

Curating the Frontier: Tactical Interventions, Spatial Negotiation, and the Re-Signification of Chiang Saen in Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023

*Voraprat Kharanant¹, Ming Turner²

¹PhD Candidate, Institute of Creative Industries Design, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

²Professor Dr., Institute of Creative Industries Design, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400619>

Received: 29 April 2026; Accepted: 04 May 2026; Published: 20 May 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the intersection of contemporary art, curatorial practice, and development policy in the Mekong Subregion through a case study of Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023: The Open World in Chiang Saen District. Located at the tri-border area of Thailand, Laos, and Myanmar, Chiang Saen reflects overlapping pressures of heritage preservation, cross-border mobility, tourism development, special economic zone planning, and ecological precarity along the Mekong River. The Biennale strategically used historical ruins, riverfront areas, municipal spaces, warehouses, schools, and local cultural venues as temporary exhibition sites, transforming the district into a distributed curatorial landscape. The study investigates how these interventions reconfigured fixed or underused spaces into platforms for public reflection and critical dialogue. Methodologically, it adopts a qualitative case-study approach combining document analysis, site-specific interpretation, and thematic analysis of selected artworks and venues. Findings suggest that the Biennale operated as a form of spatial negotiation in which contemporary art activated tensions between existing site functions and new interpretive possibilities. The paper proposes the concept of curatorial intersectionality to explain how such interventions mediate among state policy, global art discourse, local memory, and socio-ecological urgency. Although temporary, the Biennale re-signified Chiang Saen as a critical cultural site for reconsidering development, heritage, and regional identity in the Mekong context, while also indicating the potential and limits of cultural events as catalysts for spatial and policy reflection.

Keywords curatorial strategies; spatial negotiation; Mekong Subregion; cultural policy; border urbanism; Thailand Biennale

INTRODUCTION

Global cultural mega-events, including biennales, triennials, and international art festivals, have increasingly moved beyond the narrow function of presenting contemporary art. They are now closely linked to urban policy, cultural tourism, creative-economy strategies, and forms of cultural diplomacy. In many cities, biennales are used to generate symbolic visibility, attract visitors, activate underused spaces, and reposition localities within regional and global cultural networks (García, 2004; Arif & Aldosary, 2023). However, the meaning of such events becomes more complex when they take place outside major urban centers and are situated in border towns, heritage landscapes, or ecologically sensitive areas. In these contexts, cultural events do not simply decorate space; they intervene in environments where policy, memory, economic ambition, and environmental risk are already in tension (Cox, Low, & Robinson, 2008).

This paper examines Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023: The Open World as a cultural intervention within the Mekong Subregion, with particular attention to Chiang Saen District. Chiang Saen is not only a historical

town associated with Lanna civilization, ancient ruins, Buddhist sites, and local memory; it is also a contemporary border district located near the Golden Triangle, where Thailand, Laos, and Myanmar meet through the spatial and symbolic presence of the Mekong River (Thailand Biennale, 2023). This layered condition makes Chiang Saen an important case for understanding how curatorial practice can operate within a frontier zone. The district is shaped by tourism, cross-border trade, migration, heritage conservation, and the broader dynamics of Mekong regional development (Jittipat, 2022). Spatial meaning in this context is not fixed, but continuously negotiated through history, policy, economy, and everyday life.

The Thailand Biennale was initiated as a rotating national cultural event, and its Chiang Rai edition carried an official aim to connect contemporary art with local context, international visibility, and cultural policy (Thailand Biennale, 2023). In Chiang Saen, the exhibition extended across historical monuments, museum grounds, riverfront areas, community spaces, warehouses, schools, and independent art initiatives (Art4d, 2024; Sumiyoshi, 2024). These curatorial decisions produced a temporary but significant reorganization of space. Sites previously understood as heritage remains, tourist backdrops, or everyday facilities were reactivated as locations for artistic interpretation and public engagement. Through this process, the Biennale opened a space for questioning how art can make visible the political, ecological, and social conditions that shape a border district.

