

UNITED WISDOM

Order and entropy: what physics actually says about disorder

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W28 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Order and entropy: what physics actually says about disorder

Epigraph

> *entropy must increase in an irreversible adiabatic process.*

Elliott H. Lieb and Jakob Yngvason, A Guide to Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics, 1998, printed p. 6. Complete grammatical clause after the introductory It says that. Process conditions and the equilibrium-state framework remain essential; this is no assertion about every open part at every instant.

What this article is about

A neatly arranged desk tells us little about its physical entropy. Tidiness serves a purpose: finding a document, freeing space or keeping an object accessible. Entropy in physics concerns a specified system and its states. Sharing the words order and disorder does not make these questions identical.

This article considers Joel Lebowitz's explanation through microstates and macrostates, Lieb and Yngvason's axiomatic account of accessible transitions, and selected Herbert Simon passages on organisation and formation. Comparing them distinguishes a quantity, probability, process direction and the rate at which a form develops. An original card example illustrates grouping without measuring objects' entropy. For United Wisdom, the practical point is precise language: what characteristic do we observe, what convenience do we seek, and why call a change good? A physical term can frame a question. It does not evaluate spirituality, personal worth, relationships or the rightness of a life decision.

I. Order needs a question

Order can have different criteria. Books may be arranged by size, author or subject. One arrangement suits appearance, another assists searching. Without a stated purpose, arguing about which is better may hide different tasks. Rearranging objects establishes neither an increase nor a decrease in physical entropy. That would require a defined physical system, its state and a suitable description. An everyday judgement retains meaning without becoming a measurement through a scientific term. The article's first question is therefore straightforward: order for what, and which characteristic should change? Naming it makes the proposed improvement assessable rather than universally desirable.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

“More chaotic” also combines different observations. Perhaps there are more objects, the required item is harder to find, or a familiar sequence of actions has disappeared. These changes differ. Chaos in physics and mathematics has conditions of its own; scattered papers and unknown causes supply no ready demonstration. Everyday language can often say that searching takes longer or that placement no longer follows a chosen rule. Precision does not impoverish experience. It preserves the observable difference without implying that the state has already been calculated within a physical theory or that a particular scientific mechanism explains it.

In Boltzmann’s Entropy and Time’s Arrow, Lebowitz distinguishes a detailed microscopic state from a macroscopic description. This contrasts neither tidiness nor unattractiveness. In the classical account considered, a microstate includes particles’ positions and velocities, while a macrostate uses fewer, aggregate characteristics. Many detailed states can fit one description. Detailed and aggregate concern how states are specified, not an object’s value. Applying the distinction requires identifying the characteristics retained and those no longer distinguished by the description. Without that choice, saying that there are many possibilities leaves the relevant possibilities and the intended comparison unclear.

Lieb and Yngvason start with a different question: systems, equilibrium states and accessible transitions between them. Their entropy principle comes with explicit assumptions rather than being extracted from an observer’s impression. The sources can be compared, but their definitions cannot be freely exchanged during an argument. One explains statistical direction in macroscopic development; the other considers conditions for ordering equilibrium states through permitted processes. When entropy appears without a definition, first identify which question is actually being asked and whether the selected model applies. A familiar term alone supplies neither the model nor its conditions.

II. How many detailed states fit a description?

In Lebowitz’s account, a macrostate corresponds to a region of possible microstates. Boltzmann entropy relates to that region’s size, rather than how appealing a picture is. Having many detailed states that look alike under selected macroscopic characteristics matters for a statistical explanation. Yet many must be defined within a state space using a suitable measure. Counting alternatives offers an intuition; a physical calculation needs more precise conditions. The card example below has no assigned physical entropy: a calculation would require states defined by the system’s physical nature and conditions, rather than merely counting desk objects. The connection concerns compatible states, not a direct numerical measure of visual tidiness.

Our original teaching example contains four distinguishable cards: red R1 and R2, blue B1 and B2. They occupy four positions in sequence. Permuting distinct cards gives twenty-four

records: four choices for the first position, three for the next, then two and one. Considering colours alone gives six sequences, each admitting four permutations of individual labels within the colours. Check this by choosing red positions: first with second, third or fourth; second with third or fourth; third with fourth. Two positions remain for blue cards in each case. This finite construction illustrates detailed and aggregate descriptions, not all physical motions of cards and surroundings.

