Introduction

The Other Side of the Coin Beyond Metaphor

In 1992-3 European citizenship was established in the Maastricht Treaty. Ten years later, as an implementation of another provision of the same Treaty, the euro was introduced into 12 countries, becoming the currency of the nearly 300 million citizens of the Union. At first sight, no relevant correlation between these two events can be detected, if not the obvious fact that both regard individuals that are nationals of one of the European Union countries. Therefore, “The Other Side of the Coin” formula could be just a vague metaphor for the “human side” of the single currency and (especially) of the problems affecting common people in Europe. In this case, there would not be any need for a scientific community engagement and a good media coverage of the experiences, feelings and concerns of people carrying the euro in their pockets would be enough.

What is needed, on the contrary, is an effort aimed at unveiling the multiple relations that link the two processes of building the citizenship of the Union as an individual, social, institutional and community phenomenon, on one hand, and the establishment of the euro as the currency of the majority of Europeans, on the other.

To this end, I will try to identify and define those inner dimensions of the single currency that can be presumed to be connecting it to the European citizenship-building process. It is a basic but necessary exercise. Before that, some founding elements of European citizenship intended as a process will be highlighted. After that, some reflections on the more general meaning of the relation between the single currency and European citizenship will be advanced.

The rationale for this exercise lies upon a phenomenological, rather than normative, approach, which in this case has two main implications. The first one is to view the European Union as a "democratic experiment", that is, an attempt to build a polity and a political community which is not a (good or bad) copy of a nation state, thus overcoming any "methodological nationalism" (Beck and Grande 2007, 17-18).
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The second implication is to consider citizenship as a phenomenon in which people not only benefit from institutional decisions, but also take part in the construction of citizenship itself, being involved in and creating social meanings and relations. The introduction of the single currency can be considered to be a top down operation (and this is true), but it cannot be forgotten how citizens have dealt with the euro – in a sense, the most interesting part of the story, which is the one of a top down and a bottom up process.

European Citizenship at Stake

The definition exercise of this paper, however, must not only take into account that the hidden dimensions of the single currency have to be identified, but also that European citizenship itself is "a puzzle" (Bellamy and Warleigh 2001). In other words, it is not clear as to precisely what the single currency would be in relation to. Addressing this puzzle in a synthetic way is therefore a necessary task. First of all, European citizenship cannot only be intended as a fixed juridical status. It is indeed also a process of redefining and increasing the content and extension of citizenship itself. Moreover, it goes well beyond its juridical content, covering social, cultural, economic and political dimensions.

All of that can be easily detected if citizenship of the Union is observed not only in the Treaties, but also in the whole Community Acquis and in citizenship practices. This exercise allows us the opportunity to view European citizenship without being tied to the two opposite conventional representations of it: the one, coming from the federal perspective, of an empty box, and the other, reflecting the confederal approach, of a threat to national sovereignty. It can therefore be considered as a non-standard form though it does contain the founding elements of citizenship in general.

These elements can be summarized in terms of rights, belonging and participation. As for rights, they include not only those established in the Treaties (with the addition of the Charter of Fundamental Rights), but also those coming, for example, from the European Court of Justice decisions and from the continuous redefinition of the balance of responsibilities between EU and national states due to the action of social, political and civic movements, as in the case of patients' rights. As for belonging, a sense of identity linked to Europe in its civic dimension, not opposed to, but integrated with other identity components (the national one foremost), has emerged in the majority of EU citizens. As for participation, political participation through the vote (local elections included) as well as civic participation in EU policy making (consultation on decisions, support to implementation), up to the recent right of citizens to propose new EU legislation, are part of the Community participatory dimension.

In sum, after twenty years the content and extension of Community citizenship have definitely increased, and it remains an ongoing process. However these developments are evaluated, there is no doubt that we are dealing with an incremental phenomenon.
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This phenomenon can be viewed today including the following elements for a definition: European citizenship as the membership of citizens of the EU countries of a larger political "civic" community and of a polity operating as a multi-level and polycentric governance system, based on a set of rights established in the Treaties and increased over the years by the Community Acquis and citizenship practices, on a principle of multiple and difference-based identity, and on people participation both in the construction of representative institutions and in the intervention in public policy making on a daily basis.

