

MY NDSU THESIS — SANDBOX

A Dissertation  
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
of the  
North Dakota State University  
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major :

August 27, 2023

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University  
Graduate School

---

**Title**

MY NDSU THESIS — SANDBOX

---

**By**

---

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this dissertation complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Approved:

---

Date

---

Department Chair

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	v
1. TEST CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	1
1.1. Section . . . . .	1
1.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	1
1.2. References . . . . .	5
2. TEST SECOND CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	6
2.1. Section . . . . .	7
2.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	7
2.2. Second Section - NDSU Style Equation Spacing . . . . .	9
2.3. References . . . . .	11

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1. Professional looking fixed-width table using booktabs package. . . . .	1
1.2. Professional looking automatic full-width table using tblr environment and booktabs package. . . . .	2

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	3
1.2. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	3
2.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	8
2.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	8

# 1. TEST CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX

This “`ndsu-sandbox.tex`” file can be used as a sandbox to try out things in the actual NDSU thesis environment. Things tested here (including the bibliography) can be readily inserted into the original thesis/dissertation document. Therefore, this lightweight source will be convenient to test things out. So, go for it — and remember anything is possible by  $\text{\LaTeX}$  (almost!?).

## 1.1. Section

### 1.1.1. Sub-Section

#### 1.1.1.1. Sub-Sub-Section

Dummy text from kantlipsum[9]. Reference listing on the next page. Check it for the intended formatting. I refer to (Baczkowski et al., 1990; Kopka and Daly, 2004; Lamport, 1994). In all theoretical sciences, the paralogsms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogsms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

**Table 1.1. Professional looking fixed-width table using booktabs package.**

Number (left)	Our rating (center)	Month (right)
1	Colder	January
2	Okay	February
3	Good	March

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

**Table 1.2. Professional looking automatic full-width table using `tblr` environment and `booktabs` package.**

Number (left)	Our rating (center)	Month (right)
1	Colder	January
2	Okay	February
3	Good	March

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Firstfootnote<sup>1</sup> And second<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>One - this is our first footnote. We can have our text here.

<sup>2</sup>The second footnote! Important as we have used 2 footnotes the next chapter footnote, if required, should be manually input as 3. Check how it is done on the chapter title in Page # 6.



**Figure 1.1. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command.**

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogsms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogsms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.



**Figure 1.2. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified.**



Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So, it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general.

As we have already seen, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells us that the

objects in space and time, in the full sense of these terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

## 1.2. References

- Baczkowski, L. S., Enderle, J. D., Krause, D. J., & Rawson, J. L. (1990). NDSU undergraduate design projects for the disabled. *Biomedical Sciences Instrumentation*, 26, 95–99.
- Kopka, H., & Daly, P. W. (2004). *A guide to  $\text{\LaTeX}$  and electronic publishing* (Fourth) [[https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide\\_To\\_LaTeX.pdf](https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide_To_LaTeX.pdf)]. Addison-Wesley.
- Lamport, L. (1994).  *$\text{\LaTeX}$  – A Document Preparation System* (Second) [User's Guide and Reference Manual. <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Lamport-La-TeX-A-Document-Preparation-System-2nd-Edition/PGM159713.html>]. Addison-Wesley.

## 2. TEST SECOND CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX<sup>3</sup>

The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know, our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so regarded, exist in our judgements.

The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence

---

<sup>3</sup> This paper footnote

of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

## 2.1. Section

### 2.1.1. Sub-Section

#### 2.1.1.1. Sub-Sub-Section

Dummy text from kantlipsum. Reference listing on the next page. Check it for the intended formatting. I refer to (Butin, 2009; Cassuto, 2010; Goossens et al., 2008; Pires et al., 2021; Rudestam and Newton, 2014). In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

A new footnote<sup>4</sup>.

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding. Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the complexnessivity<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>The footnote next of the new tootnote!

<sup>5</sup>Is that a word?



**Figure 2.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command.**

By virtue of natural reason, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in all theoretical sciences, the pure employment of the discipline of human reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the transcendental aesthetic constitutes the whole content for, still, the Ideal. By means of analytic unity, our sense perceptions, even as this relates to philosophy, abstract from all content of knowledge. With the sole exception of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that our sense perceptions exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori. Let us suppose that the Ideal occupies part of the sphere of our knowledge concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$A$ .....	Area ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$c$ .....	Speed of light ( $299.792 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ )
$R^2$ .....	Coefficient of determination

**Figure 2.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified.**

## 2.2. Second Section - NDSU Style Equation Spacing

Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding. Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the.

$$\text{Parameter} = ax^2 + bx + c \quad (2.1)$$

eq. (2.1) is one equation. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time.

$$P = ax^2 + b \quad (2.2)$$

$$P = ax^2 + bx + c + d^3 \quad (2.3)$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Tran-

scendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends.

$$R = 7.25x \times \alpha \quad (2.4)$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \gamma \quad (2.5)$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \frac{\beta}{3.6} \quad (2.6)$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \Delta \quad (2.7)$$

Equation (2.7) is the last one. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time.

$$y = \frac{2}{3} \times x \quad (2.8)$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends.

Equation (2.7) is the last one. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have

lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time.

$$y = \frac{2}{3} \times x b \quad (2.9)$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \gamma \quad (2.10)$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \frac{\beta}{3.6} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\text{Rate} = 8.8y \times \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \quad (2.12)$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them whole time.

$$X(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{se } \omega \in A \\ 1250 & \text{se } \omega \in A^c \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them whole time.

### 2.3. References

- Butin, D. W. (2009). *The education dissertation: A guide for practitioner scholars*. Corwin Press.
- Cassuto, L. (2010). Advising the struggling dissertation student. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 57(17), 51–53.



- Goossens, M., Rahtz, S., & Mittelbach, F. (2008). *The L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X Graphics Companion*. Addison-Wesley Reading, MA.
- Pires, F., Masanet, M. J., & Scolari, C. A. (2021). What are teens doing with YouTube? Practices, uses and metaphors of the most popular audio-visual platform. *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(9), 1175–1191.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2014). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Sage publications.