The Sex That Didn't Matter

Structural Violence in the Giuliani Administration's Redistricting of New York City

Rachel Narozniak

Abstract

This paper uses Nirmala Erevelles' Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic and Samuel R. Delaney's Times Square Red, Times Square Blue to examine the Giuliani administration's rezoning and redistricting of New York City's public sex spaces in the late '80s and early '90s as an example of "structural violence." This paper foregrounds Johan Galtung's theory of "structural violence" and Ervelles' definition of the social model of "disability" to argue that the Giuliani administration's spatial redefinition of New York (of Times Square, specifically) was a heteronormatively and capitalistically motivated initiative that effectively 'disabled' the homosexual population that frequented the homoerotic public sex spaces.

The spatial redesign of Times Square supplanted Times Square's prior identity as an "entertainment area catering largely to the working classes who lived in the city," for a vision of a new Times Square that would capitalistically cater to a middle-class group of heteronormative families and tourists. This analysis reads the redistricting of New York through a disability theory lens to tease out the relationship between structural violence, capitalism, aberrant sexual identity, and conceptions of space.

Keywords:
Structural violence, Disability, Capitalism, Heteronormative, New York, Sex

Otherness: Essays and Studies
Volume 8 · Number 1 · March 2021

The Sex That Didn't Matter

Structural Violence in the Giuliani Administration's Redistricting of New York City

Rachel Narozniak

The "bodies that do not matter" are a central conceptual facet of Nirmala Erevelles' *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic*. No reticent theorist, Erevelles underscores their importance to the argument that she will progressively develop in the introduction. There, the "bodies that do not matter" is not just a phrase that Erevelles implements as she develops the framework of her disability studies argument but also the title of this prelude (Erevelles 2011, 1). Erevelles' choice to christen her introduction in this way is anticipatory; it's a silent yet prominent signal that the "bodies that do not matter" will constitute a core focus of the text. Indeed, they do.

Erevelles invokes "structural violence," a term originally coined by Johan Galtung, to analyze how, specifically, this dichotomy—the body that holds importance and its converse—comes to be (2011, 16). Structural violence describes the "…social structures—economic, political, legal, religious, and cultural—that stop individuals, groups, and societies from reaching their full potential" (16). Because these social institutions are normalized and "so customary to …our ways

Otherness: Essays and Studies
Volume 8 · Number 1 · March 2021

of understanding the world," their inhibitive effects can be imperceptible (16). Indeed, as Erevelles writes, these "social structures…appear almost invisible" (16).

Galtung's concept is the theoretical conduit to reading disability not as a biological condition but a social condition. To look through the lens of "structural violence" is to perceive the body as a passive vessel, acted on by social configurations that impose disability in the capitalist framework that Erevelles studies (16). It is in this way that "structural violence" strikes a similarity with the social model of disability, which "…views disability as socially created such that disability oppression is linked to the material and ideological transformations of capitalism" (19).

Erevelles extends her work's purview beyond Western contexts to contemplate disability in Iraq and Afghanistan. In doing so, she deviates from poststructuralist disability studies scholars' late focus on "…disabled embodiment within the specific context of the local" (20). This paper will put pressure on this phrase, "the specific context of the local," to bridge *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic* with Samuel R. Delaney's *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*, in an effort to read The Forty-second Street Development Project as an act of "structural violence" (Erevalles 2011, 20).

The "specific context" of Samuel Delaney's "local"—as the text's title suggests—is Times Square, Forty-second Street and Eighth Avenue (Erevelles 2011, 20). A work deeply attuned to the geographic parameters of this area and the temporality of the public sex spaces that christened it with sexual infamy, *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* chronicles the spatial shifts in Times Square following the Giuliani administration's launch of The Forty-second Street Development Project in 1990. Delaney asserts that the redevelopment brought about "…a violent reconfiguration of [New York City's] landscape" predicated on rezoning laws that required the street's sex-specific businesses to relocate to New

York's waterfront (Delaney 1999, xi). However, the forced migration of these public sex spaces was not safe nor even wholly viable, as Michael Warner outlines:

