

Original Paper

Received: May 31, 2019

Accepted: July 17, 2019

Strategic Defense Management: Transforming the Military Environment in Face of the New Demands in Security and Defense

Jacintho Maia Neto*

Abstract

The dynamics of wars have demanded new challenges from the military. Acting on the whole spectrum of conflicts, in an environment that may not have winners, achieve goals with the lowest number of military and civilian casualties, with minimal material losses, and manage the chaos that comes after the conflicts, the major challenges for states and international organizations. Alongside these challenges, the military structure, in times of peace, needs to be adapted to its strategic environment, that is, to what is imposed on it by governments and the society it must protect. Flexible, specialized, and better equipped military structures have become, not only an operational requirement of the new asymmetric battlefield environment, but a requirement of society. It is understood that the main result of this work will be to present a proposal of how the Armed Forces and Brazilian society need to face these new challenges, ranging from aid to natural catastrophes, support for major events, acting in a police environment, and at the same time, be able to act in an external environment, markedly in UN missions or regional cooperation.

Keywords: Organizational transformation; Strategic Defense Management; Armed Forces and Society; Security and National Defense.

* PhD in Administration from Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Adjunct professor at the Brazilian War College (ESG). (jacinthomaia@gmail.com)



Introduction

The term strategy has become the central axis of many studies in Administration Science, especially in Public Administration. The strategies used in the business environment have transposed this division between what is public and what is private, causing public managers to make adaptations of the management tools used by the business community to the public administration.

However, there is an even more differentiated environment of the business environment, and even within public management, it is still different from this environment, which is highly hierarchical organizations, such as military organizations. In this context, this article is based on theories that underlie strategic management contextualizing them within an environment where the hierarchy plays a central role in the organization, with the objective of answering the following question: **as organizations with highly hierarchical structures, especially the military, can absorb the concepts of strategic management, aiming at improving organizational effectiveness?**

The field of strategic management is still considered new in the Administration environment, having started its debate from the 1950s onwards, with the proposal to restructure teaching in the United States Administration Schools, being born as a multidisciplinary area with integrate the knowledge of other disciplines. Since then, the concept of the field has evolved and is based on theories that support its diverse constituent elements, such as the Classical Theory of Organizations (TAYLOR, 1966; FAYOL, 1968), Theory of Organizations (MARCH; SIMON, 1967), Industrial Organization Theory (PORTER, 1981), General Theory of Systems (BERTALANFFY, 1975), Theory of Contingency (BURNS, STALKER, 1962; CHANDLER, 1962) and Complexity Theory (MORIN, 2006).

In reflective terms, this paper proposes to think of solutions in the military organizations environment, which can help in the strategic management of these organizations, considering that the literature in this field has been directed, almost exclusively, to the business environment and when it does so for the public environment, rarely contemplates the military environment. With this focus, it is believed that this article can contribute to the theoretical debate on the insertion of managerial technologies and the processuality of strategic management in this public environment, but with different characteristics.

Due to the central issue, the following premise is introduced:

- **the strategic management**, which has as one of its main foundations the ability to provide organizations with the interaction of different hierarchical levels (strategic, tactical and operational) throughout their phases and their respective decision-making process, in line with the military environment, even considering that *a priori*, this interaction with the "subordinate echelons" is not a regular practice in these organizations.



REPATS

The New Demands for Defense and Security

Nowadays, when studying the military environment and its relations with society, one cannot ignore the existing perspectives on civil-military relations. This relationship has focused on the debate about the vital need of civilian control over the military, as some authors (MEI, MATHIAS, 2000; MATHIAS, 2007; SAINT-PIERRE, 2007; ZAVERUCHA, REZENDE, 2009), in this study, this vision will be called the 1st Agenda.

However, new security and defense demands, such as new threats (ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS, 2003), peace enforcement and peacekeeping operations¹, increased law enforcement and law enforcement operations, and subsidiary actions (BRASIL, 1988), could lead to a new debate, which, unfortunately, has not yet crossed the Anglo-Saxon frontier: that of military effectiveness.

This new debate or 2nd Agenda, already part of the premise of civilian control over the military and seeks to optimize resources, from this perspective the concern of society becomes the effectiveness of the current military structure (NIELSEN, 2005; FEAVER, 1999) and no longer the previous debate of the control of the military by the civilian, being this subject surpassed.

