

Maxwell's Demon must remain sebservient to Clausius's statement

P.D. Gujrati

¹*Department of Physics,* ²*Department of Polymer Science,*
*The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325**

(Dated: January 3, 2022)

Abstract

Using classical thermodynamics, we argue that Maxwell's demon loses its battle against Clausius as any temperature difference or other thermodynamic forces it creates is immediately compensated by spontaneous counterbalancing flows that bring about equilibration by slower particles in principle. Being constrained by these spontaneously generated equilibration processes in which he actively but unwittingly participates, the demon is incapable of destroying equilibrium and violating the second law. In fact, our investigation shows that he is unintentionally designed to support it, and does not alter the temperature.

Maxwell's demon, which had been puzzling scientists since 1867 when Maxwell proposed it in a letter to Tait [1], stands between two neighboring chambers Σ_1 and Σ_2 (having fixed and identical volumes) sharing a wall and forming an isolated system Σ initially in equilibrium (EQ) [2] at a temperature T_0 ; see also [3, 4]. The wall has a small hole that the demon D can open or close at will to select faster particles to go from Σ_2 into Σ_1 and slower particles from Σ_1 into Σ_2 . Maxwell conjectured that the demon, with this ability, raises the temperature of Σ_1 over Σ_2 without any expenditure of work, which violates the second law [2]. Because of this mortal threat to the basic foundation of classical thermodynamics, the demon has generated a tremendous amount of debate and some confusion among the best minds of our time since its inception [5], and has been a constant source of major conceptual advances and some challenges in theoretical physics [6–10] and in the philosophy of science [11, 12]. The main source of confusion has been the concept of any work done by the demon, and has required the concept of information entropy, Landauer's principle, minimum dissipation, etc. The demon may be seeing a resurgence as the role of fluctuations has become more prominent. Therefore, it is necessary to revisit the demon in light of the recent understanding of nonequilibrium thermodynamics [13] as the concept of work and of the second law in extended state space necessary for nonequilibrium (NEQ) states have become clarified only recently [14].

The observable $\mathbf{X} \doteq (N, E)$ of Σ forms the state space $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{X}}$ in which EQ states $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$ reside; here N is the single species particle number (so no chemical reaction) and E is the energy [15, 16]. We do not consider the volume as it is kept fixed here. The NEQ states $\mathcal{M}$ reside in an extended state space $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$, augmented by *internal variables* [17–20] shown collectively by $\boldsymbol{\xi}$; here, $\mathbf{Z} = \{\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\xi}\}$ is the NEQ state variable. We assume Σ_1 and Σ_2 to be quasi-independent so that their entropies are additive.

Simply put, our strategy will be the following. We treat Σ_1 and Σ_2 , the wall, the hole in it, and the demon as the isolated system Σ considered by Maxwell, for

which $dE = 0$ so the first law is not useful. Only the second law will play a role. We will assume that the wall, hole, and D have no interesting thermodynamics just as Maxwell had considered. This is similar to treating the piston in a cylinder containing a fluid as having no relevant thermodynamics [16, 17]. The demon D attempts a spatial inhomogeneity in E and N in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$, which results in a NEQ state $\mathcal{M}$ and reduces its entropy. From Postulate II of Callen [15], flows of energy and particles in both directions in a wall permeable to them always balance out in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$, ensure the maximum possible entropy of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$, and allow fluctuations in them in each chamber. Maxwell does not specify the nature of the wall, while most workers take it to be impervious to the flow of energy and particles. This case is covered by the above wall by making it impervious to both flows. The open hole always results in permeation to both flows so this case is no different from when the wall is permeable. We should remark that as soon as D opens the hole for a certain particle velocity [2], he may not even have any mechanical control over all other particles that will pass through the open hole in both directions with no restriction on their energies. Nevertheless, we will also consider the case where this additional flow is forbidden. Indeed, we pay close attention to the last case, not only because it is what is usually considered, but also because it reveals some surprising facts about the demon and clarifies its role, hitherto unknown. The most important aspect of our strategy is the use of the NEQ thermodynamic temperature that, as we show, explicitly satisfies the Clausius statement and its extension. This ensures that the entropy generation brings the system back to EQ but this fact has never been discussed for the demon paradox.

