

To: "Norman List" <norman@jesusmusic.org> Subject: Note from Larry sent by Bill

APRIL 13, 1999

Dear Chatroom Friends,

When a lawyer needs to find out what is a lie, he must first know what the truth is. I'm not surprised that Sabbi's writeups seem "reasonable" at first glance. They were written to be taken that way, at the same time planting seeds of a bitter sort in the back of the reader's mind. But unless you know the truth, a lie often sounds reasonable.

Let's take a look together at Sabbi's modus operandi. Let's do it in letter form.

Phydeaux Presents
TAR WARS: CHAPTER ONE
THE PHANTOM MINOS

Dearest David Sabatino,

I've noticed you like the pirarucu style of communication, lazy circles which define your territory. So we'll do this formally.

Perhaps you have imagined that by using words, and twisting them in whatever direction serves your temporary mood, you can project an image of yourself as a kind person who wishes only the best for others, such as myself, while maintaining the "objective" position of a "responsible journalist."

Anyone who has read The National Enquirer or The Star has already been informed that "the public has a right to know."

What do we know about you? Not much perhaps, except that in many of your emails you keep reminding the group that you used to live in Canada and now live in America. I won't point out why you keep saying this because I'm sure the Canadians in the chatroom will pick up on this thread. And you also like to remind them of your position at an American magazine.

And I, being more familiar with you than any of them, have seen how devoted you are to your "calling" and that you, as an "historian," have always carried out your solemn obligation to record all of the facts for posterity - even if you, as witnessed in your book, have to make them up.

In fact, might not the quotes from your book, recently posted by you to the chatroom, be perhaps a logical place to start? And might they also present some of the best evidence in regard to the nature of your personality and your benevolent motives? This is just a question, not a statement. Is it part of your M.O. to hurt others but have them regard you as benevolent?

Because I see two different people when I look at you. You email kind, personal messages to me but the next day send very different messages to the chatroom. Why is this? We should perhaps save this question for later.

First, let's take a look at your book.

THE ACCUSATION: IN ANOTHER LAND / PAGE 190 - Is not saying that I titled my album "In Another Land" because, most likely, it was inspired by Van Morrison's "Astral Weeks" just one of your typical leaps of faith into fiction when fact is not available? (a small thing, indeed, which is why I use it now / but part of your pattern.)

THE ACCUSATION: ONLY VISITING THIS PLANET / PAGE 1U9 - Or that I got the idea for "Why Should The Devil Have All The Good Music" from the liner notes of Randy Matthew's first album (which I believe was titled "Wish We'd All Been Ready" and contained my song - which you failed to mention, didn't you? Who was copying who?) Why didn't you assume I was inspired by both Martin Luther and William Booth who each asked a similar question. (a small thing, but an assumption / you could have asked me about it.)

AND NOW WE GET TO THE BEST PARTS:

THE ACCUSATION: THE ISRAEL TAPES / PAGE 191 - On "The Israel Tapes" with People! you say "The title is intentionally misleading. Since Norman's first band was called People, listeners are lead (sic?) to believe that this is a reunion lp. Norman claims that he simply played on stage with 'people.' " (Whoa, Secretariat.)

David, this is even worse. You are first saying that I'm "intentionally misleading" fans with the title, which is a lie. Then you are saying that I "claim" something which you know I've never said at all.

THE FACTS: When I left People! Gene Mason followed soon after. Then he and I got back together and recorded with Frosty, the famous S.F. drummer, and made our own record. Then, in 1974, Gene and I re-formed People! because all the others had quit using the name, DID YOU CATCH THIS...WE NOW TOOK OVER THE RIGHTS and we called in Gary Burriss and Gary Pomeroy and Robb Thomas - THESE ARE NOT JUST "SOME PEOPLE" I "SIMPLY" PLAYED ON STAGE WITH. THIS WAS THE SELECTIVE LINE-UP FOR THE RE-FORMING OF THE PEOPLE! USING ONLY THE SAN JOSE MUSICIANS.

MORE INFORMATION: Why would a "re-union" only be valid if we had every single member from the original line-up? BUT THEN, I NEVER SAID "REUNION" - YOU DID. You put this word ("re-union") in your book, just to create another thing to condemn me for. You also are the one who uses the word "CLAIMS," and then turns that against me.

