

Chapter Six

Leadership in the Council

In pastoral councils, the pastor is the primary leader. Canon 536 speaks of him as the presider, because to him the bishop has entrusted the parish. The pastor consults the council and accepts or rejects its advice. He may share responsibility with the council for the parish's mission, and he may invite the council's advice about parish governance. But when he does so, the council serves at his invitation. Indeed, only a pastor may convoke the pastoral council.¹ The council's very identity is dependent on the pastor. In that sense the pastor is the council's primary leader.

The pastor, however, is not the only one who exercises leadership in the council. On this, most pastoral council guidelines agree. Pastoral councils themselves "lead" the parish, say the guidelines. Councils exemplify Christian leadership in general, and parish leadership in particular, by sharing leadership with the pastor. Moreover, particular members take a lead in the council. This is especially true of the lay chairperson who, in many councils, facilitates meetings. Leadership in the council apparently belongs to more than the pastor. But this poses a logical problem. How can both the pastor and the councillors be said to "lead"?

In order to answer this question, we will describe the leadership of

parish pastoral councils in empirical terms. They represent a synthesis of what thirteen guidelines for pastoral councils, surveyed in 1995, say about leadership. Guidelines use the word “leadership” to describe the role of the pastor, of the chairperson, and of the council in general. But they do not usually explain how the leadership of pastor, chairperson, and council differ. That is the task of this chapter.

We shall begin by looking at the way guidelines explain the leadership of the pastor. Some guidelines describe this leadership as directing, and others as facilitating. There is a tension between these styles, and we shall try to both explain the tension and to suggest how it might be resolved. Next, our goal is to look at other kinds of council leadership: leadership by the council itself and leadership by council members. Guidelines are vague about these kinds of non-pastor leaders. But experience suggests that the guidelines’ vague generalizations are an attempt to describe a complex and distinctly Pauline reality, namely, the diversity of spiritual gifts at the service of Christian unity.

Leadership by the Pastor

Pastors are described as the “presider” over the council in eleven out of thirteen guidelines surveyed.² The guidelines typically do not define “presider” or “president,” except to say that canon 536 gives the pastor this presiding role (and even the Code of Canon Law does not define it).³ Instead of explaining what “presider” means, guidelines give the pastor a variety of roles that we normally associate with leadership. And so the curious reader of guidelines who wants to know what it means for the pastor to “preside” at the pastoral council, remains somewhat in the dark.

Presiding over the council, however, is not utterly mysterious. The guidelines suggest that it means both decisive direction setting for the council and support for the council’s own initiatives. As an illustration, consider the following cases of Fathers John Sweeney and Thaddeus Colman, fictional pastors of nearby churches.

Father Sweeney and St. Bridget Parish

When Father Sweeney came to St. Bridget’s, the parish council could be called “conventional.” The council gathered in the same place on a regular basis, the parish hall, and observed the familiar rituals: call to order, opening prayer, reading of the minutes, old business, new business, and so on. This was what the council had always done. After he had been pastor for a

year, Father Sweeney said that he wanted to steer the council into uncharted waters. The parish was changing, he said, and the number of Hispanic parishioners was growing. He wanted to lay the basis for a renewal of the parish, and he invited the council to plan it with him.

Father Sweeney proposed a year-long process to reflect on the parish's changing members. As chairman of the council, he felt that he had a right to do so. In his direction to the council, he was very explicit. He formed sub-committees to document the number and neighborhoods of Hispanic parishioners, to explore how other parishes had become more hospitable to Hispanics, and to research how to invite more participation by Hispanics in the liturgy. Not every council member liked Father Sweeney's proposals, but there was no doubt about what he wanted. Their task was one of study and reflection.

Fr. Colman and St. Emerich

At St. Emerich Church, Father Colman faced a different situation. As soon as he became pastor, Father Colman wanted to let the parish council exercise its own initiative. He started with a hospitality survey. Father Colman wanted to discover how hospitable St. Emerich Church is. Instead of simply asking the council to help him administer a survey that he had designed, he asked members to collaborate on the survey instrument. They did, and it was a success. Parishioners gave valuable feedback about the ushers, and the parish started to serve coffee and donuts after Mass.

