Refutation of the Bertrand postulate and Bertrand-Chebyshev theorem

We assume the apparatus and method of Meth8/VŁ4, with

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bertrand%27s_postulate, the Bertrand postulate:

[F]for every n > 1, there is always at least one prime p such that n < p < 2 n. (1.1)

LET: pq pn; (%p>#q) 1; (%p<#q) 2

#(q>(%q>#q)) > %((q<p)&~ (p>((%q<#q)&q))) ; CCCC CCCC CCCC CCCC (1.2)

From: proofwiki.org/wiki/Bertrand-Chebyshev_Theorem, Bertrand-Chebyshev theorem:

For all *n*∈N>0, there exists a prime *number p* with *n*<*p*≤2*n*. (2.1)

LET: r N; ~(q<p) p≤q

(q<r)>%((q<p)&~(p>((%q<#q)&q))) ; TTCC TTTT TTCC TTTT ; (2.2)

Eqs. 1.2 and 2.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous, meaning both Bertrand expressions are suspicious.