Research question and aims

The central research question of this paper is: how did site-specific curatorial strategies in Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023 use existing spaces in Chiang Saen to generate critical dialogue on development, ecology, heritage, and regional identity? This question addresses a gap in the existing literature on cultural mega-events. While previous studies often focus on urban branding, tourism, or creative-economy policy (García, 2004; Arif & Aldosary, 2023), less attention has been given to how temporary artistic interventions operate in peripheral border areas. In such contexts, the issue is not only whether art can attract visitors, but whether it can reframe the social meaning of space and contribute to broader discussions on development and regional identity.

Accordingly, this study has three specific aims: (i) to analyze how site-specific curatorial strategies recontextualized heritage, civic, and ecological sites in Chiang Saen; (ii) to develop the concept of curatorial intersectionality as an analytical framework for cultural interventions in transitional regions; and (iii) to discuss the implications of such interventions for cultural policy, urban planning, and heritage management in the Mekong Subregion.

Structure of the paper

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on art-led urban regeneration, curatorial studies, and Mekong regional development, and introduces the concept of curatorial intersectionality. Section 3 outlines the qualitative case-study methodology. Section 4 presents the empirical findings across heritage, riverfront, civic, and community-based sites. Section 5 discusses the wider implications for cultural policy and planning. Section 6 concludes with the contribution, limitations, and directions for further research.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Cultural events, urban regeneration, and curatorial practice

Literature on art-led urban regeneration has highlighted the role of cultural events in activating space and producing new forms of urban value. Cultural policy has been understood as an important tool in shaping urban transformation and public perception (García, 2004). At the same time, curatorial studies suggest that exhibitions are not only displays, but forms of knowledge production and spatial practice (O'Neill, 2012; Spaid, 2020). From this perspective, the placement of artworks within specific sites can reshape how those sites are interpreted and experienced. In Chiang Saen, this means that a ruin is not only a historical object, and a riverbank is not only a scenic landscape. Each location becomes a site of interpretation where historical,

political, and ecological meanings are reconfigured through curatorial practice. Comparable arguments have been made about how art can re-image urban experience and reshape perception of place (Kaliner, 2014).

The Mekong Subregion as geopolitical and ecological context

The Mekong Subregion provides an important geopolitical and ecological context for this analysis. The river has long been associated with regional exchange, cultural connection, and environmental uncertainty (Chandler, 2001). At the same time, contemporary development in the region is shaped by infrastructure expansion, cross-border economies, and competing policy agendas (Jittipat, 2022; Yale Council on Southeast Asia Studies, 2024). Chiang Saen, as a border district, reflects these dynamics in a concentrated form. The Biennale's engagement with this context can therefore be understood as an intervention within a broader regional condition, rather than simply an art event located in a provincial setting.

Heritage as living interpretation

Heritage is another key dimension of this study. In Chiang Saen, historical sites are often framed through preservation discourse, where heritage is treated as evidence of the past. While this approach is important, it can also make heritage appear static and disconnected from contemporary life. The Biennale introduced an alternative approach by placing contemporary artworks within these sites, allowing them to function as active spaces of interpretation. This aligns with broader discussions in curatorial practice, where exhibitions can create new relationships between past and present, and between institutional frameworks and public experience (Simon, 2014; Townsend et al., 2003). In settler-colonial and post-colonial contexts, scholars have further cautioned against treating cultural inclusion as merely symbolic, arguing that meaningful engagement with land, memory, and displacement requires more than representational gestures (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Towards curatorial intersectionality

This paper proposes the concept of curatorial intersectionality as an analytical framework. The term describes how multiple forces intersect within curatorial space. In Chiang Saen, each site was shaped by at least three overlapping dimensions: state and global policy, including tourism and development strategies; local heritage and identity, including Lanna history and community narratives; and ecological or spatial concerns, particularly those related to the Mekong River. Curatorial intersectionality refers to the capacity of the exhibition to mediate these forces without resolving them. Its significance lies in creating a temporary platform where different and sometimes conflicting meanings can be presented, negotiated, and made visible through artistic practice.

