



# INNOVATIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL SOCIETIES

*An initiative of  
the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs  
and the Bobst Center for Peace and Justice,  
Princeton University*

---

Series: Policing Interview no.: X3

---

Interviewee: Motlepu Marhakhe  
Interviewer: Daniel Scher  
Date of Interview: 1 February 2010  
Location: Police Inspectorate  
Maseru  
Lesotho

---

Innovations for Successful Societies, Bobst Center for Peace and Justice  
Princeton University, 83 Prospect Avenue, Princeton, New Jersey, 08544, USA  
[www.princeton.edu/successfulsocieties](http://www.princeton.edu/successfulsocieties)

SCHER: My name is Daniel Scher. I'm the associate director of the Innovations for Successful Societies Project, and I'm here in Lesotho at the inspector, inspector of police. Mr. (Motlepu) Marhakhe, thank you very much for taking time out of your busy schedule to meet with me. And we've discussed the outline of our conversation and the parameters of it and just before we start talking about the Inspectorate and your work here, I wonder if you would mind just introducing yourself and just telling me a little bit about the position you hold now and perhaps some of the other positions you held before coming here?

MARHAKHE: *Thank you, Mr. Scher. I think I am pronouncing you well—your name correctly.*

SCHER: Yes, you are. I hope I'm approaching pronouncing your name correctly?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, my name is Motlepu—that's my Sotho name. Motlepu is my Christian name, Marhakhe is my surname, family name. I am working here at the Police Inspectorate; I'm working as a deputy inspector of police. I've been here, it's my third year now. I joined this office in 2007; I was assistant commissioner of police before. So one of the reasons why I joined this office I was recruited by the former inspector of police. I'm calling the former because he's started in 2005 and then his contract ended last year, December, so I'm now left with the office. So far, I'm the one acting in his absence.*

*So, one of the reasons why I joined here, I was recruited by him because he thought to establish the office of this nature, you need somebody whose experience was a little bit more related to the police. So especially when it comes to the inspection part of it because the office was not established for any other reason other than trying to inspect the policing in Lesotho. And even now our law says that we inspect the policing in general in Lesotho and again we inspect the annual policing plan that is made by the Lesotho police. Fortunately, we got only one police force in Lesotho. It is the Lesotho Mounted Police Service (LMPS).*

*So I was in the office of the commissioner of police. The commissioner of police office is constituted by three offices. The commissioner himself, deputies, and assistant commissioners. Now, in Lesotho you've got one commissioner of police, two deputies and eight assistant commissioners of police. So, I was one of those people, and I had to make something called departmental transfer. So, I'm no longer a policeman now, but I'm working in the institute or in the office, which inspects the policing service in Lesotho.*

*It's a government office, so we are not only going to report about the efficiency and effectiveness in isolation of the government. We were entrusted to improve our inspection or evaluation or monitoring. It's meant to advise the minister to see to it that LMPS improves its services where there's some lacking, so if there is a no good practice that one has to be—or if there are some substandards and then some people are not performing well—that is where what we check and then we can always advise, OK, you are doing below the standard or you are doing above the standard and keep it up that is entirely why we are here for, yes*

SCHER: You mentioned that the previous inspector had recruited you because he felt that you had some experience that would be useful in this position?

MARHAKHE: Yes.

SCHER: And I was wondering what, what is the type of experience that you've found to be helpful in manning this office and carrying out its responsibilities?

MARHAKHE: *I have been in the service myself, I know how to do about the policing, I should think so. Now some things that you as a layperson you may think as this has been very effective, and of which it's not. For instance, we are living in a democratic world now, and human rights is one of the issues that you gauge the police. If the police are not respecting the human rights of the people that they serve, that could be a yardstick, that OK, these people even if they are making some—they are policing but they don't respect the human rights. Like if somebody gets into a shop and then maybe steals something, like a cookie or something, and then the police shoots him, you know that is a brutality.*

SCHER: Right.

