



**HAL**  
open science

**You certainly know the second law of thermodynamics,  
Do you know its connection to other laws of physics and  
chemistry?**

Qiong Ye, François-Xavier Machu, Qiuping A. Wang

► **To cite this version:**

Qiong Ye, François-Xavier Machu, Qiuping A. Wang. You certainly know the second law of thermodynamics, Do you know its connection to other laws of physics and chemistry?. 2022. hal-03469396v2

**HAL Id: hal-03469396**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03469396v2>**

Preprint submitted on 28 Feb 2022 (v2), last revised 8 Nov 2022 (v3)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

You certainly know the second law of thermodynamics,  
Do you know its connection to other laws of physics and chemistry?

Qiong Ye<sup>1</sup>, François-Xavier Machu<sup>2</sup>, Qiuping A. Wang<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>IMMM, CNRS UMR 6283, Université du Mans, Ave. O. Messiaen, Le Mans, France

<sup>2</sup>Laboratoire SCIQ, ESIEA, 9 Rue Vésale, 75225 Paris, France

### **Abstract**

Violation of the second law of thermodynamics has almost become a trivial locution today in physics, so often we hear about its experimental evidences, theoretical deduction and arguments coming from statistical mechanical or even quantum mechanical considerations. In this work, we bring to light an evidence against this violation. We propose a short revisit of the trilogy of the discovery of the second law, in order to bring out an almost hidden connection between the second law and the first law of energy conservation. This connection guarantees the second law of entropy increase is an inviolable iron rule and a fundamental law of physics, just like the law of energy conservation. Any presumable violation of the second law, even a probabilistic one, inevitably violates the law of energy and mass conservation, and undermines all fundamental laws of physics and chemistry. We conclude by summarizing an alternative pathway to the second law taking into account the multiplicity of paths of random motion.

**Keywords:** Entropy, second law of thermodynamics, random dynamics, energy, energy conservation, Carnot engine, perpetual mobile machine.

## **1) Introduction**

The second law of thermodynamics (second law for short) stipulates that entropy  $S$  always increases in the evolution of an isolated system and remains constant when the system reaches

thermodynamic equilibrium. Entropy of a system is defined by its small variation  $\delta S = \delta Q/T$  caused by a small quantity of heat  $\delta Q$  absorbed by the system from its surroundings, where  $T$  is the absolute temperature of the system evolving in an ideal and extremely slow reversible process [1][2]. For any other process out of equilibrium, also called irreversible process,  $\delta S > \delta Q/T$ ; this is the mathematical expression of the second law. When the system is isolated with  $\delta Q = 0$ , the second law becomes  $\delta S > 0$  as stipulated above<sup>1</sup>. According to a widely accepted interpretation, entropy represents a measure of the uncertainty or disorder in the movement of the molecules composing the systems. This idea is reflected in Boltzmann's famous formula  $S = \ln W$  where  $W$  is the total number of microstates (arrangements of the position and momentum of the molecules) in the system. Larger is  $W$ , more the molecules are moving in disorder. The second law means that the system always evolves towards the states having as many as possible microstates, or towards more and more disorder. A good example is the expansion of gas in an isolated recipient from a part of the volume to the empty part, because the number of microstates in the whole volume is larger than in a part of it; the entropy reaches its maximum when the gas uniformly fills the volume in an equilibrium state.

Since its discovery and especially its interpretation given by Boltzmann within statistical mechanics [3][4], the second law has never ceased to raise controversies until today. The most remarkable question is whether the second law is an inviolable fundamental law of nature, as for example Edington very famously insisted<sup>2</sup> [5], or whether it is just a statistical, or even anthropocentric law subject to possible violation, as proposed by Boltzmann and Maxwell, the two most famous pioneers and protagonists of statistical interpretation [3][4]. The twin demons

---

<sup>1</sup> It is worth mentioning the entropy is only defined for equilibrium states. It has been extended to non-equilibrium systems changing sufficiently slowly so as to keep local equilibrium and to apply equilibrium thermodynamics using entropy in each of their sufficiently small partitions [6].

<sup>2</sup> The law that entropy always increases holds, I think, the supreme position among the laws of Nature. If someone points out to you that your pet theory of the universe is in disagreement with Maxwell's equations - then so much the worse for Maxwell's equations. If it is found to be contradicted by observation - well, these experimentalists do bungle things sometimes. But if your theory is found to be against the Second Law of Thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it to collapse in deepest humiliation.

of Maxwell<sup>3</sup> [7] and of Laplace<sup>4</sup> [8] remain to date the unvanquished devils haunting the second law, with their sharpened faculties, endowed by classical mechanics, to observe and follow the motion of molecules, and to make entropy decrease and even disappear completely [9]. The statistical interpretation of the second law was proposed in this unfavorable context [3][4]; it asserts that the second law (entropy increase) has an overwhelmingly large probability; nevertheless, the probability of entropy decrease is not zero, albeit very small. Obviously, Boltzmann was seeking a reconciliation with the fundamental laws of classical mechanics, to the detriment of the fundamental attribute of the second law. This point of view has become the mainstream understanding of the second law as well as of the time irreversibility [10].

Violation of the second law has become a trivial locution in physics today. We have seen its experimental evidences [11][12] (more and more from quantum consideration, see for example [13]), theoretical arguments [14][15][16], and even a whole theory based on the fluctuation theorem [17], allowing systematic violation of the second law. According to this theorem, for every process in isolated systems where entropy increases by certain amount  $A$  with a given probability, there is a nonzero probability of the inverse process yielding the same amount of entropy decrease  $-A$ . In this formulism of the statistical interpretation, the second law violation, despite its small probability, becomes a ubiquitous phenomenon in every non-equilibrium thermodynamic process [17].

---

<sup>3</sup> ... if we conceive of a being whose faculties are so sharpened that he can follow every molecule in its course, such a being, whose attributes are as essentially finite as our own, would be able to do what is impossible to us. For we have seen that molecules in a vessel full of air at uniform temperature are moving with velocities by no means uniform, though the mean velocity of any great number of them, arbitrarily selected, is almost exactly uniform. Now let us suppose that such a vessel is divided into two portions,  $A$  and  $B$ , by a division in which there is a small hole, and that a being, who can see the individual molecules, opens and closes this hole, so as to allow only the swifter molecules to pass from  $A$  to  $B$ , and only the slower molecules to pass from  $B$  to  $A$ . He will thus, without expenditure of work, raise the temperature of  $B$  and lower that of  $A$ , in contradiction to the second law of thermodynamics [7].

<sup>4</sup> Une intelligence qui, à un instant donné, connaîtrait toutes les forces dont la nature est animée et la situation respective des êtres qui la composent, si d'ailleurs elle était suffisamment vaste pour soumettre ces données à l'analyse, embrasserait dans la même formule les mouvements des plus grands corps de l'univers et ceux du plus léger atome ; rien ne serait incertain pour elle, et l'avenir, comme le passé, serait présent à ses yeux [8].

