Accepted version, with page numbers indicated in **[blue bold square brackets]**.

Encountering Publicness and Multiculture:
Public Pedagogy with a Multilingual Community Choir

Samantha Sebastian Dieckmann, University of Oxford

Abstract. This article presents an ethnography of Lullaby Train: public art performances by a multilingual community choir in Melbourne, Australia. Singing lullabies on trains and platforms produced encounters that were notably distinct from those experienced within the Lullaby Choir itself as well as in performances attended by self-selecting audiences. Lullaby Train was designed to revitalize particular modes of civic engagement but instead produced conflicting forms of publicness and multiculture. Examining these performances as pedagogical sites, I argue that the quotidian interactions that characterize urban social relations provide important insights for the study and practice of intercultural music.

On November 3 and 24, 2017, a multilingual choir traveled and sang lullabies on the Upfield Line of Melbourne's metro train network, north of the central business district. Lullaby Train took place on and between Coburg Station and Jewell Station as part of Platform, a series of performances curated by Ilana Russell and the Forum of Sensory Motion for the annual public art festival MoreArt.[1] Lullaby Train was designed to revitalize particular modes of civic engagement and invoke positive intercultural relations but instead gave rise to living multiculture and conflicting forms of publicness. Weighing the project's anticipated social relations against those engendered raises questions about intercultural music projects with public pedagogical aims. What forms of publicness and multiculture did Lullaby Train's musical performances enact? What was taught and learned through this venture, and by whom? How was Lullaby Train shaped by the spaces in which its performances took place? And **[p.52]** to what extent were the project's objectives delimited by the ways in which it was organized?

In this article, I address these questions through an analysis of ethnographic fieldnotes, participant observations, audio-video recordings and interviews, and ultimately draw attention to the significance of everyday, street-level encounters.

Routine negotiations of difference and belonging intervene in academic literatures and public discourses dominated by either celebratory multiculturalism or antiracist praxis. Through the notion of living multiculture (Neal et al. 2018), I argue that the quotidian interactions that characterize urban social relations provide important insights for the study and practice of intercultural music.

Although Lullaby Train was not conceived through the lens of public pedagogy, adopting this frame supports analytical interests in "how sites or practices of art, social movement activism, media, literature, or popular culture operate pedagogically" (Cooper and Sandlin 2020:421). What is often at stake in the field of public pedagogy is publicness itself, rather than any specific content knowledge pedagogues may be trying to transmit. One of the key approaches to understanding publicness is distinguishing between different types of publics, identifying how they are produced and the connections and boundaries between them. For example, Savage's (2014) influential classification makes a distinction between political publics, constituted by members of a particular political grouping such as the nation-state, popular publics, self-organized by members that share interests in and consume the same or related media texts, and concrete publics, which are spatially bounded within discrete geographic borders. Importantly, the publics addressed by Lullaby Train were spatially bounded in two ways: confined to the performing space of the train commute and presumed connected to Moreland by way of regular transit, if not by residency or employment. In this, the discrete geographical boundaries of Coburg and Jewell Stations, and the interconnecting Upfield Line trains, set the stage for Lullaby Train to produce forms of publicness characterized by living multiculture. Contrary to ideals of multicultural harmony and social cohesion, the concept of living multiculture does not ignore or demonize the tensions that may arise when negotiating differences. Instead, emerging conflicts and indifference are viewed as "unpanicked" and "normal" features of living with others, maybe even indicative of "mature community relations" (Harris 2014:585). Its emphasis on "how difference is rendered ordinary and unproblematic in everyday worlds" (Samanani 2023:2) is also central to closely affiliated notions of convivial relations and what political theorist Bart van Leeuwen calls "the shoulder-shrugging indifference to difference" of side-by-side citizenship (2010:638).

That the socio-spatiality of public transport is inherently compressed and mobile provides special insights into urban social dynamics such as these (Bovo et al.

2023). As Wilson explains, "In a space of such extraordinary intimacy with others and intense materiality, where bodies are pressed up against each other, seats are shared, and personal boundaries are constantly negotiated, we find an important and often overlooked site of ordinary multiculture, where differences are negotiated on the smallest of scales" (2011:635).

Because of this intimacy, compared with other modes of transport, buses, trams, metros, and trains provide the greatest potential to engage with and observe the social lives of strangers. They are particularly fascinating sites of ordinary multiculture because, despite this potential, many if not most travelers actively avoid encounters with fellow commuters (te Brömmelstroet et al. 2017). These banal contiguities are especially significant considering one of the key rationales for the choir's development, namely, to counter recent tensions between anti-immigration and antiracism protestors.

This article comprises three parts. The first introduces the Lullaby Choir, an ensemble that emerged from an applied ethnomusicological research project. In this section I will describe the choir's genesis, including the various roles I inhabited throughout its development and until the conclusion of the ethnographic fieldwork. I will then turn to how the choir came to sing on trains and platforms as part of MoreArt, drawing connections between Lullaby Train and the ways music and public transportation have been understood in scholarship. In the final part of the article, I focus on the ways that the pedagogical workings of Lullaby Train were generative of living multiculture and contested publics. Taken together, these various sections reveal the importance and mechanics of the vernacular ways people share space with various others. These phenomena, currently underrecognized in ethnomusicology, are of especial consequence for musical projects concerned with intercultural encounters and related questions of belonging and placemaking.

The Lullaby Choir: Moving (in) Multicultural Coburg

The Lullaby Choir was developed in September 2016, borne from reflections on the universality and cultural specificity of lullabies within the context of my postdoctoral research fellowship. The fellowship, which sat within a broader project led by Professor Jane W. Davidson, principal investigator, "involved

collaborating with a range of community and sector organizations—examining existing projects and developing new ones—to explore questions around music, empathy and conciliation" (Dieckmann 2024; see "Funding Details"). Building on previous research into intercultural lullaby singing (Marsh and Dieckmann 2016), Jane and I developed one such research collaboration with the Victorian Cooperative on Children's Services for Ethnic Groups (VICSEG) New Futures, a not-for-profit organization that provides education, employment pathways, childcare, and community programs for refugees, asylum seekers, and **[p.54]** migrants. Our initial intentions to foster "a colloquial and open-ended intercultural exchange through the sharing of lullabies" (Dieckmann and Davidson 2018:156) evolved into a formal ensemble.

At the time of the Lullaby Train performances described in this article, the Lullaby Choir included twenty-five members that had migrated to Melbourne from more than ten countries of origin, from regions including South Asia, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, the United Kingdom, and Latin America. Although the choir was open to the general community in and beyond Coburg, the suburb where VICSEG New Futures' head office was located, its core membership was made up of the organization's employees whose daily labor addressed the needs of refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants, often from a position of having shared lived experiences. Fortnightly sessions involved learning and performing lullabies in each other's languages. The songs' lyrics and themes drew attention to ethnocultural and religious diversity among the choir's membership. At the same time, it was part of the research agenda to use lullabies to highlight similar experiences and memories of family, home, and migration in the hopes of generating connections across difference.

The local political climate around multiculturalism was important to our aims. Four months before the Lullaby Choir was established, the streets of Coburg became the stage for what media called "violent scuffles" between antiracism and anti-immigration protest groups (see ABC News 2016; Gray 2016; Hall 2016; Willingham 2016 for these descriptions). The chant "Say it loud, say it clear, Muslims always welcome here" was countered by a banner that read "No refugees. Our home, our future" among a sea of large Australian flags. This was in turn opposed by the chant "Nazi scum, off our streets." Anticipating counterprotests, the local business association pleaded with Moreland City Council not to approve the staging of the antiracism rally, with its president

arguing, "We do multiculturalism really, really well here, and to have a protest about anti-racism when that is something that is so far removed from business and the local community, it seems quite pointless" (Masanauskas et al. 2016: para 13). On the day of the rallies, shops were forced to close, and seven people were arrested following weapons searches and physical alterations. Regarding the escalation of what became known as the Coburg race riots, some apportioned blame for "the violence that predictably unfolded" between the rival activists (Hall 2016: para 7), and others identified the intimidating tactics and presence of the police (ABC News 2016: para 10–12).