MARHAKHE: *But the owner of the shop, maybe no—the police are efficient, they are effective. Those are some of the things that OK, they have the standards, the norm, they've got the things that they have to adhere themselves, if like they have to use the minimum force. The minimum simply means the act itself should also be equal to what do you apply. You see, simply put, I don't know anything but if you come with a knife, it's another thing, rather than if you come with your fist and then you fight the policeman. And if the policeman said it was in self-defense and then he shoots you and you die, those are some of the things that we need to have the police that will be effective both to the criminals as well as to the victims.*

*And well if the criminal has committed a crime, he has to be stopped to commit a crime or be arrested and then be put before the courts of law. And also the victim has been victimized. The policemen, they have to make all the measures to see to it that they make all those preventative measures so much that they are not prone to criminals, they are—you see—they are not vulnerable. Police have to have things that will make people not fear crime—yes, to be in a safe and secure place. That is basically why the police are there; they have to provide security and safety to people. How they do that, they will tell us at the Police Inspectorate that, to ensure that we are going to one, two, three, four, five. And then we will just come and then check on that one and inspect on that and see the effectiveness of that, so that is basically on that.*

*And then, if those measures they want to put to prevent crime, they are not effective—that is when we can come. And even before, maybe. They say we'll be doing this for a certain period of time, say six months or something. So for the first month we can come and say, no, no, no that is just wasting a lot of resources and energy and money. If you keep on doing this for six months, it's not effective, it's not bearing some results. We had better stop it. Or we refused—the manner in which we are doing it, you know doesn't have or doesn't get into the intended results. That's how we are here.*

SCHER: So there must be quite a high level of cooperation between your office and between the high levels of the police itself, so that when they're doing these new initiatives and starting new programs. [Interruption.] So I was just saying that in order to effectively know what's happening within the police force, so that you can inspect effectively, you must have quite a high degree of cooperation between your office and between the highest levels of the police who are

implementing these new programs. And I was wondering do you have regular meetings or do you base your inspections around the annual plan for, for the police? How do you go about sort of working with the police themselves?

*MARHAKHE: I just want to refer myself back a little bit. Our office has been newly established. Of course, the police did not work under the environment where there will be an outsider, the external audits, because they have the similar office like we do it. It's called the Inspectorate, for them it's Inspectorate Discipline and Complaints, where they have their own internal audits. They check whether the police are still doing their duty. Well, like whether the uniform is being worn properly, all those kind of—attending their job duties on time and things like that. They have such kind of mechanisms. For us on our side, we have—now I think we can do everything that tarnishes anything that is going to be an effective or efficient policing. So that means we get into strategies, policies and then see if those things are working. And we have always been saying we shouldn't be understood to be some intruders of some sort—like we are going to be coming, infringing ourselves into their day-to-day duties like that. You see all the power—the powers, operational powers rest with the police, the commissioner of police.*

*So we ourselves we just come there as observers. We don't have anything to do like Mr. Fix-it, like say, "You—this road block should not be." It's not done this way, no. My own observers just say, these people said they are going to man their road blocks this way but now they said they are going to have about eight people, one will be here and there and there, but what I see now is only one person. What has happened, I can phone the authorities and say I am at a certain place, I see a policeman here trying to make something there, to call to say this and that and that and how about that. So they can make some instant corrections like that. Ours we just get the things that can have an impact in the policing, yes. Not the knitty-gritty that the policeman came late at work or drank. But if that drinking is now something that people talk about. They say, "Oh, you go to this station and you always find those people drunk." We can go and then find ourselves and inspect and say, this impacts negatively on the efficiency or the effectiveness of policing. So if the discipline is not being well observed, that is a thing that can come about.*

*So, now to come straight to your question, of course there was that sort of resentment that these people—they think that knowing the police are rank-conscious they just wanted to know, do we have any powers of some sort for them or things like that? That's why there was a need, that's why there was a need for our office and the authorities of LMPS to come and sit down. We can call it something like standard operating procedures. We had to sit down with them and then talk about that and the method of our approach—how are we going to approach one another without compromising our duties because we get mandate from the minister. They get the mandate of policing from the minister, from the same authority. And we call him Police Authority, our minister, we call him Police Authority.*

*So I think, why we had to do that, we also wanted them to know that we can come at anytime, announced or unannounced, we can come in. What we are going to check, they may be informed or not informed about that, because it all depends on the nature of the duty that we would be sent to do by the minister. At times we can go to the communities themselves, members of the community, they can tell if these people are really of some helpful.*

*For instance, normally we check the public reports. So they will tell, "After I reported my case before the police, I never had any police to come and visit the scene of the crime, there was no—I don't even know who is handling my case, I don't even know the stage of the investigation up to now. Every time I take a phone, I'll just be told, 'Oh, police are still investigating.'" Those kinds of the things that we want them—no, no, no, you had better—that person is entitled to know every stage of the investigation and then you cannot just say the police they going out all those days. Now we are in a democracy we have to police in a manner in which we focus on the community, we have the community-oriented policing.*

*So those are some of the things. So I think even those standard operating procedures we pointed out clearly that it is not to mean memorandum of understanding like rubbing shoulders and things like that. It's not about who has got powers and who's—and then it's not about who has got rights over who, it was all about what is necessary. And what is necessary is to have an effective policing that is going to be to applauded by the people that we police, or the community that is being served, or the policing activities are being rendered above board. That would be our point of departure and point of arrival, and it has to be like that, yes.*