> Adult businesses [were] allowed only in certain zoning areas…Almost all [were] poor neighborhoods…the city's maps showing the areas reserved for adult businesses [were] misleading, as the majority of the land listed as available [was] in fact unusable. It [included] for example, Kennedy Airport. (Warner 158)

The then ongoing closure of the homoerotic—but not always homosocial—public sex spaces that pervaded Forty-second Street leads Delaney to conclude the first volume of *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* with a question: "What kind of leaps am I going to have to make now between the acceptable and the unacceptable, between the legal and the illegal, to continue having a satisfactory sex life?" (Delaney 1999, 108). Delaney's inquiry into the means by which sexual satisfaction will be possible in the wake of the "…erosion of public sexual culture" in New York City—which, importantly, was also an "…erosion of queer publics"—signifies a problem of access to the homosexually oriented public sex spaces (Warner 2000, 161).

The Forty-second Street Development Project posed a "constraint" for the homosexual population that frequented Times Square's peep shows, sex shops, adult video stores, and porn theaters (Erevelles 2011, 18). A "constraint," Erevelles asserts, is "…a lack of resources, geographical distance, and physical and social barriers, that make it impossible for many people to take advantage of available services," or, phrased differently, a social condition that "cause[s] disability" (18). The rezoning laws that expelled adult businesses created a paucity of sexual resources due to the distance of the public sex spaces, which were pushed to the fringes of New York City under the new laws. The gentrification of Forty-second Street evidently imposed the "physical and social barriers" typical of a "constraint" (18). Delaney broaches these interpersonal impediments in his discussion of contact, which he defines as

> …the intercourse—physical and conversational—that blooms in and as 'casual sex' in public rest rooms, sex movies, public parks, singles bars, and sex clubs, on

> street corners with heavy hustling traffic, and in the adjoining motels or the apartments of one or another participant, from which nonsexual friendships and/or acquaintances lasting for decades or a lifetime may spring. (Delaney 1999, 132)

Jane Jacobs' definition of contact as a

> …fundamentally urban phenomenon…necessary for everything from neighborhood safety to a general sense of social well-being…[and] supported by a strong sense of private and public in a field of socioeconomic diversity that mixes living spaces with a variety of commercial spaces, which in turn…provide a variety of human services (Copjec, Sorkin 1999, 30)

further underscores the natural fluidity and diversity of interpersonal contact relations in an urban setting. Delaney posits that the Giuliani administration's "Disneyfication" of Times Square disrupted the formation of cross contact relations due to its economic redevelopment of a socioeconomically and culturally diverse locality into "…a ring of upper-middle-class luxury apartments around a ring of tourist hotels" (Delaney 1999, 149). The renovation erected socioeconomically weighted "social barriers" that had a negative impact on the contact relations among the predominantly working class patrons of Forty-second Street's public sex spaces, because they inhibited this population from partaking in the street's services, sexual or otherwise. "I have talked with a dozen men whose sexual outlets, like many of mine, were centered on that neighborhood [that of Forty-second Street]," Delaney writes, "It is the same for them. We need contact" (1999, 175). Here, "contact" is dual in meaning: the men need the physical, sexual engagement facilitated by the public sex spaces. They also require the non-sexual interpersonal interaction that is the byproduct of urban phenomena.

Given that contact "…is associated with public space and the architecture and commerce that depends on it and promote it," and is thus "…contoured, if not organized, by earlier decisions, desires, commercial interests [and] zoning laws," contact is intimately entwined with and shaped by the "contouring" city's capitalistic agenda (Delaney 1999, 129). The social model of disability contends that "…disability oppression is linked to the material and ideological

transformations of capitalism" (Erevelles 2011, 19). Although Delaney never explicitly calls The Forty-second Street Development Project an example of "structural violence," he nevertheless enacts a comparable study of the bodies that lost significance in this metropolitan context as others gained it (16). This paper advances the argument that the redevelopment of Forty-second Street constituted an instance of "structural violence" that socially disabled the homosexual population that frequented these public sex arenas. The Forty-second Street Development Project and its rezoning laws that ousted these businesses from spatial centrality conveyed that the bodies that patronized the adult establishments were the bodies that "did not matter" in this broader capitalistic schema.