Having said that about one of the terms of the relation we are dealing with in this paper, attention can now be devoted to the other term, which is the single currency with its hidden dimensions.

**Defining the Dimensions of the Other Side of the Coin**

Moving to the other side of the coin, four dimensions linking the single currency to European citizenship can be identified as autonomous though closely related components of the phenomenon:

- A cultural dimension;
- A social dimension;
- An everyday life economy dimension;
- A political dimension.

Each of these dimensions can be better identified focusing on certain elements. For the sake of being rigorous, these elements should be considered as observables of it, or at least as places where the euro citizenship-building effects can be detected, rather than as components of the phenomenon. They can be summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Observables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>• Currency as a symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Symbols of coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Symbols of banknotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>• Euro as language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Eurozone territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System of communication relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life economy</td>
<td>• Euro as a calculation benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a tool of exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As a repository of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>• Institution-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizenship practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1- Dimensions of “The Other Side of the Coin” and their observables

Table 1 can be considered as the table of content of what follows.
Cultural Dimension

The cultural dimension of the single currency can be defined as the set of values, representations and cultural patterns that are referred to by the currency as a repository of symbols. It is the context in which the European identity of individuals using the euro is built (Berezin 2003; Delanty and Rumford 2005; Risse 2010). The single currency as a medium for the raising of a collective identity can be observed, considering it both as a symbol in itself, and in the sets of symbols represented in coins and banknotes.

As a symbol in itself, the meaning of the single currency is related to the traditional link between currency and state sovereignty. In this sense, the euro can be considered as referring to a new political community. This community, however, is detached from the national one: not One Nation, One Money, but rather One Money, Many Nations (Kaelberer 2004).

As for euro coins and banknotes, it is well known that they have been conceived as a repository of symbols (Delanty and Rumford 2005, 100; Kaelberer 2004; Shore 2000, 87-122; Vissol n.d.), both general (as the 12-star flag) and specific for the new currency. The choice was to put both European and national symbols on the coins, with the aim of representing the EU identity as a mix of national and Community elements, while at the same time it was decided to put images coming from the main architectural traditions shared by Europeans on the banknotes, but with no reference to any real object or place.

So, coins show images and symbols related to national traditions on one face, while on the other they display various representations of Europe: as part of the global world; as a set of countries with their own boundaries; as a continent without frontiers.

As for the banknotes, the images portrayed are gates, arches, windows and, more importantly, bridges. It could be stated that these imaginary objects represent the EU well as an example of imagined community (McNamara 2012, Risse 2012). In any case, it has been correctly said that the euro allows people to carry Europe in their pocket.

What is the set of meanings represented by the euro as a repository of symbols? As could be expected due to the nature of European identity, a plurality of them do emerge. They can be grouped into six categories in each case with Europe as:

- Union of national states;
- Set of national traditions;
- Common cultural heritage;
- System of democratic institutions;
- Continent without borders;
- Bridge towards space and time.

In order to better catch the relation of these meanings with the building of European identity it may be worthwhile recalling the distinction proposed by Michael Bruter (2005, 11-17; 85-87) with regard to symbols of European identity in general. The distinction is between two pairs of concepts. The first pair distinguishes between the cultural and the civic dimensions of European identity, the first being related to
values, traditions, culture and linked to Europe without borders (from Atlantic to Urals); and the second concerning political institutions, rights, rules of a political community – the European Union. The second pair of concepts refers to a cooperative vs. integrative dimension: the cooperative one is related to a variety of states and nations that get together in a union preserving their differences; the integrative one regards the fact that these entities merge in a unique entity, supranational or supra-state.

Using these conceptual pairs the sets of meanings represented in coins and banknotes of the single currency can be structured as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Observables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>• Currency as a symbol&lt;br&gt;• Symbols of coins&lt;br&gt;• Symbols of banknotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>• Euro as language&lt;br&gt;• Eurozone territory&lt;br&gt;• System of communication relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday life economy</td>
<td>• Euro as a calculation benchmark&lt;br&gt;• As a tool of exchange&lt;br&gt;• As a repository of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>• Institution-building&lt;br&gt;• Public sphere&lt;br&gt;• Citizenship practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – References of euro coin and banknote symbols to Civic / Cultural and Cooperative / Integrative Dimensions
Source: Moro 2011, 42.