The discussions of the validity of second law, since Boltzmann, have been largely based on the classical mechanics laws, all presumably being valid for the molecules composing thermodynamic systems [3]. As well known, the classical mechanics laws have all been well verified in their own domains for large enough (macroscopic or mesoscopic) systems; its extension to microscopic particles, however, may be fraught with difficulties. Quantum mechanics is better qualified for this molecular and atomic scale. Nevertheless, the optimism of interpreting the second law within quantum mechanics [9] has its limits because many systems obeying second law may be composed of large enough corpuscles obeying classical mechanics. Therefore, it is of first necessity to address the second law within classical mechanics.

The trouble of the classical mechanics approach to the second law is the conflict between the time *symmetric or reversible* character of mechanics laws and the time *asymmetric or irreversible* character of second law. This is the famous reversibility objection of second law opposing Boltzmann to Loschmidt<sup>5</sup> [21]. Although this debate remains open today, the Boltzmann's statistical interpretation of second law is one of the widely accepted, probably the surest and simplest way, to make peace between mechanics laws and the second law [10]. The consensus is the following: the mechanics laws are fundamentally inviolable iron rules at any scale; while the second law is only a statistical behavior, sometimes verified, sometimes violated. Put it differently, when an isolated thermodynamic system obeys the second law, it is perfectly normal because it is a consequence of the fundamental laws of mechanics; when the system violates the second law, it is completely normal as well because it is also a consequence of the same fundamental laws. In any case, the classical mechanics laws are fundamental, inviolable, and absolute, no matter what is the behavior of entropy. Moreover, all suggestions of violation give you the impression that the second law is an isolated phenomenon independent of all other physical and chemical phenomena, so that its violation does not have any impact on other laws of physics and chemistry, as if nothing important had happened.

In this paper, we address this debate under a different angle to show that this isolation of the second law is illusory. The second law actually has a vital connection to other fundamental laws, especially to the law of conservation of energy and mass. For this purpose, we propose to

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loschmidt%27s\\_paradox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Loschmidt%27s_paradox)

revisit succinctly the history of the discovery of the second law. In the course of those exploits from Carnot [1], Kelvin[23] to Clausius [2], we cannot but notice that the second law and the energy law are mutually conditioned, like conjoined twins. Energy conservation is a necessary condition for the second law (no energy conservation, no second law). Inversely, if the second law is broken, the law of energy conservation collapses at once.

After this demonstration, we discuss a new approach to the reconciliation between mechanics laws and second law. This approach is different from statistical mechanics in that it takes into account a key characteristic of random motion, ubiquitous in thermodynamic systems: the multiplicity of paths; this is the fact that a random motion can take different paths from a given initial state, contrary to classical mechanics motion taking only a single unique path from a given state. In this framework, the obstacles to the entropy increase of the second law, such as Liouville's theorem [18], Poincaré's recurrence theorem [19], and time symmetry [21], are removed once and for all [22][27]. Detailed discussion is given in the concluding remarks.

## 2) Discovery of entropy

It is sometimes said that the second law is an empirical finding<sup>6</sup>. It is not exactly true. The discovery of the second law, in its most profound form in terms of entropy, is actually a result of pure thought experiments and mathematical calculations.

Historically, the discovery of entropy has something to do with a decree of the Academy of Science of Paris in 1775 deciding not to examine any proposition of perpetual mobile machines [20]. Today we call this engine the perpetual mobile machine of first kind (PMM1)<sup>7</sup>. Since then, the impossibility of PMM1 began to be taken for granted on the basis of a common belief that

---

<sup>6</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second\\_law\\_of\\_thermodynamics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_law_of_thermodynamics)

<sup>7</sup> A dream of many engineers of that time is to construct what is called today the perpetual mobile machine of first kind, a machine that can produce unlimited amount of work without consuming heat or other energy resources. This machine violate the law of energy conservation. There is another type of perpetual mobile machine called of second kind capable of transforming heat from a single reservoir into work without any side effect. It is straightforward to show that this engine makes heat flow from cold to hot body, hence violate the second law. We will show later in this paper that it turns out to violate the first law of energy conservation as well because we can use it to fabricate a perpetual engine of first kind.

energy and motion cannot be created from nothing [1]; the law of energy conservation was not yet known at that time. Today we have the mathematical proof that this machine cannot exist because it violates the first law of thermodynamics, the law of conservation of energy. This decree is the starting point of the remarkable work of Carnot in the study of the efficiency of thermal engine [1], leading to the second law many years later. We can at once guess that there must have some vital connection between the second law and its starting hypothesis. In order to highlight this connection and the mathematical rigor in it, we will retrace the impressive trilogy from the impossibility of perpetual mobile all the way to the discovery of the second law. The reader will see a summary of the key elements of the story below. The details of the mathematics are described in **Appendix**.

*a) From perpetual mobile machine to Carnot theorem*

Carnot was concerned with heat engine and its efficiency. In 1824, he published the extraordinary idea of a reversible heat engine<sup>8</sup>, now called Carnot engine. This ideal engine can work in a reversible cycle between two reservoirs of heat, one at higher temperature  $t_1$  and the other at lower temperature  $t_2$ . The reversible cycle means that the engine can work in a forward cycle, extract a heat  $Q_1$  from  $t_1$ , reject a heat  $Q_2$  ( $<Q_1$ ) to  $t_2$  and produce a mechanical work  $W = Q_1 - Q_2$ ; it can also backtrack the same cycle inversely, extract the heat  $Q_2$  from  $t_2$ , consume the work  $W$ , and reject the heat  $Q_1$  to  $t_1$ . Carnot engine works in both directions with the same efficiency defined by  $\eta = \frac{W}{Q_1} = \frac{Q_1 - Q_2}{Q_1} = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ . The capacity of this reversible engine is extremely nontrivial because such a machine cannot exist. It is impossible for a real machine to perform such reversible operation due to friction or other form of energy loss. So all real engines are irreversible machines. With the help of this magic machine, Carnot discovered the efficiency limit for all possible engines; he described this discovery in the first part of his theorem, asserting that<sup>9</sup>:

*All irreversible heat engines between the two reservoirs are less efficient than the reversible engine working between the same reservoirs.*

---

<sup>8</sup> Ref [1], pp17-20

<sup>9</sup> Le maximum de puissance motrice résultant de l'emploi de la vapeur est aussi le maximum de puissance motrice réalisable par quelque moyen que ce soit. Ref [1], p22

Carnot proved this theorem by *reductio ad absurdum* based on the impossibility of PMM1<sup>10</sup>. The details of his proof are illustrated in **Appendix i**. To summarize, this theorem is true if and only if the PMM1 does not exist. In other words, if an irreversible engine working between the same reservoirs is more efficient than the Carnot engine, we can then use this irreversible engine to construct a PMM1 (Figure A1 of Appendix I) to produce energy with no need of energy source; this engine would solve our big worry about renewable energy source and environment<sup>11</sup>.

