

17-2231 (L), 17-2232, 17-2233, 17-2240 (Consolidated)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, *et al.*
Plaintiffs-Appellees,

and

ALLAN HAKKY and SAMANEH TAKALOO
Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, *et al.*
Defendants-Appellants

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland

**BRIEF OF MASSACHUSETTS TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP COUNCIL,
INC., *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES**

Gare A. Smith
Michael B. Keating
Kristyn M. DeFilipp
Christopher E. Hart
Daniel L. McFadden
FOLEY HOAG LLP
1717 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae* MASSACHUSETTS TECHNOLOGY
LEADERSHIP COUNCIL, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
ARGUMENT	1
I. THE THIRD TRAVEL BAN IS MERELY A CONTINUATION OF THE PRESIDENT’S UNCONSTITUTIONAL ANTI-MUSLIM POLICIES.	3
A. The President Banned Muslims.	3
B. The Federal Courts Ordered The President To Cease Implementing The Ban, in Both of Its Previous Iterations.	5
C. The Third Travel Ban Is A Continuation Of Its Predecessors And Is Equally Flawed.	6
II. THE THIRD TRAVEL BAN IS NOT ONLY ILLEGAL, BUT IT WILL OPERATE AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST, INCLUDING AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY SECTOR.	8
A. The Domestic Technology Industry Benefits From Immigration.	8
1. Immigration Supports The Innovation Economy.....	8
2. Immigrants Are Inventors.....	11
3. Immigrants Are Technology Leaders.....	12
4. Immigrants Are Business Leaders.....	13
5. Immigrants Contribute To The Field Of Medicine.	15
B. Unless It Is Enjoined, The Third Travel Ban Will Harm The Technology Industry	16
C. Unless It Is Enjoined, the Third Travel Ban Will Undermine the Competitive Strength of the Domestic Technology Industry and Will Chill the Culture of Innovation.	19
CONCLUSION	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aziz v. Trump</i> , No. 17-116, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889 (E.D. Va. Feb. 13, 2017).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Epperson v. Arkansas</i> , 393 U.S. 97 (1968).....	21
<i>Hawai’i v. Trump</i> , No. 17-361, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36935 (D. Haw. Mar. 15, 2017)	2, 8
<i>Peacock v. Duval</i> , 694 F.2d 644 (9 th Cir. 1982)	8
<i>United States v. Ballard</i> , 322 U.S. 78, 86 (1944)	21
<i>Washington v. Trump</i> , No. 17-141, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16012 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 3, 2017), <i>stay denied by</i> No. 17-35105, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 2369 (9 th Cir. Feb. 9, 2017)	2, 4, 5, 7
Orders	
82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Jan. 27, 2017).....	2, 4, 5
82 Fed. Reg. 8,978.....	4, 5
82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 6, 2017)	2
82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sep. 24, 2017).....	2
Other Authorities	
Adam Vaccaro, <i>Boston Business Leaders Oppose Trump Immigration Order</i> , The Boston Globe (Jan. 29, 2017), available at https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2017/01/29/chief-says-company-will-stand-with-employees-from-banned-countries/5v00oFyvZZpGPd5CxPDjfN/story.html	18
January 27, 2016 Letter of Edward J. Ramotowski, Deputy Ass’t of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State	4

September 15, 2017 Tweet from Donald J. Trump, *available at*
<https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/90864516146265090>6

Trump Advisor Says New Travel Ban Will Have ‘Same Basic Policy Outcome,’ FoxNews.com, Feb. 21, 2017, *available at*
<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/02/21/trump-adviser-says-new-travel-ban-will-have-same-basic-policy-outcome.html>.....3, 7

Zeninjor Enwemeka, *Local Tech Companies Say Trump’s Immigration Order Is Bad For Business*, WBUR (Feb. 7, 2017), *available at* <http://www.wbur.org/bostonmix/2017/02/07/boston-business-travel-ban>18

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

Amicus Curiae is the Massachusetts Technology Leadership Council, Inc. (“MassTLC”), a not-for-profit association of companies that collectively employ more than 170,000 people in the Massachusetts technology industry. MassTLC represents a vibrant and growing community of innovators in fields including software, computers, robotics, and security products. MassTLC therefore closely follows issues—including immigration policy—that may affect the ability of its members to build value, attract talent, and compete in the diverse global marketplace.

