



Revivals And Church History :: Mozambique's Revival

Mozambique's Revival, on: 2005/7/14 23:25

Maybe you've heard of her. I heard of her thru Michael Tyrell (the guitarist of Jason Upton's band) (Michael has his own band too). Heidi Baker and her husband Rolland. Desperation from God. Truly desperate.

I heard one women (who was powerful) said 'after meeting Heidi, i felt i never knew God, so i fasted for 10 days after i met her, Heidi just gives you a spirit of NEED for God'. And later she said 'i thought i was extremely close to God, but after Heidi, i NEEDED MORE OF GOD. I felt in comparision i didn't know the Lord'. This is coming from a women of God.

Michael said 'She is raising the dead, casting out demons, healing the sick, all for the sake of the gospel.'

All in all, she (from what ive heard) is walking FULL of the Spirit and even overflowing at all times. (All, meaning like she is TRULY in Love with God, who makes our love for God look like a vapor).

Here is an article from The 700 Club. and links to her ministry is in the article.

<http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/news/050622a.asp>

Another article here. This is in Rolland's own words. (Heidi's husband)

inthenameofjesus.org

Two words, (from what ive heard) Heidi is characterized as, Desperate and Compassionate. She is desperate for God, like a SUPERNATURAL LOVE for God, i never knew love expanded that BIG. (i know what love is, but this is SUPERNATURAL) Compassionate, she is just serving these kids and people in Mozambique.

Someone said 'Heidi pretty much has the NATION, and she gives it to the Lord'.

Again, i don't know much about her husband, but i bet he is the same way. I hope this encourages all of you about TRUE revival in the world.

Re: Mozambique's Revival - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2005/7/14 23:37

Quote:
-----Again, i don't know much about her husband, but i bet he is the same way. I hope this encourages all of you about TRUE revival in the world.

I firmly believe this is NOT "true revival" and there are many excesses of an eronous kind in these types of ministries. The Word of God is neglected and spiritual experience is everything. I would be very weary looking to this example as something of an foundational stepping stone in my walk with Jesus Christ.

Re:, on: 2005/7/14 23:42

Really why?

Thousands are getting converted. Truly converted.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2005/7/14 23:58

This video is taken from the Toronto Airport Fellowship, I find her way of ministering very peculiar and unedifying. The way she is always interrupted with spasmodic sounds and words such as WHOOAAA! is quite strange and unbiblical.

October 3, 2003 - Toronto, Canada
Video of Toronto Service

This type of ministry has an appearance of Godliness but really is deceptive in many ways. I would rather be under a bible believing, teaching ministry that seeks first after Jesus Christ and the revelation of Him in scripture.

I don't doubt that God is doing something through this ministry or is using the preaching of His name. But I totally think it is a mis-representation of true Christianity and a shame to God's name in the end.

I can't bear to watch over 15 mins of this video. :-(

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2005/7/15 1:20

I love their ministry and firmly believe it is true revival that they are experiencing in Mozambique. These people are so simple and pure it seems crazy to us Westerners at first. But they have totally sold out to God!

I think they are more biblical than most of us. After all, they are experiencing God and raising the dead while most of us here in the Western Church are going to church week after week talking about Him. I'll take God's manifest presence over good Bible teaching anytime!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/15 5:10

Quote:

-----I'll take God's manifest presence over good Bible teaching anytime!

todd

do you really want to say this? How is this different to Jake's position of personal assessment taking priority over scriptural revelation?

Re:, on: 2005/7/15 10:25

I was thinking about this last night. "Bible or spiritual revelation".

I bet there has been a time in everyone's life where the bible seemed like a desert. A dry land. Even though it IS full of water. Just for some reason we can't find the river to our life at that present moment.

During those times, friends and random people, or random things (in nature, on t.v. a flyer in the street...etc) have always lifted me up. I'm not dissing the bible, nor am I elevating it above 'spiritual revelation' but putting it side by side. I don't think there is anything wrong with that. Any revelation should be able to be backed up with the Word. Simple as that.

When I was around a friend of mine, who was 100% sold out for Christ (still is). He witnessed left and right, he prophesied, he was walking with the Lord, (behind Him for that matter, 'following God'). And I was pierced to my heart, saying 'I need this, I have not even close to a drop of that passion he has for God'.

