Entropy Has No Direction: A Mirror-State Paradox Against Universal Monotonic Entropy Increase and a First-Principles Proof that Constraints Reshape the Entropy Distribution $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$

Ting Peng
t.peng@ieee.org
Key Laboratory for Special Area Highway Engineering of Ministry of Education, Chang'an University, Xi'an 710064, China

February 17, 2026

Abstract

We present a purely theoretical, self-contained argument that the Second Law of Thermodynamics cannot be a universal fundamental law in the form "entropy does not decrease" (whether asserted trajectory-wise or as a universal statistical principle) when the underlying microscopic dynamics are time-reversal invariant. The core is a mirror-state construction: for any microstate A one constructs its time-reversed partner B (momenta inverted). If a universal monotonicity statement is applied to both A and B, it implies that A is a local minimum of entropy at every moment, which forces entropy to be constant and destroys any entropic arrow of time. The consistent replacement is that entropy is a stochastic variable described by a probability distribution $P(S)$, whose shape depends on constraints and boundary conditions. We then prove from first principles that constraints necessarily reshape the long-time entropy distribution $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$ by altering the invariant measure through changes in the Hamiltonian and/or the accessible phase space. A sharp criterion is given: in the microcanonical setting, the *only* way $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda)$ can remain the same up to translation is when all accessible macrostate volumes are scaled by a common factor; otherwise the distribution changes structurally.

1 Introduction

The "Second Law" is often presented in two forms. *Strict (deterministic) form*: for an isolated system, entropy does not decrease along *every* trajectory, i.e. $S(t+\delta t) \geq S(t)$ for all t and all microstates (or $\mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t \geq 0$ wherever defined). *Statistical form*: for an appropriate ensemble or limit, entropy increase is "overwhelmingly probable" or the ensemble-average entropy change is nonnegative.

This paper has one scope: we address these statements only insofar as they are claimed to be *universal* consequences of time-reversal invariant microscopic physics. We show that such universal monotonicity claims are logically incompatible with time-reversal symmetry. The consistent replacement is not to end thermodynamics, but to replace "entropy has a direction" with: **entropy has no direction; it is described by a probability distribution**. Moreover, **constraints and boundary conditions reshape this distribution**.

2 Preliminaries and assumptions

2.1 Microscopic dynamics and time reversal

Let $\Gamma(t)$ denote the phase-space microstate of an isolated system evolving under time-reversal invariant microscopic dynamics (Hamiltonian dynamics being the canonical example). Let $\mathcal{T}$ denote time reversal, which (for classical mechanics) acts by reversing momenta while leaving positions unchanged.

Time-reversal invariance means: if $\Gamma_A(t)$ is a solution, then $\Gamma_B(t) := \mathcal{T}\Gamma_A(2t_0 - t)$ is also a solution. In particular, the forward-time evolution of the mirror state $\Gamma_B(t_0) = \mathcal{T}\Gamma_A(t_0)$ replays the past of Γ_A in reverse.

2.2 Entropy as a coarse-grained state function

We use Boltzmann (coarse-grained) entropy: fix a time-reversal symmetric coarse-graining (partition) of phase space into macrostates (cells) $\{C_m\}$. Assign to any $\Gamma \in C_m$ an instantaneous entropy $S(\Gamma) = S_m$.

For mathematical cleanliness (finite volumes), we adopt the energy-shell form used in statistical mechanics: at fixed energy E define the accessible macrostate volume $W_m^{(E)}$ on the energy shell and set $S_m^{(E)} = k_B \ln(W_m^{(E)}/W_0)$, with an arbitrary reference volume W_0 (shifting entropy by a constant does not affect any conclusions). This is the same entropy notion used below to derive $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$.

We assume the coarse-graining is time-reversal symmetric, so $S(\mathcal{T}\Gamma) = S(\Gamma)$.

2.3 Continuity (minimal regularity)

The mirror-state paradox below is clearest when $S(t) := S(\Gamma(t))$ is continuous in time along trajectories (standard for smooth coarse-graining, or for coarse variables defining macrostates). This is the only regularity used to turn "local minimum everywhere" into "constant everywhere".

