

The Goadfly

Unreliable Narrators Since 470 BCE

Extra-Issue Documents

Current Version: v/M.12-D.25-Y.2025

Articles of Agreement for The Gadfly

The OAOAFTG - Eleventh Revision

Preamble

The Gadfly is an independent, democratic, student-driven satirical newspaper that needs no introduction. In order to protect the foundations of this newspaper, all members are bound by the following rules, subject to change at regular intervals (See section V for more details).

I. Rights as a Member

As a member of The Gadfly, you are entitled to certain rights. You additionally are expected to honour all other members' rights. You have the right to anonymity; The Steering Committee does not (See section III. for expansion on the steering committee). You have the right to leave The Gadfly at any point with no consequences. You have the right to speak your mind, while understanding that certain things may be moderated by The Steering Committee or by consensus to protect the newspaper and its members.

II. Staying Indie

Staying independent is an important part of The Gadfly, but it needs to be done in a way that protects the members of The Gadfly from punishment. The Gadfly will have a teacher adviser; this differs from a sponsor. A teacher adviser will review the final copy of an issue before we release it. They will point out risks and issues. Their advice is non-binding, though it will be heavily considered.

III. Steering Committee

Although The Gadfly is consensus-driven, there will be a two-layered participation system. The upper layer (known as the 'Steering Committee') will draft the rules for everyone to vote on at the time of review, and make quick time-sensitive decisions. The other tier will still have autonomy over most matters. Unanimity can override any decisions that the Steering Committee makes, and the Steering Committee will discuss every decision they make with everyone. When the Steering Committee dies, leaves, or otherwise moves on, they are expected to provide a written 'last will' that describes their plans for The Gadfly until a new Steering Committee is created.

IV. Distribution

In the spirit of our anti-establishment ideologies, our distribution style is highly decentralised. Every member who is able to print is encouraged to print several copies of The Gadfly. We will also distribute copies of The Gadfly digitally through email, QR codes, the website, etc.

V. Voting

Every two publications, or whenever a problem arises, the rules (The OAOAFTG) will be re-evaluated by The Steering Committee and voted on by the group as a whole. New rules, changes, and members will not go forwards without at least 70% (or the next closest number, relative to group size) in favour, though we will strive for unanimity. The current member cap is six people.

The Gadfly

Unreliable Narrators Since 470 BCE

The Gadfly - Official Style Guide

By Hassan Ahmed, Mateo Grgić, & Lianne Elkadri

To maintain integrity and consistency within The Gadfly, the Steering Committee has drafted a style guide. Whilst the style guide is not binding in the way that The OAoAFTG is, it's still strongly recommended that you follow it to a tee. Articles & other Gadfly-related things will be minimally amended to comply with the guide.

Content Guidelines:

Consent is key.

Everyone who is in the region, or from the region needs express consent to be featured in the paper. They must see one of the final drafts of the piece they're in and will ideally provide recorded consent to be in the section. Don't bother asking a political leader for consent though, as per standard journalist practices, it's not required.

We have to follow the law.

Anything that breaks the law has to be removed. This extends to school board policy as well. Sensationalist language involving harm or violence, if it is included, has to be cartoonish in nature and can not be disturbing to read for anyone; in other words, stay PG.

Keep personal grudges outside of the newspaper.

Even if someone you know has done something extremely wrong, the newspaper is not a place for you to rail against them and their actions.

Avoid in-jokes & vulgar language

In-jokes aren't funny to readers outside of the team. Use of vulgar language will diminish any impact you may have had, and make the entire paper look unprofessional.

Our Tone:

Stay rebellious, unapologetic, and anti-authoritarian.

If you couldn't tell, this publication doesn't like authority. Follow content guidelines, but don't be apologetic otherwise. Be as rebellious as you can, the group will reel you back in if you go too far.

Be fun and witty.

What's the point in reading our newspaper if we aren't funny? Keep the content interesting, witty, and entertaining. We would prefer you didn't write anything, than write something low quality.

Formatting Section:

Spelling & grammar is to be in proper British English, not American or Canadian English.

