Refutation of another conjecture to coerce Bell's inequality to be true

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with Tautology 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, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET p, q, r, s: P, A, B, C;
~ Not; + Or; & And; > Imply, greater than; < Not Imply, less than;
= Equivalent; @ Not Equivalent;
(p=p) Tautology; (p@p) **F** as contradiction, ordinal zero; ~(p<q) (p≥q).

We ask if another conjecture for Bell's inequality as *assumed* is provably true:

$$P(A\land\neg B)+P(B\land\neg C)\geq P(A\land\neg C). \tag{1.1}$$

~(((p&(q&~r))+(p&(r&~s)))<(p&(q@~s)))=(p=p); TTT**F** TTT**F** TTTT TTTT (1.2)

Remark: Another mapping of Eq. 1.1 by substituting "∧¬" with "Xor" (@) produces
~(((p&(q@r))+(p&(r@s)))<(p&(q@s)))=(p=p) ; TTTT T**F**TT TTT**F** TTTT (no.go)

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous.

This means another conjecture to prove Bell's inequality is refuted.