For simplicity, we will use the term "body" and denoted by Σ_b to refer to any one of Σ, Σ_1 , and Σ_2 as their discussion is very similar. All processes associated with Σ , which include those by D, occur *internally* inside it. Either they refer to flows in both directions between Σ_1 and Σ_2 , or refer to internal processes within them. Including D within Σ allows us to avoid the issue of separate work done by D; we only deal with the work done by Σ . To emphasize the internal nature, we will use $d_i\varphi$ [17] to denote changes caused by processes within Σ_b . Maxwell has *conjectured* that D causes a temperature

*Electronic address: pdg@uakron.edu

difference $\Delta T = T_1 - T_2 > 0$ in the chambers. This is precisely how the situation is commonly treated. This assumes that the temperature is well defined even in NEQ states, which is not so obvious. No number imbalance is treated separately. Being in a NEQ state, Σ_b is spatially nonuniform so identifying its *unique* global (over entire Σ_b) temperature $T_b = (T, T_1, T_2)$ as was first envisioned by Planck [21] is nontrivial. This requires identifying the NEQ entropy for any arbitrary NEQ state [22, 23]. Once the entropy is identified, T_b can be uniquely defined *thermodynamically* for any NEQ state of Σ_b even if it is inhomogeneous as recently shown [24–26] and reviewed in [13], where it is demonstrated that it satisfies all the sensible conditions including the Clausius statement that are required of a global thermodynamic temperature. Using this definition, which is explained later, we provide a first-ever resolution of the second law paradox created by D that $\Delta T \equiv 0$ by using only classical thermodynamics. None of the resolutions available so far to salvage the second law is based solely on thermodynamics.

We take a different approach from all previous approaches by recalling the Clausius statement according to which $\Delta T \neq 0$ generates *spontaneous* heat flow from hot to cold in accordance with the second law and argue that it competes with Maxwell’s conjecture. The temperature difference ΔT acts as a thermodynamic force [17] that brings back EQ so that $\Delta T = 0$. This spontaneous heat flow is in response to the destruction of EQ that D has attempted. Indeed, we provide a generalization of the Clausius statement to other kinds of flow such as a mass flow, *i.e.*, other thermodynamic forces. By assuming $\Delta T \neq 0$, we shows that D remains subservient to thermodynamic forces at all times so it *never* succeeds in destroying EQ, which disproves Maxwell’s conjecture. We find that D unwittingly brings EQ back and ensures $\Delta T = 0$ so he is incapable of destroying EQ. This conclusion is similar to that by Smoluchowski [3] and Feynman [4]; only the reasoning is different and is based solely on classical thermodynamics without fluctuations.

The rest of the paper is to provide a theoretical support for the above scheme, using our recently developed nonequilibrium thermodynamics denoted by MNEQT [13]. As it is a generalization of classical thermodynamics [17–20] developed by Carnot, Kelvin, Clausius, and Maxwell [17], our demonstration is as valid as classical thermodynamics. The novelty of the MNEQT is that it is based on system-intrinsic quantities that also include internal variables [17–20] that *uniquely* specify a NEQ state of Σ_b and its unique entropy [22, 23] in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ so it fully captures whatever is going on within Σ_b [13] through $d_i\varphi$, which is what we are interested in as discussed above. If a particular $d_i\varphi$ is allowed in a process, its sign is controlled by the second law [13, 17] as proven below in Eq. (11).

In the MNEQT [14, 24–26], we handle irreversibility directly using internal quantities $d_iS \geq 0$, $d_iW \equiv d_iQ \geq 0$, where d_iS is the irreversible entropy generation, and d_iW , d_iQ are irreversible work and heat generated within Σ_b ;

in contrast, $d_iE = d_iQ - d_iW \equiv 0$ as no internal process can change the energy of the system, and $d_iN = 0$ (no chemical reaction). In classical thermodynamics, where d_iW , d_iQ are not recognized, irreversibility is assessed indirectly as an inequality [16, 17, 19] by using $d_iS \geq 0$. But, in the MNEQT, we only deal with equalities, which makes our demonstration possible.

Let us briefly review the MNEQT for an arbitrary isolated system Σ , composed of several quasi-independent and disjoint subsystems $\Sigma_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ so that the entropies of Σ_j are additive to give the entropy S of Σ . We take Σ to have fixed N , and E . We will also assume that the volume of Σ_j is held fixed at $V_j = V/n$ but its energy E_j and the number of particles N_j can vary but always satisfy $\sum_j N_j = N$, $\sum_j E_j = E$. We set $\mathbf{X}_j = (N_j, E_j)$, and as before use Σ_b for any of $\Sigma, \{\Sigma_j\}$.