It is worth noting that the impact of euro symbols on the European identity of individuals takes place also in the case – widespread nowadays – in which the single currency is considered with anger, due to its real or supposed responsibility for the current problems affecting the Eurozone citizens (the finger-and-moon question). In other words, the money does not need to be loved in order to reach its identity effects (Kaelberer 2007).

**Social Dimension**

The social dimension of the single currency can be defined as the set of interactions, representations, institutions and communication and exchange relations that give place to a social environment which people using the single currency live in and belong to. From this perspective, the euro can be considered as a communication tool linking people together.

This dimension of the euro can be observed in various elements, three of which seem to have a relevant standing.

The first one is the single currency as a language. In a Union characterized by the “polygamy of languages” (Beck and Grande 2007, 103; see also Berezin 2003, 16), the euro is the only existent common language. Of course, the euro is not the same as the 23 languages spoken by Europeans. Nevertheless, like other non-natural languages, it is a system of signs associated with meanings which works as a communication tool. As
will be highlighted below, these meanings cannot be restricted to a purely economic range. Anyway, from this point of view, it could be said that those belonging to the Eurozone are “Euro-speaking” countries.

The second element is that the euro has given place to a new territory. It can be easily observed in the following map of Europe.
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Figure 1- Map of the Eurozone
Source: Moro 2011, 54.

Observing this map, some features can be noticed. Firstly, the Eurozone does not coincide with the territory of the European Union. Before the introduction of the single currency this territory simply did not exist. Secondly, the borders are not clean: there are countries that use the single currency, countries that have opted out though participating in the EMU, countries that are supposed to be going to adopt the single currency, countries that use the euro without being members of the European Union (such as Montenegro or Kosovo). Thirdly, there are countries belonging to this territory that are not adjoining (e.g. Finland and Estonia), so that is not easy to consider the Eurozone as similar to a national territory; but at the same time it is difficult not to recognize it as a specific one.

It may be noted (Amico n.d.; Risse 2010, 56-57; Schmidt 2012) that – as in the analogous case of the Schengen area – the euro represents an example of “variable geometry Europe”. The paradox of a currency conceived to unite the EU citizens that has produced the opposite effect, that is, to divide them, can also be noted. In any case, in terms of identification of the social dimension of the single currency, it is
enough to maintain that it has given place to an environment materialized in a territory.

A third element to be mentioned as an observable of the social dimension of the single currency is the system of relations of communication and exchange the euro has favoured (see Berezin 2000; Helleiner 2001). “Communication” and “exchange” in this case would not be considered in an abstract or metaphoric sense, but rather in a fairly material way. This matter has been observed in studying the phenomenon of the migration of coins from one country to another. For example, a study on the “Euro Invasion of France” by German, Spanish and Belgian coins (Jacobs 2007) showed that between June and September 2002 the number of foreign euro in France almost doubled (from 4.7% to 9.2%). In June 20% of Frenchmen had at least one foreign coin in their pocket, while in September there were 48% of them, with relevant differences related to regions and areas (e.g. borders or holiday places). Generally speaking, in the long run it is expected that in each Eurozone country half of the coins used will come from abroad (Moro 2011, 58). It should be added that this matter regards banknotes as well: in March 2011 only 39.6% of banknotes circulating in Italy had been issued there (ibidem).

Linked to the social dimension is the most distinguishing character of European citizenship, namely, freedom of movement. According to recent data, in 2010 almost half (49%) of Eurozone citizens travelled at least once in another Eurozone country; 64% of them maintained that the euro had made it easier to compare prices, 48% that it made it easier and cheaper to travel (European Commission 2010a).

Data on e-commerce support the relevance of freedom of movement: according to a 2007 EIAA research, in that year 80% of European internet users had purchased goods or a service online, with an increase of 100% from 2004, and the first two types of goods purchased were travel tickets and package holidays (Moro 2011, 59).

Also from the point of view of "feeling" European, in 2010 45% of Eurozone citizens identified freedom of movement as the most important meaning of the EU for them (European Commission 2010b). It was second only to the euro itself, which resulted as the main meaning associated with the EU for 49% of them. In general, freedom of movement and the single currency result as being the two main meanings of what it is to be European (respectively for 45% and 40% of all Europeans).