Yea, I read the bible, but the story of a friend, or the life of a friend in this case, caused me to be a radical Jesus Freak ever since. The bible never did that for me, technically it did :-P (WE are epistles to be read by every man/women)

Heidi's wooah is just a different response to feeling God. Some people shout, some people raise their hands, some people whisper, etc..etc (One person in my church shakes, and that actually bothers me, but maybe I could be in the wrong.. lol

Revivals And Church History :: Mozambique's Revival

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2005/7/15 10:33

Philo,
I don't see why not. If I am off here I am open to be corrected, but I feel very confident about what I said. I see the Scriptures mostly as a means to an end. Because the letter is dead but the Spirit gives life.

John 5:39-40

"You search the Scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is these that bear witness of Me; and you are unwilling to come to Me, that you may have life."

I believe that knowing God is an experience and it's what I want most of all. Life is not found in the Scriptures themselves, it's in coming to Jesus. That's why there are people who can study the Bible all day every day and never experience or know God.

I don't know who Jake is or what he said. Maybe you could tell me where to find that...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/15 15:19

Quote:

-----I don't know who Jake is or what he said. Maybe you could tell me where to find that...

Bubbaguy is the name of the artist formerly known as Jake. He is a modern 'Quaker' and whatever I say here he is likely to contest it but his bottom line is that the 'revelations' of the Bible must be subjected to his own 'inner light' and/or reason. This has led him to reject Paul, Revelation and much of the NT.

The question is 'is the blessing biblical'? That is to say is it consistent with what God has already revealed? Is it compatible with NT experience and teaching. Is there an objective way of measuring the 'manifestation/revelation' that I am watching?

I am not afraid of 'lively meetings'. I have probably been in meetings as wild as any that have been reported here on SI. I have jumped up and down until I was dizzy and clapped till my hands bled! For almost 2 years I attended one of the most extreme Pentecostal churches in the UK. (we English are not nearly so phlegmatic as we are often made out to be) I believe passionately in the 'manifestation of the Spirit'. I believe a church must have prophetic thread in its life; although the person who brings it may not call it that. I believe a body without the Spirit is dead; no matter how doctrinally accurate it may be.

However, I repeat my question, 'is there an objective way of assessing phenomena?' We are all inevitably subjective in our personal assessments which is why although I am strongly in favour of the leading of the Spirit in day to day life choices, I am much less comfortable to the 'witness of the Spirit' for matters affecting the whole church and doctrine. This is why we have the scriptures. In the first generation of the church this role was fulfilled through the availability of 'apostles of Christ' and their promise of infallible guidance. Since that time their 'infallible guidance' is enshrined in the Scriptures; not as an alternative to personal encounter with Christ.

When someone says 'the Lord told me' we can believe him or not, but when someone says 'the Lord told me to tell you' his utterance must be held to the measure of the scripture. When people advocate 'spectacular manifestations' as proofs of God's presence I say that God's public work and God's public statements of truth in the Scripture must be compatible. Your either/or is really a false dichotomy; God will not ignore His spoken testimony to us in the things that He does.

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2005/7/15 15:49

Philo,

Let me attempt to clarify. I think I see what you're saying and I think I agree with most of what you wrote, though I might think about it a little differently than you do.

I do believe that the Bible, the whole thing, is the plumbline to measure everything by as to whether or not we are to be open to it or closed to it. I am closed off to anything that *contradicts* the Bible. So clearly I am not coming from the same place as Jake. I believe in the authority of the Scriptures.

Quote:

"is there an objective way of assessing phenomena?"

My simple rule of thumb is that if it contradicts the Scriptures, it is to be rejected. However, you've probably heard this statement before and it has helped me as well:

"God will never contradict His Word. But He may contradict our understanding of His Word."

I think that is very important to keep in mind when attempting to assess phenomena as you speak of.

I think I see what you are saying about my either/or dichotomy being false, but maybe I don't fully see it because I still stand by my statement.

In reality I don't think we ever really have to make that choice, but in our hearts we may. But if we ever did have to make that choice, I think you'd make the same one as me.

If you were ever faced with the decision and let's say you had 2 doors in front of you- and you knew Jesus Himself was waiting for you on the other side of door #1 and the Bible itself (and perhaps your favorite Bible teacher) was waiting for you on the other side of door #2- and you were forced to make a decision... which would you pick?

