# Notes

### What is this?

This is the Brain Drain DA from the Open Borders negative put out as a separate file to read against the High-Skilled Immigration affirmative. The cards are all the same as in the original Open Borders aff and neg.

### Brain Drain General Explanation

“Brain Drain” is the idea that when many people move to a particular country it does harm to the country they are leaving. Essentially, when the most skilled people leave, it leaves their original country without enough high skilled workers like doctors. The DA argues that that process causes big problems for the developing countries they no longer have the skilled workers they need to develop infrastructure, advance their economies so that they can grow their economy, and get people out of poverty.

### Answering the Brain Drain DA

“Brain Drain” is the idea that when many people move to a particular country it does harm to the country they are leaving. Essentially, the most skilled people will leave, leaving behind a country without high skilled workers like doctors. The DA argues that that process causes big problems for the developing countries. The negative also argues that the DA “turns the case” — because of brain drain, the plan actually *increases* inequality and poverty and is unethical.

There are two arguments you want to emphasize when answering brain drain. The first is “*brain circulation”* — this is the idea that with open borders people would be more willing to move back and forth between countries, so even if they move to the US, they (or their kids) are likely to return. This is a turn that is better for open borders than other affirmatives because of the magnitude of restrictions eliminated — people will be way more confident that if they leave the US for some period they will be able to return. The second argument is *“brain gain”* — these are a variety of different arguments about why emigration (people moving out of their home country) helps those home countries by stimulating educational development or remittances (immigrants sending money home.)

### Brain Drain Glossary

Brain Drain — when a wealthy/developed country attracts migrants from a developing country who have skills that society could use (doctors, nurses, engineers etc)

Brain Gain — when migrants encourage developing countries to improve their educational system/there are spillover effects that benefit that country

Brain Circulation — when migrants move back and forth between home and host country, spreading their knowledge

Bottom Billion — the idea that we should evaluate things morally from the perspective of the poorest billion people/adopt policies that benefit them most

# Negative

## Brain Drain DA

### 1NC — Brain Drain DA

#### The [first/next] off is the Brain Drain DA.

#### First, the status quo balances migration and brain gain — it’s Goldilocks.

Khilji and Schuler 17 — Shaista E. Khilji, Professor of Human and Organizational Learning and International Affairs at GW University, founding editor of the South Asian Journal of Business Studies, worked on President Obama’s initiative to develop transparent US government culture, and Randall Schuler, Professor of Strategic International Human Resource Management and Strategic Human Resources Management, former director of the Center for Global Strategic Human Resource Management, Fellow of the American Psychological Association, 2017 (“Talent Management in the Global Context,” in The Oxford Handbook of Talent Management, edited by David G. Collings, Kamel Mellahi, and Wayne F. Cascio, ISBN-13: 978-0198758273)

China, following in Korean and Taiwanese footsteps, provides a good example of a country that has successfully embarked on a comprehensive policy of luring back diasporic persons. Zweig (2006) traces Chinese interest in diasporas to the 1990S, when the central government realized that in order to improve science and technology in China, it had to let people go abroad freely, and then compete for them in the international market by creating a domestic environment that would attract them. Subsequently, the Chinese government improved the environment for immigrants and returnees by devel oping job introduction centers, offering preferential policies (of giving them more living : space and higher professional titles), establishing a national association of returned students, and increasing support for scientific research. Local governments also started competing for talent by instituting their own policies. At the same time, universities and government-funded research organizations also actively started recruiting immigrants and returnees. Many other countries in Asia and Eastern Europe have adopted similar practices to lure back highly skilled persons to support their respective economic development (Ragazzi, aoi; Tung and Lazarova, 2006). These programs and incentives have resulted in a reverse brain drain globally, or what Saxenian refers to as “brain circulation” (2005: 36)—that is, the ability of the diasporic and returnees to establish business relationships or to start new businesses while main taining their social and professional ties elsewhere (countries they graduated from and gained experience in). These returnees have proven critical to the overall development of talent nationally by transferring their knowledge and experience to the people they work with (DeVoretz and Zweig, 2008; Kapur and McHale, 2005; Tung and Lazarova, 2006) and establishing a new form of economic growth model through entrepreneurship and experimentation (Saxenian, 2005).

