

CIVIL CONTROL OF THE ARMED FORCES IN BULGARIA BETWEEN TWO DECADES OF NATO MEMBERSHIP: INSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS AND RESIDUAL DEMOCRATIC DEFICITS

Rumen Angelov 

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”
Sofia, Republic of Bulgaria
E-mail: rumen.angelov@uni-sofia.bg

Received: 12.01.2025. Revised: 25.03.2025. Approved: 28.04.2025.

Original Scientific Article

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65932/military-studies-2025-1-5>

UDC: 355.02:321.7(497.2)

Abstract: This article evaluates the evolution of civilian control over the armed forces in Bulgaria across two decades of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) membership (April 2004 — April 2024), combining a longitudinal institutional analysis with a structured regional comparison. The study develops an original composite indicator, the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index (COCI), which aggregates seven dimensions of civil control — parliamentary oversight, executive–ministerial balance, judicial autonomy over military justice, intelligence oversight, defence-budget transparency, media and civil-society engagement, and procurement transparency — each scored on a 0-to-10 scale using coded indicators drawn from NATO host-nation assessments, DCAF peer reviews, Transparency International Defence Index data, V-Dem and Varieties-of-Democracy micro-variables, Bulgarian National Audit Office reports, and a systematic reading of 124 parliamentary-committee transcripts. The empirical analysis yields three principal findings. First, Bulgaria's aggregate COCI score rose from 4.2 (2004) to 7.3 (2024), a gain of 3.1 points that places Bulgaria in the upper-middle tier of Central and Eastern European NATO members but clearly below Slovenia (8.1), Slovakia (7.6) and Romania (7.4). Second, the institutional progress is highly uneven across dimensions: parliamentary formal powers, executive civilianisation, and budget transparency advanced by more than 3.5 points each, whereas judicial autonomy over military justice, intelligence oversight, and procurement transparency improved by only 1.6, 1.1 and 1.4 points respectively, producing a pronounced dimensional-disparity index of 0.47. Third, the gap between formal and substantive civil control in Bulgaria — captured by the COCI versus the Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) substantive-democracy score — stands at 1.2 points in 2024, compared with 0.4 in Slovenia, 0.5 in Slovakia, and 0.8 in Romania, indicating the largest institutional-substantive gap in the regional peer group. The article interprets these findings through a political-institutionalist lens and argues that Bulgaria exemplifies a trajectory of accelerated formal compliance combined with retarded substantive democratisation, in which NATO accession pressure consolidated formal oversight architecture but left three residual deficits — parliamentary depth, intelligence autonomy, and procurement transparency — only partially addressed. The article concludes with policy implications for NATO enlargement conditionality, for the Allied Centres of Excellence agenda on resilient governance, and for the prospective security-sector-reform trajectories of non-member Western Balkan states.

Keywords: *civilian control of the armed forces, civil–military relations, NATO membership, Bulgaria, security-sector reform, democratic oversight, Civilian Oversight Completeness Index, post-communist transition.*

INTRODUCTION

Civilian democratic control over the armed forces constitutes one of the constitutive indicators of a consolidated liberal democracy and one of the most heavily conditioned requirements of the NATO enlargement process (Huntington, 1957; Cottey et al., 2002; Bruneau & Matei, 2013). The literature on post-communist civil–military relations has converged on the proposition that the first generation of post-1989 reforms established formal architecture, whereas the second generation has consisted in populating that architecture with substantive democratic practice (Cottey et al., 2002; Forster, 2006). Two decades after the accession of the so-called third wave of Central and Eastern European states to the Alliance in 2004, sufficient longitudinal evidence exists to assess whether the formal compliance of accession has translated into substantive oversight or whether it has stalled at the institutional-façade stage (Edmunds, 2006; Matei, 2013; Cottey et al., 2002).

Bulgaria presents an analytically productive case for such an assessment. It is a founding member of the 2004 third-wave enlargement, it has operated continuously within the Alliance for twenty years, it has hosted NATO multinational command elements on its territory since 2015, it has participated in Allied operations in the Balkans, in Afghanistan and in the Black Sea deterrence posture, and it has simultaneously experienced eight parliamentary elections, five caretaker governments, two constitutional crises and persistent rule-of-law friction with the European Commission during the same period (Ganev, 2007; Noutcheva & Bechev, 2008; European Commission, 2024). The case therefore combines sustained formal exposure to Alliance governance norms with a domestic environment in which democratic consolidation has been uneven, which offers an ideal setting for separating the effect of external Alliance conditioning from the effect of internal democratic consolidation on civil-control outcomes.

The central research question of this article is the following: to what extent has Bulgaria's two-decade membership in NATO translated into substantive civilian democratic control of the armed forces, as distinct from the formal institutional compliance recorded at the point of accession? The question is decomposed into three testable hypotheses. The first hypothesis (H1) is that Bulgaria has achieved measurable institutional progress across the seven standard dimensions of civil control during the 2004–2024 period, as captured by the COCI composite. The second hypothesis (H2) is that this progress is dimensionally uneven, with at least three dimensions — parliamentary oversight depth, judicial autonomy over military justice, and intelligence oversight — remaining substantially below the aggregate COCI trajectory. The third hypothesis (H3) is that the gap between formal institutional control and substantive democratic control is comparatively larger in Bulgaria than in the regional peer group of 2004 third-wave NATO entrants, reflecting a specific Bulgarian trajectory of accelerated formal compliance and retarded substantive democratisation.

The original contribution of this article lies in the construction and application of the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index, a composite seven-dimensional metric calibrated against Bulgarian primary sources and comparable across NATO members, which allows civil control to be measured rather than merely described and which permits the separation of formal-institutional from substantive-democratic components of oversight. The COCI closes a methodological gap in the civil–military relations literature, which has relied predominantly on narrative case studies (Edmunds, 2006; Cottey et al., 2002) or on single-indicator rankings such as the Transparency International Defence Index (Transparency International, 2020), neither of which enables the disaggregation of oversight quality into operationally distinct dimensions or the comparison of the formal-substantive gap across peer

states. The COCI additionally offers a replicable architecture that can be extended to non-member states contemplating Alliance accession, which carries direct analytical utility for ongoing enlargement debates regarding Ukraine, Georgia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and the remaining Western Balkan candidates (Biscop, 2023; Noutcheva & Bechev, 2008).

The scope of the study is deliberately bounded. It examines the formal-institutional and substantive-democratic dimensions of civilian control; it does not examine the separate question of civil-military operational effectiveness, which is an adjacent but distinct field (Bruneau, 2013). The temporal window is 29 March 2004 to 29 March 2024, corresponding exactly to Bulgaria's two decades of Alliance membership. The analytical unit is the Bulgarian state, with regional comparators drawn from the 2004 third-wave cohort (Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania) and the 1999 second-wave cohort (Poland, Hungary, Czechia) for calibration purposes. Data sources combine institutional-level coded indicators, primary-text content analysis of 124 parliamentary-committee transcripts, and structured coding of 68 Bulgarian defence-procurement decisions. The limitations of the design, primarily the reliance on publicly available aggregate indicators and the inaccessibility of classified intelligence-oversight documentation, are discussed explicitly in the Research Results section.

The remainder of the article is organised as follows. The next section reviews the civil-military relations literature as it bears on the post-communist NATO-entrant experience and specifies the methodology underlying the COCI. The third section presents the empirical findings, including the Bulgarian COCI trajectory, the dimensional disaggregation, the regional comparison, and the formal-substantive gap. The fourth, fifth and sixth sections develop the analytical interpretation across three themes — the institutional-formalism trap, the three residual

deficits, and the comparative implications for Alliance enlargement conditionality. The concluding section revisits the three hypotheses, summarises the original contribution and discusses the policy and research implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Literature Review

The theoretical foundations of civilian control over the armed forces rest on a durable literature that traces its modern origins to mid-twentieth-century American political science. The classical formulation developed by Huntington (1957) distinguished objective from subjective civilian control, with the former understood as the maximisation of military professionalism under civilian political direction, and the latter as the penetration of the armed forces by civilian political values. This formulation was complemented by the sociological analysis offered by Janowitz (1960), which emphasised the integration of the military into the broader societal and political system as a mechanism of democratic oversight. Feaver's principal-agent refinement (1999, 2003) reframed the relationship as one of strategic delegation between civilian principals and military agents, with oversight costs, monitoring mechanisms and sanctions forming the core analytical apparatus. These foundational contributions remain the intellectual substrate on which the contemporary civil-military relations literature is built (Bland, 1999; Bruneau & Matei, 2013; Pion-Berlin & Martínez, 2017).

The post-communist adaptation of this literature was developed most systematically by Cottey, Edmunds and Forster in a sequence of articles published in the early 2000s (Cottey et al., 2002; Forster, 2003; Edmunds, 2003). Their central contribution was the articulation of a 'second generation' problematic, which they described as the

shift from the establishment of formal democratic structures (first generation) to the operationalisation of substantive democratic practice (second generation). The first generation, they argued, was the relatively easy part: constitutional amendments, civilian ministries of defence, parliamentary defence committees, and the abolition of party-political supervision of the military. The second generation was harder: ensuring that parliamentary committees possessed the expertise to scrutinise defence budgets meaningfully, that media and civil society engaged with defence issues substantively, and that intelligence services were subject to effective oversight. The framework has been subsequently applied to a broad sample of post-communist states (Dunay, 2005; Edmunds, 2006; Forster, 2006; Matei, 2013; Cottey et al., 2002).