Require both red cards to occupy the first two positions. Four detailed arrangements satisfy it: two orders of red and two of blue. Twenty arrangements do not. Under an explicitly stipulated uniform choice among all twenty-four, the probability is one sixth. Uniformity belongs to the example's selection rule; it does not follow from seeing cards before us. Deliberately arranging them by colour changes the selection distribution. Observing one prepared record cannot reconstruct the selection rule from its appearance. Probability needs information about how a choice was made, alongside possible records. Compatible alternatives, preparation and actual probability remain separate questions.

We could call another colour sequence ordered, and it would likewise admit four detailed records. Ignoring colour order altogether admits all twenty-four. Our observational condition changed; the cards need not have moved. This guards against a rushed conclusion: arbitrary classification establishes no arbitrarily assigned physical entropy without further grounds. Here the example concerns grouping and compatibility. Physical macrovariables and an appropriate measure require their own justification. Naming a class according to personal taste replaces neither definition nor measurement. Its explanatory use remains limited to the construction we specified, and the distinction between a description and a change in its object.

III. Typical does not mean compulsory for every case

Lebowitz explains that, for the macroscopic systems considered, an overwhelming proportion of compatible microstates belongs to the equilibrium region. Typical development therefore differs from every conceivable trajectory. An unlikely possibility is not logically forbidden merely because it is rare. Conversely, an exceptional state does not abolish an account of typical behaviour. Even establishing a particular outcome says nothing by itself about its frequency across a specified set of repetitions. What occurred and how outcomes are distributed require different information; cards illustrate that distinction without a physical calculation. Neither "for most in a defined sense" nor a numerical probability should become an unconditional claim about every object.

Low-entropy initial conditions matter for the directional account. Symmetric microscopic rules alone do not establish the entire observed history. Lebowitz treats this separately from computational sensitivity. Chaos should therefore not become a universal answer. Differences in initial states, the predominance of macroregions and preparation conditions play different

explanatory roles. This article supplies no unified account of the universe’s low-entropy origin. Cosmological discussion in the historical paper retains the status of positions considered by its author. It is not presented as today’s complete solution, and no contemporary consensus is inferred from the paper’s date or authority.

The possibility of a reversed microscopic history must be distinguished from ordinary access to a process that prepares it. If an idealised return requires changing detailed velocities and maintaining special conditions, it differs from the ordinary action of putting everything back. That physical question does not decide whether a human mistake can be repaired. Restoring some conditions, compensating consequences or changing future conduct need not erase what happened. This latter comparison is UW’s original analogy and requires ethical and practical grounds. Entropy does not prohibit repairs, responsibility or revising decisions merely because the language of return sounds similar.

Lebowitz also distinguishes Boltzmann entropy from Gibbs entropy associated with an ensemble description. They cannot be declared interchangeable in every argument about increase. It matters whether a statement concerns a particular system’s macrostate, a distribution or another specified construction. This is not a detailed statistical-mechanics course, and the respective formulas are not derived here. Retaining the distinction already helps: once a quantity is defined in one way, its change needs an argument using that same definition. Moving to another quantity calls for a separate explanation rather than relying on the same familiar word in their names.

IV. Conditions of the thermodynamic principle

In A Guide to Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics, Lieb and Yngvason consider adiabatic accessibility between equilibrium states. Accessibility means a permitted transition under stated conditions, including treatment of auxiliary devices and surroundings. This is more precise than “everything becomes disordered”. The exposition specifies comparability assumptions and properties of the relation before formulating an entropy principle. Those conditions belong to the claim’s substance. Removing them turns a short quotation into a promise of applicability to every event that the text does not make. Its technical formulation should therefore accompany, rather than vanish behind, an everyday interpretation.

In this framework, entropy characterises states and agrees with transition accessibility under the assumptions. Reversible equivalence and irreversible transitions have different corresponding relations between entropy values. The point is no moral judgement of direction; it constrains permitted physical transformations. The authors also discuss compound systems and additivity. This article does not independently verify their complete mathematical argument. It uses the read formulation, assumptions and theorem statement. A rigorous

argument in the primary source is not evidence that UW has reproduced its proof or checked every real process. Both the source's strength and this article's actual scope remain visible.