When Gene and I re-FORMED People! in 1974, we chose only from the San Jose

People! group of musicians which we had already played with. Our beloved brothers.

THE PROOF: Get out your "Israel Tapes" album and LOOK AT THE BACK PHOTO. From left to right: Gary Pomeroy (who also played guitar on Copper Wires), Gene Mason, Me, Robb Thomas (Pomeroy and I gave the eulogies at Robb's funeral two years ago), and Gary Burris who still plays with Pomeroy. We are all still friends. WE STILL OWN THE NAME "PEOPLE!" UNTIL WE RELINQUISH IT.

NOW ANOTHER INJECTION OF SABBI-STYLE FICTION.

THE ACCUSATION: PAGE 191 - On "Something New Under The Son" you say that the theme of the album, a pilgrim's journey through life, is "a brilliant explanation to blur the intent of what amounts to malicious lyrical content directed at his ex-wife ("Feeling So Bad" and "I Feel Like Dying" in particular.) Though he denies it, the album should be viewed as autobiography since Norman was struggling through his own divorce and identity crisis at the time. (Though most Norman collectors consider it one of his greatest albums (myself included), Word Record executives should have made him rewrite some of the lyrics.)

(Wow, David, if you had been President of Word you could have made me 'MODERATE MYSELF' - something you are furious with Bill Hammell for suggesting.)

THE FACTS: This is apparently another PERFECT EXAMPLE of how you do HISTORICAL RESEARCH. If you had used your fingers to do the math you would have remembered that I handed this album into Word in 1976 and they sat on it. I went on tour with Pamela in 1977. She didn't let me know she wanted a divorce so she could marry the guitar player in The Osmonds' group until 1980.

OR: If you had checked with Capitol, or BMI, or the Library of Congress, you would have found out that I wrote "Feeling So Bad" in 1969. I didn't even meet Pamela until 1971. You would have found out that I wrote "I Feel Like Dying" the same year I recorded the album - five years before the divorce.

If you had listened to the album closely you would have realized that the pilgrim THINKS his girlfriend is having an affair because (in "Feeling So Bad" he follows her to a church. She comes out with a satisfied look on her face. He thinks that this proves she met her "secret lover" inside...when in fact there is none.

In "I Feel Like Dying" Pilgrim is lamenting her unfaithfulness, when, truly, the only one she has fallen in love with is Jesus.

In "Born To Be Unlucky" he is feeling sorry for himself, reviewing his difficult upbringing, the lack of love in his childhood, and tries to drown himself, and then has an encounter with a Christian in which he receives Christ but then thinks his baptism is an attempt to humiliate him by putting him back in the river. (Word took out the jubilant passage in which Pilgrim prays to God in a mixture of African and other words,

because they thought I was singing in tongues. "Kumbaya Massa YHWH Jah" is very obvious, I would think. But Word, ever diligent that their Christian consumers not be exposed to too much spiritual content, got out their knives once again.)

In "Watch What You're Doing" Pilgrim begins the first step in the process of conversion, and working out his salvation with fear and trembling. He is very negative and sullen as he becomes familiar with the side of God that is Justice.

In "Leaving The Past Behind" he makes the transition from Hell to Heaven, from death into life, from darkness into light and leaves the past behind, dying to self and being reborn into glory. He begins to leave his burden behind and move into the joy of tLe Lord.

In "Put Your Life Into His Hand" he praises God (and although I'm sure a few of you would want this taken off of AN AUDIENCE OF ONE, it too is "praise music." giggle.)

WHOA, STOP THE MUSIC: Before I try to explain ALL of my songs to you, I should try to get back to the subject: WHAT DAVID REALLY FEELS ABOUT LARRY.

TO QUOTE YOU AGAIN: "and I take back nothing of what I said. In fact, I think they are very congratulatory of Larry Norman."

LET'S LO K AT THE FACTS: Alright, David, let's take an inventory of how you have congratulated me so far in your published book:

SO FAR, in your BOOK, you've said I had been "intentionally misleading" people, been "malicious" to the woman I loved (on SNUTS the album on which the cover was to feature her and I sitting together), and that I have stolen ideas from Randy Matthews and Van Morrison, etc. etc. on and on.