No party’s counsel authored this brief in whole or in part. No party or party’s counsel contributed money intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief. No person other than MassTLC, its members or its counsel contributed money intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief.

ARGUMENT

MassTLC writes in support of the Respondents in opposing the Administration’s effort to overturn a nationwide injunction restraining the execution of President Donald Trump’s Executive Order dated September 24, 2017, entitled “Enhancing Vetting Capabilities and Processes for Detecting Attempted Entry Into the United States by Terrorists or Other Public-Safety

Threats” (the “Third Travel Ban”).¹ As the Court is aware, the Third Travel Ban was issued to supplant a similarly-titled Executive Order entitled “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States” (the “Second Travel Ban”),² which itself was issued to voluntarily narrow an identically titled Executive Order issued January 27, 2017 (the “Original Travel Ban”).³

The Third Travel Ban, like the ones before it, is arbitrary, illegal, and does not serve the public interest. This is fundamentally the same discriminatory “Muslim Ban” that has been repeatedly enjoined over the last nine months.⁴ Cosmetic changes—such as the *post hoc* addition of purported security justifications, or the addition of certain non-Muslim countries—do not alter the fact that this policy still proceeds from the same irrational and unconstitutional religious animus. When the Original Travel Ban was revised, the President’s own

¹ 82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sep. 24, 2017).

² 82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 6, 2017).

³ 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Jan. 27, 2017).

⁴ See, e.g., *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-35105, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 2369, at *3-7 (9th Cir. Feb. 9, 2017); *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 17-116, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889, at *9-13, 27 (E.D. Va. Feb. 13, 2017); *Hawai’i v. Trump*, No. 17-361, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36935, at *33-45 (D. Haw. Mar. 15, 2017)

Senior Policy Advisor admitted that the revision was intended to achieve the “same basic policy outcome” as its patently illegal predecessor.⁵

The public interest demands an immigration system that does not discriminate against any religion, and that is fair, orderly, and predictable. In particular, technology companies in Massachusetts require such a system to recruit innovators from around the world to build businesses here at home, and to sell their products back out into the global marketplace. President Trump’s attempt to ban the entry of entire nationalities—even when the person seeking entry clearly poses no risk—is antithetical to the public interest and undermines America’s innovation economy and its fundamental values.

I. THE THIRD TRAVEL BAN IS MERELY A CONTINUATION OF THE PRESIDENT’S UNCONSTITUTIONAL ANTI-MUSLIM POLICIES.

A. The President Banned Muslims.

During his election campaign, President Trump repeatedly promised to ban Muslims from entering the United States.⁶ As one court has explained, “[t]he

⁵ See *Trump Advisor Says New Travel Ban Will Have ‘Same Basic Policy Outcome,’* FoxNews.com, Feb. 21, 2017, available at <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/02/21/trump-adviser-says-new-travel-ban-will-have-same-basic-policy-outcome.html>.

⁶ See *Aziz*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889, at *9-13.

‘Muslim ban’ was a centerpiece of the president’s campaign for months, and the press release calling for it was still available on his website as of [Feb. 13, 2017].”⁷

Within days of taking office, President Trump issued the Original Travel Ban. Section 3(c) of that order immediately prohibited all people from seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States, even including returning permanent residents and visa-holders residing in the United States.⁸ The President ordered that this exclusion continue for 90 days, during which time federal agencies would purportedly review their immigration security procedures.⁹ To implement this order, the Department of State “provisionally revoke[d] all valid nonimmigrant and immigrant visas of nationals” of those seven countries without any due process or advance notice.¹⁰

Notably, the Original Travel Ban contained provisions to add additional countries to the “banned” list, and also to extend the ban indefinitely beyond the

⁷ *See id.*

⁸ *See Washington*, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 2369, at *3-7. Notably, the order included a safety valve to permit “religious minorities”

⁹ 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977, 8,977-78.

¹⁰ *See* January 27, 2016 Letter of Edward J. Ramotowski, Deputy Ass’t of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State. This letter made a small number of exceptions for military and diplomatic visas, or case-by-case determinations “in the national interest.”

initial 90-day period.¹¹ Thus, with the stroke a pen, President Trump suddenly excluded a vast number of Muslims from the United States, stripped legal status from many already residing here, and created well-founded fear that more nationalities would find themselves banned without warning.

