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Dingle provided a valid critique of STR Einstein.

Dingle may not have been aware, however, that he was criticizing the interpretation of the mathematics on which the STR was based, not the mathematics of the STR itself.

It is necessary to be aware that every physical theory consists of two elements:
1. mathematics theory,
2. interpretation of this math.

Mathematics itself, without its interpretation, does not define a theory in an unambiguous way.

The problem with Einstein's STR is that Einstein proposed a misinterpretation of the mathematics on which his theory is based.

Therefore, STR is a flawed theory.

I formally proved it in the article "Derivation of All Linear Transformations that Meet the Results of Michelson–Morley's Experiment and Discussion of the Relativity Basics"
https://rd.springer.com/article/10.3103/S0027134920060181

online https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350050565

So the mathematics on which STR is based should be interpreted differently than proposed by Einstein.

Dingle showed an easy to see contradiction in STR (formulas (2) and (4)). But this is a contradiction resulting from the interpretation of STR math.

By contrast, the author of the article, Adrian Sfarti, defends STR mathematics, not its interpretation.

In the article he rightly pointed out that time dilation in one direction occurs for x=0, and the other way occurs for x'=0 (it is more precise to write that dx=0 and dx'=0).

But this STR defense doesn't address Dingle's criticism. The author of the article showed that there is no symmetry in time dilation, but this does not explain the problem presented by Dingle, who criticizes the current understanding of time dilation in STR.

Details of research on the Special Theory of Ether, which is an alternative to Einstein's STR, are presented at www.ste.com.pl