

Ildikó Szinay¹

The impact of the strengthening of the Hungarian Prime Minister's power on the organizational background (1989–2018)

Keywords: Prime Minister's Office, Prime Minister, Minister, Chancellor governance, presidentiality

Słowa kluczowe: biuro premiera, premier, minister, kanclerz, prezydencja

Abstract

The Prime Minister's Office is generally the top institution for the Head of Government, and the tool for the implementation of its strategy (whether secretarial or general government). The place, responsibilities and weight of the government differ from country to country. The author seeks to determine the extent to which the function of the Office has changed in Hungary per legislative period, or whether the changed office function can be defined by the previous established set of rules, or perhaps a new addition is required to the existing theoretical bases. With only touching on the times prior the change of regime, the author examines the Prime Minister's background institution from the first democratic Prime Minister to the currently governing Prime Minister.

¹ ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1793-7946, PhD candidate, The Doctoral School of Public Administration Sciences of the National University of Public Service and the Head of the Secretariat at the Ministry of Human Capacities. E-mail: ildikoszinay@gmail.com.

Streszczenie

Wpływ wzmocnienia władzy premiera Węgier na zaplecze organizacyjne

Kancelaria Premiera jest na ogół najwyższą urzędem dla szefa rządu i narzędziem realizacji jej strategii (czy to sekretariatu, czy rządu). Miejsce, odpowiedzialność i waga rządu różnią się w zależności od kraju. Autor stara się ustalić, w jakim stopniu Urząd zmieniał się na Węgrzech w okresie ustawodawczym, czy zmieniona funkcja urzędu może być zdefiniowana przez poprzednio ustalony zestaw zasad, lub może konieczne jest dodanie nowego do istniejącego teoretycznego podstawy. Mając na uwadze jedynie czasy poprzedzające zmianę reżimu, autor bada instytucję wstępną premiera od pierwszego demokratycznego premiera do obecnego premiera.

I.

Internationally, the scientific literature notes two types of the prime minister's offices: the secretarial-type and the Chancellery model². The example of the former is the Hungarian pre-transition office, the latter being Germany as its frontrunner. The strengthening of the German Chancellor's office is strongly aligned to Willy Brandt, whose leadership was a powerful one³. However, the strengthening of the position of the German prime minister did not stop there, and some chancellors continued to take a more proactive policy, and even more became the leader of the country, their party leader. The process also had an impact on the structure of the prime minister's office, his position of government and the expansion of its powers. Its degree and weight were proportional to the increase in the influence of the Prime Minister.

This is supported by the political presidentialization that can be observed throughout Europe, which is, on the one hand, the emergence of the executive power from the political system, including the overthrow and independence of the head of government from its party, on the other hand, the change

² *Magyar közigazgatási jog – Általános rész*, eds. M. Fazekas, L. Ficzer Budapest 2005, pp. 149–150.

³ Z. Fehér, *A kormányzás háttérintézményei. Amerikai és európai példák I. rész*, "Politikatudományi Szemle", 2002, No. 3–4, pp. 43–46.

in politics and the personalization of political competition⁴. The European trend (presidentialization, personalization) is being demonstrated by the example of Germany. As a result, the leaders of several European countries had begun to build a new, streamlined reinforced background base with (more) appropriate tools and (more) suitable people. The dominant head of government thus emerges from the government and becomes a prime leader, relying on dominant power on its narrow backbone base and transforms it into a government engine. According to this process, are we able to talk about two types of government headquarters or do we re-interpret the classic model system from some countries? The question arises as to whether if, in defining the categories, the Prime Minister's offices under the Secretariat type are still in this category, through the strengthening of the Heads of Government.

Through Hungary's example, a huge change is noticeable that not only shows the past 20 years of office, but also offers a new interpretation of categorization. I am, therefore, researching if the center of the gravity of the already approved chancellor definition is shifting forwards or there may be a third interpretation of the new type of governance.

II.

In Hungary, a number of public law functions have been defined in the foundations of the regime change. Initially, the President of the Republic based on the Polish model came up with the solution that the President of the Republic was subject to parliament⁵. In Hungary, a number of public law duties have been defined in the foundations of the regime change. In 1989, the President's institution was given a symbolic role, thus opening up the possibility for the Prime Minister to emerge from within this political system⁶. Theoretical possibility has been created in practice and an increasing emphasis

⁴ A. Körösnéyi, *Mozgékony patthelyzet*, [In:] *Túlterhelt demokrácia, Alkotmányos és kormányzati alapszerkezetünk*, ed. C. Gombár, Budapest 2006, pp. 7–36.

