

A SOLDIER'S LIFE REPORTS

Your ancestor's service, made plain · asoldierslifereports.com

REAL ARCHIVAL FILE — This report reads the genuine 1865 naval general court-martial of Acting First Assistant Engineer William Braidwood, U.S.S. Chimo, a public record of the United States National Archives (RG 125). It is published as a demonstration of the report itself.

A COURT-MARTIAL RECORD REPORT

William Braidwood

Acting First Assistant Engineer · USS Chimo (Engineer's Department) · United States Navy

Navy general court-martial, 1865, Navy Yard, Brooklyn, New York

Family Keepsake Edition · Researcher-Reviewed

Prepared September 2, 2026

Every fact in this report is traced to the page that states it.

Prepared from the original court-martial records of the United States National Archives (Record Group 153, Army; Record Group 125, Navy).

William Braidwood

Acting First Assistant Engineer, USS Chimo (Engineer's Department), United States Navy

Short Biography

William Braidwood was an Acting First Assistant Engineer aboard the ironclad light-draft monitor USS Chimo, which lay coaling at the Brooklyn Navy Yard in February 1865. When the ship's firemen and coal-heavers were kept at the coal past their supper hour, Braidwood knocked his men off work; a clash with the captain, Acting Master John C. Dutch, over whether Braidwood needed a written order to keep his men laboring ended with Braidwood suspended from duty. Tried by a naval general court-martial that same month, he was found guilty of conduct unbecoming an officer and of disobedience, and the court sentenced him to be dismissed from the naval service. The file preserves the trial and Braidwood's own written defense but does not contain the reviewing authority's final action on the sentence.

The Story of William Braidwood and the Coal of the Chimo

In the winter of 1865 the ironclad monitor **USS Chimo** — "an iron-clad; one of the class of light draft monitors," as one witness described her (p. 9) — lay at the **Brooklyn Navy Yard**, taking coal from a canal boat alongside. Aboard her as **Acting First Assistant Engineer** was **William Braidwood**, in charge of the engineer's department. He had been attached to the Chimo since **October 14, 1864**, and she had gone into commission on **January 21, 1865** (his own statement, p. 49).

The trouble came on the afternoon of **February 10, 1865**. The firemen and coal-heavers had worked from early morning, with breaks only for breakfast and dinner, and their **supper hour had been postponed** so the coaling could be finished (p. 13). A little after 4:30 P.M. Braidwood came up and **protested to the executive officer, Acting Ensign Francis Wallace**, that his men were being kept at work at so late an hour without their supper, and he ordered his firemen and coal-heavers to knock off (pp. 9–10). What followed moved down into the captain's cabin: **Acting Master John C. Dutch**, commanding the Chimo, told Braidwood it was his positive order that the coaling be finished at once, warning that if Braidwood disobeyed he would be suspended. "*Am I suspended from duty now then?*" Braidwood asked. "*You are, unless you set the men to work again,*" the captain replied — and Braidwood left the cabin (pp. 15–16, 33).

At the heart of the quarrel was a demand for a **written order**. Braidwood insisted he needed his men in the engine room — the pillow blocks had been taken from under the rock-shafts, one being broken, and the engines had not been touched since the day before (pp. 39, 48) — and that he would put his firemen back on coal only if the captain would give him the order in writing to "cover himself." The captain's answer, more than one witness recalled, was that "*it was a damned pretty how do you do*" if his orders could not be obeyed without writing them (pp. 34, 37, 41).

Braidwood also went ashore that day. The record shows a **Navy Department order of January 17, 1865** and a **Navy Yard order of February 8, 1865** forbidding line officers of a vessel from which men had deserted to go on shore (pp. 18–19) — and three men had deserted from the Chimo. But the captain and the executive officer both testified that Braidwood had gone ashore **with permission, on duty**, to see the chief engineer about engine stores (pp. 16, 27, 30).

The accused conducted his own defense — he "stated that he did not desire the aid of Counsel" (p. 4) — cross-examining every government witness and reading a long written statement to the court (Exhibit B, pp. 46–51). He drew from the captain the admission that Braidwood was "*a competent engineer*" (p. 22), and from the executive officer, Wallace — the very man named in the first charge — the statement that Braidwood's manner "*was neither impertinent nor insubordinate — he spoke to me in a gentlemanly kind of a manner*" (p. 30).

The court, after weighing the evidence, **found the specification of the first charge proved and Braidwood guilty of the first charge; found the first specification of the second charge proved but the second specification (going ashore) not proved; and found him guilty of the second charge** (pp. 42–43). It **sentenced him to be dismissed from the naval service** (p. 43). The seven members and the judge advocate signed the record. What the reviewing authority did with that sentence — approve it, mitigate it, or set it aside — is **not in this file**, and so the story's ending, as the paper preserves it, stops at the court's own words.

The Proceeding at a Glance

- **Accused:** Acting First Assistant Engineer **William Braidwood**, of the U.S.S. Chimo.
- **Proceeding:** Naval general court-martial, convened under the authority of the **Act of Congress approved July 17, 1862** ("for the better government of the Navy").
- **Convening authority:** **Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy**, by precept dated **May 31, 1864** (Navy Department), addressed to Rear Admiral Samuel L. Breese; the court originally ordered at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, for the trial of Acting Volunteer Lieutenant Frederick S. Hill and others, later removed to the Navy Yard, New York (pp. 1–4).
- **Where and when it sat in this case:** Navy Yard, Brooklyn/New York; sessions **February 24, 25, and 27, 1865** (pp. 1, 17, 35).
- **Court members present at trial:** Rear Admiral **Samuel L. Breese** (President); Commodore **William C. Nicholson**; Commodore **Henry Eagle**; Captain **James Glynn**; Commander **George A. Prentiss**; Lieutenant **James A. Doyle**; Lieutenant **Payse N. Westcott** (pp. 4, 17). Judge Advocate: **Philip Hamilton** (appointed in lieu of Samuel C. Perkins, per order of Oct. 11, 1864).
- **Counsel:** none — the accused stated he did not desire the aid of counsel (p. 4) and defended himself in person.
- **Outcome in one sentence:** Found **guilty of both charges** (the second specification of Charge II excepted as not proved) and **sentenced to be dismissed from the naval service** (pp. 42–43); no reviewing endorsement is present in the file.

Charges, Specifications, Pleas, and Findings

The charges were **preferred by the Secretary of the Navy** and dated **February 15, 1865** (pp. 6–7; Exhibit A, pp. 44–45). The trial ran under the **Articles for the Government of the Navy (Act of July 17, 1862)**; the oaths were administered under "*the Twelfth Article of the First Section*" of that act (p. 7). The charge sheet **does not recite any article numbers**, so the governing articles below are named from the code, not from the file (see flags).

