



THE SOLE TRADERS

by Bonnie Miller

The legal system in this country is based on English Common Law. When pilgrims and emigrants populated the new world that was the system that they employed. Through the years it came to be practiced as American Common Law.

Society assumed that all women would be married. Upon marriage, all of her personal assets transferred to her husband. Control of her assets prior to her marriage had lain with her father. A married woman only conducted business as a partner bound to her husband. She did not do business as an equal, but as an extension of him.

What society never assumed was that a woman would not be married, be widowed, or be abandoned by the husband. A single woman, free of the bondage of her father once he passed away, could control her own assets and conduct business as she saw fit without question. The question arose when a married woman became widowed or chose to act independently from her husband.

Early American sentiment fell upon the Bible as their guiding law. Those who wished to deny women property rights quoted the Bible as their justification. They claimed that the husband was the ordained ruler of the family. He owned everything, and he could do with it as he wished. Opponents said that to go against the divine doctrine would threaten the very stability of social order. A woman not aligned with her husband, acting on her own, would be partnered with the devil. Besides, she needed to be “protected” from the business of business. What the opponents did not address was the husbands who failed to maintain their households in order.

The laws regarding married women’s property rights in this country have a variety of interesting origins. A unique Maryland law from 1674 required an interview between a judge and a wife to confirm her consent to her husband’s selling of her property.

In Pennsylvania a surprisingly progressive law was passed in 1718. The idea was to prevent

“The trades and professions are all open to us; let us quietly enter and make ourselves, if not rich and famous, at least independent and respectable.”

—Elizabeth Stanton to the Akron Falls Women’s Convention, 5/16/1851

Sole Traders.

An Act to authorize married women to transact business in their own name as sole traders.

Approved April 12, 1852, 101.

6915. SECTION 1. Married women shall have the right to carry on and transact business under their own name, and on their own account, by complying with the regulations prescribed in this act.

6916. SEC. 2. Any married woman, residing within this State, desirous to avail herself of the benefit of this act, shall give notice thereof, by advertising, in some public newspaper of general circulation in the county in which she resides, for four successive week; provided, if any newspaper be published in said county, said publication shall be made in the paper so published in said county. Such notice shall set forth that it is her intention to make application to the district court of said county, on the day therein named, for an order of said court, permitting her to carry on business in her own name and on her own account, and it shall specifically set forth the nature of the business to be carried on. On the day named in the notice, or at such further time as the court may appoint, on filing proof of publication, the court shall proceed to examine the application, on oath, as to the reasons which induce her to make the application, and if it appear to the court that a proper case exists, it shall make an order, which shall be entered on the minutes, that the applicant be authorized and empowered to carry on, in her own name, and on her own account, the business, trade, profession, or art, named in the notice; but the insolvency of the husband, apart from other causes tending to prevent his supporting his family, shall not be deemed to be sufficient cause for granting this application. Any creditor of the husband may oppose such application, and may show that it is made for the purpose of defrauding such creditor, and preventing him from collecting his debt, or will occasion such result, and if it shall so appear to the court, the application shall be denied. On the hearing, witnesses may be examined on behalf of either party. Before making the order, the court or judge shall administer to the applicant the following oath:

"I, A. B., do, in presence of Almighty God, truly and solemnly swear, that this application is made in good faith, for the purpose of enabling me to support myself and my children, (if the applicant have minor children), and not with any view to defraud, delay, or hinder, any creditor or creditors of my husband; and that of the moneys so to be used, in said business, not more than five hundred dollars has come, either directly or indirectly, from my husband. So help me, God."

widowed women with children from becoming a financial liability upon her community. The law specifically cited the real life cases of the wives of mariners, deserters and adulterers. Through this law needy Pennsylvania women could conduct business and make an independent living, thereby supporting herself and her family. The law also allowed that an abandoned woman was no longer liable for her absent husband's contracts. When the husband was found to be healthy and just shirking duty or perhaps engaging in adultery, his estate could be sold to settle the debts left behind with the wife.

New York in 1771 also required that a judge meet privately with a woman to confirm her approval of the sale of her property. It also required that her signature, as well as her husband's, be on the deed being transferred.

Married Connecticut women in 1809 were permitted to execute wills regarding their property.