Official Gadfly Documents are to be:

- Size 24 Bolded Opens Sans for document titles

- **Example**

- Size 15 Bolded Open Sans for headers
 - **Example**
- Size 13 Regular Open Sans for authorship credits
 - Example
- Size 10 Regular Open Sans for body text
 - Example

Fonts Used in the newspaper itself:

- Coromant Garamond Bold for Headers
- Coromant Infant Medium for body text
- Wordmark is UnifrakturCook with custom kerning, and motto is Coromant Garamond Bold Italicized. - In any case, if you need the official logo, please contact Mateo for the actual wordmark in either PNG or SVG format.

Official Colour: **Custom 'Gadfly' Forest Green (#09461d, rgb:9,70,29)**

Printed margins: 0.4 inch

All potentially required resources can be found here:

<https://github.com/matey-0/thegadfly.news/tree/main/assets>

What We Are Not:

We are not The Forecast, or a clone of it.

The Forecast is a different newspaper with different goals. We are not them, and we have no problem with members of this paper joining The Forecast. In our view, The Gadfly and The Forecast are complementary papers that do not need to compete with each other.

We are not The Onion, or a clone of it.

While we share some minor similarities, we are not The Onion. The Onion is political, we are not always. Do not try to write like The Onion, write like The Gadfly. The Onion is also usually not very funny; mostly duds. If you are going to plagiarise, at least steal from The Beaverton.

We are not a magazine.

We do not have one set theme, we do not rely on gossip, and we do not rely solely on illustrations or images. Your words should carry the message. Images can be used, but used sparingly.

We are not a repository of information.

Basic terms do not need to be defined. This is not a dictionary, an encyclopedia, or any trusted source of knowledge. Assume readers have a basic understanding of the thing you are about to satirise.

Contact Info:

In the event you need to contact the team, we've provided some contact info:

General Inquiries:

Official Email: thegadfly.team@proton.me

Mateo Grgic:

Personal: mateo.grgic@gmail.com

School: grgim5962@wrdsb.ca

Phone Number: +1 (226) 989-8322

Hassan Ahmed:

Personal: hahm3724@proton.me

School: ahmeh0354@wrdsb.ca

Lianne Elkadri:

School: elkal8123@wrdsb.ca

How to Write 'Gadfly-esque' Satire

By Mateo Grgic

There are generally 4 main steps to writing good satire:

- Find your target
- Choose a lens or a Satirical Frame
- Commit to the bit (keep a straight face)
- Add details, build the world

I'll go into some depth with all 4 steps. Of course, **satire isn't an absolute thing, and these rules aren't set in stone; feel free to modify & deviate from this framework**. It's meant to be a starting point of sorts, to show you what good, conventional satire looks like, and to provide a quality way to write satire.

Step One: Find your target.

Almost all good satire starts with a shared observation. You often don't want to try to be funny just yet, just figure out something that is illogical, absurd, frustrating, etc that people will relate to.

Your target should almost never be a person. Generally stick to these types of ideas:

- A System
 - The 'education system', bureaucracy, etc
- An Idea or trend
 - Latest fads, the way people talk, trends, etc
- A Type of language
 - Corporate jargon, medical speak, advertisement exaggeration, etc
- A Shared frustration
 - A notoriously bad local business, a confusing rule, something that doesn't work

Example: Your 'target' *probably shouldn't be a teacher*, rather, the stereotypical idea of a 'Teacher'.

Step Two: Choose your Satirical Frame (Your lens):

Now that you have your target, you need to attack it. Generally, the point of satire is to attack an idea indirectly. The satirical frame you use is your fictional scenario or voice you use to make a point. This is where your creativity shines.