Remark (discrete coarse-graining). If the coarse-graining is strictly discrete, then $S(t)$ may be piecewise constant with jumps. The paradox still goes through for a universal monotonicity claim that is asserted for *arbitrarily small* $\delta t > 0$: Eq. (1) forces $S(t_0)$ to be simultaneously a right- and left-minimum at every t_0, which rules out any jump up or down and again implies that $S(t)$ is constant.

2.4 What is meant by $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$

In the second part of the paper, $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$ denotes a *long-time* entropy distribution induced by an invariant measure. Two standard routes make this precise: (i) assume the dynamics are ergodic/mixing on the relevant invariant set so that time averages (and long-time distributions) are independent of the initial microstate up to measure-zero exceptions; or (ii) consider an ensemble whose initial microstates are drawn from the invariant measure (microcanonical or canonical), in which case P_∞ is immediate. Our formulas below are statements about the invariant measures themselves and the entropy distributions induced by them; the above routes justify interpreting these as long-time distributions.

3 The mirror-state paradox

3.1 Strict (trajectory-wise) monotonicity is impossible as a universal law

Claim. A universal law of the form "for every microstate and every time, $S(t + \delta t) \geq S(t)$ for all sufficiently small $\delta t > 0$" is incompatible with time-reversal invariant microscopic dynamics and time-reversal symmetric coarse-grained entropy.

Proof (mirror-state construction). Fix an arbitrary time t_0 on an arbitrary trajectory $\Gamma_A(t)$. Construct the mirror state at the same time: $\Gamma_B(t_0) = \mathcal{T}\Gamma_A(t_0)$, and let $\Gamma_B(t)$ be its forward-time evolution. By time-reversal invariance, for any $\delta t > 0$,

$$\Gamma_B(t_0 + \delta t) = \mathcal{T}\Gamma_A(t_0 - \delta t).$$

By time-reversal symmetry of the coarse-graining, $S(\mathcal{T}\Gamma) = S(\Gamma)$, so

$$S_B(t_0 + \delta t) = S_A(t_0 - \delta t), \qquad S_B(t_0) = S_A(t_0).$$

Now apply the universal monotonicity statement to *both* A and B:

$$S_A(t_0 + \delta t) \geq S_A(t_0), \qquad S_B(t_0 + \delta t) \geq S_B(t_0).$$

The second inequality becomes $S_A(t_0 - \delta t) \geq S_A(t_0)$. Hence, for all small $\delta t > 0$,

$$S_A(t_0 + \delta t) \geq S_A(t_0) \quad \text{and} \quad S_A(t_0 - \delta t) \geq S_A(t_0). \tag{1}$$

Thus t_0 is a (two-sided) local minimum of $S_A(t)$.

Because t_0 was arbitrary, *every* time is a local minimum. If $S_A(t)$ is continuous (Sec. 2.3), a function for which every point is a local minimum must be constant. Therefore the universal strict Second Law implies that entropy is constant on every trajectory, which contradicts the empirical fact that macroscopic systems exhibit entropy increase and eliminates any entropic arrow of time. □

3.2 Extension: the statistical Second Law cannot be universal

The same mirror-state logic refutes the statistical Second Law *when it is asserted as a universal principle applying to every microstate, including its mirror.* Suppose one claims, universally, that entropy increase is "overwhelmingly probable" for the forward-time evolution of *any* initial microstate. Apply this to A at time t_0, and also to $B = \mathcal{T}A$ at t_0. Since the forward evolution of B corresponds to the time-reversed past of A, "overwhelmingly probable increase" for both implies (with overwhelming probability) the two-sided inequalities in Eq. (1), i.e. that t_0 is a local minimum with overwhelming probability. Choosing t_0 arbitrarily destroys any persistent arrow of time in the same way.

Therefore, the statistical Second Law cannot be a universal state-by-state principle. Any one-way statement about ΔS must depend on additional structure: special initial ensembles, coarse-graining choices, limits, or constraints/boundaries that select a particular effective description. This observation motivates the corrected view below.