CHARGE I (verbatim, p. 6): "*Conduct unbecoming an officer and subversive of good discipline.*" - **Specification (verbatim, p. 6):** "*In this that on or about the tenth day of February, eighteen hundred and sixty five, the said William Braidwood, did, interfere with Acting Ensign F. Wallace, Executive officer of the U.S.S. 'Chimo' while in discharge of his duties, by coming on deck, and in an*

impertinent manner, and in the presence of the men, ordering the coal heavers and firemen to knock off work, they being at the time engaged in coaling the ship, at the Navy Yard New York." -

Governing article (from the reference): scandalous conduct / general article — Navy **Article 7** ("scandalous conduct tending to the destruction of good morals") or the general **Article 8**; not recited in the file. - **Plea (p. 7):** "not guilty." - **Finding (p. 42):** "That the specification of the first charge has been proved." / "That the said William Braidwood an acting first Assistant Engineer of the United States Navy is Guilty of the first Charge."

CHARGE II (verbatim, p. 6): "Disobedience of the lawful orders of his superior officers." -

Specification 1st (verbatim, p. 7): "In this, that at the time and place mentioned in the specification of Charge I. the said William Braidwood having been ordered by Acting Master J.C. Dutch, commanding the U.S.S. 'Chimo' to send Coal Heavers, and Firemen, not on duty, on deck, to assist in coaling the ship, did positively refuse to do so, stating that he, the said William Braidwood had ordered them to knock off work." - **Specification 2nd (verbatim, p. 7):** "In this, that at the time and place mentioned in the Specification of Charge I the said William Braidwood did leave the vessel and go on shore in violation of the positive officers of the Navy Department." (The exhibit copy, p. 45, reads "positive **orders**" — see flags.) - **Governing article (from the reference):** disobedience of a superior — Navy **Article 3** area, or the general **Article 8**; not recited in the file. - **Plea (p. 7):** "not guilty." - **Findings (pp. 42–43):** "That the first specification of the second Charge has been proved." / "That the second specification of the second charge has not been proved." / "That the said William Braidwood an Acting first Assistant Engineer of the United States Navy is Guilty of the second Charge."

The Proceedings, Day by Day

- **Friday, February 24, 1865 (pp. 4–16):** Court met pursuant to precept and orders; members and judge advocate present; accused present, declined counsel (p. 4). Precept and orders read aloud; accused had no objection to any member; declared himself ready for trial; oaths administered to judge advocate and members (pp. 5–6). Charges read; accused pleaded **not guilty** (pp. 6–7). Testimony of **Ferdinand G. Morrill** taken in full (direct, cross by accused, direct resumed, by the court), pp. 7–14. Testimony of **John C. Dutch** begun (pp. 14–16). Court adjourned to Saturday, February 25, at 11 A.M. (p. 17).
- **Saturday, February 25, 1865 (pp. 17–35):** Court met; same members present; proceedings of the 24th read (p. 17). **John C. Dutch** recalled and examination completed, including production and reading of the Paulding order (Feb. 8, 1865) and the Secretary of the Navy's order (Jan. 17, 1865), pp. 17–25. Testimony of **Francis Wallace** taken in full, pp. 25–31. Testimony of **Charles S. Park** taken in full, pp. 32–35. Judge Advocate **rested the case on the part of the Government** (p. 35). Court adjourned to Monday, February 27, at 11 A.M. (p. 35).
- **Monday, February 27, 1865 (pp. 35–43):** Court met; same members present; proceedings of the 25th read (pp. 35–36). Defense witness **William R. Vernon** taken in full, pp. 36–40. Defense witness **George E. Hobbs** taken in full, pp. 40–42. Accused announced he had no further testimony; testimony closed; accused **read his written defense** (Exhibit B), p. 42. Court cleared for deliberation; **findings and sentence** rendered and signed (pp. 42–43).

Testimony Digest

All testimony was sworn and taken under adversarial conditions; what follows is the substance of what each witness said, not established fact. Witnesses disagreed on the central question — whether Braidwood's manner was impertinent — and that disagreement is the substance of the trial.

1. Ferdinand G. Morrill — Acting Ensign, USS Chimo (pp. 7–14). Called by the judge advocate; had known the accused since about Jan. 21, 1865. Direct: he was on deck on watch a little after 4:30 P.M. on Feb. 10 when *"the accused came and protested to Mr Wallace against his men being kept at work at so late an hour, stating at the same time that they had no supper"* (pp. 9–10); the accused ordered the men to stop, Wallace ordered them to continue, and finally Captain Dutch came up and set the men to work. Cross by accused: he noticed nothing impertinent in the accused's manner — *"No Sir, I did not"* (p. 12). By the court: the supper hour had been postponed until the coaling was finished (p. 13); the remonstrance applied to the firemen and coal-heavers only; his manner *"was not peculiar in any way except that the accused appeared to be a little excited"* and *"He merely said to me, that he did not wish his men to be working at that late hour without their supper"* (pp. 13–14).

2. John C. Dutch — Acting Master, commanding USS Chimo (pp. 14–25). Called by the judge advocate. Direct (the cabin confrontation): *"I told him 'if he did not obey my orders I would suspend him from duty' — he replied 'Am I suspended from duty now then?' I said 'You are, unless you set the men to work again' — he said 'he would not or should not do that' and left the cabin"* (pp. 15–16). Produced and had read the order of Rear Admiral Paulding (Feb. 8) and the Secretary's order (Jan. 17), received Feb. 8 in one envelope (pp. 18–19). Cross by accused: he had never given Wallace any order to stop the accused from going on shore, and *"He had my permission to go on shore and return that night"* (pp. 22–24); regarded the accused as *"a competent engineer, but as an officer his conduct was not calculated to promote good discipline"* (p. 22). By the court: on the first occasion (Boston, before the Chimo was in commission) the accused was excited and called an order unjust; *"On the second occasion his manner was insulting and defiant"* (p. 24).

3. Francis Wallace — Acting Ensign, Executive officer, USS Chimo (pp. 25–31). Called by the judge advocate; the officer named in the specification of Charge I. Direct: recounted relaying messages between the accused and the captain, the captain's positive order to finish coaling, and the accused ordering his men below (pp. 26–28). By the court, on the crucial point: *"It was neither impertinent nor insubordinate — he spoke to me in a gentlemanly kind of a manner"* (p. 30). Confirmed the order restricting officers to the ship unless going into the yard on duty (p. 30).

4. Charles S. Park — Acting Assistant Paymaster, USS Chimo (pp. 32–35). Called by the judge advocate; present in the cabin. Corroborated the captain's account, quoting Dutch: *"Mr Braidwood if you presume to disobey my orders I shall suspend you from duty,"* and the accused's *"Am I suspended now then?"* (pp. 33–34). Cross by accused: could not recall the accused saying he had engine-room work, *"but I do not mean to say that he did not say so, as the accused speaks very rapidly"* (p. 34). By the court: *"He was rather excited when he came in; I do not say that he was impertinent any further than by saying he would not turn his men to"* (p. 34). On cross resumed, asked about the captain's profane language, he answered *"No Sir, nothing of that kind was said that I am aware of"* (p. 35).

5. William R. Vernon — Acting Second Assistant Engineer, USS Chimo (pp. 36–40). Called for the accused. Direct: the accused told him he was going ashore to the chief engineer's office with requisitions (p. 36); described the engine-room work and the confrontation, quoting the captain's *"it was 'a damned pretty how do you do'"* (p. 37); testified fifteen firemen and coal-heavers were attached, only ten working, and five or six were needed to secure the rock-shaft (p. 39). Cross by the judge advocate: conceded the wiping down and putting the engine room in order *"could have been deferred until the next day without endangering the ship"* (p. 40).

