Dialoguing with Diversity:
Towards an inclusive and egalitarian society

Koichi Iwabuchi
Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan

Abstract   'Diversity and inclusion' has been widely recognized as a key principle to be promoted by institutions, corporations and administrations across the world. Yet actual promotion of diversity does not necessarily enhance egalitarian inclusion of marginalized people. It might operate to manage and/or tame differences in society and foster particular kinds of diversity—business-centered, expedient and pleasurable ones— while suppressing others. Through critical appraisal of the discourse and practice of the promotion of diversity, this paper will discuss several ways in which the apparent embracement of diversity deters the advancement of the tackling of lingering inequality and marginalization with some attention to the Japanese situation. Such critique does not negate the significance of diversity and inclusion, but on-going critical dialogue with diversity is indispensable to positively and productively advance and implement the inclusion of diversity towards the construction of egalitarian inclusive society.

Keywords   critical dialogue; diversity and difference; diversity and inclusion; marginalization and inequality; intersectionality; public pedagogy.

'Diversity and inclusion' has been widely recognized as a key principle to be promoted by institutions, corporations and administrations across the world. Yet it is easier claimed than realized. Actual promotion of diversity does not necessarily enhance egalitarian inclusion of marginalized people. It might operate to manage and/or tame differences in society and foster particular kinds of diversity—business-centered, expedient and pleasurable ones—while suppressing others. Through critical appraisal of the discourse and practice of the promotion of diversity, this paper will discuss several ways in which the apparent embracement of diversity deters the advancement of the tackling of lingering inequality and marginalization with some attention to the Japanese situation. Such critique does not negate the significance of diversity and inclusion. On the contrary, advancement of diversity and inclusion has become even more an imperative issue. We have observed the rise of antipathy against growing diversity and migration in many parts of the world and various social actors strive to counter such reactionary movements by engaging with the promotion of diversity in inclusive manners. In such emerging socio-historical contexts, the critical consideration of diversity and inclusion is indispensable to positively and productively implement the inclusion of diversity. In the following, I will first discuss key critiques of the globally popularized discourses and practices of 'diversity', then moving to critical appraisal of the Japanese situation and discussing the fundamental issues to be tackled. Finally, I will conclude by suggesting how to keep critical dialogue with diversity towards the construction of egalitarian inclusive society.

1. Confusion of BLM and Diversity & Inclusion

The Covid-19 pandemic has been making considerable influences on our lives—ecologically, politically economically, socially and culturally. Covid-19's impacts on the embracing of diversity and inclusion has been ambivalent. 'Stay at home' nationalism, xenophobia and racism against 'Asians' and 'China', and socio-economic disparity have been newly engendered. At the same time, the necessity of fostering altruism has been much advocated and collective engagement with social justice, inclusive togetherness and mutual care has been enhanced. The rise and diffusion of BLM (Black Lives Matter) movement across the world including Japan can be understood as a symptom of how Covid-19 encourages some people to be more caring and sensitive to the suffering of other people. Many people who have been hitherto inattentive to BLM has come to take it as 'our' problem and become more willing to combat racism, directly or indirectly participating and supporting the movement. Their eventual consequences are yet to be known. It can be said that the movement has been dying down in many parts of the world. Yet, we should not easily dismiss how the pandemic crisis at least brings about an opportunity to encourage people to realize, if faintly, that our action, imagination and solidarity create our destiny and future.

BLM also induces no small number of corporations to engage with the fight against racism. A global HR director of British publicity company detected the upswing of engagement with tackling racism and constructing "actively anti-racist workplaces" (Folarin 2020). She contends that BLM offers a great chance to make a "deeper structural change" to break racism as "businesses' last taboo" (Folarin 2020) but such serious engagement has been softened as BLM is confused with diversity and inclusion (D&I):

> Businesses are starting to talk less in terms of Black Lives Matter and more in terms of diversity and inclusion, as if retreating to a safe space where the subject of racism is more palatable somehow. D&I cannot become a hiding place for BLM (or any movement that deals with issues of race). Racism needs to be called out. If we mask it as another D&I initiative, we excuse ourselves from doing the hard work that's needed; BLM gets diluted into something we're comfortable with and we put our commitment to change at risk. (Folarin 2020)

