

Time Line: The life of social-activist/ free-thinker -- leading up to the Scam

John was born in March of 1945 in the Los Angeles area. His father was a radio repairman; his mother a fanatically religious house wife who aspired to be an English teacher. They divorced when he was about five. His mother then moved herself, him, his two older sisters, and a younger brother in with an aunt and grandmother. They were living in a glorified four room shack located behind another aunt's home in Pasadena Calif. They all survived on the incomes of the grandmother and mother who were working doing ironing, cooking, and cleaning for well-to-do families.

His mother had been raised as a Quaker and believed that god was allowing these hard times as a way of testing her religious faith. She lived much of her non-working hours within a fantasy world of dreams of what it would be like to have money like the families she worked for - a dream John soon rejected.

Looking back, this background had instilled in John a firm sense of right and wrong, and a sense of himself and others as being intrinsically good. yet at the same time it resulted in his stubborn independence of thought, since he had been convinced at a very young age that his mother's view of reality was way off base. He learned to have faith in his own ideas and in his own views of reality; to question all types of authority, and to know that if their answers didn't make sense they probably weren't true. He also learned that the more people that believed in something, and the stronger that they believed it, the more likely it was false - he learned that the majority was usually wrong.

John went on to high school in Redondo Beach. He was a loner and social outcast except within the math and science clubs. He would easily ace the technical courses, while barely squeaking by on the others. He graduated in 1962, and went on to try junior college for several years. In 1964 he gave up on the academic scene and joined the Navy becoming a aviation electronics technician. His training in the Navy took him to San Diego, El Centro California, and Memphis Tennessee. He finally was stationed with patrol and attack squadrons at the navel air base at Whidbey Island Washington, and from there went on detachments to Japan, the Philippines and Viet Nam during the Viet Nam conflict.

The base at Whidbey Island was fairly remote, so several times a year the USO would bus down ladies from a teachers college in Bellingham for a big dance. It was at one of these dances that John met Pamela the woman he would later marry. John had been raised by his mother with the expectation that he would marry a "nice religious girl" - the definition of which included that the woman not actually enjoy sex but only reluctantly participate in it to meet the needs of her husband.

Pamela met this criteria and became a replacement for John's mother. She was a convert to the LDS church (Mormons), and she had a disdain for anything sexual. By contrast, John was an atheist and a free spirit sexually. To say the least, this was a marriage doomed to failure.

Upon release from the Navy, John married Pamela in a Mormon church. They moved to Everett Washington. With Pamela's insistence, he returned to college, first to a community college and then a year later to the University of Washington. Pamela supported both of them during this time by working as a fourth grade teacher in a local school, while John received some assistance through the GI bill. In June of 1972 John received his Bachelors of Science in Electrical Engineering, and they moved to Santa Clara California where John worked for National Semiconductor.

In March of the following year John's daughter, Lisa Ann, was born. Two years later his son, Andrew Jason was born. After a slow start, John took on the raising of his children as his primary goal in life. He wanted them to grow up as independent thinkers, and to question religious and civil "authority". He also wanted his children to grow up with a healthy attitude and an acceptance of human sexuality unlike what

their mother had. At the same time, Pamela had taken on the primary active role for a woman in the Mormon church, that of raising her children as "good" Mormons. These two people, John and Pamela, who once thought that they could stay together in spite of their differences, suddenly found themselves as arch enemies in their primary life's goal: that of raising the children that they both loved.

In 1978, with un-reconcilable differences (and with Pamela's insistence), they divorced with Pamela getting custody of the children. Because of her experiences with her own abusive father, and her understanding of John's ideas on raising children, she requested that **she be allowed to be along** whenever he had visitation. Since John still had feelings toward Pamela, and since he had always valued their time together as a family unit, he agreed.

She had her attorney write up the dissolution agreement which John signed. As it turned out, the wording was that **visitation had to be in her presence** which was not his understanding of their verbal agreement at all. It took him only a couple months to figure out how much control this gave Pamela over his visits with his children. Unfortunately though, since he had voluntarily agreed to that stipulation, to have it removed it was now his burden of proof to show that he was not a threat to his own children.

After about a year, John found a psychiatrist who, over a four month period, analyzed and tested John with a critical eye toward evaluating the parenting/nurturing aspects of his personality. At the end of that period, the psychiatrist reached the conclusion that John had normal parenting instincts (ie. a drive to raise his children the way he believes to be best) and that he was **not** a threat to his children.

John had his attorney write up and submit the papers to modify the dissolution agreement, including the sworn statement of the psychiatrist. Pamela's attorney responded only with requests for changes in child support. So, in 1981, John finally got full visitation rights with his children.