B. The Federal Courts Ordered The President To Cease Implementing The Ban, in Both of Its Previous Iterations.

The Original Travel Ban was rapidly enjoined by numerous federal courts. Most broadly, Judge James Robart of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington issued an order that the federal government was “ENJOINED and RESTRAINED from . . . [e]nforcing Section 3(c)” of the Original Travel Ban on a nationwide basis.¹² The federal government appealed this order, but ultimately dismissed the appeal after the 9th Circuit construed the order as a preliminary injunction and refused to stay its operation.¹³

Notably, at least one court enjoined the Original Travel Ban based on the strong likelihood that it would be proved to be an exercise in religious

¹¹ 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977, 8,978.

¹² *Washington*, No. 17-141, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16012, at *7-8 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 3, 2017).

¹³ *See Washington*, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 2369, at *34 (stay of preliminary injunction denied); Order, *Washington*, No. 17-35105 (9th Cir. Mar. 8, 2017) (granting federal government’s motion to voluntarily dismiss appeal of preliminary injunction, including payment of State of Washington’s costs).

discrimination. Judge Brinkema of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia concluded, based in large part on the President’s own statements, that the Commonwealth of Virginia had established such a strong likelihood of success on its Establishment Clause claim that the Original Travel Ban should be enjoined on that basis alone.¹⁴ Similarly, after President Trump signed the Second Travel Ban, that too was enjoined.¹⁵ Even while litigation concerning the Second Travel Ban was pending, just days before the Third Travel Ban was issued, the President tweeted that the “travel ban into the United States” should be “far larger” and “tougher.”¹⁶

C. The Third Travel Ban Is A Continuation Of Its Predecessors And Is Equally Flawed.

On September 24, 2017, President Trump signed the Third Travel Ban, which supplants the original two orders. Unchanged, however, is the ban’s basic function: to prohibit people from predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States based solely on their national origin.¹⁷

¹⁴ *Aziz*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889, at *28 n.11.

¹⁵ *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017).

¹⁶ September 15, 2017 Tweet from Donald J. Trump, *available at* <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/90864516146265090>.

¹⁷ This is prohibited discrimination even if the ban does not restrict travel from every predominantly Muslim country. *See id.* at *26-27 (“The major premise of

While the Third Travel Ban is somewhat narrower than the Original Travel Ban, and included two non-Muslim majority countries (unlike the previous orders), it nevertheless still achieves (in the words of President Trump’s own senior advisor concerning the Second Travel Ban) the “same basic policy outcome.”¹⁸ For example, although permanent residents and aliens already issued visas are exempted from the revised order, the residents of six Muslim-majority countries still cannot obtain new visas. Inevitably, travel from those countries will be incrementally extinguished as existing visas expire.

Further, although the Third Travel Ban now contains purported security justifications for restricting travel from the identified Muslim-majority countries (Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, Yemen, and Chad), and extends to certain individuals from Venezuela and a tiny group of North Korean travelers (estimated at fewer than 100 annually), it is telling that these justifications were not proffered until after the Original Travel Ban had been enjoined (and new non-Muslim countries added after the Second one, too, had been enjoined).¹⁹ Asserted now—in the teeth

that argument—that one can only demonstrate animus toward a group of people by targeting all of them at once—is flawed.”).

¹⁸ See *Trump Advisor Says New Travel Ban Will Have ‘Same Basic Policy Outcome,’* n.4, *supra*.

¹⁹ *Washington*, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 2369, at *32 & n.8.

of numerous adverse rulings—these *post hoc* rationalizations are entitled to little weight.²⁰

The Third Travel Ban has the purpose and effect of banning Muslims from the United States, as is evident from the overwhelming record of the President’s statements targeting Muslims. The Third Travel Ban also violates the Immigration and Nationality Act.²¹ For all of these reasons, as well as for those set forth in Plaintiffs’-Appellees’ Brief, the Third Travel Ban is illegal.

II. THE THIRD TRAVEL BAN IS NOT ONLY ILLEGAL, BUT IT WILL OPERATE AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST, INCLUDING AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY SECTOR.

Although the Third Travel Ban is contrary to the public interest in many ways, MassTLC writes to explain one particular facet of that harm: the ban’s profoundly disruptive effect on the technology sector, including in Massachusetts.

A. The Domestic Technology Industry Benefits From Immigration.

1. Immigration Supports The Innovation Economy.

The technology industry is a critical driver of the Massachusetts economy. Nearly 400,000 people in Massachusetts work in jobs that are either in the

²⁰ *Aziz*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889, at *24 n.10 (citing *Peacock v. Duval*, 694 F.2d 644, 646 (9th Cir. 1982)); *Hawai’i*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36935 at *39-40, n. 15 (citing *Aziz*).