SCHER: I see, I see. Could I ask how—I mean your mandate seems to be much broader than say the Police Complaints Authority and you seem to have more responsibility to sort of be very active in looking and saying well this doesn't look like it's working, this doesn't look like it's working. As opposed to the Police Complaints Authority, who wait for somebody to come in and say to them, this isn't working. Would that be fair to say—that that's how your office is separate from the activities of the Police Complaints Authority?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, in some other countries, maybe to avoid confusion, it is one office. Like Police Inspectorate, the duties I have just mentioned, a few of them—and Police Complaints, it's another desk within that. And Police Directorate another desk within that, so much that you can have one person that is seen overseeing all of these offices like that. But again, it's better if we have an independent body, so much that even if the commission—*

*Of course, all these other offices are police supporting services and they are there to support the police service. We also call them Policing Support Services. But now another danger can be what, if that person who is pivotal point around which these office rotate, if he is not or she is not in good terms with the commissioner of police, that could be another issue.*

*So there is always pros and cons in everything, it depends on how you see it. But if it comes to a point that this office is—and there are too many now, why can't we just unify them and then form into—it all depends on the behavior and all those. But as of now, I think that same autonomy, it's OK for all those offices, so much that they can have different—not biased—approach to everything that we do, yes.*

SCHER: I see, I see. I wonder if we can just go back a little bit—sort of more historically, I guess—and if you could tell me a little about the challenges that the Lesotho police were facing that led to the creation of this office. Because as we said

earlier, the office is still fairly new—five years old. So where was the drive for the creation of, of this office?

*MARHAKHE: Lesotho history starts in 1966, the political history. It was then under the protectorate of British. So in 1966, that's when they got their full independence. Now, that meant the democratic whatever form of government until, I'm told, until 1970. So the minister, the prime minister when he saw that the elections were not OK, he set a state of emergency, declared a state of emergency. Until 1996. We had a coup here—'96. Until '92, 1992, so during that military regime, of course, military regime would be a military regime. So then came, the democratically elected form of government, it was 1992—yes, 1992—and they had some consultants. They called some consultants and said, what do police do in a democratic world?*

*They found out that Lesotho police were still under the minister of defense—soldiers and national security services, they were still under the same ministry. Now they said, the police in almost every democratic country is answerable to the minister of home affairs, because it talks about the national security and that is why it's within the country, the national security, the public security.*

*So there came something like a white paper. So they suggested to the government, that, you need to separate the police from the minister of defense and they should be answerable to the minister of home affairs. And now when we talk about the policing, now we talk about the community policing that is community-oriented policing. Now this, of course, made some hiccups, and we had some strikes. Even the police went for strikes, because people just come—you know the politicians who just come and influence the police. And say you see now the government is coming, it's divided rule and all such kind of things, and yet they wanted to separate the police from—so that did not of course touch the police well.*

*Until 1998, now there was this law that was enacted that the police will be this way. So it had that little history that we did not understand the law or the police did not understand that this new notion they have to be answerable to the nation. This like the people who will have the powers now to ask the police who arrest them—during the previous years it was only enough for the police to say, no your case is under review or being investigated. And that would be all.*

*So they even suggested that the office of this nature, like my office, that now in a democratic world we need to have people who can come to the police and then prove on behalf of the community—say, "You said you were still under investigation but when we got into the investigation we found you were not doing anything here." So I think the effectiveness and efficiencies around those lines, that, "You have the resources—are you optimally using these resources or there are a lot of misuse and what?" And then where is the policy of your handling the management of resources, and things like that. You understand, yes?*

*SCHER: OK, I see. It strikes me that your job must be very difficult because, as you say, and as you have in your brochure here, the office, the office of the Inspector of Police should not be viewed as a negative or unwelcoming influence. But at the same time, you want to have enough, to be viewed with enough authority that if you say this should be done differently or we don't think this is the way it should be done. You want the police to respond and change and become more effective*

and more efficient. So it strikes me, you're walking a very, very delicate line between trying to be supportive but also wanting things to change?

*MARHAKHE: Yes, of course. We are the agent of change. But the manner in which we do it—if we live outside the human element, things will be OK. Because I should not appear to them as somebody with some powers to them to tell them what they should do. I should always come to them telling them that this is what the minister has told me to do and see. You see, I should always—I have to see to it that all the power that I have emanates from the minister.*

SCHER: The same place that—?