I am all for the philosophy of the vital importance of both "The Word and the Spirit." But in my heart I know where my priorities are.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/15 17:26

Quote:
-----In reality I don't think we ever really have to make that choice, but in our hearts we may. But if we ever did have to make that choice, I think you'd make the same one as me.

If you were ever faced with the decision and let's say you had 2 doors in front of you- and you knew Jesus Himself was waiting for you on the other side of door #1 and the Bible itself (and perhaps your favorite Bible teacher) was waiting for you on the other side of door #2- and you were forced to make a decision... which would you pick?

We are not talking about the choice but the manner of the choice. We may make the same choice but why would I choose as I would? How will I know it isn't something which has transformed itself into an angel of light? (2 Cor 11:14) How would I know that in this instance even the 'elect' might not be deceived? I know that any revelation of Christ must be consistent with what has already been revealed of the Christ. Peter saw the Lord revealed in His glory on the mount of transfiguration but spoke of a 'more sure word of prophecy'. 2Pet. 1:19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; where unto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: and I am bidden to take heed to that more sure word of prophecy... until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts. This must mean that until Christ returns in Parousia my prime and final reference point will be the scripture.

It is not a question of choosing Christ or the Bible (BTW I have no favourite Bible teachers). It is a question of identifying Christ by means of the Bible. Because God has ordered it thus He will not reveal Himself in a way that is contrary to scripture. It is not that the Bible is greater than Christ but that the Bible is greater than my perception of Christ, and all my perceptions must be subject to the scriptural revelations. Is. 8:20 To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. ...no matter how bright the light might seem to be, if it does not speak (or show itself) according to this word (of the law and the testimony) it is because there is no light in it.

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2005/7/15 17:34

Philo,

I like your post and think it is full of wisdom. I think I fully agree with most of it.

Here's a couple possible exceptions...

You wrote:

"We are not talking about the choice but the manner of the choice."

I think we *were* talking about the choice but it seems we might be getting away from it. The statement I made that you seem to be questioning is, "I'll take God's manifest presence over good Bible teaching anytime!" Is this not about a choice?

You also wrote:

" This must mean that until Christ returns in Parousia my prime and final reference point will be the scripture."

Must it? The Scripture reference there seems kind of vague to me. And even if it must mean what you say, how confident are you in your understanding of Parousia?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/15 17:52

Quote:

-----I think we *were* talking about the choice but it seems we might be getting away from it. The statement I made that you seem to be questioning is, "I'll take God's manifest presence over good Bible teaching anytime!" Is this not about a choice?

It will result in choice but it is actually based on perceptions. How do you recognise 'God's manifest presence'? By comparing the current data against the previous data. The previous data here is not my preference for lively or quiet meetings but the revelation already entrusted to us. The Pentecostal may like to 'keep the pot boiling' and some in the past regarded that as evidence of 'manifest presence'; the Quaker will be seeking 'stillness' in which to hear the voice. These are both conditioned responses. The only objective route is to rigorously compare the latest data with the earliest ie 'what saith the scripture?'

Quote:

-----Must it? The Scripture reference there seems kind of vague to me. And even if it must mean what you say, how confident are you in your understanding of Parousia?

Parousia is the ultimate royal presence. In that Christ will return in like manner as we saw Him ascend, I am very confident. As regards men's scheduling of this I have little confidence.

Muddying the waters - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2005/7/15 18:11

Quote:

philologos wrote:

The only objective route is to rigorously compare the latest data with the earliest ie 'what saith the scripture?'

What do we do if the scripture is silent?

We are told to discern the spirits, what then is the measuring rod? It can't always be the word and it can't always be the Spirit. I feel that the gift of discernment is a gift not so much of discerning doctrinal error, but the error which lies within and at the root of men's actions. If that is true what do we do?

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2005/7/15 18:16

Philo,

I think we might be in agreement. It seems that ultimately God's manifest presence is recognized a mixture of both subjective and objective. And we must be careful that the subjective part does not violate the objective part.

Personally, up to this point in my life I have tended to experience God in a comparatively quiet manner. But I am open to different ways of experiencing God. I think I would be a fool to shut myself off from any legitimate way of experiencing Him. I want to know Him as much as He can be known. Don't we all...