The scope of this study is limited to selected sites and artworks in Chiang Saen District. It does not aim to evaluate the entire Biennale or measure its economic impact. Instead, it focuses on how curatorial strategies redefined specific spaces and how these interventions contribute to ongoing discussions in cultural policy, urban planning, heritage management, and Mekong studies. By doing so, the paper offers a more situated understanding of biennales in Southeast Asia, where cultural events are often embedded within complex relations between policy ambition, historical memory, and uneven regional development.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study employs a qualitative case-study design (Yin, 2018, as a methodological reference for case-study logic; here applied within a humanities/curatorial-studies frame) to examine Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023 in Chiang Saen District. A qualitative approach is suitable because the research focuses on meaning, spatial experience, curatorial intention, and the relationship between artworks and their sites. Rather than measuring visitor numbers or economic outcomes, the study investigates how curatorial interventions temporarily reshaped the interpretation of specific spaces. The case-study method allows for close attention to local context, particularly in a border district where heritage, development, ecology, and community life intersect. Chiang Saen was selected as the primary site because it functioned as one of the Biennale's most

conceptually significant zones, combining ancient monuments, riverfront locations, warehouses, municipal spaces, schools, and local art initiatives (Thailand Biennale, 2023; Art4d, 2024).

Data collection

Data collection was conducted through three interrelated methods. First, document analysis examined the official curatorial statement *The Open World*, exhibition materials, press releases, artist documentation (e.g., Baan Noorg Collaborative Arts & Culture, 2024; Navin Production, 2023), critical reviews (Iida, 2023; Sumiyoshi, 2024; Urban Creature, 2024), and selected scholarly literature on cultural policy, heritage, urban regeneration, and the Mekong Subregion. These sources provided the institutional and conceptual framework for understanding the Biennale’s objectives and public positioning. Second, site-specific analysis was applied to interpret the original function, spatial characteristics, and symbolic meaning of selected venues, including Wat Pa Sak, Ancient Monument No. 16, Chiang Saen National Museum, the Golden Triangle Activity Area, Huai Kiang Warehouse, the Community Digital Center, Ban Mae Ma School, and Sridonmoon Art Space. This approach considers how existing sites were recontextualized through curatorial decisions and artistic placement. Third, thematic artwork analysis was conducted on selected projects by artists and collectives such as Baan Noorg Collaborative Arts & Culture, Navin Rawanchaikul, Nipan Oranniwesna, Hsu Chia-Wei, Chitti Kasemkitvatana, and Apichatpong Weerasethakul. The analysis focuses on how artworks engaged with site conditions and addressed themes of history, ecology, mobility, and regional identity. Rather than offering a comprehensive survey of all exhibited works, the study selects key examples that demonstrate how curatorial strategies operated across different types of space.

Analytical framework

The analytical process follows the framework of curatorial intersectionality, through which each selected site is examined across three interconnected vectors: state and global policy; local heritage and identity; and ecological and spatial urgency (Table 1). The first vector considers how the Biennale was positioned in relation to cultural diplomacy, tourism development, creative-economy discourse, and the broader ambition to situate Chiang Rai within international art circuits (Arif & Aldosary, 2023). The second vector focuses on how artworks engaged with local memory, Lanna history, Tai Yuan identity, community participation, and the lived meanings of specific places. The third vector addresses environmental and spatial conditions, including the Mekong River, border mobility, land use, displacement, and the transformation of underused or transitional spaces.

Table 1. Analytical framework for curatorial intersectionality in Chiang Saen.

Analytical vector	Main question	Indicators in the case study
State / global policy	How does the work relate to official development, tourism, or cultural diplomacy?	Biennale branding; SEZ discourse; international art networks; use of public venues
Local heritage / identity	How does the work activate local history, memory, or community narrative?	Lanna ruins; Tai Yuan memory; museum context; local art spaces; community participation
Ecological / spatial urgency	How does the work respond to border, river, land, or environmental pressure?	Mekong River; migration; displacement; warehouse reuse; frontier economy

Limitations and reflexivity

This study also recognizes its limitations. The analysis is based primarily on exhibition documentation, textual sources, visual materials, and interpretive site analysis. It does not include extensive ethnographic research involving residents, visitors, local administrators, or business stakeholders. As a result, the study does not

attempt to measure long-term social or economic impact. Instead, it focuses on the immediate spatial and curatorial logic of the Biennale as a temporary intervention.