#### Second, increasing open migration causes devastating brain drain in developing countries.

Brock and Blake 16 — Gillian Brock, Ph.D. Professor of Humanities at Auckland, and Michael Blake, Ph.D. Professor of Philosophy at Washington University, 2016 (“Global Justice and the Brain Drain,” Journal Ethics & Global Politics, Vol. 9, Issue 1, Available Online at <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v9.33498>)

Our world is a terribly unequal place. It is unequal in terms of simple dollars and cents: the average citizen of Malawi has an annual income of US$320, while the average citizen of Japan has an annual income of almost US$48,000.1 This sort of inequality has been much discussed in recent political philosophy and theory; theorists have spent a great deal of time trying to understand precisely what sorts of inequality might be regarded as unjust, and why.2 The world is, however, terribly unequal in other ways, and these ways have not received similar levels of analysis. Consider again Malawi and Japan: Japan has around 21 physicians per 10,000 people, while Malawi has only one physician for every 50,000 people.3 This radical inequality in medical skills and talents has, obviously, bad consequences for health; people born in Malawi will live, on average, 32 years fewer than their counterparts born in Japan.4 These facts are troubling in themselves. They become more troubling, though, when we start asking why nations like Malawi have so few physicians. It is not that the citizens of developing countries have no interest in becoming physicians, or entirely lack the opportunity for training. Indeed, developing societies spend a great deal of money training new physicians and spots in medical schools are avidly sought. Rather, the low number of physicians has much to do with what medical training provides\*namely, the opportunity to leave that developing society, in search of perceived better prospects. Developed societies such as the United States and the United Kingdom have made immigration comparatively easy for those with scarce medical skills, and such citizens often choose to pursue these immigration options. Consider, for instance, that in 2000, Ghana trained 250 new nurses\*and lost 500 nurses to emigration.5 In 2001, Zimbabwe graduated 40 pharmacists\*and lost 60.6 In 2002 alone, Malawi lost 75 nurses to the United Kingdom\*a cohort that represented 12% of all the nurses resident in Malawi.7 The result has been a continued shortage of medical personnel in developing countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, despite considerable African investment in education. This phenomenon of high levels of migration of skilled people from developing nations to developed ones is often referred to as the brain drain. Brain drain should be troubling to those who care about global justice. The phenomenon seems poised to perpetuate the inequality in life-chances between developing and developed societies. The absent talent of the emigrant undermines both the life-chances of present citizens of the developing society\*a society with fewer doctors, after all, is a society in which more people will die avoidable deaths\*and the chances for that society to develop flourishing institutions for future citizens. The phenomenon is troubling in other ways: the wealthy citizens of the developed world, already well-equipped with skilled citizens, are further increasing their stock by drawing on some of the world’s worst-off societies, thus rendering those societies even more badly positioned to address citizens’ needs in the future.8

#### Finally, the plan is exploitative — ethical obligation to protect developing countries from brain drain.

Delgado and Stefancic 95 — Richard Delgado, JD, Professor of Law at University of Colorado, and Jean Stefancic, JD, Research Associate in Law at University of Colorado, 1995 (“Cosmopolitanism Inside Out: International Norms and the Struggle for Civil Rights and Local Justice,” Connecticut Law Review, Vol. 27, Spring, Available Online at <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2411633>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