One of the more unusual laws passed, and oft-cited, was based on Native American tradi-

tion and had to do with slavery. In the Chickasaw culture, a woman owned her own property. In 1839 in Mississippi a Chickasaw woman sued her husband over the ownership of a slave she had owned prior to their marriage. The court ruled in her favor, recognizing the woman's cultural traditions and rights. The ruling became a landmark case for women's property rights.

The single case that most directly affected California women was from New York in 1846. One of the reasons cited by the New York proponents was the idea of taxation without representation. They felt it inappropriate for abandoned or widowed women to be responsible for paying taxes when they had not been involved in the business matters that brought about the tax. They drafted a law giving women the right to conduct business.

Western thought

The earliest California pioneers must have been forward-thinking individuals. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo specifically laid out instructions mandating that American Common Law be blended with the civil laws being practiced in California at the time. The existing Civil Law was greatly influenced by the Spanish or Californios who inhabited the area prior to statehood. In the Spanish culture, the woman was allowed to own her own estate and conduct business. The instruction from the treaty laid the ground work for allowing women to conduct their own business in the new California.

"Any married woman availing herself of the benefit of this act, shall be responsible for the maintenance of her children."

—1856 Amendment to the Sole Trader Act

Will Support Herself.

Cecelia Keesing has asked the Superior Court to be appointed a sole trader on the ground that her husband, who has become financially embarrassed, does not provide sufficient support for her. She will open a millinery store.

San Francisco Call, 4/4/1891.

At the same time that a nugget of metal from the American River was being tested at Sutter's Mill, thereby launching the great Gold Rush, a convention of women was again meeting in New York. The feisty New York women who had been so instrumental in their 1846 law were continuing to convene and work to further women's rights. While the rest of the country viewed the property of women as under the control of her father or husband, California chose to be different, more like New York.

When the first representatives met in Monterey in 1849 to draft California's constitution, several of the members felt the New York law had merit in the new society. The driving force was a group of bachelors, led by an attorney from Monterey named Henry Halleck. He argued that allowing married women to do business would entice the right kind of women to the state. Married women, he felt, possessed the skills and acumen needed in the territory. Opponents argued that allowing women to do business would undermine the very nature of marriage, fearing "two heads in one family."

The bachelors won the argument. They used the progressive 1846 law from New York as their model where women's property rights were concerned. They did not, however, grant her the right to do business in her own name. She could not operate alone, or be a sole trader.

The Sole Trader

A young inexperienced senator from the Shasta County area, Philip A. Roach entered the

"In the new Code of Laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I desire you would Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power in the hands of the Husbands. Remember all Men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice, or Representation."

—Abigail Adams, in a letter to her husband, March 31, 1776



Henry W Halleck of Monterey drafted major portions of California's first constitution and proposed progressive rights for women. National Archives image.

California Legislature early in 1852 and quickly went to work. Within two months he had introduced a bill which passed on April 12, 1852, as the Sole Trader Act. Representing Calaveras County was Assemblyman William P Jones, a Whig, and George E Young, a Democrat. In the senate was John Y Lind. It is not known how these individuals voted, but we must assume that they supported the act. Calaveras County was in the heart of the gold action, and the skills of any and all women who chose to work in the gold fields were appreciated.

What exactly did being a registered sole trader mean? It meant that a married woman could conduct business in her own name. She could earn a living and keep her earnings, and she could incur her own debts. She could sue and be sued. The law only applied to married women and had no affect on the marriage.

The new law allowed women to engage in business in their own name. She was required to petition the court and be granted the designation of "Sole Trader." She could not invest more than five hundred dollars (some accounts say five thousand dollars) toward her venture, but she could retain all proceeds from her business without the consent of her husband.

The original intent of the law was to address women who were widowed with children. The idea was that the orphaned family could become a burden upon society. It was also

recognized that most women had saleable skills. If the woman was allowed to work for pay, then she could become self-sufficient and support her children, thereby avoiding being a financial burden. The law by no means intended to provide more flexible financial opportunities for women. Rather, the law was written for women to pursue honorable skills such as opening a restaurant, or operating a laundry or boarding establishment.

It was also recognized that some women were abandoned rather than widowed. Most common were the wives of seamen who risked being lost at sea. Others were women flat abandoned by a husband no longer interested in his family. They faced the same plight.

The law radically changed how women did business in California. It provided the necessary stop-gap measure to allow a widowed woman to provide for her family, and it allowed the woman's skills to be available to society. What it also did was permit abandoned women to keep their selves afloat.