*MARHAKHE: Yes—they come from the minister. I shouldn't be going there to be seen and to be something that when I come everybody have to shiver, you see. So that's where the problem is. And then if that is the attitude that I—then I think that could trigger some things and wanted some results, but now I will always have to tell them, the minister has told me to come and then look at one, two, three, four and five. So much that they don't look at me as Marhakhe, so they should understand the office. If the authority wanted the power, I am invested with the official powers from the minister—that's all, not me as a human being.*

*Even if I have something, they can also go and report, "Look, this guy when he comes here, he doesn't want to talk to us, the manner in which he does things, you know, he's." Because there are things that are very sensitive, yes, that I cannot just come there as and when I what and say, "Open the armory" at night to see the things. I have to come formally and then tell them, "I want to see how you handle your weapons, because I see that there are a lot of people." If I can cite an example, there was a shooting incident that involved the police; it was the surface firearm, and now it's the 10<sup>th</sup> incident that we get. "How do you manage your weapons? Is there anybody who is registering them and knowing? Can you show me where is this gun—right now? Where is it?"*

*Yes, those are some of the things, the surprise checks that we can do. Or if we don't know, that is what there could be some misused if you don't even know that your gun has been taken or it has been stolen and things like that. If there is mismanagement of the resources, a lot of things can happen.*

*So those are some of the things that will come, and we don't have to argue with them. Ours is just to check if they got the registers. "Can I see the pistol number so-and-so? Where is it now?" You will be able to know or get your reference book and say, "This pistol has been offered to officer so-and-so. They are out of work." And I can come tomorrow and check. "No so-and-so, I saw him—he is back at work now. Where is the pistol? Oh, that officer told me that he left it at home." You can see that, that is not enough; something like that.*

*So those are some of the things that will come—like we are the new office, but they will understand why we do that. It's also to protect them, yes, yes.*

SCHER: Right, right, absolutely.

*MARHAKHE: Even also to manage the police. They have, of course—they will say, if they fear to tell them frankly, they will say: If those Police Inspectorate people come, they do not want those people to come in find us like this, you see, yes.*

SCHER: So can we stick with that example, just hypothetically? So let's say you did ask for this particular firearm and the person wasn't able to tell you where it was. Then what is your responsibility from there? Do you write a report to the minister? Does your office get involved in saying, 'well clearly you have a problem with managing your firearms; here's how we think you should be doing it?' How does the process work from there on?

MARHAKHE: *The process works this way. We inspect and report to the Police Authority, which is the minister, period. It's like that, that's the law. And now why we had the standard operating procedures. When we come and then find out there are such kind of mishaps on them, we can talk to the authorities directly if they are so willing, and then they tell us, "No you don't even need to report to the minister; we can correct that instantly." And then that is like that.*

SCHER: OK.

MARHAKHE: *We can go to the minister and say we found things like these, but fortunately we even had some chance to talk over this matter, and what we can assure you, Minister, we told them that we made some surprise checks, maybe we give them something like a week to rectify all those things. And then we are still expecting that they will be having the books corrected. Anytime from now we can go, which is—we have promoted the effectiveness on that regard. It's not only that we want the minister to know that they are not doing well. But if things are like—say in the case that we lock eyes or don't see eye to eye—that is why I say we can go and then say, "Minister this is how we found things there." And then the minister, from the recommendations that we made, he can even instruct what to do. It will all depend on the nature of the mandate he has given us. At times, he can just say, "You go and come and report without any recommendations."*

SCHER: I see.

MARHAKHE: *Yes. At times you go and then come with some recommendations as the case maybe. Yes.*

SCHER: OK, I see. So you are very much an agent of the minister and helping him to ensure that the police are doing—

MARHAKHE: *Everything is OK.*

SCHER: That everything is OK—

MARHAKHE: *So that's where—*

SCHER: I see, I see.

MARHAKHE: *It also protects us. That way we cannot be seen or asking, "Those people don't hear us, they don't respect us." It's not a matter of respect here; it's the matter of doing our job. If they are cooperative—and we underline the word cooperative—it is then that we can tell them, "We don't think you are supposed to be doing this and that; how about doing it this way?" And then they come, they can tell us, justify that. "OK we did not do this, we tried to improvise. Look we have only one [undecipherable] here, so we couldn't do that." And we also tell the minister—say, "OK, these people much as they were willing and they were very much*

*knowledgeable about what they were supposed to be doing, but they were under-resourced. So we think if—.” So we also have, we are also as the mouthpiece.*

SCHER: An advocate for their concerns?