There are thus many reasons not to apply cosmopolitanism as its latter day advocates urge. Doing so stands to deprive so-called advanced countries of a source of knowledge and experience that they may need. n94 And, as we have pointed out, in narrowing the range of options available, it renders cosmopolitanism of taste and life choice difficult, if not impossible, even for Westerners. n95 Is the recent interpretation of it merely an intriguing "flip," a clever reversal, like political correctness and reverse discrimination, put forward by conservatives who basically do not much care for diversity and rowdy, noisy, clamorous identity politics? n96 We think there is more to it than that, and that the kind of anti-minority, anti-identity sentiment that marches under the cosmopolitanism banner has a thinly veiled power dimension. Consider the timing of the cosmopolitan turn. Many formerly backward nations, which suffered under the yoke of colonialism, are developing [\*786]. They are building industry and beginning to contribute to pollution and the international environmental crisis. At the same time, their populations are booming. Since many of them are still not yet economically self-sufficient nor politically stable, their excess populations are finding their way to economically advanced countries in a wave of immigration, both legal and illegal. n97 If these countries can be persuaded to be "cosmopolitan" and to accept environmental standards dictated by the advanced countries and billed as "the law of nations," their economic development will be slowed but pollution may be abated somewhat. n98 If they can be encouraged to cooperate with immigration controls and standards according to which only urbane, skilled, collegeeducated citizens (not unskilled laborers) will immigrate to the advanced countries, countries in the First World will be better off. Third World countries will be encouraged to forget historic injustices they have suffered and grievances they may justly harbor, and begin doing business with the advanced countries on terms which disrupt these First World countries as little as possible. Developing countries, like minority groups everywhere, need protection first, then the opportunity to assimilate ("mongrelize," as Rushdie puts it) later. Unless this order is followed, cosmopolitanism will be exploitive and one way, as exemplified, for example, by those in the United States who appropriate black music but have little to do otherwise with black culture, n99 or like immigration laws that cause a brain drain from Third World countries because they allow resettlement by surgeons, engineers, and others likely to fit into the professional managerial sectors of the economy. n100

### They Say: “Brain Circulation Not Drain”

#### Educational structure prevents brain circulation — relevant skills aren’t taught.

Skolnikoff 93 — Eugene B. Skolnikoff, Professor of Political Science at MIT, 1993 (“Knowledge without Borders? Internationalization of the Research Universities,” The American Research University, Vol. 22, No. 4, Fall, Available Online at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20027206.pdf>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Brain Drain. As American society and universities became increasingly attractive to citizens of other countries after the war, a steadily growing number of students, especially from developing countries, have come to American universities and have stayed in the country after graduation. The issues associated with this migra tion of talent or "brain drain" have been a continuing source of controversy because of the effects on the countries from which the individuals came. Some have argued that the universities have a responsibility to ensure that the students return home after gradu ation, or at least a responsibility to tailor an educational program suitable for the situation of that home country. Most research universities make little provision for adjusting their educational program to the needs of developing countries. This is especially so in the most popular fields of engineering and science where the quality of the curriculum depends on close interaction with the cutting edge of research, a relationship that cannot be altered by fiat. In fields in which issues of particular concern to development form important parts of the research agenda, such as urban studies, political science, and civil engineering, relevant courses and research opportunities can be offered. But, in the majority of fields at a research university, the domestic needs of developing countries are not directly addressed. This increases the likelihood that students from those countries will be dissatisfied if they return home after completing a degree. In effect, the advanced curriculum of the research universities is providing an added incentive for those from developing countries to stay in the United States. But the students typically come because of that advanced curriculum, and not to learn about their own problems. Universities cannot be indifferent to the issue, but neither is it their role to restrict admissions, control students after graduation, or compromise their educational objectives because of the possible effects on other countries. It is clear, however, that this is an important economic and foreign policy issue for the United States, and a domestic issue for the countries of origin. As mentioned earlier, some countries are making new efforts to create the condi tions at home that will lure their former nationals back. This is a sensible step for those countries, for it is only by finding ways to make effective use of the training received in the United States that the economic advantages to the home nation can be realized. The US government is not an innocent party or indifferent to the brain drain; immigration legislation actually encourages individuals with skills to remain in the United States. If the brain drain were to dry up, the US economy would suffer unless successful steps had already been taken to increase the supply of American students moving into the fields in which foreign students are making such a large contribution. (247-8)

