In the framework of the Anthropology of Tourism it is accepted as a commonplace that the subjects’ identities are under negotiation and that the mobility/ies of people constitute a permanent status in the modern globalized world. In a similar sense, the ‘places’ are not tight cultural entities, but conceptual constructs as defined by social networks in interactions with both other places, and other ‘times’ in a context of complexity diversity and plurality (Massey 2005).

Based on the above arguments, the aim of this paper is twofold. Firstly to analyze the means by which the tourist development has formed a ‘cosmopolitan’ cultural profile of Mykonos island the last fifty years and secondly to show the interconnection between cosmopolitanism and neoliberal tourism market in the recent socio-cultural context.

The analysis is based on long-term research data in the framework of doctoral and post doctoral ethnographic fieldwork. The data concerns life stories, statistics from public records, newspapers and photographic archives.

MYKONOS’ TOURIST PROFILE

Mykonos is located to the area of the central Aegean Sea (East Mediterranean Sea) and belongs to the prefecture of Cyclades. Its total surface is 26.370 acres, while the length of its shores reaches 81 kilometers. It consists of the municipality of Mykonos. The resident population of the island adds up in 11.000 people according to the census of 2011 (E.S.Y.E.). ‘Chora’, as the town of Mykonos is commonly known, impresses and casts its spell on the visitor from the first moment, with its beautiful position, scale and architecture. Despite the
great tourist development of the island, it manages to maintain its cycladic features and traditional look, like few other towns. Ano Mera is the second historical settlement in size. Generally speaking, there are not villages as organized settlements. There are only scattered houses and buildings in the area, and also two organized tourist settlements.

From the Registry of Cyclades Chamber, the official records show intense financial/entrepreneurial activities (1800 businesses of all kinds). Special records related to the hotelier’s and Rented Rooms Associations a figure number of 515 ‘legal’ enterprises (almost 23,000 beds) Apart from these recordings andaccording to Urban Planning Services over 8000 buildings have been built in the last 20 years on Mykonos’s landscape. More than half of them are second holiday homes most of which are rented seasonally by informal and untaxed ways.

Subsequently, the population of the island in high season (July-August) can be 60,000-70,000 people while in the winter season, Chora and the tourist areas (across the beaches) are deserted and the population some times is less than 4000-5000 people (Christmas period).

According to the above, describing Mykonos as ‘a tourist destination’ is directly linked to the presence of visitors – Greeks and foreigners – for years on the island, the continuous influx of people, the constant exchange of currency, the flow of goods and the use of capital – material and symbolic. As a place, Mykonos could stand for ‘ethnoscape’, in other words a space full of people who make up the fluid world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, workers, visitors and other groups of people who move around (Appadurai 1996). Consequently, as a ‘space’ which is associated with the development of tourism – a phenomenon which creates global market networks, engages local societies in international economic and cultural activities – Mykonos can be regarded as a ‘finanscape’. The finanscape is one of the parameters of ‘globalization’ and refers mainly to the increasing freedom of movement, transfer and commercial capability of the funds and of the commercial capital to unify effectively national markets in a new, international system. This characteristic, as Featherstone claims, incorporates local features into more faceless
structures, where the commands of markets and of management centers - which are administered by the national elites or intercultural professionals and experts - have the capacity to supersede the decision making processes on a local level and decide about the fate of the locality (1995).

Turning Mykonos into a tourist area is closely linked to the tourist industry. This kind of industry comprises services and manufacturing, as well as a mixture of diverse projects in the world of business. (So-Min, Miller 2000).

From this point of view, it is obvious that Mykonos is involved in the big theoretical debate on what one could describe as ‘space’ and ‘local’ ‘superlocal’ or ‘global’. As has been argued “For if one begins with the premise that spaces have always been hierarchically interconnected… then cultural and social change becomes not a matter of cultural contact and articulation but one of rethinking difference through connection” (Gupta & Ferguson 1992, p. 8).

The current perception of Mykonos as ‘a tourist’ place – in other words a place where many intercultural means of exchange of people, money, goods and information exist – is tied to theory on “shrinking the world's geography in terms of time and space” (Featherstone 1995).

Furthermore, the open and unregulated markets, liberated from state intervention, represent the optimal mechanism to socioeconomic development. Neoliberalism is determined by the Individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills, strong private property rights. Is also defined by the ‘creative destruction’ of division of labour, social relations, ways of life and thought, reproductive activities, attachment to the land and habits of the heart (Harvey 2005).