We will see below that the meaning of the existence of this PMM1 is much deeper than giving a solution to our energy concern. This first part of Carnot theorem is crucial for the discovery of the second law, which would be impossible however without the second part of Carnot theorem.

The second part of Carnot theorem is somewhat implicit in the first part. Since the Carnot engine is the most efficient of all possible engines, all Carnot engines, each working with a different substance (air, steam, etc.), must be equally efficient. If two Carnot engines were not equally efficient, we would be able to replace the first irreversible engine in the Carnot's proof (Appendix I) by this more efficient Carnot engine, in order to make a PMM1. If all Carnot engines have the same efficiency regardless of their working substances, then this efficiency, say,  $\eta$ , can only depend on the temperatures of the reservoirs  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . The second part of the theorem states:

*All Carnot engines have the same efficiency regardless of their working substances; this efficiency only depends on the temperatures of the reservoirs:  $\eta(t_1, t_2)$ .*

For Carnot, the only interest of his magic engine is to specify the limit of the efficiency of all possible heat engines. A practical question is how to calculate this limit  $\eta(t_1, t_2)$  when the temperatures of reservoirs are given? Physicists had to wait about thirty year to see the answer, given by Kelvin [23].

---

<sup>10</sup> Ref [1], pp21-22

<sup>11</sup> Ref [1], p22

*b) Kelvin's efficiency of Carnot engine*

In 1854, Kelvin found the expression of  $\eta(t_1, t_2)$  by considering the second part of the Carnot theorem and using a new scale of temperature called absolute temperature denoted by  $T$  [23]. The expression is

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1} \quad (1)$$

for a Carnot engine working between two reservoirs of absolute temperature  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  ( $T_1 > T_2$ ). This expression can be found in a general way using a combination of two Carnot engines in series, the first one working between the reservoir 1 at  $T_1$  and the reservoir 2 at  $T_2$  ( $T_1 > T_2$ ), the second one working between the reservoir 2 and the reservoir 3 at  $T_3$  ( $T_2 > T_3$ ). The mathematic tricks are straightforward as shown in Appendix II. This expression is an unavoidable consequence following the second part of the Carnot theorem that the efficiency only depends on the temperatures of the two reservoirs.

Now let  $\Delta Q_1$  be the heat absorbed by the Carnot engine from reservoir 1, and  $\Delta Q_2$  the heat it “absorbs” from reservoir 2 (it actually rejects  $-\Delta Q_2$  to reservoir 2). After a cycle, the engine returns to the reservoir 1, and produces a positive work  $W = \Delta Q_1 - (-\Delta Q_2)$ . It is obvious that the efficiency  $\eta = \frac{W}{\Delta Q_1} = 1 - \frac{(-\Delta Q_2)}{\Delta Q_1} = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ , leading to  $\frac{\Delta Q_1}{T_1} + \frac{\Delta Q_2}{T_2} = 0$ . Suppose now the number of the reservoirs contacted by the engine during a cycle is  $N$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  reservoirs ( $i = 1, 2 \dots N$ ) at temperature  $T_i$  gives  $\delta Q_i$  to the engine, Kelvin obtained

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i} = 0 \quad (2)$$

But he stopped here in his quest of the second law without reaching the concept of entropy [23][24].

*c) Clausius' perception*

The very discovery of what is called the second law of increasing entropy finally came to Clausius who, like Kelvin, reached also Eq.(2) [2]. But he saw something deeper in it. If the number of reservoirs contacted by the engine is very large, Eq.(2) takes the form of a closed line integral :  $\oint \frac{\delta Q}{T} = 0$ . This integral over a reversible cycle implies that the quantity  $\frac{\delta Q}{T}$  is the variation of a state variable, he denoted by  $S$ , of the engine. During the contact with a reservoir

at  $T$ , the engine gets  $\delta Q$  as well as a variation of  $S$ :  $dS = \frac{\delta Q}{T}$ . After a cyclic evolution, the engine comes back to its initial state, the total variation of  $S$  is zero:  $\oint dS = \oint \frac{\delta Q}{T} = 0$ .

Clausius didn't stop here with  $dS = \frac{\delta Q}{T}$  for reversible process. He had the genius idea to make the same analysis as above for a real irreversible engine, of efficiency  $\eta'$ , cycling between the same reservoir 1 and 2, absorbing  $\Delta Q_1$  and  $\Delta Q_2$ , and doing a work  $W'$  after a cycle. We have  $\eta' = \frac{W'}{\Delta Q_1} = 1 - \frac{(-\Delta Q_2)}{\Delta Q_1}$ . Then he considered the first part of Carnot theorem  $\eta' < \eta$ , and Kelvin's limit  $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ , to write

$$1 + \frac{\Delta Q_2}{\Delta Q_1} < 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1} \quad (3)$$

which means  $\frac{\Delta Q_1}{T_1} + \frac{\Delta Q_2}{T_2} < 0$ . For a large number of reservoirs on the cycle, he wrote  $\oint \frac{\delta Q}{T} < 0$ , which yields (see Appendix III):

$$dS \geq \frac{\delta Q}{T} \quad (4)$$

for both irreversible ( $>$ ) and reversible ( $=$ ) processes. Clausius coined the name *entropy* for this variable  $S$  because he wanted to find a Greek word that is parallel and analogous to the Greek word *energy*<sup>12</sup> [25]. He certainly felt some intrinsic link between energy and entropy, himself having just at that time proposed the first law of thermodynamics of energy conservation [26].

### 3) If we backtrack the trilogy

By summarizing the trilogy of discovery of the second law, we wanted also highlight the impressive and infallible mathematical tricks going from the impossibility of perpetual mobile machine all the way to the second law. These rather straightforward mathematical deductions show that, if perpetual machine is impossible, then there must be the Carnot theorem, and then the second law follows; you cannot get other thing different. And inversely, if the second law

---

<sup>12</sup> I prefer going to the ancient languages for the names of important scientific quantities, so that they may mean the same thing in all living tongues. I propose, accordingly, to call the entropy of a body, after the Greek word 'transformation.' I have designedly coined the word entropy to be similar to 'energy,' for these two quantities are so analogous in their physical significance, that an analogy of denomination seemed to me helpful [25].

is broken, i.e., Eq.(4) breaks down, you can backtrack all the mathematical calculations of Clausius from Eq.(2) to Eq.(4), to prove Eq.(3) untrue. Eq.(3) stems from Eq.(1) and the first part of Carnot theorem. Its falseness implies either the falseness of Eq.(1) or that of the first part of Carnot theorem.