Four years after its passage the Act was amended to require the married women to advertise their intentions in the paper. There was a flurry of legal notices posted as they had to be completed within six months of the passage of the new law.

*"I, Elizabeth Smith,
do in presence of
Almighty God, truly and
solemnly swear, that
this application is made
in good faith, for the
purpose of enabling me
to support myself and
my children and not with
any view to defraud,
delay, or hinder, any
creditor or creditors of
my husband; and that the
moneys so to be used, in
said business, not more
than five hundred dollars
has come, either directly
or indirectly,
from my husband.
So help me, God."*

—The oath sworn by sole traders,
according to the 1856 amendment
requiring advertising

The reasons women gave for their need or intention to conduct business were as interesting as they were varied. The most common reason cited was that the husband had been unsuccessful at mining and could not support her or the family. Or, "Husband wants to go into another business separately by himself," claimed one applicant. Another wanted to support her child from a previous marriage. One woman stated that her husband had become "financially embarrassed."

Auguste Sandrough petitioned the court in San Francisco in 1892 to allow her to open a restaurant. The newspaper reported "She says that her husband has been uniformly unsuccessful in business ventures." Margaret Trestler in Sacramento gave no reason as to why her husband could not support her in 1856. She just wanted the Sole trader designation "for the purpose of serving up coffee... and oysters..."

It wasn't only the wives that advertised matters in the papers. In one account, an aggrieved husband resented the new direction his wife had taken. In 1854 he placed the following ad in the *Daily Alta California*: "**NOTICE.** My wife, Mary E J Barrett, having unjustifiably left my bed and board, I do hereby forbid all persons harboring or trusting her on my account, as I shall pay no debts of her contracting from this date."

The amendment passed two years later addressed exactly his concern. In addition to advertising, the 1856 amendment reiterated that the husband could not possess her income, but also clarified that he was not responsible for any debts she incurred.

application, it is ordered, adjudged and decreed by the Court that the said Alice Hearsey wife of William Harvey aforesaid, be and she is hereby permitted to carry on business in her own name and on her own account as a Sole Trader in the business of buying and selling goods, Liquors, Cigars and Merchandise and keeping a Saloon, Tavern, Hotel and boarding house in the village of Milton, County of Colararas, State of California, and to do each and every act necessary to be done in and about the business aforesaid
March 18th 1875
W B Borman

Married women who had ne'er do well husbands took advantage of the law. Technically the women were not widowed and perhaps not even abandoned, but the husbands were unable or unwilling to financially provide for the family. Under the common law, all of the woman's earnings ended up in the hands of her husband, at the expense of her family. Her golden dreams were going up in smoke, or more likely in alcohol vapors. These women were driven to commence a business in their own names and legally be allowed to keep their income for their own purposes.

The architects of California's Sole Traders Act probably never understood the possibilities unleashed by the new law. The law itself was passed just prior to another Act requiring ranches to conduct annual rodeos. This prioritization almost indicates the insignificance with which the issue was regarded. Yet the Act foretold major significance in women's business rights in California.

An 1858 legal notice in Sacramento announced a woman's intent to conduct business as a Sole trader. In the notice she claimed ownership of one half of the family's farm. This action indicated the tone that was to dominate sole trader status thereafter. Women wanted half of what they had worked for in the marriage, setting in motion California's new community property laws.

With their new status as property owners, married women pursued not only business interests but social causes. Mrs A B Taylor in San Francisco chose to establish a beneficiary society. The primary employment of women during the gold rush was prostitution and she wanted to reverse that trend. She opened an office that provided refer-

An Important Decision—The Rights of Married Women as Sole Traders.
State of California—District Court, 4th Judicial District.
Maria Rippstein vs. Wm. S. White.—Upon the trial of this case the jury returned a verdict in favor of the plaintiff. A new trial is asked for, on the ground that the verdict is against the evidence and contrary to the instructions of the Court.

