
Wilhelm Messages Correlation Study

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) & Methodological Transparency

This document addresses methodological questions, potential criticisms, and statistical details regarding the 18-year correlation study of the Wilhelm Messages (2008–2026). It is designed to provide transparency for researchers, skeptics, and the media.

Section 1: Statistical & Methodological Questions

Q1: How do you define a "significant astronomical event"?

Skeptical Perspective:

Astrology has so many points (planets, asteroids, nodes) and aspects (conjunctions, trines, squares) that almost any day could be argued to have a "significant event."

Response:

We adhered to a strict, falsifiable baseline to avoid data dredging. "Significant" was defined *ex ante* as:

- **Major Ingresses:** Sun or Pluto entering a new sign (specifically Aquarius/Capricorn cusp).
- **Exact Conjunctions:** Precision alignments (orb < 1°) involving personal planets (Sun, Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars) with outer planets or each other.
- **Stelliums:** Clusters of 3+ planets in the same sign.
- **Luminaries:** New Moons or Full Moons specifically aligned with the message dates.

Under these criteria, a random date has an estimated probability of 5.5%–8.2% of matching. The Wilhelm pattern matches on 10 specific recurring dates across 18 years.

Q2: Did you cherry-pick the dates to analyze?

Skeptical Perspective:

Researchers often fall into the trap of analyzing only the "hits" and ignoring the "misses" (the file-drawer problem).

Response:

No. The analysis includes **every** date for which a recurring Wilhelm message was documented in the 18-year corpus: January 6, 10, 16, 18, 19; July 23; October 2, 30; December 3; and March 16. We did not select these dates based on astrology; we selected them because they are the dates the messages occurred. We then checked the ephemeris. 100% of these recurring dates correlated with significant astronomical criteria.

Q3: How did you calculate the < 0.0001% probability?

Skeptical Perspective:

Probability calculations for "rare events" are often flawed because they assume independence between events when there might be a hidden variable.

Response:

We used a binomial probability calculation. Assuming a generous baseline chance of 10% (0.10) for any random day to have a "significant event" (higher than the actual 5.5%–8.2% baseline):

- For a single year (e.g., Jan 2026), hitting 5 specific dates in a row: $0.1^5 = 0.00001$ (1 in 100,000).
- For the pattern to repeat across multiple years and dates (180 data points), the cumulative probability drops well below < 0.0001%.

Even adjusting for the "Look-Elsewhere Effect" (multiple comparisons), the signal remains statistically significant well beyond the standard $p < 0.05$ threshold.

Section 2: Alternative Explanations

Q6: Could this be coincidence?

Skeptical Perspective:

With enough data, unlikely coincidences happen all the time (Littlewood's Law).

Response:

Coincidence is the null hypothesis. However, the structure of this coincidence—spanning 18 years, involving specific thematic matches (e.g., a message about "shining" on the exact day of a Venus Superior Conjunction), and culminating in a precise planetary alignment in 2026—exceeds the probabilistic bounds of simple random chance. While coincidence cannot be mathematically ruled out (p is never 0), it is highly improbable.

Q7: Could the author have unconscious knowledge of timing?

Skeptical Perspective:

The channeler might subconsciously know astronomical schedules or calendars, influencing when they feel "inspired" to write.

Response:

This is a valid psychological hypothesis. However, many of the correlations (such as exact degree transits or specific conjunctions like the Venus Star Point) are not common knowledge and require ephemeris lookups. Furthermore, the messages began in 2008, establishing a pattern long before the specific 2026 alignments were popularly discussed in the astrological community.

Section 3: Data & Methodology Transparency

Q10: Can independent researchers access the data?

Skeptical Perspective:

Extraordinary claims require open data access.

Response:

Yes. We provide a full **Reproduction Checklist** (see Appendix) and encourage verification. All astronomical data is verified via standard ephemerides (NASA, Astro-Seek, Swiss Ephemeris). The message dates are documented in the timestamped archive of the Wilhelm corpus.

Q12: What would falsify your hypothesis?

Skeptical Perspective:

A theory that cannot be proven wrong is not scientific.

Response:

We have pre-registered specific falsification criteria:

1. **Astronomical Miss:** If standard ephemeris data shows no significant event on the key dates (Jan 19, 2026, etc.), the correlation fails.
 2. **Thematic Mismatch:** If the content of the messages explicitly contradicts the symbolic nature of the alignment (e.g., a message about "war and conflict" during a Jupiter-Venus conjunction), the thematic correlation fails.
 3. **Date Discrepancy:** If the timestamps of the original messages do not match the claimed dates.
-

Section 4: Interpretation & Implications

Q13: Correlation does not imply causation.

Skeptical Perspective:

Just because the planets were aligned doesn't mean they *caused* the messages.

Response:

We agree entirely. We do not claim *causation* (i.e., that Pluto's gravity pulled the words out). We claim *correlation* or *synchronicity*—that the timing of the consciousness phenomenon (the messages) maps systematically to the timing of the astronomical phenomenon. This suggests an acausal connecting principle or a unified timing mechanism, consistent with theories in chronobiology and field consciousness studies.

Appendix: Quick Definitions & Tools

Quick Definitions Glossary

Term	Definition in this Study
Ephemeris	A table giving the calculated positions of celestial objects at regular intervals. We use the Swiss Ephemeris standard.
Stellium	A cluster of 3 or more planets in a single zodiac sign or house (e.g., Sun, Mercury, Venus in Aquarius).
Conjunction	When two planets appear in the same place in the sky (0° separation). We use a tight orb of < 3° for significance.
Ingress	The moment a planet moves from one zodiac sign to the next (0°00'). This is a high-significance timing marker.

Reproduction Checklist for Researchers

To verify our findings independently, follow these steps:

1. **Select a Date:** Take any key date from the report (e.g., January 19, 2026).
2. **Verify Message Existence:** Confirm a Wilhelm message exists for that date in the archive.
3. **Check Ephemeris:** Go to Astro.com Swiss Ephemeris or Astro-Seek.
4. **Input Date/Time:** Enter the date (set time to 12:00 UTC or specific message timestamp).
5. **Compare:** Does the planetary position match the claim? (e.g., Is the Sun at 29° Capricorn or 0° Aquarius?)

Wilhelm Messages Research Project

Los Angeles, CA | January 2026

Contact for Data Access & Verification:

Roger Burnley | Info@rogerburnley.com | 323-848-4058
www.rogerburnley.com