Now suppose Eq.(1) is false, in view of the infallible mathematics of Kelvin using Figure A2 (Appendix II), the second part of Carnot theorem must be untrue. In other words, different Carnot engines using different working substances may have different efficiencies. According to the discussion in the section 3a), we will be able to construct a PMM1 using two Carnot engines of different efficiencies.

If now we suppose Eq.(1) and the second part of the Carnot theorem are true but the first part of the theorem is false, so there may be engines more efficient than Carnot engine. Then we can use these more efficient engines, as shown in Figure A1 of Appendix I, to fabricate PMM1, which will give us infinite quantity of clean energy we need to preserve our pet planet.

Up until now, we have only talked about how the PMM1. The reader might wonder what would happen if the perpetual mobile machine of second kind (PMM2) is involved. PMM2 is a machine transforming heat from a single heat reservoir into mechanical work with no other effects. Unlike PMM PMM2 does not violate the first law. But this machine is forbidden by the Kelvin-Planck expression of the second law [7][23] stipulating simply that this perpetual machine is impossible. We show in Appendix IV how it allows a machine to transfer heat from a cold reservoir 2 at  $T_2$  to a hot reservoir 1 at  $T_1$  ( $T_1 > T_2$ ) without side effects, leading to  $dS < \frac{\delta Q}{T}$ , or  $dS < 0$  for an isolated system, which violates the Clausius's expression of the second law Eq.(4). In this case, we can then construct engines with an efficiency  $\eta'$  larger than the efficiency of the Carnot engine  $\eta$ , i.e.,  $\eta' > \eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ . These engines, violating the first part of the Carnot theorem, can be of course used in Figure A1 of Appendix I to construct PMM1 (see Appendix IV, Figures A4 and A5) violating energy conservation.

To summarize, the violation of the second law (even by PMM2) necessarily entails the existence of PMM1 providing free energy. Well, PMM1 and free source of energy come into being! So much the better, granted! So what!

#### 4) So what if the second law is violated?

The most important implication of the violation of second law is not the existence of perpetual mobile machine (PMM) as a source of infinite energy. There is another much deeper meaning behind the PMM : energy becomes something you can create or annihilate as much as you please. It loses at once the attribute of a conservative fundamental quantity of motion, regardless of its form, thermal, mechanical, electromagnetic, gravitational, and so on. The first mathematical consequence is the collapse of the first law of thermodynamics  $dU = \delta Q + dW$ . Why? Because after a cycle of the PMM in the Figure A1 of appendix I for instance,  $dU = \delta Q = 0$ , but  $dW \neq 0$ ; this is the work done by the perpetual engine without consuming heat. Needless to say, the whole theoretical edifice of the thermodynamics will collapse.

This is not all. As well known, energy conservation is not only one of the cornerstone of thermodynamics, it is also a key pillar of the whole edifice of physical and chemical science, as well as a fundamental rule guaranteeing the stability of all natural systems. For example, our pet planet is in stable revolution around the sun because its total mechanical energy remains constant (conserved) when the pair earth-sun is a good isolated system, at least for a period sufficiently long for our intelligence to develop, fortunately. Now if the energy of the isolated earth-sun was no longer a constant and can arbitrarily change (maybe due to a PMM in the system modifying arbitrarily the energy of the earth without changing anything else), the earth would have fallen in the sun or flight to the border of Milky Way since long. Please make the same reasoning for nuclei, atoms, molecules and any energy conservative system in Nature; do you think that they can be there as stable components of our universe? Imagine also that you want to make a solid state synthesis; you put the prepared sample in the oven and increase the temperature to 1000 K. But one day you realize that the sample is freezing! Why? Because the heat is flowing from the colder sample into the hotter oven, a direct consequence of the violation of the second law and of the energy conservation! Think also that most, if not all, fundamental equations in physics and chemistry are based on the energy and mass conservation. Energy and mass are connected by Einstein's equivalence formula<sup>13</sup>; so if energy is not conserved, the mass neither. We would see the disappearance of Newtonian equation, Maxwell equations, chemical

---

<sup>13</sup> In special relativity theory, we have the famous formula  $E = mc^2$ , where  $E$  is the energy of a matter,  $m$  its mass, and  $c$  the velocity of light in vacuum.

reaction equations, stoichiometry formula, Maxwell's equations, the laws of diffusion of matters and heat, Einstein's equation of general relativity, and, finally, Schrödinger equation! After these losses, what does remain in physics and chemistry?

Indeed, when the violation of the second law is regarded as isolated phenomenon, it looks like something plausible and interesting even exciting to investigate. However, when it is coupled to the violation of the law of energy conservation, we quickly understand to what extent the second law of thermodynamics is an inviolable iron rule. Can we imagine a violation of energy and mass conservation, even probabilistic with infinitesimal likelihood, as the fluctuation theorem stated for second law violation [11][17]? Can we imagine that energy and mass are no more conservative quantity? Simply we cannot! That would be a fatal menace for the whole edifice of physics and chemistry; the whole nature would collapse into nil even if the violation of the second law and of energy-mass conservation took place during only a fraction of a second. Why? Because these rare events would hint that energy is no longer a fundamental conservative quantity as a pillar of nature, menacing the stability of the whole universe actually guaranteed by the law of energy and mass conservation. If one want to prove second law violated, he must first explain how energy and mass can become non-conservative quantities at the same time, in both classical and quantum systems!

Now we understand better the comment of Edington about the violation of the second law (footnote p.2) [5].

## **5) Concluding remarks**

After the above analysis of the relationship between entropy and energy hinted in the trilogy of the discovery of the second law starting from Carnot theorem, we must admit that the second law is a fundamental law of nature, at the same fundamental level as the laws of energy and mass conservation. Therefore, the second law is connected to all other fundamental laws of physics and chemistry based on the conservation laws. Put it differently, entropy increase is not an isolated phenomenon on its own in nature, and is a necessary consequence of energy-mass conservation. The violation of the second law would necessarily lead to fatal failure of the conservation laws, implying the collapse of the whole physics and chemistry science. In view of the incontestable universal validity of energy-mass conservation, any claim of violation of the second law, be it classical or quantum, is necessarily questionable. We would say that if a theory, well confirmed in its own domain, goes into conflict with the second law,

the only possible explanation is either the theory is fallaciously applied to thermodynamics or the "entropy" violated is not the entropy of the second law.