²¹ 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101 *et seq.*

technology sector, or are in technology-related occupations in other sectors—roughly 13% of the state’s total workforce.²² This industry is a global enterprise, fueled in large part by immigration and international travel. According to one recent study, as of January 1, 2016, “[i]mmigrants have started more than half (44 of 87) of America’s startup companies valued at \$1 billion dollars or more and are key members of management or product development teams in over 70 percent (62 of 87) of these companies.”²³ More than half of Silicon Valley’s corporate founders are immigrants.²⁴

The integral role that immigrants play in the technology industry does not arise because “immigrants steal jobs” (as many nativist demagogues have claimed), but rather because the technology industry is growing too rapidly to be staffed through domestic labor alone. By 2020, for example, projections indicate that 1.4 million computer specialist positions will be open in the United States, but domestic universities will only produce enough graduates to fill 29% of those

²² Addendum, *The Economic Impact of Immigration on the U.S.*, June 2017 (“Add.”). This Addendum is a version of a publicly-available report published by MassTLC and available on its website, <http://www.masstlc.org/immigration/>. The report cites original sources for the data relied on in this brief. MassTLC provides a version of the full report here as an Appendix for the Court’s convenience.

²³ Add. at 24.

²⁴ Add. at 37-38.

jobs.²⁵ In Massachusetts today, there are seventeen technology jobs for every person who graduates with a degree in computer science or information technology.²⁶ Immigrants are responsible for substantial economic growth. This is true as a general matter of the country as a whole: in 2015, immigrants contributed \$2 trillion to the U.S. GDP, which represents 11% of the country's total GDP.²⁷ Zooming in to the Massachusetts technology sector, one study projects that, if half of Massachusetts' 3,608 advanced level graduates in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) related fields, studying on temporary visas, remained in Massachusetts upon graduation, then 4,726 new jobs would be created for U.S.-born workers by 2021.²⁸

As it stands, immigrant students are disproportionately more likely to get their degrees in a STEM field, and international students make up over 30% of the post-baccalaureate degrees in STEM fields.²⁹ Individuals from the six banned countries, moreover, are more likely to have a bachelor's degree, approximately

²⁵ Add. at 15.

²⁶ Add. at 17.

²⁷ Add. at 33.

²⁸ Add. at 17.

²⁹ Add. at 91.

twice as likely to have a graduate degree, and four times as likely to have a doctoral degree relative to the native-born population.³⁰ Quite apart from this population being a disproportionately educated and skilled one, they are also part of a population making immediate impacts on the U.S economy: During the 2015-16 academic year, international students contributed \$32.8 billion to the U.S. economy and supported more than 400,000 jobs.³¹

2. Immigrants Are Inventors.

So too do immigrants drive the development of inventions and other useful arts. For example, in 2011, 76% of patents awarded to the Top 10 patent-producing U.S. universities had an inventor that was foreign-born.³² In recent years, foreign nationals contributed to more than three quarters of patents in the fields of information technology, molecular and microbiology, and pharmaceuticals.³³

The amount of invention originating from immigrants can have dramatic effects on innovation, with discernable spillover effects. One academic study

³⁰ Add. at 84.

³¹ Add. at 85.

³² Add. at 27.

³³ Add. at 27-28.

noted that a 1.3 percentage point increase in the share of the overall U.S. population composed of immigrant college graduates, and a 0.7 percentage point increase in that same share composed of post-graduate immigrants, led to an increase in patenting by approximately 12 to 21%.³⁴ Similarly, as little as a 0.45 percentage point increase in immigrant scientists and engineers in the overall U.S. population increases patenting per capita by approximately 13 to 32%.³⁵ High-skilled immigration has an important and discernable impact on the innovation economy. Limiting such immigration clearly threatens future innovation.

3. Immigrants Are Technology Leaders.

The highly-educated foreign-born scientists, mathematicians, and engineers also represent some of the best in the field. Forty percent of the Nobel Prizes won by Americans in Chemistry, Medicine, and Physics since 2000 were awarded to immigrants.³⁶ In 2016, all six American winners of the Nobel Prize in economics and scientific fields were foreign born.³⁷ From 2010-2015, four out of eight U.S. Turing Award (for computing) recipients were first or second generation

³⁴ Add. at 29.