The characteristics of the new conflicts go through an environment of uncertainties, diffuse and asymmetric, requiring Armed Forces with new conceptions of preparation and employment, for this purpose, the National Defense Strategy (BRASIL, 2016) defined in its scope, the National Defense Capacities, among them we mention:

The Protection Capacity of the territory and the Brazilian population expresses the most relevant national objective, that of guaranteeing sovereignty, national patrimony and territorial integrity. [...]

Closely related to the Protection Capacity is the Ready-to-respond Capacity, which includes several elements of National Power. It aims to prevent the worsening of a crisis situation or to close an already contested dispute quickly, avoiding the country's engagement in a prolonged armed conflict. [...]

Deterrence Capacity, in turn, is an essential factor for National Security, insofar as its purpose is to discourage possible aggressions. It is based on the conditions that the Nation has to assemble and apply its Protection and Ready-to-Answer Capacity in the event of any hostile actions against the sovereignty and legitimate interests of Brazil. (BRASIL, 2016, p.19, **emphasis added**).

In the context of the new demands of National Security and Defense, it is necessary to define these two central terms: National Security, which should be understood as "the condition that allows the preservation of sovereignty and territorial integrity, the realization

¹ These operations are described, respectively, in Chapters VI and VII of the Charter of the United Nations of 1945.



of national interests, free of pressures and threats of any kind, and the guarantee to the citizens of the exercise of constitutional rights and duties "and the National Defense that must be understood as" the set of attitudes, measures and actions of the State, with emphasis in the military expression, for the defense territory, sovereignty and national interests against preponderantly external, potential or overt threats" (BRASIL, 2016, p. 5).

Basically, the term Security is related to the feeling of guarantee that the Nation has against threats of any nature, while the usual concept of Defense is linked to the actions that must be performed to obtain that sense of security in the face of those threats, that is, Security it is a feeling and Defense action necessary for the maintenance of that feeling.

With this focus, it is important to address the meaning of the word "threat", initially the concept of threat refers to something external to the person or entity. This idea finds support, also, in the own understanding that comes from the National Defense Policy, being expressed explicitly in the manuals of the Brazilian War College:

Threats to National Security often originate in the environment outside the Nation. However, individual and/or community insecurity can reach a degree of generalization and seriousness of such a nature that, in jeopardizing one of the Fundamental Objectives, they become important factors of instability for the Nation. (ESCOLA SUPERIOR DE GUERRA, 2009, p. 61)

Saint-Pierre (2007) presents a careful analysis of the concept of threat, its constituent elements and its relations with the terms Security and Defense. The author characterizes in two the types of threats that can justify the use of the Armed Forces: "External threats: [those relating to] territorial integrity and national sovereignty. Internal threats: [those relating to] the constitutional order and inner peace [actions of guarantee of law and order]" (SAINT-PIERRE, 2007, p.78 e 79).

The concern with what these threats or new threats are (MATHIAS, 2007) has been on the agenda of the meetings of the Organization of American States (OAS). Since the Special Conference on Security in Mexico City held in 2003, Member States have made statements to alert everyone about the new threats to hemispheric security, "many of the new threats, concerns and other challenges to hemispheric security are transnational nature and may require appropriate hemispheric cooperation." (ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS, 2003). These new threats are quoted in this document, which will be recalled almost continuously at the next Conferences of Defense Ministers of the Americas, as follows:

- The security of the states of the Hemisphere is affected differently by traditional threats and the following new threats, concerns and other challenges of a diverse nature:
- terrorism, transnational organized crime, the world drug problem, corruption, money laundering, illicit arms trafficking and the connections between them;



REPATS

- extreme poverty and social exclusion of large sectors of the population that also affect stability and democracy. Extreme poverty undermines social cohesion and undermines state security;
- natural and man-made disasters, HIV / AIDS and other diseases, other health risks and deterioration of the environment;
- trafficking in human beings;
- cyber security attacks;
- the possibility of damage arising in the event of an accident or incident during the maritime transport of potentially hazardous materials, including oil, radioactive material and toxic waste;
- the possibility of access, possession and use of weapons of mass destruction and their vector systems by terrorists. (ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS, 2003).

Mathias (2007) presents a summary of the new threats, enabling a more contextualized understanding for Brazil, namely: "human rights, environment, drug trafficking, arms trafficking, terrorism, migration and organized crime." (MATHIAS, 2007, p. 86).