From that point on Father Colman gave the council more and more responsibility. He asked them to develop a policy about renting the parish hall, and they consulted every parish organization about it. He requested an assessment of the effectiveness of the Sunday bulletin, and council members compared it with the bulletins of every other church in the city. He wanted to survey what other parishes were doing about adult education, and the council developed a column in the bulletin listing adult education events in parishes throughout the diocese. The council rose to Father Colman's challenges.

Eventually, members no longer waited for Father Colman's direction, but began to exercise their own initiative. It was the council that first proposed an assessment of the parish youth ministry, that first studied and suggested a children's liturgy of the word, and that first recommended the establishment of a food pantry. Father Colman encouraged the council. He believed that his role was to help the council achieve its goals.

The Guidelines on Presiding

The examples of Fathers Sweeney and Colman illustrate the two main tendencies in pastoral leadership suggested by guidelines for councils. Some guidelines bluntly direct the pastor to take the helm in seeking advice. They state that he sets the agenda, consults, receives proposals, and decides.⁴

This is the kind of leadership that Father Sweeney exercised. He clearly defined tasks for his council: a demographic survey, consulting with other parishes about hospitality, and research on liturgical participation by Hispanics. His clear direction is a leadership style suggested by many guidelines. The Ogdensburg and Philadelphia guidelines even make the pastor the chairman of the council.⁵

In these guidelines, the pastor has a clear and directive role. Other guidelines, however, suggest that the pastor's role is to help the council achieve its task. They say that the pastor "presides" by ratifying the council's decisions, by participating, and by listening. He may chair the meeting or he may not. He may help determine the agenda with the executive committee, but he does not set it by himself.⁶

This is the kind of leadership exercised by Father Colman. When his councillors proposed an assessment of youth ministry, or a children's liturgy, or a food pantry, he participated in their discussions and ratified their proposals. His was the leadership style recommended in many guidelines in which the pastor is less directive than he is supportive.

Diocesan guidelines overall are ambiguous about the strength with which the pastor ought to lead the council in accomplishing its task. Some give the pastor a strongly directive role. Others do not, preferring to cast him as a servant leader, one who serves the council by helping it achieve its own tasks.⁷ Council guidelines suggest that all pastors promote the task of councils, but they do so in different ways.

So much for task-centered behavior. What about the pastor's leadership in fostering good relations with the council?⁸

Here the guidelines are less ambiguous. In most guidelines, the pastor is typically the consensus-builder, the spiritual leader, and the creator of trust. He fosters a sense of community in the council by serving, that is, by helping the council achieve its ends in regular meetings.⁹

A pastor reading these descriptions of his role may not be certain how to build consensus or community. But no one is telling him not to try. "Presiding" means behaving as a servant, a trusted friend, and a spiritual leader. In these ways the pastor shows concern for council relationships.

Leadership by Non-Pastors

When we consider leadership in the council we mean more than what the *pastor* does. Many pastoral council guidelines give the council itself a leadership role in the parish. The Ogdensburg guidelines, for example, state that the parish council “provides leadership and direction.” The Detroit guidelines speak of the parish council as “the leadership body of the parish,” and the Bismarck guidelines make substantially the same point.¹⁰ These guidelines assign a guiding role to councils. It is a role by which the council can be said to guide the parish in a direction that the council itself sets.

Some might suppose that the council leads in only a metaphorical way. They might think that council recommendations bear merely a distant likeness to the decisions of the actual leader. But evidence from the Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life suggests otherwise. In 1986 it emphasized the leadership that councils provide. It spoke of “governance” by the council, described a council whose committees actually “run” the parish, and praised the council’s ability to make “hard decisions.”¹¹ The means by which councils lead remain somewhat obscure in the Notre Dame Study. Leading, however, is what many councils apparently do.

Leadership fittingly describes not only the council in general, but also the role of gifted lay individuals in it. Guidelines suggest that the lay chairperson, for example, actually conducts the meetings in many councils. Other leaders, apart from the pastor, may facilitate discussions and contribute to the council’s organization and task. As an illustration, consider the situation of St. Monica Church, a fictional suburban parish with a large number of retirees.