In keeping with the local business association's perspective, the so-called Coburg race riots took place on Sydney Road, which, "In the broader imagination of Melbourne (as presented by mainstream media) . . . is frequently characterized as having a 'Middle Eastern character.' For the purposes of local cultural tourism, this means a combination of Turkish, Lebanese, Egyptian, Syrian, and **[p.55]** Afghani restaurants, bakeries, grocery stores, Islamic clothing shops and specialist bookstores, halal butchers and shisha cafes" (Woodcock 2015:172).

Given this role and characterization, local businesses hoped for a shift in rhetoric. Rather than the contest between adversarial sentiments ("Moreland Says No to Racism"), business operators wished to celebrate the positive aspects of the area's cultural, linguistic, and religious plurality, fundamental to its reputation and economic success ("Moreland Says Yes to Multiculturalism"). In line with this shift, VICSEG New Futures entered into the collaborative research partnership with hopes that the project would "affirm what Coburg is rather than tries to counteract what maybe Coburg was seen to be on one day, because none of the tradespeople want to be associated with it. They don't want to be known as where there's Reclaim Australia nonsense" (interview, VICSEG Executive Director Maree, February 21, 2018, Melbourne).

Engaging with community partners and collaboratively developing the configuration of its musical outcomes situates the Lullaby Choir within the paradigm of applied ethnomusicology. Here, researchers move beyond "learning how to do what the people participating in their research are already engaged in (and presumably would have been doing anyway)" (Pink 2015:7) toward the cocreation of new musical opportunities. Employing these creative participatory research processes poses various challenges, and it has been noted that applied

ethnomusicology can be presented in overly rosy terms without due attention to "the very difficult and often dangerous negotiations of power in the fieldwork" (Diamond and Castelo-Branco 2021:17). Elsewhere I have reflected on the barriers to horizontal relations in coproductive arts-based research, including participants' adoption of strategic essentialism and the impact of imagined audiences and institutional apparatuses (Campion and Dieckmann 2023; Dieckmann and Davidson 2018). This article contributes to the body of applied ethnomusicology literature in which authors reflexively critique their own community-engaged music interventions.

Just as the Lullaby Choir aimed to foster intercultural engagement, this article is intended to interrogate these aims, including my complex positionality in the field. I undertook eighteen months of ethnographic fieldwork for this project, carrying out participant observation while coleading sessions with choir member and guitarist Michael; sourcing, arranging, and conducting warm-ups and songs; soliciting and learning lullabies from various choir members; facilitating guest-led and peer-to-peer teaching and conducting; and coordinating performances and creative collaborations with those outside the choir. Administratively, I contributed to efforts to have the project funded at the outset and to sustain the choir's activities once I was due to leave, overseeing the transition to a new facilitator. In addition to numerous written and transcribed fieldnotes, informal conversations, and observations, this fieldwork produced recordings **[p.56]** of nineteen formal interviews (some in focus groups, others individual, many conducted over a meal in a local establishment) and forty-three sessions (sharing sessions, rehearsals, and performances), most of which were recorded.[2]

In this article I focus on the ethnographic data most pertinent to the Lullaby Train activities in November 2017, exploring how our musical performances operated pedagogically and enacted certain kinds of publicness and multiculture. These research foci demand sensitivity to the embodied qualities of intercultural encounters and the social-spatial production of place. My analysis draws attention to the choir's (including my) emplacement on train platforms and carriages and the ways in which we became "at the same time a constituent of place (one of those things brought together through or entangled in a place-event) and an agent in its production" (Pink 2015:97). Our emplacement in and coproduction of Moreland-as-place encompassed active involvement in the enterprise central to public transit: movement. Walking to and from Coburg Station in a large group,

standing and waiting for the train, boarding and alighting the carriage, and being carried from one station to the next; the physicality and copresence involved in this mobility was not only crucial to Lullaby Train's artistic design but also methodologically germane. This article's analysis depends on our mobile emplacement as multisensory, resonating with Aduonum's approach to walking as fieldwork method in ethnomusicology:

> Our ways of feeling, seeing, hearing and even smelling in local ways can be acquired through walking. . . . How our bodies move and our ways of walking produce certain kinds of encounters and interactions that are not possible with other methods. When we walk, we take something of the place with us and leave a bit of ourselves. . . . We forge relations with the environment and the strangers in our paths through our ways of walking, which ultimately deepens our understanding of those music cultures. (2021:250–251)

The movement in this ethnographic experience can be understood to have constituted Lullaby Train as mobile field site (see Watts 2008). Our in-transit emplacement produced encounters and interactions contrary to all our other performances, which took place in typical, dedicated performance spaces. Because of this difference, "our relations with the environment and the strangers in our paths" (Aduonum 2021:251) are pertinent to this article as both method and object of study. To this end, findings generated from my longterm and deep involvement with the Lullaby Choir are complemented by rapid "pop-up ethnography" observations of everyday behavioral repertoires, used by urban geographers and sociologists for studying social relations in multiethnic societies and casual encounters in urban public spaces (Radice 2022). In the ethnographic analysis of Lullaby Train, I am especially alert to the habituated and subtle regimes of in-transit conduct, bringing them into dialogue with the longer-term ethnographic materials, including interviews with the choristers, **[p.57]** to provide a rounded understanding of "the dynamics of public spaces as well as their contextualization in private narratives" (11).

Lullaby Train

Our Lullaby Train performances took place on the Upfield Line, once considered the "poor relation" (Carey 2016: para 22) of Melbourne's rail network. With trains

running every half hour, Moreland City Council, Metro Trains, VicTrack, and Public Transport Victoria have chosen the Upfield Line as a site for various art and musical installations over the past decade (see Borg 2023; Chadwick 2012; Mannix 2016). These programs align with the worldwide paradigmatic shift toward creative cities and cultural industries since the 2010s, in which transport networks seeking to harness aesthetic potential to facilitate cultural placemaking and deter so-called delinquent behaviors have become "influential public art institutions" (Enright 2023:376).

Lullaby Train formed part of the Lullaby Choir's contribution to Platform,[3] the seventh edition of the annual public art festival MoreArt. On November 3 and 24, 2017, nineteen members of the Lullaby Choir walked from VICSEG New Future's office to Coburg Station, boarding the 9:07 a.m. to the city. Instructed not to sing on this first part of the journey, we planned to arrive at Jewell Station at 9:15 a.m. and cross over to platform 2, where—by 9:30—we would sing one of our favorite warm-ups, "Bella Mama." Ten minutes later, after performing songs including the Sinhala lullaby "Chanda Mama" from Sri Lanka, the Gunggari "Maranoa Lullaby" from elsewhere in Australia,[4] and "Didn't Leave Nobody but the Baby," an African American lullaby from the South, we would board the train headed toward Upfield. Once in the carriage, we would sing the Ilonggo lullaby "Ili Ili Tulog Anay" from the Philippines; "Yalla tnam Reema," known to Arabic speakers from many regions; and the Portuguese lullaby "Se Essa Rua" from Brazil, alighting at 9:47 a.m. on arrival to Coburg Station.

As outlined by Platform curator Ilana Russell, our performances aimed to invigorate commuters' daily routine with something beautiful and thought provoking, as "commuting to work or school is often such an isolating experience, with most people absorbed in their phones or listening to headphones. . . . Hopefully these lullabies will provide a shared sense of calm and transcendence, momentarily bringing together a platform or carriage of strangers through shared experience" (quoted in VICSEG New Futures 2017: para 2).