In relation to Brazil, the demands resulting from these threats have directly impacted Brazilian legislation, especially in the public security environment. In addition to the Federal Constitution of 1988, cited above, a whole legal framework has been constructed so that the Public Security Forces and the Armed Forces can deal with these threats, especially drug trafficking, arms trafficking and organized crime (BRASIL, 2013, p. 13-14) which are:

- Complementary Law nº 97, of June 9, 1999, as amended by LC No. 117 of September 2, 2004 and LC No. 136 of August 25, 2010, which lays down general rules for the organization, preparation and use of Armed Forces (AF);
- Decree nº 3.897, of August 24, 2001, which establishes the guidelines for the employment of the Armed Forces in the Guarantee of Law and Order;
- Decree nº 4.411, of October 7, 2002, which provides for the actions of the Armed Forces and Federal Police in the conservation units;
- Decree nº 4.412, of October 7, 2002, which provides for the actions of the Armed Forces and the Federal Police in indigenous lands;
- Decree nº 5.144, of July 16, 2004, which provides for the Brazilian Aeronautical Code, with respect to aircraft that are hostile or suspected of trafficking in narcotic substances and related drugs;



REPATS

- Decree nº 5.289, of November 29, 2004, which regulates the organization and operation of the National Public Security Force (FNSP); and
- Decree nº 7.496, of June 8, 2011, which establishes the Strategic Border Plan.

With regard to human rights and the environment, in addition to the corresponding federal legislation and its standardization within the MD and the Forces, the military school curricula (officers, sergeants and soldiers) were updated to include those topics, enabling the military to be aware of the relevant legislation and its implications for military operations.

The preparation of all Brazilian military personnel that are destined for UN missions, either as a troop or as observers, is conducted by the Joint Peace Operations Center (CCOPAB – Acronyms in Portuguese) which has in its teaching program these two themes, adapted to the areas of conflict, in particular human rights (BRASIL, 2011a).

Another aspect to be considered, in the context of the new threats, is how the Brazilian population perceives them. From this point of view, that of the Brazilian population, the Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA - Acronyms in Portuguese) carried out, during 2011, a survey about the perception of Brazilian society on the present and future of National Defense (BRASIL, 2011b). The research was structured around four thematic axes, namely:

- perception of threats;
- perception about National Defense and the Armed Forces;
- Brazilian military power and international insertion; and
- Armed Forces and Society.

The questioning of threats has sought to capture in Brazilian society what it perceives as a threat "to its survival, welfare, or social and political condition, as well as to the integrity of the country and national institutions" (BRASIL, 2011b, p. 5). A list of these possible threats is given in the table below:



REPATS

Table 1 - Perception of threats

Perception of threats by Brazilian geographic region						
<i>Question: Every person has a perception of what might be a threat to him, his family, his city and country, that is, each person has certain fears. So which of the following threats are you afraid of?</i>						
Note: in this question, the respondent could indicate more than one answer (values in%)						
Threat	Midwest	Northeast	North	Southeast	South	Brazil
Organized Crime	53,7	50,1	63,1	58,0	46,3	54,2
Environmental or climatic disaster	46,3	36,2	54,0	39,2	29,4	38,6
War with foreign power	28,9	39,5	29,2	33,5	34,6	34,7
War with neighboring country	27,8	35,0	29,5	33,6	31,5	33,0
Epidemics	34,8	33,3	47,6	29,2	17,3	30,5
Terrorism	38,5	39,5	32,2	25,5	15,5	29,5
Others	0,4	1,1	1,3	0,9	0,2	0,8
None of the previous	2,2	3,4	1,3	2,1	4,2	2,7
Do not know/Did not answer	0,4	0,4	0,0	0,2	0,2	0,3

Source: Institute of Applied Economic Research, 2011 (BRASIL, 2011b).

As it turns out, organized crime is considered a threat by more than half of the respondents, confirming the strong public security bias. However, when comparing the two threats related to homeland defense, "foreign power war" and "war with neighboring country", the sum of these threats (67.7%) outstrips organized crime. Confirming the society's demand by the Armed Forces that can act in both spectra: public security and defense of the motherland.

In the case of threats related to humanitarian aid (natural disasters and epidemics), the population's fears in this area confirm the need for the Armed Forces to be prepared to meet these demands.

Terrorism, which had not yet been defined as a crime in the national legal system, was cited by almost 30% of the interviewees, reaching the highest percentage in the Northeast (39.5%) and in the Midwest (38, 5%), being characterized as one of the main demands by society. These will be the central ideas, which will be implicit when the term "new threats" is used, since they are more appropriate to the context of Brazil and South America.