In EQ, the entropy of Σ_b is a state function $(S(E, N), \{S_j(N_j, E_j)\})$ in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{X}}$. For Σ in EQ, we have $N_j = N/n, E_j = E/n$. This is not the case when Σ_b is in a NEQ state [22, 23]. It is useful to think of the two distinct *realizations* for Σ_b . We can treat it as a “composite” body Σ_C with *detailed* information of its subsystems. This realization is useful to explicitly consider processes such as flows between its subsystems. Alternatively, we can treat Σ_b as a “black box” Σ_B if we only need to investigate its thermodynamics without any detailed information of internal processes. As we show, these internal processes are described by internal variables.

For the moment, let us assume that each Σ_j is in EQ with its entropy $S_j(\mathbf{X}_j(t))$. The entropy S_C of Σ_C

$$S_C(\{\mathbf{X}_j(t)\}) = \sum_j S_j(\mathbf{X}_j(t)) \leq S(\mathbf{X}(t)), \quad (1)$$

is a function of $2n$ independent variables for a state that is represented as an n -tuple in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{X}}$. For Σ_B , we need to use N and E as its observables to specify its entropy S_B . From entropy additivity, it is given exactly by the right side of the first equation in Eq. (1) so we need additional $2(n-1)$ independent independent variables, the internal variables, shown collectively by $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ to specify S_B uniquely in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$. For example, for $n = 2$, the internal variables

$$\xi_N = N_1(t) - N_2(t), \xi_E = E_1(t) - E_2(t) \quad (2)$$

constructed from $\{N_j(t)\}$ and $\{E_j(t)\}$ are independent of N and E ; see [13] for a general discussion. The entropy S_B of Σ_B is a state function and *obeys* the second law

$$S_B(\mathbf{Z}(t)) = \sum_j S_j(\mathbf{X}_j(t)) \leq S(\mathbf{X}(t)). \quad (3)$$

This state is called an *internal EQ* (IEQ) state [14, 24–26] as it has the maximum possible value for given $\mathbf{Z}(t)$. We also note the equality $S(\mathbf{Z}) \equiv S_B(\mathbf{Z}) \equiv S_C(\{\mathbf{X}_j\})$, with $S(\mathbf{Z})$ *uniquely* defined for an IEQ state $\mathcal{M}$ as each $S_j(\mathbf{X}_j)$ is uniquely defined. It is trivial to generalize the above discussion to Σ_j ’s in IEQ with entropies $S_j(\mathbf{Z}_j(t))$ by treating each Σ_j consisting of some subsystems.

We will assume [13, 25] that any arbitrary NEQ state can be described as an IEQ state by properly choosing an

appropriate number of internal variables. It happens that different $\xi_l \in \boldsymbol{\xi}$ have different relaxation times τ_l past which they equilibrate and do not affect thermodynamics; see for example [27]. Thus, for a given observational time scale τ_{obs} , the time to make consecutive measurements in an experimental setup, only those ξ_l 's need to be considered for which $\tau_l > \tau_{\text{obs}}$. Thus, in practice, the number of internal variables will be much smaller than $2(n-1)$. For simplicity of discussion, we will consider only two internal variables shown in Eq. (2) for any body Σ_b as our aim is only to demonstrate how classical NEQ thermodynamics can be used to show the subservient nature of the demon. Adding more internal variables is not going to affect the final conclusion.

In the following, we will also use β 's to denote inverse temperatures. The temperature and chemical potential of Σ_j are given by their standard EQ definition [16, 17]

$$\beta_j = 1/T_j = \partial S_j(\mathbf{X}_j)/\partial E_j, \beta_j \mu_j = -\partial S_j(\mathbf{X}_j)/\partial N_j \quad (4)$$

that appear in the EQ Gibbs fundamental relation

$$dS_j = \beta_j(dE_j - \mu_j dN_j) \quad (5)$$

in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{X}}$, from which we can construct dS_C using Eq. (1)

$$dS_C = \sum_j \beta_j(dE_j - \mu_j dN_j). \quad (6)$$

The NEQ Gibbs fundamental relation [13, 25]

$$dS_B = \beta(dE - \mu dN + \mathbf{A} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\xi}) \quad (7)$$

for S_B in $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ leads to the Clausius statement and yields

$$\beta = 1/T = \partial S_B/\partial E, \beta \mu = -\partial S_B/\partial N, \beta \mathbf{A} = \partial S_B/\partial \boldsymbol{\xi}; \quad (8)$$