Her point is suggestive of the pitfall of globally popularized discourses and practices of diversity and inclusion. Much has been said that we are living in the age of diversity. Needless to say, all societies are full of diversity in terms of gender, LGBT/SOGI, race/ethnicity, nationality, age, class, dis/abilities, religion. This is never new but the intensifying flows of people crossing borders, diversification of people's lifestyles and value-orientations as well as social movements to make cultural differences fairly treated have been making diversity in society deepened and more visible. Accompanied with the change is the perception that fostering diversity is vital to enrich corporations, institutions and society as it promotes innovation and creativity. However, it cannot be stressed too much that various differences that make up of diversity in society have been much associated with exclusion, inequality and discrimination under colonialism and modern construction of the nation. To fight against such marginalization, many social movements have nee actively formed and enacted such as civil right movement, human rights protection, equal opportunity, anti-racial discrimination and identity politics to make suppressed differences socially recognized and demand just redistribution. The realization of inclusive society that equally treat differences is still far from being a reality. The key question is not how to make use of diversity but whether and how the current prominence of diversity and inclusion sincerely attends to structured inequality and discrimination and strives to eliminate it. Folarin's warning shows how the promotion of diversity and inclusion is apt to be disconnected from such engagement.

2. Critiques of "Diversity"

The rise of "diversity" discourse has been criticized for obscuring structured inequality and discrimination against migrants and long-standing ethnic and racialized minorities. Let me take up three critical approaches to examining how the promotion of diversity is deployed to control and contain differences. The first one is related to the critique of multiculturalism that superficially celebrates diversity. As Hage (1998) argued in the Australian context, 'ethnic' culture such as food, music, costume and dance is put onto display to be consumed and approved of in society. While being favorably considered to enrich society, diversity is eventually a matter of being acceptable or tolerable by the majority group. It is "multiculturalism of having," in which the dominant group can claim the power to control, tolerate, and consume cultural diversity in society in disguise of benevolence without fundamentally changing the social structure. Hage argues that this is opposite to "multiculturalism of being" in which everyone fully recognizes cultural diversity as fundamentally constitutive of society and is responsible for self-reflexively changing their own view of self/other relations and transforming society in an inclusive manner. In the context of the United States, Brown (2008) also argues that multiculturalism is built on majority's tolerance of differences, which easily turns into rejection and antipathy. This is apt to happen when ethnic and racial minorities challenge the status quo by claiming the elimination of structured inequality and marginalization. This is also related to the rise of modern racism under neoliberalism, which urges the ethnic majority people who experience socio-economic distress to consider that multiculturalism is unfair as it offers material benefits only to the minority, not taking care of 'us.'

Multiculturalism-related diversity has been perceived more and more un-tolerable as multiculturalism has been severely criticized for being divisive by embracing differences too much in society especially since 9/11. In this situation, the discourse of celebrating diversity has not died out but has been promoted in neoliberal terms in association with the innovation and productivity. Immigration policy has been turning to integration and selection of useful migrants who agree to comply the key socio-cultural norms and values of host society. Accordingly, as Eriksen (2006: 15) points out in North European contexts, the rising attention to diversity takes place with the negative evaluation of differences—"diversity is seen as a good thing, while difference is not." Difference has come to be considered unwanted collective qualities that is detrimental to social integration and cohesion, while diversity is positively associated with individual's productive capabilities that enrich society. As Eriksen argues, "there is considerable support for diversity in the public sphere, while difference is increasingly seen as a main cause of social problems associated with immigrants and their descendants" (2006: 14) and it is considered that "diversity is economically profitable and morally harmless...while difference threatens the individualism underpinning and justifying neo-liberalism" (2006: 24). The promotion of diversity and inclusion is in line with this thinking, which tends to obscure lasting structural inequality and discrimination of culturally different others recognized as such, while individualized capabilities of people with diverse backgrounds is considered innovative and productive human resources to economy and society.