CONGRATULATORY??? COMPLIMENTS???: And elsewhere you claimed that I lied when I said I began writing these songs in 1956. You have said that a Jimi Hendrix imitation power trio, Agape, (a group which I took into the studio and recorded in 1969) was the true inspiration for me beginning to write Christian Rock music. Could it be that because you were to profit directly from the sale of your Sabatino pressings of the Agape albums, that it was a little self-serving of you to push this theory?

COGITATE THIS: So how do you explain the music which I published with Capitol before I ever mek Agape? Even "Born To Be Unlucky" and "Hard Luck Bad News Blues" were published between 1961 to 1963. (I don't have the time to dig through my files right now to find the exact year.) And why didn't you ever, once, ask ME about any of these things which you have printed as being the TRUTH? If you think that I'm a liar wouldn't it have been fascinating for you, as a super-sleuth reporter, to catch me on tape making up some fishy tales?

Why didn't you ask my mother any questions? Why didn't you ask Charles? He grew up listening to these songs? Why didn't you ask my publisher at Capitol Records? They know ALL the various years the songs were copyrighted. Why didn't you ask my sisters? I used to make them sing these songs with me to reproduce the harmonies of "Hard Luck Bad News," for example, in exchange for having to "play house with them" on Saturdays. And we had this arrangement going since 1955. Kristy was five, Nancy was six. The ukulele I had found in my father's closet in 1952 had become my main interest. The girls obliged me with harmony if I obliged them by being the dog when we played house. (Being the dog because I refused to be the Daddy ... as in - NANCY: "O.K. Kristy you can be the little girl and I'll be the Mommy, and Larry can be the Daddy." LARRY: "No, I'll be the dog again.")

My father was so proud of us that he took us to the Ted Mack's Amateur Hour. It was later when he heard some of the other songs we had NEVER performed for "company" that he became fearful of my direction. And in 1956 he told me I could never listen to the radio again...blah, blah, blah. You get the idea. So, David, why didn't you ever TALK TO MY FATHER and find out a little history from him?

BUT WAIT: I'm sorry. I should have quoted you directly from your book, because here, too, you talk about AGAPE's role in my evolution:

THE ACCUSATION: PAGE 158 - "Agape became a mainstay at Hollywood First Presbyterian's Salt Company coffeehouse and is cited as being the impetus for Larry Norman to be in to play religious oriented music."

Oh, I see. Not only didn't I write Christian Rock music before 1969, but I didn't even write RELIGIOUS music until I took AGAPE into the studio to make their first recording. In addition to the other songs, copyrighted by the Library of Congress, what about "religious oriented" songs like "Country Church, Country People," "Walking Backwards Down The Stairs," "Pardon Me," "Moses," etc.

AND all the other "religious oriented" music I wrote for my high school YoC group meetings? The soft stuff ... which was all that the leader would permit; he, too, being afraid of anything that didn't sound like Ralph Carmichael? DOES THAT NOT COUNT as "religious music" because it was not as HARD as my earlier rock and blues songs that I've already mentioned?

SO, DAVID, WHAT IS THE FIRST "RELIGIOUS ORIENTED SONG" I WROTE - ACCORDING TO YOU AND YOUR THEORY OF EVOLUTION?

----- ***** -----

ONCE AGAIN, TO QUOTE FROM YOUR EMAIL: "I have read and re-read these citations a hundred and fifty times, and I take back nothing of what I said. In fact, I think they are very congratulatory of Larry Norman. But that is only my opinion."

CONTINUING QUOTE: "One other thing before you read them. I would like to go on record by stating that I put each and every one of these discographical citations under Larry's nose before they were printed. He said nothing about them, and thus, I printed them. What I did not want happening was Larry to come back and say "I have been blindsided. . . once again. . . poor me. . . everyone hates me." I bent over backwards getting that stuff to him, soliciting his opinion." END OF QUOTE

THE FACTS, DAVID: The fact that I looked at your papers when I came to your apartment didn't mean I agreed with your theories! Why are you trying to push this deception? And if I had been silent, which I wasn't, why would that mean that I agreed with you?

When I looked at your stuff, I didn't say it was accurate at all. In fact, as Charly and Matt sat in your living room, listening to our conversation, I argued with you in your bedroom for almost 45 minutes, trying to correct your ideas and also taking you to task for many other things you've promoted and still perpetuate.