The property in controversy was levied upon by the defendant under and by virtue of an execution issued in favor of Kasper Thomas and against Jacob Rippstein. The plaintiff, who is the wife of Jacob Rippstein, claims that the property belongs to her; that she is a sole trader, and as such acquired it. In the case of *Mary Jones vs. D. N. Hunt*, I commented briefly upon the act authorizing married women to conduct business in their own name, and endeavored to call public attention to the real intent and design of the act. I remarked that it was passed for good, laudable and benevolent purposes, but resorted to, I feared, in too many cases, for the purpose of concealing property and perpetrating wrong; that it was intended to protect the honest and industrious wife against an improvident, idle and worthless husband, to save to her her earnings, the proceeds of her labor and industry, so as to enable her to support herself and clothe, feed, educate and maintain her children; that it was not intended to aid and assist husbands in concealing their property—not intended to degrade the husband into becoming the slave of his wife. I held that, in order to prevent fraud, the law would not suffer the wife to assume the previous occupation and business of her husband, and yet permit the husband to continue in the management and conduct of it under the assumed name of agent; nor would it suffer a husband in embarrassed circumstances to furnish means to his wife to enable her to carry on business as a sole trader, and so defeat the rights of creditors; that the husband should be just before he was generous, and that the statute had not changed this rule of the common law.

The fact that a married woman declares her intention of carrying on a business uncoventional, unbecoming and unsuited to a woman, does of itself afford *prima facie* evidence of some fraudulent intent. Women are rather unsuited for the hardware, blacksmithing, carpentering and brick-making business, yet we find, on reference to our public newspapers, that they pretend to be engaged in each and every one of these pursuits and occupations, employing, as their agent, their husbands, who previously carried on the same business in their own names.

The law was not intended to aid and assist a man who had become unfortunate in business. The law was not passed for the benefit of the husband; it was not enacted for the purpose of saving to him or to his wife his earnings and the proceeds of his labor. It was only intended to enable the wife to save for herself or children the results of her own industry, to enable her to engage in business, to build it up by her own energy, by her own labor and work, not by that of her husband. If he aids and assists her in it—if it is a business in which he was previously engaged—if he manages, superintends and controls in the same manner as he did when he carried it on in his own name, it affords strong, if not conclusive, evidence of fraud. In my opinion, for the purpose of preventing fraud, the husband ought not to be permitted to interfere, to aid, assist, manage or control in any way or manner, the business which the wife is conducting as a sole trader, no matter whether it is a business in which the husband was previously engaged or not; and I am not prepared to say that such is not the law. If it is not, then the act opens a wide door to fraud, and it should be either repealed or amended. If the husband can legally act as the agent of his wife and superintend and manage a business which she is carrying on as a sole trader, a very convenient way is afforded, and without much chance of detection, for the husband to conceal his property and avoid the payment of his debts.

In this case, it appears from the evidence, that Jacob Rippstein, about two years since, kept a public house a few miles from this city, known as the Tivoli House. He became unfortunate in business, and failed. Shortly thereafter his wife declared her intention of carrying on the business of farming, buying, selling and raising stock; buying, selling and trading in real estate; keeping a hotel and doing general trading—in most, if not in all, of which occupations her husband had been engaged previous to his failure. It does not appear that the wife entered upon any of these various pursuits until about May last, as she had accompanied and remained in the mines with her husband until about that date. In May last, however, they both returned to this place, and shortly afterwards the Tivoli House is opened in the name of Mrs. Rippstein, and she has ever since pretended to carry it on. The evidence shows that Jacob Rippstein manages and controls the business, the same now as he did when the house was carried on in his own name. He receives the money, pays the bills, purchases most of the articles wanted for the house, hires the bar-keepers and employees, and superintends everything except the kitchen department. In all this he pretends to be acting as the agent of his wife. This, I have endeavored to show, the law will not permit, and, moreover, I am satisfied that the agency is a mere pretence; that Rippstein is conducting the business in the name of his wife, for the purpose of hiding and concealing his property from his creditors. If the jury in this case had paid the slightest regard to the instructions of the Court, they would have returned a different verdict, and thereby saved to both parties much additional expense and litigation. As it is, I am compelled to interfere and set the verdict aside.

A new trial is granted—costs to abide the event.
 A. C. Mossop, District Judge.

Sacramento Union, 12/1856.

als to distressed women who desired respectable employment.

Not all cases of sole traders were good for business. In a few rare cases couples tried to take advantage of the law. The wife registered as the sole trader but the husband conducted the business or even other businesses. Assets were hidden from creditors between the various enterprises. When debts accrued the two got to pointing at each other in order to avoid responsibility. Later amendments attempted to discourage such collusive behavior in unscrupulous couples.