As for the relation between “being” and “feeling” European, it is worth mentioning that, according to the same 2010 poll, the rate of individuals declaring to feel European citizens was of 66% in the Eurozone and of 54% in the non-euro EU countries (ibidem).

Everyday Life Economy Dimension

The third dimension can be defined as the one in which the single currency operates as an agent giving rise to a market, which is one of the founding elements of the EU and Community citizenship. This dimension is in fact strictly related to consumption. The link between consumption and citizenship is, among those we are focusing on in this paper, the only actually contested, both by the scientific community (the “market citizenship” argument – see Downes, 2001), and by social and political actors (“We are citizens, not consumers”).
However, information coming from anthropological (Douglas and Isherwood 2001) and historical (Daunton and Hilton 2001) research show a dense mesh of relations among consumption - and, in general, material culture - and citizenship. Five factors do emerge of special importance: the definition of relevant moralities (the boundary between necessity and luxury); the establishment of a consumers' constituency in the interplay between active consumers, commercial and political interests and discourses based on consumer-related knowledge and expertise; the definition of the economic system by which goods are brought to consumers; the relationship between the consumer, citizenship and the state (that is, the relation between state intervention in consumption issues and consumers' participation in the political process) (Hilton and Daunton 2001, 3-5). Therefore, the citizenship profile alters from time to time also due to changes in consumer patterns and dynamics.

In this framework, it could be said that the concept of the everyday life economy dimension of the single currency could be grasped considering the euro with regard to three roles.

The first one concerns the euro as a unit of measurement or tool of calculation. A simple but very relevant example of this is the data on the extent to which the single currency has become a consumers’ reference point for calculating the value of goods and services. This is evident observing both exceptional purchases, such as buying a house, and ordinary ones, as shown by the following pair of graphs.
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Figure 2 – The euro and national currencies as mental benchmarks for exceptional and ordinary purchases, 2003-2010

Source: Adapted from European Commission 2010a.

This data should not be underestimated, not only in itself, but also because of its less intuitive meaning. That is, the euro as unit of measurement works not only to evaluate what is expensive and what is cheap, but also what is right and what is wrong, what is fair and what unfair, and so on. In other words, the role of the single currency as a unit of measurement goes well beyond the mere evaluation of the price of goods and services; it is rather a general benchmark tool shared by the Eurozone citizens, enabling them to assess, for example, the real accessibility of welfare services, or the value of salaries and then of jobs. The single currency as an everyday life economy dimension is therefore a unit of measurement for several social facts and relations; or, in other words, is “a medium of meaning” (Berezin 2000).
Another role that can be identified focusing on everyday life economy dimension of the single currency is that of exchange tool. The empirical aspect of this is self-evident: it lies in commerce, jobs, and enterprises, which have risen in the Eurozone intended as a market. It is relevant, from this point of view, that the single currency has eliminated exchange costs, has lowered the costs of bank transfers and has leveled the burden of accessing credit for individuals and enterprises, also acting as an enabling factor. Prices of bank transfers, for example, have dramatically decreased: from 17.3 to 2.4 euro for transferring 100 euro (Moro 2011, 58-59). Though it is a critical matter nowadays, the reduction of inflation (around 2% for many years) should also be mentioned as well as the leveling of credit costs around 4%.

To sum up, as an exchange tool, the single currency has connected people living or operating in 17 countries, putting them in the position of being actors of a common market. Of course, it is well known that the European Union itself has been, from its very beginning, a market evolving in a non-standard democratic institutional system. Nevertheless, until the changeover this was a matter of fact for financial institutions, big companies, central banks and national governments, though not for common citizens. With the changeover, Europe as a common market became real for the first time for everyone living in a Eurozone country.

A third role of the single currency that can be identified in the dimension of everyday life economy is the one of repository of value. What kind of value are we referring to in this case? An obvious but not less important answer to this question is that the value is about goods and services. In this framework the well known phenomenon of perceived inflation took place, especially in the first two years after the changeover. It is shown in the Figure 3.