The state domain matters too. The authors work with equilibrium systems and particular scaling rules, explicitly limiting transfer to some objects. Dividing or enlarging an object does not always preserve the properties the construction needs. This boundary discourages entropy as a universal scale of every change. Fatigue, a tangled conversation and an overloaded calendar do not become equilibrium thermodynamic states by analogy. They can be described and investigated in other ways. Assigning a physical quantity requires conditions everyday speech usually does not supply, so the technical framework should not be presented as a ready diagnostic scale for those experiences.

Comparison with Lebowitz clarifies the explanatory structure. One account centres on compatible microstates, typicality and prepared initial conditions; the other on a defined accessibility relation and assumptions for an entropy function. Starting with different questions does not by itself make the approaches contradictory. Neither may one substitute for the other without a connecting argument. An actual physical calculation needs a system and a suitable method. Readers can retain the narrower distinction for now: statistical explanation and an assumption-dependent theorem have different structures, although both help clarify limits on processes. Their shared term does not remove that difference.

V. A system boundary changes the claim

A statement about a part can mean something different from a statement about that system together with its surroundings. Receiving energy or matter prevents automatically extending an isolated-whole claim to the part. Yet pointing to exchange also proves no particular local entropy decrease. A specific result needs states, a process and an accounting of exchanges. This precision preserves both boundaries: local structure need not violate the second law, while an appealing energy-flow story is not a calculation. Identify the boundary before interpreting a change physically. Otherwise a statement can silently shift between a local object and a larger system.

In Lieb and Yngvason's exposition, conditions on restoring auxiliary devices and treating a compound system matter. Gas returning to its former volume need not restore its complete original state together with its surroundings. One visible variable may return while other conditions change. This explains why can it be returned needs an object and a permitted procedure. Restoring a coordinate in a diagram establishes no reversal of the complete process. An everyday rearrangement cannot replace the source's precise example. The comparison merely reveals what the initial question omits and why a visible resemblance between endpoints is insufficient.

Suppose someone clears a desk by putting papers in a cupboard. The chosen purpose may be served, but the papers have not disappeared, and no physical sign of entropy change has been established. A thermodynamic description would need more than arrangement: actions, energy exchanges and appropriate states would matter. This original UW example calculates none of them. It distinguishes visible tidiness from a full process description and evaluates no person through their desk. Arrangement may depend on space, physical accessibility, time and the work's purpose. Those conditions belong to an ordinary practical question rather than a measure of character.

Simon's organisational remarks remind us to test divisions through interactions. A convenient line around an object does not eliminate its connections. Yet a historical systems argument supplies no numerical thermodynamic balance for that object. Such work needs other data and a model. The comparison is substantive but limited: both questions require identifying what enters the description and what crosses the boundary. The difference remains. System organisation and a thermodynamic quantity do not become a single cause because parts, exchange and a whole appear in the story. Shared vocabulary helps locate a question, without supplying the missing physical calculation.

VI. Organisation and the rate of formation

In a selected Architecture of Complexity passage, Simon discusses stable intermediate forms and notes that an entropy characteristic alone does not describe their rate of formation. This distinguishes a possible state from its formation history. In the watchmakers illustration, preserved intermediate assemblies change the process under specified interruptions. It does not follow that every organised formation must arise or that evolution heads toward a predetermined goal. The illustration is a constructed model. Its conditions support comparing assembly procedures rather than a universal demonstration about life. An attractive form and a plausible story do not establish that the necessary history occurred.

The predominance of a state-space region and the time needed to reach a result also differ. A permitted state and a large region still leave questions about connecting transitions and rate limitations. The number of card arrangements says nothing about how long someone takes to rearrange them. That needs action rules, durations and stopping conditions, absent from the initial count. Lebowitz's statistical discussion includes dynamics and preparation; Simon emphasises intermediate-step organisation. Possibilities differ from paths. Their comparison gives no ready rate of biological evolution or social change; that numerical forecast would need another formulation and independent evidence.

Simon's historical biological entropy and information estimates are not used here as current measurements. The narrower distinction between a quantity and a formation mechanism matters. Local structure should likewise not become proof of a spiritual victory over physics.