Calaveras County Women

The Calaveras County Archives has two books that list the women who registered as sole traders between the years 1854 and 1906. Within those volumes are several names that stand out in our county's history.

On October 23, 1854, Elizabeth Spicer registered her intent to conduct business in ranching and dairy operations. So did Nancy Ann Bean of Cave City in 1855. This was a common occupation of women who registered as sole traders.

February 19, 1868, Zelia Dennis, wife of Napoleon Dennis, listed an inventory of her personal property prior to their marriage. This registration of her properties functioned as a pre-nuptial agreement.

Elise Gatinelli of Happy Valley opened a tavern and store. Mary Antonia Green in Moke Hill brewed beer and ale for sale. Christina Oppenheimer, also of Moke Hill opened a general trading post in 1856, and two years later Mary Musto too opened a store for merchandizing in nearby Mosquito Gulch. In Angels Camp Fredericka Barkhorn opened a billiard saloon, provided lodging and sold liquor.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that I, **BARBARA M. WILSON**, wife of William Wilson, residing in the city and county of San Francisco and State of California, do hereby make and publish this my declaration, from and after this date to become a sole trader, under and by virtue of an Act entitled, "An Act to authorize married women to transact business in their own name as sole traders," passed April 12, 1852; and I further declare, that the business which I intend to carry on is keeping a Bar and a Saloon connected therewith, and that I will be responsible in my own name for all debts contracted by me for and on account of said business; and I further declare that the said business will be conducted by me in said county, and that the amount of capital invested in said business is less than two thousand dollars.

MRS. BARBARA M. WILSON.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.—On this 9th day of February, 1855, personally appeared before me **BARBARA M. WILSON**, to me known to be the person who executed the foregoing declaration, and being by me examined separate and apart from her husband, declared that she executed the same freely and voluntarily, and for the uses therein contained.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

SAML. H. DWINELL,
Notary Public.

f10-21

WANTED—A good COOK. Apply to **W. HART** corner Jackson and Montgomery streets. f10

WANTED—A person who is a good NEEDLE-WOMAN, and to do Chamberwork. Apply to **W. HART,** corner Jackson and Montgomery street. f10

WANTED—A smart business YOUNG MAN, with \$2000, to go into business for four months. The person, if qualified, will receive \$500 for the use of his money, and one hundred and fifty dollars per month for his services. Good security given, with reference and residence. Apply to **WM. H. HALE & CO.,** No. 1721-2 Montgomery street, opposite the Metropolitan Theatre. f10

Alta, 10/15/55.

Catherine Fischer of Jesus Maria conducted butchering and ranching. Adaline Holland, Mary Dorsay, Delila Scroggins, Celia McNichols and Eliza Dowling all raised poultry or had dairies for making milk and cheese for sale.

Margaret O'Neill opened a store and operated the O'Byrnes Ferry. Eliza McCoy stated she was going to do blacksmithing and mining, while Bridgit Rice of Chili Gulch stated she was going to

Keeping a Dairy under an act of the Legislature passed 12th April 1852 authorizing married women to transact business in their own name as sole traders and the amount invested does not exceed five thousand dollars

Elizabeth Spicer

On Her Own Hook.

Auguste Sandrough has asked the Superior Court to give her permission to carry on a restaurant and bakery as a sole trader. She says that her husband has been uniformly unsuccessful in business ventures.

San Francisco Call, 1/3/1892.

do ditching and wood cutting. Mary Eliza La Forge went into the business of loaning money, while Eliza Osborn went into real estate. In all almost one hundred women in Calaveras County registered to conduct business as sole traders.

Tuolumne County had equally robust married women pursuing their own businesses. In the first eighteen years after the Act was passed, 131 women registered as sole traders in that county.

Economists have determined that the Sole Trader Act was a significant component of California's early growth. Married business women contributed significantly to the economic stability of the burgeoning territory.

Modern Views

Women have gained many business rights over the subsequent years. An 1856 law dictionary did not recognize the term Sole Trader, yet over the intervening decades many states passed such laws. By 1900 all states had given women substantial control over their own property, a far cry from the colonial attitude. In 1911 women in California gained the right to vote yet it was nine more years before the Nineteenth Amendment passed giving all women in this country the right to vote. In 1964 the Civil Rights Act assured that women could no longer be subjected to legalized discrimination thereby nullifying the need for the 1852 Sole Traders Act.

Conflicts in California still existed as late as 1971.

