

# Jersey Bronze Coinage 1923-1924

## Overview

These documents tell the complete story of the commissioning, design, manufacture, and payment for a new Jersey bronze coinage from 1923-1924. Together they form a remarkably complete administrative record of how a small jurisdiction obtained new coinage from the Royal Mint.

---

## Phase 1. Origins

**1st May 1923** is the earliest document in the entire collection. Herbert Freaut, Treasurer of the States of Jersey, writes to the Master of the Royal Mint with a straightforward enquiry: the Finance Committee wished to know whether it would be possible, in the event of calling in the French copper in circulation on the island, to have it melted down and remade into a Jersey copper coinage similar to the one coined "this year" (i.e., 1923). He asks for an approximate cost per £100 and encloses samples of the French coinage in circulation. This letter is the seed from which the entire project grew.

**7th May 1923** is the Royal Mint's reply. The Deputy Master confirms the Mint would be quite ready to receive, melt down, and re-mint the French bronze pieces into a Jersey bronze coinage similar to that dispatched the previous month. The charge would be at the same rate as last year — and here, crucially, the rates are given as:

### Denomination Rate per £100

Halfpence	£11. 4. 0.
Pence	£19. 4. 0.

This is the letter whose rates were later found to have been **transposed** — as noted in the covering letter of 23rd January 1924 from the Royal Mint, which corrected the error, reversing the figures so that pence cost £11.4.0 per £100 and halfpence £19.4.0 per £100. The correction makes logical

sense: halfpennies cost more to produce per £100 of face value because twice as many coins are needed, each requiring the same striking effort.

The letter also reveals an interesting side note: the **British Post Office** held a stock of approximately 400 lbs. of similar French and Italian coins (about £80 worth of pennies) which they would be glad to dispose of at an inclusive cost of £24. The Deputy Master suggests Jersey might find it convenient to acquire this additional supply at the same time. The continuation page — making this suggestion explicitly: if the French bronze held in Jersey is sufficient to produce the additional Jersey coinage required, Jersey might find it convenient to take this opportunity of acquiring the Post Office stock as well.

**4th May 1923** is a brief internal Mint note from Colonel R.A. Johnson to **Mr. Hocking**, asking him to fill in the missing gaps in the accompanying draft letter and noting that the Post Office might be willing to take a conversion rate for their French and Italian pieces. This pre-dates the sent letter by three days, showing us the drafting process at work.

Next is a handwritten note headed "**Foreign Bronze Coin held by G.P.O.**" — a memorandum of the General Post Office's stock:

- French: 14,212 pieces
- Italian: 3,194 pieces
- Miscellaneous: 2,750 pieces
- **Total: approximately 20,156 pieces**

A calculation follows: approximately 20,000 coins at approximately 50 to the lb. = approximately 400 lbs. A further note records that they also had about 5½ lbs. of old copper coin and about 4½ lbs. of melted-on coin gumming (fused coins). This memo is the raw intelligence behind the Mint's offer to Jersey regarding the Post Office stock.

(12th September 1923) is the Treasurer's letter that directly triggered the detailed design discussions. Having collected approximately £1,400 of French bronze pieces, Freaut writes to ask whether it would be possible to **alter the design** so as to keep this new issue distinct from the one already

made that year. He also asks for practical clarification on the bagging of the French copper — whether it matters if he puts £5 or £6 worth in a bag, since the total weight is all the Mint needs.

## **Phase 2. The Bureaucratic Chain of Authority**

The formal authorization process involved an impressive number of institutions, each passing the request upward or onward.

**9th October 1923** is the foundational document in this set: a letter from Herbert Freaut, Treasurer of the States of Jersey, to **Sir William Henry Venables Vernon, K.B.E., Bailiff of Jersey**. It explains that under an Act of the States dated **31st October 1922**, sanctioned by His Majesty in Council on **29th January 1923**, the Finance Committee had been authorized to issue copper coin not exceeding £3,000 sterling. The Committee wished to proceed with approximately £1,400 (the equivalent of the French copper being sent to the Mint), keeping the same pattern as the current issue with the addition of a small star as a distinguishing mark, with £150 of the amount in halfpennies.

