Frequently Asked Questions

Here you will find some answers to some of the most commonly asked questions about the destruction of the World Trade Center skyscrapers on 9/11. As each FAQ response is published in our newsletter and posted on our website, it will be added to this page.

FAQ #1: Who demolished the Twin Towers and Building 7 and why?

We do not know who the perpetrators of this crime are. Identifying the culprits is the purpose of a real criminal investigation. However, we are able to provide overwhelming evidence of a cover-up of this crime. In addition, scientific forensic evidence indicates that only individuals who could gain long-term access inside the highly secure WTC skyscrapers and obtain advanced thermitic materials could have orchestrated the destruction of the Twin Towers and Building 7. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #2: What about the planes that slammed into the Twin Towers? Wouldn’t they have disturbed the demolition devices?

Some of the demolition devices were undoubtedly disturbed by the plane impacts, but not enough to prevent the rest of the devices from performing adequately. Even the NIST report states that the collapse of the North Tower started on a floor with fairly minor structural damage. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #3: What’s your assessment of the Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) hypothesis?

The DEW hypothesis is not supported by the forensic evidence, nor can it explain the available evidence, including the molten iron microspheres documented by USGS and RJ Lee, the molten metal at Ground Zero and the active thermitic material discovered in the WTC dust. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #4: Why weren’t the sounds that were heard during the destruction of the WTC skyscrapers on 9/11 as loud as the blasts heard in videos of known controlled demolitions?

Many sounds of explosions were in fact heard at the WTC on 9/11, and their continuous and rapid nature would make individual explosions very difficult to hear. In addition, thermite incendiary materials, which were identified in the WTC dust, create less noise than conventional explosives. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #5: What caused the isolated high-speed ejections of pulverized dust and debris from the Towers?

Video evidence shows that these ejections were composed of pulverized building materials, and they occurred at isolated, geometrically precise locations, in an engineered pattern which are attributable to explosives – not air pressure from above. In addition, the ejection speeds were too high to have been caused by the pressure of the collapsing structure above. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #6: Why does AE911Truth represent only a small percentage of architects and engineers?

Most architects and engineers have never been presented with the scientific evidence of controlled demolition. In addition, most of those who take the time to examine this evidence acknowledge that the official story can’t be true. As of the date of this publication, there are almost 1,700 architects and engineers who openly support
the findings of AE911Truth vs. only a few dozen who have openly supported the NIST WTC reports. Even so, in the end, the evidence stands on its own, regardless of how many professionals are aware of it. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #7: Aren’t the red-gray chips identified in the WTC dust merely primer paint from the WTC steel structural elements?

Key ingredients of the primer paint are not present in the chemical composition of the red-gray chips – and vice versa. More importantly, scientific tests have revealed that the red-gray chips ignite at 430° C, creating molten iron as a reaction product – characteristics that confirm they are thermitic material and not primer paint. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #8: What is nanothermite? Could it have been used to demolish the WTC towers?

Thermite is a mixture of a metal and the oxide of another metal that produces temperatures well in excess of 4000° F when ignited, certainly high enough to allow cuts through the structural steel of the Twin Towers. Nanothermite is a nano-engineered variant of thermite that can be formulated to be explosive, intensifying its destructive power. Residues of thermite and nanothermite were discovered in the WTC dust, which indicates they were used to destroy the WTC skyscrapers. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #9: Were the Twin Towers designed to withstand the impact of the airplanes?

Yes. Airplane impact tests that were conducted during the design of the Twin Towers showed that the skyscrapers would withstand the impact of a Boeing 707, which has more energy upon impact than the 767 aircraft that crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11. In the following years, lead WTC structural engineer John Skilling, WTC structural engineer Leslie Robertson and WTC construction manager Frank Demartini made statements that underscore that analysis. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #10: Did WTC 7 Owner Larry Silverstein Admit to Ordering the Controlled Demolition of the Building?

Larry Silverstein’s “pull it” statement is so cryptic and vague that it is impossible to know for sure what he was referring to. However, according to Fox News journalist Jeffrey Scott Shapiro, Silverstein tried to get approval to demolish WTC 7 on the afternoon of 9/11. Even though Silverstein’s statements have no bearing on the scientific evidence that proves WTC 7 was destroyed by controlled demolition, he should still be questioned in a future WTC investigation. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #11: Does the NIST WTC 7 computer animation of the collapse prove that the skyscraper came down by fire?

No. The NIST WTC 7 computer animation of the collapse does not even closely resemble the observations and actual video footage of the destruction in three main ways. A scientifically valid explanation of any phenomenon must account for the key observations. Moreover, a computer simulation does not constitute an explanation. It is merely a tool for determining and visualizing what might have happened if various assumptions are true. NIST has refused to disclose the computer inputs of its mathematical models. This makes it impossible for anyone to check their work. A more detailed answer is available here.

FAQ #12: Where are the 9/11 Whistleblowers?

Many of those who cannot accept the scientific evidence that refutes the official story of the collapse of the three WTC towers on 9/11/2001 argue, "If 9/11 was an inside operation, surely at least one whistleblower would have come forward by now. You couldn't keep something like that secret." While at first blush this argument might seem to be logical, closer examination shows that it makes no sense. Since scientific evidence has clearly shown that the official explanation for the destruction of the WTC skyscrapers cannot be true, the theory that
the official story must be true because there have been "no 9/11 whistleblowers" is entirely specious. A more detailed answer is available here.

**FAQ #13: Who was Responsible for the Controlled Demolition of the WTC Skyscrapers?**

Arguably, no question surrounding 9/11 arouses more intense interest than this one. An investigation of 9/11 will certainly not be complete until we know who perpetrated the crimes and until they are brought to justice. Crime scene investigators know that, "Physical evidence cannot be wrong; it cannot perjure itself; it cannot be wholly absent. Only its interpretation can err." (Paul Kirk, Crime Investigation) A more detailed answer is available here.

**FAQ #14: What was the Molten Metal Seen Pouring Out of the South Tower Minutes Before its Collapse — Steel and Iron, or Aluminum and/or Lead?**

Liquid metal was seen pouring out of the South Tower during the final seven minutes before its collapse on September 11, 2001. Was it a combination of steel and iron, or was it aluminum and/or lead? What was the molten metal reported under the rubble of the Twin Towers at Ground Zero? And why is the identification of the molten metal important? A more detailed answer is available here.