From another point of view, in the course of the extensive anthropological debate on tourism as a cultural phenomenon subject to interpretation, ‘Mykonos’ described as ‘tourist destination’ is founded on a system of discourses which the actual system manufactures as
such. These discourses belong to the media and to agents/tour operators who act as mediators as far as a place is concerned and project it as ‘a tourist product’ for sale or for consumption (Nazou, 2003; Nazou 2015).

These discourses also belong to individuals or collective groups, to private or public bodies, within or outside local society who act on the basis of their own interests.

Consequently, Mykonos has acquired a specific tourist identity for many reasons, which had continuously moulded and reshaped the meaning and significance of what is widely understood to be ‘a tourist’ destination and is represented as such. The media have been the primary means of representation, to such an extent, that as Sant Cassia argues in the case of Malta “control of the means of representation is as important here as control of the means of production” (1999). The media, the known and the famous visitors have been the basic carriers/producers of these discourses since the 1930s, when the first steps in tourist development were taking place.

DATING THE MYKONIAN TOURIST IDENTITY

Nonetheless, Mykonos, long before the island was embroiled in the networks of world tourism, had participated in extensive trade and naval networks of the Mediterranean, and at the same time it was an open space to be explored by the ‘others’. It was also a place of origin of immigrants who went to Athens and the USA but also a reception venue for exiles during the period between two world wars (Stott 1982). Communication channels with what could be described as ‘foreign’ is also evident in a very large number of documents by visitors of Grand Tour, written mainly by European visitors to Mykonos which cover the period from the 12th to the 20th century.

In 1930, opening up to contact with ‘the others’ as ‘tourists’ was the result of interest in the archaeological site at Delos. An educated elite of intellectual men, artists, architects and wealthy city dwellers who ‘were discovering’ and assessing these locations laid the foundations on which the ecumenical dimension of Mykonos was shaped (Loukissas 1978).
In the 1950s, Mykonos enjoyed international fame, irrespective of Delos. The emphasis on ‘the authenticity’ of its landscape as an island of the Cyclades group, the hospitality of its residents, the ‘intellectual’ and the ‘natural’ feeling of its folk architecture which many artists and architects were discovering formed the fundamental idea around which the rhetoric aiming at attracting tourists developed.

Towards the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, Mykonos as a ‘place’ was defined by discourses which formed the ‘cosmopolitan’ identity of the island. Characteristics such as discretion and tolerance of moral principles of the ‘foreigners’ rendered Mykonos into a place of ‘freedom’ and a ‘paradise’ for all those ‘non locals’ who wanted to have a break from their western European working routine or those who simply wanted to continue their bohemian and hippy type of life during the summer months.

In 1970’s more than 80% of the visitors were foreigners. They had the hippy type of tourist, according to which students, artists and intellectuals flooded the island and were more welcomed than the rich visitors who arrived in their yachts and did not leave much money on the island. Mykonos in the 1970s was considered an ideal place of welcome for non-conventional elements of this socio-historic period. The island served as a magnet for ‘homosexuals’ – something which holds to this day.

Mykonos was being simultaneously advertised in many publications as the preferred location/resort of high and cosmopolitan society. Famous visitors have, through their own exploits, turned Mykonos – and with that themselves – into a symbol of a place where a particularly aesthetic style of life was available: extremities in style and eccentricity in dress, in entertainment, in heterosexual and homosexual practices, intensive consumer practices were adopted by many who did not belong to the cosmopolitan ‘groups’ of the celebrated. Since then Mykonos has become the primary ground when one could exercise one’s new styles, either they were from Greece or elsewhere in Europe; it was the ‘place’ of tolerance and of welcome for all kinds of experimentation. The non-conventional, the borderline and the carnival style, as well as the ‘other’ are the most popular features of Mykonos as an attractive tourist venue (Bousiou, 1998).
The 1980s and, to a greater extent, the 1990s, were marked by the ways the meaning of these features which Mykonos had acquired were revamped and consolidated. What emerged over and above anything else was the notion of an open and extensive ‘market’.

The Mykonos market combined and still combines sales and the consumption of ‘nature’, the sun, the sea and the ‘picturesque’ landscape of the Aegean coupled with a special kind of ‘tourist’ experience. This experience relates to becoming familiar with a ‘luxurious’ life style which focuses mainly on adopting a discrete aesthetic understanding: many night clubs, restaurants for demanding and wealthy customers, shops selling designer clothes and various sophisticated objects from different parts of the world have created the image of Mykonos – mainly – as a place which trades in style, fashion and imagination especially when it comes to ‘life style’.