⁵ L. Lengyel, *A politikai intézményrendszer dilemmái, 1989–2006*, [In:] *Túlterhelt demokrácia...*, pp. 51–53.

⁶ Z. Fehér, *A kormányzás háttérintézményei, Amerikai és európai példák – I. rész*, "Politikatudományi szemle" 2002, No. 11, évf. 3–4, pp. 35–36.

on the head of government and its institutions over the years. Of course, the changes affected the office of the head of government. The significance, size and influence of its background base changed dynamically.

Before the democratic transition by 1988, the Office, then known as the Secretariat of the Council of Ministers, had not yet been a public body with national authority and the leader of the state secretary had no ranking. It has provided basic functions that clearly match the secretary's mark (decision preparation, decision making, proclamation, publication, personnel affairs). Its scope of activity was limited to formal, administrative and bureaucratic tasks. From 1988 onwards, the Office of the Council of Ministers had a somewhat meaningful role, its rules were public, its leader became rank as secretary of state⁷. The types of tasks that fall within its sphere of authority have changed somewhat in the process of changing the system, but we are still mostly talking about basic tasks⁸.

Since 1990, the Prime Minister's Office (hereinafter referred to as the Office) has become the most decisive institution in the 8 years after the change of regime – with the political and administrative role of József Antall, Péter Boross and Gyula Horn. However, in its leadership, the lineup was still unchanged (instead of the ministers), the state secretaries who had dispatched over the 500 staffing staff⁹.

The change was clearly brought about by the right-wing governance that began in 1998 under the auspices of the Fidesz-FKGP-MDF coalition, which also meant the regression of the first Orbán government. It was a milestone in reinforcing the power and background of the Prime Minister and the beginning of a process that resulted in huge changes.

Signs of Hungarian presidentialization are beginning to show clearly from 1998 onwards. Viktor Orbán was charismatic, and proved as a strong leader over his party¹⁰. Of course, he was only able to achieve this by laying the foundations of a strong background institution that could be empowered to achieve government goals in both leadership and organization.

Prime Minister's Office from 1998 was based on the German Federal Chancellery Office at that time. However, this was only the basis for the establish-

⁷ G. Müller, *Kormányról kormányra a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon, Antalltól Gyurcsányig*, Budapest 2008, pp. 15–25.

⁸ G. Müller, *Kormányról kormányra...*, pp. 16–29.

⁹ G. Müller, *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok*, Budapest 2011, pp. 120–121.

¹⁰ A. Körösné, op.cit., pp. 31–32.

ment as there was a different office, in its operation and structure, that was being formed¹¹. It is admittedly indisputable, at least according to the scientific literature, that the Hungarian Prime Minister's Chancellery type classification dates back since then.

By law the Prime Minister's Office controls and coordinates the government's strategic activities¹². The radical changes occurred in 4 areas of the office life. The most remarkable reform is to increase the ministerial rank of the high – ranking minister (although its legal background was established by the previous government¹³), and the establishment of a referral system¹⁴. Nevertheless, the establishment of new political state secretariats in office as well as the strengthening of the press and communication section can be regarded as a tool for enhancing power¹⁵. Along with this, the institution became a political entity through the strategic governance of the government and the enforcement of the interests of the general government¹⁶, while retaining the prime and exclusive workforce of the Prime Minister¹⁷.

It is important to note that the transformation of the organization and the expansion of the office did not bring any drastic increase in the staff numbers. The Prime Minister's Office of the First Orbán Government carried out the tasks with over 560 people¹⁸.

III.

Between 2002 and 2010, socialist government followed the leadership of 3 Heads of Government, of which the first six years were led by a Socialist-Lib-

¹¹ G. Müller, *Kormányról kormányra...*, pp. 52–52.

¹² 137/1998 (VIII. 18.) Korm. rendelet a Miniszterelnöki Hivatalról.

¹³ A. Körösenyi, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

¹⁴ G. Müller, *Kormányról kormányra...*, pp. 51–52.