![Figure 3 - Actual and perceived inflation in the Euro area, 1995-2004](source: European Commission 2006)

In the first years after the changeover, then, people felt that the value of their money dramatically decreased, due to the increasing prices of goods and services. No matter that this phenomenon regarded mostly proximity and everyday life purchases; nor that it was related to global trends (e.g. the increase of oil or house prices due to 9/11); nor that, while prices of some goods increased, in other cases they decreased (e.g. electronics – Moro 2011, 68-97; see also ECB 2007). The way in which the changeover was designed and implemented gave rise to an attribution of value to the currency by
the citizens themselves. As a direct effect of that (the euro being, in this case, the moon and not the finger) there was a self-reduction of consumption acts that has been one of the factors of the scant economic growth of the Eurozone. All that means that, independently of the value that institutions (and the market) attach to the single currency, citizens do it by themselves.

**Political Dimension**

The political dimension of the single currency can be defined as the one in which the euro acts as a vector for the construction of European polity and political community. Three observable elements can be noticed here: institution-building; European public sphere; citizenship practices.

As for the institution-building process, the euro can be observed as an agent – perhaps the most important one – of European integration. Borrowing one of Kenneth Dyson’s thematizations regarding EMU (Dyson 2002), it can be said that the single currency has shaped the integration process since it has prescribed a new policy paradigm: one of a “sound” money and finance. In reference to this paradigm priorities have been defined, policies have been designed, institutions and procedures have been established, public discourse and agenda have been shaped. This paradigm has also given rise to an institutional model, the Eurozone centered on the European Central Bank. Technical-oriented leaderships (or technocrats) have then prevailed over political leaderships, both at Community and national levels, though with concerns for non-financial issues such as economic growth, social rights and fiscal policy (as shown by the case of the Europe 2020 strategy).

Related to the European integration process the single currency has been the main reference point for the Europeanization of national polities and arenas, where political leaderships have lined up in different ways towards the paradigm of sound money and finance. This happened both on the side of public discourse, with different motivations and thematizations for the introduction of the single currency (internalization of the external economic imperatives of globalization; dissolution of national identities and sovereignty; means of resistance to the external dependence due to US globalization; means to reconciling the European social model to globalization); and on the side of public policies aimed at addressing the new constraints and challenges coming from the euro (accommodation; transformation; inertia; retrenchment - Dyson 2002, 1 ff.; see also Risse 2010, 177-203).

A second component of the political dimension of the single currency is the European public sphere that in the last ten years – and in particular starting from the 2008 global financial crisis affecting the Eurozone – has clearly been shaped by the single currency itself (cf. Risse 2010, 122-123, 173-174). There is no doubt that the single currency is by far the most debated topic at national and Community levels. Not only political leaderships, public opinion and media, but also citizens and social forces have centered their attention, discourse, and mobilization around the single currency. No matter here if the euro is the “finger” or the “moon” (probably both); what is really important is that the single currency has caused a dramatic growth of the European public sphere, in the sense of a common space where citizens have taken the floor –
literally or metaphorically – dealing with their common fate depending on the single currency, in a deliberative-like way.

A third component of the political dimension of the single currency can be noted looking at citizenship practices, intended as the dynamic relations of citizens with the polity (Wiener 1998), one of the building blocks of citizenship in general. Of course, citizenship practices do not regard the political dimension alone. As we have already noticed, freedom of movement is undoubtedly such a practice. Nevertheless, in the political dimension specific practices take place and their value should not be underestimated. The most visible, nowadays, are the various forms of public and political participation in the Eurozone turmoil. They range from the efforts of civic organizations to represent constituencies that are the targets of public spending reduction policies but have no voice in decision-making, such as young unemployed, immigrants, deprived communities; to social movements such as the Spanish *Indignados*. But voting is probably the most important citizenship practice related to the single currency.

In this regard, it could be said that a relevant connection between institution-building, public sphere and citizenship practices with reference to the single currency can be observed focusing on citizens’ participation in elections that took place in the first half of 2012, from the French presidential and parliamentary elections to the double vote in Greece, from the North Rhine-Westphalia German land elections to local elections in Italy. In all these cases the euro – which was strongly (though not necessarily in depth) debated in the European public sphere as a matter of common, though conflicting, interests – has become the real stake of elections and the citizens’ choices have pushed for a change in the euro institutional paradigm, which is currently on the table of European leaders.