The suggested violation of the second law is tightly related to a remarkable discordance in statistical mechanics between two concepts: *entropy* as a measure of the dynamic uncertainty in the motion of the particles, and the *motion* of these particles presumably obeying the deterministic laws of Newtonian mechanics. There is a discordance because the motion within Newtonian mechanics does not contain any uncertainty, being deterministic and perfectly predictable either to the past or to the future [27]. The twins of Maxwell's and Laplace's demons mentioned above [7]-[9] are just a product of this absence of dynamic uncertainty. Any supposed uncertainty in this framework not only carries a subjective character (dependence on the observer, some of them seeing the randomness, some others not, like Laplace's demon seeing only the motions with zero uncertainty and entropy), but also enters into direct conflict with some properties of deterministic motion. These properties include the Liouville's theorem [18], the eternal return of the Poincare's recurrence theorem [19] and the time symmetry dictated by the fundamental principle of least action [27]. On the one hand, the Liouville's theorem, as a consequence of the principle of least action, states that the density of states  $\rho$  in the phase space of a systems is a constant of motion, i.e.,  $\frac{d\rho}{dt} = 0$ . If the motion becomes random, the probability distribution of states of the system is proportional to  $\rho$ . So that any function of  $\rho$ , like the Boltzmann  $H$ -function  $H(\rho)$  and entropy  $S(\rho)$  [3], must be also constant in time because  $\frac{dH(\rho)}{dt} = H'(\rho) \frac{d\rho}{dt} = 0$ . This is at odds with the second law of increasing entropy. On the other hand, the Poincare's recurrence theorem, established on the basis of the Liouville's theorem, states that, during its movement in phase space, a real system always returns arbitrarily close to its initial states, implying that any function of states, including entropy, cannot only increase. If it increases during some periods, it must decrease in other periods in order to recover its initial value when the system returns to its initial states. This is again at variance with the second law stating that entropy never decreases.

As the above theorems being irrefutable in Newtonian mechanics, a possible pathway to escape from these constraints is the probabilistic interpretation of the second law stating that, although entropy can both increase and decrease, the second law is always observed because the entropy has an overwhelmingly larger probability to increase than to decrease [3]. This implies that the decrease of entropy, or the violation of the second law, has nevertheless an

infinitesimal probability to occur. Indeed, at first glance, a possible violation of the second law, not that often, seems acceptable. At worst, Carnot engine is dethroned from the top of efficiency in some rare events where PMM happens. However, when considering the unbreakable connection between the second law and other fundamental laws of physics, especially the parallel violation of the law of energy-mass conservation, we should be more vigilant. Even a probabilistic violation of energy conservation implies that energy and mass lose the attribute of fundamental conservative quantity, menacing the validity of all the laws of physics and chemistry, as well as the stability and even the existence of the universe, as discussed above.

This deadlock of probabilistic interpretation of the second law is a telltale sign of the incompatibility between classical mechanics laws and thermodynamics laws. This is a nontrivial conflict between two families of physics laws, both being inviolable truth and well verified by empirical facts. We have to find a reconciliation between them allowing their union in a big family. A possible solution can be perceived in an essential difference between the classical mechanics motion and the thermodynamic motion. All motions in classical mechanics are regular and deterministic, characterized by the unicity of path with given initial condition. Leaving a given initial state, a motion can take place only on a single path dictated by the least action principle [18]. This motion is predictable to both the past and the future with certainty on the unique path determined by the equation of motion (Newtonian or relativistic). On the contrary, the motions in thermodynamic systems are all random, or indeterministic, characterized by multiplicity of paths from given initial state. That is, leaving a given state, thermodynamic motion can take place on different paths to reach either a single end state or many different end states. In other words, infinitely many paths can take place from a given state or between two given states. We can mention Brownian motion as a example. This indeterministic motion is completely unpredictable or only predictable with more or less uncertainty depending on the probabilities of the different paths. In this regime, the fundamental principle of least action and the equations of motion, working only for deterministic motion, must be adapted in such a way to include many paths and their probability to occur. The new formalism must also allow recovering the original principles and equations of motion of classical mechanics whenever the randomness cancels and the multiple paths all collapse onto a single path of probability one, the least action path.

A formulation of this kind of probabilistic mechanics has been proposed in previous works [28]-[31] for the special case of random motion of quasi-Hamiltonian systems, i.e., mechanical

systems undergoing random motion but statistically conserving their energy. A good example of this kind of Hamiltonian systems is the ideal gas. When a gas is in expansion, it moves randomly from one equilibrium state to another, in keeping its energy constant with fluctuations, and following different paths, each having a given probability to happen between the initial and final states. This path probability has been investigated by analytical analysis [32] and numerical experiments simulating random motions [33][34]. The reader can find a summary of this probabilistic mechanics in [31]. We would like to just mention that, in this frame, Liouville's theorem, originally formulated for the unique path of least action [18], has been modified for multiple paths and reads  $\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = \rho(t) w(t)$ , where  $w(t)$  is proportional to the work of random forces around a point in the system. The solution of this differential equation is  $\rho(t) = \rho_0 \exp[-\int_0^t w(t) dt]$ . This modified Liouville's theorem invalidates the proof of Poincare's theorem of recurrence, thus opens the way for a non-probabilistic interpretation of the H-theorem and the second law of thermodynamics [22][31]. Whenever the random force is absent, or the system does not evolve any longer in an equilibrium state, the work  $w(t) = 0$ , Liouville's theorem  $\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = 0$  is recovered.

This multiple path approach has been since long investigated from the viewpoint of informational entropy in the framework of Jaynes principle of maximum caliber (path entropy) [35]. Successful applications of this principle to many non-equilibrium phenomena in physics, chemistry, biology and complexity science have been summarized in a recent review [36], with a proof of monotonic time increase of informational entropy as a justification of the second law of thermodynamics [37].

We would like to close this paper by mentioning a recent work, in which we provided a mathematical proof of time irreversibility within classical mechanics in a general and model-independent way, by considering the multiplicity of paths of random motion [27]. For the first time, the concept of time, defined as an attribute of motion, was shown to have an arrow pointing in the direction of increasing dynamic uncertainty, just as Edington asserted a hundred years ago: *Without any mystic appeal to consciousness it is possible to find a direction of time ... Let us draw an arrow arbitrarily. If as we follow the arrow we find more and more of the random element in the state of the world, then the arrow is pointed towards the future; if the random element decreases, the arrow points towards the past. That is the only distinction known*

to physics. This follows at once if our fundamental contention is admitted that the introduction of randomness is the only thing which cannot be undone (see [5] p.35).

The same statement is true for the arrow of entropy as well.