³⁵ Add. at 29.

³⁶ Add. at 95.

³⁷ Add. at 95.

immigrants.³⁸ Since 1936, 63% of Fields Medal (for mathematics) recipients affiliated with a U.S. research institution have been foreign born (and *all* such recipients have been foreign-born since 2002).³⁹ Forty-one percent of National Medal of Science recipients in math or computer science are foreign-born.⁴⁰ In Massachusetts, 37% of Nobel Prize winners associated with MIT are foreign-born;⁴¹ 33% of Nobel prize winners who are current faculty or alumni of Harvard University are foreign-born;⁴² and 75% of Nobel Prize winners who have been affiliated with Boston University are foreign born.⁴³ There is little question as to the importance of the contributions that immigrants make to STEM fields, in both the U.S. and Massachusetts.

4. Immigrants Are Business Leaders.

American companies that are household names—Microsoft, McDonald’s, U.S. Steel—are led by foreign-born CEOs.⁴⁴ As of 2016, over 10% of Fortune 500

³⁸ Add. at 102.

³⁹ Add. at 101.

⁴⁰ Add. at 103-04.

⁴¹ Add. at 96.

⁴² Add. at 96.

⁴³ Add. at 97.

⁴⁴ Add. at 23.

CEOs were born outside of the U.S.; the same was true for 14% of Fortune 100 CEOs.⁴⁵ In 2016, over 40% of Fortune 500 firms were founded either by an immigrant or the child of immigrants.⁴⁶

The same holds true in Massachusetts. More than half of the Massachusetts-based Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants, or by children of immigrants.⁴⁷ Their impact on the Massachusetts economy has been significant, generating over \$130 billion in annual revenue, and employing nearly half a million people around the world.⁴⁸ At the beginning of this decade, over 17 percent of all business owners in Massachusetts were foreign born.⁴⁹ In 2013, the same was true of nearly 19 percent of business owners in the greater Boston area.⁵⁰ From 2006 to 2010, Massachusetts businesses owned by new immigrants had a total net business income of \$2.8 billion.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Add. at 23-24.

⁴⁶ Add. at 25.

⁴⁷ Add. at 21.

⁴⁸ Add. at 21.

⁴⁹ Add. at 21.

⁵⁰ Add. at 21.

⁵¹ Add. at 22.

Prominent American innovators, past and present, hail from countries directly targeted by the Third Travel Ban, including Steve Jobs (the co-founder of Apple whose father is from Syria),⁵² Ali Hajimiri (an academic and entrepreneur who holds over 85 U.S. and European patents, who is from Iran),⁵³ and Joe Kiani (founder, chairman, and CEO of Masimo, and also from Iran).⁵⁴ Iranian-Americans either founded or lead mainstays of the technology sector like Twitter, Dropbox, Oracle, and eBay.⁵⁵ Similarly, several of the top venture capitalists who fund new technology companies were born in Tehran.⁵⁶

5. Immigrants Contribute To The Field Of Medicine.

Medicine, in particular, has benefitted greatly from immigrants. More than 25% of physicians practicing in the United States are foreign born.⁵⁷ Importantly, foreign-born physicians are disproportionately represented in rural clinics and public safety-net hospitals treating isolated and vulnerable populations.⁵⁸ The

⁵² Add. at 25.

⁵³ Add. at 25.

⁵⁴ Add. at 25.

⁵⁵ Add. at 16.

⁵⁶ Add. at 16.

⁵⁷ Add. at 17.

⁵⁸ Add. at 17-18.

simple reason for this is that the United States does not produce enough physicians to keep up with demand. According to a report published by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) in 2016, a current deficit of 11,000 physicians is expected to grow as the population grows and ages.⁵⁹ The AAMC estimates that the U.S. will face a shortage of up to 94,700 doctors by 2025.⁶⁰ Almost a third of the shortage will be primary care physicians.⁶¹ More than 8,400 doctors working in the U.S. are from two of the countries listed in the Third Travel Ban: Iran and Syria.⁶² Specifically in Massachusetts, in 2016 almost 1 in 4 physicians graduated from a medical school outside of the United States (suggesting non-U.S. origin).⁶³

B. Unless It Is Enjoined, The Third Travel Ban Will Harm The Technology Industry.

Implementation of irrational and discriminatory immigration policies, including the Third Travel Ban, would severely harm the technology industry in the U.S. generally, and Massachusetts specifically. Indeed, Massachusetts has one

⁵⁹ Add. at 17-18.