Strategic Management

In approaching the relations between the concepts of strategic management and its constituent elements, it is intended to show the reader how the absorption of these concepts by the military apparatus can contribute to the so-called 2nd Civil-Military Relations Agenda and no longer the previous debate of the control of the military by the civilian.

At the moment, it is based on the conceptual model of strategic management presented in the Handbook of Strategic Management (RABIN; MILLER; HILDRETH, 1989), which makes a comparison with military history, presenting two logics that contribute to the formation of strategy: nonlinear logic that addresses the vulnerabilities and expectations of the enemy and a linear logic that deals with business opportunities and optimization of resources.

The model also starts from the premise that strategic management can be used by both the public sector and the private sector, either to exploit the environment or to take advantage of the opportunities presented, in other words, using the two logics presented previously.

It considers that the definition of strategy is introductory, seminal to the conception of the strategic management model, in this way, makes use of Mintzberg's definition of strategy (2000, 2006), which defines it as a plan, a maneuver, a position and a perspective. The relationships and combinations of these definitions suggest ideas about whether or not these organizations can succeed.

Basically, the proposed model is that strategic management is an "advanced and coherent form of strategic thinking, trying to extend the strategic vision across all the units of the organization, covering all its administrative system" (TOFT, 1989, p. 6), according to Motta (2007) this is the great differential that the term strategic management has brought about the strategic planning models used previously.

This approach takes up the issue of the strategic vision that was already essential for strategic planning and which becomes central to the implementation of strategic management. Under this approach, Motta (2007) presents an overview of how the strategic vision has been addressed since the 1950s and its impacts on organizational planning. His critique is directed mainly at the attempt to separate the formulation of strategies by the levels of the organization in a watertight and non-integrated way, not considering that the strategy permeates all levels and sectors of the organization.

Just as there is no strategic vision that is broken down only at the strategic level, another at the tactical level and another at the operational level, what happens is an interaction between the three levels in the formulation and implementation of the strategies for the elaboration and attainment of this vision, allowing it to be adequate, modified or transformed according to the impacts of environmental changes.



Under this understanding, the implementation of the strategic vision is focused on the constant search for results, within a continuous process of anticipating future changes, taking advantage of opportunities and corrections. Strategic management should allow the management of this vision, not only with the elaboration of plans (perspective of the formalization of strategic planning, criticized as a fallacy by Mintzberg) or the implementation of planning techniques, but with the implementation of new forms of behavior that allow the organization to constantly exploit its environment in a timely and effective manner. (RABIN; MILLER; HILDRETH, 1989).

The understanding that strategic management is the management of the strategy process is well explained by Mintzberg, Lampel, Quinn and Ghoshal (2006) in "The Strategy Process". For the authors there is no separation between the formulation and the implementation of strategies, they consider that these phases occur in an interconnected and concomitant way. The formulation of strategy, analysis, training and strategic change are constituents of this process.

These constituent elements are impacted by forces driving the process of strategy, namely: human knowledge, which can contribute to the rational processing of information, to generate confusion, to create structures or mental maps of how things are or should be or for the construction of new knowledge; the organization, focusing on the structure of organizations and their direct relationship with the establishment of strategies; technology, its relations with innovation and its pitfalls that can drive the entire organization.

These constituent elements are impacted by forces that drive the strategy process, namely: human knowledge, which can contribute to the rational processing of information, to generate confusion, to create structures or mental maps of how things are or should be or to build new ones. For the adoption of emerging technologies totally dissociated from the organization's business; the collaboration of both the members of the organization and of other organizations, including the ability of strategists to negotiate and the sharing of technologies; and globalization, which is not limited to the decision to operate in an international arena, but also to perceive the impacts of this arena on the business of the organization and the complexity of acting in this environment.

In this context, the idea that there is a momentum for the formulation and another for implementation is deconstructed, it resumes the idea of emergent strategies, previously presented by Mintzberg (2000, 2006), and presents the contexts in which this may occur. This conception allows the understanding that strategies permeate all levels of the organization, allowing them to be elaborated and implemented even by the operational level. With an intense environment of change, strategies are changing to keep up with the pace of change, the formal existence of a plan developed by the strategic level, implemented by the organization's tactical and operational levels, is no longer conceived. The organization must have structures and systems that allow it to act with opportunity and effectiveness in this new environment, which does not allow it all this formalism.