The California Business Professions Code mandated that women could not tend bar (again for their protection). Violators were guilty of a misdemeanor, subject to imprisonment for up to three months in a county jail or a one-hundred dollar fine. The only exception was if she owned the establishment as a sole trader. The California Supreme Court had to address the legality, and silliness of invoking the code. These sorts of conflicts were finally put to rest when California fully rescinded the Sole Trader Act in 1980.

It is therefore Ordered and adjudged by the Court that the said Zelia Welch, wife of Napoleon Denis, named in said application be, and she is hereby permitted and authorized to carry on business in her own name and in her own account as a Sole Trader - to wit: Buying and selling of goods, wares and merchandise and to do so in the County of Calaveras or within any other County of this State that she may deem proper - with power and authority to do and perform each and every act necessary to be done in and about the business of Sole Trading as aforesaid.

Done in open Court this 23^d day of January
A. D. 1871

M. C. Adams
Dist. Judge

Senator Roach, the man who brought the Sole Trader Act to fruition in California went on to a long career in the legislature. Sadly his landmark efforts to gain women property rights were overshadowed by the fact he was also very active in the anti-Chinese sentiment.

Abigail Adams, wife of President John Adams, wrote many letters to her husband while he worked at the country's Continental Congress. In 1776 she implored him to "Remember the Ladies" while he drafted the laws of the country. Her astute advice was insightful, yet it took almost two hundred years for the ladies to be considered equal.

Such discriminating laws that limited women's power and participation in business were done with the argument of "protecting" them. It was thought they would be trading their soul to the devil to go against such unnatural rules of the household. In truth such discriminations served to stigmatize women as inferior. It also eliminated half of the business competition.

The California Gold Rush afforded pioneering women new opportunities never experienced before. With the help of a little law called the Sole Trader Act married women could save their families as well as contribute to the socio-economic fabric of their community.

Today all business people are on the same level playing field. Women no longer need to differentiate themselves by publicly declaring their intent to earn a living.

"The property, money, revenues, credits and profits of her business belong exclusively to her and are not liable for the debts of her husband. She has all the privileges of, and is liable to all legal proceedings provided for debtors and creditors, and may sue and be sued alone, without being joined with her husband."

—California Property Rights of Married Women, Section 1814.

LEGAL NOTICES.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, City and County of Sacramento, ss.

I, MELISSA BARTON, wife of David L. Barton, of said city, do hereby make this my declaration that I intend from this date to carry on and transact business in my own name and on my own account, in accordance with the law of this State entitled "An act to authorize married women to transact business in their own names as sole traders," passed April 12th, 1852; that the business she intends to follow is Teaming, dealing in Lumber, Produce and Coal, and that she intends to invest the profits of her said business and the rents and issues of her separate property in buildings and improvements; and that the amount of capital employed in said business is not exceeding five thousand dollars.

MELISSA BARTON.

State of California, County of Sacramento, ss.—This 15th day of June, A. D. 1856, personally appeared before me, the undersigned Notary Public, Mrs. Melissa Barton, wife of David L. Barton, to me personally known to be the person who subscribed and made the above declaration, and personally made and declared her intentions as a sole trader, as above set forth.

Witness my hand and notarial seal the day and year last above written.

{ L. S. }

Je19-3w*

N. R. WILSON,
Notary Public.

Sacramento Union, 7/7/1856

Bibliography

- Alta California*, 4/11/1854; 4/26/1854; 12/15/56.
Brands, H W; *The Age of Gold*. Doubleday, New York, 2002.
California Code of Civil Procedures, Sole Traders Statute, Section 1811–1821 incl.
California Supreme Court Decisions, Title VII.
Cunnea, Professor; "A Timeline of Women's Legal History in the United States," 1998.
Eliassen, Meredith; "Women as Sole Traders in Gold Rush San Francisco," circa 2010.
Grunwald, Lisa and Adler, Stephen J, editors; *Women's Letters*, The Dial Press, New York, 2005.
Kahn, Ava Fran, ed; "Jewish Voices of the California Gold Rush: A Documentary History, 1849–1880."
Lewis, Jane Johnson; "Property Rights of Women," circa 2005; about.com.
Mason, Anita C; NORCAL-L Archives, 1/31/2004; rootsweb.com
San Francisco Call, 4/4/1891; 1/3/1892.
The General Laws of the State of California, from 1850 to 1864, Vol II; H H Bancroft and Company, San Francisco, 1865.
The Law as to the Property Rights of Married Women in California; Chapter V.
Russell, Judy G, "California's sole traders;" *The Legal Genealogist*, 2/20/2013.
Skinner, Ellen; *Women and the National Experience*, Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, 2003.
Sacramento Union, 12/23/56; 12/21/1858.
Walsh, Madge Richardson; "Woman's Work?;" *The Covered Wagon*, 2000, Shasta Historical Society.