St. Monica Church

At St. Monica’s, the chairman is John O’Connor, an executive retired after many years with a public utility company. In his profession, John was an acknowledged leader, and the same is true in the parish council. He chairs meetings with a sure hand, moving the items briskly, and making certain that the pastor, Father Jean Duval, is satisfied with the council’s discussions. As chairman, John knows how to develop an agenda with the executive committee beforehand and follow the agenda when the council is convened. He is skilled at inviting members to take on various responsibilities pertaining to the council.

One of the council members, Heidi Frieden, is an organizational development consultant. She helps businesses reorganize as they grow or as

they respond to product or market changes. When the council faces an especially difficult issue, one that requires an extensive discernment, John O'Connor calls upon Heidi to create and facilitate a group process. This happened recently when Father Duval asked the council's help in deciding a major allocation of parish funds.

The council was divided over the establishment of a new parish ministry. Some council members had, at Father Duval's request, studied youth ministry with the aim of establishing such a ministry at St. Monica. They had done copious research, developed a plan, and had created a job description for the youth minister they hoped the parish would eventually recruit. Other council members were not certain, however, that St. Monica's needed to hire a youth minister. Far more important to the well-being of the parish, in their opinion, was the development of an outreach to retired parishioners. They felt that an eldercare coordinator, not a youth minister, should be the parish's priority. Resentment soon developed between the two factions.

Father Duval was aware of the tension and discussed with John O'Connor how it might be resolved. John invited Heidi Frieden, who was not associated with either faction, into the discussion. She recommended that the council give each side a chance to thoroughly air its point of view. She developed a group process and prayers to encourage a climate of discernment. She even offered to facilitate the meeting.

Father Duval took her advice. After the meeting, the two factions realized that they did not know as much about eldercare as they did about youth ministry. They postponed making any decision until they could more thoroughly study the need for and the costs of a ministry to retired parishioners. John asked the leader of the "eldercare faction" to head an ad hoc committee to study how the parish might accomplish a more effective outreach to the elderly. Father Duval was delighted at the resolution of the meeting. The leadership exercised by Heidi as facilitator, and by John as chairman, had lowered tensions at St. Monica's.

Lay Leadership in the Guidelines

The story of St. Monica's illustrates the roles that diocesan guidelines for pastoral councils assign to lay leaders. Most guidelines speak of such a chairperson and assign to that officer specific leadership tasks. The lay chairperson is usually not the "presider," the technical term that canon 536 reserves to the pastor.¹² But the lay chairperson does exercise many leadership functions that build up relationships in the council and help it

accomplish its tasks. Chairpersons are most commonly described as “facilitators.” They communicate, organize, coordinate, and help the council evaluate itself. In two guidelines the council chairperson is even directed to appoint the chairpersons of parish standing committees.¹³ John O’Connor and Heidi Frieden shared some of these duties at St. Monica’s. They were council leaders: they helped the council achieve its task.

What about developing good relations in the council? Every council guideline describes the pastor’s role in terms of spiritual leadership, community building, and the development of trust—all of which foster good relationships. Do guidelines describe the lay chairperson’s role in the same way? No. Many guidelines say little about the chairperson’s role in supporting good relations in the council. Five out of thirteen guidelines do not even mention that the chairperson has relationship-building duties. One might conclude that the pastor fosters good relationships and helps the council achieve its tasks, but the lay chairperson does not. The chairperson assists mainly in achieving the council’s tasks, one might think, and has little to do with developing good relationships.

This inference is not supported, however, by the majority of council guidelines that do assign relationship-building roles to the lay chairperson. Those guidelines describe the lay chairperson as one who does show a concern for relationships. The chairperson creates a climate of prayer, motivates council members, develops consensus, and resolves conflict.¹⁴

We saw these behaviors in the fictional illustration from St. Monica’s. John O’Connor and Heidi Frieden developed a group process to enable parish councillors to reflect prayerfully. They motivated the factions to express themselves, to study the eldercare option more fully, and to seek a peaceful resolution. It is unfair to conclude that the lay chairperson assumes no relationship-building roles simply because some guidelines do not mention them.

But relationship-building duties are assigned to the chairperson less frequently than to the pastor. The guidelines give him, not the chairperson, the task of spiritual leadership. The chairperson is more commonly described as the facilitator of the council task than the builder of council relationships.

