

## 106 versus 106<sup>th</sup>

The superscript 'th' is used in a great deal of unit titles but there is no general rule relating to this to my knowledge. In general terms, the superscript tends to get used for numerical referencing more so for Arms formations and units when titles are written in full words, eg:

1 ATF (the Forces based at Nui Dat) - is usually written 1<sup>st</sup> Australian Task Force. At the time other regular Army Task Forces were located at Holsworthy, Brisbane and Townsville

1 Div - headquartered in Brisbane is known in writing as 1<sup>st</sup> Division

7 Bde (Bde = TF i.e. the Task Force title redesignated to Brigade consistent with world terminology) - At Enoggera/Brisbane is known as the 7<sup>th</sup> Brigade. The Regular Army Brigades report to 1 Div. The other regular Army Brigades are now in Darwin and Townsville.

7 CSSB - at Enoggera is written as 7<sup>th</sup> Combat Services Support Battalion. This 7 CSSB is under command of 7 Bde. Other regular Army CSSBs are located in Darwin and Townsville under command of their respective Brigades.

8/9 RAR is often written as 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> Battalion Royal Australian Regiment (9 Battalions in this Regiment but in this case the title represents the merger of 8 RAR and 9 RAR when the Army was downsized post-Vietnam. 8/9 RAR maintains the regimental colours for 8 RAR and 9 RAR.) 1 Div allocates Battalions to each Brigade depending on roll or tasks.

1 Fd Regt RAA – would be written 1<sup>st</sup> Field Regiment Royal Australian Artillery

1 CER RAE – would be written 1<sup>st</sup> Combat Engineer Regiment Royal Australian Engineers

This all being said, the common practice is to use the short unit titles. The extended titles get used for very formal purposes only.

A difference in format seems to be standard for Logistic units applicable to RACT (Transport), RAAOC (Supply/Ordnance), RAEME, RAAMC (Medical) e.g.

6 Fd Sup Coy sometimes (6 FSC) now 6 Fd Sup Coy 7 CSSB. I commanded this unit for 2 years when it was an independent unit and never in that time, either formally or informally, referred to it as 6<sup>th</sup> Field Supply Company Royal Australian Army Ordnance Corps. It was only ever 6 Fd Sup Coy for formal or informal purposes .

Similarly, 106 Fd Wksp has only ever been known as 106 Fd Wksp RAEME when it was an independent unit (the RAEME title in the unit name was to differentiate it potentially from the generic term workshops which might be used by other Corps. Under the present arrangement the tag RAEME has been dropped because 106 Fd Wksp 7 CSSB is the RAEME component of the Battalion - hence this tag is redundant.)

I am also led to believe the 'th' superscript did not appear in logistic units' names as entered in the Army Orbat (Unit Order of Battle listing).

**Short Answer.** I am absolutely certain that **106** is correct and the term **106<sup>th</sup>** was wrong in our SVN days and still is. (I note our patron used the term 106 only in his 2018 note to reunion attendees - even when he wrote the workshop's name and Corps out in full. Let's use that as the standard!)