This premise diagnoses the everyday commute as an experience characterized by alienation, identifying the use of phones and headphones as barriers to more meaningful encounters with fellow citizens. Music sociology scholarship has long recognized the use of such devices in commuting contexts, employed to transform and privatize the way people inhabit public spaces (DeNora 2013) and habitually

curate an auditory experience (Bull 2001). While those who use portable music devices may describe such listening as having emancipatory qualities, nonusers may be negatively affected by sonic "overspill" (Darlington 2013:257) or object to fellow commuters aurally isolating themselves from the acoustic experience of the collective commute (Walsh 2009:55). This relationship between concurrent sonic experiences and social connection reflects the embodied qualities of in-transit publicness. Indeed, the complex sensory and social choreographies involved in public transport participation have themselves been conceived of as being musical in nature, sometimes explicitly captured in musical compositions (see Cumming 1997; Packham 2015; Piekut 2014; Venter 2021).

In singing lullabies on trains and on platforms, our aim was to make meaningful commuter interactions. Although it was not an explicit touchpoint for Lullaby Train, our aims resonated with the invigorative effects of New York's early 1990s subway music scenes, which Susie J. Tanenbaum identified as initiating "a peculiarly urban form of interaction in which a most heterogeneous population converges to affirm and explore identity" such that "riders and subway workers transcend everyday struggles and tensions by participating in moments of social and cultural transformation" (1995:222–223). Live music performances can intervene in established commuting soundscapes, generating a range of potential social relations. The big city passenger crowd can be a potent site for political resistance, evident in Bohlman's description of rappers in Chicago protesting the Rodney King verdict: "The city's el-trains became stages for rappers, who jumped on trains and performed for the riders during the course of several stops, then disembarked before taking the stage on the next el. In this way, rappers reconfigured the public spaces of the entire city, confronting all who traveled through these spaces, with the politically charged news of the Los Angeles insurrection" (1993:413).

Beyond music, permanent breakfasts, civil disobedience, public eco-art, graffiti and walking-based arts interventions have been understood to "insert into a public space a kind of 'dissensus'—an 'incommensurable element—an event, an experience and an object—that can act both as a test and as a reminder of publicness'" (Cooper and Sandlin 2020:423, quoting Biesta 2012:693). Such tests and reminders assume a decline of urban public fora, which a wide range of scholarship has attributed to corporately owned and commodified public spaces as well as the effects of mobile technologies. By "creat[ing] a scene, in the sense of a

kind of drama that intervenes in the normal actions of the place in which it occurs," interventions like flash mobs are commonly staged in "large public spaces, such as train stations, shopping malls, or street intersections . . . [to] disconnect and redirect the normal trajectories of all those passing through the area" (Foster 2015:196).

In effecting dissensus, interventions in public spaces—and certainly acts of civil disobedience—can rightly be interpreted as political counteraction. **[p.59]** Especially given the Lullaby Choir's initial development in response to the Coburg rallies, it is tempting to define Lullaby Train as a pedagogical act of resistance, connecting the learning space to "the challenges faced by social movements in the streets, and provide spaces . . . for personal injury and private terrors to be translated into public considerations and struggles" (Giroux 2003:14). There is analytical appeal in conceptualizing the intended "calm and transcendence" of our lullabies as opposite to the shouts of protest and anger that echoed throughout Sydney Road, parallel to the Upfield Line, eighteen months before. The following sections of this article will challenge such an impression.

As the history of music and public transport shows, there are various, at times contradictory, tensions and balances involved in musically navigating urban transit environments. Transit art programs, private headphone listening, live performances on train carriages, rapping on Chicago's L trains, New York's subway music, experimental train-oriented compositions, as well as the operationalization of atonal and classical music to "exclude people from public life" (Benjes 2018: para 3; see also Aspou 2020; Marshall 2018), are some examples that gesture to the wide range of social dynamics enacted through in-transit music activities. Taken together, they also demonstrate how, with increased institutionalization, public art comes to embody what Enright (2023) calls infrastructural monumentality. These sets of relations between art, infrastructure, and publicity work to raise commuters' awareness of the infrastructures that make mobility possible but do so in ways that conceal their underpinning power relations and reproduce the status quo. Enright identifies converse examples where public art avoids, or at least troubles, complicity with the institutional agendas in which they might necessarily be entangled, because they "challenge commuters in the city [to] see the networks upon which they rely, and they have unsettled the notions of community, identity, place, and rights that are conventionally bound up in these networked systems" (387), engaging commuters in infrastructural

citizenship. I do not know if or how Melbourne's city planners, transit authorities, or festival curators positioned Platform in relation to these and other transport-oriented projects and interventions. However, these examples illustrate the pedagogical capacity of music to inform passengers of news, transmit or transform cultural norms, prescribe or protest expected behaviors, and regulate public space, and they anticipate several issues germane to the forthcoming analysis of Lullaby Train.

(A)political Potentialities

The extent to which Lullaby Train might be seen as explicitly political was contested among the choristers, with most choir members unaware of the role of the Coburg rallies in the early research collaboration discussions. In general, members of the Lullaby Choir expressed ambivalence about a politicized reading [p.60] of our musical activities, especially in relation to a conflict-centered politics of difference. In interviews, choir members discussed the framing of the project, and their responses ranged from generally supportive to hesitant and even renouncing:

> I knew at one point that was the premise for it, but then that was gone out the window. I think it's a great platform if you want to say something. What are we standing for? Yes, we're singing lullabies but, I think at this point, we're all standing for different things. In ourselves, we've got our own "This is why we're here." (interview, Urmila, February 9, 2018, Melbourne)

> It's just about the unity of cultures. . . . It makes you think about something else. It takes you to another world. It will never take you to politics. (interview, Ana, February 5, 2018, Melbourne)

> I feel like it's gentle so the juxtaposition of that being in a protest is strange, but maybe that would mean that it's got more impact. . . . It's almost like the fact that it exists in the way that it does at the moment is a counterprotest in itself, because it's actually not about trying to, sticking it up anyone. . . . It's a very gentle and childlike vibe that it has. The fact that we can all share in these things together without any necessary politicization is a strong statement on its own. (interview, Michael, February 12, 2018, Melbourne)

My point is that our choir is a multicultural choir, and we get along very well. . . . We complement each other. We don't have problems with each other because we come from different countries. . . . It's the opposite of what they're protesting. . . . I think there was nothing, no political views on whatsoever when we were singing there. It was all just about music, so for me no political attachment to that. (interview,
Arlene, February 6, 2018, Melbourne)

We're singing in the train, like a multicultural group, it give people the impression that we are so united and singing freely and in a different language. I don't know about that initial conversation about the significance. But I think it's a good idea. General public, how this country look like. I think it's relevant because those people who are protesting will have thoughts about what they're doing. (interview, Chanaka, February 2, 2018, Melbourne)

Taken together, the choristers' varied responses support Urmila's opinion that participation was not indicative of shared intentionality around a political message, contrasting with other musical interventions on trains, such as the L train rappers protesting the Rodney King verdict. Further, while the rappers' "voice of resistance" (Bohlman 1993:414) was addressed toward audience comprehension of a certain message, our multilingual enunciations continued unexplained to those who came across our singing. In this way, the Lullaby Choir's activities were not protests, or even comfortably understood in relation to recent protests, resonating with forms of public pedagogy that refrain from communicating distinct political ideals (Foster 2015). Foster's distinction between events that express messages and those in which the right to public assembly inherently embodies a politics is relevant here. Our experiences and **[p.61]** performance of living-with-difference revealed tenuous ties to the oppositional paradigm manifest in the Coburg rallies. Unaware of how the local business association's position on the protests shaped the project that led to the Lullaby Choir, many of the choristers unknowingly echoed their sentiments, identifying a disconnect between the choir's activities and the affective registers of street protests.