6. George E. Hobbs — Acting Third Assistant Engineer, USS Chimo (pp. 40–42). Called for the accused; off duty that day, part of the time in the ward-room. Recounted the cabin exchange from the ward-room door, quoting the captain: "*that it was 'a damned likely story that he had got to give all his orders in writing'*" (p. 41); and the captain telling the accused to consider himself suspended (p. 42). Confirmed the accused told the captain he had work necessary that night (p. 42).

Documentary Exhibits and Orders Read

- **Exhibit A — Charges and Specifications (pp. 6–7 as copied into the minutes; original filed at pp. 44–45).** Preferred by the Secretary of the Navy, signed **Gideon Welles**, dated **Navy Department, February 15, 1865**; marked "A" by Judge Advocate Philip Hamilton (p. 44). Introduced by the judge advocate.
- **Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (pp. 46–51).** Written statement in the accused's own hand, headed "To the Honorable Court," signed **W. Braidwood, Actg 1st Assist Engineer**; marked "B" by Philip Hamilton (p. 51). Read to the court by the accused after the testimony closed (p. 42).
- **Order of Rear Admiral H. Paulding, Commandant, Navy Yard N.Y., dated February 8, 1865 (p. 18):** "*Sir, I have received your report of the 7th inst of three desertions from the 'Chimo'. Offer a reward of \$25 each for their arrest. You will not permit any of the line officers of the 'Chimo' to go on shore, in conformity with the enclosed copy of an order from the Navy Department.*" Addressed to Acting Master John C. Dutch; produced by Dutch and read into the record.
- **Order of the Secretary of the Navy, dated Navy Department, Washington, January 17, 1865 (p. 19):** "*Your communication of the 16th inst. is received. In vessels where desertions take place you will not permit the commissioned and line officers to go on shore.*" Signed **Gideon Welles, Secty of the Navy**; addressed to Rear Admiral H. Paulding. This was the enclosure referenced in the Paulding order; read into the record.
- **Convening precept and department orders (pp. 1–4):** the Secretary's precept of May 31, 1864 (naming the court and Judge Advocate Samuel C. Perkins); order of June 24, 1864 (relieving Commodore Thomas A. Conover, appointing Commander E.W. Carpenter); order of July 12, 1864 (moving sittings to New York, relieving Carpenter, appointing Commodore Henry Eagle, Captain James Glynn, Commander George A. Prentiss, and Lieutenant Westcott); order of October 11, 1864 (appointing Philip Hamilton judge advocate in lieu of Perkins). All copied into the record.
- **Referenced but NOT present:** Braidwood's engineer's requisitions for engine stores; the **Engineer's Log Book of the U.S.S. Chimo** (cited by the accused, p. 49); the ship's log-book entries disputed in testimony. These are research gaps.

The Defense

The accused defended himself in person and, at the close of the case, read a written statement to the court (Exhibit B, pp. 46–51), in his own hand and signed "*W. Braidwood, Actg 1st Assist Engineer.*" Its substance:

- On the morning of Feb. 10 all hands were called at 5:30 A.M. and the firemen and coal-passers turned to cleaning the coal bunkers and then coaling, working steadily until 6 P.M., stopping for dinner and breakfast "*but not for Supper*" (p. 46).
- He had gone ashore between 9:30 and 10:30 A.M., with permission, to see Chief Engineer De Luce about engine stores, and was directed to Chief Engineer W.W.W. Wood in New York (p. 46).

- At 4:40 P.M. he sent Acting 2nd Assistant Engineer A. Harris to ask that the firemen and coal-passers be sent into the engine room; he had **not been told the firemen's supper had been deferred** (p. 46).
- He needed his men in the engine room to secure the rock-shafts (the pillow blocks removed, one broken) and to guard the engines against damage; the engines had not been touched since 3:30 P.M. the day before (p. 48).
- He asked the captain for a **written order** because he alone was responsible for the engineer's department and would not turn his men to coal-passing without one to "cover himself" (pp. 47, 49, 51).
- He argued the going-ashore charge could not stand: *"I cannot be guilty of Going on Shore in violation of the positive Orders of the Navy Department as the Executive Officer says he gave me permission to go on Shore on duty"* (p. 50); and that the interference/impertinence charge had been disproved *"by the testimony of the Officer of the Deck and by the Executive Officer himself"* (p. 50).
- He noted he had served in the U.S. Navy since Nov. 5, 1863, under Lieutenant-Commander J.W. Smith in the U.S.S. Bermuda, and *"have never had any fault found against me before"* (p. 50).
- He closed: *"I most Respectfully leave to the Decision of the Honorable Court. I Am Very Respectfully Your Obedient Servant, W. Braidwood"* (p. 51).

Findings, Sentence, and Review — Read Against the Code

Findings (verbatim, pp. 42–43): the court, cleared for deliberation, found the specification of the first charge **proved** and Braidwood **guilty of the first charge**; found the first specification of the second charge **proved**, the second specification (going ashore) **not proved**, and Braidwood **guilty of the second charge**.

Sentence (verbatim, p. 43): *"And the Court do therefore sentence the said William Braidwood an acting first assistant Engineer of the United States Navy to be dismissed from the Naval Service."*

Signatures (p. 43): Saml. L. Breese, R. Admiral; W.C. Nicholson, Commr.; Henry Eagle, Commodore; James Glynn, Captain; Geo. A. Prentiss, Comdr.; J.A. Doyle, Lieut.; Payse N. Westcott, Lieut.; and Philip Hamilton, Judge Advocate.

Read against the code: the trial ran under the Navy Articles of 1862. The sentence — **dismissal from the naval service** — is well within the ceilings of the offenses charged (the disobedience and general/scandalous-conduct articles authorize "such other punishment as a court-martial shall adjudge"). Because the sentence was **not a death sentence**, the two-thirds concurrence and Presidential-confirmation requirement of Navy **Article 19** did not apply. However, the **dismissal of an officer** ordinarily required the confirmation of the reviewing authority (and, for an officer's dismissal, escalation beyond the fleet/yard commander). **This file contains no reviewing endorsement** — no approval, mitigation, remission, or disapproval by the Secretary of the Navy or the President. The record as preserved ends with the signed findings and sentence; the final action is therefore unknown from this file and is flagged as a research gap. Reporting the sentence as the final outcome would misstate the case: the court's sentence is the court's decision, not the concluded review.

Named Social Network

The court: - Rear Admiral **Samuel L. Breese** — President of the court. - Commodore **William C. Nicholson** — member. - Commodore **Henry Eagle** — member. - Captain **James Glynn** — member. - Commander **George A. Prentiss** — member. - Lieutenant **James A. Doyle** — member. - Lieutenant

Payse N. Westcott — member (name uncertain; see flags). - **Philip Hamilton, Esq.** — Judge Advocate (replaced Samuel C. Perkins, Esq.).