## References

- [1] S. Carnot, *Réflexion sur la puissance motrice du feu et sur les machines propres à développer cette puissance*, Chez Bachelier Libraire, Paris (1824) <https://archive.org/details/reflectionsonmot00carnrich/page/n7/mode/2up?view=theater>
- [2] R. Clausius, *Über eine veränderte Form des zweiten Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie*. *Annalen der Physik*. xciii 1854; 12, 481–506, [doi:10.1002/andp.18541691202](https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.18541691202), Retrieved 24 March 2014. Translated into English: Clausius, R. (July 1856). *On a Modified Form of the Second Fundamental Theorem in the Mechanical Theory of Heat*. London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science. 4th. 2: 86. Retrieved 24 March 2014. Reprinted in: Clausius, R. (1867). *The Mechanical Theory of Heat – with its Applications to the Steam Engine and to Physical Properties of Bodies*. London: John van Voorst. Retrieved 19 June 2012. editions: PwR\_Sbkwa8IC.
- [3] L. Boltzmann, *Weitere Studien über das Wärmegleichgewicht unter Gasmolekülen*. *Sitzungsberichte Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1872; 66, 275-370. English translation: L. Boltzmann, *Further Studies on the Thermal Equilibrium of Gas Molecules*. *The Kinetic Theory of Gases*. *History of Modern Physical Sciences*. 1. pp. 262–349.
- [4] J.C. Maxwell, *Theory of Heat*. London, New York, Longmans, Green (1871); New York: Dover, (2001) [ISBN 0-486-41735-2](https://www.dover.com/ISBN-0-486-41735-2)
- [5] A.S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, Cambridge University Press, 1928, p.74
- [6] De Groot, S.R., Mazur, P. *Non-equilibrium Thermodynamics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1962).
- [7] William Thomson, *Kinetic theory of the dissipation of energy*, *Nature*. 1874; 9, 441–444; and *The sorting demon of Maxwell*, *Nature*, 1879; 20, 126
- [8] Pierre-Simon Laplace, *Essai philosophique sur les probabilités*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1902)

- [9] K. Robertson, The demons haunting thermodynamics, *Physics Today*, 2021; 74, 44
- [10] J. L. Lebowitz, Boltzmann's entropy and time's arrow, *Physics Report*, 1993, 46, 32
- [11] Wang, G. M., Sevick, E. M., Mittag, E., Searles, D.J. & Evans, D.J. Experimental Demonstration of Violations of the Second Law of Thermodynamics for Small Systems and Short Time Scales. *Physical Review Letters*, 2002; 89, 050601
- [12] P. A. Camati, J. P. S. Peterson, T. B. Batalhão, K. Micadei, A. M. Souza, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, and R. M. Serra, Experimental Rectification of Entropy Production by Maxwell's Demon in a Quantum System, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2016; 117, 240502
- [13] A Rivas, M.A. Martin-Delgado, Topological Heat Transport and Symmetry-Protected Boson Currents, *Scientific Reports*, 2017; 7, 6350. See also : An apparent macroscopic violation of the second law of thermodynamics in a quantum system is discovered, <https://phys.org/news/2017-09-apparent-macroscopic-violation-law-thermodynamics.html>
- [14] M. Kostic, Challenges to the second law challengers, [Thermodynamics Symposium](#), 2016; [AAAS Pacific Division 97th Annual Meeting](#), University of San Diego, [San Diego](#), CA, June 14-17, 2016. See <https://sites.google.com/site/professorkostic/the-second-law-of-thermodynamics/challenges-to-the-second-law-challengers> and the references there-in
- [15] See <https://www.eoht.info/page/Violations%20of%20the%20second%20law>, and references there-in.
- [16] T. Müller, The reversibility objection against the Second Law of thermodynamics viewed, and avoided, from a logical point of view, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 2019; 66, 52
- [17] D. J. Evans, D. J. Searles, *Advances in Physics*, 2002, 51, 1529-1585
- [18] V.I. Arnol'd, *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*, Springer (1978)
- [19] H. Poincaré, Sur le problème des trois corps et les équations de la dynamique, *Acta Math.* 1890; 13, 1–270
- [20] Académie royale des sciences, *Histoire de l'Académie royale des sciences : suivi des Mémoires de mathématique et de physique tirés des registres de l'Académie royale des sciences*, Année 1775, Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1778, 1 vol., 66 p. et 575 p., in-4°
- [21] T.Y. Wu, Boltzmann's H theorem and the Loschmidt and the Zermelo paradoxes, *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 1975, 14, 289, [doi:10.1007/BF01807856](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01807856).

- [22] Q.A. Wang, A. El Kaabouchi, From Random Motion of Hamiltonian Systems to Boltzmann H Theorem and Second Law of Thermodynamics -- a Pathway by Path Probability, *Entropy*, 2014; 16, 885-894, [arXiv:2010.07697](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.07697)
- [23] Kelvin, *Mathematical and Physical Papers*, Vol. I, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1882), pp.232-291
- [24] J. Uffink, Bluff your way in the second law of thermodynamics, *Stud. Hist. Phil. Mod. Phys.*, 2001; 32, 305–394
- [25] C. C. Gillispie, *The Edge of Objectivity: An Essay in the History of Scientific Ideas*, Princeton University Press. 1960, p. 399
- [26] R. Clausius, Ueber die bewegende Kraft der Wärme und die Gesetze, welche sich daraus für die Wärmelehre selbst ableiten lassen, *Annalen der Physik*, 1850; 79, 368–397, 500–524; English Translation: On the Moving Force of Heat, and the Laws regarding the Nature of Heat itself which are deducible therefrom. *Phil. Mag.* 1851; 2, 1–21, 102–119
- [27] Q.A. Wang, No mysterious motor driving time forward - Multiple paths of random motion toward time irreversibility, [hal-03354947](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03354947)
- [28] Q.A. Wang, Maximum entropy change and least action principle for nonequilibrium systems, *Astrophysics and Space Science* 2006, 305, 273–281, [arXiv:cond-mat/0312329](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0312329)
- [29] Q.A. Wang, Reformulation of a stochastic action principle for irregular dynamics, *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 2009; 40, 2550–2556, [arXiv:0704.0880](https://arxiv.org/abs/0704.0880)
- [30] Q.A. Wang, Non quantum uncertainty relations of stochastic dynamics, *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* 2005, 26, 1045, [arXiv:cond-mat/0412360](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0412360)
- [31] Q.A. Wang, A probabilistic mechanics theory for random dynamics, [arXiv:1002.4026](https://arxiv.org/abs/1002.4026)
- [32] Aziz El Kaabouchi, Q. A. Wang, Least action principle and stochastic motion: a generic derivation of path probability, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2015, 604, 012011, [arXiv:1502.06006](https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.06006)
- [33] T. Lin, R. Wang, W. P. Bi, A. El Kaabouchi, C. Pujos, F. Calvayrac, Q. A. Wang, Path probability distribution of stochastic motion of non-dissipative systems: a classical analog of Feynman factor of path integral, *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 2013, 57, 129, [arXiv:1310.0411](https://arxiv.org/abs/1310.0411)
- [34] L. Figueiredo, T. Cardoso, R. Bufalo and F. Alves, A stochastic least action principle in the description of black swan events, [arXiv:2112.04861](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.04861)

- [35] E.T. Jaynes, The minimum entropy production principle, *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 1980; 31, 579
- [36] K. Ghosh, L. Agozzino, P.D. Dixit, K.A. Dill, The maximum caliber principle for nonequilibria, *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 2020; 71, 10.1
- [37] S. Davis and S. Gonzales, Hamiltonian formalism and path entropy maximization, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 2015; 48, 425003

## Appendix

This is a summary of the trilogy of the discovery of the second law of thermodynamics over thirty years starting from 1824.