Diversity has also been widely deployed as branding strategy of corporations and institutions. Ahmed's study of diversity campaign in British universities also shows how the promotion of diversity is made at the expense of disengagement with the tackling of ethnic and racial inequality. "The term 'diversity' has been understood as a replacement term, taking the place of earlier terms such as 'equal opportunities' or 'antiracism'" (Ahmed 2012: 52) whereby "replacement" functions "as a way of forgetting the histories of struggle that surround these terms" (2012: 201, n.2). Diversity is a positive term and its positivity works to obscure inequality and racism within institutions and society. Unlike "equal opportunities" or "antiracism" that connotes more challenging, confrontational and uncomforting,

diversity promises the enrichment of institutions, thus encouraging members to affirmatively engage with it and make practitioners use it as action tool to get members to the table of engaging the issue. However, as diversity is expressed as 'happy talk' that all differences matter, it also limits the engagement with lingering inequality. As Ahmed (2012: 71) argues, "the very talk about diversity allows individuals to feel good, creating the impression that we have 'solved it.' Diversity thus participates in the creation of an illusion of equality", which operates to obscure and disengage with the issues of lingering inequality and marginalization.

In sum, diversity is actively deployed as it signifies beneficial, productive, harmonious, digestive, feel-good and positive in contrast to difference, which is considered threatening, divisive, damaging, indigestive, confrontational and negative. Diversity is to be promoted as it enriches economy and society in terms of three Ms (merit, market, management) while the issues of structured inequality, gap, discrimination are put into the backstage. The sense of frustration the above HR director expressed about the confusion of BLM and D&I indicates this problematic.

3. Diversity in Japan: slogan without policy engagement

In Japan too, the promotion of 'diversity' has been positively taken by many corporations as well as the government and institutions as it is assumed to enhance business innovation and enrich economy and society. Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry publicly announced the "Code of Conduct of Diversity 2.0" (2017) proposing that corporations actively employ more capable women and foreigners to produce added values. Many companies adopt the principle of diversity and inclusion to employ and make use of more diverse human resources in terms of gender, sexuality and nation of origin. The positive image of diversity has urged local governments and related NGOs/NPOs to adopt the slogan of 'the promotion of diversity' to replace the former terms such as multicultural co-living and human rights protection. We are required to make case by case investigations to judge whether and how the above critique of diversity could be applied in a specific socio-historical context. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Japan is no exception to widely observed trend that the promotion of diversity is separated from the engagement with inequality and marginalization of differences. Eventually, to put it bluntly, a call for promoting diversity is more of an empty catchphrase in Japan, which does not yet accompany serious reality check to advance diversity and inclusion. For example, the former director of the Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic committee, who was a former prime minister, resigned in February 2020 for he made a sexist remark that female members tend to talk too much at the meeting and should have good manners of being reserved. Not just self-claimed feminists but many citizens and some corporations strongly criticized his sexist remark so much so that the director was pushed to resign. This shows the rising concern with such issue in Japan and what drove people into action is the deep sense of frustration with the huge gap between official slogans such as "Creation of a society where women actively work and shine" and "Unity in Diversity" and the reality. Japan's performance of global gender gap index reported by World Economic Forum (2021) has not been improved but even declining from 110th out of 149 countries in 2019 to 120th out of 156 countries in 2021.

The ample gap between slogan and reality has much to do with the lack of policy initiative to deal with diversity, which is an extra matter to be taken into consideration in the Japanese cases. Most apparent in this regard is the treatment of immigrants and ethnic minorities. There has been no policy initiative in the post-war Japan to handle immigration and multicultural situations. While Japan has been eventually receiving migrants, mostly from Asian regions and Latin American countries especially since late 1980s, the Japanese government officially has neither acknowledged the acceptance of migrants (avoiding using a term *imin* in Japanese) nor developed related policy of social integration. In 2006, the "Committee for

the development of multicultural co-living (*tabunka kyōsei*)" that was established by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications submitted a report "Towards the local development of multicultural co-living" (hereafter the MC report). This was the first initiative of the governmental involvement with immigration and multicultural situations in Japan. In the report, foreign nationals living in Japan was recognized as 'residents' of local communities instead of the hitherto notion of 'foreigners' living in Japan, implying that they participate and constitute in the local community together with Japanese residents.