Interactions and conditions may permit a structure; its meaning for a person remains another question. An attractive pattern, convenient organisation and morally acceptable conduct are not one physical characteristic. Calling them all order does not erase their differences. Those distinctions must return before a substantive discussion can evaluate the kind of improvement being claimed and the grounds actually available for it.

In work, we might ask what preserves an intermediate result. An accessible record, an agreed handover or the ability to resume after interruption may help. This is an original application of a systems question, not a thermodynamic productivity law. It provides no numerical team entropy and no basis for accusing someone of increasing disorder. Assessing suitability needs actual conditions and participants' goals. A preserved result may be mistaken, while declining to continue may be justified. Organisation is therefore no independent measure of a good decision. Its meaning depends on what it enables and for whom, including the burdens it creates.

VII. Where metaphor starts obstructing understanding

"Entropy is growing in our relationship" may express an experience of lost clarity. Without a definition it provides neither a physical quantity nor a cause. Name the observation instead: agreements have become less clear, expectations differ or messages go unanswered. Available reasons and actions can then be explored. Translating a metaphor into a question does not prohibit imagery. It distinguishes expressing experience from establishing a claim. A speaker should also not assign the same experience to every participant because a scientific word aptly describes their own impression. Other people's accounts remain information to hear, rather than results the metaphor has already determined.

The second law implies neither submission to harm nor the pointlessness of care. A physical constraint on particular processes establishes no human duties by analogy. A practical question needs circumstances, rights, available means and consequences. Repair may not restore the whole past yet still matter for what follows. UW states this boundary as an independent ground for application, not a deduction from a thermodynamic theorem. When a term justifies inaction despite an available permissible repair, examine the transition from a physical claim to a moral judgement. The analogy does not itself establish that transition or decide whether action is justified.

The opposite temptation calls inner calm an entropy decrease and presents spiritual practice as physical control of the world. The sources read establish no such claim. A personal description can be valuable without assigning a scientific quantity. "Clearer", "calmer" or "more convenient" remains meaningful when the observer and change are identified. Investigating that experience would need suitable questions and evidence, different from equilibrium gas states. This article supplies no diagnostic scale, ranks no people by orderliness

and promises no exercise result through a physical term. Personal meaning and an empirical explanation can be considered without treating them as interchangeable evidence.

A careful analogy names both a shared relation and different objects. In the card construction and a work record, a chosen description retains some distinctions and omits others. That does not make the record a thermodynamic system with an established entropy. Simon warns that analogies can assist or mislead. Here the warning has limited application: imagery reveals a question, after which its domain requires investigation. Without evidence for a conclusion, an analogy may remain an image. Its incompleteness does not need to be hidden under extra scientific vocabulary or treated as an error that a more ambitious metaphor will solve.

VIII. Precision that leaves room for action

Before an entropy claim, ask sequential questions. How is the system defined? How are its states described? Which quantity is being used? What process and exchange conditions are known? What connects that quantity with the proposed conclusion? This does not require turning ordinary conversation into calculation. When a technical assertion is unnecessary, choose an ordinary precise word. When it matters, its conditions cannot be omitted. Experience descriptions and physical hypotheses can both be useful, but need different grounds and admit different checks. Naming which one is intended keeps a modest observation from being mistaken for a scientific result.

For a desk, the question might instead be where to place papers so authorised people can find them. Space, accessibility, privacy and an agreed rule matter. An arrangement convenient for one person may obstruct another. Discuss a good order’s criterion rather than declaring a universal physical norm. This is an original UW application, promising no improvement in inner state through moving objects and permitting the choice to change nothing. Sometimes the actual constraint is limited space or time, not an incorrect attitude. Recognising that prevents a practical arrangement question from becoming an unsupported judgement about someone’s willingness or character.

Evidence about a result also needs separation. “Placement changed” is one observation. “Searching became faster” is another and requires an appropriate comparison. “Participants found it more convenient” is their report, which the diagram maker’s opinion cannot replace. “Physical entropy decreased” is a separate claim not established by those facts. This permits a limited useful result without excessive promises. We may improve selected accessibility without knowing the thermodynamic balance. We may acknowledge an unsuitable arrangement and revise it without calling that a violation of nature’s laws or evidence of insufficient spiritual discipline. Each conclusion should stay connected with what was observed.