MARHAKHE: *For, yes, for the improvement—for all those kind of things. If our office is so understood that way—not that we’re only, they include us. Of course, we also include that and some other things when the Minister says, “No, I don’t like that thing. I think the training that these people have, the initial training that they have is not relevant to what they do on the field. Each time a new police officer is involved in this, each time, what is happening?” Yes, those are some of the things that we can go there and then find out. They’ve got a nice prospectus, but they do not adhere to it.*

SCHER: Yes.

MARHAKHE: *Yes, so those are some of the things that we want them to see to it, that everything has to be for a reason and you shouldn’t just write there for the sake of satisfying the paper demand. We need to have something that will be effective and the effectiveness has to be what? On the ground, to the people you are rendering the services to, yes that’s what, yes, yes.*

SCHER: I see, I see. I’m sorry to keep questioning you, I’m just trying to get a good idea of how your office works, because it does seem to be a pretty interesting and quite unique sort of office, where you have these dual responsibilities to the police and the minister. And so a lot of the things are coming from the Minister saying to you, can you investigate this, can you look into this for me. But then can you also suggest things to the minister, and say we think this is a concern?

MARHAKHE: *Simply put we are the technocrats for the minister and that is why the police matters are concerned. We are supposed to be deciding the things that are hindering the effectiveness of policing, and we are not doing it on our own. After making some proposals, we send them to the minister and the minister gives us the go-ahead.*

SCHER: OK.

MARHAKHE: *That’s how we do. Otherwise, the minister does not know anything and is not even expected to know everything about the police.*

SCHER: Everything that is going on?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, we are his arms, and if the Minister is not doing well there it’s because some of the officers like in our office are not doing their job properly.*

SCHER: I see, I see.

MARHAKHE: Yes.

SCHER: OK, I’ve got it, I’ve got it.

MARHAKHE: OK.

SCHER: I wonder if I could shift checks slightly and just ask you that, within the five years the inspector of police, this office has been operating, what would you consider to be some of your successes? Is there anything that stands out in particular, or has it just been more general engagement or general involvement?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, I think we are on the learning process. First of all, it took our inspector of police, because he started on the first of January 2005. But to have the first inspector of police, it was me. October—it was around November actually, October was when I finalized my transfers to here—but I started work here around October 2007. So he has been two years alone, so without anybody to talk to, without anybody—so there was, there was a little bit—you know there are some things because, like they say, it's always difficult to take off, so alone—*

SCHER: Start-up programs, yes?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, alone he could not do a lot of things. So even the training that he got from U.K. (United Kingdom), because our office is modeled from the one in U.K., so there was nobody to discuss, because he had to come here to domesticate some of the things or localize some of the things. The problem now is the challenges are different—the knowledge that he has, we still have to go to the U.K. ourselves and just from them, I mean, the problem, like you say the problems that they encounter. Now there are some things we can learn from someone. Say, you are for this, you see that we made this mistake—that's why we were felt to be intruders by the police. First is because we also were not well trained—in the manner in which we interacted with. We came to them as their bosses and then these people are rank-conscious there, and we were not supposed to have done that.*

*We were not even supposed to be seen to be more Mr. Fix-it, like you always come and then fix this and that and that. Ours was just to come and see it, and they have to do it themselves. We just make them realize their mistakes, and then they correct it. We are there to make them realize that they are within the set standards, so that the good practices can continue doing everything. Because we are the people that if they have done well, we will give them the pat on the shoulder, so much that gives them encouragement. And then when something went wrong, we also tell them, and then the manner in which we tell them, we just sit them down. Like we also do, we inspect, then after we make the inspection report, we sit down with them and say these are our findings and then we discuss those kind of things. And say, this one and this one I think we would want to tell the minister we can correct it instantly.*

*That is where relationships are still good, where the cooperation is good. But we inspect and report to the Police Authority, which is the one minister, yes. So there are problems that we can see now. First of all, it is that of the newness. We are new in the office and the police themselves have not yet fully appreciated our existence.*

SCHER: I see.

MARHAKHE: *Yes, because—why I say this—there will be some times that we will agree on some certain issues; that on certain dates we will be coming and doing one, two, three, four. And then we find them—that they might hide behind their tedious*

*jobs. We say 'we have just got a political something that has just erupted here; we don't think you will be able to do that.' Or else whether they are active or inactive, we can just go there because if something has happened—busy or not busy—we can always see that no, this thing has happened. Ours is just to tell and inform them that we are coming, yes. So those are some of the small challenges that we have. Again, like I told you, they still have they own internal audits, yes.*

SCHER: Right.