Through these new circumstances of existence of the individuals, a view about Mykonos is being reinforced: namely that one important aspect of Mykonos as a tourist destination relates to its direct involvement in the cultural standing of ‘post-modernisation’, which according to Lash and Urry (1994) is the situation whose fundamental make up is consumerism (such as fashion and one’s image) and the ‘de-differentiation’ between representation and reality.

All of the above are matters of pivotal importance in the creation of the ‘tourist’ identity of Mykonos in the 1980s and mainly in the 1990s. During this period, Mykonos could be described primarily as a ‘business’ or ‘market place’ where labour, services, material goods and aesthetic symbols can be bought.

At the same time, this period of time, the local society faced a radical social transformation. Much of the land was commercialized, lost its rural character and served the development plans of local and foreign investors. New economic and social elites have appeared reshaping the social balances of the island and imposing new political hierarchies. ‘Entrepreneurs ‘as a new established social category with specific practices and cultural codes have been in the heart of these new hierarchies and inequalities until today (Nazou 2009).
Nevertheless, Mykonian society, on the one hand, as a society of a rapidly changing agrarian area, still steeped in the cultural code of agrarian societies of Mediterranean area. At the other hand, however, through tourism, its cultural reality is defined by the engagement of identities with ‘cosmopolitan’ (globalised) practices and neoliberal ideologies.

COSMOPOLITANISM AND PLACE IDENTITY

The realization that tourism is the framework of inter-cultural encounters and cosmopolitan perceptions and that the central axis of the tourist industry consists of the various exchanges which take place among persons with multiple identities, who live in different places and differ in their ethnic and cultural origin, are issues which have been debated by researchers-anthropologists and by many others (Clifford 1997; Galani-Moutafi, 2004; Swain, 2009).

However, another notion, which refers to ‘cosmopolitanism’, has mainly been studied in completely different circumstances. The idea of cosmopolitanism has been the subject of research mainly in metropolises or in colonial peripheries where the leading culture of western capitals meets with people of culture or groups of people who have moved away from their place as ‘immigrants’ or have been the ‘inferior natives’ (Appadurai 1996; Moore 1999; Derrida 2001; Tucker 2004).

In the body of literature, the cosmopolitan identity is closely linked to the definition of the world as a melting pot and the notions of globalization and hybridization as well as cosmopolitanism are socially defined perceptions (Friedman, 1997).

Scholars across the social sciences and humanities have been captivated by the concept of cosmopolitanism as a socio-cultural condition, a political project toward building transnational institutions, a political project for recognising multiple identities, a mode of practice or competence (Vertovec & Cohen 2002; Salazar 2010).

Similarly, the perspective of the cosmopolitan must entail relationships to a plurality of cultures, including a willingness to engage with the other and a kind of growing global consciousness that can be integrated into everyday life practices (Hannerz 2004).
Cosmopolitanism, as a concept and discourse, began to be debated by those involved in the tourist industry in the recent past as they placed at the centre of their critical analysis the possibility that tourism, as a phenomenon, could create areas for inter-cultural meetings. The existence and the manifestation of 'cosmopolitan' identities in tourist areas, such as for example Mykonos, is self-evident, without examining in depth firstly the pattern of relations of authority which defines the creation and the management of the identity of a place as 'cosmopolitan' and secondly the ways in which different individuals - tourists, locals, businessmen, owners of holiday homes, immigrants, employees – through their practices participate in the creation or the deconstruction of discourses relating to cosmopolitanism.

The above two axis are the focus of my analysis of Mykonos' cosmopolitan identity and its links with its tourist image throughout the years.

As it has been already mentioned, Mykonos as an island is a representation-key of a cosmopolitan symbol, which is easily accessible and ready for local consumption. The County of Mykonos is reflected, in symbols, as a multiracial environment of different aesthetic options (Bousiou 1998).

The fact is that there are many directions in which the interpretation of Mykonos’ ‘cosmopolitan’ character can be developed. One such interesting direction points to cosmopolitanism as a concept which has been shaped by the strong authoritative power of the tourist but also of the popular publications and in general the media.