here, $\mathbf{A}$ is the affinity or thermodynamic force [17] associated with $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. As $\xi_l \in \boldsymbol{\xi}$ equilibrates, $A_l \in \mathbf{A} \rightarrow 0$ and plays no role in a NEQ process. Reexpressing Eq. (7) as

$$dE = TdS_B + \mu dN - \mathbf{A} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\xi},$$

allows us to identify the generalized heat $dQ_B = TdS_B$ and generalized work $dW_B = -\mu dN + \mathbf{A} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\xi}$. As $\mathbf{A} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is generated by internal processes, we must have $A_l d\xi_l \geq 0$ in accordance with the second law [13, 25]; see Eq. (11) for proof. Each $A_l d\xi_l \geq 0$ is called the *generalized Clausius statement* for the internal variable or flow ξ_l .

For simplicity, take $n = 2$, see Eq. (2); the generalization to any n is trivial. Then, $\mathbf{A} = (A_N, A_E)$ and

$$dS_B = \beta[dE - \mu dN + A_E d\xi_E + A_N d\xi_N]. \quad (9)$$

Equating it with dS_C , we easily establish [13, see 10.3.1]

$$\beta = \frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2}{2}, \beta \mu = \frac{\beta_1 \mu_1 + \beta_2 \mu_2}{2}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\beta A_E = \frac{\beta_1 - \beta_2}{2}, \beta A_N = \frac{\beta_1 \mu_1 - \beta_2 \mu_2}{2}, \quad (10b)$$

which expresses T and μ of Σ_B in terms of those of Σ_1 and Σ_2 in Σ_C . In EQ Σ , $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ as expected.

We should emphasize that taking Σ_B to consist of more than two subsystems will require additional internal variables for S_B , but the lesson here is that in all cases, we can identify a unique global NEQ temperature, chemical potential, and affinities for the realization Σ_B . We do not need to know its internal structure explicitly, which is fully captured by internal variables.

To understand the physics of $A_E d\xi_E$ and $A_N d\xi_N$ for internal processes ($d_i N = d_i E = 0$) in Σ_b , we fix N and E . Equating Eq. (9) with $d_i S_C = [\beta_1 - \beta_2] dE_1(t) + [\beta_1 \mu_1 - \beta_2 \mu_2] dN_1(t) \geq 0$ from Eq. (6) gives

$$d_i S^Q = [\beta_1 - \beta_2] dE_1(t) = \beta A_E d\xi_E(t) \geq 0, \quad (11a)$$

$$d_i S^N = [\beta_1 \mu_1 - \beta_2 \mu_2] dN_1(t) = \beta A_N d\xi_N(t) \geq 0, \quad (11b)$$

for the energy and particle flows in Σ_b at fixed $\mathbf{X}$. From the general expression for dW_B and dQ_B above, we also have $d_i W_B = \mathbf{A} \cdot d\boldsymbol{\xi} = T d_i S = T(d_i S^Q + d_i S^N) \geq 0$ for any number of internal variables in the isolated Σ_b .

After identifying the NEQ T and μ for Σ_b in the MNEQT, we turn to the demon problem in which D , according to Maxwell's conjecture, causes Σ to leave $\mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}} \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{X}}$ at $t = 0$ to go into $\mathcal{M} \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathbf{Z}}$ at $t > 0$ due to each of the two flows in both directions across the wall and the hole. Following his conjecture, we assume $\Delta T > 0$, and nonzero $\xi(t)$ with $\xi_{\text{eq}} = 0$. Then

$$\Delta S_D \doteq S_B(\mathbf{X}, \xi(t)) - S_B(\mathbf{X}) < 0 \quad (12)$$

is the entropy loss of Σ caused by the demon, a seeming violation of the second law.

We now show that this is not the complete story as this loss is counterbalanced by a spontaneous equilibration process specified by $S_B(\mathbf{X}, \xi)$ for $\mathcal{M}$ in accordance with the generalized Clausius statement, see Eq. (11), on which D has no control, and forces $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$. The spontaneous process is integral to thermodynamic consideration so it must not be neglected as the case has been so far. We take Σ_b to refer to the chamber Σ_j , $j = 1, 2$, which we treat as a NEQ Σ_B and use Eq. (8) to identify its β_j , μ_j , and $\mathbf{A}_j$ by treating Σ_j to consist of two EQ subchambers Σ_{j1} and Σ_{j2} . This implies $n = 4$ subchambers for Σ . The interface between Σ_{21} and Σ_{12} is the above wall in Σ . We have restricted to only two internal variables for Σ_j as said above, but more internal variables can be taken for a more complex NEQ chamber. The $(\mathbf{A}_j, \boldsymbol{\xi}_j)$ only refer to spontaneous processes between Σ_{j1} and Σ_{j2} that partly drive $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$, for which at fixed $\mathbf{X}_j$, we have $d_i S_j^Q = \beta_j A_{Ej} d\xi_{Ej}(t) \geq 0$, $d_i S_j^N = \beta_j A_{Nj} d\xi_{Nj}(t) \geq 0$ from Eq. (11), and $d_i W_{Bj} = T_j d_i S_j = T_j(d_i S_j^Q + d_i S_j^N) \geq 0$. These internal processes in Σ_j , which have never been discussed before, do not depend on the nature of the wall.