Given choir members' reluctance to assign overt political meaning to our activities, Lullaby Train's politics lay instead in its interrogation of public space, in this enacting "a form of public pedagogy that expresses a concern for the public quality of spaces and places of human togetherness" (Biesta 2012:694). It is in this

interrogation of publicness that we apprehended "what Coburg is" in the everyday, complicating our idealized, commemorative, celebratory vision of multicultural unity.

Ambivalent Audiences

November 3, 2017: Jewell Station, Platform 2

A train arrives at the assigned starting time. Michael strums G major and we begin our exuberant, upbeat tune: "Bella mama, bella mama, ooohh . . ." The doors open, two passengers alight. Hands remove headphones, watching us as they walk. One stays for a few minutes, leaning against the barbed fence by the exit gate. The train pulls away. Across two sets of train tracks, platform 1. Seventeen secondary school students, uniformed in navy, congregating in two large groups at notable distance from each other. About half of them glance over, curious but uncommitted. Others look away or at each other, a few uncertain smirks. A scattering of other commuters. Adults, mostly singles, some in pairs, one threesome. In general, they offer a more attentive response, although for many it seems courteous, casual. Some convey unambiguous appreciation. Broad grins, tapping feet, sporadic applause. A mother takes her toddler out of the stroller, pointing, directing their attention to us. Delighted cooing, bouncing, swaying.

Later on the Upfield Line Train

Our first song in the carriage, having shuffled and reshuffled into position. An imploring, pensive melody in A minor: "Ili ili, tulog anay . . ."[5]
Of the commuters closest to us, one sits back, arms crossed, almost frowning. The other, a tentative, apologetic grimace, determinedly staring at their phone. Adjacent, two seats' distance from us and facing in the opposite direction, a passenger slowly turns toward us, polite, neutral. "Wala diri, umong nanay . . ."[6] The crossed-armed commuter now staring out the window, like most window-seated passengers at the far end of the carriage. Some of their neighbors watch **[p.62]** *us, respectfully indifferent. One person, having followed us onto the train from the platform, stands behind their bicycle. Keenly observing, smiling, performing recognition.*

Conceptualizing Lullaby Train as a pedagogical site of resistance is challenged not only by the uncertainty surrounding its politicization; choristers also noted, with disappointment, ambivalence in the audience's responses to our performances:

> I thought it was bigger. I don't know as if I'm making my imagination. . . . But I think I had another idea. . . . I felt like we were there. We are trying to do our best, but the people were not really involved to do a lot watching us. It was like, "Ah so, they're finished," so one started clapping hands, then the other one, "Ah so, that's what we have to do." (interview, Ana, February 5, 2018, Melbourne)

> It was a new experience and as long as I think on our first one, it was not that good to me. No, on the platform, it was okay. Although, there was only how many, maybe four or three people was on the other side listening to us. It was okay for me, but when we were on the train. No, as if I was expecting a response from the passengers, but there was no response at all. . . . I like it when we're singing on the platform. Yeah, more people on the platform. (interview, Arlene, February 6, 2018, Melbourne)

> I think it was a great idea to start with. And I think there are lot of ways we could have done it, if we had done it more often, and got a little bit more used to it. . . . Whether that's just a bit more seeming, a bit more coincidental and planned but that's just something that was big fun. . . . The platforms yeah, that wasn't super busy. I actually thought it'd be more. (interview, Michael, February 12, 2018, Melbourne)

Although the impression was not ubiquitous—for example, Chanaka explicitly stated that despite his initial nervousness his impression was that "people they like and we got the response from people" (interview, February 2, 2018, Melbourne)—the statements above reflect many of the choristers' views about Lullaby Train's audience reception.

Transitory spaces for public transport are unlike other common sites for creative interventions as public pedagogy, namely, community-centric "third places" like shopping malls, city squares, restaurants and cafes, typically shared with strangers for recreational purposes (Oldenburg 1999:20). They are instead exemplary "fourth places," characterized by social copresence with a crowd of strangers,

where behavior is dictated by a collective purpose that requires coordination and the shared activity of waiting (Benediktsson et al. 2020). Here, it is conventional for commuters to "perform a 'nonshow', purposefully hiding their thoughts and emotions" (105), and these micropolitics mean that social markers of difference that are salient elsewhere are observed with tolerant indifference, if not ignored. While Benediktsson et al.'s interactional research study was based **[p.63]** on the behavior of passengers on New York's subway system, they contend that these social practices are typical not only of mass transit settings elsewhere but also other fourth places such as waiting rooms and post offices. They suggest that, in such settings, expectations about specific behavioral conduct may shift depending on the density of the occupying population and the impact of this density on the place's utility. In the case of transport infrastructure, incompetency with navigating the "moral geography" (117) of commuting becomes the source of stigma, superseding other designations of belonging and exclusion (see also Joseph and Gopakumar 2023). Given this, commuters may have experienced our Lullaby Train performances not as (welcome or unwelcome) reminders of a declining public life but rather as a violation of the distinctive and already striking publicness of fourth places.

The contravention may have been particularly notable in a context marked by a "right to indifference," where being unnoticed is especially appreciated by those whose "bodies are marked in terms of difference" (Tonkiss 2003:301). The civil inattention involved in positive social conduct with "proximate and ethnically diverse strangers" is significant in cosmopolitan urban contexts, affording "a practice of recognition, but not reaction [which] directly relates to the banal (rather than celebratory) forms of multiculture" (Neal et al. 2018:83, 77). Our hopes to engage commuters in contemplation, celebration, and imagination were founded on highlighting multiculturality and heritage cultures through singing multiple languages and in some cases wearing "traditional" dress reserved for special occasions. In this, we sought more than the banal courtesies routinely afforded in fourth places. Intending to produce a shared sense of calm and transcendence reflected understandings of public art as sites where "learning often takes on a subtle, embodied mode, moving away from the cognitive rigor commonly associated with education and toward notions of affect, aesthetics, and presence" (Sandlin et al. 2011:348). But while Lullaby Train adhered to definitions of public pedagogy as interventions that "create a scene," our dissensus did not redirect commuters' normal trajectories (Foster 2015:196). Many

commuters continued to adhere to the behavioral repertoires that usually moderate utilitarian fourth places, irrespective of whether their bodies were marked as different.

Some resisted Lullaby Train's attempted transformation of this social ecosystem by engaging even more resolutely with the very phones and headphones the project aimed to circumvent. We imagined our singing would be received with more acknowledgment, if not warmth, expecting evidence not only of invigoration but also the bringing together, and conversation and curiosity, the project aimed to cultivate. The disappointment voiced by Ana, Arlene, and Michael exemplifies the "felt reality of relation" (Ellsworth 2005:32). Ideas about the (lack of) significance of the interruption were felt with attention to the directional dynamics of the encounters ("no response") and the spatial- and **[p.64]** socio-materiality of the environment ("quiet time, "wasn't super busy," "bigger"). Michael's suggestion for greater planning and choreography, to achieve "seeming a bit more coincidental," also attends to the affective configuration of our encounters. All these observations, and especially that the audience's more lackluster responses were noted with disappointment, signify our own "subtle, embodied" learning (Sandlin et al. 2011). Rather than a pedagogical site of resistance in opposition to the Coburg rallies, Lullaby Train effected an embodied discomfort that made it difficult for us to think, feel, and act in the ways we were accustomed to throughout the experience and when reflecting on our performances. Commuters who resisted active participation, maintaining civil inattention but ensuring that their disinvolvement did not interrupt our performance, still enacted the tacit coordination and mutuality inherent in "watchful indifference" (Amit 2020).

For both choristers and commuters, our pedagogical intervention summoned notions of affect, aesthetics, and presence in producing encounters that draw attention to in-transit behavioral norms. In particular, the limitations of Lullaby Train's dissensus resonate with findings that "cohabitation in public spaces generally leads to predictable outcomes (namely civility and avoidance)" (White and Germain 2022:171). And yet choristers noticed that, as the next vignette describes, the same lullabies performed on the same train line at the same time of day met a different audience reception on November 24. The contrast attests to the affective unpredictability of commuting, arising from its "throwntogetherness of bodies, mass, and matter" (Wilson 2011:645; term coined by Massey 2005). It is to these materialities that we now turn.