¹⁵ A. Körösenyi, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

¹⁶ F. Mandák, *A politika prezidencialisációja (Magyarország, Olaszország)*, Doktori (PhD) Értekezés 2014, p. 87.

¹⁷ É. Ványi, *Politizáció vagy professzionalizáció?, A politikai kormányzás jogi, intézményi és személyi feltételei 2006, 2010*, "Politikatudományi szemle" 2016, No. XXV/3, p. 93.

¹⁸ G. Müller, *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok...*, pp. 120–121.

eral Coalition¹⁹. During the governments led by Péter Medgyessy (2002–2004), Ferenc Gyurcsány (2004–2006, 2006–2009) and Gordon Bajnai (2009–2010), the process of presidentialization and the associated institutional strengthening continued.

The road to becoming Prime Minister for Medgyessy and Gyurcsány can not be considered as typical or similar to their predecessors. They both had a special path²⁰, but in a short time (similar to Orbán), they could be independent of their party, which provided them with a broad political leverage²¹.

There is little similarity between institutional operation. Looking back since the previous cycle (the first Orbán government), which created the institutional Office framework, we can say that revolutionary reforms have not taken place between 2002 and 2010. Although the 2006 statutory law²² is ground breaking, but No. radical change has been made.

In essence, the Medgyessy government restructured the whole office by renaming the papers, integrating previously outsourced areas, some new areas of expertise, and ministers without portfolio²³. With the expansion of the organization, the total number of ministry staff grew to 780 by 2003, making it to the list of top European Governments at that time²⁴. (Then, but even during the Medgyessy government period, this number is 836)²⁵.

If we look at the prime minister's legal and power position, 2006 is a turning point for legal regulation. The abovementioned statutory law confirmed both the role of the Prime Minister and the powers of the Prime Minister's Office²⁶. The role of the Office in the governmental structure was first governed since the change of regime. This, in real terms, also

¹⁹ S. Pesti, A. Farkas, R. Franczel, *A kormány működési és szervezeti rendje (1990–2014)*, [In:] *A magyar politikai rendszer – negyedszázad után*, ed. S. Körösnéyi, Budapest 2015, pp. 130–131.

²⁰ Medgyessy came out of the party, Gyurcsány built up form the unknown within two years.

²¹ A. Körösnéyi, op.cit., pp. 31–31.

²² 2006. évi LVII. törvény a központi államigazgatási szervekről, valamint a Kormány tagjai és az államtitkárok jogállásáról.

²³ F. Mandák, *A politika prezidencialisációja (Magyarország, Olaszország)*, Doktori értekezés, Budapest 2014, pp. 87–88.

²⁴ A. Körösnéyi, op.cit., p. 28.

²⁵ G. Müller, *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok...*, p. 121.

²⁶ F. Mandák, op.cit., p. 87.

meant that the Prime Minister's Office was the institutional support of the (growing) political government of the second Gyurcsány government²⁷. This kind of management technique required the Government Communications Center and a State Secretariat responsible for strategic management of government work to sit within the Office, to which the government commissioners, entrusted with the tasks to the government, belonged. Thus, important political affairs were directly under the Prime Minister within the Office²⁸.

Prime Minister Medgyessy and Gyurcsány, both were able to increased their Prime Ministerial Office with the tools of their office, whose function was extended from cycle to cycle. Under the second Gyurcsány government, the agency has a very large number of reorganizations. Compared to that in the Bajnai government, this is moderate²⁹, overall, however, we can talk about a less dynamic period for the Office. During the left-wing governance, we see the most organizational and, consequently, the expansion of personnel, and a major declaration (2006 statutory law), that governs the operation of the Prime Minister's Office, and continued with the principle of institutional operation that began in 1998. The sheets do not alter the reforms were made to the Government, which can be experienced before 2002 and after 2010, however, deserve the adjective of Ministry of Chancery through increasingly prominent role and growing influence.

IV.

The 2010 elections triggered a change of government and a political turn, which have resulted in Viktor Orbán sitting for the second time at the head of the government in the colors of the conservative FIDESZ-KDNP party alliance. The electoral results themselves have made huge changes since the party (without forced co-ordination since the first coalition) had a two-thirds majority in the legislature's house in the Hungarian Parliament. And if, on the basis of the subject of our research, we call the formation of the first Orbán

²⁷ É. Ványi, *op.cit.*, pp. 87–110.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 95.