Bodies on Forty-Second Street

A record of the geographical shifts both on and in proximity to Forty-second Street, *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* chronicles the structural changes that the area underwent. Delaney attributes the infrastructural alterations in part to the AIDS epidemic. AIDS was pivotal to the commercial reconstruction of Forty-Second Street and to the "…legal and moral revamping of [New York's] own discursive structures," which entailed "…changing laws about sex, health, and zoning," reformations that, according to Delaney, led the city "…to exploit everything from homophobia and AIDS to family values and fear of drugs" to enact the remodeling that the city had "…anticipated and actively planned" since 1961 (1999, xi-xii). Delaney's reference to "family values" echoes his later remark that "The Forty-second Street Development Project [wanted] families to spend their money here. So, the visible signs of sex [had] got to go" (1999, 95). Their absence gave way to the new middle-class economic thematics of this new Times Square.

Yet, more precisely, it was the emblems of *variant* sex that had to make a compulsory exit. Gayle Rubin posits,

> The criminalization of innocuous behaviors such as homosexuality, prostitution, obscenity, or recreational drug use is rationalized by portraying them as menaces

> to health and safety, women and children…the family…These rationalizations obscure the intent to shut down sexual variance. (Cohen 25)

"Criminalization" and "exploitation" are mutually inclusive in the capitalistic motivations of the "Disneyfication" of Times Square, as are women and children, the family, and family values, the last of which oozes heteronormativity (Delaney xi-xii). It is hardly any surprise that the noncommitted, heteronormatively subversive relationships of the public sex spaces qualified as "…psychologically 'dangerous' relations,'" although the peril of these relationships "…[was] rarely specified in any way other than to suggest its failure to conform to the ideal bourgeois marriage" (Delaney 1999, 122).

The Forty-second street area was an outlier of the heteronormative family and tourist friendly new Times Square. Because there was no ideological space for variant sex in this philosophical landscape, there was no longer a *physical* space for variant sex on Forty-second Street. To evaluate The Forty-second Street Development Project as disabling is to propose that the initiative brought about socially created disability. Further, to classify the reconstruction of the Times Square area as "disabling" is to recall that "disability oppression is linked to the material and ideological transformations of capitalism" (Erevelles 2011, 19). The term "transformations" (Erevelles 2011, 19) could not be more apt in an analysis of the disabling effects of The Forty-second Street Development Project, which engendered capitalistically driven material—a "…violent reconfiguration" of the terrain of Times Square—and ideological—the "…legal and moral revamping"—"transformations" (Delaney 1999, xi-xii). When "structural violence" refers to the "social structures"— "economic, political, legal, religious, and cultural"—that halt "…individuals, groups, and societies from reaching their full potential," The Forty-second Street Development Project arises as a capitalistically compelled spatial reinvention by rezoning that exemplifies structural violence (Erevelles 2011, 19).

Structural violence inhibits "full potential," or in other words, "individuals, groups, and societies'" maximum and complete capability to become (19). The phrase "full potential" bears this general significance, but may hold distinct and *specific* meaning(s) for different people and groups. On the surface, "full potential" for the homosexual patrons of the public sex spaces bespeaks access to the spaces in which one can seek, give, and receive sexual pleasure, in the pursuit of one's own sexual satisfaction (19). Delve below that surface, and the phrase "full potential" becomes increasingly elastic, signaling not just a capacity for the achievement of sexual "potential" in terms of sexual satisfaction, but also instructive, educational, and developmental "potential," derived from the cross class interpersonal interactions in these homosocial spaces (19).

For Delaney, the porn theaters were "…humane and functional, fulfilling needs that most of our society [did] not yet know how to acknowledge" (Delaney 1999, 90). Commercial niches that enabled attendees to meet these sexual needs, the primary purpose of the public sex businesses on Forty-second Street can be summarized in the manager of The Metropolitan's comment: "People come in here to have fun" (26). As Delaney acknowledges, "There [were] many men, younger and older, for whom the ease and availability of sex [at the porn theaters] made the movies a central sexual outlet" (1999, 16). Despite its morally lascivious portrayal by the Giuliani administration, the sexual encounters that occurred within the porn theaters were hardly "…Dionysian and uncontrolled…but rather some of the most highly socialized and conventionalized behavior human beings [could] take part in" (158).

