Refutation of Gleason's theorem

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). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET: & And; > Imply, greater than, believes, knows; < Not Imply, less than;
= Equivalent, is; # necessity, for all or any; % possibility, for one or some;
p probability measure; q quantum state; r measurement outcomes; s space;
(p=p) tautology, legitimate.

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gleason%27s_theorem

> "Effectively, the theorem says that any legitimate probability measure on the space of measurement outcomes is generated by some quantum state." (1.1)

%q>((#p>(p=p))<(r<s)) ; TTTT NNFF TTTT TTTT (1.2)

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous. This means Gleason's theorem is *not logically* "a mathematical result which shows that the rule one uses to calculate probabilities in quantum physics follows logically [*sic*] from particular assumptions about how measurements are represented mathematically".