



**FREE ID & ESTIMATE SERVICES**  
[FREE WATCH ID SERVICE](#)



## THE WAR FOR VIETNAM TIME PIECES BULOVA-BENRUS-

THE SINGLE CASE BENRUS SYSTEM DATES FROM 1959 THROUGH 1965. THE SINGLE CASED BENRUS HAD A ONE PIECE CASE, A DROP IN MOVEMENT WITH SPLIT STEM & SEALED LONG STEM TUBE CROWN AND WAS FURTHER SEALED BY THE CRYSTAL ALONE.

BENRUS DESIGNED THIS SYSTEM BY COPYING THE WYLER SINGLE CASE SYSTEM WITH OUT THE WYLER OUTER BEZEL. THOUGH MANY OTHER MANUFACTURERS HAD PRODUCED SINGLE CASE DESIGNS, THE REASON WHY BENRUS CREATED THIS SYSTEM WAS THE 1960 RUMERS OF LARGE US GOVERNMENT WATCH CONTRACTS FOR THE UPCOMING VIETNAM WAR.

WHEN THE US GOVERMENT RELEASED SPECIFICATIONS IN 1961 BENRUS HAD ALREADY RELEASED A WATCH TO THE PUBLIC WITH HALF THE SPECS. THEN WHEN THE US GOVERNMENT UPDATED THE SPECS IN 1962, BENRUS WAS READY WITH A PROTOTYPE.

WHEN BENRUS SUBMITTED THEIR DESIGN IN 1963 THEY ALSO SUBMITTED STUDIES OF THOSE REAL SALES AND USE OF THEIR DESIGN --LIKE THIS 3 STAR.

NOT ONLY DID BENRUS EXCEED US SPECIFICATIONS THAT WOULD SURVIVE JUNGLE WARFARE IN VIETNAM, BUT INTRODUCED SEVERAL VERSIONS, INCLUDING THE FIRST NON-SERVICABLE THROW AWAYS.

THUS, IN 1964, BENRUS WAS THE FIRST MANUFACTURER TO RECEIVE A MAJOR CONTRACT WITH THE US MILITARY TO PRODUCE THE FIRST VIETNAM MILITARY WATCHES. OVER 10,000 WATCHES FOR OVER 300,000. [1964 DOLLARS].

BENRUS BEAT OUT EVERY COMPANY INCLUDING THOSE THAT SUPPLIED THE US DURING WWI, WWII AND THE KOREAN WAR. IN FACT, BULOVA FILED A COMPLAINT WITH THE US GOVERNMENTS. ONE OF THE ALLEDGATIONS WAS THAT BENRUS WAS NOT A US BASED MANUFACTURER.



ORIGINAL 1967 VIETNAM ERA BENRUS  
17 JEWEL BENRUS MOVEMENT  
WINDS SETS RUNS KEEPS TIME HACKS  
PERFECTLY

FIRST ISSUE OF 1965  
BY THE FIRST CONTRACT EVER  
FOR VIETNAM WAR MILITARY WATCHES BY US GOV

1967  
VIETNAM  
MILITARY ISSUE  
SINGLE CASE SYSTEM  
JUNGLE FIGHTER  
VIETNAM  
BENRUS  
MILITARY HACKING WATCH  
[>>>>MIL-W-3818B<<<<](#)

B-153564, MAY 4, 1964

TO BULOVA WATCH COMPANY, INC.:

FURTHER REFERENCE IS MADE TO YOUR LETTER OF FEBRUARY 20, 1964, PROTESTING THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO BENRUS WATCH COMPANY UNDER REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. AMC/A/36-038-64-490/NS), DATED FEBRUARY 7, 1964.

THE RECORD SHOWS THAT IT WAS DETERMINED BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AIR FORCE, NAVY AND ARMY, THAT SPECIFICATION MIL-W-3818A, DATED MARCH 12, 1956, REQUIRED REVISION TO ACCOMPLISH THE FOLLOWING RESULTS:

- A. REDUCE THE VARIETY OF GRADES AND TYPES OF WATCHES. [ONE DESIGN]
- B. ASSURE CONSISTENT QUALITY OF ITEMS. [MEDIUM TO HIGH GRADE]
- C. ELIMINATE TESTING REQUIREMENTS OF ONE YEAR AND SUBSTITUTE IN LIEU THEREOF A GUARANTEE PROVISION. [TWO YEARS W/O SERVICE]
- D. INCORPORATE A NEW CASE DESIGN. [SINGLE CASE LIKE WYLER]

ACCORDINGLY, THE SPECIFICATION WAS FORMALLY REVISED ON OCTOBER 17, 1962, AND IS IDENTIFIED AS MIL-W-3818B.

SUBSEQUENT TO THE APPROVAL OF SPECIFICATION MIL-W-3818B, ALL SOURCES ON THE PREVIOUS QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST, UNDER SPECIFICATION MIL-W 3818A, WERE INVITED BY LETTER DATED DECEMBER 6, 1962, TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THEIR PRODUCT OF FRANKFORD ARSENAL FOR QUALIFICATION TESTING.

