felt this “iron approach.” In 1942, a Minister of the Polish government-in-exile based in London contacted the Colombian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, asking him to grant visas to a group of Polish Jews who were stuck in a port in France, and were at risk of being arrested by the German authorities. The Colombian government refused to help the Polish diplomat, explaining that there were already too many Jews in Colombia.

This occurred two months before the promulgation of the so-called Final Solution when there were around 5.000 Jews in Colombia.

Nevertheless, in a few cases the Colombian authorities demonstrated a more open attitude, like in the case of Heinz Rosenhain, a Jewish refugee from Breslau, today Poland, but at that time Germany. The father of Rosenhain emigrated alone to Colombia when the borders were still open, aiming to ask for family reunification once he found a job. He started to work for the national airlines, named SCATA, which were controlled by the Germans, but in the meantime, the government decided to ban Jewish immigration. However, thanks to the help of the president of the Airlines, a personal friend of Colombia's then-president Santos, the Rosenhain family managed to leave Europe with the last ship that sailed from Germany, the *Cordillera* (Rosenhain, 1996).

Ecuador

During the same decade, the issues related to migration were not at the center of the national political debate in Ecuador, contrary to Colombia. As mentioned previously in this chapter, because of its geographical position, Ecuador was not an immediate option for migrants. It was only after 1914 when the Panama Canal was inaugurated that Ecuador started to witness immigration on a large scale. Until that time, landing in the Andean country from the Old Continent was arduous, and only a few highly motivated scientists did so. One of them was Charles Darwin, who conducted researches in the Galapagos Islands in the mid-XIX century.

Ecuador started to be considered as an immigration country only with the political changes in interwar Europe when Jews started to flee Nazi Germany from 1933, Fascist Italy from 1938, and from the territories occupied by these two countries before and during WWII. Within this context, at the beginning of the 1930s, the Ecuadorian National Assembly approved decrees that obliged Jewish refugees to work exclusively in the agricultural and industry sectors (Kersffeld, 2018). These laws had two main objectives, on the one hand, the government's need for technical improvements within these sectors, which at that time had not been developed; as a result, the immigration of experts in the areas of agriculture and industry was viewed as essential for the national economy. On the other hand, the Ecuadorian government wanted to avoid any trade-related competitions between immigrants and locals, that in theory could provoke internal struggles in the society.

Connected to these objectives, there were two occasions when Ecuador attempted to host a large number of Jewish immigrants through controlled migration. During Velasco Ibarra's first administration, in the 1934-1935 biennium, the British newspaper Daily Herald published an article stating that Ecuador was available to host up to 50.000 (!) Jewish families from Europe. The government aimed to host Jewish technicians and scientists who had lost their jobs in Europe because of the racial persecution, and they wanted before other countries will do it (Kreuter, 1997). However, this initiative failed because no real program of mass immigration existed, and Ecuador was not ready to host such a great number of migrants.

Later, in November 1935, Dictator Federico Páez signed a contract with the Committee for the Study of Agriculture, Industry and Immigration in the Republic of Ecuador (*Comité pour l'Etude de l'Agriculture, de l'Industrie et de l'Immigration dans la République de l'Equateur*, in French), based in Paris and founded by the Freeland League of Jewish Colonization. This contract had the same goal mentioned above: to host Jewish refugees and make them work in the agricultural and industrial sectors. However, the project was never finalized due to the lack of preparation from both the side of the government and the Committee, the latter of which never presented a final draft of the project. Moreover, the HICEM¹ itself, which reviewed the project, was among those who actively opposed the first draft of the project, since they viewed it as an obstacle, more than an opportunity for Jewish immigrants (Kreuter, 1997).

As mentioned before, attempting to control the migration of Jews from Europe was directly linked to the need for improving the agricultural and industrial sectors. Therefore, to acquire an Ecuadorian visa, Jewish asylum seekers had to sign a letter in which they promised to work in these sectors once in the country. Although only a small portion of them kept their word, in some cases, some people had a contract in a job non-related to agriculture or industry before leaving for Ecuador, but once they arrived there, they had to change it. This was the case of Bert Zanders' father, a Jewish refugee in Ecuador who had already signed a contract as a professor at the University of Quito before leaving Poland, and once he arrived in Ecuador, he had to find a job in agriculture, as the government threatened him of expulsion (Zanders, 1998).

¹ Organization established in 1927 whose goal was to help European Jews emigrate from Europe.