The concept of strategic management has been associated with organizational change in an intense and often decisive way for the differentiation of the term with strategic planning, it is believed that by requiring strategists, managers or leaders (or as if wanting to call drivers of this management) an ability to act in the behavioral change of the whole organization and not only of certain sectors, they become agents of change (WHITTINGTON; JOHNSON; SCHOLES, 2011).

In this perspective, the strategies are intensely rethought and altered, not only by top management or by the planners of these strategies, but by all the members, especially those who will be directly impacted by its implementation. In conceptual terms, strategic management does not have a consensus, which is, in the first instance, somewhat incoherent with the dynamism of the field, both in the production of academic research and in the production of practical solutions for organizations. This incoherence was one of the motivating factors for Hambrick and Chen (2007) to conduct a research on the existence or not of this consensus on the field.

The concept of strategic management has been associated with organizational change in an intense and often decisive way for the differentiation of the term with strategic planning, it is believed that by requiring strategists, managers or leaders (or as if wanting to call drivers of this management) an ability to act in the behavioral change of the whole organization and not only of certain sectors, they become agents of change.

For the authors, the diversity and lack of consensus in the definition of the term and the field does not prevent a consensus on the implicit meaning of the field, shared by scholars and gives the members of the field a strong sense of community that distinguishes them of other communities. The authors' argument is basically that the field is established by the great scientific and practical production, which even if diversified, becomes coherent with the diversity of organizations and the diffuse environments and rapid changes that they face.

In their studies, Hambrick and Chen show how the field of Strategic Management is impacted and impacts other areas, especially economics, sociology, and marketing. Just as the elements that appear most in the definitions of the field, in quantitative terms, are: performance (86%), company (64%), strategic actions (45%) and environment (43%). The predominance of the term performance indicates the almost direct relationship of the concern of strategic management to be directed to the results of the organization and, mainly, to the environment of the private organizations.

The studies conclude that the diversity of concepts allows the field to have neither a dominant theory nor a methodological straitjacket, in addition to enabling studies from other areas to interact with the field, accepting for its constant growth. The success of Strategic Management suggests to the academic community that fields that are dynamic and malleable can be held together by a core that is permeable to diversity.



The table below presents the main concepts of strategic management with the purpose of explaining this diversity.

Table 2 - Definitions of strategic management over time

AUTHOR	DEFINITION
Schendel and Hofer (1979)	Strategic management is a process of dealing with the entrepreneurial dimension of the organization, its renewal and growth, and more particularly with the development and use of strategies to guide the operations of organizations
Bracker (1980)	Strategic management implies the analysis of internal and external environments of companies to maximize the use of resources in relation to objectives
Jemison (1981)	Strategic management is the process by which managers of complex organizations develop and use a strategy to align the organization's competencies with the opportunities and constraints of the environment
Van Cauwenberghe Cool (1982)	Strategic management deals with aspects of the formulation (the policy level) and aspects of implementation (organizational level) behaviors to meet new situations and is the basis for future administration, when there are a repetition of these circumstances
Smircic and Stubbart (1985)	Strategic management is the organization that creates and maintains meaning-sharing systems that facilitate organized action
Cunningham (1989)	Strategic management can be understood from the perspective of the organization's interaction with the environment, from the perspective of a decision-making system and from a leadership perspective
Fredrickson (1990)	Strategic management refers to the problems faced by managers who run entire organizations or their multifunctional units
Teece (1990)	Strategic management can be defined as the formulation, implementation and evaluation of managerial actions that increase the value of the company's business
Rumelt, Schendel and Teece (1994)	Strategic management is about the direction of organizations, most of times, of companies. It includes the issues of greatest concern to senior management or to those seeking the reasons for the success and failure of organizations



Bowman, Singh and Thomas (2002)	The field of strategic management can be conceptualized as one that is focused on the problems related to the creation and sustainability of competitive advantage or the search of resources for the organization
---------------------------------	--

Source: Adapted from Hambrick and Chen (2007).

Strategic management in transposing its applicability to the public sector modifies its main focus of seeking profits and competitive advantage over competitors, but maintains the broad concept of performance and the search for better services for society (BOYNE, WALKER, 2010).

However, its applicability in the public sector demands from the manager some differentiated approaches, first in relation to the difficulty of establishing and implementing long-term strategies, since the life cycle of this manager or his senior management in the organization is usually two or four years, in addition, its management is impacted by a whole legal framework that defines its level of action, how, where and when to do, considerably limiting its action as agent of change (WHITTINGTON; JOHNSON; SCHOLLS, 2011).

