THIS IS EXACTLY WHY CLIMATE OF THE PAST (CP) CANNOT BE CONSIDERED AS A PROPER SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL.

To justify this, I mention the following.

1.) While the authors submit their papers to CP free-willingly, thus, they might undertake these imposed regulations free-willingly, too. However, if these posted papers contain some potential inconsistencies, or credit other works somewhat improperly as I found in the case of Dr. Michael Ghil et al.'s recently submitted paper, then, the cited authors are drawn into posting a Comment not free-willingly, but out of scientific necessity. And then, there is no free choice to accept these fully unacceptable, authoritarian censorship conditions, clearly violating the freedom of expression.

2.) If the handling editor has the right/option to censor comments [as indicated by chief editor Dr. Rousseau], thus unilaterally deciding by her/his own will what is relevant and what is not, why she/he does not have the same right/option to censor/ edit the posted papers as well? This way she/he could unilaterally cut off some parts which she/he finds unnecessary or irrelevant, maybe she/he could also correct smaller mistakes, or even edit the main text, thus making the review process much more efficient and much quicker.

However, in the lack of such policy (that is, censoring the posted papers by the handling editor), the authors who are inadvertently drawn into posting Comments are DISCRIMINATED NEGATIVELY, as they got much less rights and rather unequal treatment in terms of freedom of expression: as far as I understand, while the posted papers can be changed only after the prior notification and discussion with the authors, only with their explicit consent (even if the paper contained some irrelevant or erroneous materials), posted Comments can be instantly and unilaterally censured (altered/edited) without any
prior notification or discussion, thus, WITHOUT THE CONSENT of its author(s)!

This way it seems that the authors of Comments are treated as "SECOND CLASS PEOPLE" relative to the authors of the posted papers, in terms of editorial censoring rights/options.

3.) But even if there were no conceptual flaws with these indicated/ implemented censoring policies on Comments as explained in points 1. and 2., there still remained two fundamental issues:

a) If the editor unilaterally deletes some parts of the Comment without any prior notification/discussion with the authors, such an authoritarian act implies that

-- the editor assumes an omnipotent knowledge, being able to judge on relevance in all circumstances instantly without even a proper understanding on the context

-- demonstrates a total lack of respect and openness towards the commenting authors inadvertently drawn into Commenting

b) Even if some parts of the censured Comment appear directly irrelevant to the commented paper, could these brief sections turn out to be useful and crucially relevant in other terms, in different contexts? Could they spur a cross-fertilizing impetus, or provoke some thoughts of vital relevance/ long-term impact concerning the future of the whole community?

Especially in the field of climate science which supposedly deals with highly complex and rather elusive, inherently interconnected phenomena, multiply linked and embedded into each other and spanning a rich spectrum between order and chaos. Can a butterfly be relevant in better understanding climate?

Could the unilateral and decontextualized pursuit of efficacy and direct relevance [displayed by CP] have inadvertent/ negative side effects, or even conceptual flaws? This question might turn out crucial especially in our times of overspecialization and tacit dehumanization which numerous world-renowned philosophers and sociologists wrote and already warned about (E. Fromm, C. Lasch, P. Virilio, J. Ellul, Y. N. Harari, B.-C. Han, etc.).

Furthermore, one just wonders how can one justify the chopping/cutting a
multidisciplinary flow of thought into disconnected pieces by arbitrary, unilateral editorial censorship? What would happen to the Earth's climate if someone censored out some irrelevant-looking climatic processes? Isn't it what is happening with our climate, unilaterally censored by some greedy, aggressive, disrespectful emission traits?

Could it have a conceptual significance if one unilaterally censors all, structurally irrelevant decorations/features out from the buildings? Would it be all right to unilaterally censor out all economy irrelevant poetry and art from everyday life? Some says though that Earth without 'art' is just an 'Eh'...

I find that it might be rather easy and practical to create such efficient censorship policies [as this blatant CP example clearly shows], but it seems much harder to properly understand/correct its conceptual flaws and inadvertent long-term consequences tacitly affecting the whole scientific community!

These implemented Comment censorship policies clearly indicate rather alarming traits in the climate of scientific research, towards overspecialization and tacit dehumanization. This is fully unacceptable and I KEEP PROTESTING AGAINST!

Some 250 years ago, in the era of Enlightenment, another Rousseau raised basically the same concerns. Now facing these authoritarian and discriminative Comment censorship policies, it seems that not much has changed in this regard since then:

"L'homme est né libre, et partout il est dans les fers. Tel se croit le maître des autres, qui ne laisse pas d'être plus esclave qu'eux." (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Du contrat social)

/*Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains. Those who think themselves the masters of others are indeed greater slaves than they." (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, The Social Contract)*/

Based on all these, I continue to express my utmost discontent and protest against these Comment censorship policies implemented at Climate of the Past, which I find discriminative, violating free expression and representing conceptual flaws. Furthermore, these clearly indicate alarming traits in the climate of scientific research towards overspecialization and tacit dehumanization.