MARHAKHE: *Their own internal inspectors, so at times they say, "No—that is government waste of money. Why do we have other?" But I say, no we want to be impartial, we need people who'll not be appearing or felt to be defensive or talking to themselves.*

*And as of now, we are a government entity, our reports have not yet been allowed to go to the public. We report to the minister, so we are not what do they call NGO, nongovernmental organization, we are—*

SCHER: And do you find that's helpful—that the reports don't go to the public—because then you can really present a picture of the challenges and the things that need to be done and give the minister the information he needs, without sort of having to be concerned about how it will reflect on perhaps his job and reflect on the government. Or do you think these reports could be made public?

MARHAKHE: *I would rather not want to answer it, how do I think it myself.*

SCHER: OK, fine. We will move onto another question.

MARHAKHE: *I can put it this way, how things should happen. In a democratic arena, one would expect that there is no stone that should be left unturned. Because if we are answerable to the people—that we police and even the government has to be answerable to the people that they govern—I don't think there is anything we have to hide.*

*Again, there is what you call the annual policing plan. The annual policing plan is prepared by the commissioner of police. He goes to the public, he makes some public gatherings here. That is where he solicits support and the manner and means and ways of policing. He asks—actually asks the community—How can we help you? Which are the areas of policing that you think we can dwell on, and delve into that one for this coming year? And then he prepares that draft, and it goes to the minister and the minister puts it before the Parliament and then tells them that now it has got the powers that, as the government, the policing for this year, it will go like this. That is the annual policing plan, which has to be inspected by us, like we are the Police Inspectorate now.*

*Of course, if something goes to the Parliament, that means it goes to the representatives of the nation. The report that will be inspecting the extent to which that annual policing plan has been carried out in that particular year, I think also should be for public consumption. That's my feeling.*

SCHER: OK, your personal feeling is?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, if things are going well and how—if these things—if I'm asked why it is happening that way, here is another question. But the thing is, if things are going well, it has to happen that way.*

SCHER: OK, OK.

MARHAKHE: Yes.

SCHER: I wonder if I could ask you, I'm very aware of your time—I don't want to take too much of your time.

MARHAKHE: *No, no we can go as much as you want.*

SCHER: OK, excellent, excellent. So one of the questions I had for you is: What are the types of things that make your job easier? So if you could wave a wand or whatever and get the things that would make your job easier, what would it be? Would it be more staff or more resources or, you know, a different sort of legislative role? What, what could you just tell me a little bit about that?

MARHAKHE: *I think you have all ready answered yourself.*

SCHER: Yes, yes?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, because if the laws are OK, because our problem here is also what makes policing very difficult. Most of our laws are outdated, yes. So we find out that like penalties—that goes like 20 rand. Twenty rand is equivalent to something like 1 pound. If you have committed an offense, even something like a criminal offense—for instance, illegal immigrants. If he's found to enter the country without whatevers, you will still find out that the penalties are still old. We still need to—we have pointed out that one to the legislature. Of course, Lesotho is also not a wealthy country, so the police are expected to go beyond what they can do without, or with meager resources here.*

*So and also, Lesotho has got only one police force, so there is nothing to compare with it. So it doesn't have a lot of challenges whereby we can say like in other countries we say, look at that force. The community that has been served by that force is doing this and that and that and that. And also if in all the governments that we have seen, they only go to police when there is political something—what to be addressed—but as for the rest of the times we'll find that no everything's OK, let the police do their job, they know what they do well with what—you see that is the problem.*

*So those are some of the challenges that we are facing. And again it's that one of the police themselves. They don't have good strategies of approaches, they don't have good policies whereby they can normally say, "OK, here is my policy of policing and now how do you chip in, government, because we need to be empowered on that and that by resources?" Look at that topography of our country. There are a lot of places inaccessible by road. There are a lot of places where we need a helicopter if you are looking for the rapid response. There are some places, we get there some days after the incident has occurred so it impairs negatively into our policing.*

*Those are some of the things that have to be considered. And then we cannot be expected to go and inspect the people who are expected to be effective and hence they don't have anything that they can make themselves effective with. So I think those are the challenges.*

SCHER: So I mean those are some of the challenges of the police very broadly?

MARHAKHE: Yes, broadly.

SCHER: But for your specific office, the Office of the Inspector of Police, is there anything that you would if you could, that you would really like—to enable the inspection process to go better and to just enable your office, this office, to function more effectively?

