FOUNDATIONAL ASSUMPTIONS — CLAUDE SONNET 5

The derivational chain from Sp-1 → Sp-2 → Sp-3 is applied with real internal consistency: the same radius/mass relations (r_{2o}, r_{3o}), the same field-momentum formulas (p_{2f}, p_{3f}), and the same 45° parallel-field approximation recur correctly across Papers B, C and D. However:

- The claim that a photon is a multi-threaded, laterally extended, sub-divisible object (Paper A) is the load-bearing assumption for everything downstream, yet it rests on reinterpreting existing low-count coincidence data rather than an independent derivation or a new discriminating experiment.
- The 45° "parallel field approximation" used to obtain a non-vanishing line integral in the Coulomb and hyperfine derivations is introduced because it is needed to make the integral non-zero, rather than derived from the postulated field geometry.
- Whether field mass or field speed is held invariant with distance is stated as a modelling choice ("we elect to keep the mass invariant") rather than obtained from a conservation law.

Verdict: coherent as an axiomatic system — the postulates are used consistently once adopted — but several of the postulates themselves are motivated by "this is needed to get the right answer" rather than by an independent physical argument. That is a materially weaker form of foundational coherence than one built from a small number of symmetry principles that are justified prior to seeing the data they are used to fit.