In the public sex spaces' absence from Forty-second Street, the means of maximizing sexual "potential"—read: the luxury to safely seek, give, and receive sexual pleasure—became difficult, dangerous, and possibly disastrous. These homosocial businesses remained central to the sexual "potential" of their patrons, despite their failure to remain *geographically* central. The Forty-Second Street

redevelopment project hindered the homosexual population that frequented these spaces from realizing "full potential" of a sexual caliber.

An analysis of the "potential" associated with these spaces would be remiss not to address the "potential" that was *not* of a sexual nature. The porn theaters and their sexual encounters constituted a community that engendered otherwise "potential," or in other words, the "potential" that could but did not need to have a sexual basis. This was the "potential" that was derivative of regular attendance at the porn theaters, and thus, of participation in the homosocial community of the theaters.

The "potential" inherent in these public sex spaces transcended the sexual to proffer "potential" of an educational kind, whether in relation to "…how not to get AIDS," or how to socialize in sexual and/or nonsexual capacities (83). "[Are they] a place where someone like Rannit might be socialized out of an annoying habit?" Delaney muses (1999, 88). His comment elucidates the potential for socially instructive encounters to occur in the theaters.

The porn theaters additionally represented public spaces in which growth into and claim of one's own sexuality as an exercise of "sexual autonomy" was not just possible but also encouraged and assisted (89). Sexual autonomy, according to Michael Warner, "…requires more than freedom of choice, tolerance, and the liberalization of sex laws. It requires access to pleasure and possibilities, since people commonly do not know their desires until they find them" (Warner 2000, 7). A historian of his own experience in "…the Times Square gay cruising venues," Delaney was well acquainted with his own desires, and it was, of course, these inclinations that led him to Times Square for visitations that were not just visitations, but repeated exertions of his sexual autonomy (Delaney 1999, 58).

Delaney is not someone unfamiliar with his own sexual preferences. He was not a man for whom the nature of his desires came into focus only after he began to patronize the porn theaters. However, many of those who sought out the porn

theaters were not so sure of their carnal inclinations, and the theaters provided an exploratory, educational platform for them. For some, these spaces were deeply important sanctuaries of sexual introduction that embodied Warner's remark, "Individuals do not go shopping for sexual identity, but they do have a stake in a culture that enables sexual variance and circulates knowledge about it, because they have no other way of knowing what they might or might not want, or what they might become, or with whom they might find a common lot" (Warner 2000, 7). By expelling sexual variation from commercial inclusion in Giuliani's Times Square and heteronormatively homogenizing it instead, The Forty-second Street Development Project disembodied this culture and halted this theater-aided flow of "knowledge." The consequence: a problem of access for the men—of past, present, and future—who relied or who would come to rely on the porn theaters for these self-actualizing sexual experiences.

Robert McRuer and Abby Wilkerson argue that "…conceptions of access remain vigilantly attentive to the production of space" in the cultural present (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 2). Here, "production of space" is synonymous with the elimination thereof (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 2): the rezoning that effectually eradicates the adult businesses from the Times Square area produces space that can in turn be "…envisioned as predominantly a middle-class [and heteronormatively oriented] area for entertainment" (Delaney 1999, 160). The withdrawal of the space that once invited "…alternative sexual and bodily identities" *makes* space for the majoritarian occupancy of the "…(hetero)normative bodies, behaviors, abilities, and desires," that, prior to the city's redevelopment, would have constituted the minority (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 6). And yet, although variant sexual identities "…behaviors, abilities, and desires" pervaded Times Square prior to the redistricting, Delaney reminds *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* readers that the previous majoritarian presence of these aberrances was dominant only in that small spatial context:

> The easy argument already in place…is that social institutions such as the porn movies take up…a certain social excess—are even, perhaps, socially beneficial to some small part of it (a margin outside the margin). But that is the same argument that allows them [these institutions] to be dismissed—and physically smashed and flattened: They are relevant only to that margin. No one else cares. (Delaney 1999, 90)

Needs relate to space, and space relates to "potential" (Erevelles 2011, 19). There are several questions to ask in a socio-spatial analysis of a commercial public and its ability to meet the needs of those who frequent it. The first, *does* it meet their needs? Whose needs might be excluded? Does the space assist "…individuals, groups, and societies [in] reaching their full potential," or does it hamper their ability to do so? (19). In posing these inquiries, it becomes increasingly clear that space bears an intimate relation to structural violence, and that structural violence seems to be inseparable from space.

Rosalyn Deutsche argues that "…the wholesale reorganization of urban space represents…no mere surface phenomenon" (Deutsche 1996, 14). For Deutsche, such "reorganization…is part of a full-scale social restructuring" (14). This is precisely what is apparent in *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* through the Forty-second Street Redevelopment Project. Delaney writes, "The old Times Square and Forty-second Street was an entertainment area catering largely to the working classes who lived in the city. The middle class and/or tourists were invited to come along and watch or participate if that, indeed, was their thing" (Delaney 1999, 159). The capitalistically motivated makeover of Times Square offered "…a middle-class area for entertainment, to which the working classes [were] welcome to come along, observe, and take part in, if they can pay and are willing to blend in" (Delaney 1999, 161). Much hinges on "if," in such a way that "if" becomes its own mode of exclusion, barring from the socioeconomic architecture of the new Times Square the working class members who cannot pay and those—of any class—who are not *willing* to blend in.

Deutsche's definition of urban "revitalization," "…a word whose positive connotations reflect nothing other than 'the sort of middle-class ethnocentrism that views the replacement of low-status groups by middle-class groups as beneficial by definition" (1996, 12), offers an classification for the redevelopment work carried out under the Giuliani administration. "Replacement" in the context of the Forty-second Street Redevelopment Project, however, necessitates further elaboration (12). The "revitalization" of the Times Square area speaks not only to the replacement of low-status socioeconomic groups by middle-class groups as beneficial by definition" (13), but also the interchange of the sexually "alternative…behaviors, abilities, and desires" for heteronormative ideals (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 6).

Like *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*, McRuer and Wilkerson's introduction to the ninth volume of *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* thinks through discourse as it relates to variant sexual identity. "In a backlash to discourses about coming out of the closet, bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men have been told repeatedly to keep it in the bedroom, as if the mere acknowledgment of a non-heterosexual identity were a gross violation of sexual propriety" McRuer and Wilkerson advance (2003, 8). The Giuliani administration's heteronormatively oriented rezoning of New York City read "non-heterosexual identity" as "…a gross violation of sexual propriety" (5) and continued the conversation to impart that "…bisexuals, lesbians, and gay men" should "…keep it in the bedroom" (8) far outside of the "family friendly" boundaries of the newly redesigned Times Square.

That dominant ideology tends to characterize "…[sexually] anti-normative subject-citizens as 'isolated perverts'" only further strengthens Delaney's point that "…social institutions" like the porn theaters are "…socially beneficial to…(a margin outside the margin)," and are therefore easily "…smashed and flattened" given their pertinence to "…that margin" (Muñoz 2009, 52; Delaney 90). The spatially related needs of the social minority are diminutive in the context of the

dominant ideology, which unsurprisingly advocates for the interests and needs of the social majority (52; Delaney 90). These marginal, anti-normative groups consequently become vulnerable to social—and certainly in this case—spatial oppression. McRuer and Wilkerson address this concept in their introduction to *GLQ:*

> Many, if not all, oppressed groups must contend with a wide array of socially imposed sexual harms. They include restrictions on sexual behaviors and expressions, characterizations of groups according to stereotyped sexual (or asexual natures), and sexually related violence…Yet all relations of oppression (not only those overtly based on sexuality) seem to create their own classes of perverts and those in need of protection from them (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 8).