The emphasis on the creation of Mykonos as 'a cosmopolitan' place is a popular rhetorical topic with some advertising publications which are addressed to rich tourists. This, in particular, is also the popular topic of nearly all the Greek magazines of various interests which create an image of Mykonos, consistent to the tastes and wishes of mainly the Greek visitors. Mykonos, for the Greek visitors, is the reproduction of an easily accessible symbol of cosmopolitanism. One such image is the one created in the article below, with a reference to “The Manhattan of the Aegean”, written by a Greek journalist for a large circulation monthly women’s magazine (Skafidas 2000, p. 120-124):
“The gap from Europe to Byzantium is bridged in Mykonos. New bourgeois, small bourgeois, middle bourgeois, very wealthy, newly rich, recently bankrupt… Onassis and Callas are no longer here, but in the age of globalization, we all become cosmopolitan – with a respectable property or simply a national loan…”

Cosmopolitan Mykonos is a well-known rhetoric to all those who work in the world of advertising and fashion and in general it is the rhetoric of many businessmen, locals and from far afield, whose businesses are based in Mykonos. It is also the popular rhetoric of many wealthy Greeks who have built houses on the island. As most of the visitors see themselves as part of the island, they include and are included in a cluster of ‘similar’ cosmopolitans, in an ‘imaginary community’ with common ‘high’ preferences and through consumer practices of ‘stating the inevitable differences.

The island’s ‘cosmopolitan’ identity is also promoted in the public political speech, even on a local level where it is coupled with the associated perceptions on ‘development’ and ‘progress.’

As far as the second axis of approach is concerned, attempted in the current document, we identify doubts and ideological changes with regard to the concept of cosmopolitanism and the additional meaning of the concept with that dimension which renders this concept synonymous with the ‘moral’ union and the crossing of cultural boundaries (Falk, 1999).

On the basis of the above analysis, Mykonos is no longer considered ‘cosmopolitan’ in the sense in which this was interpreted in previous decades by a class of visitors but also by many locals who in the past used to qualify the island in this manner. The main reason is that the artists, the famous visitors and various other categories of tourists who preferred Mykonos as a place where they could meet every kind of ‘dissimilarity’ and ‘particularity’, have, since the 1990s, gradually become ‘an extinct species.’
According to many visitors' tales of previous decades, but also through the written vivid account of the media at the time, one of the purposes of visiting Mykonos after the war was to familiarize oneself with the ‘different character’ of the place and its people.

Parallel to this, contact with various ‘others’ opened up avenues for reflection and redefinition of the identity of many visitors, some of whom were able to express in an artistic manner their pursuits and the source of their meditation. Mykonos for many of these people was the primary ‘place’ where every kind of ‘union’ and ‘social interaction’ took place: ‘unions’ with the spirit of the Cyclades, with the ‘divine’ atmosphere of Delos and of Mykonos which were marked – partly – marked by a metaphysical perception of the place.

The moral ‘unions’ happened between those who adopted the above perceptions and those who searched for the ‘other’ values, the alternative values to those which routinely governed life in Western Europe. Meetings which included a variety of individuals presupposed broad ‘limits’ – aesthetic and moral mobility and exchange of ideas; ‘unions’, which suggested the acceptance of contrast and the creation of a sense of community and hospitality among the ‘foreigners’, between the ‘locals’ and the ‘foreigners’, ‘the rich and the famous’ and the ‘simple’ people. In the photographic evidence of the 1960s and 1970s which tried to depict the general ‘climate’ of that era, one can see this type of social interaction to which I am referring. Famous, wealthy, politicians pictured embracing the locals while having fun, locals self-taught artists seen in the company of famous ‘counterparts’, beautiful women and daughters of ‘respectable’ families sitting at the same table as local ‘handsome men’ of the times, groups of young people – Westerners, Americans but also Greeks – bearing the 1970s style feeling totally idle in the summer heat, sitting at coffee shops, wandering around the streets, admiring local textiles and artifacts, singing in the company of the local ‘music lovers.’

This photographic evidence depicting the particular ‘cosmopolitan’ style of the island at that time is complemented by a series of narratives, by locals and foreigners, visitors and permanent residents of the island. They all form the ‘cosmopolitan’ identity of Mykonos, they give meaning to the notion of ‘cosmopolitanism’ through the specific socio-cultural context.
The common denominator of all these meanings can be narrowed down to the search and 
the discovery of the ‘authentic’ character of the place and its people, which is associated with 
‘tolerance’, ‘hospitality’ and ‘discretion’ of the locals with regard to the perceptions and the 
practices of the ‘foreigners’. This is how inter-cultural, intangible and material exchanges 
have been facilitated, thus people and ideas have travelled and met and through ‘the other’ 
they discovered ‘themselves’, this is how people exceeded themselves and managed to see 
themselves being ‘unified’ on the basis of the biggest possible elimination of cultural and 
social distances.