Some common satirical frames that are used are:

- A glowing review of something terrible
 - Find something bad and praise it in the language of a connoisseur.
- A serious, scientific analysis of something trivial
 - Treat a stupid thing like something important, with the utmost academic and/or scientific seriousness.
- 'The Inversion'
 - E.G. Comparing an infant to a 30 year old; take a common argument and flip it on its head to show how ridiculous the argument actually is.
- 'The modest proposal' strategy
 - Propose a solution to a problem that seems logical, but is morally horrific, to demonstrate the true nature of a problem. (This one is based on Johnathon Swift's "A Modest Proposal", one of the best pieces of satire in western literature ever written.)
- A leaked memo
 - A supposed confidential, internal document that displays the absurd or cyclical logic of an organization you want to satirize.
- Q&A
 - A Q&A that is supposed to clarify, but ends up confusing more than it helped.
- A How-to guide
 - A step-by-step guide to do something impossible, ridiculous, useless, morally questionable, or otherwise silly.
- Fish-out-of-water narrator
 - An outsider describes a common (or not common) situation from their perspective.
- Literal interpretation
 - Take a common metaphor, idiom, piece of conversation, etc and treat it as reality or something serious.
- Overly specific and niche expert
 - An article by, or an interview with a really specific niche expert on something useless or dumb.
- Re-branding/press release
 - Re-branding something bad, old, and/or unpleasant as something fun & new, often using corporate jargon, etc.
- An Open letter
 - A formal, often dramatic letter addressed to a concept, inanimate object, an institution, or something equally silly.
- The straight-faced news report
 - Read: The Onion, The Beaverton.
- Guest column
 - An opinion piece or something, by someone silly or absurd.
- Academic abstract/Scientific study

- You present a completely dry, obvious, or otherwise uninteresting finding in scientific jargon, using overly complicated language.
- A Recipe
 - You know how this one works, make a recipe for something silly.
- Reviews
 - Review of something silly, or something that can't be bought.

These are just general, common ones. Talented satire writers often use multiple frames to create something new & original. You don't need to use any of these, and you can deviate as much as you like. They're just common & decent frames to use.

Step 3: Commit to the Bit!!!

This is the most important rule; You aren't a comedian telling a joke, you are a straight-faced character in an absurd world. Your narrator should be completely unaware that what they are saying is completely insane. Don't break the fourth wall.

- Use formal language
- Avoid swearing
- Use proper sentence structure
- Be an 'Expert' (unless otherwise required)
- Never Wink (Don't use sarcasm, don't tell the reader that this is a joke)
 - The funny-ness of satire comes from the reader connecting the dots themselves. Don't spell it out.

Step 4: Write the darn thing

Now it comes time to actually write your satirical piece. A single joke can get boring and tedious, so build a world for your reader. Populate your absurd world with little jokes and details; fake statistics, strange facts, etc: All presented with an air of realism.

- Create jargon
- Invent facts
- Use sensory details

Just be a good author generally. Get your article proofread by someone. I personally am almost always available to proofread, and I'm typically a good proof reader, if you can't find anyone to proofread for you.

How To Read

By Hassan Ahmed

Hello. I am learning that I'm not the best at writing to be understood, but I'll do my best. Just as writing satire is different from writing other things, the way we read also changes text to text. I feel that people think they can just 'read', they think that there aren't different ways of reading. It's indescribable, but reading needs to adapt to the genre just like writing does. I'll give some tips that will hopefully set you on the right path.

1) It's funny if you let it be.

Writing and reading are collaborative activities. This goes for any piece of art really. Maybe there are some Michelangelo-esque art pieces that are perfect despite your attempts to criticise them. I would say that's probably just a romanticisation, but what do I know. You don't need Michelangelo to like things. You can find joy in a lot of things as long as they're genuine, I think. Just let yourself enjoy art. Doesn't mean you can't think about it critically. To give an example, I think Spinoza's writing is one of the most beautiful things I have ever read. Now if I got caught up in the realization that I think he's completely wrong and engaging in intellectual cowardice (and a touch of sophistry), I might not appreciate the beauty as much. Two things can be true.

2) Reading in your head is overrated.

This isn't fourth grade. Everyone knows you can read in your head. But that's just terrible isn't it? Reading in your head is a social conditioning we go through because it's a bit obnoxious in public. It shouldn't be the main way we read. The pauses, the dialogue, they all get lost when you don't embody them. Read it aloud, throw on an accent, be overly pompous. Or read it in a monotone voice. I don't know. Just don't be lame.