### They Say: “Brain Drain Arguments Faulty”

#### Open borders cause brain drain — empirics prove.

Obama 16 — Barack Obama, former US president, JD from Harvard, 2016 (“Young Leaders of the Americas Youth Address,” November 20th, Available Online at <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaYLAI2016.htm>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Thank you. Thank you very much. Well, first of all, I know that your father is very proud that you said he's the smartest man you know. I hope that Malia and Sasha would say the same thing about their father -- I don’t know. But I'm sure that made him feel good. Look, America is a nation of immigrants. Those of you who visited America, if you walk in an American city -- not just New York or Los Angeles, but St. Louis or Indianapolis or Columbus, Ohio -- if you walk down the street, you see people that look like they could be from anyplace. Because the fact is, is that except for the Native American populations, everybody in America came from someplace else. All of us are immigrants. And that's been our greatest strength, because we've been able to attract talent from everywhere. I use this as an example: You notice that the United States did really well in the Olympics. Now, some of that is because we're a big country, we're a wealthy country, so we have all these training facilities and we can do all kinds of -- best equipment. All that is true. But you know what, China is a bigger country and spends a lot of money also. The big advantage that America has, if you look at our team -- actually, two big advantages. First, we passed something called Title IX many years ago that requires that women get the same opportunities in sports as men do. (Applause.) And that's why -- one of the reasons the American teams did so well is the women were amazing, and just because they've gotten opportunities. Right? Which teaches us something about the need to make sure that women and men, boys and girls, get the same opportunities. Because you do better when everybody has a chance, not just some. But the second thing -- you look at a U.S. Olympic team and there are all kinds of different sorts of people of all different shapes and sizes. And part of it is because we draw from a bigger genetic pool than anybody -- right? We have people who -- these little gymnasts, they're like this big. Simone Biles came by the White House. She's a tiny little thing. Amazing athlete. Then we have Michael Phelps, he's 6'8" and his shoulders are this big. And that's good for swimming. He couldn’t do gymnastics, but he's a really good swimmer. The point is, is that when you have all this talent from all these different places, then you actually, as a team, do better. And that's been the great gift of America. Now, what we have to do not just in the United States, but in all countries, is to find a way to have a open, smart immigration policy, but it has to be orderly and lawful. And I think that part of what's happened in the United States is that even though the amount of illegal immigration that is happening has actually gone down while I've been President, the perception is that it has just gone up. Partly this is because it used to be that immigrants primarily stayed in Texas and Arizona and New Mexico, border countries, or in Florida. And now they're moving into parts of the country that aren’t used to seeing immigrants, and it makes people concerned -- who are these people, and are they taking our jobs and are they taking opportunity, and so forth. So my argument has been that no country can have completely open borders, because if they did, then nationality and citizenship wouldn’t mean anything. And obviously if we had completely open borders, then you would have tens of millions of people who would suddenly be coming into the United States -- which, by the way, wouldn’t necessarily be good for the countries where they leave, because in some places like in Africa, you have doctors and nurses and scientists and engineers who all try to leave, and then you have a brain drain and they're not developing their own countries. So you have to have some rules, but my hope is, is that those rules are set up in a way that continues to invite talented young people to come in and contribute, and to make a good life for themselves. What we also, though, have to do is to invest in countries that are sending migrants so that they can develop themselves. So you mentioned Cuba, for example, where your father fled. He left in part because they didn’t feel that there was enough opportunity there. Part of the reason I said let's reopen our diplomatic relations with Cuba is to see if you can start encouraging greater opportunity and freedom in Cuba. Because if you have people who have been able to leave Cuba and do really well in the United States, that means they have enough talent that they should be able to do really well by staying at home in Cuba.

### Impact Outweighs

#### Elites benefit disproportionately at the expense of the poorest billion. Aff evidence comes from an ideologically flawed data set.