The MC report's highlighting of localities reflects the history of the advancement of *tabunka kyōsei* in Japan where NGOs, NPOs, citizen groups and local governments have been initially engaging to support and care for migrants and ethnic/racial minorities. Actually, the term *kyōsei* has been embraced and evolved through grassroots social movements such as feminism, Minamata disease, indigenous Ainu people since 1970s. The term has been adopted in the late 1980s by some local governments and NGOs and citizens' groups have worked together to deal with the predicament which ethnic minorities such as resident Koreans and foreign national residents faced who did not enjoy fundamental citizen's rights. This attests to the significance of grassroots movements and collaboration for the fostering of diversity in Japan where citizenship is fundamentally equated with nationality, based on *jus sanguinis*, and these grass-roots activities in localities have played an important role in the expansion of some citizenship rights for foreign residents. However, this local engagement is an imposed one, it should be emphasized, in the absence of national policy. The MC report has not accompanied any proposal of related national policy to deal with intensifying multicultural situations of Japan. Rather than proposing to advance policy initiative by the government, the report aims to encourage local governments and NGO/NPOs to take the initiative to offer appropriate services for foreign residents. And this situation has not fundamentally changed since then.

It can be called "multicultural co-living without multiculturalism" (Iwabuchi 2010), which encourages the local initiative to handle ethnic diversity without engaging with the development of related national policy. It is rather problematic not least because such local initiatives' efficacy is limited as local governments and NGOs/NPOs do not have an institutional authority, capability and budget, as the state administers key areas of education, employment, health care and social welfare.[1] Furthermore, the Japanese government actually avoids acknowledging Japan as a multicultural nation and eschews making the multicultural question a national issue. In so doing, a slogan of multicultural co-living plays down the fundamental question of who the members of the nation are and what is diversity in the nation that needs to be taken care of. Adopting the term 'local residents,' the MC reports appears to be willing to assist local actors in creating a better social environment where foreign residents can live smoothly and nonthreateningly, but a new category of local residents neither attests to the inclusion of those with cultural differences as members of the national society nor discards the rigidly polarized definition of 'Japanese' and 'foreigners.' As will be discussed shortly, its usage of 'foreigners' also testifies that multicultural co-living policy discussion tends to be forgetful of long-standing ethnic and racial diversity.

---

[1] A similar situation is seen in the case of the same-sex couples. Japan does not officially approve of the use of different surnames by a married couple, not to mention same-sex marriage. Seventy-four local municipal corporations have adopted same-sex partnership, which is considered a significant development of official recognition of the same-sex couples in the local. Yet, such local initiative is a necessitated one due to the absence of policy initiative and the partnership has no lawful effect in terms of de facto status and inheritance (see Niji Bridge Website n.d.).

4. Critique of the promotion of diversity in Japan

Let us consider how the three critiques of diversity and inclusion as mentioned earlier are applicable to the Japanese situation in which diversity is promoted without any policy initiative. The MC report of multicultural co-living states that people of various nationalities and ethnicities live as members of local communities by striving to mutually recognize differences and construct equal relationships. Like the critique of tolerance for multicultural inclusion as discussed above, the multicultural co-living policy has been much criticized for this advocacy masks structured discrimination and exploitation against migrants while superficially emphasizing 'multi-culture' and harmonious co-living among groups of different cultures. It celebrates cultural diversity only for the majority by the majority, which makes no fundamental change to inequality and marginalization migrants and ethnic minorities confront (Hatano 2006). Some rejects multicultural co-living policy discussion for it is too culture-centered to deal with more urgent social and economic predicaments (Kajita et al. 2005). However, the point is that there has been no policy initiative regarding fair recognition of and respect for cultural diversity either such as multicultural education curriculum, anti-racism legalization, and media services that reflect cultural diversity. Thus, the issue at stake in the Japanese situation is not the balance or tension of recognition and redistribution but the lack of engagement with both on the national level. Moreover, a cheerful stress on harmonious co-living among groups of different cultures is rather cosmetic not just because of the posturing celebration of multicultural situations but, more fundamentally, because it keeps the rigidly exclusive assumptions of national membership, which easily turns tolerance of cultural diversity into jingoism and hate against "non-Japanese" (Morris-Suzuki 2003).