MARHAKHE: *No, I think I need a staff, I need a staff, maybe a lot of the researching skills, who can research about the policing—the best practices other police forces do to combat crime, to fight crime. And then put it down here to see if this can work in our country. So much that, like I told you, that we are the technocrats. We want to improve the policing in Lesotho so that we can be able to give advice to the minister that, OK, we think the manner in which we do our policing be it, what would they call it, where you see police—visibility policing.*

*So some people will say, no we need a lot of people, police that are visible. Some people are up for cars. They say OK, we want a lot of cars going up and down. But others, when we get to the person on the ground—they say no, we don't want them in the cars, because they are not accessible in the cars. If they are foot patrolling, it is better, because we can always call that officer and say, "Officer you can have a cup of coffee or whatever, and we give what has transpired." He says OK. "You get to my neighbor there. We saw a lot of firearms being offloaded from that, that—" You see, those are some of the things that we will say, OK, much as visibility policing is OK when it's done properly, it is by foot other than by car. By car, maybe during inclement weather or something like that.*

MARHAKHE: So we need that think tank.

SCHER: Yes, sounds like to generating ideas?

MARHAKHE: *That is very professional, that can be relied upon. because I think my work is not only to have that, I can have those technical [Indecipherable]. When I go there for inspection, they can tell me, "Go check this and that and that." But with my little experience or background from the police I know how their behavior and how they can do and maneuver some things, and then I can know where to check.*

SCHER: And if you don't mind me asking, your office size at the moment, how many, what is the staffing of the office?

MARHAKHE: *We are, as of now, we are supposed to have an inspector of police, three deputies, because we have divided our country into threes—northern region, central region and southern Region—so that our inspector of police will be dealing much with the headquarters, the police headquarters. The rest of the three, the deputies, would be dealing with the head of the regions respectively, like that. And now again we have the people that are called information analysts—those are the researchers, those are the people that I was talking*

*about when I was saying they are supposed to be able to each and every time come with some innovations, come up with some things to better the police.*

*Then they have to inform what is actually happening with the police now, as like their intents, like the number of crimes—how many house break-ins that were reported, how many rapes, how many murders. All those kind of things they need so that they can say, things are escalating or there is something that needs some serious attention here. The manner in which car theft is now going on, the manner in which people are there so much that we can have kind of those things, and then we know, for example, that the northern region has got a problem at this place. Southern region has got this place. So commissioner of police, if he needs to address these things: More vehicles are needed in the northern region, other in the central region. But to our surprise we find that where the crime is high it's less resourced.*

*So those are some of the things that we can come and say that no, how did you go about it? Where is your allocation policy? It is based on what? Or how is your promotion, your placement policy? All things like those ones. "But this guy last went to the training five years ago and he has never been trained to be at this position, to be a district commander." You see those are some of the things that we consider. The holistic approach - what do you think might be the problem of policing here? We find out that there are a lot of things that he doesn't even know—but he is expected to come out with good results. "You cannot fire this rookie; we don't think he has to be removed, but he seems to be lacking these skills. But if at all he's been trained, why is he not—some disciplinary correction has to be conducted if he is not behaving accordingly. He has been trained, he passed the competency test, but now why is he not delivering?"*

*Those are some of the things that we have to check. We don't just come there and say, this is one, this is two and then come back. We also want to dig down and say why, why is this like this? And even where the good practice is, we need to know how do you manage to keep—*

SCHER: Crime down?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, crime down, I mean reducing crime like this. So much that we tell other people, Can you go and visit that gentleman and what he does it's like he's doing one, two, three, four, five. Don't you think it's a good thing to do, don't you think there will be some problems that we can do—and then we can raise up, "OK, I tried it, but."*

SCHER: So your office is doing that in a small way at the moment, but you'd like to do—be able to do more of that, is that what you are saying?

MARHAKHE: *Yes, because now—like the resources themselves. We would like to almost every week know what is happening there, and we were supposed to have another—like you were talking about the Web site.*

*Maybe we have the Web site of the police in Lesotho, where we can know the daily incidents of crime that have been reported. So much that we can even check ourselves from the computer and say, "We see the problem area is this one." We can pick up the telephone instead of wasting petrol going to the regions. We can say, "What do you think the problem is?" Even before we go and*

*then inspect, they are able to tell us at times what is happening. They say, "OK, it's because of one, two, three, four, five, yes." At times we can say, "There are these criminals that were released. There will be a parole. We did not know that. Or he escaped from the jail. We did not know that. That's why the crime has gone like this. We are on the hand of this person, this crime-doer, so maybe that's why you see our statistics going up like that."*

*At times, you will find that internal mechanisms—of course—they will say, don't report too much because it will appear like the crime is out of hand. And when you go there, you find that, this guy is performing well because of stats but when we come there, we see that there are a lot of cases that have been reported that don't appear in our texts. Or that people are so much discouraged that "It's a waste of time even if you go there. They are not going to pay attention to what we have said. Why bother about going to report?"*

*So those are some of the checks and balances—we don't rely only on one thing. For example, the statistics look very high, look very low and therefore when they are high, crime is high; when they are low, crime is low. No. We can see that it's high but most of the cases are reported are very trivial because now that people have got more trust with the police they report everything. Where stats are low and we find people have lost confidence to the people, so those are the things that we want to check actually. So we need to, I don't know, to empower ourselves to be able to do that. We would only be able to do that if the police also have such kinds of mechanisms themselves.*

SCHER: Yes.