By this time, John was an avid nudist. He frequented a number of nudist resorts and he knew that they were all family orientated, and that the people in them were all very protective of the children. So in August of 1983, during his children's visit with him, John took his two children, his girl friend and her kids, to a nudist beach in Santa Cruz, California, that he had frequented. This trip was without the knowledge of their mother. Eventually Pamela discovered where the children had been taken, and the proverbial stuff hit the fan.

So in September of 1983,

Pamela stopped the children's unsupervised visitation with their father, she interrogated them and, unknown to John at the time, got the San Jose Police to investigate to see if charges could be brought against him. The results of that investigation was that there was insufficient evidence to charge John with any crime (this turns out later to be an uncanny coincidence). Pamela then convinced the children that John was trying to corrupt them, and then got them to agree that all visits with their father should be supervised by her or their stepfather.

In the following years John went through a number of jobs (he had a Masters in Computer Science by now) and a number of girl friends. Religious women were attracted to him because he came off as a "nice conservative guy". It took a while before they realized that he definitely wasn't conservative, but by that time they also realized that he definitely was a nice, compassionate, affectionate person who really cared a lot for children.

John would openly talk with these women about how he felt that children should be raised concerning sexual matters. But as far as how to interact with the girlfriend's children, he religiously would follow her ideas of what was proper.

Because of John's good side, they would put up with his controversial nature for a while. The limit seemed to be about a year and a half when John and the girlfriend would decide that it just won't work. They would part friends, occasionally meeting after that for lunch and sharing concern for how the other was doing.

After one such break-up, and the following six months without female companionship, John thought he at last had found a break through in December of 1989. He had found an ad in a swingers magazine that promised to be from a woman who shared his sexually liberal views on the raising of children. Now, if he had the chance, instead of initially pretending to be conservative in the beginning to appear to be compatible with a woman, all he would have to do is pretend to be more sexually liberal than he really was.

The rest is history, the ad turned out to be a lead-in to a illegal entrapment scam being run by the US Postal Inspection Service and local police. The scam was targeting Politically Incorrect Parents, and include the hiding and falsifying of evidence. For details, return to the menu and check out the section on "The Law Enforcement Scam".

John was arrested on March 9th 1990 and charged with the heinous crime of saying the wrong words during consensual phone calls (ie talk/thought crimes). His bail was set at \$50,000. Since he was unemployed at the time, had little in financial resources, and owned no property, he was unable to meet that bail and remained in custody. He also had to use a Public Defender. After six months in jail, John was offered a plea bargain: In exchange for a "No Contest" plea, he would only have to serve several more weeks in jail (this turned out to be two more months). He was released in November of that year.

John accepted the plea bargain with the intended purpose of fighting his conviction from the outside, appealing on the obvious constitutional issues. He had also assumed that he could better mend the damage done to his relationship with his children if he were on the outside. As it turned out, his ex-wife Pamela jumped in (selling her soul to rid her children of his influence?) and demanded that a condition of John's 5 year probation be that he be denied **all** contact with his children (who by now resided in the state of Washington), including letters and phone calls. This was so stipulated.

As John began looking into the laws concerning the appeal process it became obvious to him just how well the details of this police scam had been worked out. In an appeal, you can only use evidence submitted during the court actions that you are appealing, no new evidence can be submitted. With this in mind, the police had used various tactics to prevent any real evidence, that would have hinted at the illegal entrapment, from coming out in John's Preliminary Hearing, the only court hearing where any evidence is presented when a plea bargain is accepted. The policewomen, had refused to answer any questions in court concerning why she had started calling John, supposedly because "To answer that question would divulge the identity of a confidential informant". So there was no evidence of the ad or letters that could be submitted it John's appeal.

In April of 1991, 5 months after they were requested by John's private attorney, the public defender finally delivered copies of the evidence tapes of the phone conversations where John had allegedly committed his talk/thought crimes. So, for the first time and more than a year after the phone conversations had taken place, he got the opportunity to hear the eight hours of tape evidence against him. It took only one hour to realize that those tapes had been altered and only several days to realize the extent of that editing [see [Altered Evidence](#)].

In June of 1991, a friend of John's (supposedly, without any influence from him ??, since that would have been a violation of his probation -- okay maybe just a little), sent a Graduation Bouquet to John's daughter Lisa, who was graduating from a High School in Bellingham Washington at that time. The message

included with the bouquet was "Congratulations, You have come a long way. The future looks bright, keep the faith". The intent of this message was to convey to Lisa, John's increased optimism that with the extent of alteration of evidence by police, that he would be able to prove the violations of his rights by police and successfully appeal his conviction.

