

## EQUITY VERSUS EGALITARIANISM IN EDUCATION

EQUIDADE VERSUS IGUALITARISMO NA EDUCAÇÃO  
EQUIDAD VERSUS IGUALITARISMO EN LA EDUCACIÓN

### Pedro Demo

Postdoctoral fellowship at UCLA (Los Angeles). Retired Full Professor (Emeritus) at UnB. Current Professor in the PPGDH (Graduate Program in Human Rights) at UnB. Senior Researcher at CNPq – 1B – 303112/2021-2.



<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9975-3413>

### José Lauro Martins

Bachelor's degree in Philosophy, Master's and Doctorate in Education. Associate Professor at the Federal University of Tocantins.



<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7817-8165>

Correspondência: ARNE 64, AL. 2, , QI 2, 14.  
77006668 – Palmas/TO

Received: 04/01/2024.  
Accepted: 09/01/2024.  
Published: 11/31/2024.

### ABSTRACT:

Egalitarianism and equity in education have been widely debated in recent decades, leading to the prominent use of the concept of equality in political, economic, and especially educational spheres. This concept is multifaceted, and we seek to establish a dialogue that complements the principles of equality and equity. We emphasize that equity should manifest in the process, while equality should be reflected in the outcomes. We believe that egalitarian rhetoric helps meet the expectations of families and students. However, this narrative does not eliminate existing disparities, and instead of a hierarchy of inequalities, there is a complementarity between them. The aim of this discussion is to facilitate the understanding of narratives related to equal opportunities in the educational field.

**KEYWORDS:** Equality; egalitarianism; equity.

## Introduction

The words “equality” and “egalitarianism” may seem similar, but there are nuances and implications that may be very distinct. Such differences are not always clear and visible in the education context, which may imply misunderstandings and inadequate actions from involved professionals. We know that equality is an important principle in traditional education and, also, is the main point in historical discussions about educational policies.

In this essay, we discuss the issue of egalitarianism in education, since we understand it is urgent to reflect on it nowadays. Nonetheless, we want to avoid confusion with equality, which must be pursued, so that all have access to equal opportunities and resources in the learning process. What we defend is the

necessity of seeking a balance between equality and the vaporization of individual differences of each learner.

### **Egalitarianism narrative**

The use of the egalitarianism concept is complex and, therefore, we stress the relevance of understanding its importance when the issue is education. There is not, in this article, the intention to define the concept, only to summarize some aspects that may help us to understand egalitarian positions. We can say egalitarianism is based on the idea of equality of/for all: human beings must be treated in an equal form, independent of social status (Arneson, 2002).

We must, however, point out that there are divergences relative to such postulations since the issue of social equality is also quite complex. There are people who defend that such inequality is part of human nature, but others say it is possible to overcome it through education and other public policies.

We remember Boehm (1999), researching hunter/gatherer groups still surviving in our times, who uses the expression “egalitarian behavior evolution”: he recognizes that such groups had very visible hierarchies with many types of leadership, such as chief, shaman, elderly with some power, prominent warriors, etc., but managed inequality in reasonable ways, beginning with the challenge to avoid the chiefs would not be harmful to the group. In a later work, Boehm (2012) retakes the issue, suggesting “moral origin” in humans and stressing the egalitarian configuration of such “primitive” groups, as they knew how to compound equality and diversity.

The moral origin continues to be a controversial one, also because some authors think some animals, such as chimpanzees, are, on their own, “political animals” (Waal, 2000; 2017). In this case, because there is a physical and emotional loop between females and their pups, fundamental support for their “education”; beyond this, manifestations of peacemaking of members, or organized reactions, including violent ones, against alpha males, etc.

Authors such as Pinker (2011; 2018) and Rosling (2018) insist upon civilizing progress in society, tangentially in the wake of liberal theorizations (Rasmussen, 2018). We induce from this thinking that, being human societies naturally

unequal, they can be equalized through a compatible civilizing process. We perceive how complex the equality question is and, in this case, we must be careful, so that some positions, however well-intentioned, do not have the opposite effect.

