you say :

" From my analysis, only one form of energy "substance" is required, each quantum of which self-organizes by default according to the triply orthogonal structure related to electromagnetic energy, ***half of which*** stabilizes as unidirectional momentum energy ***while the other half oscillates transversely in standing mode between alternately displaying electric properties and then magnetic properties at the frequency determined by the amount of energy involved***, THE JUNCTION BETWEEN BOTH HALF SERVING AS A FULCRUM AGAINST WHICH THE MOMENTUM ENERGY HALF APPLIES PRESSURE TO DEFINE THE PARTICLE'S VELOCITY IN SPACE. "

I may ask for permission to object.

Frame-drag fields almost always have relative Eigenvalue magnitudes. The super-Poynting vector can be written in terms of two vector terms that are exactly the same as the vector terms in the Poynting vectors of the EM fields. Even here type III gravitational hopfion(s) are deemed to be involved. Let alone the fact that it is not a matter of half triply orthogonal structurations acting one way AND the other half of them acting another way. Particles velocity in space determines the resultant pressure , not the other way around. Seems you have put the cart before the horse. in case three vectors are mutually perpendicular, there are two possibilities for how they are oriented : Yes / that's correct . .. . .. . .However , all the dispute is over the issue that the space thereof is not precisely Euclidean so that such a result could come out. You say there is no need to space (Riemannian curvature). There are others who do not think so . They do not think so even at subatomic levels . I personally guess that some cyclic permutation of the vectors maintains the sign of the cross product. Means the sign rotates : Not fixed to keep the curvature constant or possibly to straighten it. Restrictions placed by Maxwell’s equations still hold *YES* In particular, the E field determines the other field , mostly named B , as far as I can rememeber . . . . A static solution, where E and B are constant, can technically be thought of as a sinusoidal solution in the limit . In vacuum, we can always add on a constant field to E or B, and it won’t affect Maxwell’s equations (and therefore the wave equation either), because all of the terms in Maxwell’s equations in vacuum involve derivatives (either space or time Or , SURPRISE ,SURPRISE ! : SPACETIME).

You say :

" From the perspective described, no virtual particles can physically exist. They end up only being mathematical metaphors to more easily deal with energy calculation. '

Agreed // 100% .

You say :

" If energy leaks from a reactor, it is because it was adiabatically induced in charged elementary particles before leaking as electromagnetic photons. Since the fundamental laws of the universe apply to the whole universe, then it seems to me that energy leaking as electromagnetic photons from matter anywhere in the universe will also have been previously adiabatically induced in some elementary charged particles. "

It is NOT so , Andre . . . . . a system may start adiabatically and then turn diabatic NOT as photons leaking. Photons are by definition massless.

You say ;

" From my analysis again, causality always applies, since that by structure all charged elementary particles in existence can only be in continuous interaction. "

I didn't say causality does not work/exist. I said it works Locally . .. ..how it works in one submanifold does not restrict it to work exactly the same way all throughout all other manifold(s).

You wish me ( for the rest of more complicated elucidations ) to go to :

[https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=84158](https://www.researchgate.net/deref/https%3A%2F%2Fwww.scirp.org%2Fjournal%2Fpaperinformation.aspx%3Fpaperid%3D84158)

Yes , Brother .. . . I will certainly do that. . .. .

***HUMBLY YOURS***

***REZA***