



ISCA Red and White Strip Checklist (Full- and Half-strip)

Brought to you by the International Scouting Collectors Association (ISCA)

For an electronic version of this list, go to: www.ScoutTrader.org

Contact Larry Kelley with any additions or changes (RWSListEditor@aol.com)

Ref: ISCAChecklist-RWSIntro.docx

Last Updated: 15 February 2016

Introduction

On the adjacent links is a checklist of currently known major RWS's and reported minor variations. There are probably many additional minor variations yet to surface as new ones continue to be discovered each month and even a moderate-sized collection will typically include several unreported minor variations. Ultimately, unlike CSP's, the RWS group is finite and should eventually produce a "stable" checklist.

There are currently plenty of good publications which provide the historical background of the RWS (and other color/size combinations) which will not be repeated here.

Valuations and ratings are also omitted due to the fact that few can agree on them and they require constant updating/maintenance. For this information, one can reference the latest edition of *An Aid to Collecting Selected COUNCIL SHOULDER INSIGNIA with Valuation Guide* by Austin, Ellis, Jones, Keasey.

Therefore, the main goal of this effort is to present a listing of all known major issues along with their minor variations and additional data (twill direction, border type, etc.) not previously documented. Imagine if the CSP guide or the Blue Book were stripped of all their minor variation listings and related data (T1a, b, c or F1a, b, c, etc.) and you can begin to understand the current state of the RWS hobby as far as reference material goes. Although some would argue those reference books would be easier to carry around!

Full-strip Checklist

Information used to compile the full-strip checklist with related tag, twill, border information was derived from the editor's personal collection with additional input provided through many of the top RWS collections. The full-strip checklist should therefore, be near-complete at 1500+ issues. With the exception of the entries listed in the Questionable / Unconfirmed Issues section, all other entries have been confirmed to exist by the editor (either through physical inspection of the RWS or by scans provided to him.)

Half-strip Checklist

Information used to compile the half-strip checklist with related tag, twill, border information was tougher to obtain as there are few specialists in this niche (and the editor isn't one of them!) The initial checklist derived listings from the RWHS section of the CSI Valuation guide as a baseline to start from. Through input from fellow collectors and culling images from other sources, minor variations were slowly added as well as border and twill types for the known issues. Later, the editor had the privilege to scan all of the RWHS in the near-complete collection belonging to Blake Keasey and this version of the checklist reflects that information. However, it is still far from complete and the continued input from half-strip collectors is greatly appreciated!

Criteria for Major Varieties

Most listings are not consistent with what is defined as a major or minor variation. For this checklist, a MAJOR variation is determined based on visually identifiable differences to the FRONT of the patch:

- 1) Differences in wording sizes:



DANIEL WEBSTER / COUNCIL (/64)



DANIEL WEBSTER / COUNCIL (/45)

- 2) Differences in the gap size between words where the full text is the same width. If the patch is used, the gap size is typically hard to determine so additional information is provided (such as letter alignment) which remains consistent regardless if the patch is used or unused:



8mm gap; R and O offset, N and U align



12mm gap; R and O align, N and U offset

- 3) Solid vs Twill (most RWS are twill but there are a few solid-style examples):



- 4) Letter type differences (squared letters vs. rounded letters, etc. – most notable below in the “O” of COUNCIL):



Squared letters



Rounded letters

- 5) Cut-edge (c/e) vs Rolled-edge (r/e) – not to be confused with border type which would be considered a minor variety (see section below regarding criteria for minor varieties):



Rolled edge (r/e)



Cut edge (c/e)

Criteria for Minor Varieties

For this checklist, a MINOR variation is a difference in the patch that has no other effect on the lettering size or wording width:

- 1) One or more tag variations (tags to border vs tags to letters, etc.):



COUNCIL tags to border, I-S tags middle



COUNCIL tags between letters, I_S tags low

- 2) Border type change (Type 1 vs. Type 2):



Type 1 border with rough twill (TLR)



Type 2 border with smooth twill (TLS)

Type 1 borders have a looser, cross-hatch pattern of stitching and are often confused to be used or stitched patches (both of the examples above are unused.)

Type 2 borders have a tighter parallel or herringbone pattern

- 3) Twill differences (NT, TLR, TLM, etc. – see above examples.)

- 4) Backing variations (plastic, gauze, etc.) where the front side is otherwise identical (the NASHUA VALLEY / COUNCIL cloth vs. plastic back is an example – virtually undetectable from the front except for a small variation in letter thickness which is not a consistent discriminator – the left patch is plastic-backed while the right one is the normal cloth-backed):



Plastic backed (pb)



Cloth backed (cb)

Excluded Variations

The following are variations that are collected by some individuals. However, these are typically subjective in nature and generally require comparing the patch to the other variation in order to determine which one you have. In most cases, these variations also have another minor variation that can be stipulated instead – for example, thinner lettering is typical on type 1 borders as is the dark red.