Thus, we pretend to perceive this more easily if we reduce our sight to little groups, such as a family. Immediately we observe how diverse people are diverse. First, between man and wife, there is diversity also, markedly physical: the roles are delimited in the familiar group, which frequently are accentuated not only by biopsychological aspects of each one but also by cultural aspects, historically demarcated by a patriarchal society that may attempt to reduce diversity.

Second, with reference to offspring, they are different from parents: it is common to have differences quite prominent among them. Beyond other familiar differences, as a son or a grandfather who needs special care in the family. Besides this, diversity may be more complex because living beings are equal and different, simultaneously, i.e., we are equal, pertaining to the same species, but different in the cultural constitution, for instance.

In counterpart, more rigid positivism postulates a fixed human nature, as an invariant code of the human condition, such as Harari (2017), in a lighter tone, if compared with the rigidity of Dawkins (1998; 2013) or Hawking (2006). Depending upon methodological “determinism” (Gazzaniga, 2011), the evolutionary process is seen as a ready package: if there is some change it is only intern, inside the system, never outside. Such determinism appears more commonly in technology (Kelly, 2011; 2016), as supposedly linear development in society, with an astronomically racing pace, as it approaches the “singularity” of Artificial Intelligence (Kurzweil, 2005; Kurzweil & Bisson, 2013).

There are people who want to qualify inequality as the human natural condition, as imagined by Rousseau (Gowdy, 1998; Dahlberg, 1975; Erdal & Whiten, 1996). From this viewpoint, equality is a formal principle in rule of law, that must be accepted in Constitutions, but not accomplished, since historical practice is a diverse tissue, without losing some equality characteristics that permit the structuration of society. Social inequality always haunted societies, especially in

dictatorial, slave, imperialist, fascist, and absolutist regimes that separated the population from those occupying power, suggesting these were special or even of divine origin.

Scheidel (2017) elaborated on a blunt historical recurrency in the human saga, indicating that violence is the great “leveler” in societies and manages to “equalize” society (Ferguson, 2018). In certain ways, societies have produced hierarchies obstinately since immemorial times. Though it is a bloody presentation that “civilization” ought to overcome (Pinker, 2011), we must not ignore how many humans can be violent and hierarchical.

The concept of egalitarianism becomes still more ambiguous if we attempt to combine equality and diversity, as natural attributes of society. Women’s battle for gender equality is an example—woman’s rights are not restricted to equality, since they impact the fundamental space of differences sanctioned by patriarchalism (Harding, 1998; 2003; 2003a; 2011; 2015). Practically, this is what democracies manage to accomplish: they do not eliminate power disputes, they regulate through rotation in power and means of control upon the elected ones. Democracies are hierarchical too, but care or ought to care about not being contaminated by extremist disguised positions, using fallacious arguments pretending to defend speech freedom.

An egalitarian conception of society attempts to combine equality and difference and has to its favor:

- 1) the historically recurrent observation, such as we never had a society that was not unequal, some more, some less, and this is the reason for Boehm (1999) to speak of egalitarianism, not of equality;
- 2) the form in which modern societies and economies organize themselves in States and markets are always hierarchies;
- 3) the specificity of rule of law, which needs to establish, in one part, an equality form of all as a constitutional principle, and, in the other part, organize itself as an open, ambiguous, incomplete society;
- 4) the incompatibility of theoretical and fundamentalist extremes, that never occur concretely: if, from one side, there are human superior groups who ought to conduct a society, from the other side, all are linearly equal;

5) the work of evolutionary and social condition as an open process, also randomly, not supremacist, as the law of the strongest, that easily appears in the natural selection of the more apt ones, in what we have the equal and the different, naturally since nature has as one of its bluntest marks: biodiversity. Synthetically, we are born and die equal, but in the history of each one we accomplish diversely.