Another aspect is the participatory process that exists in the public sector, which, when seeking to meet the needs of the population, especially during electoral periods, can be a success in terms of popular acceptance, but compromises the focus of the strategy. Constant budgetary constraints and contingencies also impact the formulation and implementation of strategies. (TOFT, 1989).

One difficulty for public organizations is the maintenance of their management staff throughout the entire strategy process, requiring constant training of new staff members, making it difficult to continue the strategies. Another characteristic of the public sector is the relationship between hierarchy and a "heavy" bureaucracy in the processes, which hinder creativity, informality and flexibility, and can generate dysfunctions in times of rapid changes. (TOFT, 1989; TAKEUCHI; NONAKA, 2008).

According to Mintzberg (2000), the strategy, structure and systems, when considered together, enable results to be achieved, as well as changes in strategy, structure and systems, allow the organization to remain effective against opportunities and constraints environment. In the public sector, organizational structure, systems and often strategies are imposed either legally or deliberately by the upper echelon of the organization, hampering, if not impeding their effective adaptation to the new environment.

This difficulty that public management has for the achievement of its strategies also suffers the impact of its temporality, independent of its organizational effectiveness. Cunningham (1989), in addressing this temporality, does so from the perspective of environmental relations with the life-cycle stages of organizations, noting that public organizations rarely die, which is also shared by Mintzberg (1984) in citing immortality of public organizations as something regrettable for the continuity of strategies.



REPATS

This idea of immortality directly impacts behavioral change both at the level of the individual and in the organization, generating a system-wide accommodation, preventing the use of opportunities and mitigating or eliminating the restrictions and risks that an environment of uncertainties and changes organizations.

In this way, it is verified that the applicability of the concepts of strategic management derived from the business sector is a "monumental task" to be carried out by the public managers (MONTANARI, DANEKE, BRACKER, 1989), however, the constant interest of these managers, academics and other practitioners for this new agenda, may allow the applicability of these concepts and positively impact the performance of public organizations (BOYNE, WALKER, 2010), using strategic management as a propeller of a new way of doing "business" in public management (POISTER, 2010).

Strategic Management and The Military Environment

When analyzing the military environment, considering the habitus and the military field, it is verified that the permeability also makes possible the growth of the field and the acquisition of new experiences that will contribute to the maintenance or development of the habitus. With this in mind, it is considered that these characteristics contribute to the increase of the knowledge in the field, independent of opposite reactions, that even based on the hierarchy, can be coopted fruit of pressures of the society and the internal public.

Highly hierarchical environments, such as the military, need to generate and absorb knowledge for their survival, especially in times of "fuzzy environments and rapid changes". The time taken to formulate a strategy planning or formulation with its consequent implementation has been diminished and often extinguished, requiring the planner to act jointly at all three levels of the organization.

The concerns that the public sector generally has with differentiated approaches to management, such as strategic management, are also felt in the military environment, however, just as a number of public organizations have implemented strategic management to address the new environments in which they are operating, it is believed that the new demands of national security and defense are already demanding a greater efficiency and effectiveness of the military apparatus, with the consequent conceptual revision of military management.

When analyzing the military environment, considering the habitus and the military field, it is verified that the permeability also makes possible the growth of the field and the acquisition of new experiences that will contribute to the maintenance or development of the habitus. With this in mind, it is considered that these characteristics contribute to the increase of the knowledge in the field, independent of opposite reactions, that even based on the hierarchy, can be coopted fruit of pressures of the society and the internal public.

Highly hierarchical environments, such as the military, decisively impact the "strategy process". Considering the relationships between the various forces that impact this process,



such as knowledge, organizational structure, technology, internal and external collaboration, and globalization, is a capability that the military manager will need to acquire.

It is understood that the absorption of the fundamentals that govern strategic management, such as performance, constant and integrated analysis of this new environment where the military acts, the interaction of strategic levels enabling the formation of emerging strategies, understanding that this does not interfere in the hierarchy, but consolidates it; and the adoption of new systems that allow a more agile decision-making in the face of constant changes, can contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the military apparatus.

