

# Story of Lowe leaves questions

(Continued from page 1)  
At the state constitutional convention Lowe undoubtedly met Dr. David Maxwell, a Monroe County representative and strong advocate of the establishment of the state seminary

in Bloomington. It is also likely that their acquaintance led to Lowe's appointment to the seminary's first board of trustees.  
The responsibility of the first board was to get some buildings under way, and

that did occur during Lowe's first tenure on the board. An additional chore for the board was the hiring of teachers, and the services of Baynard Hall and John Harney were secured during Lowe's term.

In the community at large, he served as a county commissioner (1820) and postmaster from 1830-1840. There are some interesting discrepancies in the census statistics for the Lowe household in 1820, 1830 and 1840. The 1820 census lists one male, "45-plus; the 1830 census, when Lowe would have been in his 90s, lists one male over the age of 50, and the 1840 census — the year Lowe died — lists one male between the age of 70 and 80.

IU historian James Woodburn wrote that in 1829 Lowe petitioned the legislature for an investigation of the professors and trustees of the seminary. It would be interesting to know what went wrong in his outlook on the fledgling school.

A short biography of Lowe written by Bloomington's Burton D. Myers

indicates that the lawyer and Maxwell were on opposite sides politically in the presidential election of 1828. Lowe was for Andrew Jackson, and Maxwell was for John Quincy Adams. One wonders, what, if anything, that difference of opinion had to do with Lowe's turning sour about the seminary.

Lowe's tombstone in Rose Hill Cemetery indicates that he lived to the age of 104, which was possible, but a little suspicious, considering that the life expectancy was considerably lower.

Another unanswered question remains: Why would an attorney in his 70s leave an established practice on the East Coast and move to the Indiana wilderness? Perhaps it was the same spirit that kept him going to the age of 104.

## Joint inspection rule upheld

(Continued from page 1)  
Linda Szostek, deputy city attorney, handled the case for the city. She explained on Friday that the ruling essentially establishes:

- That the joint inspection requirement of the city code means exactly what it says — that both parties must be on the premises simultaneously during the inspection.
- That inspections are mandatory and must be initiated by the landlord.
- That a fee cannot be charged for a right given by ordinance.

Szostek argued that the joint inspection must be done and that the paper check-off plan was insufficient.

STUDENT LEGAL SERVICES attorney

Sunbelt had wanted to charge tenants \$25 to complete a joint inspection.

Mayor Tom Allison said Friday that the case was important and timely because of the imminent influx of students to the city who will live in rental units. She said the ruling will aid all tenants living in the city in seeing that they are not charged for damages that they did not cause. It will also help them to receive their damage deposit upon leaving rental properties.

Ordinance 81-97 of the city code, adopted by the City Council in 1981, states that the owner or his agent shall contact the tenant and arrange a joint inspection of the premises to occur within 10 days of the tenant's occupancy and schedule another in-