Tuning In and Out

November 24, 2017: On the Upfield Line Train

A false start to our closing number. A D minor arpeggiated on the acoustic guitar, the open of a normally two-bar introduction. One and a half bars in, a distorted announcement on the loudspeakers. Some of us begin, others don't, interrupted. I motion, we begin again. "Se essa rua, se essa rua fosse minha . . ."[7] *We know it well, but it's hard to stay in key. Difficult to hear each other, the guitar, ourselves over the announcer's voice: blurred but loud, fluctuating on a pitch discordant against our melody line, incoherent mutterings about the train's movements syncing in and out of our rhythms at random. Resolute, we withdraw into our body memories. Some determinedly following the lyrics in our songbooks, others' eyes glazing over in concentration, fixing vacant stares at the windowpanes, ceiling, floor, chairs, hands grasping handrails. Trying hard to hear our voices in our heads. Only one of us remembers making eye contact with our commuting audience.*

[p.65] *The final line of the announcement arrives, in unplanned, disjointed polyphony with the first line of verse 2.* "Now arriving at Coburg" / "Nessa rua, nessa rua tem um bosque . . ."[8] *The announcement finishes, and we hear each other, look toward each other, in concert. The lullaby now more audible, tuneful, set only against the quiet, complement humming of the train in motion.*

A minute later, the train is pulling in. The carriage slows and we rearrange ourselves, teetering in inertia, collecting bags, setting bodily intentions toward the doors to open. In the moments before converging on our exit, anticipating our impending exodus, we meet their eyes more easily. "Se eu roubei, se eu roubei seu coração . . ."[9] *Relaxed smiles, an invite to acknowledge, to mutually salute our encounter at its end. Our concluding words more forceful, the guitar climactically exaggerates the finishing chords just as doors open. A release of energy, relieved, we join together with commuters letting out a pleased, understated, collective* "Woooo!" *and alight.*

The project rationale's characterization of the commuter-as-isolated-individual was a seemingly straightforward view that we as a choir propagated in our preparations for and participation in Platform. We wanted to generate what Tanenbaum, referring to spontaneous gatherings in 1990s New York's vibrant

subway music scenes, calls "transitory communities": "instances of momentary, shared experience in a multicultural city" (1995:105). Our aims for Lullaby Train to create human-centered connections through music—by overcoming the "isolating" barriers of phones and headphones—did not account for the working with and against (in relation to train carriages, platform speakers, cameras, microphones, mobile phones, etc.) that determined the quality and nature of the publicness that we evoked. If we were provoking "forms of human togetherness which contribute to the 'becoming public' of spaces and places" (Biesta 2012:683), how was this human togetherness regulated by the other-than-human materiality of these spaces and places? In defamiliarizing the socio-spatial environments of these seemingly mundane transport modes, the "conditions and discourses [that] literally make people 'tune out' some sounds and highlight others" (Abramo 2015:276) was significant here, shaping our occupancy of public space.

In examining the limited extent of Lullaby Train's intended disruption, we must consider how the aesthetics and materiality of our musical performances shaped both production and reception. Bohlman's contention that music in public spaces necessarily inhabits "contradictory ontologies" (1993:433), fetishized by recontextualization, is clear in the case of lullabies being performed on public transport. Songs often associated with the domestic sphere, traditionally deployed for the purpose of settling infants and inducing sleep, underwent a significant recontextualization from private to public, functional to presentational. **[p.66]** While the L train rappers "transformed and transported public spaces using the music produced by boom boxes, whose volume and portability endowed music with a capacity to create disorder and undermine centralized public spaces" (433), the decidedly quiet, soothing aesthetics of lullabies work to opposite ends.

Singing on trains and platforms, the challenge was not eliminating but rather singing with and within "noise." In programming and rehearsing for the performance, we carefully timed our repertoire and arrangements with the length of the planned commute, choreographed standing in the carriage—some with arms raised, feigning holding onto hanging straps for stability—and considered the line of vision with each lullaby's leader. The sound of announcements, the train on its tracks, the opening and closing of doors, the scuffling movements of our fellow commuters (and our own) were factors for which we did not especially prepare,

either in how we might contend with our unamplified voices being drowned out or in artfully integrating these sounds into our performance.

As travelers used to the inner suburb Melbourne commute, we worked out ways of navigating the performance spaces and auralities in situ. Reflecting on Lullaby Train, choristers drew attention to the acoustic quality of our singing and the interactivity of the experience in relation to the socio-spatial; some preferred the platform, others the train. Compared with our more standard choral formation on the platform, our improvised positions within the carriages—assuming the spaces most readily available, avoiding blocking the entry and exit passageways, and adopting the civil choreographies of the commute—led to a kind of insularity. We were not dispersed among the passengers, partly because each lullaby was led by a different facilitator from wherever they happened to be standing. Required sightlines dictated that we cluster together. The narrowness of the train carriage provided a more ideal closed-space acoustic than the platform, but for some songs this spacing meant we looked inward to the ensemble, perhaps signaling disinvolvement from audiences.

Addressing these materialities means paying attention to the ways in which publicness can be understood *beyond* human togetherness. It recalls how the political possibilities of Melbourne street art are revealed by the agential materialities of the street itself, such as the decay of a laneway's walls; the ways markings are made; (in)distinctions between sanctioned, gentrifying street art and unregulated graffiti; and differences between tourists and locals. "Viewing the pedagogies of Melbourne's laneways as an entanglement of the morethanhuman helps us envision a more complicated public and to view "publicness" beyond only a consideration of individual, separate human actors. In this way we decenter the anthropocentric by exploring both the tangible and intangible as they create publicness through multiplicity" (Cooper and Sandler 2020:440).

Our relatively gentle, collective lullaby singing, accompanied only by an acoustic guitar, was certainly audible/visible enough to draw attention on both **[p.67]** the railway platform and in the train carriages. In this, the aesthetics of our singing matched the choir's inconclusive, if not reluctant, connection to a more radical, disruptive politics. The tangibility of our singing encountered that of the platform, the train tracks, and the train itself, interfering with our objective to create a shared moment of calm and transcendence. Our lullabies' contradictory ontology

was underscored by our intention to induce a kind of stillness, given that the social and spatial environment was one defined by mobility. While this stillness and mobility are seemingly antonymous, lullabies and trains share a transitory function. Both construct a liminality—taking us from here to there— that encourages a withdrawing into the self.

Music anthropologist and sociologist Georgina Born describes the "often frustrated" expectations of those who construct audience-hood by addressing an imagined public, explaining how the "mutual articulation of cultural production and publics" often involves "a split between anticipated and achieved public" (2011:382). That some of the choristers were disappointed at the failed realization of their imagined audience is indicative of this, but it is also the nature of public pedagogies: necessarily experimental, open ended, absent a predetermined outcome (Cooper and Sandlin 2020).