This assertion leads to other propositions that corroborate the proposition that strategic management is consistent with the military environment and does not end in itself, but leads to other propositions such as:

- knowledge can be generated at any level of the organization, it does not preclude hierarchy, listening, giving initiative and implementing proposals from the various hierarchical levels of the military organization must be seen as consolidating elements of this hierarchy;

- in the public sector, including the military environment, the structures of organizations are governed by a legal scope, which does not allow dynamic changes, however, it is considered possible, with medium and long-term actions in the field of procedural legality, structures, making them more flexible and able to absorb or extinguish certain component parts, focusing the idea of temporality on structures, without the need for new legislation whenever this is necessary;

- the impact of technologies on the battlefield has already changed the way to "make war", it is assumed that managing this in environments of undeclared war, operations under the aegis of international organizations, public calamities or of administrative routine, are challenges that the military manager can overcome with the implementation of strategic management;

- it is necessary to seek internal and external collaboration to meet the new demands, only the determination of orders, does not mean the implementation of projects, seek the collaboration of the members of the organization, society and the three levels of government, demonstrate the negotiation capacity, initiative and mission fulfillment that should be peculiar to this new "strategic soldier"; and

- integrate with other state actors that can contribute to the insertion of the State in the international arena.

These propositions place military management in the face of new environments that can directly impact national security and defense actions, defining new strategies for the organizational context, whether in the external or internal environment.



Final Remarks

At this point, the central question of this article is answered: how can organizations with highly hierarchical structures, especially the military, absorb the concepts of strategic management, with a view to improving organizational effectiveness?

The military environment and its new demands have required of the military manager's new managerial capacities. The classical conception of military strategy, sometimes restricted to the battlefield and the alignment of military objectives with the objectives of war, which are defined by political power, do not serve the new military management.

The adequacy of management tools such as strategic planning no longer means the understanding of this environment full of uncertainties and "rapid changes". The dysfunctionalities of the bureaucracy, such as excessive formalism, over-regulation and hierarchization of the decision-making process, as well as public management impact, also do in military management.

Another feature of the public sector, its idea of immortality, which may lead to possible accommodation of public agencies at the three levels of government (federal, state and municipal), when transposed to military organizations, cannot afford such accommodation, because military management deals with the security and defense of the State, with demands that impact both society and the State, internally or externally. In this light, the search for effectiveness by these organizations must be a constant concern of the public power, of society and not only of the military.

It is understood that the present work, by bringing to the debate these distinct characteristics of military management and its difficulties in pursuing effectively in this new environment, made it possible to show the viability of the military apparatus to absorb the concepts of strategic management and, consequently, to be able to act in a differentiated and effective way in meeting the new demands of security and defense of society and the State.

In presenting the theoretical assumptions evidenced by the strategy carried out through business strategy, military strategy, military ambience, the field of strategic management and possible adjustments of strategic planning in the Army, it is believed that the objective of this article has been achieved and contributed to the debate on the insertion of strategic management in the military environment.

Finally, we have the exact notion that new concepts and deepening should be carried out, allowing other solutions to contribute to the reflection and improvement of strategic management in highly hierarchical environments, especially military environments.



REPATS

References

- Bertalanffy, Ludwig Von (1975). Teoria geral dos sistemas. 2. Ed. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- BRASIL. (1988). Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil, de 05 de outubro de 1988. Diário Oficial (da) República Federativa do Brasil, Poder Legislativo, Brasília, DF, 05 out. 1988.
- _____. (2011a). Ministério da Defesa. Portaria Normativa nº 1.069, do Ministério da Defesa, de 5 de maio de 2011. Aprova o Manual de Emprego do Direito Internacional dos Conflitos Armados (DICA) nas Forças Armadas - MD34-M-03, 1ª Edição, 2011. Brasília, DF.
- _____. (2011b). Secretaria de Assuntos Estratégicos da Presidência da República. Instituto de Pesquisa Aplicada (IPEA). Sistema de Indicadores de Percepção Social (SIPS): Defesa Nacional. Brasília, DF.
- _____. (2013). Ministério da Defesa. Portaria Normativa nº 3.461, do Ministério da Defesa, de 19 de dezembro de 2013. Dispõe sobre a publicação “Garantia da Lei e da Ordem”. Brasília, DF.
- _____. (2016). Ministério da Defesa. Política Nacional de Defesa e Estratégia Nacional de Defesa. Brasília, DF.
- Boyne, George A.; WALKER, Richard M. (2010). Strategic management on public service performance: the way ahead. *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, p. s185-s191, dez. 2010.
- Burns, Tom.; Stalker, G.M (1962). The management of innovation. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Chandler, Alfred D. (1962). Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the American Industrial Enterprise. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cuningham, Robert B. (1989). Perspectives on public-sector strategic management. In: RABIN, J.; MILLER, G. J.; HILDRETH, W.B. Handbook of Strategic Management. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc, p. 3-34.
- ESCOLA SUPERIOR DE GUERRA (2009). Fundamentos da Escola Superior de Guerra. Rio de Janeiro: A Escola.
- Fayol, Henri (1968). Administração Industrial e Geral. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Feaver, Peter D. (1999). Civil-Military Relations. *Annu. Rev. Politic Science*. 2:211–41.
- Hambrick, D. C.; Chen, M. (2007). What is strategic management really? Inductive derivation of a consensus definition of the field. *Strategic Management Journal*, v.28, p. 935-955.