In 1937, Dictator Alberto Enríquez Gallo promulgated a decree announcing the expulsion from Ecuador of all Jews who were involved in all economic sectors except in agriculture and industry within 30 days (Kreuter, 1997). Enríquez Gallo's government promulgated this decree after having received complaints from bankers and traders from the coastal city of Guayaquil, which is still today the economic center of Ecuador, because of the economic competition of the Jews of the city. However, thanks to the personal exposure of Julius Rosenstock, an early Jewish immigrant, and head of the Jewish charity association HICEM, the expulsion decree was never applied (Kreuter, 1997).

Between 1938 and 1945, thanks to the efforts of the HICEM, the Ecuadorian borders remained open during this whole period. Nonetheless, the most conservative sectors of Ecuador's national politics attempted to restrict Jewish immigration on three occasions, in 1938, 1940, and 1941. In 1938 the Law on Foreigners (1938) tried to establish more control to impede the entrance of migrants to Ecuador, leaving the opportunity open solely to professionals in the fields of science, art, and education to enter the country (Canela-Ruano, Gil-Blanco, 2018). Two years later, in 1940, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Julio Tobar Donoso, tried to modify this law through a project presented at the National Assembly to restrict Jewish migration to the country. In his opinion, the Jewish "race" could have threatened the "ethnic, economic and moral future of the [Ecuadorian] Nation" (Canela-Ruano, Gil-Blanco, 2018: 211) and was of imperative importance to reduce the entrance of Jews in the country. However, this project was not supported by a majority in the National Assembly and was consequently refused.

Nevertheless, one year later, in 1941, granting visas to Jewish individuals was also officially banned in Ecuador. The open antisemite, Tobar Donoso signed this decree. Nonetheless, most of the Ecuadorian diplomatic corps involved in Europe did not apply the above-mentioned ministerial decree, and Jews continued to acquire visas even after 1941.

Finally, all the restrictions towards Jewish immigration, together with the decrees linked to their obligation to work in specific sectors, were finally abolished in 1944. In fact, in the parliamentary debate on the abolishment, Ecuadorian President Velasco Ibarra gave a speech at the National Assembly in which he stated that "today only one law should be followed: the law of Humanity" (Kreuter, 1997).

Ecuadorian and Colombian diplomatic missions in Europe

Colombia

As mentioned in the previous section, Jewish migration to Colombia was officially banned starting from 1939. In an act signed on the 30th of January, Colombian Foreign Minister López de Mesa gave an order to the diplomatic corps based in Europe stating that

“the five thousand Jews currently living in Colombia cannot be exceeded, even though, because of our humanitarian sentiments, we stand in favor of those minorities which are being persecuted. This means that all the ambassadors and consuls should do everything humanly possible to make it impossible the issuance of new visas to Jewish individuals” (Leal Villamizar, 2011: 57).

Later on, López de Mesa sent another letter to the Colombian representatives in Europe, in which he stated that “on serious economic grounds, Jewish immigration should be drastically reduced. From this moment on, all visas to Jewish individuals should have the authorization from this office” (Leal Villamizar, 2011: 57).

As cited in the previous section, the attitude of the Colombian government can be explained by economic motivations, since Jews were seen as a threat to the locals' business activities. However, also diplomatic corps in Europe played a significant role, as some of the ambassadors working in Europe were openly antisemitic. One of them was the Colombian ambassador to Poland, Carlos Gerlein (1935-1936) who in the years immediately before the 1939's anti-immigration policy, sent a letter to the Foreign Minister stating that “the Jewish race is the race which, from ancient times, provokes conflicts in every country, and should be considered undesirable” (Leal Villamizar, 2011: 31). Moreover, until WWII, Colombia was politically close to Nazi Germany, which brought the government of Bogotá to remove their consul Lagebach because of his Jewish origin from Frankfurt in 1939; whom after his removal fled to Brazil. Humberto Donati, the Colombian consul in Trieste, suffered the same as Lagebach as he was also removed due to his Jewish origin.

Another case of open antisemitism by the Colombian representatives abroad took place in the embassy in Berlin. The building of the Colombian embassy in Germany was the property of a

German Jew named Rosenthal, but in 1939 the Nazi government confiscated it. However, Rosenthal, who in the meantime fled to London, continued to ask the Colombian government to pay the rent, but Bogotá refused it by appealing to the Nazi decree and stating that the building was not his property anymore.

Further, the fraudulent activities of some consuls and ambassadors in Europe also increased the anti-immigration attitude of the Colombian government and the general public, since some journalists discovered and published them on national media. This was the case of General Solano, consul in Marseille, France, and Mr. Eckert, secretary of the Colombian embassy in Vienna, Austria, who sold visas in exchange of bribes (Leal Villamizar, 2011). After these stories were published in national newspapers, they created a general protest against the immigration of Jewish refugees in the country.