Neoliberalist promotion of diversity has become apparent in Japan too. Great performance of Japanese national team in Rugby World Cup 2019 that much excited people in Japan is considered a good example of the productive power of diversity as the national team was made up by the mixture of players of diverse nationalities. Yet this echoes an above-mentioned trend of diversity and inclusion, which stresses beneficial kinds of diversity for the nation to be praised and promoted. Talented foreign workers and graduates are sought after and the government introduced a visa category that enables them to much quickly and easily get permanent residency in Japan. At the same time, the Japanese government revised Immigration Control Act to get more temporary labor migrants under the name of technical intern trainees. They are eventually temporary cheap labor who are not allowed to get permanent residency. Their working conditions are infamously bad and getting even more serious under the Covid-19 crisis. In 2020, Multicultural Co-living has been updated for the first time since 2006. It now includes the catchy words of diversity and inclusion. However, it does not show any sign of developing substantial social integration policy. It does not attend to socio-economic sufferings that many migrant workers confront under the Covid-19 crisis either. Rather the tone has been changing to be more selective of useful migrant workers and stress the self-responsibility of foreign residents to adjust themselves to Japanese society, which implies the eviction of those who are considered hazardous to social cohesion and highly burdensome to social welfare (Shiobara 2019). Japan is also notorious for not accepting refugees and asylum seekers. The Japanese government even tried to revise the Immigration and Refugees Act to make it possible to expel the seekers who make applications more than two times back to their 'home'. Neoliberalism turn of multicultural co-living discourse thus superficially adopts the global trend of diversity and inclusion while even fortifying the exclusive boundary of Japanese citizen to be embraced.

The promotion of diversity is also positively advocated in ways to mask inequality and racism in Japan. A posed question of how Japan should promote and achieve diversity renders the issue of diversity a future-oriented problem, as if diversity had not been part of Japan so far. Long-standing existence of many ethnic minorities and recent migrants and people of mixed heritages and backgrounds and their

lingering experiences of marginalization tend to be neglected in the discussion of promoting diversity. This point is clearly discerned in the multicultural co-living discourse too. While referring to "people of various nationalities and ethnicities", it eventually focuses on the recent migrants and disregards long-standing ethnic minorities and those who have Japanese nationalities by birth or by naturalization. This has also much to do with the fact that there is only one single category of 'Japanese' vis-à-vis 'foreigners' in the national census data. It only shows the number of Japanese nationals and foreign nationals, not showing the details of diverse ethnic/racial background identified as such by those who have been naturalized into Japanese nationals or were born as Japanese nationals while having various ethno-cultural backgrounds. Officially speaking, the number of foreigners living in Japan is 2.8millions, about two per cent of the whole population. Yet this figure only presents a limited picture of diversity in Japan as it does not include ethnic minorities, Ainu, 'mixed race' who have Japanese nationality. If we include those people with diverse ethnic and "racialized" backgrounds, the proportion of ethnic/racial minorities in Japan will be about seven to eight per cent (Mochizuki 2019). The dichotomy of 'Japanese' and 'foreigners' obscures a real picture of ethnic and racial diversity among Japanese citizens, facilitating a lingering conception of Japan as a racially and ethnically homogeneous nation.

Bipolarized understanding of diversity discourages people from recognizing lingering ethnic and racial discrimination in Japan, which has been eventually on the rise as most clearly shown by hate speech movements against resident Koreans (Iwabuchi 2017). What has been also noticeable is the stubborn rejection of any claim of racism in Japan. BLM movement also captured many people's concern in Japan and no small number of people, especially younger generation, joined the street demonstration by taking the issue of racism as their own and proposing the elimination of racial discrimination and racist hate speech in Japan as well as in the US and the world. However, even stronger backlash was also observed with remarks that there is no such racism in Japan as in the US and racism has thus little or nothing to do with 'us' despite mundane existence of racism and hate speech in Japan ("Hate lurking" 2021). Same reaction was also noted when Nike made a branding advertisement that depicts three young women athletes overcoming the suffering of social bullying and discrimination by sports, two of whose parent(s) seem to be from Korea and Africa. Japanese media rarely deal with racialized discrimination and thus the advertisement attract much praise for confronting it. But even stronger is negative reactions, which propose to boycott Nike products by claiming that Nike depresses Japan without any evidence as Japan has no such discrimination. It should also be noted that most corporations keep silent with the issue of racism and BLM, much less actively involved with the issues compared to Euro-American counterparts ("How corporations" 2020). In this sense, the fundamental problem in Japan is not the confusion of BLM and D&I as pointed out by Florina in the UK. Rather it is the absence of publicly shared awareness of the mundane existence of racism and discrimination and how it is a serious social issue that needs to be tackled. Japan has not just developed substantial policy of immigration and social integration but also shown no willingness to develop comprehensive anti-discrimination laws despite the warning of UN council about lingering and even amplifying racial discrimination and hate speech in Japan. Japanese government's disinclination to tackle lingering and even deteriorating ethnic and racial discrimination has much to do with the widespread disinterest in the issue and bipolarized understanding of diversity in terms of 'Japanese' and 'foreigners' among the populace.