**11th October 1923** shows the Bailiff's office — or rather the Lieutenant Governor's — forwarding this to the Under Secretary of State at the Home Office, over the signature of **Major General W. Douglas Smith**, Lieutenant Governor of Jersey. The chain continues upward.

**17th October 1923**, (Home Office, Whitehall) — reference 176131/23 — is a dense piece of official correspondence from the Home Office to the Secretary of the Treasury. It cites the original Order in Council of 29th January 1923 approving the States Act, whose French title is given in full: "*Acte pour mettre en circulation de la Monnaie de Bronze à un montant n'excédant pas Trois Mille livres Sterling.*" The Home Office asks the Treasury to lay the matter before the Lords Commissioners, requesting authority for the Royal Mint to supply the coinage.

**27th October 1923**, (Treasury Chambers) is the Treasury's response, from S/18309, directed by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to

transmit to the Deputy Master of the Royal Mint their authority to supply the coins — £1,250 in pennies and £150 in halfpennies — as proposed. The signature appears to be that of a senior Treasury official.

**Image 15** is the Royal Mint's internal file cover for the whole matter — Mint reference **647/23** — registered under the Finance Department, Treasury, subject: "JERSEY. Act authorizing issue of Bronze Coinage." The routing shows it passed through the Deputy Master on 22/10/23 and Mr. Sydney Turner on 23/10.

**22nd–23rd October 1923** is a neat little document showing the Treasury's internal query — signed by **Sydney Turner** — asking the Deputy Master whether this coinage could be undertaken without prejudice to any Imperial coinage or other work already sanctioned. The reply from R.A.J. (Colonel Johnson), dated 23.10.23, is simply: *"The answer is in the affirmative."*

---

### **The Design Debate: Star, Shield, or Something Entirely New?**

This is where the documents become most intellectually interesting, revealing a substantive internal debate about artistic merit versus administrative convenience.

**10th October 1923** is the Treasurer's letter to the Deputy Master, confirming that the Finance Committee had decided to keep the same design as the last issue, **with the addition of a small star** as a distinguishing mark, and forwarding 72 boxes of French copper coins via the L.S.W. Railway (London & South Western). A handwritten note at the bottom adds: *"Nota: Two boxes contain copper coins other than French."*

But the Royal Mint had other ideas.

**September 1924** is a substantial internal Mint memorandum entitled **"THE NEW COINAGE FOR JERSEY"** — a proper policy paper. It sets out two options with remarkable frankness. The first is the simple star addition, achievable at negligible cost. But the memo goes further: it suggests the Treasurer may have contemplated a more radical change, and would welcome displacing the present armorial design, which "with slight

modification, has been used on the coins since about 1866." If so, the Deputy Master would consult his **Advisory Committee of Taste** — appointed by the King for the purpose of considering coin and medal designs. This committee could draw on the history of the island or its characteristic features. An emblematic design of conventional ornaments might also be found. The memo is a gentle but clear argument for doing something artistically worthwhile.

**18th September 1923 and 20th September 1923** appear to be the typed and draft versions of the letter sent to the Jersey Treasurer based on this memo — making the same two-option argument, noting that the obverse with the King's effigy was common to all Colonial coins and not up for discussion, and that while a totally new design would incur greater expense and delay, the result would be that the States of Jersey would "possess a design on their coins which had commended itself to the artistic sense of a Committee of experts." A continuation page of the same letter, making the further point that if the star addition route was taken, the star should be "definitely removed from the shield" and sized so as to "discourage the idea that it possesses any heraldic significance" — showing the Mint's sensitivity to the semantic weight of heraldic symbols. It also notes that the packing of French bronze in £5 or £6 bags was immaterial to the Mint's purposes.