Calaveras County Historical Society

30 No. Main Street P.O. Box 721 San Andreas, CA 95249

Officers and Directors

President	Bill Ratterman, San Andreas
Vice President	Gary Herd, Mountain Ranch
Secretary	Donna R Shannon, San Andreas
Treasurer	David Studley, Mountain Ranch
Director	Joe Borden, Mokelumne Hill
Director	Dennis Downum, Valley Springs
Director	Ken Markham, Mountain Ranch
Director	Duane Wight, Lodi
Director	Dan O'Boyle, Valley Springs
<i>Las Calaveras</i> , Editor	Bonnie Miller
Office Manager	Karen Nicholson
Administrative Assistant	Danielle Ballard

Las Calaveras is published quarterly by the Calaveras County Historical Society. A subscription to *Las Calaveras* comes with membership in the Calaveras County Historical Society for \$22.00 per year. Non-members may obtain copies from the Historical Society office. The original historical material presented in *Las Calaveras* is not copyrighted and anyone is invited to use it. Mention of the source would be appreciated. Contributions of articles about Calaveras County are appreciated and may be submitted to the Historical Society for consideration.

The Calaveras County Historical Society is a non-profit corporation. It meets on the fourth Thursday of each month in various communities throughout the County. Locations and scheduled programs are announced in advance. Some meetings include a dinner program, and visitors are always welcome.

The Society operates the Calaveras County Museum which is open daily from 10:00 to 4:00 in the historic County courthouse located at 30 Main Street in San Andreas; and the historic Red Barn Museum at 891 Mountain Ranch Road, also in San Andreas, which is open Thursday to Sunday, 10:00 to 4:00.

The Society's office is located in historic San Andreas, the Calaveras County seat. Visitors are always welcome to stop by the office for assistance with research, and are encouraged to visit the museums while in the area. The office is open Monday through Friday from 8:30 to 4:00, and the telephone number is (209) 754-1058, or contact us at: CCHS@goldrush.com; Red Barn Museum (209) 754-0800.

July–September 2013

New Members

KC Cooper-Pipes—San Andreas
Kathryn Mewhinney—Valley Springs
Alan Camper—Copperopolis
Susan Kravitz—Mountain Ranch
Jon Coleman—Mountain Ranch
Angels Camp Museum—Kimberly Arth

Donations

The Historical Society appreciates the following generous donations:

Robert & Henriette Frisbie—Cash donation in memory of Pearl Cosgrave

Glenn & JoAnn Wasden (item on loan)—Pitcher with windmill—bottom of pitcher says, "Made especially for Rosa A. Agostini, The old reliable store that gives the most for the least, San Andreas, Cal."

Bill & Beverly Burton—Cash donation to Red Barn Museum in memory of Gerard Oneto

Dennis & Louise Marquering—Cash donation in memory of Gerard Oneto

Colette Lantzy—spice tins, salt and pepper shakers, salt bowls, nutmeg mill, beaded purse, tea pot

Steve Cilenti—copy of speech written by Robert C. Groves regarding Banner School

Angie Link—Post Office Registers from Rail Road Flat Post Office 1930–1933, 1946–1952

Kirk Smith—Family history on George and Frank Fischer (Fisher) family history, Mentzel/Fischer Ranch at West Pont, and Fischer/Mentzel Barn with photo of restored barn

Patricia Bradley—Cash donation in memory of Clyde Seeman

Anonymous Cash donation

Frank Wharregard—1800s coffee grinder that was in the Domenghini General Store in Mountain Ranch from the early 1900s to about 1935 when it was purchased by Frank's father for \$5

Phil D. Alberts—Flag from the Mountain Ranch School (mounted and framed)

Barbara Kathan—Photo of Dan Filippini (taken between 1883–1889)

Clare Moran—Ten copies of her book, *Ghost Towns of the Mother Lode Hills* to sell in the bookstore