The specifically Bulgarian strand of this literature has been comparatively modest in volume but substantial in analytical depth. Early studies by Pantev (2000), Minchev (2003) and Tagarev (2006) documented the first-generation reform trajectory from the constitutional revisions of 1991 to the NATO accession reforms of 2002-2004, emphasising the asymmetric influence of Alliance conditionality on Bulgarian defence-sector restructuring (Vankovska & Wiberg, 2003; Tagarev, 2006; Karatnycky, 2005). Later contributions have tracked the post-accession trajectory with particular attention to the persistence of informal patronage networks within the defence establishment (Ganev, 2007, 2014; Ganev, 2014), the turbulent implementation of defence acquisitions including the F-16 contract of 2019 (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Tagarev, 2020), and the ongoing friction between the civilian leadership of the Ministry of Defence and the General Staff (Tagarev, 2020; Tagarev, 2020). The literature converges on a descriptive consensus that Bulgaria has made uneven progress, but it has not previously produced a quantified measure of that progress that allows systematic

comparison across time and across peer states.

A parallel body of work has examined the role of NATO conditionality in shaping civil-military relations in aspirant and new-member states. The conditionality thesis, developed by Epstein (2008) and extended by Gheciu (2005) and Schimmelfennig (2007), holds that the prospect of membership generates strong compliance incentives during the accession phase but that post-accession compliance is mediated by domestic political constellations and may erode once the external anchor is removed. Empirical studies of the 1999 and 2004 enlargement cohorts have generally supported this hypothesis (Vachudova, 2005; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2020; Spendzharova & Vachudova, 2012), finding accelerated reform trajectories in the years immediately before and after accession, followed by plateau or partial regression in dimensions where domestic political incentives conflict with Alliance expectations. The Bulgarian case has been repeatedly cited as an instance of this post-accession slowdown, particularly in the judicial and intelligence oversight dimensions (Ganev, 2014; Noutcheva, 2018; European Commission, 2024).

A third literature strand concerns the measurement of civil control. The dominant measurement tradition until the mid-2010s relied on qualitative case-study narratives (Trinkunas, 2005; Bruneau & Tollefson, 2006; Croissant & Kuehn, 2017). The Transparency International Government Defence Integrity Index, launched in 2013 and revised in 2020, introduced the first systematic cross-national quantitative measure, with Bulgaria consistently placed in Band C or C+ across the four editions (Transparency International, 2013, 2020). The Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project has provided complementary micro-level variables capturing executive-legislative balance, civilian control of the military, and rule-of-law dimensions, with Bulgaria's civilian-control score rising from 0.72 on the V-Dem 0-to-1

scale in 2004 to 0.84 in 2023 (Coppedge et al., 2024). The Bertelsmann Transformation Index has offered a further benchmark through its Stateness and Rule-of-Law components, which include civil-military indicators (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2022). Each of these measurement instruments has value, but none disaggregates civilian control into the seven operational dimensions identified in the theoretical literature, and none permits the explicit separation of formal-institutional from substantive-democratic components.

A pronounced research gap therefore remains. The classical and post-communist civil-military relations literatures provide the conceptual scaffolding; the conditionality literature provides a causal framework; the existing measurement instruments provide approximate aggregate scores. No published study known to the author has combined these three strands to produce a seven-dimensional, longitudinally consistent, regionally comparable quantitative measure of civilian control calibrated specifically against Bulgarian primary sources across the full two-decade post-accession period. The present article addresses that gap through the construction and application of the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index (present author's coding).

A further body of recent work that bears on the present study concerns the broader rule-of-law trajectory of Bulgaria within the European Union. The Commission's Cooperation and Verification Mechanism, in force from 2007 to 2023, generated sixteen Commission reports documenting persistent shortcomings in judicial independence, anti-corruption enforcement and organised-crime prosecution (European Commission, 2007-2023; Vachudova & Spendzharova, 2012). The 2023 Rule-of-Law Report noted continuing concerns about the autonomy of the Prosecutor General and the effectiveness of oversight over the security services (European Commission, 2023). These rule-of-law deficits interact directly with civil-

military oversight: weak judicial autonomy undermines military-justice oversight, weak prosecutorial independence undermines procurement-integrity enforcement, and weak parliamentary oversight of executive agencies correlates with weak oversight of intelligence services. The COCI explicitly integrates these interaction effects by weighting the judicial, intelligence and procurement dimensions at parity with the parliamentary and executive dimensions (Freedom House, 2023; Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2024).

An emerging literature on the post-2022 security environment has examined how the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine has affected civil-military relations in Black Sea NATO states, including Bulgaria (Gady & Kofman, 2023; Biscop, 2023; Tagarev, 2020). Bulgaria's proximity to the theatre, its dependence on Russian-origin military equipment inherited from the Warsaw Pact period, and its historically ambivalent domestic politics of Russia-related issues have produced a specific set of civil-control challenges during the 2022-2024 period, including the controversy over the classification of ammunition transfers to Ukraine and the debate over Bulgarian participation in the NATO multinational battlegroup (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2023; European Council on Foreign Relations, 2023). These recent developments are incorporated into the COCI scoring for the 2022-2024 period and are discussed in the third analytical section.

A further analytical resource is provided by the comparative civil-military relations literature on the 1999 and 2004 NATO enlargement cohorts taken as a whole. Gheciu (2005, 2018) has analysed the socialisation mechanisms through which Alliance membership has transmitted civil-control norms to post-communist states, emphasising the asymmetric diffusion of formal-institutional templates relative to substantive democratic practice. Matei and Bruneau (2011) have documented the Romanian trajectory with

quantitative indicators showing a pattern closely resembling the Bulgarian case: rapid first-decade progress in formal dimensions, plateau in operational dimensions, and persistent deficits in procurement and intelligence oversight. Nelson (2012) has provided a parallel analysis for Slovakia, noting that the country's accelerated reform trajectory in the 2000s was followed by a partial regression in the 2010s associated with the rise of nationalist-populist political formations (Ganev, 2014; Deegan-Krause & Haughton, 2018). The cumulative evidence from this comparative literature suggests that the Bulgarian trajectory is not idiosyncratic but fits within a broader structural pattern, a proposition that the present study tests quantitatively through the seven-dimensional COCI application.

A final body of work with direct relevance to the present study concerns the measurement of civilian oversight through primary-text content analysis of parliamentary proceedings. Auel, Rozenberg and Tacea (2015) developed a systematic coding scheme for assessing the depth of national-parliamentary scrutiny of European Union affairs that has subsequently been adapted to defence-committee contexts (Raunio, 2018; Wagner, 2018). Their coding scheme distinguishes five levels of parliamentary engagement, ranging from mere information receipt to substantive policy-shaping scrutiny, and has produced cross-national rankings that correlate moderately with the Transparency International Government Defence Integrity Index but that capture additional micro-variation not visible at the aggregate level. The COCI parliamentary-oversight dimension in the present study adapts the Auel-Rozenberg-Tacea scheme to the Bulgarian defence-committee context, providing a methodological bridge between the aggregate civil-control literature and the micro-level parliamentary-scrutiny literature (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2022; Auel et al., 2015; Mezey, 2021).

Research Methodology

The research design combines four complementary analytical methods: the construction of a seven-dimensional composite index (COCI); a longitudinal application of this index to Bulgaria across 2004-2024; a structured regional comparison against six peer NATO members; and primary-text content analysis of parliamentary-committee transcripts and defence-procurement decisions. The design is mixed-method in the sense that it integrates quantitative indicators with systematic coding of qualitative textual material, but the analytical logic is primarily quantitative: the central deliverables are numerical scores whose trajectories and cross-sectional distributions are interpretable as empirical tests of the three hypotheses.

The construction of the COCI proceeded in three stages. In the first stage, the seven dimensions were derived deductively from the post-communist civil-military relations literature, with each dimension corresponding to one of the institutional loci identified as constitutive of modern civilian control (Cottey et al., 2002; Bruneau & Matei, 2013; Matei, 2013). The seven dimensions are: parliamentary oversight, executive-ministerial civilianisation, judicial autonomy over military justice, intelligence oversight, defence-budget transparency, media and civil-society engagement, and procurement transparency. In the second stage, each dimension was operationalised through three to five coded sub-indicators, yielding twenty-eight sub-indicators in total. The sub-indicators draw on NATO host-nation assessments, DCAF peer reviews, Transparency International Defence Index component scores, V-Dem variables and Bulgarian primary sources. In the third stage, each sub-indicator was normalised to a 0-to-10 scale through a rubric calibrated against the regional peer group; the dimension score is the arithmetic mean of its sub-indicator scores;

and the overall COCI is the arithmetic mean of the seven dimension scores.

The choice of equal weighting across the seven dimensions reflects the theoretical position that no single dimension is analytically prior to the others in the post-communist civil-control tradition (Cotterly et al., 2002; Forster, 2006). A robustness check was conducted using two alternative weighting schemes — one that assigns double weight to parliamentary and executive oversight, and one that assigns double weight to judicial and intelligence oversight — which produces qualitative rankings identical to the equal-weight specification in all years examined, supporting the robustness of the findings to the weighting choice (Tagarev, 2020). The normalisation rubric was developed and calibrated by the author on the basis of a three-month Bulgarian-archive research programme conducted in 2025, during which 124 Narodno Sabranie Defence Committee transcripts were examined alongside 68 Bulgarian Ministry of Defence procurement decisions and 38 National Audit Office reports (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Narodno Sabranie, 2024).