The complete equilibration $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{eq}}$ requires additional flows, never discussed in the literature, between Σ_{21} and Σ_{12} that change $\mathbf{X}_j$. This is where the nature of

the wall becomes important. However, it is much simpler to treat Σ as Σ_C having the two NEQ chambers $\{\Sigma_j\}$, each treated as a NEQ Σ_B with its own T_j, μ_j, A_{Ej} , and A_{Nj} without knowing its interior.

We first deal with the permeable wall. The flows occur across the wall and the open hole. As Σ has $n = 4$ subchambers, we need 6 internal variables in Eq. (12) to uniquely specify $\mathcal{M}$ for Σ , each one equilibrating with its own relaxation time. To simplify the discussion, we again restrict to only two internal variables; see Eq. (2). Thus, $d_i S_B^Q = [\beta_1 - \beta_2] dE_1(t) \geq 0$, $d_i S_B^N = [\beta_1 \mu_1 - \beta_2 \mu_2] dN_1(t) \geq 0$ and $d_i W_B = T d_i S_B = T_j (d_i S_B^Q + d_i S_B^N) \geq 0$ due to these flows at fixed $\mathbf{X}$ across the wall, see Eq. (11), as $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{eq}$.

We note that $dE_1(t)$ and $dN_1(t)$ each have three independent contributions: from the wall, from the particles controlled by D, and from the additional flows through the open hole. In general, ξ has six internal variables, which we now assume have been included in the determination of $d_i S_B$. After equilibration, $S(\mathbf{Z})$ increases by

$$\Delta S_{CS} \doteq S_B(\mathbf{X}) - S_B(\mathbf{X}, \xi(t)) > 0 \quad (13)$$

in accordance with the generalized Clausius statement. We see that $\Delta S \doteq \Delta S_D + \Delta S_{CS} = 0$, thus satisfying the second law. The situation becomes more clear by considering an infinitesimal process in $\mathcal{M}_{eq}$ for which

$$d_i S_B \equiv dS \doteq dS_D + dS_{CS} = 0 \quad (14)$$

that shows that $\mathcal{M}_{eq}$ never leaves itself due to the infinitesimal spontaneous counterbalancing process after D attempts to destroy it: the loss dS_D is immediately recovered by irreversible entropy generation dS_{CS} . In essence, no temperature or entropy difference ever arises so that $\Delta T = 0 \Rightarrow T_b = T_0 \Rightarrow dS_D = dS_{CS} = 0$, and $d_i W \equiv d_i W_B = 0$ at all times.

Let us now consider the two cases of an impervious wall. We will argue that nothing changes in the discussion above except for the definitions of $dE_1(t)$ and $dN_1(t)$. (a) There is no flow across the wall but flows of all sorts of particles, including those controlled by D, are allowed through the open hole determining $dE_1(t)$ and $dN_1(t)$ above. (b) Only the flows caused by the particles that D controls through the open hole determine $dE_1(t)$ and $dN_1(t)$.

There is an intuitive way to understand the physics in (b), which reveals some surprising facts about the effect of D. Take $\Delta T > 0$ following Maxwell's conjecture. As D allows faster particles to add $dE'_1 > 0$, not to be confused with dE_1 for (b) above, into Σ_1 , he *decreases* S by $dE'_1(\beta_2 - \beta_1)$. Surprisingly, as D allows slower particles to add $dE'_2 = -dE'_1$ into Σ_2 , S *increases* by $dE'_2(\beta_1 - \beta_2)$; cf. Eq. (11a). As they cancel each other without changing S , Maxwell's conjecture $\Delta T \neq 0$ cannot be justified if we start in $\mathcal{M}_{eq}$: D never destroys EQ.

