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 :

December 10, 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

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 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; Cassuto, 2010; Kopka & Daly, 2004; Lamport, 1994; Pires et al., 2021). 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.

1.2. 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.

$$\text{Parameter} = ax^2 + bx + c1 \tag{1.1}$$

eq. (1.3) 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 practi- cal 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.

$$P = ax^2 + bx + c + \frac{d^5}{r^2} \tag{1.2}$$

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 practi- cal 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.

$$\text{Parameter} = ax^2 + bx + c1 \tag{1.3}$$

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 practi- cal 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.

$$a_1 = b_1 + c_1 \tag{1.4}$$

$$a_2 = b_2 + c_2 - d_2 + e_2 \tag{1.5}$$

Test - Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science

Test - Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science

$$a_1 = b_1 + c_1$$

$$a_2 = b_2 + c_2 - d_2 + e_2$$

Test - Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science

Test - Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science

$$a_1 = b_1 + \frac{c1}{c2}$$

$$a_2 = b_2 + c_2 - d_2 + \frac{e_2}{e_3}$$

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 there.

$$a_1 = b_1 + c$$

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 there.

$$a_1 = b_1 + \frac{c1}{c2}$$

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. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case). Regular displays — has more space.

$$a_1 = b_1 + \frac{c1}{c2}$$

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.

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \tag{1.6}$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \tag{1.7}$$

$$a_2 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \tag{1.8}$$

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.

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.

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

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.

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$$

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.

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.

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \, \mathrm{d}x$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \, \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{\pi}$$

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.

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.

$$y = mx + c \tag{1.9}$$

$$y = mx + c + mx_3 + c_2 \tag{1.10}$$

$$y = mx + c \tag{1.11}$$

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. 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.

$$y = mx + c \tag{1.12}$$

$$y = mx + c \tag{1.13}$$

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.

1.3. 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.

Cassuto, L. (2010). Advising the struggling dissertation student. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *57*(17), 51–53.

Kopka, H., & Daly, P. W. (2004). *A guide to LaTeX and electronic publishing* (Fourth) [https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide_To_LaTeX.pdf]. Addison-Wesley.

Lamport, L. (1994). *LaTeX – A Document Preparation System* (Second) [User's Guide and Reference Manual. https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Lamport-La-Te-X-A-Document-Preparation-System-2nd-Edition/PGM159713.html]. Addison-Wesley.

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.