Government-approved street art can be defaced, written over by unsanctioned graffiti, and subject to environmental, material decay. For us, those most engaged with our performance paid attention to it in ways that were antithetical to the aims of the project: heightened use of their mobile devices. The audience members who communicated the most enthusiasm retrieved their phones to record our performances. One such audience member communicated special affection for the Arabic lullaby "Yalla tnam Reema" by exclaiming her love for the song and asking our permission to take a video on her phone. We'd started the song later than planned, beginning on board and finishing after alighting. She followed us off the train to capture the conclusion of our performance—it was not clear whether this was a diversion from her planned commute—and commented that she could not wait to show the video to her mother. Although this was the most immediate encounter with an audience member, it was reflective of a broader response; the commuter with a bicycle, described in the previous section's vignette, was the only especially keen audience member during our rendition of "Ili Ili Tulog Anay" on November 3, 2017, and they also recorded us on their phone. Those that were most attentive to our performance, just like those most actively avoiding it, tended to involve digital devices in their response. Counter to Lullaby Train's premise, for the former, mobiles were not used toward social atomization and private emotional regulation. Instead, these examples lend support to the suggestion that mobile technologies can be used in the "'tuning in to' rather than 'tuning out' the social and collective experiences of the city through

music, forming individual and [p.68] collective mediated yet engaged relationships with their urban environment" (Watson and Drakeford-Allen 2016:1042).[10]

Reconfiguring Infrastructural Monumentality

Field Recording Media File: 00018.MTS (Created 3/11/2017)
Timestamp: 00:00
The announcement. "We are expecting delays . . ."
Heads cocked, careful listening.
" . . . of around five to ten minutes."
We burst out laughing, including behind the camera. The video shakes.
Rearranging, we reset ourselves.
Maree's voice, distant in the transmission, "We'll have to do all of our songs!"
Wind batters the camera mic capsule, low-end vibrations. We begin singing.
(I watch and hear it back through the turbulence, translated into audio waves and decibels, sound quality output by midrange computer speakers.)

Timestamp: 03:39
The camera points downward, blurring past trousers, shoes, songbooks.
My voice, offscreen, acousmatic. "We'll do that one again. Okay? Ready?"
Urmila's feet below the camera, hands grasping the train seat handle, steadying, pulling herself/the camera upward. The camera viewpoint stabilizes, mounted from this height. A high angle of our close-knit formation.
In the frame, another two cameras promise alternate vantage points: Ilana holding her iPhone, one-handed, in landscape mode. Caspar's back against the adjacent wall for the widest angle available to him, a smartphone in two hands, held aloft for a top-down shot.

Timestamp: 03:53
Our first song in the carriage, having shuffled and reshuffled into position. An imploring, pensive melody in A minor: "Ili ili, tulog anay . . ."

The involvement of digital mediation and drawing in of broader publics—on the surface, inverse to our project aims—was not only enacted by audience members. In fact, it was most conscientiously carried out by those directly involved in

Lullaby Train's production. Audience members saw people, clearly attached to the choir, following our movements and capturing the performances with various handheld video and audio recording devices. As the choristers were focused on singing, this exercise included Ilana as Platform's curator, the communications manager of VICSEG New Futures, and two members of the **[p.69]** research project, whom I directed by my requests. In what ways might our own recording have triggered the sense of public surveillance that we identified as alienating people from public spaces? How did these mediations complicate our positioning of commuters as the primary targets of our public-making and sharing a calm and transcendent moment with them our core goal? How central were the project's funders, demonstrating "impact" or collecting data for the research project for which this article produces "output"?

Attempting broader reach, we also secured coverage by a local radio station. They interviewed one of the choristers live, via mobile phone, while we were performing. The guest on the segment commented that if he were there, he'd have gotten off the train. Beyond civil inattention, such negative audience responses might, and arguably should, have been expected. Indeed, despite their disappointment in some commuters' polite disinterestedness, choristers expressed concern about potential audience hostility.

> You don't know how people will react to entertainment. (interview, Chanaka, February 2, 2018, Melbourne)

> I don't know if [the lack of audience response is because] it was a quiet time, but at the same time I think it was safer that it was a quiet time, because you don't know the reaction you would get from the public. . . . We never know who we are dealing with. It was risky somehow. . . . To be honest with you, there are places I would avoid. You never know what's going to happen. So, I'm scared. (interview, Ana, February 5, 2018, Melbourne)

Despite Ana's and Chanaka's sense of vulnerability, the negative comment by the radio station guest was singular; it was not matched in any way by in-person responses. Commuters' seemingly inviolable civility was yet another way in which Lullaby Train's interculturalism displayed characteristics of living multiculture. Van Leeuwen (2010) argues that a sense of security is foundational to producing an "intercultural ethos", whether it manifests "in the shape of passive

indifference to difference or in its more idealistic formulations. Besides anonymity and diversity, the perception of vital safety is key to the making of intercultural city-zens" (649).

The potential for hostile responses to our performances was tempered by the parameters within which we performed. Ana explained that safety was afforded by our assigned time slot and train line, describing the midmorning Upfield Line favorably in comparison to peak-hour evenings in the central business district— for her exemplified by "Flinders Street at 6 p.m." (interview, February 5, 2018, Melbourne). Certainly, in-transit atmospheres are affected by fellow passengers' adherence to or rejection of unspoken codes of conduct, negotiations shifting over different times of day to account for changed availability of space (Wilson 2011). And yet distinctive atmospheres can take hold in different carriages of even the same train (Watts 2008), as with the strikingly divergent reception of **[p.70]** our performances two weeks apart performing the same programme on the same train line at the same time of day.

Behavioral norms and social expectations for public transit were likely shaped by the time of day. Despite our efforts to shape the atmosphere by music, the Lullaby Train carriages maintained their midmorning feel. In particular, the actors populating our first in-carriage performance site remained resolutely disinvolved. Sociologists Eduardo de la Fuente and Michael James Walsh (2021) documented an occasion when all of the passengers on a train carriage were transfixed by a man playing an acoustic guitar. The authors identified how the intensity and contagion of the altered mood reflected that which might be felt on a Friday evening train, when relaxation and the end of the working week opens passengers up to different sensory involvements. And yet this collective, social transformation was generated not by the ebb and flow of the weekly routine but the way music influenced atmosphere. For de la Fuente and Walsh, the guitarist's affective contagion was contingent on "the quality of an unplanned interaction ritual," where spontaneity was key to drawing passengers into "a point of mutual attention . . . another sensory and affective world" (2021:225). There was no such spontaneity with Lullaby Train. We were not to sing on the first 9:07 a.m. leg of our journey, so as not to disrupt the last hurried wave of the busy commute to work and school. As already described, the strategically allocated performance sites and times bestowed legitimization and fostered a sense of safety. But they also meant that the publics we addressed were differently constituted than those

produced by unsolicited rapping or guitar-playing on trains. As with commissioned street art and busking licenses, this kind of permission—together with the visibility of our audio-visual equipment and efforts to record—reinforced council and transit authorities' governance of public space.[11] In this way, Lullaby Train embodied the infrastructural monumentality of transit art, which aims to aestheticize and depoliticize public transport, treating the public as audience (Enright 2022). It is only in our "intended educational meanings" being "internalized, reconfigured and mobilized by public citizens" (Sandlin et al. 2011:259) that infrastructural citizenship was enacted. That is, not only was our staged intercultural harmony upended by the convivial social relations of everyday multiculture, but our performances unintentionally highlighted the conflicts and hierarchies that produce transport network systems. Through sensory engagements, we activated dynamics that shape the conditions for urban political engagement, complicating the relationship between "public transit, public space, and the public sphere" (Enright 2022:380).

Conclusion

Within the Lullaby Choir, participation indicated that choristers already had "some degree of shared values around notions of intercultural harmony," **[p.71]** reflecting how "spaces of organized encounter only imitate their intended emancipatory outcomes, as they meet the demand underlying the encounter" before the encounter itself (Dieckmann and Davidson 2018:163). Lullaby Train provided an opportunity to test the choir's intragroup intercultural relations—"inhabit[ing] a shared space in which they could safely construct, negotiate and enact hybrid identities" (172)—against their emplacement in a contrary, potentially risky space, shared with an unsuspecting audience of commuters. Having examined the conflicting forms of publicness and multiculture produced by the project, I concur with the contention that "place matters (still)" (Radice 2022:277) in that

> different societies manage diversity through different politics and policies, which have an impact on behaviors, experiences, and interpretations at street-level. Yet the tenor of everyday cohabitation is also shaped by the physical design of a place, prevailing norms of interaction, the general relations (including power relations) between the groups that use it, and the imaginary of a place, or the discourse that influences expectations and interpretations of

what happens there (Radice 2016). There is something to be learned from how all these elements coalesce and stick to places. (Radice 2022:278)

The significance of the materiality of the music, train, and platforms; the ways that this shaped the affective atmosphere and our social and intraactive encounters; the tensions between private and public spheres; and the heightened role of digital technologies: none of these figured in the idealized ways we imagined the public-making capacities of our project. Bringing choristers' reflections on Lullaby Train into conversation with what we said, did, and sang in the project's rehearsals and performances demonstrates how these elements intermingled and how their sticking to place cultivated social relations that were felt.