However, there were also positive examples when Colombian diplomatic corps helped Jews threatened by the German and Italian authorities. This was the case, for example, of Mr. Restrepo, Trade Representative in Genoa, Italy, who interceded with the government to help two Jewish families to acquire a visa and flee to Colombia; the Viennese family Schwartz, who fled from Austria to Italy before the Racial Laws, and the Italian Jewish family Guastalla. Nonetheless, both families were rejected by the Colombian government, despite the efforts of Mr. Restrepo (García Hernández, 2007).

Even though Colombia officially closed its borders to Jewish immigrants starting from 1939, in January of the same year 45 visas were issued by the Colombian embassy in Berlin to Jewish individuals (García Hernández, 2007). In the years following the ban, between 100 and 300 Jewish asylum seekers attempted to get an appointment in the Colombian embassies in Germany and Poland, waiting for several days in front of their gates. After 1939, only a few hundred Jews were able to travel to Colombia, thanks to the efforts of Jewish international humanitarian organizations, like HICEM (Leal Villamizar, 2007).

To some extent, the experiences of the Jewish refugees in Colombia were similar to the ones of those who emigrated to Ecuador, as it will be explained in the next section. For example, having issues with the customs offices at the port of destination was quite common also in Colombia. For example, Aline Jacobsohn remembers that once she landed at the Port of Buenaventura, the authorities did not let her enter the country because she did not have a real passport, just a

laissez-passer with the Colombian visa (Jacobsohn, 1995). This was not uncommon since Germany withdrew the citizenship from the German Jews. However, as in the case of the Zander family in Ecuador, a German Jew who already lived in Colombia helped her by corrupting the customs officers.

Ecuador

Concerning the Ecuadorian diplomacy in Europe, the instability of their national politics between 1933 and 1945 was highly reflected in the behavior of their representatives in the Old Continent. For this reason, unlike in the Colombian case, there was not a clear strategy behind the adjudication of visas to Jewish asylum seekers in Europe, which was mainly based on the will of the ambassador or consul (Grubel Rosenthal, 2010).

However, as mentioned in the previous section, the Ministerial decree sent to the diplomatic corps deployed in Europe in 1941, officially banned granting visas to Jews. Nonetheless, not all the Ecuadorian representatives abroad followed the instructions of the decree, showing an open opposition towards the national government, while in some cases the embassies followed the government's initiative. For instance, the cases of Consul Andrade and Muñoz Borrero, together with the activities of the consuls in Genoa and Amsterdam, illustrate the lack of coherence of the Ecuadorian authorities regarding the exercise of the banning decree. Consul Andrade was an openly antisemitic diplomat based in Hamburg. Since the Consulate in Berlin was just honorary, all the visas from Berlin had to be signed by the consul in Hamburg. Andrade asked for more money from the asylum seekers, and denied their visa applications on many occasions, alleging bureaucratic minutiae (Kreuter, 1997). Moreover, he used to write with his own pen a "J" for "Judío" or "Jude" (Jew in Spanish and German), on the passports of Jewish migrants, so that the authorities in Germany and Ecuador would be aware of the reason behind their flight. This kind of open hostility towards the immigration of Jews in the country was also shared by the Ecuadorian consuls in London, Anvers, and Berlin.

Interestingly, together with the dubious morality of the Ecuadorian consul in Hamburg, there were also positive examples of solidarity and humanity. For instance, the Ecuadorian consuls in Genoa and Amsterdam never required Jewish asylum seekers to pay for their visa to flee to Ecuador, which was established by the government in the 30s, which was 1.000 USD per person until 1938, and later on 400 USD per person (Kreuter, 1997). Moreover, the Ecuadorian

Ambassador in Stockholm, Manuel Antonio Muñoz Borrero, actively worked to rescue Jews from Europe. It is estimated that Muñoz Borrero, based in a neutral country, released around 1.200 Ecuadorian passports, saving approximately 800 European Jews from being exterminated (Kersffeld, 2018). Due to his humanitarian activities, in 2011 Muñoz Borrero became the first and only Ecuadorian to be awarded the title of “Righteous Among the Nations” from the State of Israel.

The attitudes of Ecuadorian diplomatic missions in Europe are also reminded in the interviews with European Jewish refugees who fled to these countries before WWII. Bert Zanders was a German Jew from Cologne, whose family acquired the visas to go to Ecuador in the consulate in Amsterdam. The Ecuadorian consul decided to permit them to flee without the agreement of Consul Andrade, who was openly against the immigration of Jews to Ecuador, and who was the direct supervisor of the Ecuadorian consulates in the Netherlands. Later on, Andrade decided to invalidate all the permissions issued by the consulates in the Netherlands and Belgium, among which there was also the Zander’s family visa. However, finally, thanks to the help of some local Jews who corrupted the customs authorities, Zander and his family safely entered the country (Zander, 1998).

