SAHILVERSE / CASE FILE 001

AUTHENTICITY THEATRE.

A field guide to performance, proof and the right to remain complex.



PRINTABLE INSPECTOR · WORKED EXAMPLE · REFLECTION SHEET

RETURN TO THE SAHILVERSE ↗

https://sahiltayal.com/

A NOTE ABOUT THE LIMITS

01 / Enter the theatre

Authenticity is not a molecule that can be extracted from another person. It is a family of judgments about source, sincerity, congruence, values and presentation. Someone may speak sincerely but be mistaken; a rehearsed sentence may be fully accurate; a fictional character may express a genuine artistic position. Before declaring a person "real" or "fake," identify precisely what kind of promise has been made.

The theatre metaphor comes from Erving Goffman’s analysis of everyday interaction. People use roles and settings to help encounters make sense. The existence of a front stage does not establish a malicious backstage. The more productive inquiry checks a claim at the right level: public facts with evidence, artistic frames with their contracts, values with patterns of action, and personal boundaries with respect.

[DOCUMENTED FACT] An institutional publisher confirms Goffman’s The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959); the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy documents broader debates about authenticity.

02 / Four distinctions

Performance is not necessarily deception. A staged presentation may clarify work, show care or support a creative persona. The ethical issue is whether the audience is materially misled about a consequential factual claim.

Sincerity is not accuracy. Belief can be genuine and wrong. Where the claim concerns a verifiable event, corroboration is more informative than a vivid emotional display.

Privacy is not concealment of wrongdoing. Refusing to reveal intimate details may preserve safety, dignity and autonomy. Ask what an audience truly needs to know to make an informed decision.

Consistency is not rigidity. People learn, change contexts and revise commitments. A documented contradiction may require an explanation, but change alone is not proof of bad character.

This field guide does not score, diagnose or reveal motives. It supports accountable interpretation. Its questions are educational editorial devices, not a validated psychometric instrument.

03 / When the stage changes

Art: A mask can plainly announce fiction. The question is whether anyone was promised literal autobiography. Platforms: Feeds are selective by design; "behind the scenes" may itself be edited. Organisations: Claims about labour, sourcing, inclusivity and safety can justify a higher evidentiary standard because others make decisions on their basis. Relationships: A person’s right to set boundaries persists even when somebody seeks reassurance.

A critic should also consider who is allowed to disagree. Audience applause is weak evidence if disagreement would cost someone a job, a friendship or safety. Social position and cultural expectations shape what observers reward as honest or “natural.”

04 / Two historical scenes

[DOCUMENTED FACT] The official David Bowie archive and the UK National Portrait Gallery record Ziggy Stardust as an important stage persona in 1972–73. Bowie’s use of character, costume and theatrical world-building is publicly documented.

The persona can be read as a constructed artistic lens rather than an affidavit about the performer’s private life. This is interpretation: the historical fact of the character does not allow us to infer the artist’s concealed motives. Audiences can value the craft without collapsing a character into a person.

[DOCUMENTED FACT] Public reporting by PBS NewsHour and the Los Angeles Times describes Daniel Dumile’s masked performances as MF DOOM and his wider use of artistic identities.

The mask complicates the demand that honesty must look like open facial access. It can direct attention toward language, music and character. This is an interpretation of public art, not evidence of private psychological states. Hip-hop’s historical development within Black and Latino communities also deserves recognition beyond individual branding analogies.

05 / The paper Claim Inspector

Complete the five steps below. Each produces a question, not an authenticity verdict.

1. Copy the exact claim. Keep quotation marks accurate. Do not rewrite another person’s words to make them more extreme.
2. Describe the context. Is it a social post, workplace promise, stage fiction or personal conversation? State the audience and potential stakes.
3. Choose an evidence class. Unknown, claim alone, selected examples, or independent records for a narrow fact. Explain why that class fits.
4. Review observations over time. Unknown, aligned, mixed, or specifically contradicted. Avoid treating one scene as a whole biography.
5. Write an ethical limit. Identify information that would be intrusive or irrelevant to demand. Name a possible fair correction.

Editorial output template: “The available evidence supports [specific narrow statement]. The key uncertainty is [named uncertainty]. A fair next question is [question]. I will not infer [hidden motive or private trait].”