UPON RECEIPT AND APPROVAL OF THE APPLICATION AS REQUIRED BY PARAGRAPH 104 OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "PROVISIONS GOVERNING QUALIFICATION," SAMPLES WOULD BE AUTHORIZED TO BE SUBMITTED. THREE FIRMS SUBMITTED APPLICATIONS AND SAMPLES DURING 1963, NAMELY, BENRUS WATCH CO., INC., LONGINES-WITTNAUER WATCH CO., AND MATBEY-TISSOT WATCH CO., INC.

HOWEVER, BENRUS WATCH CO., INC., WAS THE ONLY SOURCE THAT SUCCESSFULLY MET THE REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL. THEREFORE, THAT FIRM WAS FORMALLY NOTIFIED ON SEPTEMBER 16, 1963, THAT THE SAMPLES SUBMITTED WERE APPROVED AND THAT ITS PRODUCT WAS LISTED ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST FOR SPECIFICATION MIL-F-3818B. THE OTHER TWO SOURCES WERE NOTIFIED BY LETTER OF NOVEMBER 21, 1963, THAT THEIR SAMPLES DID NOT MEET MINIMUM SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

ON THE BASIS OF MILITARY INTERDEPARTMENTAL PURCHASE REQUESTS FROM THE MARINE CORPS FOR A TOTAL OF 10,849 WATCHES, THE CONTRACTING OFFICER EXECUTED A DETERMINATION AND FINDINGS DATED FEBRUARY 2, 1964, AUTHORIZING NEGOTIATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 10 U.S.C. 2304/A) (10) AND ASPR 3.210.2 PROMISED ON THE CIRCUMSTANCES REPORTED AS FOLLOWS:

"A. THIS WATCH IS A QUALIFIED PRODUCT AND THE TIME REQUIRED FOR TESTING WOULD UNDULY DELAY DELIVERIES.

"B. THE INTEREST OF THE GOVERNMENT REQUIRES ASSURANCE PRIOR TO AWARD THAT THE PRODUCT IS SATISFACTORY FOR ITS INTENDED USE AND NO OTHER MEANS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE IS AVAILABLE.

"C. AMPLE SOLICITATION AND OPPORTUNITY WAS AFFORDED THE CLOCK AND WATCH INDUSTRIES, RESULTING IN ONLY ONE QUALIFIED PRODUCT, NAMELY, BENRUS WATCH CO."

THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL WAS ISSUED ON FEBRUARY 7, 1964, WITH A CLOSING DATE OF FEBRUARY 24, 1964, TO BENRUS WATCH COMPANY, AS A SOLE SOURCE PREMISED ON THE FACTS SHOWN ABOVE. BENRUS QUOTED A UNIT PRICE OF \$28.28 EACH FOR A QUANTITY OF 10,849 WRIST WATCHES OR A TOTAL COST OF \$306,809.72. ON FEBRUARY 20, 1964, AN AMENDMENT WAS ISSUED EXTENDING THE CLOSING DATE TO FEBRUARY 27, 1964. THE PROCUREMENT ACTION WAS SYNOPSISIZED, FOR SUBCONTRACTING ONLY, IN THE COMMERCE BUSINESS DAILY DATED FEBRUARY 17, 1964. AT YOUR REQUEST, YOU WERE FURNISHED A COPY OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ON FEBRUARY 13, 1964.

YOU ALLEGE, IN EFFECT, THAT FRANKFORD ARSENAL IS ATTEMPTING TO CIRCUMVENT CURRENT REGULATIONS IN THE AREA OF COMPETITION AND METHOD OF PROCUREMENT AND HAS FAILED TO CLARIFY AMBIGUITIES IN THE SPECIFICATION, PARTICULARLY WITH REFERENCE TO THE GUARANTEE PROVISION AS SET FORTH IN PARAGRAPH 3.21 OF SPECIFICATION MIL-W-3818B, DATED OCTOBER 17, 1962.

YOU ALLEGE SPECIFICALLY THAT FRANKFORD ARSENAL, WITH KNOWLEDGE OF YOUR INTEREST IN THE PROCUREMENT OF BACK-TYPE WATCHES, CIRCUMVENTED PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS BY NOT OBTAINING COMPETITION.