Mathias, Suzeley K. (2007). Ameaças às democracias da América Latina. In Eliézer Rizzo de Oliveira (Org.). Segurança e Defesa Nacional: da competição à cooperação regional. São Paulo: Fundação Memorial da América Latina. 288 p

March, J. G.; Simon, H. A. (1981). Teoria das Organizações. 5 ed. Rio de Janeiro: FGV.

Mei, Eduardo; Mathias, Suzeley K. (2000). As Forças Armadas e o Despotismo Anão. Revista Novos Rumos. Ano 15, n. 33, p. 38-44.

Mintzberg, Henry. (1984). Power and organization life cycles. Academic of Management Journal. v. 9, p. 207-224.

Mintzberg, Henry; Ahlstrand, Bruce; Lampel, Joseph. (2000). Safári de estratégica: um roteiro pela selva do planejamento estratégico. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Mintzberg, Henry; Lampel, Joseph.; Quinn, J. B.; Ghoshal, S. (2006). O processo da estratégia. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Montanari, J. R.; Daneke, G. A.; Bracker, J. S. (1989). Strategic management for the public sector: lessons from the evolution of private sector planning. In: Rabin, J.; Miller, G. J.; Hildreth, W.B. Handbook of Strategic Management. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc, p. 303-318.

Morin, Edgar. (2006). Introdução ao pensamento complexo. Porto Alegre: Sulina. 120 p.

Motta, Paulo R. (2007). Gestão Contemporânea: a ciência e a arte de ser dirigente. 16. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record.

Nielsen, Suzanne C. (2005). Civil-Military relations theory and military effectiveness. Public Administration and Management v 10, nº 2, p. 61-84.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DOS ESTADOS AMERICANOS. (2019). Declaração sobre segurança nas Américas. Conferência dos Ministros de Estado da Defesa, México, 2003. Disponível em: http://www.oas.org/juridico/portuguese/decl_security_pt.pdf. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.

Poister, Theodore H. (2010). The future of strategic planning in the public sector: linking strategic management and performance. Public Administration Review, Special Issue, dez. 2010. p.246-254.

Porter, Michael E. (1981). The contributions of industrial organization on strategic management. Academy of Management Review, v. 6, n. 6, p. 609-620.

Rabin, J.; Miller, G. J.; Hildreth, W.B. (1989). Handbook of Strategic Management. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.



REPATS

Saint-Pierre, H. (2007). As novas ameaças às democracias latino-americanas: uma abordagem teórico conceitual. In Eliézer Rizzo de Oliveira (Org.). Segurança e Defesa Nacional: da competição à cooperação regional. São Paulo: Fundação Memorial da América Latina.

Shcendel, Dan.; Hofer, C. W. (1979). Strategic Management. Boston: Little Brown.

Takeuchi, Hirotaka; Nonaka, Ikujiro. (2008). Gestão do conhecimento. Porto Alegre: Bookman, (Reimpressão 2009). 320 p.

Taylor, Frederick W. (1966). Princípios da Administração Científica. São Paulo: Atlas.

Toft, G. S. (1989). Synoptic (One Best Way) approaches of strategic management. In: RABIN, J.; MILLER, G. J.; HILDRETH, W.B. Handbook of Strategic Management. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc, p. 3-34.

Whittington, J. G.; Johnson, G.; Scholes, K. (2011). Fundamentos da Estratégia. Porto Alegre: Bookman.

Zaverucha, Jorge; Rezende, Flávio da Cunha. (2009). How the Military Competes for Expenditure in Brazilian Democracy: arguments for an outlier. International Political Science Review. v. 30, n. 4, p. 1-23.



REPATS