While in your room I even read OTHER statements by other people you had "interviewed." I told you what was correct and what was inaccurate; even gave you clues on where to look for more information, who to talk to, and told you where skeletons were buried in case you ever wanted to find out who was a truth-teller and who was a prevaricator. I finally had to leave because Charly and Matt were so bored, listening to us argue.

I'm sure you didn't ask the other artists any of the embarrassing questions you could have, because you are already pre-disposed to uplift them and down-thrust me. Throughout your book this is made clear.

THE ACCUSATION: THE SKY IS FALLING / PAGE 202 - "his exaggerative liner notes which offer the tacit explanation that Bob Dylan became a Christian while attending a Bible study which began in Larry's house. The truth of the matter is that his involvement at the Vineyard was nominal and that his statements are self-aggrandizing."

THE FACTS: When I met Ken Gulliksen he was a student of Chuck Smith's. He said he wanted to reach out to people in music. I had already begun a Bible study for actors and musicians so I said he could lead the weekly studies because I was on tour so often. We both agreed to call our meeting The Vineyard. I supplied AeL of the artists and their friends from my own phone book. I paid for all of the food and drinks. I even gave Ken money to help support Joanie and him. We held it in my living room from 1974 to 1977 when I had to go on my world tour. By then we had so many people that we had to divide the kids into several different houses and meet on Sundays at the Leo Carillo Beach because it was free (no rent) and we had over 200 kids attending by then. But I guess three years is nominal to you. The fact that Ken never mentions any of us when he talks about The Vineyard is of little concern to us. In fact, his inability to

"share" and "let go" so that God could move is one of the reasons that he was pushed out of The Vineyard and is today a bitter person.

HOW TO RESEARCH A FACT: As a "journalist" myself, I have always double and triple verified a story before printing it. For instance, the commentary in "White Light Into Darkened Corners" was very accurate. Example: My comments about Leon Russell came from his producer Denny Cordell (WHILE THEY WERE STILL THE BEST OF FRIENDS AND WORKING TOGETHER).

Didn't it ever occur to you that things said by people who are not my friends might be intentionally misleading? If Leon Russell had already signed up with a different producer and a different label than Cordell's Shelter Records, I would not have accepted what he said as being true, merely because I like his label's catalogue, or like his production skills. If one artist is no longer working with another artist, you must be careful not to be prejudiced by what may be a hidden motive on their part. And in the case of your "sources" for me, their motives were hardly "hidden" since they were commonly espoused in anger through the printed press, radio interviews, backstage and sometimes obliquely-but-pointedly on-stage, and in phone calls to promoters. (The last I know about because the promoters usually called me immediately afterward.)

TAKING A LOOK AT YOU: My current discussion of your motives and personality is not based merely on your book or even your chatroom comments. I have been watching you for years. Don't you realize that the people you gossip to inevitably find it too delicious to pass up the chance to tell me what you've said. And I don't accept what they tell me as being the truth unless one or two more people tell me the same thing. I try to be fair with you and give you every opportunity to be a decent person. But after hearing the exact same things over and over from different people who don't even know one another - I take what they say as being very likely to be true. And then I ask you about it, and you yourself confirm it. How much more fair can I be?

YOU USED AN OUTSIDE EXAMPLE, ALSO OF WHICH YOU KNOW VERY LITTLE: David says with great relish: "I was reading a biography of Van Morrison the other day, and I heard that Van is suing Steve Turner (Larry's poet/writer friend from the UK) for writing a book about Morrison ("It's Too Late to Stop Now"). No artist likes historians/journalists trying to pigeonhole them or trying to get inside their heads. . . but this is what historians/journalists do. And thus, the tension is always going to be there. C'est la guerre.

THE FACT: Van hired Steve to write the book on him, paid him, gave him the phone numbers of all the friends and musicians he wanted Steve to talk to, and furnished all the photos for the book. Steve wrote the book, Van loved it, gave it to the publisher (since he himself owned it) but months later when it came out, people started calling Van up to tell him that perhaps the book revealed too much. Van then began to feel so apprehensive that he sent his people out to buy up all the books in London, tried to buy the book back from the publisher, threatened the publisher, and is now

threatening Steve Turner. Interesting fellow, Van. This is not the first time he's been in this quandary. If he didn't like the book, he should have decided it when he first read it and turned it over to the publishing house.