Considered through the lens of public pedagogy, Lullaby Train was most striking in the unexpected ways it served as "both a test and as a reminder of publicness" (Biesta 2012:693). We performed lullabies with intentions to "provide a shared sense of calm and transcendence, momentarily bringing together a platform or carriage of strangers" (Ilana, quoted in VICSEG New Futures 2017: para 2). Contrary to our aims, for some in the Lullaby Choir, what stood out most was commuter disinterest. This was felt as nonattunement, a gesture of mutual strangerhood, recalling the words of Sara Ahmed:

> When an atmosphere is shared, there is a sense of being attuned to each other. . . . An experience of non-attunement might then refer to how we can be in a world with others where we are not in a responsive relation, where we do not tend to "pick up" on how they feel. This sense of not being in harmony might not even register to consciousness. . . . Attunement might create the figure of the stranger not necessarily or only by making the stranger into an object of feeling (the stranger as the one we recognize as not us, not from here), but as an effect of not leaning that way. (2021:16)

[p.72] By "not leaning" toward our musical expressions, conditions for producing a shared atmosphere were not favorable. And yet some commuters "not being in harmony" realized another important form of "responsive relation": the civil inattention and side-by-side citizenship that dominates intercultural urban social dynamics.

In drawing attention to the significance of ordinary, unpanicked relations, I do not suggest that they embody some truer formulation of publicness. The prosaic modes of interaction produced by and resistant to Lullaby Train may be more mundane but are no more real or sticky than those displayed at the Coburg rallies or highlighted by the local trade association. But as ethnomusicology has long recognized these heightened and performed modes of belonging and placemaking in and through music, I argue that analyzing quotidian moments of encounter, and their material mediation, can sharpen our sense of "the unevenness of convivial geographies, plural publics, and the more-situated possibilities of particular places" (Samanani 2023:18). The mechanics and interactions of the seemingly unremarkable often go unnoticed despite being ethnographically rich and theoretically salient. In my portrayal of Lullaby Train, I draw readers' attention not to the joyous, sing-and-clap-along enthusiasm and strategic performance of celebratory multiculturalism, nor the anthems or outraged chants that enliven crucial democratic exercises of political demonstration; rather, I invite you to attend to the quiet, humming cohabitation of everyday multiculture.

Notes

1. A portmanteau of "art" and "Moreland," the inner-north city area of Melbourne, Australia, within which the suburb of Coburg was situated. Moreland has since been renamed Merri-bek. (Merri-bek City Council, n.d.)
2. Ethics approval was given by the University of Melbourne's Human Ethics Research Committee (ID number 1647405.1). With their permission, participants' names have been used.

    [p.73]
3. Lullaby Train also involved a sound installation of Lullaby Choir recordings that played on continuous loop at Jewell Station. The choir's experience being recorded in a studio setting is examined at length, with a focus on posthuman theorizations of the voice, in Dieckmann (2024).
4. Permissions to learn and perform the lullaby were obtained from the Gunggari community via Yugambeh language officers working at the Regional Language Centre in Southern Queensland.
5. Ilonggo lyrics and English translation provided by choir member Arlene: "Little one, little one, sleep now."
6. "Your mother is not here now."
7. Portuguese lyrics and English translation provided by choir member Anna: "If this street, if this street was mine."
8. "On this street, on this street there is a meadow."
9. "If I have stolen, if I have stolen your heart."
10. Watson and Drakeford-Allen's research relates to a very different context to Lullaby Train, specifically, context- and location-specific music recommendation systems.
11. In Australia, like other settler colonial contexts, the governance of space holds particular weight. As the council's own website then read, "Moreland remains part of the unceded territory of the Wurundjeri Woi wurrung people" claimed through colonization and dispossession (Moreland City Council n.d.).

References

ABC News. 2016. "Coburg Rallies: Seven Arrested as Police Separate Anti-Racism, Anti-Immigration Protesters." May 28. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-05-28/coburg-anti-racism-rally -protesters-take-to-melbourne-streets/7455832.

Abramo, Joseph Michael. 2015. "Application of Sound Studies to Qualitative Research in Music Education." In *Music Education: Navigating the Future*, edited by Clint Randles, 271–292. London: Routledge.

Aduonum, Ama Oforiwaa. 2021. "Walking as Fieldwork Method in Ethnomusicology." *Ethnomusicology* 65(2): 221–258.

Ahmed, Sara. 2021. "Travelling with Strangers." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 42(1): 8–23.

Amit, Vered. 2020. "Rethinking Anthropological Perspectives on Community: Watchful Indifference and Joint Commitment." In *Rethinking Community Through Transdisciplinary Research*, edited by Bettina Jansen, 49–68. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Aspou, Helena. 2020. "Why Is Classical Music Played on the Tube?" Classic FM. July 31. https:// www.classicfm.com/discover-music/why-is-classical-music-played-on-the-tube/.

Benediktsson, Mike Owen, Peter Tuckel, William Milczarski, Farimata Caruso, Michelle DeCurtis, Prahelika Gadtaula, Matt Herman, Nicholas MacDonald, Nicholas Silipo, and Daniell Singh. 2020. "The Subway as Fourth Place: Anomie, Flânerie and the 'Crush of Persons.'" *Applied Mobilities* 5(2): 103–121.

Benjes, Lisa. 2018. "'Art Shouldn't Be Weaponised': The Atonal Concert Championing Berlin's Homeless." *Guardian*. August 21. https://www.theguardian.com/music/2018/aug/31/art-shouldnt -be-weaponised-the-atonal-concert-championing-berlins-homeless.

Biesta, Gert. 2012. "Becoming Public: Public Pedagogy, Citizenship and the Public Sphere." *Social and Cultural Geography* 13(7): 683–697.

Bohlman, Philip V. 1993. "Musicology as a Political Act." *Journal of Musicology* 11(4): 410–436.

Borg, Rebecca. 2023. "'Just No!' PTV's 'Playful Surprise' on Melbourne Train Frustrates Commuters." June 8. https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/real-life/news-life/just-no-ptvs-playful -surprise-on-melbourne-train-frustrates-commuters/news-story/ba1a939a662da 13d1cab0 ec89a0c33bd.

Born, Georgina. 2011. "Music and the Materialization of Identities." *Journal of Material Culture* 16(4): 376–388.

Bovo, Martina, Paola Briata, and Massimo Bricocoli. 2023. "A Bus as a Compressed Public Space:

Everyday Multiculturalism in Milan." *Urban Studies* 60(15): 2979–2993.

Bull, Michael. 2001. "The World According to Sound." *New Media and Society* 3(2): 179–197.

Campion, Rose, and Samantha Sebastian Dieckmann. 2024. "Building Bridges: Translating Refugee Narratives for Public Audiences with Arts-Based Media." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 45(2): 208–227.

Carey, Adam. 2016. "How Protestors Saved a Railway." *Age*. June 6.

Chadwick, Vince. 2012. "Song Tracks Sung by the Train Tracks." *Age*. August 23.

Cooper, Jayson, and Jennifer A. Sandlin. 2020. "Intra-Active Pedagogies of Publicness: Exploring Street Art in Melbourne, Australia." *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* 28(3): 421–443.

Cumming, Naomi. 1997. "The Horrors of Identification: Reich's 'Different Trains.'" *Perspectives of New Music* 35(1): 129–152.