In Cases of Conflict

Based on these descriptions of leadership we can assume that lay chairpeople often duplicate the work of pastors. Guidelines describe both as facilitators, communicators, agenda-shapers, collaborators, and consensus-

builders. This creates opportunities for conflict. The Denver and Sacramento guidelines hint at such conflict by insisting that the pastoral council is consultative—consultative, that is, as opposed to decision-making. Moreover, the Sacramento guidelines state that pastors are dissatisfied because councils misunderstand their limited authority.¹⁵ When conflict occurs in the pastoral council, according to the Notre Dame Study, “pastors are about twice as likely as staff and volunteers to say that it originates with the parish council and that it pits the pastor against the council.”¹⁶ When both pastor and council assume leadership duties, conflict is inevitable.

The guidelines recommend a number of strategies to minimize the conflict. One is to stress consensus decision making and discourage a formal parliamentary procedure. “Conflicts between the pastor and the Parish Pastoral Council will rarely arise,” state the Nashville guidelines, “if the pastor actively participates in the process of consensus decision-making.”¹⁷ Another response, found in three guidelines, is the institution of formal conciliation or appeal procedures in the case of pastor-council conflict. A third is to emphasize a climate of prayer and the establishment of trust.¹⁸ In short, some guidelines recognize that conflict is inescapable. They attempt to reduce it by means of consensus, conciliation, and prayer.

In general, however, the guidelines assume that the pastor, as the canonical presider of the parish, is the primary leader. Many guidelines do not even mention conflict. They naively assume that, because the pastor is not obligated to accept the council’s advice, no one should be offended when he rejects it.

Conclusion: The Pastor and the Lay Leader

In summary, we can say that leadership in the pastoral council belongs primarily to the pastor. It also belongs to the council as a whole, and especially to the lay chairperson. The three exercise leadership to varying degrees. Guidelines focus more attention on leadership *in* the council—the leadership of pastor and chairperson—than they focus on the council’s leadership *of* the parish. The council leads the parish, one can say, only to the extent that its advice is accepted and implemented by the pastor. It leads when it and the pastor are of one mind. The chairperson helps the council develop recommendations that persuade the pastor. He or she is even more clearly a leader, the one who enables councillors to agree. The pastor is a leader in the strongest sense. He leads by convoking the council, asking its advice, and drawing conclusions based on that advice.

Ultimately his goal is to employ good advice so that he might lead the parish better.

Leadership by pastors and chairpersons differs in the way each shows concern for the council's task and for council relationships. The guidelines suggest that task leadership by the pastor is ambiguous. Some guidelines have him driving the task forcefully; others have him step back so that the chairperson can drive the task. By contrast, the pastor's leadership in developing relations of prayer and trust among council members is unambiguous. He is to be a "spiritual" leader. On this, the guidelines agree. Pastors may be strong or weak leaders of the task, but their lead in developing relationships must be consistent.

The chairperson, by contrast, is given less to do in the way of developing relationships among council members. Chairpersons, the guidelines suggest, are more task-oriented than they are focused on relations. This raises but begs the question: who is really in charge of helping the council achieve its task? The fact that the same verbs are used to describe what the pastor and the chairperson do—namely, communicate, collaborate, facilitate, shape the agenda, and develop consensus—suggests that there is a considerable overlapping of roles. Although most guidelines discuss these two forms of leadership separately, they do not always clarify where the chairperson's job ends and the pastor's begins. When the line between consultor and the consulted becomes indistinct, problems arise.

Overlapping roles may confuse the question of leadership in the pastoral council. The answer does not lie with theories of management. It lies in the Pauline doctrine of gifts. "There is a diversity of gifts," wrote St. Paul (1 Cor. 12:12), "but one Spirit." We will return to this doctrine of gifts in Chapter Twenty. Our next step is to define the kinds of gifts that pastors seek in councillors.

8. Nashville guidelines, p. 32; Green Bay guidelines, “Commentary and Resources,” p. 23. The Green Bay guidelines, however, are not univocal about the council “making” policy. They elsewhere state that the council offers “recommendations,” and “assists in setting policies” rather than making them directly (“Norms,” p. 5). At another point, the Green Bay guidelines note that the pastor is the real decision maker (“Commentary and Resources,” p. 29).