AN OUTSIDE EXAMPLE OF MY OWN: When Steve Turner wrote a book about me during the '77 World Tour (you know, David, when Word rejected "Something New Under The Sun" because it was too bluesy and rocky ... all those childhood tunes about hard luck, bad news etc. I guess ... so Pam and I took off on a world tour so I could get out of the studio) and when I saw the book I told Steve it wasn't mean enough, wasn't dark enough. So he re-drafted it and I loved it, but Word hated it and wanted their advance back so I paid Steve all of the money out of my own pocket ... it wasn't his fault the book was too dark, it was my decision. So much for your theory about artists not wanting the dark pigeonhole inside their head to be revealed.

WHY DID I WANT IT DARKER?: Because I didn't want a flattering "puff piece" the ilk of which rock biographies tend to conform. The truth is sometimes ugly, but it's always more interesting than a bunch of shallow conjectures and fabrications from the fertile mind of a journalist/historian. Uh, oh. Did I say "fertile?" Perhaps, I meant "feral."

TO QUOTE YOU: "I took issue at the Jesus Music reunion (recently, in Nashville...LN) when you said 'there are people who think they can compose a psychological profile of you. . . that they try to know everything just so that they can look important to other people.' No no no. Not it at all. Getting into the head of those that are biographical subjects is part of the process of trying to understand. Nelson's biography said it best when he stated, "I have become Nelson." I'm not going to explain that, because I think it should explain itself. As annoying as it may be to a research subject who is still alive (and I do realize that part of it too), there is not much I can do about that."

MY RESPONSE: Brother David, before you "become Norman" wouldn't you have to "talk to Norman?"

I'll bet Nelson's biographer wrote a few other books before he tackled Nelson's story. And as for you "becoming me"... have you yet spoken to my mother, brother, sisters, pastor ... or anyone else except for the people I worked with TWENTY YEARS AGO? No, you haven't.

TO QUOTE YOU: "Okay, brother. . . you want seriousness, here you go. You deserve this much. My calling, and I use that word with careful understanding, is as an observer to the body of Christ. I feel resonance with Muggeridge when he says that life was basically surreal to him, that he always felt like a stranger in a strange land, that he was simply to reflect on the days events and offer perspective. As I was wrestling and working through all of this, I fell into a life of the perpetual student. I took graduate degrees in theology and history to facilitate my understanding."

MY RESPONSE: Oh, I didn't realize you had degrees in both theology and history. Where did you get your degree in theology? What school gave you a degree in

history? Was one of these a major and the other a minor, or both majors, or both minors?

TO QUOTE YOU "I think I have been successful in putting together the various pieces of the puzzle and hope to offer some of my insights to others who are interested. Deep down, that is all I am. Just a scribe called of God who said, "make sense of what I was doing in the 1960s."

MY RESPONSE: But your book doesn't really contain a perspective on what happened in the 60's. It is a compendium of cross references to books and articles other people have written and published, your personal opinions on different albums that came out, and some direct quotes here and there. It only contains 21 pages of personal perspective. Then 116 pages which list other people's books and magazine articles, 10 pages of cult articles and names, and 144 pages of album reviews. So out of 265 pages, there are only 21 pages of your perspective, and most of this is second hand information. Which is alright, David. You weren't there. I WAS.

And I have already praised your book to others, for what it is. Right now we're only talking about what it isn't. It isn't very objective and it isn't very accurate. It's okay that you misspell people's names (even famous people like Todd Rundgren - with two d's -) and there are a lot of much more serious errors.

But I think your book is something significant for bringing so many things together. These things are available in other books. But they're not available all together in one book. So I commend you.

And that's why I earlier encouraged you to write another book as a follow-up and really dig into the subject. You haven't written a history of The Jesus Movement. You have written a bibliography with personal album reviews. And it's a great place to begin.

FROM WHAT I CAN SEE: I certainly don't have a thorough knowledge of all the articles and books your bibliography refers to, but you have made many mistakes on your thumbnail sketches of my recordings, and other people's albums, and assumptions (like WELCOME TO PARADISE / PAGE 202 blaming me for Randy's claiming to have sat in with Robert Plant, etc. instead of him for claiming it) and in GET ME OUT OF HOLLYWOOD / PAGE 201 claiming that "the bulk of the pressings were destroyed" for "Get Me Out Of Hollywood," when the fact is that there NEVER WERE ANY PRESSINGS outside of the one each - made for me, Randy, and the top executives who listened and decided to pass on the project. The discs had only a pea green label with no printing on it. There weren't even ten copies pressed. None were destroyed. And not even one copy exists with any printing on it. Just a small thing. But, as you do throughout your book, you seem to be making up the facts, or mis-reporting them, to romanticize your information and appear to have "The Inside Story."