Darlington, Bruce. 2013. "Train Listening: Music in the Spaces of the 21st Century." *Volume!* 10(1): 249–263.

de la Fuente, Eduardo, and Michael James Walsh. 2021. "Framing Atmospheres: Goffman, Space, and Music in Everyday Life." *Symbolic Interaction* 44(1): 211–234.

DeNora, Tia. 2013. *Music Asylums: Wellbeing Through Music in Everyday Life*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

Diamond, Beverley, and Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco. 2021. "Ethnomusicological Praxis: An Introduction." In *Transforming Ethnomusicology: Methodologies, Institutional Structures and Policies,* edited by Beverley Diamond and Salwa E.-S. Castelo-Branco, 1–24. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dieckmann, Samantha Sebastian. 2024. "Voicing Voicing: Attuning to the Material in Studio Recording the Lullaby Choir." *Music Education Research* 26(3): 223–239.

Dieckmann, Samantha, and Jane W. Davidson. 2018. "Organised Cultural Encounters: Collaboration and Intercultural Contact in a Lullaby Choir." *World of Music* 7(1–2): 155–177.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth Ann. 2005. *Places of Learning: Media, Architecture, Pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Enright, Theresa. 2023. "A Platform for Art: Infrastructural Citizenship Beyond Monumentality in Toronto's Transit Art." *Antipode* 55(2): 373–392.

Foster, Susan Leigh. 2015. "Why Not 'Improv Everywhere'?" In *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Theater*, edited by Nadine George-Graves, 196–210. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giroux, Henry A. 2003. "Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Resistance: Notes on a Critical Theory of Educational Struggle." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 35(1): 5–35.

Gray, Darren. 2016. "Melbourne Race Rally: Police Hunt for Violent Protesters over Coburg Clash." *Sydney Morning Herald*. May 29. https://www.smh.com.au/national/victoria/melbourne-race -rally-ugly-scenes-as-rival-protesters-clash-in-coburg-20160528-gp63pz.

Hall, Bianca. 2016. "The Anti-Racism Rally That Brought Nazis to the Streets of Coburg." *Sydney Morning Herald*. May 29. https://www.smh.com.au/opinion/the-antiracism-rally-that -brought-nazis-to-the-streets-of-coburg-20160529-gp6iel.html.

Harris, Anita. 2014. "Conviviality, Conflict and Distanciation in Young People's Local Multicultures." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 35(6): 571–587.

Joseph, Yogi, and Govind Gopakumar. 2023. "A Contingent Publicness: Entanglements on Buses." *Urban Studies* 60(15): 3010–3026.

Mannix, Liam. 2016. "One-Way Ticket to End of the Line." *Age*. November 4.

Marsh, Kathryn, and Samantha Dieckmann. 2016. "Interculturality in the Playground and Playgroup: Music as Shared Space for Young Immigrant Children and Their Mothers." In *The Routledge International Handbook of Intercultural Arts Research*, edited by Pamela Burnard, Elizabeth Mackinlay, and Kimberley Powell, 358–368. London: Routledge.

[p.75]

Marshall, Alex. 2018. "Will Jarring Music Drive Drug Users from a German Station?" *New York Times*. August 22. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/22/arts/music/atonal-music-deutsche -bahn-drugs-trains.html.

Masanauskas, John, Tom Minear, and Kara Irving. 2016. "Race Rally Shame." *Herald Sun*. May 31.

Massey, Doreen. 2005. *For Space*. London: SAGE.

Merri-bek City Council. n.d. "Renaming Moreland." https://conversations.merri-bek.vic.gov.au /renaming.

Moreland City Council. n.d. "Reconciliation." https://www.moreland.vic.gov.au/living-in-moreland

/community-services/diversity/reconciliation/Moreland-remains-part-of-the-Treaty-with -Aboriginal-Victorians.

Neal, Sarah, Katy Bennett, Allan Cochrane, and Giles Mohan. 2018. *Lived Experiences of Multiculture: The New Social and Spatial Relations of Diversity*. New York: Routledge.

Oldenburg, Ray. 1999. *The Great Good Place: Cafés, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hair Salons, and Other Hangouts at the Heart of a Community*. New York: Marlowe.

Packham, Jonathan. 2022. "Scoring the Journey: Listening to Claudia Molitor's Sonorama." *Tempo* 76(299): 44–56.

Piekut, Benjamin. 2014. "There Must Be Some Relation Between Mushrooms and Trains: Alvin Curran's Boletus Edulis-Musica Pendolare." In *The Oxford Handbook of Mobile Music Studies*, vol.

2, edited by Sumanth Gopinath and Jason Stanyek, 172–186. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pink, Sarah. 2015. *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.

Radice, Martha. 2016. "Unpacking Intercultural Conviviality in Multiethnic Commercial Streets." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37(5): 432–448.

———. 2022. "Pop-up Ethnography: Methods for Studying Social Relations at the Register of Urban Public Space." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 43(2): 267–282.

Samanani, Farhan. 2023. "Conviviality and Its Others: For a Plural Politics of Living with Difference." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 49(9): 2109–2128.

Sandlin, Jennifer A., Michael P. O'Malley, and Jake Burdick. 2011. "Mapping the Complexity of Public Pedagogy Scholarship." *Review of Educational Research* 81(3): 338–375.

Savage, Glenn C. 2014. "Chasing the Phantoms of Public Pedagogy." In *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*, edited by Jake Burdick, Jennifer A. Sandlin, and Michael P. O'Malley, 79–90. New York: Routledge.

Tanenbaum, Susie J. 1995. *Underground Harmonies: Music and Politics in the Subways of New York*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

te Brömmelstroet, Marco, Anna Nikolaeva, Meredith Glaser, Morten Skou Nicolaisen, and Carmen Chan. 2017. "Travelling Together Alone and Alone Together: Mobility and Potential Exposure to Diversity." *Applied Mobilities* 2(1): 1–15.

Tonkiss, Fran. 2003. "The Ethics of Indifference: Community and Solitude in the City." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6(3): 297–311.

van Leeuwen, Bart. 2010. "Dealing with Urban Diversity: Promises and Challenges of City Life for Intercultural Citizenship." *Political Theory* 38(5): 631–657.

Venter, Carina. 2021. "'While This Happened Here, That Happened There.'" *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 52(1): 23–38.

VICSEG New Futures. 2017. "'Lullaby Choir' Brings Communities Together Through the Power of Song." https://www.vicsegnewfutures.org.au/news/lullaby-choir-brings-communities -together-through-the-power-of-song.

Walsh, Michael. 2009. "Portable Music Device Use on Trains: A 'Splendid Isolation'?" *Australian Journal of Communication* 36(1): 49–59.

Watson, Allan, and Dominiqua Drakeford-Allen. 2016. "'Tuning Out' or 'Tuning In'? Mobile Music Listening and Intensified Encounters with the City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(5): 1036–1043.

Watts, Laura. 2008. "The Art and Craft of Train Travel." *Social and Cultural Geography* 9(6): 711–726.

White, Bob W., and Annick Germain. 2022. "Methods for the Study of Everyday Cohabitation." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 43(2): 167–175.

Willingham, Richard. 2016. "Greens Candidate Pulls Out of Anti-Racism Protest over Violence Fears." *Age*. May 26. https://www.theage.com.au/national/victoria/greens-candidate-pulls -out-of-antiracism-protest-over-violence-fears-20160526-gp4n5c.html.

Wilson, Helen F. 2011. "Passing Propinquities in the Multicultural City: The Everyday Encounters of Bus Passengering." *Environ Plan A* 43(3): 634–649.

Woodcock, Ian. 2015. "Doing Everyday Multiculturalism in Sydney Road, Melbourne." In *EthnoArchitecture and the Politics of Migration*, edited by Mirjana Lozanovska, 165–180. New York: Routledge.