Re: - posted by markm, on: 2005/7/15 18:37

Quote:

sermonindex wrote:

This video is taken from the Toronto Airport Fellowship, I find her way of ministering very peculiar and unedifying. The way she is always interrupted with spasmodic sounds and words such as WHOOAAA! is quite strange and unbiblical.

October 3, 2003 - Toronto, Canada
Video of Toronto Service

This type of ministry has an appearance of Godliness but really is deceptive in many ways. I would rather be under a bible believing, teaching ministry that seeks first after Jesus Christ and the revelation of Him in scripture.

I don't doubt that God is doing something through this ministry or is using the preaching of His name. But I totally think its a mis-representation of true Christianity and a shame to God's name in the end.

I can't bear to watch over 15 mins of this video. :(

I found the `WHOOOOAs` and the `YAYs` annoying at first also. Slightly unnerving and abrasive, especially since the audio quality is not great and the outbursts are louder than the talking. I wasn't sure at first if she was drunk on the spirit, or actually drunk. But I didn't want to dismiss it solely on the basis of preaching style, so I let it play on.

When she actually got into the message, she (mostly) regained composure and began preaching a message on absolute surrender. Much of what she was talking about was the very same notion of surrender that I've seen highlighted countless times on this site.

Keith Daniel and Ravenhill preached on similar themes of submitting to God's love so completely that the love of God just flows through you to the people around you. Both suggest that for revival to break out it would take such a person. If I'm not mistaken, Ravenhill went further and asked if such a person would not be accepted by the mainstream of the church. (On a side note, I wonder if anyone finds Daniel's or Ravenhill's gentile pounding on the podium annoying. Personally, I kinda like it.)

The uncomfortable and almost embarrassing beginning is used as an illustration later in the message. Are you willing to surrender so completely to God that you would be willing to go up on stage and make a fool of yourself if that would be God's will? (Sounds like an Art Katz question.)

Yes, there is the potential for excess ("Honey the Lord hasn't told me to wash those dishes, so I'm just waiting for Him to tell me... now where's the TV remote..."). Or the person who claims to be hearing from God, but really they stopped hearing anything (due to unrepentant sin?), and now they just blurt out or perform every imagination of their flesh and claim it to be from God.

And there is the potential (inevitability?) for those to come along who will emulate through the flesh the outward appearance of 'surrender' without actually surrendering.

But the same potential for abuse is found in sermons on this site. Maybe this is naive, but it seems that at some point we have to trust God to take care of those honestly seeking Him.

I don't know anything more about this speaker than just that one video. The style was not what I would normally listen to. But the message she preached was a familiar one to someone who comes to this site mainly to listen to the sermons.

To be so focused on the love of Jesus that all else melts away, and only His opinion matters. Whatever He wants, you'll do. And His love will flow through you to the nations.

At least that's what I got out of it.

Re: Muddying the waters - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/7/15 18:38

Quote:
-----We are told to discern the spirits, what then is the measuring rod? It can't always be the word and it can't always be the Spirit. I feel that the gift of discernment is a gift not so much of discerning doctrinal error, but the error which lies within and at the root of mens actions. If that is true what do we do?

We are told to judge/test spirits in 1 John 4:1. Which has the sense of thoroughly testing something and then adding your seal to it in affirmation. 'discerning of spirits' is a manifestation of the Spirit and in that sense would be involuntary. The context in each case is 'spirits' which is interesting in the light of the original thrust of this thread. Neither of these instances has to do with 'doctrine' but with the 'roots' of things.

Re:, on: 2005/7/15 23:03

I agree with Markm. They can be taken as truly drunk or drunk in the Spirit...or w/e in the beginning. I'm about an hour into it. And she is preaching, clearly, reading from the word of God, by now, she has quoted straight from the Word of God 3 times now. (At least 4 verses each).

There is another video, in brownsville. (When it was a real revival) She was just praying for God to 'ruin them'. Sounds crazy, but a lot of power in it. You can find it on fireonthealtar.com in the video section.

Re:, on: 2005/7/15 23:40

I heard from Heidi saying 'in the past 3 months, 8,000 muslims got saved'. She said that's normal. Is that revival? Or is that man's doing? Sorry if that's 'poking a finger' or something negative. Just something I heard and had to post, cause that's AWESOME!!!! yahoo!

Edit I just finished watching the video. The last 30 mins or so, was in worship. Prayer asking for God to come into people's lives more. For the 'laborers' that they might get rest and restoration. It blessed me a lot.