3) Reading alone is overrated.

It's easier to have fun when you're with others, and the social aspect forces you to read aloud. It's good. Do it. Ask a stranger to read with you, writing and reading shouldn't be considered a primarily solitary thing. Go find someone and ask them to read with you. Will you look like a nerd? Sure. Do it anyway. If you're nervous, ask a kid who can't read yet to sit with you. You both have plenty to learn from each other.

4) If you don't understand it, write things down.

This less applies to our satire, since its all so surface level. But read any work that's at least a little introspective and there will be things that make you think. Let yourself do that. And write things down. That's good practice. You get better at writing, and you establish a communication between yourself and the future you. Do a diary if that works for you. Or don't, I don't personally. But I write anyway, so you know. Sometimes the writing is the problem, but a lot of the time you're the problem. And even if you aren't, there's no harm in getting better, yeah?

5) If you don't like it, change it.

We all write differently. Or at least we should. There's a lot of things you might do that most people don't. Maybe you've noticed, but I start sentences with 'and' 'n 'but' a bit. I jump between tones too--It's a lot of fun, I think you should try it!--and you may not like this. So change it. You've got a doohickey in your skull that can read one thing and say another, and you don't abuse that? If it doesn't flow well when you say it, change it. Don't try this with anything analytical, but stupid stuff like this shouldn't be a problem. You already do this, just unintentionally. All I'm asking is you start doing it for real.

Keep these in mind at the start and I think it'll make for a stronger reading experience. I veered a little bit away from satire, but that's alright.

A Manifesto for The Gadfly

By Hassan Ahmed

"It would have been so pointless to kill himself that, even if he had wanted to, the pointlessness would have made him unable."

I cannot explain this. Not even to myself. It is a feeling you are too old to understand. Writing is perhaps the worst medium of all to transpose meaning. They go through countless revisions and edits because your future self assumes what the past self meant. But they are different people, fundamentally different people writing in different contexts. This will not be edited, and you will have to bear that. How hard a burden for you to bear, such a weight that has been placed on your miserable shoulders. I am not writing to be understood, you are not reading to understand, we both ought to do away with this game of respect.

I have written in a myriad of styles. A collection of essays, with all the dread and bland pasting of rules and etiquettes that kills the wit of the reader and writer. A manifesto, a fiery condemnation that lies to everyone and triggers a repulsive, primal sensation in the gut. And why did I use so many words when I could've just used one? Cringe. Who am I trying to impress? Certainly not you, I do not respect you enough to say these words to your face. I substitute with print, the unholy medium ever conceived. I believe writing is the reason hell exists, and I believe every reader and writer will go to hell. I mean that sincerely. But the window has been wide open for some time now, it would do us no favours to close it now, the room would be just as cold and the breeze would be gone. I have nothing left to frame other than what I frame naturally. This is all a convoluted satire, I'm sure you think. That is what I think. But thinking will do us no favours. Not here. It's best not to.

My writing is accessible, you can still follow every word and turn I make. Whether or not you can understand why is different; they are different words after all. That is one grace of print, it can always be read back. But every draw forward is another draw back.

There are many questions I will ask, you can ask your own if you are compelled. I cannot answer. Print is truly inhuman. Why not end my life right now? Why do anything? Why cause pain? Why not cause pain? You cannot answer because this is not a conversation. It is print. I will answer these questions, or maybe I will find better ones. Or worse ones. Or putting moral value on questions is strange and normal. I will not hold myself a slave to decisions that a past thing--a non-existent, only figurative being that once existed but does not exist now and will never exist now--made. You understand, don't you? I am not trying to make a work of art, honesty is my only goal. And not because honesty is better but because I am only capable of writing honestly. I will not explain this any further, you understand.