As a direct result of that bouquet being sent, John's ex-wife hit the roof. She contacted his probation officer demanding that John be placed on tighter supervision. After being scrutinized by his probation officer about his part in the sending of that bouquet, John was instructed that any subsequent contact with his children through third parties would result in his serving an additional year in county jail.

In Addition, John's probation, which up to this point had been focused on his getting a job and finding a place to live and which only required his filling out and sending in a form on a monthly basis, was changed to intense supervision, to where he could expect up to three unannounced visits a week from the probation officer, to ensure that he was living and sleeping where he claimed to be living.

In August of 1991, John received some money from his mother's estate (she had died the previous year while John was in jail). He then was able to afford the retainer that his private attorney had required before continuing to fight on John's behalf. In January of 1992, the attorney finally submitted a motion of "Writ of Err Corum Nobis" (a notice to the court of serious errors in facts) including transcripts of the tape evidence and outlining all the places that it was believed that edits had taken place. All that was being requested was that John's plea bargain would be **temporarily** set aside for the sole purpose of having the original evidence tapes analyzed by a audio forensic expert agreeable to both sides. The judge (Daniel Creed of the Santa Clara County Superior Court) put off making a ruling on the motion until early March

Mean while, John had to decide whether or not to run for public office (13 State Senate) that year. The commitment had to be made quickly since the papers had to be filled out and signatures had to be collected before the end of February. He still had faith in the judicial system and assumed that with the supportive evidence of the alteration of the evidence tapes that the judge would have to grant his motion and allow the tape evidence to be analyzed. He also realized that with the large number of edits to the evidence tapes, many of poor quality, that if they were analyzed by a real forensic expert, surely a number of the edits would be proven in court.

John's decision was to go ahead and run for office, but keep a low profile until he had the hard evidence of San Jose Police being involved in the alteration of tape evidence. He then felt that with the resulting publicity he actually would have a real chance of winning.

The March court date came, and with it the unthinkable. The judge denied John's request to have the original tape evidence analyzed. The only evidence to refute the claims of alterations to the tapes, had been a sworn statement of the undercover policewoman where she states that she did not alter the tapes [See [Sworn Misstatements and Lies](#)].

An appeal of that court decision was started that would end up taking one more year. In the mean time in June of that year, Judge Creed was supposedly up for re-confirmation by the voters in the primary election. So, John and a friend picketed the Santa Clara County Court House each morning for the two weeks prior to that election. They handed out a paper accusing Judge Creed of covering up police misconduct [see [Graphic of handout](#)]. Later John would discover that since Judge Creed was un-contested for his seat, he was automatically re-confirmed without his name actually being on the ballot.

One good thing did come from that picketing. A number of people remarked that they had personally placed the handout on the desk of Judge Creed. After a day of this, John's probation officer left a panicky message on his answering machine that "We have to meet" and scheduling a meeting for that Friday. The next day, Brenda Wells Herbert, the undercover police officer who had participated in the alteration of the

tape evidence (even doing voice-overs so that the spliced pieces of conversation would fit together better), passed in front of John's picketing trying to avoid any eye contact with him. John did manage to get out a few verbal barbs: "Oh I guess you already know about police altering evidence, don't you ?". On that Friday meeting the probation officers tone was unexpectedly low key. "Oh, nothing special, its just been a while since we have talked". John's probation officer then informed him that his probation would be switched from the intense supervision it had been to where he would not even have to fill out forms or ever see his probation officer again.

John's pet theory about what must have gone on, was that Judge Creed wanted to sue him for malicious slander, but to do so would have given John the legal opportunity to prove his allegations. This would have given John the legal right to have the evidence tapes analyzed. So, before proceeding, Judge Creed would have wanted to know exactly how badly the police (and specifically Officer Brenda Herbert) didn't want the tapes analyzed. After talking with Officer Herbert, it would have become clear that the tapes could not be allowed to be analyzed at any cost. Judge Creed then allegedly switched to hoping that John would just go away; he must have then told the probation officer to make John's probation as light as possible.

In February of 1993, the Sixth Appellate Court with its judges appointed by Governor Wilson, finally ruled on John's appeal. They displayed their devotion to political correctness and their grasp of reality with the following decision (paraphrased here): "The evidence tapes are so damning that even if it was proven that they were altered by police, it is still clear that Mr. Webster is guilty of the charges against him". The Appellate Court thereby reaffirms the right of the Superior Court to NOT allow the evidence tapes to be analyzed.

[Back to "The Scam" menu.](#) or [Return using your Web Browser] or [[Site Map](#)]

This HTML document was modified 06/12/06 2:28 AM.