MARHAKHE: *Yes, whereby the reporting systems, yes, we can have all those statistics and then in place and things like that. Yes if we can have that network, the network how things are done, information is so smooth, and then it's disseminated to other people.*

SCHER: That's actually—what you mentioned is a big problem in many other countries, when as the police improve and the community trust them more, crime appears to double or go up or triple even, because everybody is reporting. It's a very difficult thing, because it actually shows the police are getting better. It's quite a difficult thing to manage.

MARHAKHE: *And now you need the political approach that people will not like it. During my tenure of office in government, things were down, so you'll see that there are some other sensitive issues. That you say—even if you can tell—"OK, these are the things that, no, no don't talk about that one, things are this way you see." Because we have different inclinations, yes.*

SCHER: Different priorities for—I understand, I understand. Well this has been a very interesting conversation and I've really enjoyed getting to know more about how this office works. It certainly sounds like you are playing a very important role, I mean in checking the performance of the police and supporting them where you can. And I would like to thank you very much for taking time out. And before I end the recording, I was wondering if there are any final thoughts or comments you had on your work here, or any questions that maybe I haven't asked that I should have asked you that you would like to—maybe some ideas you have about policing in general. Or have we covered most of the ground?

MARHAKHE: *I think we have covered everything, really. Because all that I can say is, like much as we have Interpol, we think we can have similar, something of Inspectorate that checks the Interpol, yes.*

SCHER: Oh, I see.

MARHAKHE: *Yes, because you see, too, that I'm not in politics, but you'll see that there are some things that are the problems to other countries, which seem to be taken seriously by Interpol. For us, there are some other things that are still giving those people some problems in their communities but they are not regarded as international.*

SCHER: I see.

MARHAKHE: *Yes so those are some of the things that we can see, because if terrorism for instance. Terrorism, nobody likes that.*

SCHER: No.

MARHAKHE: *As a human being we like to fight somebody you defeat. And then you tell them next time you come we will fight. But now if somebody comes with bombs and things like that, you don't have to debate that, you see no respect of human life like that. I mean, you understand no, no, there is something wrong with our life as it means nowadays. Even if I wronged you, why do you have to kill yourself. I was expecting you to come and kill me because I did that, but now you kill yourself as well. How are we going to rectify, how are we going to settle down our things. You understand what I mean? So I don't want to be heard saying terrorism is not—*

SCHER: I understand exactly what you are saying, yes.

MARHAKHE: *And I know it cannot—. Maybe that is my foolish thinking, that it cannot come to poor countries like Lesotho and the like. But Lesotho has got some serious, serious problems, like the seriousness of something like stock theft, yes. So I would like to come with Interpol and say, "OK, if all our members, we can list all their problems so much that there is similar funding, there's any way of funding that." Such kind of problems also because the problem that we face at my family may not be the problems that you face in your in your family. Some problems have got the problem of too much money; others have got the problem of too little money. So you understand what I'm trying to say?*

SCHER: Absolutely, yes, yes, yes.

MARHAKHE: *So like I'm saying, the Interpol also, I think—it needs the office of this kind whereby they can say, "OK, tell me, you Interpolists, and institute, what are the reasons for your existence? What are the things that you do? How do you help these other nations? And then, did you do that something within the bigger picture that we can do that?"*

*And maybe again I think this one is too internal, but I think the inspection bodies—we need to have maybe an association of that. So that I can even go beyond the policing things maybe. I don't want to call it during my idle periods,*

*but there are some times when we find that OK, actually there's something these two weeks coming two weeks—we don't do anything. We can go and then jump into other people's, and then help. And then they tell us, "OK, we want to check one, two, three, four, five." And then we go and can be of some assistance. Because if we are united in the country, and then we find that now Education has got it's own inspectorate, Traffic has got it's own, Police have got this and that. They are very good but maybe we could have something that consolidates that.*

SCHER: I see. All right, I very much understand, and certainly what you are suggesting seems to make a lot of sense. Well, on that note, I would like to say thank you very much again.

MARHAKHE: *OK. You are welcome.*