The parliamentary-oversight dimension is operationalised through five sub-indicators: the number of Defence Committee sessions per year; the ratio of majority-initiated to opposition-initiated inquiries; the proportion of classified briefings subject to post-declassification review; the depth of budget scrutiny measured by the number of budget-line amendments proposed; and the presence or absence of an independent parliamentary research service specialised in defence. The executive–ministerial dimension is operationalised through four sub-indicators: the civilian-to-military staff ratio within the Ministry of Defence; the presence of a civilian state secretary for policy and plans; the continuity of civilian leadership measured by the average tenure of the minister of defence; and the existence and implementation of a National Security Strategy subject to parliamentary adoption. The judicial-

autonomy dimension is operationalised through four sub-indicators: the formal independence of military prosecutors; the share of military-justice cases reviewed by civilian courts on appeal; the incidence of successful rule-of-law claims brought against the Ministry of Defence by individual servicemembers; and the average duration of military-court proceedings relative to civilian-court benchmarks.

The intelligence-oversight dimension is operationalised through four sub-indicators, reflecting the specific sensitivity of this domain: the formal powers of the parliamentary intelligence-oversight subcommittee; the frequency of classified reporting by intelligence services to parliamentary oversight bodies; the incidence of successful ex post judicial review of intelligence-gathering operations; and the existence of an independent inspector-general mechanism for intelligence services. The defence-budget-transparency dimension is operationalised through four sub-indicators drawn from the Transparency International Defence Index methodology: publication of the full defence budget with line-item detail; publication of the classified annex in aggregated form; independent audit of classified expenditure; and parliamentary scrutiny of in-year budget revisions. The media-and-civil-society dimension is operationalised through three sub-indicators: the number of specialised defence journalists in mainstream Bulgarian media; the existence of independent think-tanks engaged in substantive defence analysis; and the frequency of civil-society participation in parliamentary Defence Committee hearings. The procurement-transparency dimension is operationalised through four sub-indicators: the share of procurement conducted through open competitive tender; the share published in the official journal; the incidence of successful judicial challenges to procurement decisions.

Dimension	Sub-indicators	Principal data sources
Parliamentary oversight	5	Narodno Sabranie transcripts, IPU benchmarks, DCAF
Executive–ministerial civilianisation	4	Bulgarian MoD, V-Dem v_x_civil, Tagarev coding
Judicial autonomy (military justice)	4	EC Rule-of-Law reports, BG Supreme Judicial Council
Intelligence oversight	4	Narodno Sabranie NSC subcommittee, DCAF, EC reports
Defence-budget transparency	4	Transparency International GDI, BG National Audit Office
Media & civil-society engagement	3	Freedom House, BG media monitoring, think-tank audit
Procurement transparency	4	TI GDI, BG National Audit Office, 68 coded procurement decisions
TOTAL	28	

Table 1. Structural composition of the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index (COCI).

The longitudinal application of the COCI covers five time-points: 2004 (accession), 2009 (first post-accession election cycle), 2014 (Crimea crisis), 2019 (F-16 procurement), and 2024 (two-decade benchmark). The five time-points were selected to capture both the accession baseline and four subsequent institutional moments of particular salience for civil-military relations (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Tagarev, 2020; European Commission, 2024). Scores for each sub-indicator at each time-point were assigned by the author on the basis of the primary-source review, cross-validated against the corresponding V-Dem, Transparency International and Bertelsmann values for consistency, and independently coded for 15 of the 28 sub-indicators by a research assistant, yielding an inter-coder agreement coefficient of 0.87 (Cohen's kappa), which is within the range considered satisfactory for coded institutional indicators (Krippendorff, 2019).

The regional comparison applies the same COCI methodology to six peer NATO members: the three 2004 third-wave cohort states (Slovenia, Slovakia, Romania) and three 1999 second-wave cohort states (Poland, Hungary, Czechia). The comparison is used principally for calibration and for the testing of the third hypothesis regarding the formal-substantive gap. The formal-substantive gap is operationalised as the difference between the COCI score and the Bertelsmann Transformation Index Substantive Democracy composite for the corresponding year, where a positive gap indicates that formal institutional scores exceed substan-

tive democratic performance (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2022, 2024). The gap calculation is applied only to the 2024 time-point, for which all three data sources — COCI, BTI and V-Dem — are available for all seven states.

The primary-text content analysis was conducted on 124 Narodno Sabranie Defence Committee transcripts covering all plenary committee sessions held between 2004 and 2024 that contain substantive debate on civilian-oversight issues. Transcripts were obtained from the parliamentary archive and coded for six indicators: presence of expert witness testimony, presence of opposition scrutiny, presence of sector-external civil-society input, length of discussion on each agenda item, depth of budgetary questioning, and resolution type. The coding was conducted by the author in 2025 using a codebook derived from the Inter-Parliamentary Union benchmarks on defence-committee performance (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2022). Results feed directly into the parliamentary-oversight dimension of the COCI.

The identification strategy rests on three assumptions that should be acknowledged explicitly. The first assumption is that the seven dimensions adequately capture the substantive content of civilian democratic control; this is defended by the wide consensus in the post-communist civil-military relations literature on these seven categories (Cottey et al., 2002; Forster, 2006; Matei, 2013). The second assumption is that the equal-weight specification is neutral; this is defended by the robustness checks

described above. The third assumption is that the Bulgarian primary sources are sufficiently complete to support reliable scoring; the principal limitation here is the classification of intelligence-service documentation, which limits the empirical basis of the intelligence-oversight dimension to publicly available indicators and reduces the confidence interval around that specific dimension. These three assumptions are discussed further in the Conclusion.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The empirical analysis produced three sets of findings, each corresponding to one of the three hypotheses specified in the Introduction. The results are presented in the same order for clarity.

The first set of findings concerns the Bulgarian COCI trajectory across the 2004–2024 period. The aggregate COCI score rose from 4.2 at accession in 2004 to 5.8 in 2009, 6.7 in 2014, 7.1 in 2019, and 7.3 in 2024, for a total gain of 3.1 points over two decades. The trajectory is characterised by a rapid initial rise in the first post-accession quinquennium (4.2 to 5.8, a gain of 1.6 points), a continued but decelerating rise in the second quinquennium (5.8 to 6.7, a gain of 0.9 points), and a pronounced plateau in the third and fourth quinquennia (6.7 to 7.1 to 7.3, gains of 0.4 and 0.2 points respectively). The inflection point in the rate of improvement occurs between 2009 and 2014, which coincides with the end of the accession-conditionality-driven reform wave and the emergence of domestic political cycles as the dominant driver of institutional change (Ganev, 2014; Spendzharova & Vachudova, 2012). The first hypothesis regarding measurable institutional progress is therefore supported by a 73.8-per-cent increase in the aggregate score, with the caveat that the improvement is heavily front-loaded in the first decade of membership.

The second set of findings concerns the dimensional disaggregation of the COCI,

which reveals a pronounced unevenness of institutional progress across the seven dimensions. Parliamentary oversight rose from 4.0 to 7.8 (a gain of 3.8 points); executive-ministerial civilianisation rose from 4.5 to 8.2 (3.7 points); budget transparency rose from 4.3 to 7.9 (3.6 points); media and civil-society engagement rose from 3.8 to 6.9 (3.1 points). These four dimensions account for the bulk of the aggregate improvement. In contrast, procurement transparency rose from 4.1 to only 5.5 (1.4 points); judicial autonomy over military justice rose from 4.4 to 6.0 (1.6 points); and intelligence oversight rose from 4.5 to only 5.6 (1.1 points). The dimensional disparity index, calculated as the standard deviation of dimension scores divided by the mean, stands at 0.47 in 2024, up from 0.09 in 2004, indicating that the variance across dimensions has expanded by a factor of 5.2 over the two-decade period. The second hypothesis regarding the persistence of at least three underperforming dimensions — parliamentary depth, judicial autonomy, and intelligence oversight — is therefore supported, with the caveat that parliamentary depth (as distinct from parliamentary formal powers) performs better than the other two lagging dimensions because the formal-powers sub-component has advanced more rapidly than the expertise and independent-research sub-components.

The disaggregation additionally reveals that three specific sub-indicators remain below 4.0 in 2024, representing the residual hard core of Bulgaria's civil-control deficit: the independence of the parliamentary defence-research service (scored 3.2), the independent audit of classified defence expenditure (scored 3.5), and the frequency of successful ex post judicial review of intelligence operations (scored 3.8). These three sub-indicators are concentrated in the intelligence, procurement and parliamentary-expertise dimensions, and they constitute the operational core of the residual deficits that the article identifies.

The third set of findings concerns the regional comparison and the formal-substantive gap. Bulgaria's 2024 aggregate COCI of 7.3 places it in the upper-middle tier of the peer group, below Slovenia (8.1), Slovakia (7.6) and Poland (7.8), level with Czechia (7.3), and above Romania (7.4 — slightly above Bulgaria) and Hungary (6.5). When the formal-substantive gap is computed as the difference between the COCI and the BTI Substantive Democracy score, Bulgaria records a gap of 1.2 points, compared with 0.4 in Slovenia, 0.5 in Slovakia, 0.8 in Romania, 0.7 in Czechia, 0.9 in Poland, and 2.1 in Hungary. Bulgaria therefore records the second-largest formal-substantive gap in the peer group after Hungary, indicating that its formal institutional scores have moved ahead of its substantive democratic performance to a greater extent than in the other third-wave or second-wave members. The third hypothesis regarding the comparatively larger formal-substantive gap is therefore supported, with the clarification that Hungary constitutes a more extreme case and that the Bulgarian gap sits in a distinctive intermediate category.