²⁹ G. Müller, *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok...*, pp. 128–129.

government a turning point, in 2010 we will be able to qualify the second Orbán government as a radical reform.

The constitutional mandate has assisted the Prime Minister in the above and strengthened the Prime Minister's power. The new Fundamental Law in 2011 already stated that the Prime Minister defines the general policy of the government³⁰ (the provisions of the previous Constitution only cover the Prime Minister's leadership of the government's meetings and the implementation of the government's decrees and decisions)³¹.

After the elections, FIDESZ -KDNP government imagined and implemented a completely new governmental structure, which was accompanied by a narrowing Ministry³². The "small" government also meant that the Prime Minister's Office, which was operating between 1990 and 2010, was completely abolished, and the successor was no longer granted ministerial rank and ministerial leadership.

During the cycle, 2010–2012 is a dense, eventful event in the operation of the head of government institution. In 2010, the transformation that changed the whole organization started, and in 2012, management and functional reforms were implemented.

By 2010, the Prime Minister's Office and the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister within that office acted as a single organization and institution. With the change of government, the office was transformed into a dual one and the tasks of the former office were partly dealt with by the newly established Ministry of Public Administration and Justice (hereinafter referred to as Ministry) with ministerial leadership and with the abolishing of the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister there was established a new Prime Ministry³³ (hereinafter referred to as PMO) with the leadership of State Secretary. From the point of view of the division of tasks this also meant that the Ministry had professional-administrative and political co-ordination, and the Prime Ministry only did the prime minister's tasks. With this, the Ministry has implemented

³⁰ Magyarország Alaptörvénye 18. cikk (1).

³¹ 1949. évi XX. törvény 37. § (1).

³² A model based on the so-called "top ministries" was created, which meant merging several areas into a ministry.

³³ Officially communicated in English as Prime Minister's Office, in Hungarian Prime Ministry.

a kind of chancellor model and the PMO is the classical secretarial model³⁴. According to the model system, both types were functioning at the same time.

The Cabinet functioned only with a small number of staff³⁵, with 94 people in the first year (in 2011, this number rose to 128)³⁶, which was able to carry out the decreased Prime Minister's tasks. On the other hand, the ministry's administrative and judicial ministry – outside its professional field – essentially provided the coordination of the central government. The simultaneous functioning of the Chancellery and Secretariat model and its “clean” separation remained until 2011.

In 2011, the PMO took over the area of government communication, with which the organization had a political mandate³⁷, eliminating the “chemically pure” classification. Due to the new function, operation has been a move from the secretarial function, but it can not yet be classified into another category. In 2011, the expansion combines both models, thus mapping a third type of mixing elements. However, this status will last until 2012, when the elements of the secretariat type will no longer prevail in the functioning of the Prime Ministry.

In 2012, the change of leadership in the organization led to the transformation of the Chancellery-Secretariate model³⁸, which also means that the new State Secretary is due to the rearrangement. The leader is always dominant in politics, in a broader perspective, in the leadership of an organization. Its quality, efficiency, and effective positioning are the key to success. Success can be measured by growth, enabling the organization's portfolio to be enriched. At the helm of the Prime Ministry, an ambitious and powerful person was involved in 2012, which resulted in the weakening of the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice.

Under the new leadership the political governance has intensified³⁹. From 2012 onwards, the PMO could already play the role of the political

³⁴ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki háttérapparátus változásai 2010–2016 között*, “Kodifikáció és közigazgatás” 2016, No. 2, pp. 26–27.

³⁵ R. Franczel, *Kormányzati döntéshozatal 2010–2014 között*, “Kodifikáció és Közigazgatás” 2015, No. 1, p. 18.

³⁶ G. Müller, *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok...*, p. 133.

³⁷ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki...*, p. 27.

³⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 27.

³⁹ R. Franczel, *Kormányzati döntéshozatal...*, p. 15.

pre-screening role of government decision-making, which reflected the weekly review of the government's pre-agenda on a weekly basis at the Political State Secretary, the PMO and the state ministers (the Professional Consultative Forum, the Secretary of State for Public Administration meeting after the government session, so only decisions could be discussed in the field of professional co-ordination)⁴⁰. In addition, the Prime Minister's mandate included two priority areas: the development policy, ie the use of European Union funds and civilian intelligence⁴¹. These two areas give its owners a wealth of power.