Re: - posted by Aussiedler, on: 2009/6/24 17:59

If you judge Heidi, then you have to judge Jackie Pullinger, because they are friends. and if you judge Pullinger, then you have to judge Ravenhill and Wilkerson, because they recommend Pullinger's ministry...

Re: , on: 2009/6/24 18:56

I don't believe it. Toronto was a fraud, Brownsville was fake and this garbage is just as phony.

No wonder we no longer attend a Pentecostal or Charismatic Fellowship.

Give me those dry Baptists, boring brethren and dull Christian Missionary Alliance anytime over this pseudo religious quackery.

Revivals And Church History :: Mozambique's Revival

Re: quackery., on: 2009/6/24 23:11

by Rev__Enue on 2009/6/24

"I don't believe it. Toronto was a fraud, Brownsville was fake and this garbage is just as phony.

No wonder we no longer attend a pentecostal or charismatic fellowship."

Give me those dry Baptists, boring brethren and dull Christian missionary alliance anytime over this pseudo religious quackery" .

Brothertom replied;

Well Rev; You and I are on the same page, believe it or not. It is the classic "Experience trumps the Word" heresy that is fueling the great falling away. We must look at the real fruit of the minister, and the history of doctrinal inclinations. Heidi Baker's is spurious , to say the least, and is a part of the infamous Elijah List HERETICS, that exalt their weird self proclaimed power over the foundations of the Gospel; ala the demonic Todd Bentley.

Her involvement in the rest of these lying moves of anti-Christ's spirits via Toronto and the rest, should be a validation to the discerning that she is the same.

The problem with reactionary thinking in a time such as this, is that you DO throw the baby out with the bathwater. Let us settle with nothing less than the Fullness of the Gospel; a pure holiness as fruit of a reformed life manifest in a real and loving body, that the World also identifies as holy and loving.

You must be born again by the Holy spirit. He will come and dwell within you and strive to possess you, if you let Him! Even though that the wicked puff at their perceived anointing, the Church goes on, as a remnant, learning how to love, and to serve one another and the lost.

your friend, Tom

Re: , on: 2009/6/25 13:00

Hello Tom!

I live in Toronto and we attended the Toronto "blessing" once at it's height in 1994.

It was everything you could imagine and worse.

Shaking, rattling, rolling and manifesting something for what seemed eons.

Anyway good to hear from you, we spoke once before here in this forum

rev

Re: Heidi's 'style' - posted by mjnjm, on: 2009/7/2 23:11

The first time I heard Heidi I thought she was a victim of tourette's (sic?) with a Christian manifestation...of course I'm kidding, but after reading her books I've decided that this is a result of her speaking while under the sometimes unmanageable power of the Holy Spirit. In regards to this, I also thought that maybe the affected style of many preachers; the affected speech, the breathy pauses etc. have resulted from many mimicking some long ago anointed speaker who was just trying to hold it together while under the 'power'.

Re: Heidi - posted by mjnjm, on: 2009/7/2 23:12

Quote:
-----If you judge heidi, than you have to judge jackie pullinger, because they are friends. and if you judge Pullinger, than you have to judge ravenhill and wilkerson, because they recommend pullingers ministry...

DITTO!!!!

Re: post deleted - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/7/3 10:35

post deleted

After posting some questions here I recalled that there has been a recent serious medical condition involved and I think it is best to remove my comments from this discussion.

I apologise for any disruption this may cause.

Re: 2005 thread - posted by JoanM, on: 2009/7/3 21:06

There are three links on this thread that kicked off this discussion. All pull up 404 Not found/moved pages.

1. cbn.com link
2. inthenameofjesus
3. Video of Toronto Service

Other link references on this site work so I do not think it is my computer. I found some related information on what you are calling the revival but nothing for #3. Can anyone help here with #3.

Maybe this is what happens when a thread from 2005 is, dare I say, revived for some purpose.

The beginning of a discussion regarding TRUTH and SPIRIT (oddly being shaped up here into TRUTH v. SPIRIT) is of far greater importance to me than discussing a particular ministry. For some reason threads on this fall quickly on the rocks. Perhaps this thread (given its title) is not the place to continue. I would like to view the "Video of Toronto Service" of this person or any actual ministry (not her reporting events/being interviewed) video of this person.