The Two Speed Standard
Where This Came From,
Why It Exists,
and What I Hope Happens Next

This started the way most real ideas start: by accident.

I was doing rough math on an electric conversion idea, motor sizes, torque curves, gearboxes, cost, and the like. And I kept running into the same wall. The complexity on the torque side of modern vehicles just feels... unnecessary. Like we kept adding layers because that's where the industry learned to compete, not because physics actually required it.

The math was pretty consistent: a medium-sized torque plant and an industrial gearbox could handle the work. The problem wasn't "can it work." The problem was always compromise. You could tune it for torque or you could tune it for speed, but doing both cleanly meant stacking parts.

Then I was looking for a donor chassis for something completely different, and I found a 1950s two-speed rear axle.

And it just clicked.

The exact gear delta I was trying to create elsewhere had already existed for a hundred years. Quietly. Reliably. In work trucks that were expected to run forever.

Everything that follows is me refusing to let that realization go.

Ben Trommater

(313) 552-4171
TwoSpeedStandard@gmail.com
https://github.com/TwoSpeedStandard/TwoSpeedStandard

This Is Not an Electric Project
Nor Is It a Combustion Project

I was thinking about electric motors when this started. I'm not hiding that. But this work isn't about electric vehicles, diesel trucks, gasoline engines, or ideology.

It's about torque.

More specifically, it's about power plants that can deliver useful torque across a wide, honest operating range, without relying on excessive gearing, complexity, or fragile abstraction to make them livable.

If a power plant can do that, it belongs here.

That can be a lot of things:

- Combustion engines, simple or complex
- Electric motors, large or small
- Hybrid setups, conventional or unconventional
- Power sources that run full time, part time, or only when needed
- Systems that are mechanically controlled, digitally controlled, or somewhere in between

Fuel type, cylinder count, control strategy, era, none of that's the point.

Those are just implementation details.

The drivetrain shouldn't care where torque comes from. It should only care that it arrives in a form that can be multiplied, shared, disconnected, and sustained.

This work is intentionally torque-agnostic.

Ben Trommater

(313) 552-4171
TwoSpeedStandard@gmail.com
https://github.com/TwoSpeedStandard/TwoSpeedStandard

It doesn't ask anyone to abandon what they know.

It asks them to stop assuming their preferred solution is the only valid one.

If that makes someone uncomfortable, good. That discomfort is probably the point.

Why There Are Multiple Papers

This isn't one idea. It's a stack.

I split this into multiple documents on purpose, because mixing rules, hardware, and imagination always ends badly.

Here's the structure:

1. This *Read Me* explains how the idea started and what I'm hoping happens with it.
2. *The Two-Speed Ford 9" Third Member* is the first real, buildable step.
3. *The Two Speed Standard* defines the rules, questions, and transparency metrics.
4. *Applied Power Architectures* explores what naturally follows once the core exists.
5. *Applications and Possibilities* is where imagination gets to run.

If you skip ahead without understanding the rules, you'll probably miss the point.

Ben Trommater

(313) 552-4171
TwoSpeedStandard@gmail.com
https://github.com/TwoSpeedStandard/TwoSpeedStandard

About Ownership, Money, and Credit

I'm not trying to own this.

There's no licensing scheme, no royalty expectation, no business model hiding in the margins. If someone builds something from this and makes money, fine. That's how the real world works.

Attribution would be nice, though.

Not because I need control, but because ideas have lineage. If this spreads, I'd like the origin to stay traceable. That's all.

About Me, and Why I'm Not Leading This

I don't know everything. That's not humility theater, it's just true.

I've spent my life working around broken automation and controls systems, finding workarounds that weren't "supposed" to exist. This feels like the same muscle, just applied to drivetrains instead of buildings, devices, or controls.

I'm not the right person to take this to its logical end.

I can start fires. I'm good at seeing connections. I'm good at asking the wrong questions in rooms that need them. But this needs builders, machinists, engineers, and stubborn people who like getting grease under their nails more than winning arguments online.

If someone picks this up and runs with it, that's success.

Ben Trommater

(313) 552-4171
TwoSpeedStandard@gmail.com
https://github.com/TwoSpeedStandard/TwoSpeedStandard

Engagement, If You Want It

I'm open to talking about this.

Not in comment wars, not in drive-by dismissals, and not in "that's not how it's done" conversations. If you've read the papers, thought seriously about them, modeled something, built something, or even broken something trying… I'm happy to talk.

Effort is the only filter.

A Living Thing, Not a Finished One

The Two Speed Standard is intentionally unfinished.

It's meant to evolve as people build under it and discover what works, what doesn't, and what needs clarification. The standards should live where the work lives, not with me.

I'm putting this out because I need it out of my head.

What happens next isn't up to me.

Final Thought

If this feels obvious in hindsight, good.

If it feels uncomfortable, that's fine too.

If it breaks physics, it should die quickly.

If it doesn't, then there's work to do.

Ben Trommater

(313) 552-4171
TwoSpeedStandard@gmail.com
https://github.com/TwoSpeedStandard/TwoSpeedStandard