Collier 13 — Paul Collier, Ph.D. Professor of Economics and Public Policy at Oxford University, 2013 (“Migration Hurts the Homeland,” New York Times, November 13th, Available Online at <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/30/opinion/migration-hurts-the-homeland.html>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Migration is good for poor countries, but not in every form, and not in unlimited amounts. The migration that research shows is unambiguously beneficial is the kind in which young people travel to democracies like America for higher education and then go home. Not only do these young people bring back valuable skills directly learned in the classroom; they bring back political and social attitudes that they have assimilated from their classmates. Their skills raise the productivity of the unskilled majority’, and their attitudes accelerate democratization. For example, global data on students from poor countries who have studied abroad since 1950 shows that those who went to democracies accelerated political liberalization in their home societies out of all proportion to their numbers. Democratization across Latin America, Africa and Asia has been supported by this process. In an opinion article in The Washington Post last spring, Mr. Zuckerberg asked, “Why do we kick out the more than 40 percent of math and science graduate students who are not U.S. citizens after educating them?” My response: Whatever the reason, it is a highly effective way of helping poorer societies. Even what looks like a brain drain can sometimes be beneficial. When educated people emigrate and settle in a richer country’, the poorer country’ suffers a direct loss; but by demonstrating that the effort to acquire education can end triumphantly’, it can encourage many others to pursue an education, too. The brain drain becomes a reality’ only’ if too many’ of the educated leave. But many poor countries have too much emigration. I do not mean that they would be better with none, but they would be better with less. The big winners from the emigration of the educated have been China and India. Because each has over a billion people, proportionately few people leave. In contrast, small developing countries have high emigration rates, even if their economies are doing well: Ghana, for instance, has a rate of skilled emigration 12 times that of China. If, in addition, their economies are in trouble, they suffer an educational hemorrhage. The top rankings for skilled emigration are a roll call of the bottom billion. Haiti loses around 85 percent of its educated youth, a rate that is debilitating. Emigrants send money back, but it is palliative rather than transformative. China and India, with their low rates of emigration and high rates of return, have dominated global thinking about how migration affects countries of origin. But the core development challenge is now whether the poor, small societies can catch up. Unlike China and India, they have too much emigration. They can do little about it, but we can do quite a lot: Their emigration rates are set by our immigration policies. Much of the pressure for more rapid immigration comes from diasporas wanting to bring in dependent relatives. But bowing to this pressure is not necessarily humane: Bringing relatives to America reduces the incentive to send remittances back home. Migrant families do well for themselves by jumping into a chain of lifeboats headed for the developed world, but this can be at the expense of the vastly larger group of families left behind. Seemingly the most incontestable case for a wider door is to provide a refuge for those fleeing societies in meltdown. The high-income democracies should indeed provide such a refuge, and this means letting more people in. But the right to refuge need not imply the right to residency. The people best equipped to flee from societies in meltdown are their elites: The truly poor cannot get farther than a camp over the border. Post-meltdown, the elites are needed back home. Yet if they have acquired permanent residence they are reluctant to return. For example, South Sudan, one of the world’s poorest countries, is bleeding a remittance outflow: Government officials told me that key people can be coaxed back only by high salaries, and even then they leave their families abroad and send their Sudanese earnings back to them. Our priority' should be to design policies of refuge that reconcile our duty' of rescue with the legitimate concerns of post-conflict governments to attract back the people who could rebuild their countries. Emigres face a coordination problem: Going home is much less scary' if others are doing the same. The right to refuge could include sunset rules linked to peace settlements and the monitored efforts of post-conflict governments. Bright, young, enterprising people are catalysts of economic and political progress. They are like fairy godmothers, providing benefits, whether intended or inadvertent, to the rest of a society". Shifting more of the fairy" godmothers from the poorest countries to the richest can be cast in various lights. It appeals to business as a cheap supply of talent. It appeals to economists as efficient, since the godmothers are indeed more productive in the rich world than the poor. (Unsurprisingly, our abundance of capital and skills raises their productivity.) It appeals to libertarians as freeing human choice from the deadening weight of bureaucratic control. At the more radical end of this spectrum, aficionados of Ayn Rand will see it as the triumphant release of the strong minority" from the clutches of the weak majority" “migrants shrugged.” Many on the left, for their part, don’t like to recognize that we’re taking away fairy" godmothers. They' prefer to believe that they're helping poor people flee difficult situations at home. But we might be feeding a vicious circle, in which home gets worse precisely' because the fairy' godmothers leave. Humanitarians become caught up trying to help individuals, and therefore miss the larger implications: There are poor people, and there are poor societies. An open door for the talented would help Facebook's bottom line, but not the bottom billion.