THE RECORD SHOWS YOU WERE AFFORDED AMPLE TIME TO SUBMIT YOUR PRODUCT FOR QUALIFICATION TESTING AND POSSIBLE INCLUSION ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST. HOWEVER, YOU DID NOT SUBMIT YOUR PRODUCT UNTIL FEBRUARY 13, 1964, A LAPSE OF 14 MONTHS FROM THE DATE APPLICATIONS WERE ORIGINALLY REQUESTED. THE PRODUCT YOU SUBMITTED WAS REJECTED ON MARCH 11, 1964, FOR THE REASON THAT IT FAILED THE SHOCK TEST PERFORMANCE PRESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPH 4.8.9 OF SPECIFICATION MIL-W 3818B IN THAT OVER A PERIOD OF 20 HOURS THE WATCH GAINED 1 HOUR AND 22 MINUTES. THIS FAILURE WAS CONSIDERED A SUFFICIENT CAUSE TO REJECT YOUR PRODUCT AS NOT QUALIFYING FOR INCLUSION ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST. SINCE ONLY ONE OF THREE OTHER SOURCES WHICH SUBMITTED THEIR PRODUCT FOR QUALIFICATION TESTING SUBMITTED A PRODUCT WHICH PASSED ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF MIL-W-3818B AND WAS APPROVED FOR INCLUSION ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST, THE DETERMINATION BY THE CONTRACTING OFFICER THAT IT WAS IMPRACTICABLE TO OBTAIN COMPETITION, AND THAT A CONTRACT SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED WITH BENRUS, APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN PROPER.

YOU FURTHER ALLEGE THAT THE PROPOSED PROCUREMENT SHOULD BE CANCELLED AND THAT THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD PROCEED ON AN ADVERTISED PROCUREMENT TO ASSURE ADEQUATE COMPETITION.

AS INDICATED ABOVE, COMPETITION COULD NOT BE ATTAINED BECAUSE ONLY ONE SOURCE WAS ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST AT THE TIME OF THE INITIATION OF THE PROCUREMENT ACTION, AND SO FAR AS WE ARE ADVISED NO OTHER PRODUCT HAS SINCE BEEN QUALIFIED. IN OUR DECISION OF AUGUST 9, 1961, 41 COMP. GEN. 93, IT WAS HELD THAT WHERE THERE IS ONLY A SINGLE SOURCE LISTED ON THE QUALIFIED PRODUCTS LIST, THE PROPER METHOD OF PROCUREMENT IS NEGOTIATION IN LIEU OF FORMAL ADVERTISING. WE SEE NO VALID BASIS UPON WHICH A DIFFERENT CONCLUSION MAY BE REACHED IN THE INSTANT CASE.

IN ADDITION, YOU ALLEGE THAT THE GUARANTEE PROVISION OF PARAGRAPH 3.21 OF MIL-W-38188 IS UNREASONABLE IN THAT IT REQUIRES THE CONTRACTOR TO BE LIABLE FOR THE REPAIR OF WATCHES THAT FAIL TO MEET ALL SPECIFICATIONS FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS, AFTER ACCEPTANCE BY THE GOVERNMENT, WITHOUT ANY LIMITATION OF REPAIR RESPONSIBILITY WHATSOEVER.

SINCE THE THREE SOURCES THAT SUBMITTED THEIR PRODUCTS FOR TESTING DID NOT TAKE ANY EXCEPTION, OR REQUIRE INTERPRETATION AS TO THE GUARANTEE PROVISION IN THE SPECIFICATION, IT APPEARS THAT THOSE FIRMS WERE READY TO MEET SUCH PROVISION AND THAT THE PROVISION WAS CONSIDERED REASONABLE. ANY EVENT IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT THE GUARANTEE PROVISION IS GERMANE TO YOUR PROTEST OR TO YOUR FAILURE TO HAVE A WATCH APPROVED FOR INCLUSION ON THE LIST.

AS TO THE ALLEGATION THAT BENRUS WATCH COMPANY IS NOT A MANUFACTURER OF WATCHES BUT ONLY IMPORTS

CASES AND SELLS WATCH MOVEMENTS FROM FOREIGN SOURCES, WE ARE ADVISED THAT BENRUS POSSESSES MANUFACTURING FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES AND SWITZERLAND WHICH ARE UTILIZED IN THE PRODUCTION AND ASSEMBLY OF WATCHES AND, THEREFORE, QUALIFIES AS A MANUFACTURER UNDER ASPR 12-603.1. THE BENRUS PROPOSAL SHOWS THAT IT IMPORTS THE MOVEMENT AND DIAL SETTING, DIAL STEM AND SPRING BARS, AND THAT THE CASE, CROWN, ATTACHMENTS, PACKING MATERIAL AND JEWEL BEARINGS (TURTLE MOUNTAIN ORDNANCE PLANT) ARE ALL DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED. ITS COST DATA INDICATES THAT THE COST OF THE DOMESTIC COMPONENTS IS CONSIDERABLY IN EXCESS OF 50 PERCENT OF THE COST OF ALL COMPONENTS, AND THEREFORE THE ITEM MUST BE CONSIDERED A DOMESTIC SOURCE AND PRODUCT UNDER ASPR 6-101 (D). IN THE CIRCUMSTANCES WE FIND NO VALID BASIS FOR YOUR PROTEST, AND IT IS THEREFORE DENIED