In addition, the position of the researcher requires reflexive consideration. As the first author is also a curator working on contemporary art in the Mekong Subregion, the study benefits from practical knowledge of curatorial processes and regional context. At the same time, this proximity necessitates critical self-awareness. The analysis is therefore presented as a situated interpretation, rather than a neutral or comprehensive account. This approach aligns with the understanding of curatorial practice as a form of knowledge production embedded within specific contexts and experiences (O'Neill, 2012; Spaid, 2020).

Findings

The findings show that Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023 in Chiang Saen operated through a form of tactical spatial intervention. Its curatorial strategy did not rely only on placing artworks within existing venues; rather, it activated the tension between artwork and site to generate new layers of meaning. The selected locations were not neutral containers. They carried embedded histories of religion, trade, tourism, education, administration, and everyday community life. By inserting contemporary artworks into these contexts, the Biennale temporarily shifted how these sites could be seen, interpreted, and discussed. This process can be understood as a form of spatial negotiation in which established functions were not erased but reworked through new interpretive possibilities.

Heritage sites: from preservation to active interpretation

Heritage sites became one of the most significant arenas for this negotiation. In locations associated with Lanna history and Buddhist memory, the Biennale challenged the idea that heritage should be treated only as a preserved object of the past. Instead, it introduced a more dynamic understanding of heritage as an active and contested field. Works such as *Taiyuan Return: On Transmission and Inheritance* by Baan Noorg Collaborative Arts & Culture (Figure 1) brought questions of transmission, inheritance, and displacement into direct relation with the historical landscape. Rather than presenting the monument as an isolated relic, the work framed heritage as a living process shaped by movement, community, and the fragility of cultural continuity. In this sense, memory is not fixed but continuously negotiated through present conditions and future uncertainties (Simon, 2014; Townsend et al., 2003).



Figure 1. Baan Noorg Collaborative Arts & Culture, *Taiyuan Return: On Transmission and Inheritance*, 2023. Source: Baan Noorg (<https://www.baannoorg.org/>).

At Chiang Saen National Museum and related historical sites, works by Chitti Kasemkitvatana and other artists created a dialogue between archaeological memory and contemporary temporality (Figure 2). The museum context typically organizes objects through chronology, classification, and assigned cultural value. Within this framework, history is presented as stable and continuous. The Biennale introduced a different layer by allowing contemporary artworks to intervene in this structured narrative. This intervention did not reject preservation; rather, it expanded its scope. The museum became not only a site for conserving the past, but also a space where the present could question how history is constructed—what is remembered, what is excluded, and how cultural identity is mobilized within contemporary development agendas. In this sense, the Biennale proposed an active model of heritage interpretation, where meaning is produced through ongoing dialogue rather than fixed display (Simon, 2014).



Figure 2. Chitti Kasemkitvatana, outdoor installation at Chiang Saen National Museum, 2023. Source: GroundControlTH (groundcontrolth.com).

Riverfront and Golden Triangle: contested ecologies of border

The riverfront and Golden Triangle area generated another form of spatial negotiation. These locations are commonly framed through tourism, border spectacle, and the symbolic meeting point of three countries. However, the Mekong River also represents a space of ecological uncertainty, hydrological transformation, and uneven regional development (Chandler, 2001; Jittipat, 2022). Navin Rawanchaikul's *Displaced, Whose Land?* (Figure 3) is significant because it introduced questions of displacement and land into a site often reduced to a touristic image. The work disrupted the celebratory narrative of the Golden Triangle by foregrounding the human consequences of development, including migration, land insecurity, and shifting forms of belonging. Through this intervention, the site was no longer read only as a point of convergence between nations, but as a contested space shaped by economic flows, environmental change, and social inequality (Tuck & Yang, 2012).



Figure 3. Navin Rawanchaikul, Displaced, Whose Land?, 2023.
Source: ArtReview (artreview.com).