This, nevertheless, does not mean that cultural asymmetries are excluded completely, 
but they were not an obstacle to the existence of a bigger inter-cultural communication than 
that of the 1990s and 2000’s. Besides, many of the elderly businessmen on the island have 
evaluated the asymmetric framework of relations as positive and supportive – as I'll argue 
further on – to the approach of tourists towards the locals. Sure enough when people 
recollect, in their memory, a tourist representation of the past there is always a nostalgic 
glance and an ‘embellishment’ of what it was like and is no longer present nowadays. It is 
nonetheless interesting to see how, even in a nostalgic manner, a feeling of 
‘cosmopolitanism’ is composed by the overwhelming majority of the locals, as this is in fact a 
kind of statement about the character of modern ‘cosmopolitanism.”

Intercultural meetings used to take place between the locals and the ‘foreigners’ at the 
tourist market – still ‘being developed’ – through providing accommodation and food. 
According to Scott (1982), tourism in these two decades continued to be based on family 
homes. The fundamental tourist feature of that period was for the locals to rent out to 
foreigners the houses they had built as a dowry for their daughters or to rent rooms in the 
family home. These services were kind of amateur coupled with generous offers by the 
Mykonian people, as well as ‘friendly’ personal relations. These ‘meetings’ often turned into 
festivities in public places but also into ‘family’ celebrations, to which some local families 
would invite to their homes for a meal the tourists they had met. There were indeed cases
when intercultural contact had led to marriage between locals and foreign girls (and more rarely foreign men).

Communication practices applied by the local society with ‘the others’, – mainly Western Europeans and Americans – the network of relations as well as the particular ‘identities’ of such ‘contrasts’ determined to a great extent the type of ‘knowledge’ which the actual local society had gained for itself. Moreover, tourism, according to an existing consolidated opinion, can act as a springboard for people to reflect on their identity (Galani-Moutafi 2004).

In the framework of this logic, cosmopolitan intercultural contact has also marked the way society itself had selected to present itself to the different categories of ‘foreign tourists’ of the specific period: local society gained knowledge of its special architectural ‘tradition’, of its ‘splendid’ natural landscape, its morals and its local customs which had attracted the attention of the ‘western’ world; all these being the result of how ‘others’ glanced at the local society. It was the product of the ‘cosmopolitan’ logic, as this was represented by the ‘foreign’ visitors and it is this cosmopolitan glance which the locals have assimilated in their own vague gaze.

The knowledge gained and the high self-respect for the ‘local’ and ‘the specific’ as far as the locals are concerned was compatible with perceptions of tolerance of that which could have been described in excess of the ‘local’ limit: solid ideologies on the notion of a place as ‘our place’ receded or were amended. The non locals, be they Greeks or other nationalities, set up businesses, bought fields, built houses and some chose to live permanently on the island.

The long-established local perceptions of the gender were also tried on various levels: the new reality in the labour market of Mykonos as a tourist resort in the 1960s and the 1970s underscored women as the emerging dynamic ‘individuals’ of the tourist industry; the high profile presence of tourists with homosexual practices as well as visitors with anti-conventional ideas about holidays (living in tents, as ‘nudists’) broadened up the scope of local thinking about what is morally ‘tolerable’ and ‘allowed’.
Local society was becoming acquainted with what, under other circumstances, would have been dangerously ‘provocative’ in addition to adopting a smooth acceptance of various aesthetic proposals, put forth by the foreigners – mainly – tourists can perhaps be explained in the light of financial gain which was a strong supportive basis of the ‘cosmopolitan’ character of the time. Furthermore, it is impossible not to take into account the fact that all intercultural meetings used to take place again within a framework of hierarchy and they were defined by ideas about ‘the superiority’ of the European tourists in relation to the local society. One can discern these perceptions in the narratives of the elderly local businessmen. However it is important to clarify that this ‘asymmetry’ was not regarded by the locals as an obstacle in their relations, but at the same time it is considered a fundamental convention of the intercultural approaches between ‘foreigners’ and locals. Many have pointed out that:

“The foreigners may have had manners and may have been more civilized than us Mykonians but they became one with the fishermen..they did not care that we were poor! And some of them would enter local homes and you would not distinguish them from the locals…”

It is important to note that at the end of the 1970s the focus of attention of tourists in Mykonos was the lower class. Middle and upper classes avoided tourists as much as possible

COSMOPOLITANISM AND TOURISM AT THE END OF THE 20TH AND BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century were marked by the mass arrival of Greek tourists – from Athens. The second largest group of tourists came from Italy (they already had a strong presence since the 1980s) while the number of tourists from other European countries dwindled dramatically. The Japanese and Chinese (the latest years) were another distinguishable group of tourists with steady presence,
Therefore, a focal issue of this debate which relates to the cosmopolitanism as it emerges from the above-mentioned matters has to do with the actual existence of this cultural difference, as it is manifested by tourists and expressed through their practices. Having observed that tourists who visit come nearly always from those countries that share the cultural character of the capitalist ‘West’ – a much industrialized ‘East’ which obviously includes Japan and China as well – one can raise the following question:

**In the final analysis, what is being reconstructed, strengthened and confirmed in the ‘cosmopolitan’ area of Mykonos?**

In Mykonos, tourists - no matter how ethnically different they are – absorb Mykonos as a product/image of ‘printed’ capitalism, they consume it as ‘a point’ of coexistence and a manifestation of many styles, which one meets in many big western (and not only) metropolis and which are the primary and the usual framework of reference of daily experience for special socio-cultural categories of western people.

Mykonos in particular, in the past decade and before the crisis, was projected in the tourist industry as a symbol of an aesthetic trend with great momentum, which is mainly represented by the category of ‘nouveau rich” Greek visitors (but also those who imitate their practices) – a trend which leaves little room for ‘other’ aesthetic proposals to exist and flourish. Indeed, the 1990s consolidated Mykonos as the ‘place/field’ where nouveau rich Greeks (and those who imitate their aesthetic options) applied their consumer practices, who – as they are similar to the socio-aesthetic category of the yuppies/homo consumers (Lofgren 1994)– are the biggest percentage of local tourists.

Additionally, the most commercial enterprises set up in Mykonos in the past and recent years, including many restaurants and some night-clubs, are branches or are associated with companies based in Athens or other European or US cities. The brand names of shops and the type of goods they sell contribute to creating a perception of Mykonos as ‘postmodern’ market characterized by the flow and the non-commitment to consolidated and unaffected framework of time and place. From this point of view, Mykonos could be seen as a “superplace” which combines elements of a tourist ‘park’ and a consumer ‘showroom’.
How can one redefine a new case for its ‘cosmopolitan’ identity and in what context can one seek and present a case anew for the ‘cosmopolitan’ character of Mykonos?

INTERACTING WITH TOURISTS AS A COSMOPOLITAN ENTREPRENEURIAL ATTITUDE

The first axis concerns the relation of the locals with the ‘others’, when these are ‘tourists.’ Their intercultural encounter takes place on the basis of supply and demand for tourist services and is governed by the professionalism of one group and the purchasing capability of the other. The relationship of ‘tradesman’ and ‘customer’ they establish initially restricts to a large extent their communication contact. It has less and less a personal/friendly character and there is obviously more indifference in exchanging their cultural ‘load’. Sant Cassia establishes similar conditions in the case of tourists in Malta. The possibility of interaction with the locals is limited in tourist shops and coffee shops, while it seems there is a big gap between the locals and the visitors (1999).

However, the long-term involvement of Mykonos’ inhabitants with tourism has taken on the form of a ‘capital of knowledge’, which has been created by experiences and systematically practised skills on the part of the entrepreneurs in their dealings with the ‘others’, the ‘tourists/customers’ (Nazou 2006; Nazou 2015a)

In Mykonos, the transformation of domesticity and the provision of care into an entrepreneurial gender/womens’ skill has taken on a cosmopolitan nature and is defined by a wide cultural openness. Especially in the family hotels and rooms rental units. The entrepreneurs’ cosmopolitanism consists in a combination of mental and concrete skills and abilities in order to deal with customers, crossing cultural boundaries and moving from one cultural context (the local/Greek) to another.
Business is a concrete activity that requires actual skills and, in this respect, cosmopolitan competencies are essential to business success. This implies that cosmopolitanism is not always a matter of the entrepreneurs’ will or pleasure. Despite the fact that they need to do so for reasons of financial interest, Mykonian people gendered entrepreneurial experience is defined by a wide cultural openness and the re-examination of domestic labour as a cosmopolitan practice has been linked primely to female entrepreneurial practices. These practices are defined more by a cultural openness and cosmopolitan ways of thinking and less by traditional values and stereotyped attitudes of the local culture.