Just as needs relate to space, spatial oppression relates to *sexual* oppression. In *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*, spatial oppression causes sexual oppression. The specific "sexual harms" that McRuer and Wilkerson address, the "…restrictions on sexual behaviors and expressions, [and] characterizations of groups according to stereotyped sexual (or asexual natures)" (8), find representation in the reinventive agenda of the Giuliani administration. As Delaney's conversation with Savoy customer, Bill, reminds *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* readers, the city's rezoning of Times Square's sex specific businesses to the waterfront had the potential to spawn the "…sexually related violence" that McRuer and Wilkerson reference (2003, 8). "The men who go over there [to the waterfront] looking for sex will be preyed on by…bashers," Bill says (Delaney 1999, 106).

The Giuliani administration's "…crackdown on public sex" as a part of Giuliani's "'quality of life campaign'" (Muñoz 2009, 53) —a phrase that rhetorically begs the question "quality of life for whom?"— established a dichotomy: the "class of perverts," and "…those in need of protection" from these "perverts" (McRuer and Wilkerson 2003, 8). Thus, Delaney's statement, "As in the name of 'safety,' society dismantles the various institutions that promote interclass communication," where "safety" contrasts with "…everything dangerous: unsafe

sex, neighborhoods filled with undesirables (read: 'unsafe characters'), promiscuity, [and, notably] an attack on the family and the stable social structure" (Delaney 1999, 122). The porn theaters detailed in *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue* are examples of social "…institutions that promoted interclass communication" (122) and despite the administration's identification of these public sex venues as unsafe spaces, Delaney reflects, "Given the twenty-five to thirty years I went to various theaters, I don't believe I encountered a greater amount of madness in the movies than I did outside" (65). Shiny emblems of safety, "…new city developments, such as Times Square, are conceived largely as attractions for incoming tourists…designed to look safe *to* the tourist," but as Delaney puts forth, "…the social and architectural organization" that brings about these "…new city developments" and their corresponding safe façade "…promotes precisely the sort of isolation, inhumanity, and violence that everyone abhors" (155). "Safety," in this sense, is paradoxical.

Delaney's statement that "…the Times Square takeover is one of the larger and more visible manifestations of the small being obliterated by the large" (172) reinvokes the concepts of dominant ideology and capitalism. In his "late 1990s" interpretation of New York City, but more specifically, Times Square, Muñoz notes the replacement of the "…local adult businesses" with "…more corporate representation, such as Disney stores and Starbucks franchises" (Muñoz 2009, 53). These substitutions consequently pushed "queers and other minoritarian subjects…further into the private sphere" (53). The Forty-second Street of Delaney's Times Square and its "…neon visibility of sex shops and peep shows and porn theaters" (Delaney 1999, 92) would "…basically be a mall" (95) under the oversight of The Forty-second Street Development Project, as the capitalistic commercial interests of the Giuliani administration's redistricting supplanted the interclass and interracial contact relations of the area. If "Public sex culture revealed the existence of a queer world" (Munoz 2009, 52) as Munoz puts forth, then the

redevelopment of the Times Square area and the ensuing closure of the public sex spaces that previously allowed "public sex culture" to flourish promptly stifled the "existence" of this "queer world," and the "potential" inherent in this "world" (Erevelles 2011, 16). When re-examined through the lens of the social model of disability, the capitalistic motivations of the Giuliani administration's redevelopment of New York, and the socially disabling structural violence evident in the redistricting likewise glows with "…neon visibility" (Delaney 1999, 92).

Literature Review

Putting pressure on Erevelles' concept of becoming allows us to more pointedly tease out the consequential relationship between the structural violence of the Forty-second Street Development Project, disability, and homosexuality, or more broadly, the sexual identity that is alternative to heterosexuality. When turning an analytical eye on Hortense Spillers "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe," Erevelles delineates disability "not as the condition of being but of becoming" (Erevelles 2011, 26). Importantly, "this becoming is a historical event…and it is its material context that is critical in the theorizing of disabled bodies/subjectivities" (26). This assertion is just as applicable to Ervelles' reading of disability in Spillers' work as it is to the geographic and social restructuring of Times Square and its crippling effects on the Forty-second street area's homosexual patronage.