Warehouses and adaptive reuse: art and the border economy

The use of Huai Kiang Warehouse, also referred to as Chang Warehouse, further extended this line of critique. A warehouse is not typically understood as a cultural site; it is associated with storage, trade, circulation, and economic function. By transforming such a space into an exhibition venue, the Biennale tested the potential of adaptive reuse while also revealing the relationship between border economy and urban decline. Nipan Oranniwesna's *Silence Traces* (Figure 4) is particularly relevant. His practice often engages with traces, absence, mapping, dust, and the fragile materiality of memory. Installed within the warehouse, the work made visible the subtle residues of commercial systems and cross-border exchange. Rather than presenting the space as empty or obsolete, the intervention highlighted how it remains embedded within broader economic and spatial transformations. This suggests that curatorial practice can function as a form of planning laboratory, where temporary cultural use allows neglected sites to be reimagined without immediately being absorbed into market-driven redevelopment.



Figure 4. Nipan Oranniwesna, *Silence Traces*, 2023, Huai Kiang Warehouse.
Source: Artforum (artforum.com).

Civic and educational spaces: art within everyday governance

Municipal and community spaces introduced a different mode of intervention. Hsu Chia-Wei's *The Actor from Golden Triangle* (Figure 5), presented in relation to the Community Digital Center and Wiang Subdistrict Municipality, connected Chiang Saen to wider transnational histories and resource networks. The placement of this research-based work within a civic setting is significant because it brought geopolitical discussion into an everyday administrative environment. Rather than remaining within the boundaries of the exhibition space, the work extended into the sphere of local governance and public life. It suggested that Chiang Saen's conditions cannot be understood as isolated local issues, but must be situated within broader regional dynamics, including resource circulation, political history, and cross-border relations (Yale Council on Southeast Asia Studies, 2024). In doing so, the Biennale expanded the scope of community space, challenging the assumption that such sites should only address immediate or localized concerns.



Figure 5. Hsu Chia-Wei, *The Actor from Golden Triangle*, 2023, Wiang Digital Community Center. Source: STIRworld (stirworld.com).

The inclusion of Ban Mae Ma School and works by Apichatpong Weerasethakul (Figure 6) introduced another layer to the discussion. A school is typically understood as a site of formal education, memory formation, and future-oriented thinking. Within this context, Apichatpong's filmic language, often associated with dreams, spirits, landscapes, and suppressed histories, brought non-linear and intangible forms of knowledge into an institutional setting. This intervention is significant for planning discourse, where development is often framed through visible infrastructure, measurable outputs, and economic indicators. In contrast, the artwork proposed an alternative register of value, one that includes memory, atmosphere, non-human presence, and the unseen conditions that shape relationships between people, land, and environment. By situating such a work within a school, the Biennale expanded the idea of education beyond formal knowledge, suggesting that learning can also emerge through affective, historical, and ecological awareness.



Figure 6. Apichatpong Weerasethakul, film installation at Ban Mae Ma School, 2023.
Source: Kiang Malingue (kiangmalingue.com).

Local cultural infrastructure: the role of artist-run spaces

Sridonmoon Art Space, founded by Sriwan Janhuttakarnkit, highlighted the role of local cultural infrastructure within the Biennale (Figure 7). Unlike state museums or official heritage sites, an artist-run space operates through different forms of authority. It is rooted in local networks, informal labor, and long-term cultural commitment rather than institutional scale or policy mandate. Its inclusion demonstrated that cultural development in peripheral regions does not rely solely on large-scale state initiatives. Instead, locally grounded art spaces can function as small but significant nodes of continuity, where artistic production, community interaction, and regional identity are gradually sustained. This finding shifts attention from the Biennale as a single cultural event to the broader ecology of actors that support and extend its impact. It suggests that the meaning of the Biennale is produced not only through its temporary presence, but also through its relationship with existing local infrastructures that continue beyond the duration of the exhibition (Urban Creature, 2024).



Figure 7. Sriwan Janhuttakarnkit, Sridonmoon Art Space, Chiang Saen.
Source: Thai Art News (thaiartnews.com).