Physics provides rigorous and substantive ways to reason about states and processes. Their force depends on retaining conditions, rather than extending every term to every part of life. Lebowitz clarifies detailed and macroscopic descriptions; Lieb and Yngvason clarify transition accessibility; Simon distinguishes organisation, stable stages and formation rates. A practical choice leaves independent work: name the purpose, available actions and responsibilities. The order someone seeks may concern convenience, clarity or agreement. Respecting that search does not require calling it physical entropy. It requires acknowledging the question actually being asked and the reasons that can support an answer to it.

What this means in practice

Find one phrase where entropy or disorder replaces an observation. State what is known: finding an object is difficult, a sequence is disrupted or an agreement is unclear. Keep the image if useful, alongside an ordinary description without an assumed physical quantity.

Identify the purpose and people affected. An arrangement may concern access to an object. Agree permitted changes in shared space. Privacy, physical accessibility, time and the option to decline belong to the conditions, rather than obstacles to a supposedly universal order.

Choose one small reversible rearrangement or clarification of a record. Specify the observation that will assess the intended convenience. Do not judge character by object placement; demands for composure supply neither missing space nor unavailable resources.

Afterward, separate changed facts, participants' reports and unknowns. If the purpose changed, name its new criterion separately. Faster searching and freeing a surface may need different arrangements. Preserve the original question rather than silently changing its test. Claim no physical entropy decrease without definition and calculation. This original UW exercise clarifies language and the task; its effectiveness is unstudied and no useful effect is compulsory.

Key quotation

> *these permit either order.*

Joel L. Lebowitz, Boltzmann's Entropy and Time's Arrow, 1993, p. 34, Microscopic reversibility. Complete grammatical clause after a semicolon. "These" refers to the selected dynamical laws discussed, permitting both orders of a microstate sequence. It establishes neither reversibility of every law, ordinary access to return nor a moral direction for life.

Connections between traditions

Question	Two primary anchors	Comparison and boundary
Definition before metaphor	Lebowitz, pp. 34–35; Lieb/Yngvason, printed pp. 3–6	A quantity needs a system and states; statistical and equilibrium definitions are not arbitrarily exchangeable.
Part and surroundings	Lieb/Yngvason, pp. 4–7; Simon, pp. 470–472	Exchanges and the compound whole matter for a local change; historical evolution remarks calculate no household entropy.
Typicality and accessibility	Lebowitz, p. 35; Lieb/Yngvason, pp. 6–8	State predominance differs from an assumption-dependent theorem; neither establishes a spiritual norm.
Restoring a variable	Lebowitz, pp. 36–37; Lieb/Yngvason, p. 5	Returning one characteristic restores no complete surroundings; tidying remains an original analogy.
Quantity and rate	Simon, pp. 470–472; Lebowitz, pp. 34–35	Compatible states and a formation path are different questions; evolution's purpose does not follow.
Precision of application	Simon, p. 467; Lieb/Yngvason, pp. 3–4	Technical conditions matter for transfer; original UW practice measures no psychological entropy.

Primary sources

Joel L. Lebowitz. Boltzmann's Entropy and Time's Arrow. Physics Today 46, September 1993, pp. 32–38. Original English, institutional copy. Readable article prose supports microstates, macrostates, typicality, initial conditions and entropy distinctions. The author's cosmological and quantum positions are not adopted as today's complete theory; numerical figures are not reproduced here.

Elliott H. Lieb and Jakob Yngvason. A Guide to Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Original English author preprint arXiv:math-ph/9805005v1, 6 May 1998, primary text. The scope used is introduction, definitions, adiabatic accessibility, assumptions and Theorem 1 statement, printed pp. 1–9 opening. The complete proof is not considered; equilibrium-state and scaling limits remain.

Herbert A. Simon. The Architecture of Complexity. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 106, no. 6, 12 December 1962, pp. 467–482. Original English; text reproduction, institutional copy. Selected analogy, interaction, stable-intermediate-form and formation-rate passages are used. Historical biological numbers and a universal evolutionary purpose are not adopted.

Tags

entropy, order, disorder, physics, thermodynamics, statistical mechanics, Boltzmann, Gibbs, Lebowitz, Lieb, Yngvason, Simon, microstate, macrostate, equilibrium, probability, typicality, system boundary, surroundings, adiabatic accessibility, irreversibility, organisation, model, analogy, language, consent, responsibility, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.