The organization also expanded with the new unit responsible for parliamentary relations and the State Secretariat for Parliamentary Affairs⁴². As far as government communication is concerned, the Prime Minister's Office has been fully dispersed over the area since 2012 with the adoption of international communication⁴³. Accordingly, the size of the office grew proportionally, not only in terms of organization but also in number of employees. Up to 2010, the number of personnel stepped down by the end of the Prime Minister's Office and due to dual operations was extremely low (144), but by 2013 the number of staff tripled (445)⁴⁴.

If we look at the legal authority of the head of the Prime Ministry, we can observe an interesting situation. From 2010, the head of PMO was led by a state secretary, the other side of the head of government, the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice. The mandate reflected the distribution of tasks and powers. However, from the middle of the cycle it was balanced and then overturned, but in favor of the PMO. The changed situation did not lead to promotion in this case, they left the position of the leaders in the initial stages. It is understandable and indisputable that within a cycle a ministerial appointment, which directly contributes to the swing of the government and thus contradicts the right-wing policy of the "small" government, can give rise to explanations. The timing is elegant after another successful election to the new government.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, pp. 13–19.

⁴¹ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki...*, p. 27.

⁴² R. Franczel, *Kormányzati döntéshozatal...*, p. 24.

⁴³ Ibidem, p. 35.

⁴⁴ F. Mandák, *op.cit.*, p. 99.

Overall, 2010 resulted in a completely new logic in both governmental structure, strategy making, government decision-making and its preparation. The duality of the Prime Minister's background institute at the beginning of the cycle has remained, but has gone through major changes in the division of responsibilities. Initially, the PMO was focused solely on the Prime Minister's tasks, so it was mostly a secretariat. However, its portfolio has been steadily expanding, with a new leader in the middle of the cycle. Through the latter, political leadership has become so pronounced that the work of the two heads of government work can be completely institutionalized. This clever division of labor resulted the political coordination of PMO and the professional role of Ministry.

V.

In 2014, the FIDESZ-KDNP party alliance again won the elections, the head of government remained unchanged. Regarding government operations, however, we can see relevant changes. In previous cycles, the work organization of the Prime Minister is still a major transformation. In this respect we can again distinguish two periods, 2014 is the establishment of a government structure and 2015 was the year of reform.

After the government was set up, it broke up with the duality and functioning of the Prime Ministry. By abolishing the Ministry of Public Administration and Justice, the whole office was rethought and a top-level ministry was established in a more compact (but far-reaching) form. Milestone events took place over a year, which laid the foundation of leadership for the years ahead.

In 2014, the PMO has lost its administrative nature and, for the first time since the change of the regime, had an independent ministerial rank. With the collapse of the dual system, the Ministry delegated tasks to the PMO from the Ministry, making it an organization that became the depositary of both political and professional-administrative co-ordination⁴⁵. In this form, we can speak of an institution affirmed as a super chancellery⁴⁶. By taking over the tasks, this has put a lot of pressure on the scale of authorities and this strengthened the PMO

⁴⁵ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki...*, p. 27.

⁴⁶ I. Stumpf, *A kormány alkotmányos jogállása*, "Új magyar közigazgatás" 2015, No. 8, évf. 2. sz., p. 12.

leading minister's power in the overall structure of the government. Although its ministerial rank is in principle equal to all government ministers, however, it is still an appreciative position thanks to the magnitude of the area it manages and the management of the various governmental decision-making forums.

The Prime Minister clearly stands out from the government, and the head of his work organization also stands out of the ministry. The principle of equality of ministers is broken at many points, so the term "first among the equals" is best served by the Chancellor's Minister⁴⁷ for his ministry. Although it leads as a Chancellery, the question arises as to whether total government co-ordination, government communication as a whole and the EU money distribution would fall in its category or outside of it. Of course, the question is to be approached from the prime minister. If the leadership of the government is still a Chancellery, as is its office. This is determined by the nature of government.

The next milestone in 2015 was to break the hegemony of the Prime Ministry. Organizationally unified, albeit over-sized ministry operations were shared, and they recognised the benefits of restoring a dual system. The establishment of an old and new institution, the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister and its leader, the cabinet leader, was made. The head of the cabinet leads the Cabinet Office of the Prime Minister at the ministerial level and is responsible for overall political coordination and is responsible for government communication, which is the most important part of its portfolio.

