Graduated symbology illustrates which prefectures show a high, medium or low population density and percentage of Tutsis killed during the genocide. To identify Rwanda’s memorialization gaps by prefecture, three criteria were identified: 1) where there had been a high percentage of genocide-era Tutsi deaths, 2) where there is currently high population density and 3) where there is a low ratio of existing memorials to the percentage of Tutsi deaths. These criteria were broken into classes and a final memorialization gap score from 1-12 was determined. This was performed for both total number of memorials and separately for national and informal memorials.

Final analysis shows that Rural Kigali and Butare are the prefectures with the highest memorialization gaps for both total memorials and for informal memorials; these prefectures also had the highest percentage of Tutsi deaths. For national memorials, the prefectures with the highest gaps are Kigali City, Butare, Gitarama, Gisenyi and Ruhengeri. This suggests that the Rwandan government and communities are indeed choosing the location of their memorials based on differing considerations, although it is not possible from this level of analysis to conclude precisely what those considerations are. Other prefectures with high percentages of Tutsi deaths are Kigali City, Gitarama, and those with the highest population density are Kigali City and Ruhengeri. The greatest number of national memorials is in Rural Kigali, and the greatest number of informal memorials are in Kigali City, Kibuye and Gitarama. Given that there appears to be no consistent correlation between either Tutsi deaths, current population density and memorial location in either group demonstrates that further research is needed to determine how memorial location is chosen.

This project was constrained by several factors, the first being that Rwanda changed its administrative geography in 2006 from 12 prefectures to 5 provinces. Because data on 1994 Tutsi deaths was not available by province, the unit of analysis is prefecture rather than province and does not reflect Rwanda’s current internal borders. Furthermore, the dataset of informal memorials used in this project was published in 2010 but collected throughout the previous several years; the dataset is therefore not up-to-date for 2014, nor at the time was it able to capture a majority of the informal memorials, particularly those constructed by small communities or households. This project therefore shows a representative, and not a comprehensive, distribution of Rwandan genocide memorials.

Finally, it is important to note that the study of memorialization, a deeply personal and culturally-specific process, is exceedingly difficult to approach with quantitative methods. Identifying memorialization gaps illustrates where memorials are missing based solely on the criteria deliberately chosen; it is in no way a prescription that Rwanda’s government, communities, or households change the manner in which they are constructing their own narratives of the genocide.