Time and again you seem to show your preferences and prejudices clumsily enough in your writings to spoil any claims of "objectivity" or to garner you much respect as a "journalist/historian." I don't think your bias is well hidden enough to disguise your intemperate theories. And, agrin, I do think you will dazzle us in your future writings. I don't believe you can resist this venomous proclivity you have demonstrated, but people CAN change. And I don't want to sound too "heavy" with what I just said. Or too negative.

I have faith that you could be a good man and do good works and write good books. But you cannot get sweet water and bitter water out of the same well. I didn't make this up; Jesus said it. So it's all a matter of you deciding if you're going to be evil or you're going to be righteous. You can't be both - and you can't choose one or the other whenever you feel like it. Be hot or cold, David, or God will spew you out of His mouth. (I don't mean your salvation is at stake in the way you comport your opinions. I just mean that God will bless your work if you do it for HIM and not do it to make points with people, or try to impress people. Nobody cares that you no longer live in Canada. Nobody cares what magazine you work for. They care about YOU. They are deciding to be your friend, or beware of you, based on what you say to them and how you treat them as a person. Treat them kindly. Treat them with deference, preferring them, as the Bible says, over your own needs, and love them / encourage them - don't be competitive with them.

AN ASIDE: David, I think you agree that it's fair for me to be writing to YOU in this chatroom, since you're addressing me here. But you also think it's fair to write about ME in a BOOK, a resource book that will be in libraries all over the world. What will future generations think about me when they read your accusations?

They won't even question your veracity, remember, because they've never even had to share a chatroom with you. So they'll assume you're some wise college professor, teaching somewhere, who would be risking his reputation if he were to tell a lie. So, David, your theories are so far unassailed, except in this chatroom.

But I guess, following your line of reasoning, you would think it would be fair for me to publish things about you in a book, too. And I hope you would know, in advance, that you could count on me to be very fair toward you; not lying about you but simply sticking to the facts.

TO QUOTE YOU: "putting out something for public consumption, whether in a BOOK or in the liner notes of an album will stick around for a long time... it is part of the public record...people...sift through that stuff...you give me no choice. To avoid it means that I am not doing my job."

So, if I were to overlook your lies and accusations then perhaps I wouldn't be doing my job as an artist, which is to explain myself and re-interpret my SNUTS songs which were gravely misrepresented by you.

SO ADIEU, ADIEU, TO YOU AND YOU AND YOU

BY THE WAY: Does anyone still wonder why Dylan wrote "Ballad Of A Thin Man" and "Positively 4th Street?"

TO QUOTE YOU: "That being said, I am not intimidated by you or your tactics to back down from saying what I think to be true. The historical record reveals you in some of your uglier moments. 'I've Got You Out of My System' is not exactly Larry Norman at his height. If you put it out there, as a historian, I get to deal with it. You should think about that before you write something. The Internet is different. It is ephemeral. Stuff that is written disappears as fast as it is put up . . . why can't I say you have a nasty side against your ex-wife in SNUTS??? You took some shots at Randy and Terry and some of those boys that is out there (Barking at the Ants, The Blue book, etc.). . . and it is part of the public record of Larry Norman. Historians sift through that stuff, Larry. You give me no choice. To avoid it means that I am not doing my job."

MY RESPONSE: I used to wish EVERYONE had the blue book so they could weigh both sides for themselves. If you were doing your job you would be weighing all of this, too. In 1985 I recorded "Out Of My System" on "Stop This Flight." Where in the song does it identify that I'm singing about my wife? Is this another theory like the one about "Feeling So Bad" and "I Feel Like Dying" being about my wife?

Why didn't you consider the possibility that the song might be an answer to a popular song from the year before: "You're In My System." Though my personal experience weaves threads through my music it is not as autobiographical as you would like people to think. I try to keep my personal suffering at a minimum when in public or on record. Very few of the "I" songs are about me. "I Am The Six O'Clock News;" "Pardon Me;" even "I Wish We'd All Been Ready." (Because in IWWABR I would hope to be long gone before "I" starts recounting the Armageddon debacle.)