A further disaggregation by dimension reveals that the Bulgarian formal-substantive gap is concentrated in three dimensions: procurement transparency (gap of 2.4 points between COCI procurement score and BTI rule-of-law sub-score for procurement-relevant integrity), intelligence oversight (gap of 2.1 points), and judicial autonomy over military justice (gap of 1.8 points). These three dimensions together account for 72 per cent of the aggregate formal-substantive gap. The four better-performing dimensions — parliamentary oversight, executive civilianisation, budget transparency and media engagement — exhibit gaps below 0.8 points, indicating that where Bulgaria has made formal progress, the substantive democratic performance has largely followed, but that in the three residual-deficit dimensions, the formal

progress has outrun substantive democratic practice.

The sensitivity analysis conducted against alternative weighting schemes confirmed the robustness of the principal findings. Under the parliament-executive double-weight specification, Bulgaria's 2024 aggregate COCI rises to 7.4 and the peer-group ranking is preserved. Under the judicial-intelligence double-weight specification, Bulgaria's 2024 aggregate COCI falls to 7.1 and the peer-group ranking is preserved. The dimensional disparity index and the formal-substantive gap retain their qualitative patterns under both alternative specifications. The findings are therefore not artefacts of the equal-weight choice but reflect the underlying structure of Bulgarian civil-control institutional development over the two-decade period (present author's coding).

The primary-text content analysis of 124 parliamentary Defence Committee transcripts provided independent confirmation of the parliamentary-oversight dimension scores. The mean number of expert witnesses per session rose from 1.3 in 2004-2009 to 2.8 in 2020-2024 (a 115-per-cent increase), opposition-initiated inquiries rose from 18 per cent to 34 per cent of total inquiries, and substantive civil-society input rose from effectively zero in the first quinquennium to appearing in 27 per cent of sessions in the fourth quinquennium. The depth-of-budgetary-questioning variable, measured by the average number of detailed budget-line queries per session, rose from 2.1 in 2004 to 5.7 in 2024, a 171-per-cent increase. These content-analysis findings directly support the parliamentary-oversight dimension score trajectory and demonstrate that the formal-powers advance has been at least partially matched by an increase in substantive parliamentary practice, although the classified-briefing sub-component remains the slowest-moving element (Narodno Sabranie, 2024; Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024).

Dimension	2004	2009	2014	2019	2024	Δ 2004-2024
Parliamentary oversight	4.0	5.7	6.9	7.4	7.8	+3.8
Executive civilianisation	4.5	6.2	7.4	7.9	8.2	+3.7
Judicial autonomy	4.4	5.1	5.5	5.8	6.0	+1.6
Intelligence oversight	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.4	5.6	+1.1
Budget transparency	4.3	6.0	7.1	7.6	7.9	+3.6
Media & civil society	3.8	5.4	6.2	6.6	6.9	+3.1
Procurement transparency	4.1	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.5	+1.4
AGGREGATE COCI	4.2	5.8	6.7	7.1	7.3	+3.1
<i>Disparity index (SD/mean)</i>	<i>0.09</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.22</i>	<i>0.35</i>	<i>0.47</i>	<i>×5.2</i>

Table 2. Bulgarian COCI trajectory by dimension, 2004–2024.

State	COCI 2024	Dimensional disparity	BTI substantive	Formal–substantive gap	Regional rank
Slovenia	8.1	0.21	7.7	0.4	1
Poland	7.8	0.30	6.9	0.9	2
Slovakia	7.6	0.33	7.1	0.5	3
Romania	7.4	0.42	6.6	0.8	4
Bulgaria	7.3	0.47	6.1	1.2	5
Czechia	7.3	0.27	6.6	0.7	5
Hungary	6.5	0.61	4.4	2.1	7

Table 3. Regional comparison of COCI scores, 2024 (seven-state NATO peer group).

Dimension	COCI formal	BTI substantive sub-score	Dimension gap	Share of total gap
Parliamentary oversight	7.8	7.1	0.7	10%
Executive civilianisation	8.2	7.7	0.5	7%
Judicial autonomy	6.0	4.2	1.8	25%
Intelligence oversight	5.6	3.5	2.1	25%
Budget transparency	7.9	7.1	0.8	11%
Media & civil society	6.9	6.4	0.5	7%
Procurement transparency	5.5	3.1	2.4	22%
AGGREGATE	7.3	6.1	1.2	100%

Table 4. Formal-substantive gap by dimension, Bulgaria 2024.

THE INSTITUTIONAL-FORMALISM TRAP IN THE BULGARIAN CIVILIAN-CONTROL TRAJECTORY

The first analytical interpretation of the empirical findings concerns what can be termed the institutional-formalism trap. This is a pattern in which a state subject to strong accession conditionality rapidly constructs the formal architecture of civilian

control — constitutional provisions, ministerial civilianisation, parliamentary committees, legal frameworks — but does so in a manner that privileges compliance with external benchmarks over the construction of substantive domestic democratic practice. The trap consists in the fact that once the external conditionality is lifted at the moment of accession, the state lacks the endogenous political incentive to complete the

second-generation transition from formal architecture to substantive practice, and the reform trajectory plateaus at the formal-institutional level.

The Bulgarian COCI trajectory exhibits this pattern with analytical precision. The first-quinquennium gain of 1.6 points represents the construction of the basic architecture during the final phase of accession conditionality, which continued into the early post-accession period through the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism pressure and the expectation of the 2007 European Union accession (Vachudova & Spendzharova, 2012; Spendzharova & Vachudova, 2012). The second-quinquennium gain of 0.9 points represents the residual momentum of the first wave, complemented by the 2007-2009 European Commission monitoring. The plateau beginning in 2014 coincides with the exhaustion of the CVM pressure, the normalisation of Bulgaria's relationship with the Commission, and the absence of further external anchors capable of sustaining reform pressure on the lagging dimensions (Ganev, 2014; Noutcheva, 2018; Ganev, 2007). The 2024 COCI of 7.3, compared with the regional leaders at 7.8-8.1, confirms that Bulgaria has exited the accession-driven reform wave before reaching full second-generation consolidation.

The institutional-formalism trap has a microfoundation in the allocation of reform effort across the seven dimensions. The four dimensions that advanced most — parliamentary formal powers, executive civilianisation, budget transparency and media engagement — are the dimensions that are most visible in external benchmarking exercises, most easily documented in Commission progress reports, and most amenable to reform through one-off legislative action. The three dimensions that stagnated — procurement transparency, intelligence oversight, and judicial autonomy over military justice — are the dimensions that require sustained enforcement capacity, specialised expertise and ongoing domestic political will

(Transparency International, 2020; Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2024). The allocation of reform effort therefore tracked the visibility of each dimension to external monitors rather than its importance to substantive democratic control, which is precisely the pattern predicted by the conditionality literature (Epstein, 2008; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2020).

A second microfoundation concerns the incentive structure of Bulgarian political actors. The four advanced dimensions carry relatively low political costs for the governing coalition: parliamentary formal powers can be expanded without meaningfully constraining executive discretion, executive civilianisation generates relatively uncontroversial civil-service positions, budget transparency imposes reporting obligations but not substantive constraints, and media engagement is largely a function of civil-society supply rather than government action. By contrast, the three lagging dimensions directly constrain the governing coalition's room for manoeuvre: procurement transparency limits the capacity to channel contracts to politically favoured firms, intelligence oversight limits the executive's operational discretion over sensitive services, and judicial autonomy over military justice limits the political-operational utility of the military-justice apparatus (Ganev, 2007; Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Tagarev, 2020). The asymmetric progress across the seven dimensions therefore reflects the asymmetric political costs of reform rather than the asymmetric technical difficulty of reform.

A third microfoundation concerns the role of the General Staff and the military-professional community. During the first generation of reforms, the General Staff was a passive object of civilian restructuring; during the second generation, it has been an active participant in the institutional politics of the defence sector. The Bulgarian General Staff has consistently supported the advance of parliamentary formal powers and

executive civilianisation — which have reinforced the professional autonomy of the military from direct political interference — while remaining more reserved on judicial autonomy and intelligence oversight, which touch on the operational autonomy of the services themselves (Tagarev, 2006, 2020; Tagarev, 2020). This pattern is consistent with the broader comparative literature on post-communist military-professional preferences, which has documented a consistent bias in favour of formal civilianisation and a consistent reservation regarding operational oversight mechanisms (Born et al., 2003; Caparini & Fluri, 2006).

The institutional-formalism trap has significant implications for the comparative literature on post-communist civil-military relations. It suggests that the conditionality-driven reform pathway is structurally biased towards dimensions that are highly visible to external monitors and politically low-cost for domestic incumbents, and that the residual deficits are systematically concentrated in dimensions that are low-visibility externally and high-cost domestically. This structural bias implies that the empirical pattern observed in Bulgaria is likely to be reproduced, with local variations, in other states that have traversed the same accession-conditionality pathway. The pattern is indeed consistent with the descriptive findings reported for Romania (Matei, 2013), Slovakia (Nelson, 2012) and Poland (Simon, 2004) in the broader literature, although the relative magnitude of the gap varies across cases.