### **Incomplete societies**

A utopic desire for equality is supposed, since it is common to support pretensions beyond our capacities—“homo deus”, as said Harari (2017). We call utopia the pretension to accomplish heaven on earth, as remembers Shermer (2018), easily assumed in socialist literature, promising beyond what is feasible. Equality utopia is necessary to maintain alive the change flame, recognizing that each historical conquest is something more, but never enough. Therefore, egalitarianism wants to combine such dynamics and ambiguities intending to improve equality in the context of diversity.

Concerning the liberals, they do not involve themselves in social equality promises, because liberalism is anchored upon private property, the supremacy of capital over labor, and is inspired by social Darwinism (natural selection). The liberal narrative tends to blame the excluded for their condition, thus negating any social responsibility or ethics for the condition of those who don't ascend socially.

It is understandable, for liberals, that some agreements on how to manage social inequality are always subordinated to active acknowledgment that society and economy must be conducted by a supremacist and meritocratic elite, and educational systems serve this elite (World Bank, 2018). As an example of what happens in the USA, the best American universities, private and non-profit, are clearly destined to maintain the elite, as at Harvard.

Certainly, natural evolution may be interpreted in various ways (Nowak, 2011; Nagel, 2012), even maintaining the specy's “natural selection” idea. However, this has functioned to fundamental the ideology of the free market as “natural” social order. Thus, liberalism does not want to attain an egalitarian society,

because it does not interest in what is called a productive system, letting the rest with the implicit sequel of Smith's "invisible hand" (2018). A captious notion of "wealth of nations" has suggested this miraculous metamorphosis as resulting from the collective endeavor—it seemed to be something "of the nation"—but it is a private initiative that explores a class that supports inequality. Capitalism cedes to inequality if it is forced, not from some own vocation. Or because it is necessary to use some control strategy of inequality to preserve the capitalism structure. The political inequality issue is even not touched (political poverty), still less citizenship of the excluded is taken into account so that they could organize themselves and react to ascend socially. Socialists have their sins but tend to be more sustainable, while capitalism drags on a global context of extreme disequilibrium (Amsden, 2009).

### **Opportunity equality myth**

It's common to hear that education would be responsible for economic and sociopolitical development. There is some truth since inadequate qualification makes development unfeasible (Demo, 2015). In this case, educational processes favor those who can mobilize the best resources for constructing their own history.

There is some realism in the belief that education transforms society when the quality of educational processes makes it possible to activate authorial modes of learning. However, we cannot consider it to be normal that one experiences at least 10 years of his life with English lectures in school, in the equality assumption of the educational system, and, at the end, he cannot even read an announcement in English.

Some authors propose a reproductive tendency in educational systems, particularly in the Althusserian version (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1975), where educational systems are part of the social superstructure. Education tends to be an ideological apparatus (Althusser, 1980), useful to maintain/exasperate social privileges, more than to fight them. In this case, maintaining part of society in a functional illiterate situation favors sociopolitical precepts anchored in natural inequality discourses.

Retaking the case of English learning, we know that fluency in English may contribute significantly to ascend in social status. However, our students persist in the educational system disposition, occupying precious time of their lives, without developing proficiency in knowledge areas, where the educational system would have the obligation to teach.

The belief that education can transform society is a realist (Freire, 2000), with the condition that educational process quality permits the activation of authorial modes of learning. In this manner, education may be a relevant means for the learner to develop knowledge and build his own history.

One of the greatest signs of educational mythology is the narrative of “opportunity equality”, a void narrative, contradictory and manipulative, since equal opportunities don’t exist: if opportunities are equal, they are not opportunities! As proposed by Bourdieu (2007): people in society seek “to distinguish themselves”, they want the opportunity to be distinguished, not to be equal. We only alleviate our conscience with a narrative that “to ascend in life” is a merit issue.

Actually, people are not equal, opportunities cannot be equal, and the meritocracy discourse serves to distort existent inequalities, for example: if we take for a run an 18-year-old young and an elderly 60-year-old, both make the same run, with the same rules, but there is no “opportunity equality”, since being the starting point the same, the physical conditions of the contenders are different.