5. Critically Dialoguing with Diversity

The critique of the promotion of diversity does not mean to reject the uses of 'diversity' or deny it altogether. Rejecting the promotion of diversity is not constructive, especially now that antipathy against multiculturalism, migration and diversity has been capturing the support of ethnically majority people

who nevertheless feel socio-economically marginalized or not fairly attended to. The positive tone of diversity might be tactically helpful to create a chance to involve hitherto unconcerned people (see Ahmed 2012). In Japan, the promotion of diversity at the least makes the marginalized and suppressed differences more visible and some activists and groups take it a good opportunity to progress social movement to eliminate inequality and marginalization in association with difference. Some corporations have organized seminars and symposiums to relate the issue of diversity to that of historically constituted inequality and marginalization and discuss the corporations' social responsibility to engage with their elimination.[2] Critique is neither indiscriminate rejection nor incompatible with positive affirmation. As Ahmed (2012: 17) discusses, diversity is problematic as it is presented "as a solution". Rather, "we need to keep asking what we are doing with diversity." I would like to conclude this paper by proposing to keep on dialoguing with diversity, not to discard it, so that various kinds of differences are mutually recognized and equally included.

First and foremost, we need to make critical reviews of the discourse of diversity to tackle inequality and marginalization in relation to differences as I have done so far. Key questions are what kinds of diversity is promoted, what are missing and suppressed, which issues are obscured and whether and how the promotion of diversity is dissociated with historically structured marginalization and inequality and it newly induces exclusionary power dynamics. In the Japanese context in which policy engagement with immigration and multicultural issues has been decidedly under-developing, these critiques are indispensable to advance an urgent task to make the government officially acknowledge Japan as a nation of immigrants and with substantial ethnic and racial diversity and develop related policy and laws to prevent discrimination and marginalization with penalty. Towards this to happen, critical appraisal of the promotion of diversity needs to be widely shared in society and the grass-roots critical engagement with diversity should be further fostered. And this point is related to other three suggestions.

Second, attending to and understanding of various kinds of discrimination and marginalization across various subjects as structurally interconnected. The promotion of diversity obviously gives the priority to some kinds of differences while neglecting others. Gender, LGBT and disabilities might be attracting more public attention than migrants and ethnic minorities. Others such as those who have difficulties to live in society due to poverty, bullying and adjustment disorder are not included in the discussion of diversity. The new female director of Tokyo Olympic and Paralympic promised to seriously engage the promotion of diversity and raised the ratio of female committee members up to 40%. However, nothing has been mentioned or done regarding ethnic and racialized diversity within Japan though it is also a key constituent of the slogan of "unity in diversity". The development of local approval of same-sex partnership is also criticized that some local governments use the partnership for the purpose of local branding while suppressing other kinds of diversity such as poverty and homeless people in the local (Shimizu 2017). The promotion of diversity thus does not just conceal lingering inequality and discrimination but also creates a hierarchy of acceptance and hinders the facilitation of solidarity among marginalized people, based on the principle of divide and rule. How to foster empathy, dialogue and collaboration among diverse marginalized people is not an easy task as the experience of marginalization rather varies and becomes more and more individualized. And most of them are desperately overcoming one's own dire straits so much so that they do not afford to attend to others' suffering. However, if the ultimate aim of promoting diversity is making everyone with diverse socio-cultural backgrounds enjoy their lives without suffering from inequality, discrimination and exclusion, the fostering of the manners of mutual listening to and understanding of diverse kinds of difficulties to live would be desirable to enhance solidarity and collaboration by encouraging people relate one's own difficulties to others. And

---

[2] See, e.g., "Diversity ABC to learn from scratch" (2017).

this is crucial especially in Japan where no substantial policy to protect human rights from anti-action against people with differences.

