Shortest refutation of Bell's inequality

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with `T`autology as the designated *proof* value, `F` as contradiction, `N` as truthity (non-contingency), and `C` as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET: p, q, r, s: A, B, C, N; ~ Not; & And; + Or; - Not Or;
> Imply, greater than; < Not Imply, less than; = Equivalent; (p=p) proof.

From: emmynoether.com/EAppendixBell.pdf (Leon M. Ledderman), attributed to faraday.physics.utoronto.ca/PVB/Harrison/BellsTheorem/BellsTheorem.html

"This is a special case of a more general statement for ensembles of objects each having three binary attributes, A, B, and C: N(A, not B) + N(B, not C) ≥ N(A, not C). (1.1)
We give the proof of this theorem below. We'll adapt this, following John Bell, in a "physically reasonable way" to our quantum mechanical experiment (a lot of "philosophy" is hidden in the phrase "physically reasonable way")."

Eq. 1.1 means a statement of Bell's inequality.

~((s&(p&~q))+(s&(q&~r))<(s&(p&~r))=(p=p); `TTTT TTTT TTFT TFTT` (1.2)

Eq. 1.2 is *not* tautologous. This means Eq. 1.1 is not a theorem.