**30th October 1923** is the Royal Mint's follow-up letter to the Treasurer, pressing the case for a new design still more firmly. It refers to the existing shield design dating from 1866 as being "of itself of low artistic merit," and describes the proposed star insertion above it as "really meaningless." The Deputy Master had therefore consulted the **Committee appointed by His Majesty the King** to assist on matters of taste, which had sent two drawings — one showing **William the Conqueror** on horseback and one showing the **Jersey Coat of Arms** in a new treatment. The Committee's preferred design was the William the Conqueror option.

**6th November 1923** is the Jersey Finance Committee's reply, conveying their "sincere thanks and appreciation" for the trouble taken — and announcing their decision: they would have the new copper **stamped with the design bearing the Jersey Coat of Arms** as per the sketch. Not

William the Conqueror, but the armorial design — though a new, artistically improved version. The Treasurer adds, with slight anxiety: *"I assume that the fact that a new design has been chosen will not lead to a very great delay in the minting of the Copper."*

---

### **Kruger Gray: Design in Progress**

25th October 1923) is the first of three Kruger Gray letters in this batch, written from his studio at 5 St. Paul's Studios, Colet Gardens, W.14. He is posting two versions of the Jersey design showing the Conqueror on horseback — though he cautions these "do not, of course, pretend to be even an adaptation of his seal, for the latter is altogether too primitive." He notes that if Roman caps (letters without pronounced serifs) are used, they go "fairly well with the design." He promises to return the Latvian plaster models by Tuesday with his designs. This letter establishes that Kruger Gray was working on multiple commissions simultaneously — the Latvian coinage alongside the Jersey work.

**10th November 1923** is Colonel Johnson writing to Kruger Gray with the news that the Jersey Finance Committee had chosen the Armorial design. He asks for two models — one for one-twelfth of a shilling and one for one-twenty-fourth — with the date 1923 as shown in the drawing, and models not to exceed 4 inches in diameter. Crucially, he adds: *"These are very urgently required and so are the Latvian. Could you possibly manage to let us have them all by the end of next week?"* — a very tight deadline.

**12th November 1923** is an extract from a letter, reference R.354/22, which is a postscript from Kruger Gray raising a practical question: Colonel Johnson had said the model for the Jersey penny should be 4 inches in diameter, but would it matter if he made it 5 inches? His drawing was already 2½ inches in diameter and if he doubled it to make it 5 inches, it would save time in redrawing and enlarging. This small technical note shows the physical process of coin design — the model had to be large enough for the reducing machine to work from, and the relationship

between drawing size, model size, and final coin size was a real practical constraint.

**12th November 1923** is Colonel Johnson's reply to Kruger Gray, returning two **William the Conqueror drawings** which had been submitted for Jersey, and noting that the models for the new armorial reverses were now needed "as soon as ever possible."

**16th November 1923** is a brief internal Mint note for the Jersey file: "*The penny design is to be received from Mr. Kruger Gray tomorrow, and the halfpenny at the end of next week.*" This confirms the intense pace of the design work in mid-November.

**9th–10th November 1923** is a two-part internal Mint document. The upper portion (9.11.23) is a note from the Deputy Master to Mr. Hocking, asking him to see and "put the new die in hand" and wondering what could be said to Jersey about the date of delivery. The lower portion (10.11.23) is a note from another official to the Deputy Master explaining the technical situation: Jersey requires both pence and halfpence, so new reverse matrices, punches, and dies must be prepared for two denominations. Using the reducing machine from models of the new designs, the coinage could be completed in about five weeks after receipt of the two models. A lead squeeze of the old design was attached to show the inscription. This note also records that a modified design for the halfpenny would be required.

---

## Key Observations

**The rejected William the Conqueror design.** This is perhaps the most striking revelation in the whole collection. The Royal Mint's own Advisory Committee — appointed by the King — preferred the Conqueror design, yet Jersey chose the Coat of Arms. The Conqueror design would have been historically and artistically distinctive; its rejection in favor of the familiar armorial reverse reflects a conservative institutional preference. Kruger Gray's own letter shows he was somewhat ambivalent about the Conqueror sketches, anyway, describing them as rough ideas that "show the main idea" rather than finished designs.