# Affirmative

## Brain Drain DA Answers

### 2AC — Brain Drain DA

#### Turn — freer immigration promotes brain circulation, not brain drain.

Bregman 16 — Rutger Bregman, author of Utopia for Realists: The Case for a Universal Basic Income, Open Borders, and a 15-Hour Workweek, MA in History from Utrecht University, 2016 (“The Surprisingly Compelling Argument for Open Borders,” Fortune, April 17th, Available Online at <http://fortune.com/2016/04/17/immigration-open-borders/>, Accessed 08-08-2018)

This brings us to a fascinating paradox: Open borders promote immigrants’ return. Take the border between Mexico and the U.S. In the 1960s, 70 million Mexicans crossed it, but in time, 85% returned home. Since 9/11, the U.S. side of the border has been heavily militarized, which has discouraged immigrants from going back. “We annually spend billions of taxpayer dollars on border enforcement that is worse than useless—it is counterproductive,” observes a sociology professor at Princeton University. “Migrants quite rationally responded to the increased costs and risks by minimizing the number of times they crossed the border.”

#### Brain drain arguments are faulty — they ignore market driven skills acquisition, assume finite skilled workers, and devalue rights to movement.

Clemens and McKenzie 9 — Michael Clemens, Senior Fellow @ Center for Global Development, Ph.D. from Harvard, and David McKenzie, Lead Economist @ World Bank Development Research Group with a Ph.D. from Yale, 2009 (“ Think Again: Brain Drain,” Foreign Policy, October 22nd, Available Online at <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/22/think-again-brain-drain/>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Allowing skilled emigration is stealing human capital from poor countries." No. Many of the same countries courted by the United States through aid and trade deals complain bitterly of the "brain drain" of their doctors, scientists, and engineers to the United States and other rich countries. If correct, these complaints would mean that current immigration policy amounts to counterproductive foreign policy. Thankfully, however, the flow of skilled emigrants from poor to rich parties can actually benefit both parties. This common idea that skilled emigration amounts to "stealing" requires a cartoonish set of assumptions about developing countries. First, it requires us to assume that developing countries possess a finite stock of skilled workers, a stock depleted by one for every departure. In fact, people respond to the incentives created by migration: Enormous numbers of skilled workers from developing countries have been induced to acquire their skills by the opportunity of high earnings abroad. This is why the Philippines, which sends more nurses abroad than any other developing country, still has more nurses per capita at home than Britain does. Recent research has also shown that a sudden, large increase in skilled emigration from a developing country to a skill-selective destination can cause a corresponding sudden increase in skill acquisition in the source country. Second, believing that skilled emigration amounts to theft from the poor requires us to assume that skilled workers themselves are not poor. In Zambia, a nurse has to get by on less than $1,500 per year — measured at U.S. prices, not Zambian ones — and a doctor must make ends meet with less than $5,500 per year, again at U.S. prices. If these were your annual wages, facing U.S. price levels, you would likely consider yourself destitute. Third, believing that a person’s choice to emigrate constitutes "stealing" requires problematic assumptions about that person’s rights. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that all people have an unqualified right to leave any country. Skilled migrants are not "owned" by their home countries, and should have the same rights to freedom of movement as professionals in rich countries.