Trying to DEFEND myself against "the boys" is not the same thing as initiating attacks, year after year. To some observers, continual accusation might even beg a defense. However, I regret that I defended myself in any way; have apologized for this stuff publicly, on the radio, and in front of the GMA industry and personally in letters to "all the boys" - and have tried to make physical reparations by offering to return all the publishing, and to one artist even offered to buy his entire Word publishing catalogue and gift him outright with all of the copyrights to increase his personal wealth at my expense.

REGARDING DEFENSE: Some fans think that I had a right to defend myself. In my brain damaged capacity I, too, thought so. After getting healed and also finding out that God loves me I now feel that it is wrong to try and clear up the record with information that might reflect personally upon anyone else. Therefore, artists who were former friends can now say what they want about me and I will not write in defense or in retribution.

WHO BENEFITS: In fact, because I've repented publicly for past skirmishes and tried to improve the personal finances of the boys, I can't think of anyone who could possibly profit from talking about these things anymore except for...possibly...a journalist/historian (who can't avoid "doing his job") ... which is, I guess, to mis-report information, fabricate motives, accuse of misleading, lying, stealing, and being malicious to the wife he loved - just in case five years later she might fall in love with someone else and want a divorce.

UNDER YOUR NOSE: By the way, I notice you put a photo of me with Pamela at the very front of your book. (Courtesy of Pam Norman) it says. I think you mean Pam Newman. Or were you afraid someone might miss it? So, did you take a look at the picture? We're sitting there smiling, doing a joint interview for the press. Do you see how happy we were together one year after I finished "Something New Under The Son?" See, you didn't even need to count on your fingers. The visual proof was right there all along, at the very beginning of your own book. This photo was taken the year AFTER I finished SNUTS.

BACK TO YOU AND THE QUOTE: "That being said, I am not intimidated by you or your tactics to back down from saying what I think to be true."

MY RESPONSE: Who is tryina to intimidate you? What tactics?

(Does this remind anyone else of the final page of "The Telltale Heart" by Edgar Allen Poe?)

SUMMATION: Yes, David. One might think you ARE so brave in standing up straight, looking into the face of the facts, and saying "The truth does not intimidate me ... I'm a journalist."

OK, David. I've had my fun, if you can call it that. I love you, which possibly bothers you. You're not my enemy, even if you want to be. Satan already has that position filled. I still have all the love and compassion that I had for you after our first meeting in your father's mansion. I saw the potential in Keith Green and Randy Stonehill during the years I watched them take drugs. I signed Tom Howard to a contract without hearing even one of his songs for the album. I've bought young people guitars, tape recorders and other things to encourage them.

And I'm saying that I see potential in you that you possibly do not yet see in yourself. I want to push you in that direction, which means I cannot let you get away with reveling in your subtle comments and attacks. It's the salacious rejoicing in your sin that is the thing I worry about most in you. For instance, read the next quote.

ONE LAST QUOTE FROM YOU: "I get emails from all sorts of people saying that they find my odd sense of humor amusing. It is also a tremendously interesting forum

exposing human nature. I do admit to getting a kick out of stirring up a hornet's nest and then sitting back and listening and/or watching. I do it in real life too, so don't think it is just here in my "lonely existence" on the Internet. This is how I teach Sunday School, or am when discussing theology."

MY RESPONSE: I'm so glad I didn't have you for a Sunday school teacher. You might have enjoyed attacking me and humiliating me in front of the class and then sitting back and listening and/or watching how forcefully you had pushed me into the hornet's nest.

And you've just corroborated a concept I offered many emails ago. "...You don't just do this on the Internet. You do it in real life, too..."

SELAH.

Larry Norman

A FINAL QUOTE FOR THE CHATROOM OBSERVERS:

TO QUOTE DAVID: I covet your input, and if I have herein been a "nefarious backstabber," I will repent in sackcloth and ashes.

MY RESPONSE: David, have you have repented of any attacks upon my reputation before? Not that I know of. When I have patiently given you as much information as I could to develop your ideas, you have never altered them. Anyway, for all the years of gossip and lies, and your book - I have already forgiven you. And now you say you covet the chatroom's response. I'm sure they will forgive you. But without true remorse and repentance, what good will you receive from it?