FICTION / NO REAL INDIVIDUAL

06 / Worked example

Invented claim: A fictional workshop organiser, Nova, says, “Everything I post is completely unfiltered.” The promotional video looks spontaneous, but an editor later confirms the sequence was rehearsed. Context: commercial public post. Evidence: direct admission of rehearsal for this particular video. Audience: mixed potential buyers. Pattern: one documented discrepancy, not a comprehensive history.

Question 1 — wording: Does “everything” include promotional videos? Question 2 — evidence: Which materials confirm preparation, and what remains unchecked? Question 3 — stage: Did “unfiltered” refer to unedited conversations or simply an informal visual style? Question 4 — accountability: Would the distinction affect a customer’s decision, and how could the promise be clarified?

Proportionate conclusion: One promotional scene was rehearsed despite a broad “unfiltered” statement. The claim needs definition or correction; the evidence does not establish Nova’s overall sincerity, private character or every other practice. This is a hypothetical teaching case, not an allegation.

07 / Ethics notes

- Target the promise, not the person. Describe a checkable claim and its stakes rather than announcing a global character judgment.
- Respect context. Fiction, aspiration, metaphor, value and factual assertion carry different burdens of evidence.
- Do not practise amateur lie detection. Body language, accent, silence, tears and apparent confidence cannot certify truth.
- Consider power. The costs of public disagreement, disclosure and unwanted visibility are unevenly distributed.
- Preserve correction. A good inquiry allows new records or explanations to narrow or revise its conclusion.
- Use restraint. “Insufficient evidence” is a legitimate result. Uncertainty should not be converted into suspicion.

FILL BY HAND — NO DATA COLLECTION

08 / One-page reflection sheet

Choose a public claim, your own claim, or an obviously invented example. Keep identities private when they are not necessary. The exercise is complete when you produce a narrow statement and one unanswered question.

A. Exact words of the claim / source and date (if public):

B. Context and audience / decision at stake:

C. Evidence actually checked / evidence missing:

D. Possible alternative interpretation or counterexample:

E. Privacy boundary / a fair next question:

Conclusion template: “I can currently support _____. I cannot establish _____. A proportionate next question would be _____.”

REMEMBER: A careful critic is neither a cheerleader nor a mind reader.

VERIFIED SOURCE PAGES, 27 OCTOBER 2026

09 / Further reading

Authenticity — Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy — https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/authenticity/

The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life — Erving Goffman, Penguin Random House — https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/61106/the-presentation-of-self-in-everyday-life-by-erving-goffman/

Authentic™ — Sarah Banet-Weiser, NYU Press — https://nyupress.org/9780814787144/authentic/

The Ethics of Authenticity — Charles Taylor, Harvard University Press — https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674987692

The Authenticity Paradox — Herminia Ibarra, Harvard Business Review — https://hbr.org/2015/01/the-authenticity-paradox

It's Complicated — danah boyd, Yale University Press — https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300166316/its-complicated/

David Bowie — National Portrait Gallery — https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/person/mp06534/david-bowie

MF DOOM reporting — PBS NewsHour — https://www.pbs.org/newshour/arts/mf-doom-masked-rapper-known-for-complex-lyrics-dies-at-49

LIVE DESTINATIONS VERIFIED DURING PREPARATION

10 / Explore More

Thank You, Hip-Hop — musical identity and cultural reflection — https://rap.sahiltayal.com/

The Identity–Action Gap — commitments, context and action — https://identityaction.sahiltayal.com/

The Human Behaviour Lab — interpretation and the limits of psychological inference — https://psychology.sahiltayal.online/

Sahilverse.online — open the discovery machine — https://sahilverse.online/

Sahiltayal.online — follow the other orbit — https://sahiltayal.online/

FINAL ACT / EXPLORE MORE

A MASK IS A QUESTION, NOT A VERDICT.

Creator home / Return to the Sahilverse
https://sahiltayal.com/

Discovery machine
https://sahilverse.online/

Another entrance
https://sahiltayal.online/

Related world / Thank You, Hip-Hop
https://rap.sahiltayal.com/

Related world / The Identity–Action Gap
https://identityaction.sahiltayal.com/

Written and illustrated for Sahilverse · © 2026 Sahil Tayal

https://sahiltayal.com/