#### No “brain drain” — Puerto Rico proves.

Matthews 14 — Dylan Matthews, staff writer for Vox.com, 2014 (“The case for open borders,” Vox, December 15th, Available Online at https://www.vox.com/2014/9/13/6135905/open-borders-bryan-caplan-interview-gdp-double, Accessed 08-08-2018)

Even if open borders would be economically beneficial for recipient countries, it's worth asking if it benefits the countries people are leaving. A common worry is that open borders would cause a "brain drain," taking talent away from developing countries and hurting them, even as it helps their (former) residents. The idea here is a little confused; we should care about making life better for people, whether or not they stay in their home country. But it's wrong even on its own terms. If we're worried about brain drain, we should really be concerned about the current immigration system, in which high-skilled immigrants are privileged over low-skilled ones, ensuring that what migration does occur disproportionately takes the former out of their home countries. In any case, emigration actually helps home countries in a wide variety of ways. Emigrants typically send back money, which can be hugely consequential for their home country's economy. They can create social networks in host countries, and later come home and use those connections to advance their home country's development. Caplan points to the Chinese diaspora as a prime example: "A lot of what’s going on in the development of China is there is this huge, disparate community of ethnic Chinese all over the place, and they have relatives in China. This makes it very easy for them to do business with each other." Moreover, actual examples we have of open borders suggest that migrants' home countries actually benefit. Take Puerto Rico. Shortly after the US conquered it in the Spanish American War, the Supreme Court established that it was illegal to restrict migration between the island and the rest of the United States. The result was open borders between the US and a much poorer territory, imposed more or less randomly by a court. It made for a good test of the policy's effect: since then, Puerto Rico has far surpassed neighboring countries like the Dominican Republic economically. "In terms of brain drain, it seems like there has been a lot less than for any other Latin American country, because from Puerto Rico, you can come regardless of your skill level, whereas, for every other country in Latin America, it is much easier for the skilled workers to get in," Caplan notes. "Over half the population has left, but Puerto Rico, by the standards of Caribbean island nations, is a paradise."

#### Brain drain is outdated theory — prefer brain circulation.

Clemens and McKenzie 9 — Michael Clemens, Senior Fellow @ Center for Global Development, Ph.D. from Harvard, and David McKenzie, Lead Economist @ World Bank Development Research Group with a Ph.D. from Yale, 2009 (“ Think Again: Brain Drain,” Foreign Policy, October 22nd, Available Online at <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/22/think-again-brain-drain/>, Accessed 08-09-2018)

Conventional wisdom once held that the wealth of a country declined when it imported foreign goods, since obviously cash was wealth and obviously buying foreign goods sent cash abroad. Adam Smith argued that economic development — or the "wealth of nations" — depends not a country’s stock of cash but on structural changes that international exchange could encourage. In today’s information age, the view has taken hold that human capital now rules the wealth of nations, and that its departure in any circumstance must harm a country’s development. But economic development is much more complex than that. But thanks to new research, we have learned that the international movement of educated people changes the incentives to acquire education, sends enormous quantities of money across borders, leads to movements back and forth, and can contribute to the spread of trade, investment, technology, and ideas. All of this fits very uncomfortably in a rhyming phrase like "brain drain," a caricature that would be best discarded in favor of a richer view of the links between human movement and development.

### Extend: “Immigration Helps Developing Countries”

#### Emigration net positive for developing countries: remittances, brain circulation, social networking, skill acquisition.

