

**\*\*EXCLUSIVE\*\*** PLEASE CREDIT [TheMediaReport.com](http://TheMediaReport.com)

TEXT OF 2012 MEMO BY SNAP NATIONAL LEADERS  
DAVID CLOHESSY AND BARBARA BLAINE  
TO LOCAL LEADERS AND REGIONAL CHAPTER HEADS

**Please do not circulate this. Please return it as soon as you've read it. Thanks.**

You may be aware of a four year old letter, signed by Barbara Blaine, asking the Louisiana Medical Board to NOT withdraw the medical license of Dr. Steve Taylor, who was accused of possessing child porn, until his case was resolved.

The Catholic League harps on it often and has for a while. But lately, a couple of individuals who once have begun circulating, via repeated (and often factually wrong) emails, allegations about the letter and demanding that Barbara “apologize” or “explain” or take some kind of action, like Barbara resigning. We brought this up at the leadership meeting in FL earlier this year. We spent an hour discussing it. Many participated in the discussion.

**Who Taylor is**

First, some facts. Taylor is the husband of our Lyn Heywood Taylor, our one-time volunteer New Orleans SNAP leader. He’s helped lobby for SOL reform & attended news conferences.

**Who Taylor isn’t**

Taylor is NOT and has never been a SNAP leader, a SNAP consultant, “SNAP’s shrink” (Bill Donahue’s depiction), or anything but an active SNAP member who attended events. He never has seen SNAP members professionally as a therapist.

*(We once we heard that Taylor alleged listed himself as a “SNAP consultant” on his resume. We haven’t seen the resume. We don’t know if that’s true. We were never asked if he could list himself that way. We don’t know why he allegedly has (though lots of folks obviously pad their resumes). If he did this, we wish he hadn’t/wouldn’t (though obviously, since he’s behind bars, his resume is pretty much meaningless).*

**Here’s what did NOT happen**

- No one said he was innocent
- No one said he shouldn’t be prosecuted
- No one said he should get special treatment
- No one said he should get a lenient sentence
- No one said he should keep his job
- No one tried to influence prosecutor
- No one tried to get his employer to re-hire him
- No one tried to blame anyone or anything else for Taylor’s behavior
- No one tried to minimize the crimes Taylor was accused of
- No one publicly rallied around Taylor (thus hurting or intimidating victims, witnesses or whistleblowers)

**Here’s what happened**

Years ago, one time, one SNAP person wrote a single, one page letter to one individual at one agency. The letter asked that a Medical Board NOT revoke Taylor’s license until the case was resolved. (Barbara was told the letter would remain private. Obviously, for reasons we don’t know, that didn’t happen.)

**Here’s why**

Taylor and his wife endured Katrina, restored their home, but he was fired when he was arrested. He believed that if he could maintain his medical license, he might be able to get a decent-paying job in medical research or records. Lyn asked that SNAP write a letter. The bottom line – we’ve never advocated that any accused sex offender lose all income and risk being homeless or hungry. So Barbara wrote the letter.

**Here’s the impact of the letter**

It had no impact. The medical board revoked his license.

### **A few other considerations**

- Others wrote similar letters about Taylor, including some prominent and respected people in our movement (such as Jason Berry). (Their letters have apparently remained confidential.)
- Two full years elapsed between the time Taylor was arrested and the time he was charged. That's highly unusual. It appeared to some that he may have been wrongly arrested and might well not be charged at all (and that the long delay was a way for the police or prosecutor to try and "save face").
- Steve's wife says that Steve took his computer in to a technician and said that he'd found child porn on his computer and wanted it taken off.
- The technician reportedly is a former Catholic seminarian.
- Even in the end, the DA publicly admitted, in a newspaper article, that there were evidence problems. The bottom line is that to a number of observers – some of whom are well-known and widely trusted, inside and outside of our movement - this seemed like a very murky case that might well be withdrawn.

### **Why is this coming up now?**

Bill Donahue of the Catholic League blasts us about this from time to time. But [REDACTED] [REDACTED] apparently learned of it through Donahue and is upset and is sending emails to some of our leaders.

### **But aren't we being inconsistent here?**

Nope. As best we can tell, we've ever advocated that an accused wrongdoer lose his professional or work license based on an allegation.

We HAVE advocated that accused wrongdoers be suspended or removed from their jobs once they're accused, if their jobs give them power over or access to kids.

In other words, we've never said that a psychiatrist, doctor, lawyer, or even a plumber or electrician immediately lose his or her professional license just because they were accused of wrongdoing.