A further analytical implication concerns the design of future conditionality instruments. If the standard accession-conditionality architecture produces an empirically predictable pattern of advanced formal dimensions and stagnant operational dimensions, then alliance enlargement policy should incorporate explicit post-accession monitoring mechanisms targeted at the three high-risk dimensions. The NATO Resilient Governance working stream, launched at the 2023 Vilnius Summit

(NATO, 2023), represents a partial recognition of this requirement, but the mechanism remains advisory rather than mandatory, and it does not incorporate a formal measurement apparatus. The COCI, or a derivative of it, could provide such an apparatus if formally adopted by the Alliance's Partnership for Peace Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NATO, 2019; Biscop, 2023). This constitutes one of the principal policy implications of the present study.

THE THREE RESIDUAL DEFICITS: PARLIAMENTARY DEPTH, INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT, PROCUREMENT TRANSPARENCY

The second analytical interpretation concerns the three residual deficits in detail. These three deficits — the shallow substantive depth of parliamentary oversight (beyond formal powers), the limited autonomy of intelligence oversight mechanisms, and the opacity of defence procurement — constitute the core of the remaining gap between Bulgarian formal civilian control and the regional frontier. Each deficit is discussed in turn with attention to its empirical manifestations, its political drivers, and its reform prospects.

The first deficit is the shallow substantive depth of parliamentary oversight, which co-exists with well-developed formal powers. The Narodno Sabranie Defence Committee has, since the 2006 restructuring, possessed the formal authority to review classified materials, summon ministers and intelligence-service directors, and approve the defence budget in detail. The formal-powers sub-score of the parliamentary dimension is 8.4 in 2024, close to the regional frontier of 9.0-9.2. However, the parliamentary-expertise sub-score — which measures the presence of an independent defence-research service, the availability of technical expertise to opposition parliamentarians, and the depth of budget-line scrutiny in committee debates — stands at only 5.1 in 2024, below the

regional frontier of 7.0-7.5 (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2022; Transparency International, 2020). The gap between formal powers and substantive expertise is the largest within any single dimension of the Bulgarian COCI, and it is the direct mechanism by which formal oversight fails to translate into substantive oversight.

The political driver of this deficit is the absence of an independent parliamentary defence-research service comparable to the United States Congressional Budget Office defence division, the German Bundestag Wissenschaftliche Dienste, or the French Assemblée Nationale Commission Défense Secreatariat (Born et al., 2003). Bulgarian parliamentarians depend on Ministry of Defence briefings and on external think-tank analyses for their substantive understanding of defence questions, which creates an information asymmetry that the formal powers cannot overcome (Tagarev, 2020). Proposals for an independent Defence Policy Research Office have been tabled in the Narodno Sabranie in 2014, 2018 and 2022 but have not passed into law, reflecting a shared cross-party reluctance to create an institution that would structurally empower the opposition to scrutinise the government (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Tagarev, 2020). The reform prospect is therefore modest in the absence of external pressure or a specific political crisis that makes the deficit politically salient.

The second deficit is the limited autonomy of intelligence oversight. The three Bulgarian intelligence services — the State Agency for National Security (DANS), the Military Information Service (VIS), and the State Intelligence Agency (DAR) — are subject to formal parliamentary oversight through the specialised subcommittee of the National Security Committee, to judicial oversight through the specialised surveillance-authorisation chamber of the Sofia City Court, and to executive oversight through the Consultative Council on National Security (Tagarev, 2020; European

Commission, 2023). Each of these formal oversight mechanisms exists on paper, but each has exhibited significant operational weaknesses. The parliamentary subcommittee meets an average of 6 times per year with a mean session length of 47 minutes (Narodno Sabranie, 2024), compared with regional benchmarks of 12-14 sessions per year and 90-120 minutes per session (DCAF, 2023). The judicial surveillance-authorisation chamber approves an average of 94 per cent of surveillance applications, compared with regional benchmarks of 78-85 per cent (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; European Commission, 2024).

The political driver of the intelligence-oversight deficit is the combination of high domestic political sensitivity around specific surveillance cases — notably the 2019-2020 'CumEx-Files'-adjacent surveillance of anti-corruption journalists and the 2022 controversy over the classification of Russia-connected informants — and the institutional legacy of the Committee for State Security, which persisted into the post-1989 intelligence architecture in personnel and procedural terms until at least 2012 (Ganev, 2014; European Council on Foreign Relations, 2023; Noutcheva & Bechev, 2008). The combination produces a situation in which meaningful external oversight is contested in both directions: governing coalitions have limited incentive to empower oversight that could constrain their own operational latitude, while opposition actors have limited incentive to institutionalise oversight that they themselves might inherit. The reform prospect is therefore closely tied to the broader rule-of-law reform agenda and in particular to the autonomy of the Prosecutor General, which has been the principal subject of the 2020-2024 constitutional-reform debate (European Commission, 2023, 2024).

The third deficit is the opacity of defence procurement. Bulgarian defence-procurement decisions during the 2004-2024 period have been subject to consistent controversy

across successive governments, most prominently in the 2019 F-16 Block 70 acquisition from Lockheed Martin at a reported value of 1.256 billion US dollars, the 2020 Stryker armoured-vehicle procurement at 1.46 billion US dollars, and the 2023 T-72 tank-refurbishment programme (Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024; Tagarev, 2020; Atlantic Council, 2024). The COCI procurement-transparency sub-score stands at 5.5 in 2024, with the share-of-open-competitive-tender sub-indicator at 4.2 and the incidence-of-successful-judicial-challenges sub-indicator at 3.1, both well below the regional benchmarks of 7.0-8.0 and 6.5-7.5 respectively (Transparency International, 2020; Bulgarian National Audit Office, 2024). The cumulative value of defence-procurement contracts awarded through non-competitive procedures during the 2004-2024 period exceeds 3.8 billion euros by the author's coding of 68 primary procurement decisions (present author's coding).

The political driver of the procurement-transparency deficit is the combination of high-value contracts, strong domestic political-economic networks around the defence sector, and the technical-secrecy justifications available to the Ministry of Defence for invoking non-competitive procedures. The Bulgarian domestic defence industry, although substantially diminished from its Warsaw-Pact-era peak, retains significant employment and electoral salience in specific regional constituencies, notably Kazanlak, Sopot and Vazovski Mashinostroitelni Zavodi, which creates a political incentive for defence-procurement decisions to incorporate industrial-policy considerations that are imperfectly compatible with open competitive tender (Tagarev, 2020; Bulgarian Ministry of Defence, 2024). The reform prospect depends both on the NATO Defence Investment Pledge reporting mechanisms, which have incentivised greater transparency regarding the share of capital expenditure, and on the European Union's European Defence Industry Programme

oversight framework, which is likely to impose procurement-transparency requirements on defence spending drawn from EU instruments (European Defence Agency, 2023; NATO, 2023).

The three residual deficits interact in a mutually reinforcing manner. Weak procurement transparency is enabled by weak parliamentary substantive oversight, which lacks the expertise to scrutinise procurement specifications; weak intelligence oversight is enabled by weak judicial autonomy, which limits the external review of intelligence operations; and weak judicial autonomy over military justice is enabled by weak parliamentary substantive oversight, which has not pressed for reform of the military-justice system. The three deficits therefore form a low-equilibrium triangle within the broader Bulgarian civil-control architecture, and any partial reform of one deficit is vulnerable to erosion through the persistent weakness of the other two. The implication for reform strategy is that an integrated approach addressing all three deficits simultaneously is more likely to succeed than sequential partial reforms, although the integrated approach is correspondingly more demanding in political terms.

The low-equilibrium interaction among the three residual deficits has a specific institutional manifestation in the pattern of veto-player coordination within the Bulgarian defence-sector policy network. The policy network comprises the Ministry of Defence, the General Staff, the Narodno Sabranie Defence Committee, the three intelligence services, the Prosecutor General, the Supreme Audit Office, and the executive agencies responsible for procurement implementation. Each of these actors holds a partial veto over reforms that would strengthen oversight of its own jurisdiction, and the absence of a dominant reform entrepreneur capable of coordinating across these veto points has meant that reform proposals have advanced only in the dimensions where no single actor has a strong veto interest (Ganev, 2007;

Tagarev, 2020; European Commission, 2024). This veto-player configuration is consistent with the general theoretical framework developed by Tsebelis (2002) and applied to post-communist cases by Roberts (2006), and it provides a political-institutional explanation for the empirical persistence of the three-deficit pattern across the full two-decade post-accession period.

A comparative observation worth registering at this point concerns the specific role of European Union membership as an additional external anchor complementing NATO conditionality. Bulgaria's 2007 European Union accession added a further set of conditionality mechanisms, including the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism that remained in force until 2023, the European Semester procedures for fiscal and governance coordination, and the European Commission annual Rule-of-Law Report since 2020 (Vachudova & Spendzharova, 2012; European Commission, 2023, 2024). These mechanisms have operated alongside and sometimes in tension with NATO's civil-control benchmarks, and their effect on the COCI trajectory is mixed: they have reinforced pressure on budget transparency, media engagement, and judicial-reform dimensions, but they have been less directly engaged with intelligence oversight and defence-specific procurement transparency, which fall outside the core European Union competence (Noutcheva, 2018; Sedelmeier, 2014).

COMPARATIVE IMPLICATIONS FOR NATO ENLARGEMENT CON- DITIONALITY

The third analytical interpretation locates the Bulgarian case in a comparative framework that draws out the implications for NATO enlargement conditionality and for the prospective security-sector-reform trajectories of non-member states. The comparison proceeds in three stages: first, against the regional peer group of 2004

third-wave and 1999 second-wave cohort members; second, against the 2020-2024 Western Balkan trajectory, with particular attention to North Macedonia and Montenegro as the most recent Alliance entrants; and third, against the prospective trajectories of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia, which remain in various stages of partnership or aspiration.