Synthetically, it is not enough to offer the same learning to the citizen who didn’t have the opportunity to study in the foreseen time as the others had; this is not sufficient to overcome the original deficit. He needs a scholarly environment that aggregates actions that make it possible to minimize the deficit. Opportunities must be equal, not unequal. Some Eurocentric countries—Welfare states—offer a ‘solution’ less hypocritical than most other countries when, through the public free offer of good basic education, sufficient to discourage private school.

In Brazil, private school is constitutional! According to the social narrative (Whaples, 2017), we perceive that public school is destined for the poor and must be avoided by all who have better financial conditions, also to avoid the



social stigma of pertaining to the poor class. The other narrative that destroys the equality principle is that private school is a liberal choice right; in practice, the objective is to cultivate elite supremacy that doesn't accept any other narrative that implies opportunity equality.

In a liberal context, we observe two models of educational offer: one from the classic Welfare state, which bets on elevating quality for all, is one of the best examples today Finland (Ripley, 2013; Sahlberg, 2010); another, in the USA, presents an educational model strongly privatist neoliberal, with unfortunate will with the public school (Horn & Wilburn, 2013; Lubienski & Lubienski, 2013; Russakoff, 2015).

That said, Americans betted on aggressive programs for unstructured basic school (Carnoy & Associates, 2005), such as charter schools (official permission in favor of a group, generally private, to assume a public school in decadent conditions with intervention freedom), school voucher (if there is no adequate public school, the family can opt to send the son to a private school, with government support) and homeschooling (to maintain the son studying home, frequenting the school for examinations). In the USA, confronting teacher unions is permanent, to the point of considering the profession as "the most embattled of America" (Goldstein, 2014).

As a counterpart, the European Welfare state maintains some compromise with opportunity equality, although not offering to the poorest a school with good quality. While preserving some discourse that all have the right to education, it is a right mediated by the market, avoiding "compensatory" policies. The result is an educational system frontally unequal that promotes inequality since the poorest must indulge in "minor" offers (Cottom, 2017; Caplan, 2018). In the end, education is not linked to opportunity equality, but to educational selectivity sequestered by the elite who must govern the country, while the multitude accommodates itself in the margins of the socioeconomic system.

In the liberal world, basic education is seen with quite distinct eyes, depending on the organized citizen quality and on the resulting State. When education is a right of all, with elevated quality for all, there is some effect in opportunity equalization, but when education is commodified, the logic is that of extensive



selective access, and it interposes the problem of access restriction to the poorest.

Notwithstanding, it is the case to defend that all need equal opportunities, only it is not the case to mystify this in the school with utopian narratives, pretending to preclude reality. If we want the school to have, really, emancipatory effects, as many wait for (Mezirow, 1990; Mezirow & Associates, 2000; Taylor & Cranton, 2012), we must confront social needs honestly, rather than mask under the sign of equal opportunities, only by frequenting school. Educational policies considered inclusive have an impropriety, since public school, in the actual configuration, does not solve the cognitive and social deficits. Really, pushing or redirecting poverty to schools without academic structure in the peripheries, public schools amplify this deficiency, by creating an anti-opportunity. This attitude only shows social hypocrisy and reinforces the idea that those who live in the periphery are classified as inferior in social status. It is not enough to frequent any school; it is necessary that there is an effective teaching and learning process.

### **When differences make a difference**

The school doesn't limit itself to managing only common students, since a parcel of them need special care. In principle, the rule of including such students in regular classes makes sense, and special classes tend to be more and more uncommon. This movement is healthy and reflects an expectancy that we observe in other spheres of society. From the point of view of equality of rights, it is important that all can live in society, without segregation or marginalization relative to available opportunities.

School is a space that must be inclusive, i.e., must accept all, independently of differences and necessities. So, it is important that schools be prepared to care for the demands of students with special needs. In this sense, the inclusion of these students in regular classes has been the most adopted policy in many countries. The reason is that this initiative, a priori, promotes the opportunity of equality since all students have the right to be together and to benefit from the same learning opportunities.