9. Nashville guidelines, p. 4. The Green Bay guidelines, however, are not so sanguine. “Norm VI” states that the pastor will ordinarily affirm a council’s recommendations “if he is one with the people and active in the deliberative process” (“Norms,” p. 4). Needless to say, this condition of unity is not always met.

Chapter Six: Leadership in the Council

1. The principle that only a pastor can convoke the pastoral council is articulated in canon 514 of the Code of Canon Law, referring to diocesan councils. See Pope John Paul II, *Code of Canon Law*, Latin-English Edition. The source for the canon is the apostolic letter of Pope Paul VI, “*Ecclesiae Sanctae I*” (August 6, 1966), written *motu proprio*, on the implementation of the Vatican II Decree on Bishops, translated by Austin P. Flannery, in *The Documents of Vatican II*, edited by Flannery (New York: Pillar Books, 1975), no. 16, p. 601.

2. The exceptions are the Archdiocese of Hartford, whose guidelines describe the pastor as “leader” and “supervisor” (p. 5) and which speak of the lay “President/Chairperson” (p. 8); and the Diocese of Nashville, whose guidelines describe the pastor as one who delegates authority to the council (p. 4) and ratifies its decisions (p. 7).

3. The Bismarck guidelines connect the pastor’s role in the council to the pastor’s “presiding” over the Eucharistic assembly (p. 40). My earlier study of council guidelines found that the guidelines of Louisville and of Cleveland make the same connection. See Fischer, “Parish Pastoral Councils” (1990), p. 9.

4. On setting the agenda, see the guidelines of Philadelphia (p. 4) and Sacramento (p. 5). On consulting, see Hartford (p. 5) and Denver (p. 5). On receiving proposals, see Philadelphia (p. 4) and Baltimore (p. 19). On deciding, see Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 13) and Green Bay (“Commentary and Resources,” p. 29).

5. These guidelines are also an anomaly in that they allow the lay vice chairperson to “preside” in the pastor’s absence (Ogdensburg, p. 10; Philadelphia, p. 7). Presiding (as distinct from chairing) is a pastor’s role, and these guidelines envision a council that may meet in the pastor’s absence.

6. On ratifying, see Nashville (p. 7), Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 14), Bismarck (p. 40), and Salina (p. 15). On participating, see Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 13), Green Bay (“Norms,” p. 9), and Bismarck (p. 40). On listening, see Bismarck (p. 40), Sacramento (p. 5), and Seattle (p. 42). Pastors may chair councils in Green Bay (“Commentary and Resources,” p. 10), Bismarck (p. 40), Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 2), and Seattle (p. 19). On helping the executive committee prepare the agenda, see Baltimore (p. 22), Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 17), Green Bay (“Norms,” p. 6), Salina (p. 6), Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 3), and Seattle (p. 42).

7. For a description of how the good leader in general (and not just the priest-leader) helps his followers achieve their goals, see Robert K. Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York, Ramsey, and Toronto: Paulist Press, 1977).

8. The distinction between task and relationship behavior in leaders is a commonplace in the managerial literature. See Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, *The Managerial Grid* (Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1964).

9. On consensus-building, see Ogdensburg (p. 4), Philadelphia (p. 5), Nashville (p. 7), Seattle (pp. 13-14), and Denver (p. 9). On spiritual leadership, see Hartford (p. 5), Baltimore (p. 29), and Salina (p. 2). On creating trust, see Philadelphia (p. 5), Salina (p. 8), and Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 3). On building community, see Bismarck (p. 40) and Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 3). On serving, see Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 13) and Seattle (pp. 13-14). Most pastors meet their councils on a monthly basis. Eight out of thirteen guidelines recommend monthly meetings (Philadelphia, Baltimore, Detroit, Green Bay, Bismarck, Salina, Fort

Worth, and Seattle). Three do not specify the frequency of meetings (Nashville, Sacramento, Denver). Two guidelines recommend four or four to six meetings per year (Hartford and Ogdensburg).