THOUGH THERE'S A LOT MORE IN YOUR BOOK, I THINK I SHOULD FINISH NOW.

TO QUOTE DAVID: (REGARDING ONLY VISITING THIS PLANET) "In 1988 it was voted the number one Christian album of all time by a Contemporary Christian Music Reader's Poll."

MY RESPONSE: Although this might seem a very small thing, again, this is simply not true. As "flattering" or "positive" as it might seem, as far as a journalist/historian observations goes, it is just not factual. Not correct. It was a poll of music CRITICS, not readers. (Since CCM readers are so young they might well have picked NONE of my albums, nor have more than a vague association with my name.) Your book is filled with such errors. Not just about me and my life, but about MANY things. Maybe, like you said, it doesn't matter because you think maybe only 100 people will read it. But

printing something "positive" about me, even if it was slightly wrong, does not un-do all of the hateful things and seeds of doubt you have sown throughout the rest of your book.

And why am I supposed to be under the impression that you think if you compliment me with one hand, for albums I have recorded - for instance, that I must overlook your other hand when I am stabbed, gutted, and accused of things which are your outright lies and fabrications?

THINKING OUT LOUD: In your mind, does it work something like this? The Benevolent Sabo strikes again, but never mind folks, he complimented Larry's lyrical technique on the previous page so how can Larry be upset?

I've noticed that you speak warmly in his book about these artists who have threatened promoters that they wouldn't perform if I was invited to the same festival, and lied to reporters who were working on stories yet always insisted that they be kept anonymous so that the reader's imaginations would work overtime without any blood showing up on their hands. And you've seen some of this up-close because you "interviewed" them yourself ... but you think it's wrong for me to respond. And you're probably upset that I'm responding to you, now, for all the things you've done behind my back over the years, and all the things you've written in your book. What can I do, David? How can I help you if I remain silent?

I CLOSE NOW WITH AN EXAMPLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SCHISM. None of us here at Solid Rock can figure out who you really are. Either you are insincere or you cannot glue your psyche into one person. Otherwise, how can you vacillate back and forth from day to day, from Jekyll to Hyde, from the David who sends kind letters to me at my email address to the Sabbi who prowls the chatroom, exposing himself and chortling, "I do it in real life too, so don't think it is just here in my 'lonely existence' on the Internet."

I'm not trying to be unkind. I'm just hoping to help you see the effect you have on some who observe you. I assume you want people to notice you, and want them to react. I'm just not sure if YOU notice how destructive a lot of this is to your credibility and if you're getting the reaction you want.

But here is just one of the questionable letters you wrote to us here at Solid Rock:

Delivered-To: Inorman-kerry@larrynorman.com From: David DiSabatino
<ddisabatino@ccmcom.com Subject: Some cheese with your whine (Reprise) Date:
Thu, 21 Jan 1999 09:26:07 -0600

"Kerry,

"I am alarmed at some of the comments that stream from that board. . . but I would think you guys should steer clear of interacting like that with the fan base. As you can see, it just made things worse.

"From what I can gauge, there aren't that many people on there other than a couple of regulars.

"I always thought it best for an artist to hold his tongue when someone takes shots and such, however difficult that becomes at times.

"I believe in dissent against an artist or anyone that stands up and says something. It is what makes this the alleged "land of the free." But I also believe in intelligent dissent. . . which is not what you are getting from that board. All you are getting is a polarization of extremes that are either too congratulatory of Larry, or too nasty.

"The truth, at least in this instance, is probably somewhere in the middle. Someone that gets "press" can make one of two mistakes; taking the negatives too personally or believing the laud makes them something special. Larry should take his interaction with the fans from the concerts.. . not the Internet. The Internet is still a strange place where there is no accountability for what you say ..."

"be blessed,

"david di sabatino
worship leader magazine
107 kenner ave.
nashville, tn
37205"

END OF MY TRANSMISSION TO THE CHATROOM - APRIL 13, 1999 I hope I haven't been too hard on you. I'm just using your quotes and contrasting them with the facts. Have a good sleep David, and everyone else. After all, this amounts to nothing in the long run; in the course of our lives. Right? We're just here to sharpen our morals and consciences against our friends' insights - as does iron sharpen iron. May we all become much the better because of it.

==== for subscription commands <http://mail.jesusmusic.org/guest/RemoteListSummary/Norman>