However, it is important to underline that such a policy must be implemented in an adequate manner, guaranteeing that students with special needs have the necessary support to be able to follow the content and develop their abilities. Inclusion does not restrict to putting all in the same common classes; the most significant is equitable treatment, i.e., to improve the conditions of those who require any type of different care. In this case, we understand in lato sensu special needs: from food for them who come hungry to school, or a table adequate for the left-handed to write comfortably, to the specialized care for the autistic and so on. Otherwise, the attempt to promote equality ends up in the same void of meritocracy discourse.

In the last two decades, emphasis was put on inclusion policies; we are questioning what “inclusion” is being made. It appears to us that actions are insufficient, hurried, and have the effect of getting rid of the problem. Only doing student enrollment of who needs special care in a common class is not inclusion; on the contrary, it can cause trouble for all.

The attempt to treat in equal form the unequal has shown us that it was not well accepted by parents and others responsible for the students, resulting in a market niche for private schools. We perceive that, while public school stresses the equality of treatment, private school offers a “differentiated treatment”, i.e., more equitable. However, only a part of student parents who need special care has the financial means to enroll in private schools that offer such adequate care.

In these cases, two formation elements are important: these students need specialized treatment and convivence with other students. Observing the behavior of families who have sons with some deficiency, it is common that parents agree upon two treatments: there is a circumstance where all are equally treated; in other ones, special care is needed. This is the principle of equity to treat unequal people in an unequal manner positively...

While inclusion is an objective to be sought, it is necessary that it be implemented in an adequate and responsible manner. Unhappily, frequently the inclusion narrative is used as a twist to obliterate the lack of technical and pedagogical ability of school agents to manage the real challenges. Example:

the enrollment of a deaf child in a common class, without a Libras interpreter, is not inclusion. Even with this interpretation in class, the student may need specialized support outside the class to continue his studies.

When we aggregate students who have some special need in a class of so-called normal students, without adequate care, there is the risk to stigmatize still more. Aiming to make an effective inclusion, it is necessary that teachers be adequately prepared, in terms of technical and pedagogical formation. Besides, that scholar architecture must be adequate and accessible to all, including hired collaborators, apt to care for the specific demands of these students. Only so it is possible to guarantee a real inclusion that benefits not only the students with special needs but the scholar community.

If we formerly exaggerated the offer of exclusive classes, today it is the case in common classes. The private school seems to have yielded to the parent demand. Practically, the issue is not solved. Inclusion does not come only from laws, although obviously, we need a juridical structure to support the implementation of public policies of inclusion and the offer of permanent formation for all teachers and professionals in proximate areas, to act accordingly. This takes time and investment; punctual actions are not enough to change reality.

Differences between students are unquestionable reality; we must not mask them, pretending to favor a false and harmful egalitarianism. It is important to remember that, the greater the differences between them, the more complex is the educational process of implied professionals. Nonetheless, this does not signify that these differences are neglected in the name of a supposed equality. A qualitative school respects his students as individual subjects, independent of age, not as mere components of a class.

Each student, it may be stressed, has its particularities and differences, and this makes him or them a citizen with individual and collective rights. It is necessary, therefore, that these rights be respected and that each student has an opportunity to learn according to his needs and abilities.

It is not enough—we reaffirm—to add a student to a common class, because this attitude is not enough to guarantee that his rights be respected. He needs a

careful and personalized approach from educators, as well as a scholar structure that permits the inclusion and learning of all, independent of their differences. Only so it will be possible to build an effective inclusive school and a qualitative one. We know that equality is an important principle in education and must be sought so that all students have access to the same opportunities and resources. But we need to be careful not to confound equality with egalitarianism since equality supposes no differences. In practice, this may favor a standardized education: the class is the smallest teaching management unit, not the learning subject (Martins, 2022).