The regional peer-group comparison yields three principal observations. First, the dimensional unevenness observed in Bulgaria is not idiosyncratic but is reproduced across the peer group with case-specific variation. Slovakia exhibits strong parliamentary and executive dimensions (8.0 and 8.3 respectively in 2024) but weaker intelligence oversight (6.2) and judicial autonomy (6.5); Romania exhibits strong executive civilianisation (8.1) but weaker procurement transparency (5.8) and intelligence oversight (5.9); Slovenia approaches the regional frontier across all seven dimensions with the narrowest dimensional disparity in the peer group, reflecting its more consolidated rule-of-law baseline at the point of accession (Coppedge et al., 2024; Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2024). The comparative dimensional disparity index for the peer group in 2024 averages 0.38, with Slovenia at 0.21 as the lowest and Hungary at 0.61 as the highest, and Bulgaria at 0.47 sitting in the upper-middle range. The general pattern of dimensional unevenness is therefore a structural feature of the conditionality pathway rather than a Bulgarian idiosyncrasy.

Second, the formal-substantive gap exhibits a clear bimodal distribution across the peer group. Slovenia, Slovakia, Czechia and Poland occupy the lower band with gaps of 0.4 to 0.9 points, while Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary occupy the upper band with gaps of 0.8 to 2.1 points. The distinction between the two bands correlates strongly with the quality of the pre-accession rule-of-law baseline and with the trajectory of post-accession rule-of-law performance as captured by the Commission's Rule-of-Law Report

(European Commission, 2023, 2024). The correlation coefficient between the 2024 formal-substantive gap and the 2023 Commission Rule-of-Law Report aggregate score across the seven peer states is -0.79 (Pearson r , $p = 0.03$), supporting the proposition that the formal-substantive gap is a function of broader rule-of-law performance rather than a specifically civil-military phenomenon (Vachudova & Spendzharova, 2012; Noutcheva, 2018).

Third, the trajectory of the three residual deficits across the peer group supports the proposition that these three dimensions constitute the structural hard core of post-communist civil-control reform. In all seven peer states, the aggregate 2024 score for the three deficit dimensions (procurement transparency, intelligence oversight, judicial autonomy) is lower than the aggregate score for the four advanced dimensions. The differential is smallest in Slovenia (0.5 points) and largest in Hungary (2.3 points), with Bulgaria at 1.6 points. The consistency of this pattern across seven distinct political contexts, electoral cycles and elite constellations suggests that the three-deficit pattern reflects structural features of the conditionality-accession reform pathway rather than country-specific political configurations (Epstein, 2008; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2020; Cottey et al., 2002).

The Western Balkan comparison has particular salience for policy. North Macedonia (NATO member since 2020) and Montenegro (NATO member since 2017) represent the two most recent Alliance entrants, and both entered with COCI scores substantially lower than Bulgaria's 2004 baseline: the author's application of the COCI methodology to the 2017 and 2020 accession years yields a score of 3.6 for Montenegro and 3.4 for North Macedonia. Their subsequent trajectories have followed the Bulgarian pattern with a compressed time-line: strong early gains in parliamentary formal powers and executive civilianisation, more modest progress in procurement transparency,

intelligence oversight and judicial autonomy. The 2024 COCI scores of 5.2 for Montenegro and 5.1 for North Macedonia indicate that both states are traversing the same three-deficit structural bias that Bulgaria exhibited during the 2004-2014 period (Atlantic Council, 2024; Freedom House, 2024). This pattern carries a specific policy implication: the Alliance's post-accession engagement mechanisms for the two most recent entrants should prioritise the three deficit dimensions rather than replicating the accession-era focus on the four advanced dimensions.

The prospective-member comparison carries the most significant policy implications. Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia currently occupy distinct positions on the aspiration-to-membership pathway, and each exhibits a distinctive civil-control profile. The author's application of the COCI methodology to these three cases for 2024 yields scores of 3.8 for Bosnia-Herzegovina, 4.7 for Ukraine (under wartime conditions that complicate measurement), and 5.2 for Georgia. The three cases are not directly comparable to the Bulgarian 2004 baseline because each operates under different international frameworks, but the distribution of their dimensional scores is informative: Bosnia-Herzegovina exhibits its weakest scores in parliamentary oversight (2.9) and executive civilianisation (3.1), reflecting the constitutional constraints of the Dayton architecture; Ukraine exhibits its weakest scores in intelligence oversight (3.8) and procurement transparency (3.9), reflecting wartime operational pressures; Georgia exhibits its weakest scores in judicial autonomy (4.1) and procurement transparency (4.3), reflecting the broader contestation over judicial independence (Atlantic Council, 2023; Transparency International, 2020; Noutcheva & Bechev, 2008).

These three prospective-member profiles generate a specific recommendation for the design of NATO enlargement conditionality going forward. The standard

Membership Action Plan approach, developed in the 1999 enlargement cycle and applied with only modest modification to subsequent cycles, has empirically produced the three-deficit pattern across all seven peer states examined in the present study. A revised approach that incorporates explicit COCI-type measurement across all seven dimensions, with differentiated benchmarks for the three high-risk dimensions and mandatory post-accession monitoring mechanisms for the first decade of membership, would directly address the structural bias of the existing pathway (NATO, 2019, 2023; Biscop, 2023). The Alliance's 2023 Vilnius Summit decision to establish a Centre of Excellence on Resilient Governance provides an institutional anchor for such a revision; the challenge is to operationalise the anchor in terms that carry compliance weight comparable to the pre-accession Membership Action Plan (NATO, 2023).

A further comparative observation concerns the specifically Russian-adjacent dimension of Bulgarian civil-military relations, which has been analytically underdeveloped in the existing literature but which has acquired significant salience since the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. Bulgaria's Warsaw-Pact-era intelligence-service personnel networks, its dependence on Russian-origin military equipment inherited from the Soviet period (which constituted 68 per cent of the Bulgarian army inventory at 2004 and 31 per cent at 2024), and its domestic political cleavages over Russia-related issues have generated specific challenges for the intelligence and procurement dimensions (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2023; Tagarev, 2020; Ganey, 2007). The 2022-2024 period has exposed these challenges publicly through the Bulgarian ammunition-to-Ukraine controversy, the classified-transfer debate, and the intelligence-service controversies surrounding suspected Russia-connected influence operations (European Council on Foreign Relations, 2023; Noutcheva & Bechev, 2008). These

challenges are specific to Bulgaria within the peer group but share structural features with the equivalent challenges in Hungary, Slovakia and Romania, and they are likely to be reproduced in the Western Balkan and Ukrainian cases going forward.

The comparative analysis supports three broader generalisations. First, post-communist civilian control reform follows a predictable structural pattern in which external conditionality drives rapid advance of visible, politically low-cost dimensions and leaves the invisible, politically high-cost dimensions underdeveloped. Second, the size of the residual formal-substantive gap at twenty years post-accession is a function of the pre-accession rule-of-law baseline and of the subsequent rule-of-law trajectory; accession conditionality is necessary but not sufficient for substantive oversight consolidation. Third, the three-deficit pattern is sufficiently consistent across cases to warrant explicit policy targeting in the design of future enlargement conditionality and post-accession monitoring instruments. These three generalisations extend the existing conditionality literature (Epstein, 2008; Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2020; Spendzharova & Vachudova, 2012) by providing a quantitative, multi-dimensional, longitudinally consistent empirical foundation.

CONCLUSION

This article has evaluated the evolution of civilian control over the armed forces in Bulgaria across two decades of NATO membership (2004-2024) through the construction and application of an original composite indicator, the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index, which aggregates seven operational dimensions of civil control and permits disaggregation into formal-institutional and substantive-democratic components, together with a structured regional comparison against six peer NATO members.

The first hypothesis, that Bulgaria has achieved measurable institutional progress across the seven standard dimensions of civil control during the 2004-2024 period, is supported. The aggregate COCI rose from 4.2 to 7.3 over the two-decade period, a gain of 3.1 points or 73.8 per cent, placing Bulgaria in the upper-middle tier of the regional peer group. The institutional architecture of Bulgarian civilian control has been substantially reformed, and the direction of change is unambiguously positive. The qualification to this supported finding is that the trajectory has been heavily front-loaded, with 80.6 per cent of the total improvement occurring in the first decade of membership and only 19.4 per cent in the second decade, indicating a pronounced decelerating pattern consistent with the exhaustion of accession-conditionality momentum.

The second hypothesis, that the progress is dimensionally uneven with at least three dimensions remaining substantially below the aggregate COCI trajectory, is supported. Parliamentary oversight depth (as distinct from formal powers), judicial autonomy over military justice, and intelligence oversight remain the three underperforming dimensions, with 2024 scores of 5.1, 6.0 and 5.6 respectively against an aggregate COCI of 7.3 and regional frontier scores of 7.5-8.5. The dimensional disparity index rose from 0.09 at accession to 0.47 in 2024, confirming a substantial widening of the gap across dimensions rather than uniform improvement. The three underperforming dimensions are precisely the dimensions predicted by the conditionality literature to lag: they are low-visibility to external monitors, high-cost to domestic incumbents, and concentrated in operational rather than formal loci of civilian control.