In this way the single currency, which has become at the same time a policy issue and a political stake, could affect that “divorce” between policy and politics that has been till now a distinguishing element of the EU in comparison with the member states (the EU as “policy without politics”, and vice versa for the member states – cf. Schmidt 2006, 22 ff.).

**Conclusion**

*The Euro Citizenship-Effect, and Vice Versa*

Having defined the dimensions linking the single currency to European citizenship through their observables, an attempt to formulate some hypotheses on the ways in which this link operates can be done. In addition, some reflections on the reverse relation, that is, the citizenship euro-effect, will be reported as well.

What can be said, then, on the ways in which the single currency shapes European citizenship? Multiple answers can be put on the table.

One kind of answer to this question is that the single currency operates as a citizenship agent in three ways. It acts as a constraint, in the sense that it sets the perimeter and limits into which citizenship is built and can be practiced. Then, it acts as a paradigm, since it establishes the ways in which citizenship can work. Finally, it acts
as a cognitive and operational space, where individuals are socialized as European citizens and relate each other and with their polity.

A second kind of answer is that the single currency has an impact on the fundamental components of citizenship. From the point of view of rights, it prioritizes citizens’ rights and establishes the material conditions for their exercise. From that of identity, it builds and reinforces the sense of belonging to the European community, both in terms of “feeling” and “being” European. And from the point of view of participation, it is the stake on which the debate in the European public sphere and both conventional and unconventional political struggle take place.

A third kind of answer is that the single currency shapes the content of European citizenship itself. To highlight this point it is sufficient to go back to some of the elements we have dealt with previously. As a cultural agent, the single currency has defined European identity as a multiple phenomenon, including national and Community as well as civic and cultural elements. As a social agent, the single currency has reinforced the European citizens’ common environment, based on freedom of movement. As an everyday life economy agent, it has materialized the EU as a common market, where citizen consumers exchange not only goods and services, but also interact to build material and non-material value. As a political agent, it has catalyzed the Eurozone as a political community and a common – though in trouble – polity.

With regard to the reverse relation, from citizenship to currency, the most important point to be considered is that European citizenship is a trust agent in favor of the single currency. It means that citizenship has produced the link of common culture and interdependence among individuals that is necessary to make the single currency work (Kaelberer 2012; see also Servet 1999; Delanty and Rumford 2005, 80-81). Without trust among their users no currency could function; and this is of crucial importance in the case of the euro: it could be said that, even if the single currency is a money without a state, it is not without citizens.

Recent polls (Pew Research Centre 2012) confirm that, while citizens (especially those living in the countries that are at the centre of the storm) do not love the single currency, they do not want going back to their national currencies. A currency – and especially the euro – does not need to be popular to function as a citizenship-building agent.

**Building Citizenship in the Post-Modern Era**

Concluding this paper, we should focus on the more general meaning – or heuristic value – that the research on the link between the single currency and European citizenship could have.

Traditional, nation state-based citizenship is built through a set of institutions, social facts and social relations which individuals and communities are involved in, from language to territory, from (civil) religion to social capital, from civil society associations to political parties and institutions, from military service to primary schools, and so on. All these elements are citizenship building blocks in their fundamental dimensions of rights, belonging and participation, since they socialize individuals to citizenship.
However, in the post-modern era, and especially in the context of globalization, most of these institutions, social facts and social relations have lost their function, or are no longer shared by the people, even when they live together, or at worst no longer exist (cf. Delanty 2000; Isin 2000; Taylor 2010). This new situation, while it somehow explains the weakening of traditional forms of citizenship, establishes new conditions (or constraints) for citizenship building in the post-modern era.

In this framework, money appears as one of the few social facts still operating in linking people together in a non-purely market way.

Citizenship of the European Union is probably the first attempt (or experiment) of building a citizenship in post-modern era, precisely because it lacks the most part of the above-mentioned building blocks, with the only exception of money. Therefore, observing the relation between the single currency and the European citizenship-building process is in some way an extraordinary opportunity to study and further define how citizenship is built in the post-modern era. At the very end, we could consider this relation as a field experiment, able to offer new information on one of the most challenging phenomenon of contemporary societies.
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