

What the Met needs is a moral compass

Published: January 14, 2026, 4:49 pm

What is there to say about the resignation of Cressida Dick from the Met?

First, this was well overdue. Many have had doubts about her since she was duty officer when Jean Charles da Silva e de Menezes was killed by the Met in 2005, despite which she went on to become Commissioner.

Second, many did not need the wholly inappropriate policing of the Sarah Everard vigil to be reminded of the misogyny of the Met.

Third, there was her approach to corruption. On so many issues during her time the Met appeared unable to take action where Tory MPs appeared to be close to the scene, from the funding of the Brexit campaign onwards.

The force was found to be [institutionally corrupt](#) on her watch.

Will that be solved by her going? In many ways that is the more interesting question. In part, the answer comes down to who is appointed, and we do not of course know that as yet. But the influence of the prime minister, who is currently under investigation by the Met, on this is clearly of significance as well. One just has to hope that a fair appointment is possible at the moment and to simultaneously have doubt as to whether it is.

What is the answer going forward? It has, surely, to be that the Met must be the London police force again. It should not have direct access to the government. It should be accountable to London, which it is not, even though Sadik Khan used his influence to finally remove Dick from office.

What the Met also needs is a moral compass. But then, so much of public life requires that, and too often it is absent. We are suffering the plague of Thatcher's children who were taught that self-interest is all.