4 Corrected view: entropy is a random variable with a constraint-dependent PDF

The consistent replacement of "entropy has a direction" is: **entropy has no direction; it has a probability distribution**. Write $P_t(S)$ for the (time-dependent) entropy distribution induced by an ensemble of microstates at time t, and $P_\infty(S; \lambda)$ for the long-time distribution under constraint parameters λ (geometry, boundary conditions, static fields, etc.).

The remainder of this paper proves the second core claim: **constraints/boundaries can change the long-time entropy distribution** $P_\infty(S; \lambda)$ in an explicit, first-principles way.

5 First-principles derivation: constraints $\lambda \to P_\infty(S;\lambda)$

5.1 Constraints as Hamiltonian/accessible-set modifications

Let λ denote constraint parameters. Constraints enter through the Hamiltonian

$$H(\Gamma;\lambda) = H_0(\Gamma) + V_{\mathrm{c}}(\Gamma;\lambda), \tag{2}$$

and/or through an accessible set $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ (hard constraints). Both views are equivalent: hard walls correspond to $V_{\mathrm{c}} = +\infty$ outside $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$.

5.2 Long-time invariant measures (microcanonical and canonical)

Microcanonical (isolated). At fixed energy E, a natural invariant measure is uniform on the accessible energy shell:

$$\rho_\infty^{(E)}(\Gamma;\lambda) = \frac{1}{\Omega(E;\lambda)}\,\delta\big(H(\Gamma;\lambda) - E\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}(\lambda)}(\Gamma), \tag{3}$$

where the accessible density of states is

$$\Omega(E;\lambda) = \int \mathrm{d}\Gamma\,\delta\big(H(\Gamma;\lambda) - E\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}(\lambda)}(\Gamma). \tag{4}$$

Canonical (heat bath). With a heat bath at temperature T and dynamics obeying fluctuation–dissipation, the invariant measure is

$$\rho_\infty(\Gamma;\lambda) = \frac{1}{Z(\lambda)}\,e^{-\beta H(\Gamma;\lambda)}, \qquad Z(\lambda) = \int_{\Gamma\in\mathcal{A}(\lambda)} \mathrm{d}\Gamma\,e^{-\beta H(\Gamma;\lambda)}. \tag{5}$$

5.3 Boltzmann entropy on the energy shell

Fix a time-reversal symmetric coarse-graining $\{C_m\}_{m\in\mathcal{M}}$. Define the accessible macrostate volume on the energy shell:

$$W_m^{(E)}(\lambda) = \int \mathrm{d}\Gamma\,\delta\big(H(\Gamma;\lambda) - E\big)\,\mathbf{1}_{C_m}(\Gamma)\,\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}(\lambda)}(\Gamma), \tag{6}$$

and assign the Boltzmann entropy value

$$S_m^{(E)}(\lambda) = k_B \ln\left(\frac{W_m^{(E)}(\lambda)}{W_0}\right). \tag{7}$$

5.4 Closed-form expression for $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$ and a sharp change criterion

Microcanonical. Because the microcanonical measure is uniform on the energy shell, the macrostate probability is a ratio of accessible volumes:

$$\pi_m^{(E)}(\lambda) = \frac{W_m^{(E)}(\lambda)}{\Omega(E;\lambda)}, \qquad \Omega(E;\lambda) = \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} W_m^{(E)}(\lambda). \tag{8}$$

Therefore the long-time entropy distribution at fixed energy is

$$\boxed{P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda) = \sum_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \frac{W_m^{(E)}(\lambda)}{\Omega(E;\lambda)}\,\delta\big(S - S_m^{(E)}(\lambda)\big).} \tag{9}$$

Proposition (sharp criterion; "only translation" degeneracy). Fix E and the coarse-graining. Let $\mathcal{V}(\lambda)$ denote the multiset of accessible macrostate volumes $\{W_m^{(E)}(\lambda)\}_{m\in\mathcal{M}}$ (counting multiplicity).