Officers named in the convening/removal orders (not sitting at trial): Commodore **Thomas A. Conover** (relieved); Commander **E.W. Carpender** (appointed then relieved); Commodore **Andrew A. Harwood** (named in precept; reading uncertain); Commander **Edward M. Yard** (named in precept); Acting Volunteer Lieutenant **Frederick S. Hill** (the officer for whose trial the court was originally ordered); **Samuel C. Perkins** (original judge advocate).

Witnesses: - **Ferdinand G. Morrill** — Acting Ensign, USS Chimo. - **John C. Dutch** — Acting Master, commanding USS Chimo. - **Francis Wallace** — Acting Ensign, Executive officer, USS Chimo ("F. Wallace" in the charge). - **Charles S. Park** — Acting Assistant Paymaster, USS Chimo. - **William R. Vernon** — Acting Second Assistant Engineer, USS Chimo. - **George E. Hobbs** — Acting Third Assistant Engineer, USS Chimo.

Others mentioned: **Gideon Welles**, Secretary of the Navy (convening authority and accuser); Rear Admiral **H. Paulding**, Commandant, Navy Yard N.Y.; Chief Engineer **De Luce** (Navy Yard); Chief Engineer **W.W.W. Wood(s)**, Engineer in charge of the Iron Clad Department (reading uncertain); Acting Second Assistant Engineer **A. Harris**; Acting Third Assistant Engineer **Davis**; Chief Engineer **Sewell** (Navy Yard); Admiral **Stringham** (reading uncertain); Lieutenant-Commander **J.W. Smith** (USS Bermuda); Chief Engineer **P. Brewster** — the last three named in the accused's defense.

Research Gaps, Next Steps, and the Identity Boundary

Gaps in this file: - **No reviewing action is present.** The record ends with the court's signed sentence; the Secretary of the Navy's (or President's) confirmation, mitigation, or remission of Braidwood's dismissal is not in these pages. This is the single most important gap — the outcome is not concluded on paper here. - **Exhibits referenced but absent:** Braidwood's engineer's requisitions for engine stores; the **Engineer's Log Book** and the **ship's log-book** of the USS Chimo (both discussed in testimony); these would corroborate or contradict key testimony. - **The Frederick S. Hill trial** for which this court was originally convened is a separate proceeding pointed to by the precept.

Next steps: the Navy court-martial case files and general court-martial index (RG 125, NARA); the Secretary of the Navy's letters and the abstracts of court-martial sentences for early 1865, to find the reviewing action; the deck and engineer's logs of the USS Chimo; and Braidwood's individual naval service/personnel records (which would show whether the dismissal was executed and whether he was later restored).

What this file does and does not establish about identity: this record establishes that **the William Braidwood of the U.S.S. Chimo** was an Acting First Assistant Engineer who had served in the Navy since **November 5, 1863** (first in the U.S.S. Bermuda under Lt.-Cmdr. J.W. Smith), was attached to the Chimo from **October 14, 1864**, and was tried and sentenced to dismissal in February 1865 (pp. 49–50). Those service dates, the vessels, and the officers who recommended him (Lt.-Cmdr. Smith and Chief Engineer P. Brewster) are the identity anchors a family should use. This file gives **no age, birthplace, residence, physical description, or named kin**. Matching this William Braidwood to a specific family line requires correlation with records **outside this file** — census, naval personnel and pension records, city and church records — and same-named men of the era are common. This report reads the trial record; it cannot, by itself, confirm any particular descent.

Artifacts in the File

The file holds more than paperwork. These pages are reproduced here exactly as they were filed — a caption beneath each tells you what the record itself says about it, and nothing more.

To the Honorable Court—

On the morning of the 10th of February at 5:30 AM, all hands were called on board the U.S.S. "Chimo" and the Firemen and Coalpassers were turned to by my orders, in cleaning the Coal Bunkers preparatory to receiving Coal, as soon as that was done, they were sent on Deck to get the Coal out of the Barge and put it in the Bunkers. They kept steady on that work all day untill 6 PM. Stopping work to get Dinner and Breakfast; but not for Supper. Between 9:30 and 10:30 AM, I asked permission to go on shore, to the Navy Yard, to see Chief Engineer De. Luce about the Engine Stores for the U.S.S. "Chimo". There were some articles on my requisition, that he said he could not supply me. Chief Engineer De Luce, told me to go to Canal Street New York to Chief Engineer W.M.W. Woods, U.S.N. who was Engineer in Charge of the Iron Lad Department and as I was under his Orders he would probably give me what I wanted. I returned on board of the U.S.S. "Chimo", and at 4:40 PM sent acting 2nd Assistant Engineer A Harris to the Office of the Deck with my Compliments to ask him to send the Firemen and Coalpassers into the Engine Room, intending to go there myself to Superintend the work necessary to be done. Mr Harris returned and told me that the Officer of the Deck wanted all the Coal, in that night. I had not been acquainted of the fact that the Firemen's Supper time had been deferred. I went on Deck and found the Executive Officer there I told him that I wanted my men down in the

Plate 1 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 46). inscribed/captioned: "To the Honorable Court". Exhibit B, page 1 — William Braidwood's written defense, in his own hand; opens with the events of the morning and afternoon of Feb. 10, 1865.

Engine room to do some work that was necessary to be done that night. He that is the Executive Officer went below to the Captain and returned with Captain Dutch's positive Orders to keep the men at the Coal. I then told the Executive that I could not possibly do without the Firemen but if he would give me a written Order it would clear me of all trouble. The Executive Officer went below again and returned and told me that the Captain desired to speak with me in the Cabin.

In the mean time I told the Firemen to pick up their Shovels as I thought the Captain would have no objection to me taking the Firemen to the Engine room when it was necessary that I should have them — I had not the least trouble or difficulty with the Executive Officer in Obedience to the Captains Orders. I went into his Cabin. When he told me he wanted me to turn all my hands to pass Coal, I told him that I wanted my men in the Engine room. When the Captain said if I did not do so he would suspend me from duty. I told him that I could not do so as I wanted my men in the Engine room. But that I would do so if he gave me a written Order. Captain Dutch replied that it was a damned how do you do if I cant get my Orders obeyed without writing them. I told him that I wanted my men and that I could not put them on Coalpassing without he would give me a written Order to cover myself. He told me I was suspended from Duty.

*would have charged me with insubordination
inasmuch that I had not taken proper care of my*

Plate 2 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 47). Exhibit B, page 2 — Braidwood's account of the demand for a written order and his suspension; his own words, tiered as an interested party's sworn-adjacent statement.

I have had Steam on the Boilers of the U.S.S. "Thimo" all the time we have been at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and for sometime previous to the 10th of February the Navy Yard Mechanics have been engaged in overhauling parts of the Engines and Harbord Boiler. They had taken the covers of the Air pumps attached to the main Engines and the Steam escaping partly through imperfect Valves, Condensed and Settled down on the Engine. Owing to the Construction of the Vessel which would damage the Slides and Working parts of the Engines by Oxidation or rust. As the Engines had not been touched since 3:30 pm on the 9th inst it was absolutely necessary that it should be done on the 10th. I could not do anything on the 10th as all my men were passing Coal. If the Captain had given me the use of my own men when I wanted them I could have done my work, and brought the remainder of the Coal on board, on the morning of the 11th inst in one hour - the Coal Barge was alongside in the same berth about 6 Days, we received on board at the time that I wanted the men about 34 Tons of Coal so there was no actual necessity to get it on board as we had to coal again before going to Sea and the 34 Tons of Coal would have served for the use of the Boilers for 42 Days.