⁶⁰ Add. at 17-18.

⁶¹ Add. at 17-18.

⁶² Add. at 17-18.

⁶³ Add. at 19.

of the highest numbers of applications for temporary non-agricultural work permits in the United States.⁶⁴ The impact is expected to destabilize the workforce and reduce the competitiveness of U.S. technology firms. For example, Microsoft’s public securities filings explain that “[c]hanges to U.S. immigration policies that restrain the flow of technical and professional talent may inhibit our ability to adequately staff our research and development efforts.”⁶⁵ In addition to stifling recruiting from the “banned” countries, the Third Travel Ban could accelerate the rise of technology hubs abroad, making such locales as Vancouver, London, and Singapore more “attractive alternatives to existing hubs” of technology in the United States,⁶⁶ and force companies based abroad to put off opening offices in the United States.⁶⁷ It will also likely result in the relocation of foreign born employees from the United States to other countries where they can reside without fear of a sudden revocation of their rights to access their families and homes.

The Massachusetts technology sector expects to feel this impact acutely.

⁶⁴ Add. at 75.

⁶⁵ Add. at 19.

⁶⁶ Add. at 19.

⁶⁷ Add. at 19-20.

As reported in the press, numerous Boston-based businesses have expressed grave concern regarding the Administration’s travel ban and its potential expansion. As Jeff Bussgang, a general partner at the venture capital firm Flybridge and professor at Harvard Business School stated, the travel ban is “the innovation economy’s worst nightmare.”⁶⁸ Paul English, founder of the travel booking site Kayak and startup Lola, expressed concern about a Mexican national hired to develop an app who was worried about traveling out of the country to visit his family.⁶⁹ Leaders of Massachusetts-headquartered technology companies, from large to small—including GE, TripAdvisor, Carbonite, Brightcove, and Fuze—have expressed concern over the direct impact that implementation of the travel ban had on their businesses.⁷⁰ This anecdotal evidence is strongly supported by the empirical data noted above: a high percentage of founders, managers, and employees of

⁶⁸ Adam Vaccaro, *Boston Business Leaders Oppose Trump Immigration Order*, The Boston Globe (Jan. 29, 2017), available at <https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2017/01/29/chief-says-company-will-stand-with-employees-from-banned-countries/5v00oFyvZZpGPd5CxPDjfN/story.html>.

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ *Id.*; Zeninor Enwemeka, *Local Tech Companies Say Trump’s Immigration Order Is Bad For Business*, WBUR (Feb. 7, 2017), available at <http://www.wbur.org/bostonmix/2017/02/07/boston-business-travel-ban>.

Massachusetts technology companies are immigrants and potentially impacted by the Third Travel Ban, either directly or indirectly.

It is thus clearly in the public interest—including in the interests of the Massachusetts technology industry—for the Court to restrain the operation of the Third Travel Ban. The United States deserves fair, rational, and predictable rules to govern immigration and international travel. Such a system permits individuals and companies to reliably arrange employment and commercial relationships, without fear that those relationships will be abruptly disrupted by irrational or discriminatory policies.

C. Unless It Is Enjoined, the Third Travel Ban Will Undermine the Competitive Strength of the Domestic Technology Industry and Will Chill the Culture of Innovation.

The Third Travel Ban is also contrary to the public interest because it substantially undermines the ability of the Massachusetts technology industry to compete in the international marketplace. It discourages travel to the U.S. by potential customers and investors, either because they are directly impacted by the ban, or because they are worried that the ban would be unexpectedly expanded to exclude additional nationalities. Indeed, this is not a theoretical concern. Flight bookings to the United States from January 28, 2017 to February 4, 2017 dropped

by 6.5% overall in comparison to the previous year.⁷¹ Bookings to the United States from the six targeted countries in the Second Travel Ban dropped by 80% during this same period.⁷²

It may also force companies to move jobs outside of the U.S., locating businesses where employees live rather than enticing them to come to the U.S. Similarly, the Third Travel Ban discourages talented foreign students from attending local educational institutions, from which the technology industry hires many engineers and scientists to drive innovation in the United States. Foreign-born students already in the U.S. will be less likely to remain, as they may be unable to receive or renew a visa, or may be fearful of that possibility. The Third Travel Ban will inevitably reduce the relative strength of domestic industry in global markets, which does nothing to make the United States more safe, prosperous, or secure.

