Shortest refutation of Gödel's completeness theorem

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). Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal

LET: p, q, r: x, y, R; & And; > Imply, greater than, →;
% possibility, <>, for one or some, ∃; # necessity, [], for every or all, ∀.

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gödel's_completeness_theorem

By Gödel's completeness result, the formula $(\forall x.R(x,x))\rightarrow(\forall x\exists y.R(x,y))$ (1.1)
holds in all structures, and hence must have a natural deduction proof.

(#p&(r&(p&p)))>((#p&%q)&(r&(p&q))) ; `TTTT TCTT TTTT TCTT` (1.2)

Eq. 1.2 is *not* tautologous, meaning it does not hold in all structures and serves as a contra-example. Hence Gödel's completeness theorem is refuted.

Remark: When reduced to an abstract and atomic state, Eq. 1.1 becomes weakened as $R(x,x)\rightarrow R(x,y)$ or (r&(p&p))>(r&(p&q)) ; `TTTT TFTT TTTT TFTT`.