

When a moralist forces the issue with an individual the individual 'confabulates'.  
When the individual forces the issue with a moralist the moralist 'explains'.

When an individual calls the moralist on his explanation the moralist will simply complicate the matter by adding qualifiers and rationalization. The moralist will call this 'explanation'. But when the individual gives such additional explanation his additional effort will be deemed confabulations, or stated in current terminology, 'spin'. Thus, the moralist 'explains' his inconsistency while the individual 'spins' his inconsistency. The distinction between 'explaining' and confabulation is not derived from some deep profound understanding of how best to manage the inconsistency in the assessment, but who has more social dominance. Since the moralist, by definition of his position, intrinsically has a strong social dominance he will be able to declare the individual's assessment false. The individual will be branded a liar. The moralist is immune to charges of confabulation, and will simply state he is explaining or elaborating his position even when he commits the same sin of confabulation. The difference lies in social dominance and not in 'actual' knowledge.

Social dominance evades consciousness. Its determined by who defers to who first in a conflict. A somewhat reliable measurement is a staring contest in which the one that looks a way first defers to the other. Or stated otherwise, the one that maintains the stare has social dominance over the one that looks away. In argument, the person that concedes the point but doesn't mean it defers. The obdurate arguer establishes social dominance over the deferring arguer. Social dominance seems to be some neural mechanism in place to give a social hierarchy a rapid and nonviolent way of resolving conflict. This dominance is always found in moralists. Social dominance is the power that enables them to do those things that mark them as moralist.

Ultimately 'truth' was discovered by the baboon that could stare down the another baboon after he stole his banana.

This realization makes it relatively easy to ascertain how the vast majority of explanations of things in the world develops into 'truth'. The moralist denounces competing explanations as confabulations and sublimates his 'explanation' into the 'true' assessment. Religious explanation almost always derives its 'truth' from social dominance. This is why as religious institutes lose dominance over people their explanations become less 'truthful'.

However, linking explanation to religion as a function of social dominance does not excuse science. Even in the hallowed ground of 'objectivity' and 'peer confirmation' social dominance plays some role in determining the 'true' natural

explanation. The mere act of 'peer confirmation' requires social dominance to function. And the preferential bias of 'objectivity' is unjustified and requires something outside of 'justification'. Social dominance is the outside justification for 'objectivity'.