Another story related to the Ecuadorian consuls in Europe is the one narrated by Karl Nagel, who also applied for a visa in the Ecuadorian consulate in Amsterdam, the only one available at the time. Nagel was an engineer, but since his documents were written only in German, he could not demonstrate this to the Consul during his interview. The fact that he was an engineer was highly important since Ecuador only wanted to host professionals in the industry or agricultural fields. Therefore, to prove his knowledge, the Ecuadorian consul asked Nagel to repair the broken radio used by the consulate to communicate with Quito. Nagel was able to repair it and consequently acquired his visa to Ecuador (Nagel, 1996).

Conclusion

Regarding the hypothesis posed at the beginning of this chapter, the difference between the government’s approaches towards Jewish migration of Colombia and Ecuador was mainly attributable to internal causes more than to external ones, and it is directly connected to the economic reality of the two countries at the time. Moreover, while Ecuador treated Jewish immigration as a mean for its economic growth, the Colombian authorities approached it as a menace to the Colombian labor market. It is true that the approach of the Ecuadorian and

Colombian governments towards Jewish immigration was influenced only by internal motivations, and no external actors played a relevant role in the policy-making process. Even though both countries became allies of the United States, their policies towards Jewish migration did not change. However, while the Colombian authorities viewed the Jewish migration as a menace against their local economy, it is only partially true that Ecuador saw the immigration of refugees as a means *tout court* for its economic growth. In fact, until 1944 the Ecuadorian authorities were only interested in the development of certain areas of Ecuadorian economy, such as agriculture and industry. Regarding the other economic fields, the policies were as restrictive as the Colombian ones, as shown by the attitude of a group of businessmen in Guayaquil, who brought the Páez's government to expel those Jews who were not employed in the mentioned sectors. In this case, the great difference between Ecuador and Colombia was based on the stability of the internal political system, which brought the former to change its position in several occasions, and the latter to maintain a strong and coherent anti-immigration approach.

An important aspect undervalued in the hypothesis was the antisemitic attitudes of some government officials and their representatives in Europe. The policies of the two governments were not only of economic nature. As it is clear from this chapter, in both cases, antisemitic sentiments played an important role in the restrictive migration laws. Some of the examples of such attitude were the Ecuadorian Foreign Minister Tobar Donoso and his Colombian equivalent López de Mesa, together with some members of both diplomatic corps, like the Ecuadorian consul in Hamburg, Andrade, and the Colombian Consul in Marseille, General Solano. Finally, I conclude that the main causes behind the different governmental approaches towards the Jewish refugee migration in the two countries were connected to the states' economy and the antisemitic views of some state officials.

References

Chiriboga, R. O. (2005). *La herencia sefardita en la provincia de Loja*. Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana.

Leal Villamizar, L. M. (2015). *Colombia frente al antisemitismo y la inmigración de judíos polacos y alemanes 1933-1948* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidad Nacional de Colombia).

Gil-Blanco, E., & Canela-Ruano, A. J. (2018). *The European migration to Ecuador (1935-1955). The diplomatic vision of the arrival of problematic groups: the Jews*. Chasqui-Revista Latinoamericana de Comunicación, (138), 211-227.

Grubel Rosenthal, M. (2010). *Ecuador: Destino de Migrantes. Una Biografía de la Comunidad Judía del Ecuador*. Manuel Grubel Rosenthal.

Hernandez García, J. Á. (2007). *Emigración judía en Colombia en los años 1930 y 1940. Un caso particular: los polacos*. Pensamiento y cultura, 1(1), 177-190.

Jacobsohn, A. (1995). Interview 3636. Segments 24 and following. *Visual History Archive*, USC Shoah Foundation. Retrieved January 29, 2018.

Kerssfield, D. (2018). *La migración Judía en Ecuador. Ciencia, cultura y exilio 1933-1945*. Academia Nacional de Historia.

Kreuter, M. L. (1997). *¿Dónde queda el Ecuador? Exilio en un país desconocido desde 1938 hasta fines de los años cincuenta*. Quito - Ecuador: Abya-Yala.

Nagel, K. (1996). Interview 24369. Segments 87 and following. *Visual History Archive*, USC Shoah Foundation. Retrieved January 29, 2018.

Rosenhain, H. (1996). Interview 19644. Segments 40 and following. *Visual History Archive*, USC Shoah Foundation. Retrieved January 29, 2018.

Zanders, B. (1998). Interview 52491. Segments 55 and following. *Visual History Archive*, USC Shoah Foundation. Retrieved March 5, 2018.