



behavior, or in more limited sense, to identify how the emerging interplay between economic stakeholders (Turkey, EU, Russia and Iran) do not indicate conformity with the traditional notions of classical realist *geopolitik*.

- Anonymous

### Editorial Note

We consider Dr. T. N. Marketos' contribution to be a relevant, contemporary topic which may become outdated in some of its particulars if its publication were to be delayed any further.

Additional reviews and comments on the article are welcome and can be sent to [info@ethnogeopolitics.org](mailto:info@ethnogeopolitics.org). These could then be published as Critical Responses in one or more next issues of the journal—in anonymized form if one wishes so. For now, we include here some of the critical comments made by Assistant Editor Nathasja de Vries:

“If Turkey is not the main topic of the second section [Prospects of the “Turkish route”] in the paper and Iran is, Iran needs more prominence in the initial sentences of the section. You could have opened the second sentence with “For example, it is worth noting that”; you could also have restructured the first sentence as “In order to present itself as a reliable alternative to Russian exports to the EU, Ankara can use other sources, such as natural gas imports from Tehran” or something to that effect.

Your observation in the third section of your paper [What's Next?] that “it was decided in the Western capitals that its [Syria's] regime needs to change” seems an important point, supported by the Syrian unrest point made earlier in the same section, but has not been alluded to in the Introduction; the introduction's ‘soft-landing of Sykes-Picot’ would, in fact, give the opposite impression.”

- Caspar ten Dam, Executive Editor & Nathasja de Vries, Assistant Editor