**The star that never was.** Jersey's original request — the same old design with a small star added — was firmly and diplomatically talked out of by the Royal Mint, which regarded it as artistically meaningless and potentially heraldically confusing. The Mint's persistent advocacy for genuine design quality is noteworthy.

**The complete bureaucratic chain.** These documents make every link visible: States of Jersey → Bailiff → Lieutenant Governor → Home Office → Treasury → Royal Mint. Each body added its approval or referral before the next could act. The whole chain from the Treasurer's letter of 9th October to the Treasury's authority of 27th October took barely three weeks — reasonably efficient for 1923.

**The French copper.** Jersey was literally recycling old French bronze coins — 72 boxes, roughly £1,400 worth — sending them to the Mint to be melted down and reissued as Jersey bronze. This metal-for-metal exchange was standard practice and explains why the nominal value of the new coinage was directly tied to the weight of the French coins received.

**Simultaneous commissions.** Kruger Gray was clearly working on Latvian coinage at the same time as the Jersey work — the letters repeatedly mention the Latvian models alongside the Jersey ones. This was a busy period for one of the most productive coin designers of his generation,

---

### **Phase 3. The Design Phase (November 1923)**

**27th November 1923** is the earliest document, a letter from the Deputy Master & Comptroller of the Royal Mint to the Treasurer of the States of Jersey. It confirms that the Finance Committee of the States of Jersey had selected a revised design bearing the **Jersey Coat of Arms** for their new bronze coinage, and that preparation of the die had begun, with delivery hoped for before the New Year — an ambitious timeline.

**18 November 1923** is the most personal and artistically significant document: a handwritten letter from **George Kruger Gray** at his studio at 5 St. Paul's Studios, Colet Gardens, W.14, addressed to Colonel Johnson at the Royal Mint. Kruger Gray was one of the most prominent coin designers of the 20th century, responsible for numerous British and Commonwealth coin reverses. He writes that he has finished the "2/4 of a shilling for Jersey" and explains a deliberate artistic decision: he had **linked up certain letters** in the inscriptions — not out of affectation, but to preserve the size of the letters, since the two inscriptions were "rather long." He argues there is plenty of precedent in old work for this, and that keeping the lower inscriptions as large as possible was essential to achieve "the muscle richness of effect." He concludes confidently: *"I think this design should make a good coin."*

---

#### **Phase 4. Royal Approval (December 1923)**

**21st December 1923** is a brief, informal note from the Deputy Master to P.J. Grigg, urging that the matter of royal approval be handled quickly: *"We have promised to deliver the coins to Jersey by the end of the year."* He acknowledges the submission is "a purely formal matter, but I see that it ought to be done," and asks for the three specimen coins to be returned.

**21st December 1923** is the formal memorandum to the Master of the Mint, noting that the States of Jersey had been authorized by an **Order in Council of 29th January** to issue a new copper coinage, and that authority had been received from the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury. Two specimen coins with the new reverse design were forwarded for the King's approval, along with one of the old patterns for comparison. It is noted that **the obverse remains unchanged**.

**22nd December 1923** confirms the happy outcome: a letter from **Donald Ferguson** to Colonel R.A. Johnson, O.B.E., stating that he had written to **Lord Stamfordham** (the King's Private Secretary) enclosing the new coins for submission to the King, and had "this morning received a notification of the King's approval." The coins are returned with the letter.

---

## Phase 5. Manufacture and Dispatch (January 1924)

**9th January 1924** is a handwritten internal Royal Mint document, reference I.I.O. 647/23, setting out the **charges for manufacture of matrices and punches** for new reverse designs for the penny and halfpenny for Jersey. The itemization covers, for each denomination: one reverse reduction punch, one matrix, and two punches. The total comes to **£31. 10. 0**, signed and dated 9.1.24.