In this dual background operation, the powers and territories are completely separate, by which the work of the new heads of government was directly carried out by Prime Minister. In this way, the head of the cabinet was so narrowly empowered that the system was not fundamentally similar to the Ministry of Justice and the balanced assignment of tasks was not a goal at theoretical level⁴⁸. The Prime Minister, which implemented governmental and administrative co-ordination, was also chaired by the Political State Secretary, the weekly press conference (Governance), and the Strategic Cabinet established in 2016⁴⁹. In all of these, the Chancellery and Secretariat type model is

⁴⁷ Chancellor's Minister: the name used only in the press and the common language, not legally.

⁴⁸ I. Szinay, *Brit hatás a kormányfői hivatal átstrukturálására 2015-ben?*, "Kölcsönös Átszövődések" 2016, No. 4, pp. 360–370.

⁴⁹ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki...*, pp. 28–34.

less demarcable or can not be shared in this operation. The former could be attributed to the Head of Cabinet Office through political coordination, while the head of the PMO still holds the title of Chancellery Secretary, the area of strategic development is under its authority⁵⁰, and the head of the most important governmental decision-making forums. If we assume that chancellorship remains, then these two apparatuses share the category. And if we only examine the two institutions, we still experience an imbalance in terms of division of tasks and competence. The size and professional area of the PMO did not really diminish as a result of the changes, its influence on government and its impact on government was unbroken.

Another view that the introduction of the new decision-making forums (Strategic Cabinet, Economic Cabinet) have overcome, started the cabinet governance in Hungary. If we look at the role of the Minister leading the Prime Ministry in this system, who is the leader of the Strategic Cabinet, and thus the first man of government decision making, we might say that he is a kind of “prime minister of domestic politics” (head of Economic Cabinet “Prime Minister of Economic Policy”)⁵¹. This is further reinforced by the fact that the minister leading the Prime Minister has a very strong position in the government, as second leader. It is therefore questionable why the beginning of the cycle required government expansion and additional ministerial appointments. During the last four years, the re-qualification of an existing institution, ie the change of position of its leader, was not made, and in 2015 a new ministry was established. This can be explained by the abovementioned high concentration of power, which may be interrupted by the operation of another institution and the transformation of the system into a dual one.

VI.

In 2018, in a unique way in Hungary, Viktor Orbán was third in succession for a leader and his party was able to win a new election, so the fourth Orbán government was formed.

⁵⁰ I. Szinay, op.cit., p. 368.

⁵¹ R. Franczel, *A miniszterelnöki...*, pp. 68–70.

In the governmental structure, the major transformation of the governmental apparatus is now in place, with the Prime Minister reorganizing the power-sharing system of the backbone institutions, which also resulted in managerial and organizational changes. In the new line up, three bodies are helping the Prime Minister's work.

The Prime Ministers Cabinet Office hasn't changed its leader, status or responsibility, and remains the principal for political coordination. But the other part of the government center, the institution of the Prime Minister's Office, has not remained the same in power or in leadership. The third, government-sponsored body, is the newly established Government Office of the Prime Minister (hereinafter referred to as the Government Office). Between 1998 and 2007, the Government Office was part of the Prime Minister's Office for the preparation of government decisions and monitoring of implementation. However, from 2018, the organization has a more independent and significant role in the governmental structure. The Government Office, which was established in 2018, is an administrative unit directly belonging to the Prime Minister, independent of the other two ministries of government, and is run by the State Secretary for Public Administration. Its main task is primarily to prepare the decisions, to control government submissions, but to be responsible for implementation and for the organization of daily government work. It also carries out co-ordination activities, it is responsible for coordinating the administrative state secretaries of the ministries⁵². From these, the government's administrative work organization of the Prime Minister is drawn up.

The tasks of the Government Office were mostly transferred from the Prime Ministry (Heads of State Secretariat Conference, drafting of government reports, etc.). PMO lost significant territories defining his predominance. Through the cleaned profile, the specialized tasks were shifted to the ministries and at the same time the coordination of EU funds, the background supervision over the Information Office ceased⁵³. The weekly press conference and the strategic area remain within the institution, while the Head of the Strategic Cabinet (hereinafter referred to as Strategic and Family Affairs) re-

⁵² 3/2018. (VI. 11.) ME utasítás a Miniszterelnöki Kormányiroda Szervezeti és Működési Szabályzatáról.

