Refutation of Dezert-Smarandache theory

The Dezert-Smarandache theory arises from the following scenario with Alice and Bob as suspects.

> That either Alice or Bob is not innocent or both Alice and Bob are not innocent is a tautology. (1.1)

Using Meth8/VL4,

> LET p q: Alice; Bob; + Or; & And; > Imply; = Equivalent;
> % possibility, for one or some; # necessity, for all; (p=p) tautology; (%p>#p) ordinal one.
>
> The designated *proof* value is `T` ; other logical values are `F` *contradiction*, `N` *truthity*; and `C` *falsity*. The 16-valued proof table is row-major and horizontal.
>
> (p+q)+(p&q)=(p=p) ; `FTTT FTTT FTTT FTTT` (1.2)

If Eq. 1.1 introduces probability as a numeric variable, then we rewrite as:

> That either Alice or Bob is not innocent or both Alice and Bob are not innocent is one. (2.1)
>
> (p+q)+(p&q)=(%p>#p) ; `CNNN CNNN CNNN CNNN` (2.2)

Eqs. 1.2 and 2.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous. This refutes the Dezert-Smarandache theory.