We emphasize also that, while some learners with special needs claim for specific adaptations so that they can learn in the best possible manner, there are students with differentiated abilities, who need more complex challenges in their development. It is important to seek a balance between what we can call equality and respect for differences and singularities so that all have opportunities to develop in their rhythm and according to their potentialities.

### **Final Considerations**

We still believe in education. Families take care of their children and invest in the improvement of their life quality, but the main school product is lecture, not learning! We may not expect families to understand the difference between lecturing and being co-responsible for student learning, even if schools/teachers understand that they can have signification learning in alternative manners, outside the traditional lecturing structure. School essence is not lecture; it is learning, and this does not depend on expositive lecturing (Demo, 2015). We need a school that forms a learning community, where all are agents of the learning process: staff, students and their families are part of the process. We must grasp that equity means giving each student the opportunity to attain the same common objective: to learn as an author, to become their own history author. Therefore, we are not speaking of grades, nor of governmental statistics, but of a learning subject whose differences must be respected.

Society may tend to stigmatize diversity as inequality (superiority or inferiority) and attempt to normalize it through an equality narrative. Respecting diversity is

an equality gesture and a slow and persistent conquest. The main merit is not the result but the process.

## References

- Althusser, L. (2009). *Ideologia e aparelhos ideológicos do Estado*. Lisboa: Presença.
- Amsden, A. H. (2009). *A Ascensão do “Resto” – Os desafios ao Ocidente de economias com industrialização tardia*. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp.
- Arneson, R. (2002). Egalitarianism. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest: The evolution of egalitarian behavior*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Boehm, C. (2012). *Moral Origins: The evolution of virtue, altruism, and shame*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1975). *A Reprodução: Elementos para uma teoria do sistema educativo*. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves.
- Bourdieu, P. (2007). *A Distinção: Crítica social do julgamento*. São Paulo: Edusp.
- Caplan, B. (2018). *The case against education: Why the education system is a waste of time and money*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carnoy, M., Jacobsen, R., Michael, L., & Rothstein, R. (2005). *The Charter School Dust-up: Examining the evidence on enrollment and achievement*. New York: NY College Press.
- Cottom, T. M. (2017). *The troubling rise of for-profit colleges in the new economy*. New York: The New Press.
- Dahlberg, F. (1975). *Woman the gatherer*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (1998). *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dawkins, R. (2013). *An Appetite for Wonder: The making of a scientist*. New York: Ecco.
- Demo, P. (2015). *Aprender como autor*. São Paulo: Gen.
- Erdal, D., & Whiten, A. (1996). Egalitarianism and Machiavellian Intelligence. In P. Mellars & K. Gibson (Eds.), *Modeling the Early Human Mind* (pp. 139-150). Cambridge: MacDonald Monograph Series.
- Ferguson, N. (2018). *The square and the tower: Networks and power, from the freemasons to Facebook*. New York: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogia da indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*. São Paulo: Unesp.
- Gazzaniga, M. (2012). *Who's in Charge?: Free Will and the Science of the Brain*. New York: Robinson.
- Goldstein, D. (2014). *The Teacher Wars: A history of America's most embattled profession*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gowdy, J. (1998). *Limited Wants, Unlimited Means: A reader on Hunter-Gatherer Economics and the Environment*. St. Louis: Island Press.
- Harari, Y. N. (2017). *Sapiens: uma breve história da humanidade*. Porto Alegre, RS: L&PM.
- Harding, S. (1998). *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, feminisms, and epistemologies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