10. Ogdensburg, p. 8; Detroit (“Guidelines”), p. 15; Bismarck, p. 18.

11. David C. Leege, “Parish Life Among the Leaders” (December, 1986), Report no. 9 in Leege and Joseph Gremillion, Editors, *The Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life*, 10 reports in total (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1984-1987), Report no. 9, pp. 2, 7, and 14.

12. Although in two guidelines the lay “vice chairperson” may, at times, actually “preside” (Philadelphia, p. 7; Ogdensburg, p. 10), nevertheless this is not the norm today. The earliest parish council publications, however, would typically speak of the elected lay leader of the council (not the pastor) as the “president.” See Robert C. Broderick, *The Parish Council Handbook: A Handbook to Bring the Power of Renewal to Your Parish* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1968), p. 45; Bernard Lyons, *Parish Councils: Renewing the Christian Community* (Techy, Illinois: Divine Word Publications, 1967), p. 135; and Edward E. Ryan, *How to Establish a Parish Council: A Step-by-Step Program for Setting Up Parish Councils* (Chicago: Claretian Publications, 1968), p. 27.

13. Lay chairpersons are described as “facilitators” in the following guidelines: Hartford (p. 8), Baltimore (pp. 41-42), Detroit (“Handbook,” pp. 45-46), Green Bay (“Commentary and Resources,” p. 10), Salina (p. 6), Fort Worth (“Practical Suggestions,” pp. 13, 22), and Seattle (p. 43). Lay chairpersons appoint the heads of parish standing committees, according to the guidelines of Baltimore (p. 42) and Bismarck (p. 48).

14. On prayer, see Hartford (p. 8), Detroit (“Handbook,” pp. 45-6), and Green Bay (“Commentary and Resources,” p. 10). On motivation, see Detroit (“Handbook,” pp. 45-6), Bismarck (p. 18), and Salina (p. 6). On developing consensus and resolving conflict, see Baltimore (p. 35), Detroit (“Handbook,” pp. 45-6), Fort Worth (“Practical Suggestions,” p. 37), and Seattle (p. 32).

15. Denver, p. 4, Sacramento, p. 3.

16. Leege, Report no. 9; see Castelli and Gremillion, p. 107.

17. Nashville (p. 6).

18. On consensus, see Nashville (p. 2), Baltimore (p. 23), Salina (p. 7), and Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 1). On conciliation, see Nashville (p. 7). On appeals, see Detroit (“Guidelines,” p. 14) and Green Bay (“Norms,” p. 5). In my earlier study of pastoral council guidelines, nine out of thirteen guidelines provide for appeal in cases of pastor-council conflict. See Fischer, “Parish Pastoral Councils” (1990), p. 9. On prayer, see Hartford (p. 4), Baltimore (p. 10), and Detroit (“Handbook,” pp. 6 ff.); on trust, see Philadelphia (p. 5), Salina (p. 8), and Fort Worth (“Guidelines,” p. 3).

Chapter Seven: The Selection of Council Members

1. See William J. Rademacher, *The Practical Guide for Parish Councils* (West Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1979), p. 118; and McKinney, pp. 6-8.

2. Of the 13 guidelines surveyed in 1990, five exclusively recommend at-large elections (Harrisburg, Boston, Raleigh, Fargo, and San Bernardino). Five others recommend elections either at-large or from parish standing committees (Cleveland, Milwaukee, New York, Omaha, and Portland). See Fischer, “Parish Pastoral Councils” (1990), Table 5, p. 6.

3. Of the 13 guidelines surveyed in 1995, nine recommend the election of most council members (Hartford, Ogdensburg, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Nashville, Bismarck, Salina, Sacramento, and Seattle). Three others allow the selection of councillors by drawing lots as an alternative to parish-wide elections (Detroit, Green Bay, and Fort Worth). One guideline (Seattle) allows for election of members by the pastoral council itself or by ministerial committees as an alternative to parish-wide elections.

4. The guidelines of Hartford (p. 6), Philadelphia (p. 6), Baltimore (p. 40), Salina (p. 7), and Seattle (p. 41) mandate or allow the appointment of council members for the sake of representation, diversity, or balance. Five other guidelines (Ogdensburg, Green Bay, Bismarck, Fort