MEXICO: WOMEN'S PROTEST

GROUP 6 TEAM MEMBERS

JOOHWAN KIM

PRADNYA KARWADE

JAGRUTHI KOMMIDI

KIMBERLY ROJAS

KUNYANG LI

Introduction: A Struggle for Justice

Decades of Violence

Gender violence and femicide have plagued Mexico for decades. On average, **10 women are murdered daily, and 98% of gender crimes go unpunished.** The justice system has been deficient, criminals have gone unpunished, and victims have not been secured

The Rise of Feminist Resistance

These conditions have fueled heightened rage among feminist forces, leading to massive mobilizations demanding **legal reform**, increased **protections**, and government **accountability**

1993: Ciudad Juárez Femicides

- Systematic murders of women in Ciudad Juárez
- International outrage over femicide in Mexico
- Weak enforcement and impunity persist despite public outcry

2019: Glitter Revolution

- Activists protest police inaction on gender violence
- Pink glitter used as a symbol of frustration with government complacency
- Marks a shift toward more radical feminist activism

2020: Massive Protests on International Women's Day

- Hundreds of thousands protest across Mexico City and other cities
- Vandalism of monuments and clashes with security forces
- Government responds with repression (e.g., metal fencing around monuments)

2023: Supreme Court Legalizes Abortion

- Landmark decision to decriminalize abortion nationwide
- Partial victory for reproductive rights, but systemic issues (corruption, impunity) remain unresolved

Methodology: GMCR+ Analysis

The conflict between the Mexican Government (MG) and Feminist Groups (FG) is modeled using the Graph Model for Conflict Resolution (GMCR+)

The conflict involves two primary decision-makers:

- **Feminist Activists (FG)** – Can protest, escalate, or negotiate
- **Mexican Government (MG)** – Can ignore, suppress, or negotiate

1

Feminist Activists

Representing activists advocating for gender equality and reproductive rights.

2

Mexican Government

Representing policymakers responsible for gender-related policies.

Strategic Interactions & Pay Off Matrix

Feasible & Infeasible States

Feasible states represent realistic strategic interactions between FG and MG. There are five feasible states that realistically represent the strategic interactions between FG and MG.
Some state combinations are **illogical**:

- MG **cannot negotiate while suppressing protests** simultaneously
- FG **cannot escalate protests while negotiating**

Mexico: Women's Protest		State Number				
		1	2	3	4	5
FG	Maintain Protests	Y	N	Y	N	N
	Escalate Protests	N	Y	N	Y	N
	Negotiation	N	N	N	N	Y
MG	No Response	Y	Y	N	N	N
	Suppress Protests	N	N	Y	Y	N
	Negotiation	N	N	N	N	Y

Pay Off Matrix

- (5,5) in (Negotiation - Negotiation) represents the best mutual outcome, where both parties agree to a peaceful resolution - **Nash Equilibrium and Pareto Optimal**.
- (4,5) in (Maintain Protests - No Response) reflects MG's preference for inaction, while FG still benefits from continued activism.
- (1,2) in (Maintain Protests - Suppress Protests) is the worst outcome for FG, as suppression weakens their movement.

States	No Response (MG)	Suppress Protests (MG)	Negotiation (MG)
Maintain Protests (FG)	(4,5)	(1,2)	(5,1)
Escalate Protests (FG)	(3,4)	(2,3)	(4,2)
Negotiation (FG)	(2,3)	(3,4)	(5,5)

Preference Vectors :

- **Most Preferred:** *Negotiation (S5)* for institutional reform
- **If negotiation fails:** Escalate Protests (S2) to pressure the government
- **Least Preferred:** *Violent repression (S3, S4)* weakens the movement

- **Most Preferred:** *Maintain Status Quo (S1)* to avoid disruptions.
- **Least Preferred:** *Negotiation (S5)* as it may force policy concessions
- If **protests escalate (S2)**, suppression (S3, S4) becomes likely despite risks

Equilibrium Analysis

GMCR+ Results

- The results of the GMCR+ model indicate the **stability of different states** under various equilibrium concepts
- **Nash Equilibrium** states include State 5 (Negotiation - Negotiation) is also the **Pareto Optimal**, but MG has an incentive to exit
- General Metarationality (GMR) includes S1, S2 (Escalate Protests - No Response), and S5
- **Sequential and Simultaneous Stability** (SEQ & SIM) include S1 and S5
- SMR Stability includes S1, S2, and S5. S2 is a transitionary state, meaning FG may escalate protests before either MG engages in suppression (S4) or considers negotiation (S5).

	Ordered		1	2	3	4	5
	Decimal	Filter	9	10	17	18	36
1 - [FG] Feminist Gr	Maintain Protests	-	Y	N	Y	N	N
	Escalate Protests	-	N	Y	N	Y	N
	Negotitation	-	N	N	N	N	Y
2 - [MG] Mexican Gro	No Response	-	Y	Y	N	N	N
	Suppress Protests	-	N	N	Y	Y	N
	Negotitation	-	N	N	N	N	Y
Payoff For:	[FG] Feminist Groups	-	4	3	1	2	5
Payoff For:	[MG] Mexican Govern	-	5	4	2	3	1
	Nash	-	Y				Y
	GMR	-	Y	Y			Y
	SEQ	-	Y				Y
	SIM	-	Y				Y
	SEQ & SIM	-	Y				Y
	SMR	-	Y	Y			Y

States / DM	Most Preferred				Least Preferred
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
FG	4	3	1	2	5
MG	5	4	2	3	1

GMCR+ Policy Recommendations

01

Addressing the Prolonged Conflict in S1 (Maintain Protests - No Response)
Apply international pressure and develop negotiation platforms

02

Encouraging MG to Sustain S5 (Negotiation - Negotiation)
Offer incentives and facilitate external mediation

01

Preventing Escalation from S2 (Escalate Protests - No Response) to S4 (Escalate Protests - Suppress Protests)

Enhance monitoring and promote non-violent strategies.

Conclusion

The Mexican Women's Protests **remain unresolved**, with the government resisting policy changes while activists demand justice.

GMCR+ analysis shows that the conflict is stuck in S1 (Protests - No Response), as S5 (Negotiation) is unlikely due to political reluctance. If protests escalate (S2), suppression (S4) may follow, worsening tensions.

Breaking this deadlock requires **international pressure, policy incentives, and structured negotiations**, while activists must balance advocacy with strategic dialogue.

Without systemic reforms, gender violence, impunity, and **resistance will continue**, delaying long-overdue justice and accountability.

Thank you!

We are open to questions