In Medellin Case, U.S. Turned a Cold Shoulder to International Law

By Charles S. Doskow

O ver the summer, in the midst of the U.S.-Mexican drug war, the Founding Fathers spoke to a number of media outlets in Arizona, California and Texas about the need for steady, consistent border enforcement to keep drugs out of their states. In the same period, the Mexican government, in the person of President Felipe Calderon, was fighting to keep the drug tables off the streets of his country, and to keep the currency stable, in a country that is 30 times larger than the U.S. It is no surprise, then, that there are few countries that look forward to the United States' policy of rolling back access to justice for Mexican citizens who believe they have been violated by the United States.

In Medellin v. Texas, the world court, issued a judgment in the case of Medellin v. Texas, on which the United States has failed to act. The world court found that the United States had violated its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, a treaty to which the United States is a party. The defendants included Mexican consular officials in the Mexican Consulate in Dallas, Texas. The world court ruled on Mexico's complaint that the United States had failed to notify Mexico about Medellin's case. In Medellin v. Texas, the world court found that the president was entitled to act, and that he lacked empathy.
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