2 Firemen had to stand on watch all the time the rest were passing Coal without relief except to meals

If Chief Engineer De. Luce or Chief Engineer Woods had come on board on the evening of the 10th they would have charged me with incompetency inasmuch that I had not taken proper care of my

Plate 3 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 48). Exhibit B, page 3 — technical justification concerning the engines, boilers, and the necessity of engine-room work on Feb. 10.

Engines. ~~it sent to cover~~ and Engineers Department
ent in the Ship that I was attached to, it was
to guard against that. That I asked Captain Dutch
for his written Order, as he would not take the
responsibility if any fault was found in the Engine
Department in the U.S.S. "Chimo" by the Chief
Engineer of the Department

I have been attached to the U.S.S. "Chimo" since Oct
14th 1864. The U.S.S. Chimo went into Commission on
21st January 1865. I had Steam on the Boilers
before she went into Commission to try the Engines
and kept it up for a few days untill Chief
Engineer Sewell sent for me and told me to
go down to the "Chimo" and draw the fires and bleed
the pipes that were likely to burst with the action
of the Frost and fasten up the Engine room
and report to him every morning at 9 AM in his
Office - I obeyed Mr Sewell's Orders and Captain
Dutch wanted me to put my junior Engineers
on Tick watch there being but one watch Officer
attached to the Ship and he was executive Officer
I told the Captain that the vessel had not been
accepted by the Navy Department and that there
was a Watchman on board

This is the Charge that Captain Dutch makes that
I questioned his Authority as Commanding Officer
The particulars are noticed in the Engineers Log Book
of the U.S.S. "Chimo"

The Other time that Captain Dutch Says I questioned
his Authority Happened in Brooklyn Navy Yard
it is as follows

The night we arrived I reported to him the Engine

Plate 4 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 49). Exhibit B, page 4 — service dates aboard the Chimo, the Boston incident, and reference to the engineer's log book.

Department all right and asked his position
permission to go on shore, he gave me permission
at the same time telling me that I would have to
come back that night. I returned about 10 pm the
same night, but could not gain access to the Navy
Yard. I returned on board the U.S.S. "Chimo" in the
morning and reported to the Captain and reported to him
the circumstances why I had not been on board the
previous evening. The Officer of the Deck had put in
the log that I had liberty for one hour but had
not returned untill next morning, which was wrong
for the Captain had not stated any time except that
I was to be on board that night. I spoke to the
Captain and he told me he would have it altered as
it had been a mistake of the Officer of the Deck

I have been in the Service of the U.S. Navy since
November 5th 1863 I have served under Lieutenant-
Commander J. W. Smith in the U.S.S. "Bermuda" and
recommended by him to the Department and also
my Chief Engineer P. Brewster — and have never had
any fault found against me before

It has been proven that I did not interfere with
Ensign Wallace the Executive Officer or use imper-
tinent language toward him, by the testimony of
of the Officer of the Deck and by the Executive Officer
himself

And I cannot be guilty of going on shore in violation
of the positive Orders of the Navy Department as
the Executive Officer says he gave me permission
to go on shore on duty connected with the Engine
Department of my Ship, and that he had that privilege

Plate 5 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 50). Exhibit B, page 5 — the log-book dispute; his naval service since Nov. 5, 1863; argument that the charges are disproved by the deck and executive officers.

And the Charge of refusing to keep the
Firemen and Coalpassers at work Coaling
Ship without the written order of the Commanding
Officer, when I absolutely wanted them for
the Benefit of the Engine Department, and
knowing that I alone am responsible for its
preservation, I most Respectfully leave to the
Decision of the Honorable Court

I Am Very Respectfully
Your Obedient Servant
W. Braidwood
Actg 1st Assist Engineer

Exhibit marked 'B'.
Philip Hamilton
Judge Advocate

Plate 6 — Handwritten defense statement (accused's own hand) (page 51). inscribed/captioned: "I Am Very Respectfully Your Obedient Servant W. Braidwood Actg 1st Assist Engineer". Exhibit B, concluding page — signed by the accused; marked 'B' by Judge Advocate Philip Hamilton.

Document Inventory

Page	Document Type	Summary
1	Proceedings heading & convening precept	Title of the proceedings against Acting First Assistant Engineer William Braidwood, convened at the Navy Yard, Brooklyn,

		N.Y., Feb. 24, 1865; begins copy of the Secretary of the Navy's precept (to Rear Adm. Breese) ordering the court at Philadelphia, June 7, 1864, for the trial of Acting Vol. Lt. Frederick S. Hill; member list begins. File no. 3828 and docket notes at top.
2	Convening precept & department orders (continued)	Remainder of member list and Judge Advocate Samuel C. Perkins; signed Gideon Welles, May 31, 1864; order of June 24, 1864 relieving Commodore Conover and appointing Cmdr. E.W. Carpender; order of July 12, 1864 begins (sittings to be moved to Navy Yard, New York).
3	Department orders (continued)	Continuation of July 12, 1864 order: Carpender relieved; Commodore Henry Eagle, Capt. James Glynn, Cmdr. George A. Prentiss, and Lieut. Westcott appointed members; officers and witnesses to be transferred to New York. Order of Oct. 11, 1864 begins.
4	Department order & opening of court	Oct. 11, 1864 order appointing Philip Hamilton judge advocate in lieu of Perkins. Court met pursuant to precept; present list of members and judge advocate; accused present and stated he did not desire the aid of counsel.
5	Minutes — arraignment procedure	Precept and orders read aloud; judge advocate asked whether accused objected to any member (he had not) and whether ready for trial (he was); President administered the oath to the judge advocate, who administered oaths to the members, under the 1862 Navy act.
6	Charges and specifications (copied into minutes)	Charges preferred by the Secretary of the Navy, marked 'A'; Charge I (conduct unbecoming an officer and subversive of good discipline) and its specification; Charge II (disobedience of lawful orders of superior officers) begins.