The second point also suggests that to fully tackle the issues of diversity-related inequality and marginalization requires the solving all issues at once as they are structurally related to each other. In this respect, the idea of intersectionality is helpful to promote complicated understanding of diversity, encouraging people to nurture social imagination of others' sufferings, and foster collaboration and solidarity across differences. Intersectionality problematizes assumed homogeneity of category of gender, LGBT, race, ethnicity, class and attends to how various kinds of inequality and marginalization are not separated from each other but intersect to exert actual inequality and marginalization on particular subjects.[3] The experience of Black men or white women is not same as that of Black women in which at least two related issues of race and gender intersect. It looks into unnoticeable power relations within a particular category, which actually operate across sections and categories. Such understanding illuminates the necessity to tackle all kinds of inequality and marginalization at once, as they are mutually constitutive. It also fosters intersectional imagination of other kinds of inequality and marginalization, to which one appears not to be related, as being different but fundamentally associated. As Shimizu (2021) argues with reference to Ahmed's "an affinity of hammers" (2016), simultaneously destroying adjoining walls, which is structurally connected to and sustain other walls, would open up the radical possibility of intersectional solidarity. Shimizu's point is made regarding feminist critique of transphobia, but it has wider implications for other subjects, issues and categories.

Last but not the least, how to put above critical insights into mundane praxis is crucial so as to involve as many citizens as possible in active engagement with diversity. While people in the center tend to be unconscious of the privileges they enjoy, widespread socio-economic distress under neoliberalism has made no small number of ethnic majority people feel that they are deprived and become frustrated with welfare benefit the ethnic minority and migrants claim and enjoy. The idea of intersectionality has been adopted in educational practices that encourage people to realize the complexity of when and how they hold privilege (Case 2013). It is also necessary to let people realize that anyone can be put in some position of marginalization and caring for others' suffering ultimately benefits themselves as the idea of altruism contends. In any case, it is crucial to develop public pedagogy so that people with diverse backgrounds and social locations nurture the sense of "our" problems to be tackled in society for lingering inequality and marginalization others experience. Many social actors other than schoolteachers such as museum, artists, media practitioners, NGOs/NPOs, citizen networks and local governments have been already engaging with and advancing pedagogical practices across sections and borders. University researchers and teachers should more actively collaborate with them to further advance public pedagogy across sections and borders (see Iwabuchi 2018).

Diversity enriches society and institutions. It is not just because the use of diverse human resources will enhance innovation but, more significantly, because the tackling with inequality and marginalization related to diversity will make everyone enjoy life and work without being marginalized and deprived. Such societal situation would be the very foundation that creative vigor and innovation of society is generated in the long run. The current situation is far from the ideal. Yet Covid-19 has not just illuminated widening gaps of haves and have-nots but also encouraged many people to be more caring for others' suffering by considering them as 'our' problem. Critical dialogue with diversity will further foster such a sign into a radical hope and into actual social changes.

---

[3] As for the definition of intersectionality, see Collins & Chepp (2013). As for original key works that conceptualize intersetionality, see Crenshaw (1988) and Collins (1990).

References

"Code of Conduct of Diversity 2.0." Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, March 2017. Revised June 2018. https://www.meti.go.jp/press/2018/06/20180608001/20180608001-3.pdf

"Diversity ABC to learn from scratch. How Companies Should Face Diversity." *Fujitsu Journal*, 19 December 2017. https://blog.global.fujitsu.com/jp/2017-12-19/01/

"Hate lurking in our everyday life: Is Japan really a discrimination-free society?". *Mainichi Newspaper*, 12 February 2021. https://mainichi.jp/articles/20210212/k00/00m/040/027000c

"How corporations should commit themselves to social issues." *Visual Shift*, 26 November 2020. https://visual-shift.jp/20728/

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, Sara. 2016. "An Affinity of Hammers." *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* 3(1-2). 22-34.