Caplan 14 — Bryan D. Caplan, Professor of Economics at Georgie Mason University, published in the American Economic Review, the Economic Journal, the Journal of Law and Economics, Social Science Quarterly, the Journal of Public Economics, the Southern Economic Journal, and Public Choice, Ph.D. in Economics from Princeton, BA in Economics from UC Berkeley, 2014 (“The case for open borders,” Bryan Caplan interviewed by Dylan Matthews, Vox, December 15th, Available Online at https://www.vox.com/2014/9/13/6135905/open-borders-bryan-caplan-interview-gdp-double, Accessed 08-08-2018)

Dylan Matthews: What do you make of the brain drain argument? If you have open migration, and 80 percent of Haiti moves to the US, will the remaining 20 percent have an even more miserable existence? Does that negate the benefits? Bryan Caplan: The first thing to know is that the main reason for selective brain drain is current immigration policy, because right now it is much easier for a skilled worker to get in than an unskilled worker. The reason you have so many skilled workers leaving and so few unskilled workers leaving is because skilled workers can legally leave, and unskilled workers cannot. The main point of open borders is to open up immigration to low-skilled workers as well. But the conventional wisdom among economists who study this is that the net effect even of the smartest people leaving the country is, in general, quite positive, for a few reasons. One is remittances. Your high-skilled workers leave, but they don’t suddenly cut all their emotional ties as soon as they go. Instead, they go and they make a lot more money, and they send a lot of that money home. Remittances exceed foreign aid now. There are a lot of areas in the Third World that are really kept afloat by the people who have left. Within the US we have the much milder idea of people commuting into the city. They work, and then they send the money back home into the suburbs. That way they support their family far better than they could if they had to take the best job they could get within five miles of their house. It’s not such a weird idea. There has also been a lot of work done on the question of whether the possibility of going abroad if you become more skilled actually leads to an increase in the acquisition of skills among people who remain behind. A classic example is the Philippines. The Philippines is a massive exporter of nurses, so you might think this would mean that the Philippines would have almost no nurses left, but, actually, they have an unusually favorable ratio of nurses to population, and a big part of the answer is there are a lot of Filipinos going to nursing school, incentivized by this chance they might be able to go abroad and then become a nurse and make a ton of money abroad. Many don’t actually get that permission, but they still become nurses, and then they wind up being nurses at home. On top of this, a lot of immigrants eventually come home. They go abroad, they often acquire business connections while they’re abroad, and they return. They not only bring the skills back, but they also bring back connections, which are a huge deal. A lot of what’s going on in the development of China is there is this huge disparate community of ethnic Chinese all over the place, and they have relatives in China. This makes it very easy for them to do business with each other. A lot of what the so-called brain drain does is create these same kinds of social networks, which wind up being a big help for development. If you want to get an idea about what to really expect under open borders, my favorite social experiment is Puerto Rico. In 1904 there was a Supreme Court case which ruled that Puerto Rican immigration could not be restricted. After the Spanish American War, Puerto Rico became a territory of the US. A Puerto Rican woman went to New York City, and the US Government tried to deport her, she sued, and she won. The Supreme Court didn’t just say that this woman gets to stay. They said any Puerto Rican is free to come and go to the United States. So by judicial fiat, which easily could have the other way, you wind up opening borders between Puerto Rico and the United States. By the way, one funny footnote to the case is the cultural gap was so large that the official Supreme Court docket misspells the woman's name, because they had so little familiarity with Spanish at the time they just got the spelling wrong. There is actually very good data on Puerto Rican migration. In the first 10 years, only a few thousand people come, but then it just becomes like 10,000, and then 30,000, 50,000 and, by now, over half of Puerto Ricans live in the United States. In terms of brain drain, it seems like there has been a lot less than for any other Latin American country, because from Puerto Rico you can come regardless of your skill level, whereas, for every other country in Latin America, it is much easier for the skilled workers to get in. Over half the population has left, but Puerto Rico by the standards of Caribbean island nations is a paradise. It’s poorer than any American state, even worse than Mississippi, but compared to any of the other islands around there, Puerto Rico is doing fantastically well. It does show us what happens not only to Puerto Ricans who moved, but even to the people that stayed behind. They’re still doing very well compared to how they would be if they didn’t have this open borders benefit.