### l) Carnot theorem from a thought experiment

**Figure A1** illustrates a combination of an irreversible real engine and a reversible Carnot engine, both working between a hot reservoir at temperature  $t_1$  and a cold reservoir at temperature  $t_2$ . The irreversible engine produces a work  $W' = Q_1 - Q_2$  in absorbing a heat  $Q_1$  from the hot reservoir and rejecting a heat  $Q_2$  to the cold reservoir. Its efficiency is given by  $\eta' = \frac{W'}{Q_1}$ . The reversible engine is working in the inverse direction using a work  $W$  to absorb the heat  $Q_2$  from the cold reservoir and give a heat  $Q_1$  to the hot reservoir. Its efficiency is given by  $\eta = \frac{W}{Q_1}$ . After a cycle, the two reservoirs recover their initial states respectively because they didn't obtain nor lose heat.




Figure A1, Illustration of a PMM1 (red line) composed of a real irreversible engine having efficiency  $\eta' = \frac{W'}{Q_1}$  and a Carnot engine having the efficiency  $\eta = \frac{W}{Q_1} = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ . If  $\eta' > \eta$ , the PMM1 is able to produce the work  $\Delta W = W' - W$  after each cycle without consuming heat, so that the energy  $\Delta W$  is created from nothing.

Now Carnot supposed that the irreversible engine has a larger efficiency than the reversible engine,  $\eta' > \eta$ , or  $\frac{W'}{Q_1} > \frac{W}{Q_1}$ , leading to  $W' > W$ . In this case, the reversible engine can use a part of  $W'$  to produce the work  $W$ , so that after a cycle, the only thing changed is the extra work  $\Delta W = W' - W > 0$  produced by the ensemble of two engines (red line in Figure A1). This means that the ensemble of two engines is a perpetual mobile machine of first kind (PMM1) producing the work  $\Delta W$  from nothing, which Carnot thought impossible according to a common belief that mechanical work and motion cannot be created from nothing (a rudimental idea of energy conservation). Conclusion:  $\eta'$  can never be larger than  $\eta$ ; which is the first part of Carnot theorem  $\eta' \leq \eta$  [1].

From the same reasoning, we can prove that all reversible engines must have the same efficiency regardless of their different working substances. This is because if a reversible engine was more efficient than another one, we could combine them in the same way as in Figure A1 with the more efficient Carnot engine replacing the irreversible one; this would make a PMM1 (absurd). Conclusion: *all Carnot engines must have the same efficiency depending only on the temperatures of the reservoirs  $t_1$  and  $t_2$* , which is the second part of Carnot theorem [1].

## II) Kelvin's efficiency

It is quite logical that the efficiency  $\eta$  of Carnot engine depends only on the temperature of the reservoirs. But what is the form of the function  $\eta(t_1, t_2)$ ? Kelvin is concerned with this question, and made a calculation [23] which can be illustrated by the connection of two Carnot engines as shown in Figure A2. The first engine works between two reservoirs at  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  ( $t_1 > t_2$ ), absorbing  $Q_1$  from  $t_1$ , rejecting  $Q_2$  to  $t_2$  and doing a work  $W_1 = Q_1 - Q_2$ ; the efficiency is  $\eta_1 = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ . The second engine works between the above reservoir at  $t_2$  and a third reservoir at  $t_3$  ( $t_2 > t_3$ ), absorbing  $Q_2$  from  $t_2$ , rejecting  $Q_3$  to  $t_3$ , and doing a work  $W_2 = Q_2 - Q_3$ ; its efficiency is  $\eta_2 = 1 - \frac{Q_3}{Q_2}$ . On the other hand, these two engines connected in series can be considered as a third engine, working between the hot reservoir at  $t_1$  and the cold reservoir at  $t_3$  ( $t_1 > t_3$ ), absorbing  $Q_1$  from  $t_1$ , rejecting  $Q_3$  to  $t_3$ , and doing a work  $W_3 = W_1 + W_2 = Q_1 - Q_3$ ; its efficiency is  $\eta_3 = \frac{W_3}{Q_1} = 1 - \frac{Q_3}{Q_1}$ .





Figure A2: Illustration of Kelvin's idea to connect two Carnot engines in series to compose a third Carnot engine (red line) working between  $t_1$  and  $t_3$ .

The magic trick is the following: from the three efficiencies  $1 - \eta_1 = \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ ,  $1 - \eta_2 = \frac{Q_3}{Q_2}$  and  $1 - \eta_3 = \frac{Q_3}{Q_1}$ , it is straightforward to write  $(1 - \eta_1)(1 - \eta_2) = 1 - \eta_3$ . As all Carnot engines have the same efficiency depending only on the temperature of the reservoirs, we can write  $1 - \eta_1 = g(t_1, t_2)$ ,  $1 - \eta_2 = g(t_2, t_3)$  and  $1 - \eta_3 = g(t_1, t_3)$ , leading to  $g(t_1, t_2)g(t_2, t_3) = g(t_1, t_3)$ , where  $g(\cdot)$  is any continuous function. The only way to reach this last equation is to let  $g(t_1, t_2) = \frac{f(t_2)}{f(t_1)}$ ,  $g(t_2, t_3) = \frac{f(t_3)}{f(t_2)}$  and  $g(t_1, t_3) = \frac{f(t_3)}{f(t_1)}$  with certain function  $f(t)$ . Now let us simply take  $f(t)$  as a temperature scale, say,  $f(t) = T$ , which turns out to be the absolute temperature. Kelvin finally got  $1 - \eta_1 = \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ ,  $1 - \eta_2 = \frac{T_3}{T_2}$  et  $1 - \eta_3 = \frac{T_3}{T_1}$ , or in general, for a Carnot engine working between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  ( $T_1 > T_2$ ):  $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$  [23].

### III) Clausius' discovery

Clausius' work [2] starts with a Carnot engine working between  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . He writes  $\eta = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1} = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ , or  $\frac{Q_2}{Q_1} = \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ , and  $0 = \frac{Q_1}{T_1} - \frac{Q_2}{T_2}$ . With a change of notation  $\delta Q_1 = Q_1$ , and  $\delta Q_2 = -Q_2$ , he obtained  $\frac{\delta Q_1}{T_1} + \frac{\delta Q_2}{T_2} = 0$ . Notice that  $\delta Q$  is a heat absorbed by the engine from a reservoir (see **Figure A3**). Obviously, if the engine is in contact with  $N$  reservoirs during a cycle, and absorbs  $\delta Q_i$  from a reservoir at  $T_i$ , we necessarily get  $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i} = 0$  (**Figure A3**).