Celebrated by some as the catalyst for Times Square's flourishing commercial comeback and lamented by others who perceived the project as a dismantling of queer culture in New York, the redevelopment and its subsequent social disabling of the sexually 'aberrant' both qualify as historical events, and without the former, we would not have the "disabled bodies" of the latter to theorize (26). In its contention that the Forty-second Street Development Project was an act of structural violence that displaced a homosexual niche by design, this paper puts forth the notion that the initiative inhibited Times Square's sexually alternative

populace from achieving potential of various sorts, sexual and otherwise. The issue of access that the Forty-second Street Development Project posed, specifically to the homosocial public sex spaces, was socially disabling in that this endeavor effectively stripped the homosexual patrons of critical sexual and interpersonal resources, which were not feasibly replicated or replaced. In interpreting this project and its implications in this manner, we gain the ability to visualize the social disability that resulted from the rezoning as a process not as a fixed, pre-existing state of disability, but as the transition towards social disability under the capitalistically-rooted structural violence of the Forty-second Street Development Project. The redevelopment catalyzed this process of socially disabled "becoming," to confer a social identity that "[was] not a property that [was] inherent" (Erevalles 2011, 34) in any one of these heterosexually antithetical patrons, but was rather "a property 'conferred on' [them] through [their] interactions with the social world," specifically the highly-stylized, heteronormatively oriented social world of the new Times Square. Phrased differently, the "economic rebirth" (Stern 1999) of Times Square precipitated the social rebirth of this subpopulation.

This paper is continuously cognizant of the binary that decisively guides the Forty-second Street Development Project's social restructuring: the individuals who align with its heteronormative fundamentals, and those who do not. The Forty-second Street Development Project characterizes patronage of the public sex spaces "dys-functional" in the ideologically redesigned context of Times Square post-revamp, and impairs the homosexual individuals who frequents these sites in its eradication of them. The initiative affected *both* the individuals and the sites, both of which, I argue, could not subsist in Times Square in an optimal capacity without the other.

Further, my use of the descriptor "dys-functional" recalls Erevelles' observation that "impairment enables the disabled body to experience an explicit self-awareness where the body becomes the focus of attention because of its dys-

functional mode of operating within the norm" (Erevelles 2011, 35). Erevelles describes "impairment"–which I implement interchangeably with "disabled" in this paper–as a manner of "becoming in the world," which orients the self with other bodies in a socially intersecting style (35). Her focus is primarily on the physical determinants of disability, hence her mention of the "dys-appearance (not disappearance)" that follows this jolting moment of self-consciousness, but mine is not (35). Alternatively, I am specifically interested in the "dys-functional mode of operating" (35) that Erevelles mentions, which can—and does—branch out beyond physical facets.The "impairment" that the structurally violent Forty-second Street Development Project inflicts on Times Square's heterosexually alternative populace forces these bodies to become "the focus of attention" of the Giuliani administration's initiative, due to their "dys-functional mode of operating," which I define as their frequenting of the public sex spaces. This "mode" and its commercial ties are incongruous with the heteronormative commercial blueprint and target audience of the Forty-second Street Development Project, causing the "dys-functionality" of these bodies in this context to consequently be thrust into view before they are thrust out of and away from Forty-second Street. In relating the notion of "dys-functionality" in this sense to the lived experience of the public sex space-frequenting homosexual population during the restructuring of the Times Square area, I also invoke Kevin Paterson and Bill Hughes' point that impairment is not "an intracorporeal phenomenon" (Erevelles 2011, 35).

In interpreting the ousting of Times Square's homosocial public sex spaces and by extension, homosexual community, as a socially disabling act of structural violence, I find Robert McRuer's following observation on a facet of the "minority thesis" germane: "a group is socially constructed as a minority because of structural oppression: a heteronormative or able-bodied society has structured the world so that those who do not fit the norm are constituted as a minority" (McRuer 2003, 97). "World" is too sweeping of a scope for the Forty-second street area of this

paper's focus. Perhaps, in this instance, "city" would be more apt, but the general meaning here nevertheless is applicable to the Forty-second Street Development Project. To be "able-bodied" in the context of the new Times Square is to personally align with the heteronormative family-centric commercial values of the redevelopment and to ~~dys-~~function among its streets. In this instance, able-bodiedness preludes inclusion, and paves the path of expulsion for those who are its antithesis. As Delaney reminds us, the institutions that are valuable to a minority—whether that minority is socially constructed or otherwise—are vulnerable, and as I posit through the Forty-second Street Development Project, susceptible to strategic targeting and exile from a given geographic space.