Brown, Wendy. 2008. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Case, Kim (ed.). 2013. *Deconstructing Privilege: Teaching and Learning as Allies in the Classroom*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia H. & Chepp, Valerie. 2013. "Intersectionality." In Waylen, Georgina & Celis, Karen & Kantola, Johanna & Weldon, S. Laurel (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*, 57-87. New York: Oxford University Press.

Collins, Patricia H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1988. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140. 139-167.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 2006. "Diversity Versus Difference: Neo-liberalism in the Minority-Debate". In Rottenburg, Richard & Schnepel, Burkhard & Shimada, Shingo (eds.), *The Making and Unmaking of Difference*, 13-36. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Folarin, Amina. 2020. "Stop confusing BLM and D&I. They are not the same thing: Businesses are missing their opportunities to change." *Campaign*, 19 June 2020, https://www.campaignlive.co.uk/article/stop-confusing-blm-d-i-not-thing/1687008.

Hage, Ghassan. 1998. *White nation: fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Annandale: Pluto Press.

Hatano, Lilian Terumi. 2006. "Zainichi Burajirujin wo Torimaku 'tabunka kyôsei' no shomondai." ("Issues of Multicultural Co-living for Japanese Brazilians"). In Ueda, Kôji & Yamashita, Hitoshi (eds.), *Kyôsei no naijitsu: Hihanteki shakaigengogaku kara no Toikake* ('*Debunking "Coliving": Appraisal from a Viewpoint of Critical Social Linguistics*'), 55-80. Tokyo: Sangensha.

Iwabuchi, Koichi. 2010. "Tabunkashakai Nihon ni okeru bunka notoi" ("What is the cultural questions of Japan as a multicultural society"). In Iwabuchi, Koichi (ed.), *Tabunkashakai no bunka wo tou: kyousei, komyuniti, media* ('*Interrogating "cultural" issues of multicultural society: Co-living, community and media*'), 9-34. Tokyo: Seikyusha.

Iwabuchi, Koichi. 2017. "Introverted jingoism in a post-imagined-community digital era: The Upswing of Hate Speech Demonstration in Japan." In Wang, Chih-Ming & Goh, Daniel PS (eds.), *Precarious Belongings: Affect and Nationalism in Asia*, 39-55. London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Iwabuchi, Koichi. 2018. "Migrancy and Diplomacy: Fostering Cross-Border Dialogue and Collaboration in the Age of Hyper-Mobility." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 25(1). 165-178.

Kajita, Takamichi & Tanno, Kiyoto & Higuchi, Naoto. 2005. *Kao no mienai teijûka: Nikkei Burajirujin to kokka, sijou, imin nettowâku* ('*Invisible Settlement: Japanese Brazilians and the State/Market/Migrant Networks*') Nagoya: Nagoya University Press.

Mochizuki, Yudai. 2019. *Futatsu no Nihon: Imin kokka no honnne to tatemae* ('*Two Japans: Official principle and reality of the nation of immigrants*'). Tokyo: Kodansha Gendai Shinsho.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 2003. "Immigration and Citizenship in Contemporary Japan." In Graham, Jeff & Maswood, Javed & Miyajima, Hideaki (eds.), *Japan: Change and Continuity*, 163-178. London: Routledge.

Nijiro Diversity. *Niji Bridge. Bridging the gaps for diversity and inclusion*. (English version). https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=ja&sl=auto&tl=en&u=https://nijibridge.jp

Shimizu, Akiko. 2017. "Daibaasiti kara kenrihoshou he: Toranpu ikou no amerika to 'LGBT bumu' no nihon" ("From diversity to the protection of human right: USA after the Trump presidency and Japan in the midst of LGBT boom"). *Sekai*. May: 134-143.

Shimizu, Akiko. 2021. "Onaji josei de naikoto no kibou: feminizumu to intersectionality" ("A hope of recognizing same and different experiences as female: Feminism and intersectionality"). In Iwabuchi, Koichi (ed.), *Tayousei tono taiwa* ('*Dialogue with diversity: what the promotion of diversity masks*'), 145-164. Tokyo: Seikyusha.

Shiobara, Yoshikazu. 2019. "Tabunkashugi wa haigaishugi wo yokuseishiuruka" ("Can multiculturalism control jingoism?"). *Fukuin to Sekai* 74(12): 30-35.

World Economic Forum. 2021. *Global Gender Gap Report*. March 2021. https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2021