- Harding, S. (2003). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. London: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (2003a). *Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (Ed.). (2011). *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.
- Harding, S. (2015). *Objectivity and diversity: Another logic of scientific Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawking, S. W. (2006). *The Theory of Everything: The origin and fate of the universe*. Beverly Hills, CA: Phoenix Books.
- Horn, J., & Wilburn, D. (2013). *The Mismeasure of Education*. Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Kelly, K. (2011). *What Technology Wants*. New York: Penguin.
- Kelly, K. (2016). *The Inevitable: Understanding the 12 technological forces that will shape our future*. London: Viking.
- Kurzweil, R., & Bisson, T. (2013). *How to create a mind: The secret of human thought revealed*. New York: Duckworth Overlook.
- Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The Singularity Is Near: When humans transcend biology*. New York: Viking.
- Lubienski, C. A., & Lubienski, S. T. (2013). *The Public-School Advantage: Why Public Schools Outperform Private Schools*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Martins, J. L. (2022). *Efemero e incerto: O futuro já chegou*. Ponta Grossa-PR: Editora Atenas.
- Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as Transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Nagel, T. (2012). *Mind and Cosmos: Why the materialistic neo-Darwinian conception of nature is almost certainly false*. New York: Audible Studios.
- Nowak, M. (2011). *Super Cooperators: Altruism, evolution, and why we need each other to succeed*. New York: Free Press.
- Pinker, S. (2011). *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. New York: Viking Adult.
- Pinker, S. (2018). *Enlightenment Now: The case for reason, science, humanism, and progress*. New York: Viking.
- Rasmussen, D. C. (2018). *The infidel and the professor: David Hume, Adam Smith, and the friendship that shaped modern thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosling, H. (2018). *Factfulness: Ten reasons we're wrong about the world – and why things are better than you think*. New York: Flatiron Books.
- Russakoff, D. (2015). *The Prize: Who's in charge of America's Schools?*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Sahlberg, P. (2010). *Finnish Lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?*. New York: Teachers College.
- Scheidel, W. (2017). *The great leveler: Violence and the history of inequality from the stone age to the 21st century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Shermer, M. (2018). Heavens on Earth: The scientific search for the afterlife, immortality and utopia. Amazon Digital Service: Robinson.
- Smith, A. (2018). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations. Amazon: Flip.
- Taylor, E. W., Cranton, P., & Associates. (2012). The Handbook of Transformative Learning: Theory, research, and practice. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Waal, F. (2000a). Chimpanzee Politics: Power and sex among apes. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Waal, F. (2000b). The bonobo and the atheist: In search of humanism among the primates. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Whaples, R. M. (2017). Egalitarianism: Fair and equal? New thinking on egalitarianism. The Independent Review, 21(2).
- World Bank. (2018). Learning: To realize education's promise. Washington, DC: The World Bank.



**RESUMO:**

O igualitarismo e a equidade na educação tem sido amplamente debatido nas últimas décadas, levando ao uso proeminente do conceito de igualdade nas esferas política, econômica e, especialmente, educacional. Este conceito é multifacetado e buscamos estabelecer um diálogo que complemente os princípios de igualdade e equidade. Enfatizamos que a equidade se deve manifestar no processo, enquanto a igualdade deve ser refletida nos resultados. Acreditamos que a retórica igualitarista ajuda a atender as expectativas de famílias e alunos. No entanto, essa narrativa não elimina as disparidades existentes, e, em vez de uma hierarquia de desigualdades, há uma complementaridade entre elas. O objetivo desta discussão é facilitar a compreensão das narrativas relacionadas à igualdade de oportunidades no campo educacional.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Igualdade; Igualitarismo; equidade

**RESUMEN:**

El igualitarismo y la equidad en la educación han sido ampliamente debatidos en las últimas décadas, llevando al uso prominente del concepto de igualdad en las esferas política, económica y, especialmente, educativa. Este concepto es multifacético y buscamos establecer un diálogo que complemente los principios de igualdad y equidad. Enfatizamos que la equidad debe manifestarse en el proceso, mientras que la igualdad debe reflejarse en los resultados. Creemos que la retórica igualitarista ayuda a satisfacer las expectativas de familias y estudiantes. Sin embargo, esta narrativa no elimina las disparidades existentes, y, en lugar de una jerarquía de desigualdades, hay una complementariedad entre ellas. El objetivo de esta discusión es facilitar la comprensión de las narrativas relacionadas con la igualdad de oportunidades en el campo educativo.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Igualdad; igualitarismo; equidad.