Once he or she admits or is proven guilty, we often have of course

When someone's accused of wrongdoing, we say "Get him/her away from kids." We don't say "defrock him/her" or "Revoke his/her professional license."

### **Why don't we just issue a statement explaining this**

If we write anything, we're pretty sure that

- we'll help no children
- we'll deter no crimes/cover ups
- we'll warn no neighbors, relatives, employers about predators
- we'll squander precious time that we could be doing all of the above.

And this much we strongly suspect:

- the key instigator of all this won't be satisfied
- he'll keep pushing for more
- somehow what we write will get to the Catholic League
- they'll blast out more criticism of us and repeat more misinformation, and
- that, in turn, will demoralize even more victims

So the UP SIDE of writing any letter/statement is probably ZERO (other than perhaps making a tiny handful of people – most of whom long ago chose to **not** be a part of SNAP - a tiny bit happier for a day) And the DOWN SIDE of writing any letter is considerable. . .

We also have to remember that our actions set the tone, pace, and example for other leaders. We're constantly having to remind our leaders and members that it's **almost never** productive or healthy to respond to critics (it distracts from and hampers meaningful work, it drains our morale, it continues the endless, escalating cycle of angry emails, etc.)

Refusing to engage critics leaves us open to accusations of being arrogant. The truth is, however, that we're focused. We try very, very hard to NOT get dragged into efforts that don't protect kids, expose wrongdoers, reform laws or deter crimes and cover ups.

### **Isn't it important for us to admit mistakes.**

Absolutely. We do so often. And we did so repeatedly at the Florida meeting. But it's also important that we

- not make "a mountain out of a molehill"
- set a good example for survivors (ignoring critics)
- divert precious energy from our mission and
- act carefully so we don't make a bad situation worse.

### **If we do nothing, won't this just continue to fester?**

It may or may not. At this point, however, we've seen critical emails from just about five individuals. It's important that we keep some perspective and not rush into action because of the actions of a small few. Years ago, we realized that we simply don't have (and never will have) the time, money and resources to reply to our critics. At best, doing so is a distraction that is a disservice to kids and victims. At worst, it's a morale-zapping waste of our precious resources.

### **What do these few want?**

It's sometimes hard to tell. [REDACTED] is an individual who holds extremely high and rigid standards, then gets upset when others don't meet them. He tends to relentlessly pound out emails in which he initially sounds caring. But almost no matter what happens, he keeps demanding that others respond, explain, apologize and take the action he deems appropriate. He's been a member of several organizations, quits or is asked to leave, and then becomes harshly critical of them.

Each of us has dealt with individuals who either

- are "lone wolf" types who don't want to - or aren't able to - be part of a larger movement, but prefer to act independently and "follow their consciences" and do what they like, regardless of whether it helps victims or kids or not, OR
- have been involved in SNAP and have found us wanting in some way and no longer want to be associated with us.

That's normal, inevitable and perfectly fine. (No one's got the corner on truth. Every group has members who leave.)

Usually, we try hard to prevent or repair such rifts. But at a certain point, some folks choose to go their own way & do their own thing. We almost always respond the same way - "thanks for being involved, we hope you'll continue to do all you can to protect kids, expose corruption and heal victims." Sometimes, they later choose to re-engage with us, and they're almost always welcome.

But sometimes they don't, and they snipe at and criticize us, sometimes for a long time.

And while it's tempting to respond, doing so sends precisely the wrong message and rewards precisely the wrong behavior. By replying, we're essentially saying "Our popularity matters most" and "We want to try and make everyone happy. And if you level enough accusations often enough to enough people, you'll finally succeed in getting us off track and responding to you." So responding sometimes basically encourages similar hurtful behavior in the future. That's why we don't think it's wise or productive or helpful to do so in this case.

### **So what if you are contacted about all this?**

As harsh as this may sound, we'd recommend that you not respond. If you choose to respond, we'd encourage you to talk with him, not e mail him. (Any email you send him will likely be misconstrued and forwarded to everyone on his email list, sometimes over and over again.) If you DO talk with him, we hope you'll just listen and avoid being defensive and certainly avoid criticizing him in any way. (Even with those in our movement who blast us, we try hard to not criticize others.)

### **For more information**

The best source of info on this is this New Orleans Times Picayune article (notice that Jason Berry wrote a letter and says he'd do it again.)

[http://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2011/08/st\\_tammany\\_doctor\\_convicted\\_in.html](http://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2011/08/st_tammany_doctor_convicted_in.html)

Sorry for any discomfort or confusion or embarrassment or difficulty this may cause. Thanks for your understanding.