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Abstract
This paper presents a review of papers and theories proposed by this author so far. Brief reviews, clarifications and corrections on the papers has been presented. Some papers yet require proof of validity. Some papers have been identified as wrong.

The two 'mutually exclusive' views - relativity and absolute motion/space - have remained 'impossible' to reconcile to this date. The discrepancies, contradictions and confusions between the numerous experiments and phenomena of light, the known postulates of light and notions of motion and space still seem to have no point of convergence. Generations of scientific communities have exhausted on these and there has been little progress. Hence, a final solution which can reconcile all these contradictions can never be taken for granted. Denial of absolute motion and absolute space has been the 'best' solution ever found, since Einstein. Although this may be part of the solution, it can not be taken as the whole solution as it has never ended all the controversies over (absolute and relative) motion/space and the speed of light.

Ever since I started working on alternative theories on these problems, I passed through these same confusions, especially during the early stages. There were several occasions when I was about to reject a theory of relativity in favor of a theory of absolute motion/space only to reverse my decision the next day or the next week : to reject an absolute theory in favor of a relativity theory.

Eventually, now I feel that these confusions seem to have been cleared up to some extent and the contradictions have converged towards some theoretical frame work which happens to include concepts from all the known postulates of light within new paradigms and describes all or most of the experiments and phenomena of light. There were also some bizarre consequences in some theories and it took a fairly long time to eliminate these from the theories. At least a reasonably coherent and comprehensive theoretical frame work has been developed. Testing these theories and hypotheses experimentally is the next logical step.

Therefore, I feel that this is the appropriate stage to review my papers.

The purpose of this paper is to briefly review all my papers in a single paper, in order to provide more important information and clarifications.

There are also some papers that may need major improvements or changes. Some other papers may need to be rejected because they are based on mistakes and wrong assumptions or are more speculative. And the validity of some papers is to be proved yet. All such papers have been referred to collectively in number (9) below. The final review and decision on each of these papers is a task to be done yet.
This review is not to be taken as a final one.

The papers are reviewed in the same general order that they were posted. Obviously, this review is for the versions of the papers which were posted before this paper.

1. 'Interpreting science from the perspective of religion'

This theory introduces a new way to reconcile science with religion.

One question which may arise is: 'if the sun swept the sky only once during all those millions of years, the dinosaur never experienced night. How could it survive such a condition?'
"Or, if there were billions of days and nights, with the sun sweeping the sky billions of years, but according to Genesis only one literal day is mentioned or implied?"

Even though the theory doesn’t state which one of these is correct and why, it introduces a new way of reconciling religion and science. So I strongly believe that this theory is, at the least, part of the solution (if not a complete solution).

2. "Corrections to Maxwell’s Equations - Invalidating the theory of Relativity ?!"

Maxwell’s equations may need a fundamental review. There may be some fundamental wrong assumption on which these equations are based: the ether or absolute space.

The new theory is based on an intuitive view that an EM wave is defined relative to its source and therefore is always 'attached' to it. From this it follows that the center of the wave fronts is always at (moving with) the source. Therefore, it follows that the speed of light depends on the speed of its source. During the formulation of this theory, I held the view that the wave is 'rigidly' connected to its source and I always felt this view as counterintuitive and never felt comfortable with it. A major change has been made to this view in papers/theories I proposed recently. I consider this as one of the most significant steps.

Despite the 'rigid' connection of the wave with its source, this paper identifies and attempts to solve a fundamental problem in Maxwell’s equations: 'detachment' of the wave from its source.

These equations need further major changes and improvements. They have to be reviewed to be in accordance with the new theory: 'Relativity of EM Fields/Waves'. The source observer relative velocity and the compression / expansion of the wave should be encompassed. If space has dual nature- absolute and relative - objective and intrinsic- what is the implication of this on Maxwell’s equations?

3. 'Modified Huygens Principle - Non linear propagation of EM Waves ..”

This theory was developed in an attempt to find an alternative explanation for the bending of light near massive objects, which is one of the phenomenon claimed as confirmation of Special Relativity. I finally found out a striking analogy: propagation of EM waves with motion of gases.
According to this theory, only light (EM wave) from an ideal isotropic source propagates in straight line.

One clarification:
We know that real sources are never isotropic. But, the waves emitted from the real source will propagate in non-linear paths (kind of spiral?) until they become distributed uniformly in every direction relative to the source. This will happen at infinite (or great) distances. Therefore, all real sources become isotropic when seen from infinite distances. Therefore, at infinite distances from the source in free space:
- light travels in straight line
- the source becomes isotropic

4. ‘The bending of light near massive objects is not due to their mass but due to their size. …’

In this paper the theory of ‘… Non linear propagation of EM waves …’ is applied to explain the bending of light near massive objects.


This theory resolves the light speed paradox in a very simple way. However, its early versions contained some bizarre consequences. In the latest version (version 5) these unintuitive features have been eliminated and the theory has now been developed to its final form, and is a simple, self evident and realistic solution to the light speed paradox.

6. ‘Dynamic Absolute Space’

This paper revealed and introduced a new paradigm: dynamism of absolute motion. However, it was developed within the old paradigm of objective absolute space. It can explain the MMX null result. However, it can not explain the Sagnac effect. That was why the ‘intrinsic’ paradigm was introduced in the next papers:
' Dual and Dynamic Nature of Space/ Motion’ and ’Absolute Motion is Intrinsic’. However, the explanation given in this paper for stellar aberration is not correct. This explanation was given before the discovery that the Relativity of EM Waves theory also predicts the transverse Doppler effect, which is predicted by Special Relativity. Originally I assumed the constancy of light speed for an observer moving directly towards or directly away from the source. Later I discovered that the speed of light is the same for all observers, i.e., the theory applies to all observers, including observers moving in the lateral direction (at 90 degrees) relative to the source, hence transverse Doppler effect.

7. ‘Dual and Dynamic Nature of Space’ and ‘Absolute motion is intrinsic’

These papers explain in detail the new paradigms of motion and space: dynamic, intrinsic and dual (absolute and relative) nature.
8. 'Relativity of EM Waves - Review and clarification'

This paper clarifies the 'Novel solution ... Relativity of EM waves' theory, clears the bizarre consequences, and briefly presents a complete form of the theory, in both the observer reference frames, explains it in relation to existing postulates.

9. Some of the papers not mentioned in this list are based on an objective absolute space paradigm, which I have abandoned in my latest papers. There are also other papers which need major changes/ improvements or which must be rejected. Some papers may be speculative or may need to be proved for validity.

The 'General Relativity of EM Waves' theory may be an unnecessary and a wrong theory which was a result of some mistake I made during the development of 'Relativity of EM Waves' theory. It states that the speed of light is different from $C$ if source and observer are in relative acceleration. However, the speed of light relative to any observer is always equal to $C$ irrespective of the relative or absolute motions of the source and the observer, including accelerations. The exception to this is when the source and the observer share the same motion, according to the 'Dual, dynamic and intrinsic' theories of motion.