You have nothing against me. If I were to kill myself right now, there is nothing you could say or do. And if I wait a century, you still will not do anything but now for reasons outside your own control. And so you are irrelevant. The answer is my own answer. Suicide is such a strange thing. The word itself is more repulsive than the act. Print, I was told, is only a medium. And yet sooner should one kill himself than say she is going to. No other word is like suicide. Genocide maybe, but it is bureaucratic. It is boring. It is impersonal, only occurring to an other until it happens to you. But suicide is special. Especially made for me, so why shouldn't I? I would be free from print. Is that it? That it is freedom in its most pure form? No. Do not think that. That would be too beautiful for the disheveled. That is a good word. It revolts against its meaning. The answer is that suicide's resonance is only with us because the people who are in genocide are not us. And how stupid are they, to fall on genocide? I would never, and I will never test that assertion. Suicide's power cannot come from the beauty in its freedom, it comes from the tribalistic threat. And how stupid was I for thinking not the latter? I wanted to talk about suicide, because you won't. You will talk of the action of suicide, the effects of suicide, but not suicide. You will not respect it. Do you fear it? Your power comes from the state, and you are afraid? Pity is what I am thinking but it is not the right word. There is still hesitation here. From the time that I think and when my fingers hit the keys. I do not like print.

I think there's a better explanation for why you are so afraid of a word. It makes you uncomfortable. And you do not know why. You can explain it, but you do not know. There's a sense of unease in everything. We all see it don't we? It's that hesitation. That something isn't quite right. It's what we build our monuments on, it's what the stories we tell say, they do not know. I do not know either. Don't pretend I do. Disheveled have done unto suicide what Freud has done unto Shakespeare. You are Freud, isn't that embarrassing? Words are narcotics aren't they? But moving away from suicide, the act of killing yourself is entirely mundane. Scrape away romanticisations and demonifications and there is nothing. It is in the most complete way, human. It's just another door we close. And we close many doors. What is so scary about this one? That we will no longer get to close any more after this final gate? But it is more than just a door, isn't it? It is an exit, and exits are not resonant; they are different words. That is another problem with print, speech altogether. So that is it, the fundamental question answered, which leaves us only with more questions. But no, I have more to say. Or rather type, since not a word is leaving my throat. I am not in the business of making moral claims. Only moral judgements, and I am a writer. I am going to hell. The judgments of a sinner mean nothing.

Escape is so strange? No one has ever done away with escape, writing is an escape. Writing is an escape just as heroin is an escape. And not writing is also an escape. But suicide is an escape. I think you will understand that. Should we not strive to end escape? Death is the final escape. All other escapes should be done away with. Vapers should be killed so that every ungrateful disheveled can appreciate the fog. And you are ungrateful. Everything you

own, every relation you have, all built on blood. You stand for the anthem of the murderers and acknowledge the deaths of the murdered. But you do not stand willingly. You lie to yourself to make it easier to stand. That is escape. Or your soul is unconvinced and you do not stand. That can be escape. Resonance cuts through escape. It is truer. It is beauty, if two words could ever be related to one another. Love is resonant. Emotion is resonant.

What is your reason for suicide? Was it born from hedonistic masturbation? And now you don't feel and your escape compels you to build on escape? Was it intellectual masturbation? Which does the same but feels better for nerds? I wish words were fluid, but they are not. Or was your reason greater? An old Jewish man spoke of costume parties, that is a good reason for suicide. But he was still there, because God compelled him. But he was an atheistic Jew, and god was controlled by him. Was this escape? He has given to me a burglary of my own voice. I cannot say. And then he was gone, as fluid and undefinable as I wish everything was. There are good reasons for suicide and bad reasons, I hope you understand that now. But the good reasons can only be held by people who cannot commit suicide. They are unafraid of life and death, and are not attracted to suicide. Once they realise that suicide is just escape, it all becomes so boring.

And so there is no suicide. Or there is, but it is only an option out of many. Its exclusivity faded when the veneer fell. And so whatever escape takes its place is not a replacement. Because suicide has no inherency, it was only holding place for something greater. Or something equal. Or something worse. It was only holding place. Whatever that may be. For me, it is something that is resonant. To me and me only. The only resonance this bundle of words has had. Words. Words that carry meaning. Words that pretend to carry meaning, deliberately sent with subversive meaning. Is that not poetic? So that's what this is. This is my manifesto, written in one session. But I am not done, even if I thought I was. There is always more to write. It has no physical limit. It is wholly unholy.