**7th January 1924** appears to be an internal annotation or approval note, partially legible, dated 7/1/24, referring to extra charges.

**1st January 1924** is a formal letter from the Royal Mint's Chief Clerk to the Treasurer of the States of Jersey, confirming dispatch of the pence and halfpence via the **London & South Western Railway**, with a memorandum of packing enclosed. It notes that the weight of old French bronze coins received from Jersey was **7,175 lbs. avoirdupois**, and that the exact equivalent in new coins — **£1,255 in pence and £150 in halfpence** — had been forwarded.

**1st January 1924** are the **packing memoranda**, Form 84a, from the Royal Mint dated 1st January 1924. They record 71 boxes of Jersey bronze coins addressed to *The Treasurer of the States of Jersey, 5 Library Place, Jersey*, marked G.↑R. (George Rex). The contents were £1,255 in pence and £150 in halfpence, totaling **£1,405**. The detailed box-by-box weight records (in cwt., qrs., lbs., oz.) are signed by the Staff Officer "Sabre."

---

## Phase 6. Billing and Payment (January 1924)

**23rd January 1924**, reference No. 647/1923, is the Royal Mint's covering letter transmitting the invoice for the bronze coinage, amounting to **£200. 17. 2** (*Two hundred pounds seventeen and twopence*). It also corrects an earlier error: the charges quoted in the Deputy Master's letter of 7th May had been reversed and should have read **Pence: £11.4.0 per £100** and **Halfpence: £19.4.0 per £100**.

**23rd January 1924** is the **formal invoice** from the Royal Mint addressed to the Master of the Mint, for a bronze coinage of nominal value **£1,405** (one thousand four hundred and five pounds) in pence and halfpence for the Government of Jersey (coin delivered 1st January 1924). The charges break down as:

Item	£	s.	d.
Mint charge: 1d. £1,255 @ £11.4 per £100	140	11	2
Mint charge: ½d. £150 @ £19.4 per £100	28	16	—
Extra charges: 1d. Punches & matrix	15	15	—
Extra charges: ½d. do.	15	15	—
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>

**23rd January 1924** is a letter from the Jersey States Treasurer, **Herbert Freaut**, to the Deputy Master of the Royal Mint, asking to be informed of the exact amount owed, noting that the States' financial year closed on 31st January 1924, and he wished to settle before that date.

**17th January 1924** is a typed extract (original on R.854/24) being a brief letter from "R.A.J." (Colonel R.A. Johnson) to **Kruger Gray**, enclosing a new Jersey penny as a gift: *"I am enclosing herewith a new Jersey penny which you may keep."* A charming personal gesture acknowledging the designer's contribution.

**3rd January 1924** — acknowledges receipt of **71 boxes of bronze coin** — £1,255 in pence and £150 in halfpence — signed by Herbert Freaut, Treasurer of the States.

**25th January 1924** is the final payment letter, from Herbert Freaut to the Master of the Royal Mint, confirming that he had instructed the **Midland**

**Bank** to place to the credit of the **Mint Cash Account, Bank of England**, the sum of **£200. 17. 2** — the amount due for the bronze coinage to the order of the States of Jersey.

---

## **Key Observations**

**Speed of execution.** The entire process from design finalization to delivery took barely six weeks. The coins were dispatched on 1st January 1924 — New Year's Day — fulfilling the Mint's promise to deliver before year's end (albeit just barely).

**The old French coins.** The letter of 1st January reveals that Jersey had supplied 7,175 lbs. of old French bronze coins to the Mint, which were melted down and recast as the new Jersey bronze. This was standard practice — the metal value offset the cost.

**Kruger Gray's artistic voice.** His letter is unusually candid. The linked lettering he describes can be observed on the actual coins produced. His concern for "muscle richness of effect" reflects his philosophy that coin design should have visual weight and presence even at small scale.

**The correction of charges.** The Royal Mint's letter of 23rd January quietly corrects a previous error in the rate quoted, reversing the per-£100 charges for pence and halfpence. The halfpenny was more expensive per £100 face value to produce than the penny — logically, since more coins were needed to make up £100 in halfpence, but the weight-based pricing made halfpence costlier relative to face value.