Martin F. Manalansan IV's essay, "Race, Violence, and Neoliberal Spatial Politics in the Global City" is a useful resource for contemplating the precariousness of queer community and its longevity in the modern city in the face of various movements and structures that can easily push out specific occupants and the resources that they identify with or draw upon to enrich their own lived experiences in the space.

> Despite the centrality of the city as the site of queer cultural settlement, imagination, and evolution in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, larger economic and political forces have increasingly and vociferously shaped, fragmented, dispersed, and altered many of queers of color's dreams and desires (Manalansan 145)

writes Manalansan, whose insight here is specific to queers of color, but is certainly also applicable to the queer population at large, with the heterosexually alternative population that frequented the Forty-second street sex businesses serving as a microcosm. In the Forty-second Street Development Project and its large-scale social and ideological restructuring of the area, we can see that the structurally violent initiative embodies redevelopment as Manalansan understands it in his analysis of Greenwich Village and Jackson Heights: a project of "fencing off unwanted colored [and queer] bodies" (Manalansan 145) that is marked by the

collective sequestering of these bodies elsewhere (Weiss 2018, 113). Mere mention of such enisling recalls the Giuliani administration's rezoning and redistricting of the Forty-second street area to the fringes of the city in a resolute redirecting of the "dys-functional" bodies from the new built world of Times Square, then in progress.

The works highlighted in this literature review help focus and focalize the Forty-second Street Development Project's marginalization of the homosexual population that patronized the public sex spaces. This community was ideologically and discursively precluded—recall Giuliani's "quality of life" campaign—from the New Times Square by a socio-spatial initiative that was inherently structurally violent (Muñoz 2009, 53). Thinking in binaries can be limiting, however, in an analysis of the restricting of Forty-second street and the surrounding area, binary-based interpretation can be a useful way of specifying who qualifies as functional and who, "dys-functional," within the capitalistically restructured Times Square, to unequivocally illuminate the structural violence in the Forty-second Street Development Project and its socially disabling implications.

Bibliography

Copjec, Joan, and Michael Sorkin. *Giving Ground : The Politics of Propinquity*. London ; New York Verso, 1999.

Delaney, Samuel R. 1999. *Times Square Red, Times Square Blue*. New York, New York University Press.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1996. *Evictions Art and Spatial Politics*. Cambridge, The MIT Press.

Erevelles, Nirmala. 2011. *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Manalansan, Martin F. 2005. "Race, Violence, and Neoliberal Spatial Politics in the Global City." *Social Text*, vol. 23, no. 3-4, 2005, pp. 141–155., doi:10.1215/01642472-23-3-4_84-85-141.

Mcruer, Robert. 2003. "As Good As It Gets: Queer Theory and Critical Disability." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, vol. 9, no. 1-2, Jan. 2003, pp. 79–105., doi:10.1215/10642684-9-1-2-79.

McRuer, Robert, and Abby L. Wilkerson. 2003. "Cripping the (Queer) Nation." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, vol. 9, nos. 1-2, 2003, pp. 1-23.

Muñoz, José Esteban. 2009. *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York, NYU Press.

Stern, William J. 1999. "The Unexpected Lessons of Times Square's Comeback." *City Journal*, 1999. www.city-journal.org/html/unexpected-lessons-times-square's-comeback-12235.html.

Warner, Michael. 2000. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Harvard University Press.

Weiss, Margot. 2018. "Queer Politics in Neoliberal Times (1970–2010s)." *The Routledge History of Queer America*, Edited by Don Romesburg, 2018, pp. 107–119. doi:10.4324/9781315747347-9.