**Figure A3:** Examples of the cycle of Carnot engine in the  $T - S$  diagram. The horizontal segments represent the contact of the engine with the reservoirs to absorb heat. The vertical segments represent adiabatic compression (left sides) and expansion (right sides). **Left** : a cycle starting from and ending at an initial state A after two contacts with  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , leading to  $\frac{\delta Q_1}{T_1} + \frac{\delta Q_2}{T_2} = 0$ . **Right** : a cycle starting from and ending at the initial state A after the contacts with  $N$  reservoirs at different temperature  $T_i$ , each giving  $\delta Q_i$  to the engine, leading to  $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i} = 0$ .


Clausius understood at once that  $\frac{\delta Q}{T}$  is the variation of a variable of state, he denoted by  $S$  ( $\delta S = \frac{\delta Q}{T}$ ) and coined the name *entropy*, because when the engine comes back to its initial state after a cycle and a series of variations  $\frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i}$ , this variable also comes back to its initial value with zero variation  $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i} = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta S_i = 0$ . If  $N$  is vary large, we can write a closed line integral  $\oint dS = 0$  over a cycle.

Clausius made the above analysis with Carnot engine. What does happen with a real irreversible engine working between the same reservoirs with  $\eta' = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ ? Considering  $\eta' < \eta$  and  $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$ , we get  $1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1} \leq 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1}$  or  $\frac{Q_1}{T_1} - \frac{Q_2}{T_2} < 0$ . The same formal change as above yields  $\frac{\delta Q_1}{T_1} + \frac{\delta Q_2}{T_2} < 0$ . With  $N$  reservoirs during a cycle, we have  $\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\delta Q_i}{T_i} < 0$  or  $\oint \frac{\delta Q}{T} < 0$ . Suppose that the variation of entropy of the engine at each equilibrium contact with a reservoir is  $\delta S_i$ , we have, after a cycle,  $\sum_{i=1}^N \delta S_i = 0$ , or  $\oint dS = 0$  for large  $N$ . Compare  $\oint dS = 0$  to  $\oint \frac{\delta Q}{T} < 0$ , it is straightforward to write  $dS > \frac{\delta Q}{T}$  for irreversible engine, or  $dS \geq \frac{\delta Q}{T}$  for any engine, reversible or irreversible. This inequality is the mathematical expression of the second law of thermodynamics. For an isolated system without exchange of heat with the exterior,  $\delta Q = 0$ , and  $dS \geq 0$ . This is why the second law is often referred to as the law of increasing entropy. Notice that the entropy of an open system exchanging heat with environment has  $dS \geq \frac{\delta Q}{T}$  and can decrease ( $dS < 0$ ) if the system loses heat  $\delta Q < 0$  (like our body); this decrease does not violate the second law. Again, *the violation of the second law implies the decreases of entropy in an isolated system.*

#### IV) Perpetual mobile machine of second kind

A perpetual mobile machine of second kind (PMM2) is capable of extracting a heat  $Q_3$  from a cold reservoir 2 at  $T_2$  and transform it entirely into a mechanical work  $W_3 = Q_3$ . This cycle of PMM2 does not violate the first law of energy conservation.

However, the work  $W_3$  can be used by a Carnot engine in an inverse cycle, as shown in Figure A4, to extract a heat  $Q_2$  from the colder reservoir 2 and to transfer a heat  $Q_1$  to a hotter reservoir 1 at  $T_1$ , with  $Q_1 = Q_2 + W_3 = Q_2 + Q_3$ . During this cycle, the reservoir 2 loses an entropy  $\Delta S_2 = -\frac{Q_2+Q_3}{T_2}$ , and the reservoir 1 receives an entropy  $\Delta S_1 = \frac{Q_1}{T_1} = \frac{Q_2+Q_3}{T_1}$ , giving a total entropy change  $\Delta S = \Delta S_1 + \Delta S_2 = Q_1 \left( \frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right) < 0$ , which violates the Clausius expression of the second law Eq.(4)  $\Delta S \geq 0$  for the isolated system composed of the two reservoirs and the engines in Figure A4.




**Figure A4:** Illustration of how a perpetual machine of second kind (PMM2) allows a flow of heat  $Q_1 = Q_2 + Q_3$  from a colder body to a hotter body without any other effects upon the environment.

In order to show how this violation of the second law by PMM2 enables PMM1, we introduce a second Carnot engine in Figure A4 (see Figure A5), which during a cycle absorbs  $Q'_1$  from the reservoir 1, does a work  $W$  to the environment, and rejects a heat  $Q'_2$  to the reservoir 2. Its efficiency is  $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1} = 1 - \frac{Q'_2}{Q'_1}$ , leading to  $\frac{Q'_1}{T_1} = \frac{Q'_2}{T_2}$ . During the same cycle, the system composed of the two engines in Figure A4 transfers a heat  $Q_1$  from the reservoir 2 to the reservoir 1. The ensemble of the three engines in Figure A5 (surrounded by red line) is equivalent to an global engine which in one cycle absorbs a heat  $Q'_1 - Q_1$  from the reservoir 1, does a work  $W$ , and rejects a heat  $Q'_2 - Q_1$  to the reservoir 2, leading to an efficiency  $\eta' = 1 - \frac{Q'_2 - Q_1}{Q'_1 - Q_1}$ . It is easy to prove that  $\frac{Q'_2 - Q_1}{Q'_1 - Q_1} < \frac{Q'_2}{Q'_1}$ , making  $\eta' > \eta$  for any  $Q_1 > 0$ . It turns out the global engine in Figure A5 is more efficient than the Carnot engine (violating the first part of Carnot theorem). We can of course use it to construct a PMM1 with the same tricks of Figure A1.

In similar way, we can also create a PMM1 using a PPM2 associated with an irreversible engine replacing the second Carnot engine in Figure A5. In this case, the entropy increase

created with the system of two engines of Figure A4,  $\Delta S = Q_1 \left( \frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right)$ , must be larger than

$$\frac{Q'_2}{T_2} - \frac{Q'_1}{T_1}, \text{ i.e., } Q_1 > \frac{\left( \frac{Q'_2}{T_2} - \frac{Q'_1}{T_1} \right)}{\left( \frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right)}.$$



**Figure A5:** Illustration of an engine (red line) having an efficiency  $\eta' = 1 - \frac{Q'_2 - Q_1}{Q'_1 - Q_1}$  larger than the efficiency of the Carnot engine  $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_2}{T_1} = 1 - \frac{Q_2}{Q_1}$ .