7	Charges (concluded) & plea; first witness	Specification 1st and Specification 2nd of Charge II; signed Gideon Welles, Feb. 15, 1865; accused pleaded not guilty; Ferdinand G. Morrill called and sworn, examination begins.
8	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (direct)	pp. 7-14: Morrill, Acting Ensign; identifies self, the Chimo at Brooklyn Navy Yard, knowing the accused since ~Jan. 21, 1865; the ship coaling from a canal boat.
9	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (direct)	pp. 7-14: Morrill describes the Chimo as an iron-clad light-draft monitor; men worked until after 4:30 P.M.; accused protested to Wallace against the men being kept at work without supper and ordered them to stop.
10	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (direct)	pp. 7-14: Wallace ordered coaling to continue; the men had ceased; Morrill gave the order and men obeyed; accused returned and ordered his department's men to the engine room.
11	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (direct/cross)	pp. 7-14: captain (Dutch) came on deck, spoke with Engineers Harris and Davis, ordered the men set to work; coaling stopped between 5 and 6 P.M.; judge advocate finished; cross-examination by the accused begins.
12	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (cross/direct resumed)	pp. 7-14: on cross, orders came from Wallace to go on with the work; noticed nothing impertinent ('No Sir, I did not'); direct examination resumed re when coaling finished and the canal boat's later deliveries.
13	Testimony — Ferdinand G. Morrill (by the court)	pp. 7-14: by the court — did not know of a general order requiring written orders; could not say if accused went ashore; the crew's supper hour was postponed; remonstrance applied to firemen and coal heavers only; manner not peculiar.
14	Testimony — Morrill (concluded); Dutch called	pp. 7-14 conclude: accused merely said he did not wish his

		men working at that late hour without supper; witness discharged. John C. Dutch called and sworn (pp. 14-25 begin).
15	Testimony — John C. Dutch (direct)	pp. 14-25: Dutch, Acting Master, commanding the Chimo; the ship coaling Feb. 10; the cabin scene begins — Dutch ordered coaling finished, warned of suspension; accused: 'Am I suspended from duty now then?'
16	Testimony — John C. Dutch (direct)	pp. 14-25: accused refused to set men to work and left; Charles Park present in cabin; Dutch had an order permitting/limiting officers going ashore; ordered Wallace to read the order to all officers; accused went ashore Feb. 10; prior desertions occurred.
17	Minutes — adjournment & new session	Examination suspended for adjournment; testimony read back to Dutch, acknowledged correct. Court adjourned to Feb. 25, 1865. Saturday Feb. 25 session opened; present list; proceedings of the 24th read; Dutch recalled.
18	Testimony — Dutch & Exhibit (Paulding order)	pp. 14-25: Dutch identifies the order produced as Rear Admiral Paulding's, received Feb. 8 with another paper; order read into record — report of three desertions, \$25 reward, line officers not to go ashore.
19	Testimony — Dutch & Exhibit (Welles order)	pp. 14-25: Secretary of the Navy's order of Jan. 17, 1865 read (officers not permitted ashore where desertions occur); Dutch confirms he gave Wallace both orders to read to the officers.
20	Testimony — John C. Dutch (cross by accused)	pp. 14-25: cross — Wallace reported the accused unwilling to keep his men on coal; Dutch's positive order to finish; Wallace's second report that accused would not regard the order unless in writing.
21	Testimony — John C. Dutch (cross by accused)	pp. 14-25: canal boat's later coal deliveries to the Casco; Dutch did not recall accused saying he

		needed men in the engine room that night; never ordered accused to send more than he could spare; did not tell accused he was prohibited from going ashore on engineer business.
22	Testimony — John C. Dutch (cross by accused)	pp. 14-25: Dutch never gave Wallace an order to stop accused going ashore; regarded accused as a competent engineer but whose conduct as an officer did not promote good discipline; accused had questioned his authority on two or three occasions.
23	Testimony — John C. Dutch (cross by accused)	pp. 14-25: first occasion at Boston (order to keep an engineer on watch day and night, before the Chimo was in commission); second at Brooklyn re log-book entries; Dutch's orders were from Admiral Stringham (reading uncertain); accused had permission to go ashore and return that night.
24	Testimony — John C. Dutch (cross/by the court)	pp. 14-25: accused could not get through the gate at night (~Jan. 25/26); by the court — after directing Wallace to promulgate the Secretary's order, accused went ashore Feb. 10 without permission and was absent when sent for; on the two prior occasions accused excited/insulting; the Chimo in commission on the second.
25	Testimony — Dutch (concluded); Wallace called	pp. 14-25 conclude: accused had reported for duty at Boston; Dutch sent for accused ~12 M.; no recollection Wallace called accused impertinent; witness discharged. Francis Wallace called and sworn (pp. 25-31 begin).
26	Testimony — Francis Wallace (direct)	pp. 25-31: Wallace, Acting Ensign, Executive officer of the Chimo on Feb. 10; at 4:25/4:30 P.M. received the accused's message wanting his men in the engine room; captain's orders to finish coaling first; accused ordered his men below.
27	Testimony — Francis Wallace	pp. 25-31: Wallace informed

	(direct)	captain, who directed accused be sent to the cabin; accused went ashore Feb. 10 on duty with Wallace's permission; Wallace received the Secretary's and Paulding orders from Dutch to promulgate; read them to officers in the wardroom Feb. 10.
28	Testimony — Francis Wallace (direct/cross)	pp. 25-31: accused not present at that reading but informed of the substance at tea time; judge advocate done; cross by accused — accused behaved gentlemanly, used no impertinent language; the log-book/morning incident recounted.
29	Testimony — Francis Wallace (cross/by the court)	pp. 25-31: accused had asked why his name was on the log as absent, calling it a disgrace; captain agreed to erase it as an officer-of-the-deck mistake; log book was altered; Wallace never faulted accused as engineer except Feb. 10; by the court begins.
30	Testimony — Francis Wallace (by the court)	pp. 25-31: crucial answer — accused's manner Feb. 10 'was neither impertinent nor insubordinate — he spoke to me in a gentlemanly kind of a manner'; the shore-leave order restricted officers to the ship unless on duty; accused sent ashore on duty to see Chief Engineer De Luce.
31	Testimony — Francis Wallace (by the court)	pp. 25-31: Wallace certain the accused ordered the men to stop after being told the captain's order; accused questioned the log-book entry as a disgrace; officers going ashore on duty needed only the executive officer's leave, for pleasure both captain's and executive's.
32	Testimony — Wallace (concluded); Park called	pp. 25-31 conclude: Wallace discharged. Charles S. Park called and sworn (pp. 32-35 begin); Acting Assistant Paymaster; present at the cabin interview Feb. 10 between Dutch and the accused.

33	Testimony — Charles S. Park (direct)	pp. 32-35: Park recounts the cabin scene, quoting Dutch's warning of suspension and 'Mr Braidwood if you presume to disobey my orders I shall suspend you from duty,' and the accused's 'Am I suspended now then?'; judge advocate done; cross by accused begins.
34	Testimony — Charles S. Park (cross/by court/resumed)	pp. 32-35: accused told captain he had work for firemen and would put them on coal with a written order; accused speaks very rapidly; by the court — 'rather excited... I do not say that he was impertinent any further than by saying he would not turn his men to'; cross resumed on the captain's profane expression.
35	Testimony — Park (concluded); case rested; adjournment	pp. 32-35 conclude: no such profane words that Park was aware of; discharged. Judge Advocate rested the case for the Government. Court adjourned to Feb. 27, 1865; Monday session opened with present list.
36	Minutes & Testimony — William R. Vernon (direct)	pp. 36-40: accused present; proceedings of the 25th read. William R. Vernon called for the accused; Acting Second Assistant Engineer; testifies accused went ashore with requisitions to the chief engineer's office; Chief Engineer De Luce/W.W.W. Wood referenced.
37	Testimony — William R. Vernon (direct)	pp. 36-40: Vernon in the wardroom 3-5 P.M.; recounts accused telling captain he had work for his men in the engine room; the captain's demand and 'a damned pretty how do you do'; suspension of the accused.
38	Testimony — William R. Vernon (direct/cross by JA)	pp. 36-40: accused done; cross by judge advocate — Vernon's position in the wardroom (~6 ft from cabin door, door ajar); captain spoke loud and excited, accused in an ordinary tone; whether Park was present he could not tell.
39	Testimony — William R. Vernon	pp. 36-40: men required in