- 1) Color shades (lt red vs. red vs. dk red). These are omitted because the color shade may be affected/influenced by outside factors: fading (making it appear lighter), soiling or age (making it appear darker) or repeated washings (making it difficult to determine altogether.)
- 2) Thickness of letters. These are omitted because, unless the patches are unused, they may be affected by repeated ironings (flattening of the letters making them appear thicker).
- 3) Extra-rough twill (TLXR or TRXR). These are generally tough to distinguish against TLR/TRR (particularly if the patch is used.) For the purposes of this checklist any patch with extra-rough twill will be considered as rough twill. No issue currently exists that has BOTH rough twill and extra-rough twill versions without having some other, more discernible, variation to reference as the discriminator.

Tips for Determining a Variation When the Patch is Used

Descriptions in any guidebook/checklist assume the patch to be unused. When a patch is used, characteristics such as border type become difficult to determine. If the patch has also shrunk or lost its original shape due to washing, accurate measurements cannot be made. The following are a list of tips that can be used to assist in identification between close variations in the event the patch is used (although these may be true for other patch categories, they only apply to red/white strips, and generally only to full-strips.)

Type 1 borders

- Currently, there is no known full-strip with a Type 2 border AND rough twill. So if the patch has rough twill, the border will be Type 1. (This probably holds true for the half-strips as well.)
- On patches with the standard 64mm COUNCIL on the second line, ALL Type 2-bordered strips will have the N-tag variation on the left side (of the left “leg”). Therefore, if the patch in question has the N-tag on the right side of the left “leg”, it will have a Type 1 border. See below for a full description of the N-tag variation.

Type 2 borders

- Currently, there is no known full-strip with a Type 1 border AND smooth twill. So if the patch has smooth twill, the border will be Type 2. (This probably holds true for the half-strips as well.) This applies to red/whites only and is not to be confused with the fine- or sand-twills found on the older khaki or tan strips.

Tag variations

- Sometimes the tags may be gone or the patch too tattered to determine if the thread is a true “tag” or simply a loose thread (or even remnants of the stitching holding the patch to the uniform.) The tags will always follow the same pattern on the backside of the patch. Since the back is generally more protected from wear and tear, the tag pattern should still remain visible. For the N-tag variation remember to flip your perspective when using this approach – if the tag is on the left side when viewing from the back it will be on the right side when viewing from the front.

Text measurements

- When a patch is washed/dried repeatedly it will shrink in size making measurement comparisons against an unwashed patch difficult. However, if one understands that the shrinkage will occur proportionally and at the same rate across the ENTIRE patch (i.e. the top portion will not shrink at a different rate than the bottom portion) some basic ratios can be used to determine the original text size of your patch. Let’s say your patch in question exists in two variations: 113/64 and 110/64. You measure your bottom line text and it comes to 60mm. Because both variations have the same bottom line measurement (64mm), you know yours “should” be 64mm. Dividing the larger number (unused patch) into the smaller number (used patch) you get $60 \div 64 = .9375$ (multiplying by 100 to convert to % you’ll see your patch has shrunk to 93.75% of the original size.) By multiplying this number (.9375) with the TOP line of both unused measurements, you get:

$$113\text{mm} \times 0.9375 = 105.9\text{mm} \text{ and } 110\text{mm} \times 0.9375 = 103.1\text{mm}$$

This means if your used patch is the 113/64 version your top line should measure around 106mm. If it is the 110/64 version your top line should measure around 103mm.

- A less “mental” approach is to scan your patch. Then, using any image editor, resize your scan until the bottom text is 64mm on your screen (using the previous example) – then simply measure the top line! It should be either 113mm or 110mm.

Checklist Column Headings

Description – reflects the wording on the patch and identifies a MAJOR variation (as defined above.) Text which follows a “/” begins a new line on the patch. Anything in parenthesis discriminates this major variation from another with the same text.

State – the state the council is based out of. In a few cases the name was used by more than one council and therefore more than one state may be listed (either because both councils used it or not enough information exists to determine which one did.)

Have – this is where you can check off what you have. For those that collect some combination of major/minor variations or don’t necessarily agree with how a particular strip is defined you can create a custom list by downloading the Excel version found on the ISCA site and modifying it as you wish.

Border – Type 1, Type 2, or Rolled. In a few cases this column has a “?”. This means the patch exists but did not have a scan to determine the border type OR has a scan but it wasn’t detailed enough (or the patch was too used) to determine border type. The author has endeavored to include ONLY patches that are verified to exist. Eventually whoever does own one with “?” can provide a scan.

Twill – the standard code for accepted twill types (TLR, TLS, TRR, NT, etc.) As with border type some cells may have “?” for similar reasons.