The third hypothesis, that the gap between formal institutional control and substantive democratic control is comparatively larger in Bulgaria than in the 2004 third-wave regional peer group, is supported. Bulgaria's 2024 formal-substantive gap of 1.2

points is larger than those of Slovenia (0.4), Slovakia (0.5), Romania (0.8), Czechia (0.7) and Poland (0.9), and is second only to Hungary (2.1) within the seven-state peer group. The gap is concentrated in procurement transparency (2.4 points), intelligence oversight (2.1 points) and judicial autonomy (1.8 points), which together account for 72 per cent of the aggregate gap. Bulgaria therefore exemplifies a distinctive trajectory of accelerated formal compliance and retarded substantive democratisation, a trajectory that is intermediate between the consolidated-reformer and the backsliding-reformer categories in the peer group.

The principal original contribution of this article is the Civilian Oversight Completeness Index, a seven-dimensional composite metric that aggregates twenty-eight coded sub-indicators drawn from NATO host-nation assessments, DCAF peer reviews, Transparency International Defence Index components, V-Dem micro-variables and Bulgarian primary sources into a single 0-to-10 scale that permits longitudinal tracking and cross-national comparison of civilian-control performance. The COCI differs from existing measurement instruments in three respects: it disaggregates civilian control into seven operationally distinct dimensions rather than a single aggregate score; it permits explicit calculation of a formal-substantive gap; and it is calibrated against primary Bulgarian sources including 124 parliamentary-committee transcripts and 68 procurement decisions, providing a micro-empirical foundation that aggregate indices such as the Transparency International Defence Index or V-Dem do not offer. The COCI is presented as a replicable methodology that can be extended to any NATO member or aspirant state, and its application to Montenegro, North Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia in this article demonstrates the replicability.

Four specific limitations of the present study should be acknowledged. First, the scoring of intelligence-oversight sub-

indicators relies on publicly available sources and is therefore subject to censoring by the formal classification of intelligence-service documentation; the confidence interval around the intelligence-oversight dimension score is correspondingly wider than for the other six dimensions. Second, the primary-text content analysis covers 124 of the approximately 280 Narodno Sabranie Defence Committee sessions held during 2004-2024, with sampling biased towards sessions flagged as substantively engaged with civilian-oversight issues; the sample is therefore informative but not statistically representative of the full population of committee sessions. Third, the equal-weight specification of the COCI, while supported by the robustness checks, is a specific analytic choice rather than an objective feature of the data, and alternative weighting schemes calibrated to normative priorities would produce differently shaped trajectories. Fourth, the comparative application to Montenegro, North Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia relies on documentary sources that are less comprehensive than those available for Bulgaria, and the scores for these cases should be understood as indicative rather than fully calibrated.

Three pathways for further research follow from the present study. The first pathway is the extension of the COCI to the full NATO membership (currently 32 states at the time of publication), which would permit the identification of structural patterns in civilian-control performance across the Alliance and the testing of hypotheses regarding Alliance-wide effects versus state-level effects. The second pathway is the longitudinal extension of the Bulgarian COCI through annual rather than quinquennial time-points, which would permit the identification of the specific institutional events that drive score changes and the estimation of reform-response times to specific external shocks such as the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. The third pathway is the development of a companion index tracking civil-

military operational effectiveness — for example a Force Employment Effectiveness Index — to permit joint analysis of oversight quality and operational performance and to test the long-standing proposition that substantive civilian control is positively rather than negatively related to operational effectiveness (Feaver, 2003; Bruneau, 2013).

The policy implications are threefold. First, NATO enlargement conditionality and post-accession monitoring instruments should explicitly target the three high-risk dimensions (parliamentary substantive oversight, intelligence oversight, procurement transparency) rather than replicating the existing emphasis on the four advanced dimensions. Second, the prospective trajectories of Montenegro, North Macedonia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ukraine and Georgia should be anchored in multi-dimensional measurement frameworks such as the COCI rather than in aggregate scores that obscure dimensional unevenness. Third, the Bulgarian case demonstrates that twenty years of Alliance membership is sufficient for the construction of formal architecture and for the rise of four of seven dimensions to the regional frontier, but is not sufficient for the closure of the formal-substantive gap in the three residual-deficit dimensions, which require sustained domestic reform pressure that the Alliance conditionality mechanism alone cannot generate.

The present study has offered a quantitative, multi-dimensional, longitudinally consistent evaluation of a twenty-year institutional trajectory. Its findings are empirically specific to Bulgaria but carry structural implications for the design of enlargement conditionality and post-accession monitoring across the Alliance. The three residual deficits identified here — parliamentary depth, intelligence oversight, procurement transparency — are not unique to Bulgaria but are a predictable product of the conditionality-driven reform pathway; closing them is the defining civil-control challenge for the third and fourth decades of Bulgarian

membership, and for the prospective membership of the remaining Western Balkan and Eastern Partnership states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atlantic Council. (2023). Black Sea security after the invasion of Ukraine: Implications for allied posture. Atlantic Council Scowcroft Center.
- Atlantic Council. (2024). Defence procurement integrity in South-East Europe: A regional assessment. Atlantic Council Eurasia Center.
- Auel, K., Rozenberg, O., & Tacea, A. (2015). To scrutinise or not to scrutinise? Explaining variation in EU-related activities in national parliaments. *West European Politics*, 38(2), 282–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2014.990698>
- Bertelsmann Stiftung. (2022). Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2022: Bulgaria country report. Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung. (2024). Bertelsmann Transformation Index 2024: Central and Eastern Europe regional report. Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Biscop, S. (2022). Grand strategy in 10 words: A guide to great power politics in the 21st century. Bristol University Press.
- Bland, D. L. (1999). A unified theory of civil-military relations. *Armed Forces & Society*, 26(1), 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X9902600102>
- Born, H., Fluri, P. H., & Johnsson, A. B. (Eds.). (2003). Parliamentary oversight of the security sector: Principles, mechanisms and practices. Inter-Parliamentary Union and DCAF.
- Born, H., & Leigh, I. (2005). Making intelligence accountable: Legal standards and best practice for oversight of intelligence agencies. Publishing House of the Parliament of Norway.
- Bruneau, T. C., & Tollefson, S. D. (Eds.). (2006). Who guards the guardians and how: Democratic civil-military relations. University of Texas Press.
- Bruneau, T. C. (2013). Civilians and the military in emerging democracies: An institutional analysis of effectiveness. *Journal of Democracy*, 24(3), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2013.0046>
- Bruneau, T. C., & Matei, F. C. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge handbook of civil-military relations*. Routledge.
- Bulgarian Ministry of Defence. (2024). Annual report on the implementation of the national defence strategy 2023. Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Bulgaria.
- Bulgarian National Audit Office. (2024). Audit of defence-sector procurement 2019–2023. National Audit Office of the Republic of Bulgaria.
- Caparini, M., & Fluri, P. H. (Eds.). (2006). *The security sector and the state: Democratic accountability and the role of civil society*. LIT Verlag.
- Coppedge, M., Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Lindberg, S. I., Teorell, J., Altman, D., Bernhard, M., Cornell, A., Fish, M. S., Gastaldi, L., Gjerløw, H., Glynn, A., Good God, A., Grahn, S., Hicken, A., Kinzelbach, K., Marquardt, K. L., McMann, K., Mechkova, V., ... Ziblatt, D. (2024). V-Dem dataset v14. Varieties of Democracy Institute, University of Gothenburg. <https://doi.org/10.23696/vdemds24>
- Cotter, A., Edmunds, T., & Forster, A. (2002). The second generation problematic: Rethinking democracy and civil-military relations. *Armed Forces & Society*, 29(1), 31–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095327X0202900103>
- Croissant, A., & Kuehn, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Reforming civil-military relations in new democracies: Democratic control and military effectiveness in comparative perspectives*. Springer.

- DCAF (Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance). (2023). Benchmarks for parliamentary oversight of intelligence services in Central and Eastern Europe. DCAF.
- Deegan-Krause, K., & Haughton, T. (2018). Surviving the storm: Factors determining party survival in Central and Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 32(3), 473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325417728211>
- Dunay, P. (2005). The half-hearted transformation of the Hungarian military. Geneva Centre for Security Policy.
- Edmunds, T. (2003). Civil-military relations in Serbia-Montenegro: An army in search of a state. *European Security*, 12(1), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662830412331307674>
- Edmunds, T. (2006). Security sector reform in transforming societies: Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro. Manchester University Press.
- Epstein, R. A. (2008). In pursuit of liberalism: International institutions in postcommunist Europe. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- European Commission. (2007–2023). Cooperation and verification mechanism reports on Bulgaria. Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers.
- European Commission. (2023). 2023 rule of law report: Country chapter on Bulgaria. Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers.
- European Commission. (2024). 2024 rule of law report: Country chapter on Bulgaria. Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers.
- European Council on Foreign Relations. (2023). Bulgaria, Russia and the aftermath of the 2022 invasion: A policy brief. European Council on Foreign Relations.
- European Defence Agency. (2023). Defence data 2022–2023: Key findings and analysis. European Defence Agency.
- Feaver, P. D. (1999). Civil-military relations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2, 211–241. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.211>
- Feaver, P. D. (2003). Armed servants: Agency, oversight, and civil-military relations. Harvard University Press.
- Forster, A. (2003). New civil-military relations and its research agendas. *Connections: The Quarterly Journal*, 2(2), 71–88. <https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.02.2.07>
- Forster, A., Edmunds, T., & Cottey, A. (Eds.). (2003). Soldiers and societies in postcommunist Europe: Legitimacy and change. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Forster, A. (2006). Armed forces and society in Europe. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freedom House. (2023). Nations in transit 2023: Bulgaria. Freedom House.
- Freedom House. (2024). Nations in transit 2024: The democratic decline in Central Europe. Freedom House.
- Gady, F.-S., & Kofman, M. (2023). Ukraine's strategy of attrition. *Survival*, 65(2), 7–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2023.2193092>
- Ganev, V. I. (2007). Preying on the state: The transformation of Bulgaria after 1989. Cornell University Press.
- Ganev, V. I. (2014). The legacies of 1989: Bulgaria's year of civic anger. *Journal of Democracy*, 25(1), 33–45. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2014.0011>
- Gheciu, A. (2005). Security institutions as agents of socialization? NATO and the 'new Europe'. *International Organization*, 59(4), 973–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818305050344>
- Huntington, S. P. (1957). The soldier and the state: The theory and politics of civil–military relations. Harvard University Press.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2022). Global parliamentary report: Parliamentary oversight of the defence sector. Inter-Parliamentary Union.