1. If there exists $c > 0$ such that $\mathcal{V}(\lambda_2) = c\,\mathcal{V}(\lambda_1)$ (i.e. all macrostate volumes scale by a common factor, up to permutation), then

$$P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda_2) = P_\infty^{(E)}(S - k_B \ln c\,;\lambda_1)\,,$$

i.e. the distribution changes only by translation of the entropy axis.

2. Otherwise, $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda_2)$ is *not* a translate of $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda_1)$; the distribution changes structurally.

Proof. Let M be the macrostate index with $\mathbb{P}(M = m) = \pi_m^{(E)}(\lambda)$ and define $X_\lambda := W_M^{(E)}(\lambda)$. Then $S = k_B \ln(X_\lambda/W_0)$ and Eq. (9) is exactly the law of S. If $W_m^{(E)}(\lambda_2) = c\,W_{\sigma(m)}^{(E)}(\lambda_1)$ for some permutation σ, then $X_{\lambda_2} \overset{d}{=} c\,X_{\lambda_1}$, hence $S_{\lambda_2} \overset{d}{=} S_{\lambda_1} + k_B \ln c$, which is the claimed translation. Conversely, if $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda_2)$ were a translate of $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda_1)$ by Δ, then $X_{\lambda_2} = W_0 e^{S/k_B}$ would be distributed as $e^{\Delta/k_B} X_{\lambda_1}$, which implies $\mathcal{V}(\lambda_2) = e^{\Delta/k_B}\mathcal{V}(\lambda_1)$ (up to permutation). □

Canonical as an exact energy mixture. The canonical energy density is

$$P_\beta(E;\lambda) = \frac{\Omega(E;\lambda)\,e^{-\beta E}}{Z(\lambda)}, \qquad Z(\lambda) = \int \mathrm{d}E\ \Omega(E;\lambda)\,e^{-\beta E}. \tag{10}$$

Since $P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda)$ is the entropy distribution conditioned on energy E, the canonical long-time entropy distribution is the exact mixture

$$\boxed{P_{\infty,\beta}(S;\lambda) = \int \mathrm{d}E\ P_\beta(E;\lambda)\,P_\infty^{(E)}(S;\lambda).} \tag{11}$$

5.5 Bulletproof qualifier: changing rates is not changing the invariant measure

The above results concern changes that alter the invariant measure by changing $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)$ and/or $H(\Gamma;\lambda)$. By contrast, a purely kinetic modification that only rescales crossing rates or mixing times *while leaving the invariant measure unchanged* can change the finite-time distribution $P_t(S)$ but does not change the long-time distribution $P_\infty(S)$.

6 Conclusion

The mirror-state paradox shows that the Second Law cannot be a universal fundamental law in the form "entropy is monotone" (strictly or as a universal statistical principle) under time-reversal invariant microscopic physics. The consistent replacement is that entropy is described by a probability distribution $P(S)$, without an intrinsic direction, and that this distribution depends on constraints and boundary conditions. We proved from first principles that constraints reshape the long-time entropy distribution $P_\infty(S;\lambda)$ by altering accessible macrostate volumes and/or statistical weights, with a sharp microcanonical criterion that isolates the only degenerate case of mere translation.

In this corrected framework, the traditional "impossibility" intuition behind a perpetual motion machine of the second kind is no longer a fundamental axiom but a limit-dependent, model-dependent statement; in that precise sense, one may say that the road toward a perpetual motion machine of the second kind is now faintly visible.

References (background)

References

[1] H. Goldstein, C. Poole, and J. Safko, *Classical Mechanics* (Addison–Wesley, 3rd ed., 2002).

[2] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics* (Wiley, 2nd ed., 1985).

[3] R. K. Pathria and P. D. Beale, *Statistical Mechanics* (Elsevier, 3rd ed., 2011).

[4] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II: Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, 2nd ed., 1991).

[5] J. L. Lebowitz, "Boltzmann's entropy and time's arrow," *Physics Today* **46**(9), 32–38 (1993).