	(cross by JA)	engine room to secure the rock-shafts (pillow blocks removed, one broken); fifteen firemen/coal-heavers attached, only ten working; five or six needed to secure the rock shaft; others wiping down.
40	Testimony — Vernon (concluded); Hobbs called	pp. 36-40 conclude: wiping down could have been deferred to next day without endangering the ship; two men to tend fires; fires spread not banked; witness discharged. George E. Hobbs called for the accused.
41	Testimony — George E. Hobbs (direct)	pp. 40-42: Hobbs, Acting Third Assistant Engineer, off duty Feb. 10, part-time in the wardroom; heard the cabin conversation through the ajar door; accused asked to knock his men off, captain refused, accused wanted a written order; captain's 'damned likely story' about written orders.
42	Testimony — Hobbs (concluded); defense; findings begin	pp. 40-42 conclude: captain told accused to consider himself suspended; accused confirmed he had necessary night work; discharged. Accused had no further testimony; testimony closed; accused read Defense (marked B). Court cleared; findings — specification of first charge proved, guilty of first charge.
43	Findings, sentence, and signatures	Findings: first specification of second charge proved, second specification not proved, guilty of second charge. Sentence: to be dismissed from the naval service. Signed by Breese, Nicholson, Eagle, Glynn, Prentiss, Doyle, Westcott, and Judge Advocate Philip Hamilton. No reviewing endorsement follows.
44	Exhibit A — Charges and Specifications (original)	Original charge sheet marked 'A' (Philip Hamilton, Judge Advocate, in margin): Charge I (conduct unbecoming) and specification; Charge II (disobedience) and Specification 1st.

45	Exhibit A — Charges (concluded)	Specification 2nd of Charge II — leaving the vessel and going ashore 'in violation of the positive orders of the Navy Department'; signed Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, Navy Department, February 15, 1865. Remainder of page blank/ruled.
46	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (p. 1)	Written statement 'To the Honorable Court' in Braidwood's hand: the day's coaling from 5:30 A.M. to 6 P.M.; going ashore 9:30-10:30 A.M. to see Chief Engineer De Luce and W.W.W. Woods about engine stores; sending Harris at 4:40 P.M. to request his men; unaware supper was deferred.
47	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (p. 2)	Recounts the executive officer relaying the captain's positive order to keep men at the coal; accused's request for a written order to clear himself; the captain's demand and the 'damned how do you do' remark; being told he was suspended from duty.
48	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (p. 3)	Technical defense: steam kept on boilers; Navy Yard mechanics overhauling engines and starboard boiler; air-pump covers off; engines needing attention since 3:30 P.M. the 9th; the coal received (~34 tons) not urgently needed; two firemen on watch throughout; risk of an incompetency charge had chief engineers seen the neglected engines.
49	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (p. 4)	Service history: attached to the Chimo since Oct. 14, 1864; ship in commission Jan. 21, 1865; obeyed Chief Engineer Sewell's orders; the Boston incident re junior engineers on deck watch; asserts the log-book records the particulars; the Brooklyn incident begins.
50	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (p. 5)	The log-book dispute (liberty for one hour vs. captain's actual instruction) and its promised alteration; service since Nov. 5, 1863 under Lt.-Cmdr. J.W.

		Smith (USS Bermuda) and Chief Engineer P. Brewster; argues the interference and going-ashore charges are disproved by the officer of the deck and the executive officer.
51	Exhibit B — Defense of the accused (concluded)	Closing on the refusing-to-keep-men-at-work charge — he wanted them for the engine department for which he alone was responsible — and leaves the decision to the court; signed 'W. Braidwood, Actg 1st Assist Engineer'; marked 'B' by Philip Hamilton, Judge Advocate.
52	Fold3/NARA source information page	Administrative page: Title '3828 (1864-1865)'; 51 total images; Publication M273; Content source/partner NARA; Record Group 125; year added 2017.

Every Fact and Its Source

Each substantive fact in this report, with the document that states it. Tier 1 = sworn or own-hand documents; Tier 2 = official contemporaneous records; Tier 3 = claim-process paperwork; Tier 4 = administrative material. Notes mark facts a witness learned second-hand, values worked out by calculation, and uncertain readings.

Fact	Source document (page)	Tier	Notes
The accused is William Braidwood, Acting First Assistant Engineer of the U.S.S. Chimo.	Proceedings heading / charge sheet (p. 1)	2	—
Braidwood was attached to the U.S.S. Chimo as her first assistant engineer in charge; the Chimo was an iron-clad light-draft monitor.	Testimony of Ferdinand G. Morrill (p. 9)	1	—
Braidwood stated he had been attached to the U.S.S. Chimo since October 14, 1864, and that the ship went into commission January 21, 1865.	Defense statement (Exhibit B) (p. 49)	1	—
Braidwood stated he had been in the U.S. Navy since	Defense statement (Exhibit B) (p. 50)	1	—

November 5, 1863, having served under Lt.-Cmdr. J.W. Smith in the U.S.S. Bermuda, and had never had fault found against him before.			
A naval general court-martial was convened by precept of the Secretary of the Navy (Gideon Welles), dated May 31, 1864, originally at the Navy Yard, Philadelphia, for the trial of Acting Vol. Lt. Frederick S. Hill and others.	Convening precept (p. 1)	2	—
The court's sittings were moved to the Navy Yard, New York, by order of July 12, 1864.	Department order (p. 2)	2	—
Philip Hamilton was appointed judge advocate in lieu of Samuel C. Perkins by order of October 11, 1864.	Department order (p. 3)	2	—
The court sat in the Braidwood case on February 24, 25, and 27, 1865, at the Navy Yard, Brooklyn/New York.	Court minutes (p. 17)	2	corroborated by second source
The members present were Rear Adm. Samuel L. Breese (President), Commodore William C. Nicholson, Commodore Henry Eagle, Capt. James Glynn, Cmdr. George A. Prentiss, Lieut. James A. Doyle, and Lieut. Payse N. Westcott, with Philip	Court minutes (p. 4)	2	reading uncertain