**Financial year deadline.** The urgency with which the Treasurer sought to settle the account before 31st January illustrates that even in 1924, end-of-financial-year pressures shaped institutional behavior.

**The King's approval.** The speed with which royal approval was obtained — the submission on 21st December and confirmation on 22nd December — confirms it was indeed a formality, but an essential constitutional one, as the coins bore the King's effigy.

## Design Selection, September–November 1923

These documents reveal the story: the bureaucratic chain that authorized the coinage, the design debate that nearly produced a very different coin, and the creative back-and-forth with Kruger Gray before the Coat of Arms design was chosen.

---

## The Complete Narrative: A Final Report

With all documents now in hand, we can reconstruct the complete story of the 1923–24 Jersey bronze coinage from inception to payment.

## Origins: The French Copper Problem

Jersey had long had a curious monetary situation. French bronze coins — centimes, primarily — had circulated alongside official Jersey coinage for decades, a legacy of the island's geographical proximity to France and its complex commercial ties. By 1923, the island held a significant stock of this foreign bronze in circulation, and the Finance Committee had decided to call it in and convert it into proper Jersey coinage.

The first letter — May 1st, 1923 — is therefore not about a new coinage so much as a **recycling operation**. The Treasurer is asking: can we melt down the French coins we have and turn them into Jersey pennies and halfpennies? The Mint's reply is prompt and positive.

## The Authorizing Framework

Behind the Treasurer's initiative lay a formal legal structure. The States of Jersey had passed an Act on 31st October 1922 — "*Acte pour mettre en circulation de la Monnaie de Bronze à un montant n'excédant pas Trois Mille livres Sterling*" — authorizing the Finance Committee to issue bronze coin up to £3,000 sterling. This Act had been sanctioned by His Majesty in Council on 29th January 1923. By September 1923, with £1,400 worth of French bronze collected, the Committee was ready to act on that authority.

The formal chain of authorization then ran: States Treasury → Bailiff of Jersey → Lieutenant Governor → Home Office → Treasury → Royal Mint.

Each institution added its approval or referral before the next could act, a process completed in roughly three weeks from the Treasurer's letter of 9th October 1923 to the Treasury's authority of 27th October.

## **The Design Controversy**

The most intellectually interesting episode in the whole correspondence is the design debate of September–November 1923. Jersey's original request — the same old design with a small star added — was firmly but diplomatically rejected by the Royal Mint, which regarded the star insertion as artistically meaningless and potentially heraldically confusing.

The Royal Mint's position was not merely aesthetic fastidiousness. It reflected a genuine institutional philosophy: the Advisory Committee of Taste, appointed by the King, existed precisely to raise the artistic quality of British and colonial coinage above the merely functional. The Deputy Master's letters are models of diplomatic persuasion — acknowledging Jersey's preference while clearly making the case for something better.

Two alternative designs were commissioned from **George Kruger Gray**: one showing **William the Conqueror on horseback** (the Advisory Committee's preference), and one showing the **Jersey Coat of Arms** in a new artistic treatment. Jersey chose the Coat of Arms — a conservative decision, but one that produced a genuinely improved design compared to the old shield that had appeared on Jersey coins since about 1866.

## **George Kruger Gray**

The correspondence reveals Kruger Gray as a highly professional, articulate, and commercially busy designer. Working simultaneously on Jersey and Latvian coinage, he met extremely tight deadlines — delivering the penny design in mid-November and the halfpenny by the end of that week, barely a month after receiving the commission.

His two letters to Colonel Johnson are particularly valuable. The first (25th October 1923) shows him working rapidly on the Conqueror design while being honest about its limitations as a sketch. The second (18th November 1923) reveals his thinking about the adopted Coat of Arms design: the

linked lettering was a deliberate artistic decision to preserve letter size and achieve what he calls "muscle richness of effect" in the lower inscriptions — a phrase that perfectly captures his design philosophy. He was not decorating a coin; he was creating a small piece of monumental art, and he knew the difference.