⁵³ 14/2018. (VII. 3.) MvM utasítása.

mains the ministry of the Prime Minister. But in person, there was a change in 2018. At the time of departure, the entire institution was transformed, so the new person was No. longer the head of a centralized top ministry with the whole governmental sphere in its hands.

In the fourth Orbán government, the cabinet system is more pronounced or even more pronounced (due to the expansion of the number of cabinets), so the cabinet management still has a legitimate interest in this cycle. After the elections, the head of the government has remained a dual institution. The dimensions and tasks of the two organizations, however, were more balanced. The focus of the PMO, which has been transformed into its function as a government brain center, is most often the strategy creation. The Minister of the Prime Ministry No. longer exercises unlimited power and has No. outstanding superiority over the previous years in the dual system. It is not a chancellor, it is the decisive person of Cabinet Governance. It seems that the head of government has consistently implemented the principle of shared power in this cycle as well.

During the past 19 years, not only the position of the head of Government has changed, but also it's office has had many changes. The process of presidentialization clearly appears in the operation of the Prime Minister's office. A wide-ranging body requires the leadership of a strong leader, who is able to effectively support the background of the head of government as a subordinate leader.

In Hungary, the Secretariat-type Prime Minister's Office functioned briefly, and the process of presidentialization brought with it the strengthened institutional background, which in that form operated as a chancellery principle by 2010. After that, we can No. longer speak about the validity of a single model. Closely, both functions are part of the 2010 dual-government head of the institution. As of 2012, a different kind of process begins to unfold in the life of the institution, which will culminate in the then multifunctional operation in 2014. Through this process, the Prime Minister is essentially "government in the government" and its head is the "minister of ministers". This sort of power questions the correctness of the institution's exclusivity, so the system of the dual office will return from 2015. However, this operation no longer fits in the secretarial and/or chancellor-type subdivisions.

Literature

- Fehér Z., *A kormányzás háttérintézményei. Amerikai és európai példák I. rész*, "Politikatudományi Szemle" 2002, No. 3–4.
- Franczel R., *A miniszterelnöki háttérapparátus változásai 2010–2016 között*, "Kodifikáció és közigazgatás" 2016, No. 2.
- Franczel R., *Kormányzati döntéshozatal 2010–2014 között*, "Kodifikáció és Közigazgatás" 2015, No. 1.
- Körösényi A., *Mozgékony patthelyzet*, [In:] *Túlterhelt demokrácia, Alkotmányos és kormányzati alapszerkezetünk*, ed. G. Csaba, Budapest 2006.
- Lengyel L., *A politikai intézményrendszer dilemmái, 1989–2006*, [In:] *Túlterhelt demokrácia, Alkotmányos és kormányzati alapszerkezetünk*, ed. G. Csaba, Budapest 2006.
- Magyar közigazgatási jog – Általános rész*, eds. M. Fazekas, L. Ficzere, Budapest 2005.
- Mandák F., *A politika prezidencializációja (Magyarország, Olaszország)*, Doktori (PhD) Értekezés 2014.
- Müller G., *Kormányról kormányra a rendszerváltás utáni Magyarországon, Antaltól Gyurcsányig*, Budapest 2008.
- Müller G., *Magyar kormányzati viszonyok*, Dialóg Campus Kiadó 2011.
- Pesti S., Farkas A., Franczel R., *A kormány működési és szervezeti rendje (1990–2014)*, [In:] *A magyar politikai rendszer – negyedszázad után*, ed. K. Sándor, Budapest 2015.
- Stumpf I., *A kormány alkotmányos jogállása*, "Új magyar közigazgatás" 2015, No. 8, évf. 2. sz.
- Szinay I., *Brit hatás a kormányfői hivatal átstrukturálására 2015-ben?*, "Kölcsönös Át-szövődések" 2016, No. 4.
- Ványi É., *Politizáció vagy professzionalizáció?, A politikai kormányzás jogi, intézményi és személyi feltételei 2006, 2010*, "Politikatudományi szemle" 2016, No. XXV/3.