In our reasoning, we are justified in relying on simple logical rules. For instance, we are justified in inferring from “It is raining outside” and “If it is raining outside then the streets will be wet” to “The streets will be wet.” By contrast, we are not justified in inferring from the relevant axioms of arithmetic to some difficult mathematical theorem in a single step. Such an inferential step is intuitively "too large" to count as justified. What accounts for this difference?
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