His postscript query about model diameter (2½ inches doubled to 5 inches rather than the specified 4) is a practical reminder that coin design in 1923 was a physical craft. The reducing machine that transferred the large model to die size required a model of sufficient diameter to work from accurately, and saving time by not redrawing at an intermediate scale was a legitimate workshop concern.

### **Royal Approval**

The royal approval process, completed between 21st and 22nd December 1923, is revealing in its brevity. The Deputy Master's informal note to P.J. Grigg describes it as "a purely formal matter" — and so it proved, with Lord Stamfordham's notification of the King's approval arriving the very next morning. Yet the Deputy Master also notes that it "ought to be done" — the constitutional requirement was not to be bypassed even when its outcome was certain. The obverse of the coin bearing the King's effigy was common to all colonial coins of the series, but the new reverse design, bearing the updated Coat of Arms, required explicit royal sanction.

### **Manufacture and Delivery**

The physical logistics were efficiently handled. The old French bronze — 7,175 lbs. avoirdupois, the accumulation of years of foreign coin circulation on a small island — was received at the Mint and its exact equivalent returned as 71 boxes of new Jersey bronze coin: £1,255 in pennies and £150 in halfpennies, a total face value of £1,405. The coins were dispatched on 1st January 1924 — New Year's Day — via the London & South Western Railway, addressed to the Treasurer of the States of Jersey at 5 Library Place.

The packing memoranda, detailed to the ounce, reflects the Mint's meticulous accounting culture. Every box is numbered, every coin value

noted, every gross weight recorded. The Staff Officer's signature — "Sabre" — appears on both copies of the dispatch record.

## **Financial Settlement**

The invoice of £200. 17. 2 was settled promptly. Freaut's letter of 23rd January 1924 — noting that the financial year closed on 31st January and he wished to settle before that date — prompted the Mint to send its invoice the same day, and payment was instructed to the Midland Bank for credit to the Mint Cash Account at the Bank of England by 25th January: six days before the deadline.

The invoice itself breaks down neatly. The manufacturer charges for the coin itself totaled £169. 7. 2. The punches and matrices for the new designs — the tools that had to be created before any coin could be struck — added £31. 10. 0. This extra tooling cost, representing 15.7% of the total bill, is the direct price of choosing a new design rather than simply adding a star to the existing one.

---

## **Broader Significance**

This archive is an unusually complete record of a small but historically interesting episode in British numismatic history. Several themes emerge with particular clarity.

**The persistence of colonial monetary relationships.** Jersey in 1923 was not a colony in any ordinary sense, but its coinage was produced by the Royal Mint under authority ultimately derived from the Crown, with the King's effigy on the obverse and a design process that required both royal approval and Treasury sanction. The island's Finance Committee had genuine authority over its own coinage — it chose the design, set the denominations, and controlled the timing — but it operated within a framework of Imperial institutions.

**The role of the Royal Mint as a design institution.** The Mint was not merely a manufacturer. Its Advisory Committee of Taste, its advocacy for artistically meritorious designs, and its willingness to commission a

distinguished designer like Kruger Gray all reflect an institutional culture that took aesthetic quality seriously. The Deputy Master's patient persuasion of Jersey away from the star addition and towards a genuinely new design was an exercise of soft cultural power.

**The biography of a small coin.** What emerges most vividly from the complete correspondence is the sheer number of people, institutions, and decisions involved in the production of a small bronze coin worth one twenty-fourth of a shilling. From the Treasurer of Jersey collecting French centimes, through the bureaucratic chain of authorization, through Kruger Gray's studio in Colet Gardens, through the Mint's engraving department and reducing machines, through the King's private secretary at Buckingham Palace, through the London & South Western Railway to a Treasurer's office at 5 Library Place in Jersey — the humble penny accumulated its history at every stage. The archive preserves all of it.