Hamilton as judge advocate.			
The accused stated he did not desire the aid of counsel and defended himself in person.	Court minutes (p. 4)	2	—
Charge I was 'Conduct unbecoming an officer and subversive of good discipline,' its specification alleging that on or about Feb. 10, 1865 Braidwood interfered with Acting Ensign F. Wallace by ordering the coal heavers and firemen to knock off work while coaling.	Charges and specifications (Exhibit A) (p. 6)	2	corroborated by second source
Charge II was 'Disobedience of the lawful orders of his superior officers,' with Specification 1st (refusing Acting Master Dutch's order to send firemen and coal heavers) and Specification 2nd (leaving the vessel and going ashore in violation of the positive orders of the Navy Department).	Charges and specifications (Exhibit A) (p. 7)	2	source conflict
The charges were preferred by the Secretary of the Navy, signed Gideon Welles, dated Navy Department, February 15, 1865.	Charges and specifications (Exhibit A) (p. 45)	2	corroborated by second source
Braidwood pleaded 'not guilty' to the charges.	Court minutes (p. 7)	2	—
The men had worked from early	Testimony of Ferdinand G. Morrill	1	—

morning until after 4:30 P.M. on Feb. 10, and their supper hour had been postponed until the coaling should be finished.	(p. 13)		
Braidwood protested to Executive Officer Wallace that his men were kept at work at a late hour without supper and ordered his firemen and coal heavers to knock off work.	Testimony of Ferdinand G. Morrill (p. 9)	1	—
In the cabin, Captain Dutch warned Braidwood he would be suspended if he disobeyed; Braidwood asked 'Am I suspended from duty now then?' and Dutch replied 'You are, unless you set the men to work again.'	Testimony of John C. Dutch (p. 15)	1	corroborated by second source
Braidwood demanded a written order before he would put his firemen back on coal-passing, saying he needed them in the engine room and would be responsible for the department.	Defense statement (Exhibit B) (p. 47)	1	corroborated by second source
Executive Officer Francis Wallace testified that Braidwood's manner was 'neither impertinent nor insubordinate — he spoke to me in a gentlemanly kind of a manner.'	Testimony of Francis Wallace (p. 30)	1	—
Captain Dutch testified he	Testimony of John C. Dutch (p. 22)	1	—

regarded Braidwood as a competent engineer, but that as an officer his conduct was not calculated to promote good discipline, and that on a second occasion his manner was insulting and defiant.			
Dutch testified that Braidwood had his permission to go on shore and return, and that permission to go ashore on duty did not require the commander's leave.	Testimony of John C. Dutch (p. 23)	1	corroborated by second source
A Navy Department order of January 17, 1865 (Welles) directed that in vessels where desertions occur, commissioned and line officers not be permitted to go on shore.	Order read into record (exhibit) (p. 19)	3	—
A Navy Yard order of February 8, 1865 (Rear Adm. H. Paulding) to Acting Master Dutch acknowledged three desertions from the Chimo, offered a \$25 reward each, and forbade the Chimo's line officers to go ashore.	Order read into record (exhibit) (p. 18)	3	—
Defense witness Vernon testified fifteen firemen and coal-heavers were attached to the Chimo, only ten working, and that five or six were needed to secure the rock-shaft	Testimony of William R. Vernon (p. 39)	1	—

(pillow blocks removed, one broken).			
Vernon conceded on cross that the engine-room wiping-down could have been deferred to the next day without endangering the ship.	Testimony of William R. Vernon (p. 40)	1	—
Braidwood read a written defense (Exhibit B) to the court after the testimony closed, arguing his refusal was to protect the engine department for which he alone was responsible.	Defense statement (Exhibit B) (p. 51)	1	—
The court found the specification of the first charge proved and Braidwood guilty of the first charge.	Findings (p. 42)	2	—
The court found the first specification of the second charge proved, the second specification not proved, and Braidwood guilty of the second charge.	Findings (p. 43)	2	—
The court sentenced William Braidwood to be dismissed from the naval service.	Sentence (p. 43)	2	—
The findings and sentence were signed by all seven members and by Judge Advocate Philip Hamilton.	Sentence signatures (p. 43)	2	—
No reviewing authority endorsement (approval, mitigation, remission, or disapproval)	Record (absence noted) (p. 43)	2	—

appears in the file after the signed sentence.			
The file is NARA Record Group 125, Publication M273, titled '3828 (1864-1865),' 51 images.	Fold3/NARA source information page (p. 52)	4	—

Hard-to-Read Entries

These are original handwritten records, in places faded or damaged with age. Where a word could not be read with confidence, it is flagged here rather than guessed at - nothing in this report is invented. A researcher reviewed each entry below against the original scans; some were made out on a closer look, and the rest remain genuinely unclear.

- **Page 4** - flagged as hard to read (The court member's given name is difficult to read and appears variously as 'Payse,' 'Bayse,' and with the middle initial 'M.' or 'N.' across the session headers (pp. 4, 17, 35) and signatures (p. 43); the convening order (p. 3) gives only initials, apparently 'B.N. Westcott.'). A researcher re-checked it against the original scan; it remains genuinely unclear, which we note honestly.
- **Page 2** - flagged as hard to read (The original judge advocate's surname is written on p. 2 in a form reading like 'Perlins,' but pp. 4 and the Oct. 11 order clearly give 'Perkins.'). A researcher re-checked it against the original scan; it remains genuinely unclear, which we note honestly.
- **Page 2** - flagged as hard to read (A member named in the precept is written in a form resembling 'Hardwood'; the likely officer is Commodore Andrew A. Harwood). A researcher re-checked it against the original scan; it remains genuinely unclear, which we note honestly.
- **Page 37** - flagged as hard to read (The chief engineer of the Iron Clad Department is written as 'W.W.W. Wood' (p. 37) and 'W.W.W. Woods' (p. 46); the final 's' is uncertain). A researcher re-checked it against the original scan; it remains genuinely unclear, which we note honestly.
- **Page 23** - flagged as hard to read (The name of the admiral said to have issued Dutch's Boston orders is faint and could be misread). A researcher re-checked it against the original scan; it remains genuinely unclear, which we note honestly.

Where the Documents Disagree

Here two or more perfectly legible documents say different things. That is a finding about the record, not a reading problem - both versions are shown, and neither was silently preferred. Where the evidence clearly favored one reading, the story above follows it, and the note here says why - a visible weighing, never a silent one.

- **Page 3** - the documents disagree here (The convening/removal order names the appointed member by initials only, while the trial minutes and signature give a spelled-out first name; the record's apparatus is internally inconsistent as to this member's name). Both readings appear in the report; review confirmed the disagreement is in the record itself. Our read: Same officer throughout; the minutes' spelled-out form is fuller. Not fully adjudicable from the file — verify externally via the Navy Register.
- **Page 7** - the documents disagree here (The clerk's copy of Specification 2nd of Charge II reads 'officers' where the original charge sheet reads 'orders'; a copying slip in the record's own apparatus). Both readings appear in the report; review confirmed the disagreement is in the record

itself. Our read: 'orders' is the correct word, per the signed original (Exhibit A, p. 45); the minutes contain a clerical error.

What the File Does Not Establish

The file is silent on these points. No document states them, so the report says so rather than filling them in.

- **Page 43** - the file does not answer this (The record ends with the court's signed findings and sentence (dismissal of an officer); no approval, mitigation, remission, or disapproval by the Secretary of the Navy or the President appears in the file, though an officer's dismissal ordinarily required confirmation). The Research Gaps section points to the records that might.
- **Page 49** - the file does not answer this (The accused's defense cites the engineer's log book and requisitions as recording the particulars; these exhibits are referenced but not present in the file). The Research Gaps section points to the records that might.

About this report: it was produced from the file provided, read page by page. It does not search records beyond that file - the Research Gaps section points to the outside records that could carry the story further.