

Peer Review

Review of: "Why Native Language Secrecy No Longer Works in Modern Warfare: The Case of North Koreans in the Russo-Ukrainian War"

Ilkhom Khalimzoda¹

1. Department of Language and Communication Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

The paper effectively situates the North Korean case within the historical legacy of Indigenous code talkers, highlighting how languages once served as natural encryption in warfare. The author shows that advances in artificial intelligence, the availability of linguistic resources, and South Korea's long-standing monitoring of North Korean dialects undermine any secrecy value such troops might provide. The inclusion of an AI experiment, where Kurdish was used as a code system, underscores how modern technology can quickly erode the security once provided by obscure languages.

While the commentary's strength lies in its timely engagement with a current geopolitical issue, it also has limitations. The evidence of North Korean troop language code remains speculative. Furthermore, the paper focuses mainly on language as a cipher, leaving aside the psychological, symbolic, and propaganda functions that native-language communication might still hold in combat. Some technical aspects to consider: on pages 2 and 6, the paper unnecessarily repeats the same argument — namely, that *in the case of the Russo-Ukrainian war the effectiveness of code talking has significantly diminished in the contemporary era. This paper argues that while code talking proved effective in past conflicts (and may still have uses on a small scale), it is no longer a viable strategy in modern warfare.* This point could be stated once with more precision to avoid redundancy.

Additionally, the conclusion could be revised for clearer delivery of the central argument. The text would benefit from smoother sentence flow, reduced reliance on commas, and consistent capitalization after full stops. In conclusion, nonetheless, the study makes an important contribution by arguing convincingly that code talking in its historical form has lost strategic value in modern, technologically

interconnected warfare.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.