COSMOPOLITANISM AND THE ‘OTHERS’

Another area in which one could map out symbolically the diffusion of the limits between the locals and the ‘others’ lies in the intermediate space defined by the relationships among those who live on the island and consider Mykonos as ‘place of residence.’ There are intensely discernible cultural categories of individuals who live on the island. Mykonos is inhabited by many and different ‘residents’ who see it in many different ways: those who work in the tourist industry – men and women – seasonal or not, and mainly economic migrants from Eastern Europe, Albania, India, Pakistan are a large and noticeable category of ‘foreign’ residents, perhaps the largest category after the ‘locals’ or the ‘indigenous’ Mykonians. Some of the migrants, having lived for more than a decade on the island and having secured some capital, bought plots of land to build a house or use them for tourist purposes. This happened in the last decades and it was associated with the appearance of a small-scale business activity by migrant families who settled on the island assuming a more permanent character. With respect to the above and as Bianchi has shown in most resorts the tourism workforce does not constitute a unified social category (2000).

Another small socio-cultural category is the various foreigners – Europeans and Americans in their majority – who set up businesses, bought houses and plots of land and live on the island during winter and summer. This group also includes some foreign women
who while they are married to locals, they have become very close and they socialize with
other foreign residents more than the family or the local social circle of their husbands.

The categories which relate to those who share Mykonos ‘in terms of space’ have to
include Greeks from different parts of Greece who, in search of a better professional career
than the one they have in their place of origin, in the countryside or the big city, they saw
Mykonos as the place of their professional success and the location where their financial
designs would be affected. On this category of residents, anthropologist M Stott, towards the
end of the 1970s, has noted the tension that exists between the locals and the non locals
working in Mykonos.(1982).

The question that arises with regard to this particular case is the basis on which the
cosmopolitan code among the above categories takes effect.

The presence of economic migrants, foreign (part time/full time) workers and the way a
large part of the local society sees them as ‘foreign body’ questions the consolidated
perception of Mykonos as a ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘ecumenical’ place, at least the way the
media and the visitors describe the island in the time of the Greek crises. Their low-paid
uninsured labor, their non-existent labor rights, their living conditions, the power
relationships in which they are involved and finally, the social and racists discrimination they
faced, all indicate the following:

there is a large part of this ‘ecumenical’ or cosmopolitan idea which has not been
‘realized’ and this is where the core of the issue lies in tourist neoliberal places such
as Mykonos island.

AS A CONCLUSION

Butler’s opinion on this is particularly important; she stresses that ‘the ecumenical begins
to be defined exactly through the doubts of its existing definition. These doubts emerge
wherever some people are not covered by the definition of ecumenical and have no right to
assume the position of ‘an individual’ but in spite of all this they demand that they are
included in the notion of ecumenical (1999, p. 65). The future definition of
ecumenical/cosmopolitan, however, can only exist if we find way to see which aspects of
ecumenical are proposed, on which prohibitions they are based and how the introduction of those who are excluded from the ecumenical world demands a radical reassessment of our thought with regard to ‘ecumenical’.

In sum, as it has been shown by the analysis of the ways in which Mykonos identified as cosmopolitan and tourist place through perceptions, discourses and practices of those who were and still are involved in the tourist trajectory, there are always historical and social contexts where identity are inscribed. These identities are constantly determined by the current balance of political forces/authorities and can not be viewed independently of the power relationships and interests that link local communities to international financial arenas.

From this perspective, interpretative approaches that bring cosmopolitanism / cosmopolitanism into a ‘critical’ dimension, reposition them in the field of hope for social change and improvement of the world which we live in, are a very useful lens to think about what has been argued in this paper.

From this point of view Swain’s questions / arguments, when referring to cosmopolitanism and worldmaking in the critical study of tourism seem to be at the center of my own reflection as she emphasizes «If these two related (?) constructs provide any hope for equitable power relations and knowledge sharing for tourism practitioners» and finally she argues that «we can find ethnographic evidence in global governance, corporate policies and individual behaviour to be sceptical about cosmopolitanism and, yet, cautiously hopeful» (2007, p. 507).
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