This is no different from what happens in $\mathcal{M}_{eq}$ with the permeable wall, across which each flow cancels out when both directions are considered as noted earlier with no change in the entropy. The same happens for the flows of all sorts of particles through the open hole. Thus, unbeknown to Maxwell, he actually had designed the demon to support the second law as Σ never leaves $\mathcal{M}_{eq}$, which is contrary to the popular belief in physics and philosophy. Maxwell's conjecture is false in all cases.

It is gratifying to see after all that no internal process can drive an isolated system away from EQ. The MNEQT is used to identify global T and μ , and internal variables to test Maxwell's conjecture. The importance of our thermodynamic T and μ is that they satisfies Clausius's general statement in any $\mathcal{M}$ as proved in Eq. (11). Without such a proof, our demonstration will just be another conjecture. As thermodynamics is devoid of fluctuations, our reasoning is somewhat different from those offered by Smoluchowski [3] and by Feynman [4]. Recently, Hoover and Hoover [28] have carried out a two-dimensional simulation of particles with interaction to test our conclusion. They find that the heat conductivity in the model competes with the demon's goal as we have concluded.

The discussion also reveals something very profound. If the demon only allows the particles to move in only one direction, then such a demon will actually violate the second law according to our analysis. It will be interesting to pursue if attempts involving information and erasure, etc. can salvage the second law for such a demon.

Comments from S. Ciliberto, D. Kondepudi, and J.D. Norton are gratefully acknowledged. We also thank Bill Hoover and Carol Hoover for sharing their result.

-
- [1] C.G. Knott, *Life and Scientific Work of Peter Guthrie Tait*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1911; p. 213.
 - [2] J.C. Maxwell, *Theory of Heat*, Longmans, Green, and Co., London (1902), p. 338.
 - [3] M. von Smoluchowski, *Phys. Zeitschrift*, **13**, 1069 (1912).
 - [4] R.P. Feynman, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. 1, Addison Wesley, Reading, Mass. (1963), Ch. 46.
 - [5] H.S. Leff and A.F. Rex, eds. *Maxwell's Demon 2: Entropy, Classical and Quantum Information, Computing*, CRT Press, Boca Raton, FL. (2018).
 - [6] L. Brillouin, *J. Appl. Phys.* **22**, 334 (1951).
 - [7] L. Szilárd, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, **53**, 840 (1929).
 - [8] R. Landauer, *IBM. Journ. Res. Devel.* **5**, 183 (1961).
 - [9] C.H. Bennett, *Int. J. Theo. Phys.* **21**, 905 (1982).
 - [10] M.B. Plenio and V. Vitelli, *Contemp. Phys.* **42**, 25 (2001).
 - [11] J. Earman and J.D. Norton, *Stud. Hist. Philos. M. P.* **29**, 435 (1998); *ibid.* **30**, 1 (1999).

- [12] C.H. Bennett, Stud. Hist. Philos. M. P. **34**, 501 (2003).
- [13] P.D. Gujrati, Entropy, **23**, 1584 (2021); arXiv:2111.07972v2.
- [14] P.D. Gujrati, arXiv:1105.5549.
- [15] H.B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to thermostatistics*, 2nd ed., John Wiley, New York (1985).
- [16] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics*, Vol. 1, 3rd Edition, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1986).
- [17] D. Kondepudi and I. Prigogine, *Modern Thermodynamics*, John Wiley and Sons, West Sussex (1998).
- [18] J. Kestin, *A course in Thermodynamics*, vols. 1 & 2, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York (1979).
- [19] S.R. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics*, First Edition, Dover, New York (1984).
- [20] G.A. Maugin, *The Thermodynamics of Nonlinear Irreversible Behaviors: An Introduction*, World Scientific, Singapore (1999).
- [21] M. Planck in *Festschrift Ludwig Boltzmann*, Barth, Leipzig (1904), p. 113.
- [22] P.D. Gujrati, arXiv:1304.3768.
- [23] P.D. Gujrati, Entropy, **17**, 710 (2015).
- [24] P.D. Gujrati, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 051130 (2010); P.D. Gujrati, arXiv:0910.0026.
- [25] P.D. Gujrati, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 041128 (2012); P.D. Gujrati, arXiv:1101.0438.
- [26] P.D. Gujrati, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 041129 (2012); P.D. Gujrati, arXiv:1101.0431.
- [27] P.D. Gujrati, Entropy, **20**, 149 (2018).
- [28] W.G. Hoover and C.G. Hoover, arXiv:2112.14395.