DISCUSSION

The Biennale as a platform for spatial negotiation

Taken together, these interventions show that the Biennale functioned as a platform for spatial negotiation. It translated abstract policy questions into site-specific and embodied experiences. Development, for example, was not addressed only through planning documents or economic ambition; it appeared through displaced bodies, contested land, reused warehouses, and the staged visibility of the Golden Triangle. Heritage was not framed solely as a protected historical category, but emerged as a living field of inheritance, interpretation, and contemporary questioning. Ecology, similarly, was not reduced to environmental data, but became visible through river instability, atmospheric traces, non-human presence, and the vulnerability of communities along the Mekong. In this way, the Biennale made complex regional issues legible through spatial and artistic practice.

Curatorial intersectionality: strengths and limits

The concept of curatorial intersectionality helps explain the significance of these interventions. The Biennale did not simply oppose state policy, nor did it fully reinforce it. Instead, it operated within an intermediate space shaped by cultural diplomacy, global art visibility, local memory, and ecological urgency. This in-between position produced both its strength and its limitation. Its strength lay in its ability to assemble multiple forms of knowledge within a shared public field, allowing different perspectives to coexist and interact. Its limitation, however, was its temporality and its reliance on institutional frameworks. As a time-bound event, its capacity to generate lasting change remained uncertain. Nevertheless, the Chiang Saen case demonstrates that biennales in Southeast Asia can extend beyond cultural branding. When grounded in local context, they can function as temporary civic platforms that enable communities, planners, artists, and audiences to reconsider the meaning and future of a border town.

Implications for cultural policy and planning

Several implications emerge for urban planning and cultural policy. First, temporary cultural interventions can act as low-risk laboratories for adaptive reuse, particularly in underutilized spaces such as warehouses or administrative buildings (García, 2004). Second, they can expand approaches to heritage management by linking historical sites to present-day concerns, rather than isolating them within preservation frameworks (Simon, 2014). Third, they can support the decentralization of cultural policy by introducing international artistic discourse into peripheral regions while maintaining local specificity. However, these potentials depend on sustained engagement. Without long-term institutional commitment, a biennale risks producing only symbolic visibility. With careful continuity and support, it can contribute to the development of local cultural infrastructure, new forms of policy imagination, and ongoing regional dialogue within the Mekong Subregion (Jittipat, 2022).

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023 operated in Chiang Saen as more than a temporary exhibition. Through its strategic use of heritage sites, riverfront areas, warehouses, municipal spaces, schools, and local art initiatives, the Biennale functioned as a mechanism of spatial negotiation. It re-signified Chiang Saen from a peripheral border district into a critical cultural site where development policy, ecological precarity, local memory, and regional identity could be examined through contemporary art. While the exhibition did not produce permanent transformation, it created a temporary condition in which familiar spaces could be reinterpreted and publicly reconsidered.

The main contribution of this paper is the proposal of curatorial intersectionality as a framework for analyzing cultural interventions in transitional regions. In the Chiang Saen case, curatorial practice mediated among three overlapping forces: state and global policy, local heritage and identity, and ecological or spatial urgency. This framework moves the analysis of biennales beyond a focus on economic impact, tourism promotion, or artistic

representation alone. It positions curatorial practice as a form of situated research and spatial critique, particularly in regions where development pressure and cultural memory are closely intertwined.

The findings also suggest that temporary cultural events can contribute to planning and heritage discourse when they are grounded in local context. In Chiang Saen, the Biennale activated historical sites as living spaces of interpretation, used the Golden Triangle and Mekong riverfront to question border development, and highlighted the role of local cultural infrastructures such as Sridonmoon Art Space. These interventions offer a model of decentralized cultural policy that does not depend solely on metropolitan centers. They also demonstrate how contemporary art can make visible forms of knowledge often overlooked in conventional planning, including memory, atmosphere, displacement, community narrative, and ecological vulnerability.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The study focuses on immediate curatorial and spatial outcomes and does not assess long-term social, economic, or policy impacts. Future research should therefore examine the Biennale's legacy through longitudinal and ethnographic approaches. Interviews with local residents, artists, business owners, municipal officers, and cultural workers would provide deeper insight into whether these temporary spatial interventions led to sustained changes in heritage management, community engagement, or local planning discourse. Comparative studies of biennales in other Southeast Asian border regions would also help evaluate the broader applicability of curatorial intersectionality. Despite these limitations, the Chiang Saen case demonstrates that curatorial practice can function as a meaningful cultural and spatial tool for rethinking frontier conditions in the Mekong Subregion.