The technology industry, in Massachusetts as elsewhere, thrives on a culture of diversity, inclusivity, and equal opportunity. The Third Travel Ban is antithetical to these values. It is a patently illegal and discriminatory attempt to

⁷¹ Add. at 158.

⁷² Add. at 158.

inflict harm upon a religious minority.⁷³ This animus was both proven and magnified by the manner of the Original Travel Ban’s implementation, which—without any notice—barred the re-entry of Muslims who have made their home in our country, separating them from their homes, families, and careers. A government that acts to hurt people based on their religion (or non-religion) undermines not only the inclusive principles of the modern technology industry, but also legal principles “rooted in the foundation soil of our Nation” and “fundamental to freedom.”⁷⁴ “Freedom of thought, which includes freedom of religious belief, is basic in a society of free men [and women].”⁷⁵

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, MassTLC respectfully requests that this Court affirm the decision below.

⁷³ *Aziz*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20889, at *9-13, 27.

⁷⁴ *Epperson v. Arkansas*, 393 U.S. 97, 103-09 (1968).

⁷⁵ *United States v. Ballard*, 322 U.S. 78, 86 (1944).

Dated: Washington, D.C., November 16, 2017.

/s/ Gare Smith

GARE SMITH
MICHAEL B. KEATING
KRISTYN DeFILIPP
CHRISTOPHER E. HART
DANIEL L. McFADDEN
FOLEY HOAG LLP
1717 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
MASSACHUSETTS TECHNOLOGY
LEADERSHIP COUNCIL, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on November 28, 2017, the foregoing amicus curiae brief was served on all interested parties or their counsel of record through the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Gare Smith

GARE SMITH
MICHAEL B. KEATING
KRISTYN DeFILIPP
CHRISTOPHER E. HART
DANIEL L. McFADDEN
FOLEY HOAG LLP
1717 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
MASSACHUSETTS TECHNOLOGY
LEADERSHIP COUNCIL, INC.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
Effective 12/01/2016

No. 17-2231(L) Caption: Intl. Refugee Assistance Project, et al. v. Trump, et al.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT
Type-Volume Limit, Typeface Requirements, and Type-Style Requirements

Type-Volume Limit for Briefs: Appellant's Opening Brief, Appellee's Response Brief, and Appellant's Response/Reply Brief may not exceed 13,000 words or 1,300 lines. Appellee's Opening/Response Brief may not exceed 15,300 words or 1,500 lines. A Reply or Amicus Brief may not exceed 6,500 words or 650 lines. Amicus Brief in support of an Opening/Response Brief may not exceed 7,650 words. Amicus Brief filed during consideration of petition for rehearing may not exceed 2,600 words. Counsel may rely on the word or line count of the word processing program used to prepare the document. The word-processing program must be set to include headings, footnotes, and quotes in the count. Line count is used only with monospaced type. See Fed. R. App. P. 28.1(e), 29(a)(5), 32(a)(7)(B) & 32(f).

Type-Volume Limit for Other Documents if Produced Using a Computer: Petition for permission to appeal and a motion or response thereto may not exceed 5,200 words. Reply to a motion may not exceed 2,600 words. Petition for writ of mandamus or prohibition or other extraordinary writ may not exceed 7,800 words. Petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc may not exceed 3,900 words. Fed. R. App. P. 5(c)(1), 21(d), 27(d)(2), 35(b)(2) & 40(b)(1).

Typeface and Type Style Requirements: A proportionally spaced typeface (such as Times New Roman) must include serifs and must be 14-point or larger. A monospaced typeface (such as Courier New) must be 12-point or larger (at least 10½ characters per inch). Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5), 32(a)(6).

This brief or other document complies with type-volume limits because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. R. 32(f) (cover page, disclosure statement, table of contents, table of citations, statement regarding oral argument, signature block, certificates of counsel, addendum, attachments):

- this brief or other document contains 3,964 [*state number of*] words
- this brief uses monospaced type and contains _____ [*state number of*] lines

This brief or other document complies with the typeface and type style requirements because:

- this brief or other document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word _____ [*identify word processing program*] in Times New Roman font, size 14 _____ [*identify font size and type style*]; **or**
- this brief or other document has been prepared in a monospaced typeface using _____ [*identify word processing program*] in _____ [*identify font size and type style*].

(s) Gare A. Smith

Party Name Mass. Tech. Leadership Council

Dated: 11/17/2017