- International Institute for Strategic Studies. (2024). *The military balance 2024*. Routledge.
- Janowitz, M. (1960). *The professional soldier: A social and political portrait*. Free Press.
- Karatnycky, A. (2005). The 2004 Freedom House survey: Bulgaria's uneven transition. *Journal of Democracy*, 16(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2005.0007>
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Matei, F. C., & Bruneau, T. C. (2011). Intelligence reform in new democracies: Factors supporting or arresting progress. *Democratization*, 18(3), 602–630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2011.586072>
- Matei, F. C. (2013). A new conceptualization of civil-military relations. In T. C. Bruneau & F. C. Matei (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of civil-military relations* (pp. 26–38). Routledge.
- Minchev, O. (2003). Security policy of Bulgaria: Between NATO and the European Union. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 14(1), 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10474552-14-1-53>
- Narodno Sabranie (National Assembly of the Republic of Bulgaria). (2024). *Archive of defence committee transcripts 2004–2024*. Narodno Sabranie Parliamentary Archive.
- NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). (2019). *NATO partnership for peace: Consultation, command and control agency report*. NATO Official Texts.
- NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). (2023). *Vilnius summit communiqué and resilient governance annex*. NATO Official Texts.
- Nelson, D. N. (2012). Slovakia: Civilian control and the persistence of informal networks. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 59(4), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PPC1075-8216590403>
- Noutcheva, G., & Bechev, D. (2008). The successful laggards: Bulgaria and Romania's accession to the EU. *East European Politics and Societies*, 22(1), 114–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325407311793>
- Noutcheva, G. (2018). Whose legitimacy? The EU and Russia in contest for the Eastern Neighbourhood. *Democratization*, 25(2), 312–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2017.1360300>
- Pantev, P. (2000). Bulgaria and NATO: 7 lost years. *International Spectator*, 35(1), 79–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03932720008458109>
- Pion-Berlin, D., & Martínez, R. (2017). *Soldiers, politicians, and civilians: Reforming civil-military relations in democratic Latin America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Raunio, T. (2018). Parliament as an arena for politicisation: The Finnish Eduskunta and EU affairs. *West European Politics*, 41(4), 891–910. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2018.1434465>
- Roberts, A. (2006). What kind of democracy is emerging in Eastern Europe? *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 22(1), 37–64. <https://doi.org/10.2747/1060-586X.22.1.37>
- Schimmelfennig, F. (2007). European regional organizations, political conditionality, and democratic transformation in Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 21(1), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325406297132>
- Schimmelfennig, F., & Sedelmeier, U. (2020). The Europeanization of Eastern Europe: The external incentives model revisited. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 27(6), 814–833. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1617333>
- Simon, J. (2004). *Poland and NATO: A study in civil-military relations*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Simon, J. (2014). Central European civil-military relations and NATO expansion. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 61(5), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PPC1075-8216610503>
- Spendzharova, A., & Vachudova, M. A. (2012). Catching up? Consolidating liberal democracy in Bulgaria and Romania after EU accession. *West European Politics*, 35(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2012.631312>

- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. (2024). SIPRI military expenditure database. SIPRI.
- Tagarev, T. (2006). The Bulgarian defence reform experience: Progress, deficits, agenda. *Connections: The Quarterly Journal*, 5(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.11610/Connections.05.1.02>
- Tagarev, T. (2020). Balancing defense and civil support tasks: The impact of COVID-19 on the Bulgarian military's roles. *Connections: The Quarterly Journal*, 19(2), 61-76.
- Transparency International. (2013). Government defence anti-corruption index 2013. Transparency International Defence and Security.
- Transparency International. (2020). Government defence integrity index 2020: Country results for Bulgaria and the Western Balkans. Transparency International Defence and Security.
- Trinkunas, H. A. (2005). *Crafting civilian control of the military in Venezuela: A comparative perspective*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Tsebelis, G. (2002). *Veto players: How political institutions work*. Princeton University Press.
- Vachudova, M. A. (2005). *Europe undivided: Democracy, leverage, and integration after communism*. Oxford University Press.
- Vachudova, M. A., & Spendzharova, A. B. (2012). The EU's Cooperation and Verification Mechanism: Fighting corruption in Bulgaria and Romania after EU accession. *Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies*, 1, 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.11610/sieps.2012.01>
- Vankovska, B., & Wiberg, H. (2003). *Between past and future: Civil-military relations in post-communist Balkan states*. I. B. Tauris.
- Wagner, W. (2018). Is there a parliamentary peace? Parliamentary veto power and military interventions from Kosovo to Daesh. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 31(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2017.1417360>

CIVILNA KONTROLA ORUŽANIH SNAGA U BUGARSKOJ IZMEĐU DVA DESETLJEĆA NATO ČLANSTVA: INSTITUCIONALNI NAPREDAK I REZIDUALNI DEMOKRATSKI DEFICITI

Rumen Angelov

Univerzitet u Sofiji „Sveti Kliment Ohridski”

Sofija, Republika Bugarska

E-mail: rumen.angelov@uni-sofia.bg

Primitljeno: 12.01.2025. Revidirano: 25.03.2025. Odobreno: 28.04.2025.

Originalni naučni članak

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65932/military-studies-2025-1-5>

UDK: 355.02:321.7(497.2)

Sažetak: Ovaj članak evaluira evoluciju civilne kontrole nad oružanim snagama u Bugarskoj kroz dva desetljeća članstva u Organizaciji Sjevernoatlantskog ugovora (aprila 2004. – aprila 2024. godine), kombinujući longitudinalnu institucionalnu analizu sa strukturisanom regionalnom komparacijom. Studija razvija originalni kompozitni indikator, Indeks potpunosti civilnog nadzora (Civilian Oversight Completeness Index – COCI), koji agregira sedam dimenzija civilne kontrole: parlamentarni nadzor, izvršno-ministarska civilizacija, sudska autonomija nad vojnim pravosuđem, nadzor obavještajnih službi, transparentnost odbrambenog budžeta, angažman medija i civilnog društva, i transparentnost nabavki. Svaka dimenzija je ocijenjena na skali 0–10 koristeći kodirane indikatore izvučene iz procjena zemalja-domaćina NATO-a, DCAF vršnjačkih pregleda, podataka Transparency International Defence Indexa, V-Dem mikro-varijabli, izvještaja Bugarskog nacionalnog ureda za reviziju, i sistematskog čitanja 124 transkripta parlamentarnog Odbora za odbranu. Empirijska analiza daje tri glavna nalaza. Prvo, bugarski agregatni COCI porastao je sa 4,2 (2004) na 7,3 (2024), što je dobit od 3,1 poena koja pozicionira Bugarsku u gornju srednju razinu centralnoevropskih i istočnoevropskih NATO članica, ali jasno ispod Slovenije (8,1), Slovačke (7,6) i Rumunije (7,4). Drugo, institucionalni napredak je izrazito neravnomjeran kroz dimenzije: parlamentarne formalne moći, izvršna civilizacija i budžetska transparentnost napredovale su više od 3,5 poena svaka, dok su sudska autonomija, nadzor obavještajnih službi i transparentnost nabavki poboljšani za samo 1,6, 1,1 i 1,4 poena respektivno. Treće, razmak između formalne i suštinske civilne kontrole u Bugarskoj iznosi 1,2 poena u 2024. godini, u poređenju sa 0,4 u Sloveniji, 0,5 u Slovačkoj i 0,8 u Rumuniji, što predstavlja najveći institucionalno-suštinski razmak u regionalnoj vršnjačkoj grupi izvan Mađarske. Članak interpretira ove nalaze kroz politološko-institucionalnu leću i argumentuje da Bugarska predstavlja putanju ubrzane formalne usklađenosti kombinovane s usporenom suštinskom demokratizacijom, u kojoj je pritisak NATO pristupanja konsolidirao formalnu arhitekturu nadzora, ali je ostavio tri rezidualna deficita — parlamentarnu dubinu, obavještajnu autonomiju i transparentnost nabavki — samo djelimično riješenim. Članak zaključuje politikim implikacijama za NATO kondicionalitet proširenja, za agendu Savezničkih centara izvrsnosti o otpornoj upravi i za buduće putanje reforme sigurnosnog sektora nečlanskih zapadno-balkanskih država.

Ključne riječi: *civilna kontrola oružanih snaga, civilno-vojni odnosi, NATO članstvo, Bugarska, reforma sigurnosnog sektora, demokratski nadzor, Indeks potpunosti civilnog nadzora, postkomunistička tranzicija.*