REFERENCES

1. Arif, M., & Aldosary, A. S. (2023). Urban spatial strategies of the Gulf Cooperation Council: A comparative analysis and lessons learned. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 13344. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813344>
2. Art4d. (2024, March). Thailand Biennale Chiang Rai 2023: The Open World. Art4d Magazine Online. Available online: <https://art4d.com/2024/03/thailand-biennale-chiang-rai-2023> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).
3. Baan Noorg Collaborative Arts & Culture. (2024). Thailand Biennale Chiang Rai: Methodology for a Tai Yuan return (2023–2024). Available online: <https://www.baannoorg.org/thailand-biennale-chiang-rai-methodology-for-a-tai-yuan-return-2023-2024> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).
4. Chandler, D. (2001). Review of *The Mekong: Turbulent past, uncertain future*, by M. Osborne. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 60(3), 922–923. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2700174>
5. Cox, K. R., Low, M., & Robinson, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of political geography*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607880>
6. García, B. (2004). Cultural policy and urban regeneration in Western European cities: Lessons from experience, prospects for the future. *Local Economy*, 19(4), 312–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0269094042000286828>
7. Iida, S. (2023). Thailand Biennale Chiang Rai 2023 inspection tour report. National Center for Art Research (NCAR). Available online: <https://ncar.artmuseums.go.jp/en/upload/Thailand%20Biennale%202023%20Chiang%20Rai%20Report.pdf> (Accessed: 9 November 2025).
8. Jittipat, P. (2022). Power politics and the institutional architecture in the Mekong subregion: Beyond the geopolitical trap. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*. Available online: https://image.mfa.go.th/mfa/0/40JCTby7gE/Points_of_View/Journal_1-2022_Power_Politics_and_Institutional_Architecture_in_the_Mekong_Subregion_Jittipat.pdf (Accessed: 9 November 2025).
9. Kaliner, M. E. (2014). *Art, crime, and the image of the city* [Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University]. Digital Access to Scholarship at Harvard (DASH). <http://dissertations.umi.com/gsas.harvard:11306>
10. Navin Production. (2023). *His displaced, whose land?* Available online: <https://www.navinproduction.com/> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).
11. O'Neill, P. (2012). *The culture of curating and the curating of culture(s)*. MIT Press.
12. Simon, R. I. (2014). *A pedagogy of witnessing: Curatorial practice and the pursuit of social justice*. State University of New York Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book35231>

13. Spaid, S. (2020). *The philosophy of curatorial practice*. Bloomsbury. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350115361>
14. Sumiyoshi, C. (2024). *Thailand Biennale Chiang Rai 2023*. RealTokyo. Available online: <https://realtokyo.co.jp/en/exhibition/thailand-biennale-2023/> (Accessed: 9 November 2025).
15. Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023. (2023). *The Open World: Curatorial statement*. Office of Contemporary Art and Culture (OCAC). Available online: <https://tbc2023.thailandbiennale.org/about/> (Accessed: 8 November 2025).
16. Townsend, M., Bradley, J., Cook, S., Diamond, S., Fraser, A., Grenville, B., Katyal, A., Martin, S., Medina, C., Mesquita, I., Rollig, S., Sholette, G., & White, P. (2003). *Beyond the box: Diverging curatorial practices*. Banff Centre Press. <https://e-artexte.ca/id/eprint/16092/> (Accessed: 9 November 2025).
17. Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40. Available online: <http://hdl.handle.net/1807/138516>
18. Urban Creature. (2024). *Thailand Biennale, Chiang Rai 2023: Reflections and interpretations*. Available online: <https://urbancreature.co/thailand-biennale-chiang-rai-2023/> (Accessed: 9 November 2025).
19. Yale Council on Southeast Asia Studies. (2024). *Mekong and metaphor: Contemporary art and regional imaginaries in mainland Southeast Asia*. Available online: <https://www.nysean.org/events/mekong-and-metaphor-contemporary-art-and-regional-imaginaries-in-mainland-southeast-asia> (Accessed: 9 November 2025).