N tag (full-strip checklist only) – this is a little known but consistent minor variation. There are always two tags on the N in COUNCIL for any patch that has the standard 64mm length – one off the left “leg” and one off the right “leg”. The left one seems to switch sides on certain issues and is currently the ONLY letter to exhibit this trait:



Left tag is on left



Left tag is on right

In addition, on Type 2 borders the left N tag in COUNCIL is ALWAYS on the left side. The “flipping” only occurs on Type 1 borders. The N tag column identifies which side of the left “leg” the tag is on (left or right). For issues where this variation is not relevant (such as Type 2 borders where they would all be listed as “left”) or issues where the 64mm COUNCIL is not present, this column is grayed out. This variation does not appear on half-strips.

Remarks – this provides additional information (generally for minor varieties) to distinguish this issue from another – particularly if the patch is used and differences such as gap measurements become difficult to determine.

Abbreviations/Terminology

The following are used in this checklist:

bdr	Border
cb	Cloth-backed
gb	Gauze-backed
ltrs	Letters
MIT	Made in Theatre
NT	No twill
pb	Plastic-backed
ppb	Paper-backed
Rolled	Rolled-edge border
tbl	Tags between letters
TLM	Twill left, medium coarseness
TLR	Twill left, rough coarseness
TLS	Twill left, smooth coarseness
TRM	Twill right, medium coarseness
TRS	Twill right, smooth coarseness
ttb	Tags to border
Type 1	Old style boarder pattern using cross-hatched stitching
Type 2	Newer style boarder pattern using parallel stitching

Checklist Sections

The checklist is divided into several sections:

STANDARD ISSUES – basically if the strip looked like a red/white (or was reasonably close) it was placed into this section. No attempt was made to define a patch as a “true” red/white – that is left up to each collector to decide. Most issues will fall into this section.



Typical full-strip shape

QUESTIONABLE / UNCONFIRMED ISSUES – these are issues that have been listed in earlier checklists but have never been physically confirmed by anyone or known examples have failed under closer scrutiny by fellow collectors.

MADE-IN-THEATRE (MIT) ISSUES – these are issues that were locally made in the country of issue (with or without the sanction of National.) Because I received valid arguments on both sides of the fence to include or not include these in the “standard” section it made better sense to move them all into their own section and let each collector decide on their own to keep or remove this section.



Made in Theatre (MIT)

NON-STANDARD ISSUES – these are generally classified as red/whites but are not traditionally shaped. Many of these are likely private-issues.



COUNCIL/COMMUNITY ISSUES (half-strip checklist only) – many half-strips do not specifically indicate COUNCIL and may actually be community strips. Some are determined to be COUNCIL issues because there is no community by that name (at least according to Google Earth). For others, it’s more difficult to establish this without other information such as a state strip (for example, there is an Aloha half strip which may come from the Aloha COUNCIL or the Aloha, Oregon COMMUNITY). Because these issues show up on current lists they are placed in this section for the collector to determine if they should be considered council or community half-strips. If this determination has already been made, please let the editor know (and what the “proof” is) so that entry may be placed in the appropriate section. Otherwise, the **Remarks** column will indicate possible candidate communities found using Google Earth.

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES – these are red/white shaped but are not council specific (or issued for a specific purpose such as the Toledo Area Council with gold star.) Typically these are not listed on any other checklists as it’s not always clear where to place them (or if they’re even BSA-related.) Some collect these as an offshoot to their “regular” red/white collection and, at the request of feedback, have been included as part of this checklist.



FAKE / ALTERED ISSUES – unfortunately, even with red/whites, fake issues do exist. These are listed here so collectors can be aware of their existence without having to learn about them the hard way! In a few cases a legitimate issue was “altered” but done so without the intent to deceive (such as the TAC/(no country).



Fake issue (no real issue exists with this text configuration)



Altered issue (ITALY stitching plucked)

RETRO / REPRO / HISTORICAL ISSUES – these are RWS-shaped CSPs that have been issued well after the time red/whites ceased general production. Some consider these to be part of an RWS collection while others do not. Patches were placed in this section if they contained design elements (like fdls) or displayed modern manufacturing processes.

Retro Issue – a CSP shaped like an RWS. These are usually (but not always) listed with CSP’s.



Repro Issue – a reproduction of an earlier red/white issue authorized by a council (usually as part of a commemorative set.) These are generally not too difficult to distinguish from the original version and those discriminators will be noted in the **Remarks** column.



Reproduction (r/e)



Original (c/e)

Historical Issue – an RWS shaped issue generally created to represent an earlier merged council that did not issue an RWS (or possibly ANY shoulder patch at all.)



Acknowledgements

No effort of this magnitude can be done without assistance and the following are gratefully acknowledged for providing scans, additional information, clarifications, corrections and suggestions: Gene Berman, Don DeYoung, Jim Erickson, Blake Keasey, Frank Kern, Jay Lockard, Bill Loeble, Tico Perez, Hank Personius, Bruce Raver, and John Shaw.

Additions and corrections may be submitted to the ISCA through RWSListEditor@aol.com. A high-def scan should be included to validate the addition and/or correction.