Everything is fake, and you see that, don't you? We take the actor, who makes meaning from nothing, knowing it is nothing, with no expectations. But we pervert that and become the actor in our daily lives. And we act because everyone else does. And of course the disheveled have words for stepping out of line. Immaturity. Youth is to dishevelment what resonance is to escape. But that is something you cannot understand. There are many things you are unable to understand. You think you can, and you will explain them as if they do, but you lack the resonance.

Do you ever stop? Stop everything when you are in a quiet room? It's only when you cease endless noise that you realise that nothing is ever quiet. You'll hear the humming of the computer. And you'll hear the ticking of the clock. And you'll hear it get louder. You don't notice that, do you? Not until everything is quiet. How many people do you think can read a

clock? How many people say they can? The disparity will shock you, I am sure. And now I am talking a lot to you, though this isn't a conversation. And I am not saying the clock doesn't matter, it fills noise and gives pause to otherwise incessantly noisy men. But the time doesn't matter. Time is an escape. A primal escape, the most resonant escape. And so time gets to stay, because its meaning is beautiful because time evades meaning. It is how all things should be. You can only label that which you do not understand, and you can never label that which you do. How disheveled. I still like that word better than most. And not for its meaning, that has no use to me. I lack inspiration, my words feel dead. Stale.

Interactions all feel forced, emails are of great annoyance. They are almost a parody of speech.

Print imitating speech which has been corrupted by print. All these are worth the laughter you may get from mocking them. Laughter has resonance.

The resonance of laughter is strong. It is the resonance of fun. Isn't that a strange concept? To live a life of reflection--though certainly not sophistry--and to break it with laughter. Two resonant forces in contradiction to one another. And they need each other. Because reflection becomes unbearable. It becomes so unbearable that the escape of intellectual masturbation guides you onto a dark dirt road. A place where not even senses can help. And then the car begins to falter and you have to leave the car behind. And then the soul is stranded. And so laughter is needed to pull out of reflection. But laughter does not come from ease. It comes from subversion. And subversion comes best when the version is unfit. It is a marriage of opposites. Where they entangle into each other and become one. And that is something new, as resonant as time. But words fail here.

I have nothing else to say. My words are complete, though the message has been lost in translation.

The Gadfly

Unreliable Narrators Since 470 BCE

Consent Form for Feature in “The Gadfly”

The following form is to be signed in the event of your name or likeness’ feature in The Gadfly. Please read the following information, fill out the relevant sections, and return to The Secretary of The Gadfly (the person who gave you this form).

What This Applies To:

The purpose of all this is to record your consent. We would ideally just ask you for consent and leave it at that, but the bureaucracy™ would like us to have a form. Useful to keep track of things I suppose. This form ONLY counts towards the single piece of media your likeness is being used in (article, ad, photo, etc.); if you are included in more than one piece of media, you will have to sign another form. If you are included in a future issue, you will also have to sign another form then.

If you are a public figure (e.g. politician, celebrity, high-level government worker) we do not need your consent. Because you sold your soul to the devil, we do not care for your opinion.

We Will Bother You.

We believe that consent matters. You will have the right to review your media upon its completion and offer your feedback. Your feedback is binding and will be implemented prior to the official release. We will stay in contact until you are satisfied with the piece of media your likeness is attached to. Please note that once the newspaper for that month is printed, we cannot recall the copies and as such all mentions are final. We cannot stress how important it is to voice any concerns you have before we release.

- ☐ I, the person whose likeness is being used in The Gadfly, agree to the above.
- ☐ I, the person whose likeness is being used in The Gadfly, do not agree to the above.
(checking this box guarantees a follow-up from The Gadfly team to negotiate terms)

Now onto the signing, we apologise for the dehumanising nature of the following fields. Just how 'professionalism' works.

The Actual Signing Part:

First Name of Subject: _____ Last Name of Subject: _____

Media Type (please circle):

Article Ad Photograph Other

Signature of Subject: _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian (If Applicable): _____

Date: _____