THE TWO SPEED STANDARD

A Framework for Mechanical Clarity, Serviceability, and Honest Torque

Table of Contents

Ben Trommater

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

Version 1.1

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

Two-Speed Ford 9-Inch Third Member

Concept Architecture and Engineering Notes

1. Purpose of This Document

This paper defines a bolt-in two-speed third member for the Ford 9-inch rear axle. It's a proof-of-concept architecture, not a final design, and I'm not claiming it's optimal.

What this device is supposed to do:

1. Provide two discrete final drive ratios at the axle
2. Eliminate the need for multi-speed transmissions in a lot of applications
3. Stay fully mechanical, serviceable, and bench-repairable
4. Use the Ford 9-inch ecosystem as a modular development scaffold

This document intentionally avoids standards language. That's covered in a different paper.

2. Why the Ford 9-Inch Third Member

The Ford 9-inch is selected for development practicality, not because it's absolutely the strongest option out there.

Key reasons:

1. Removable third member makes bench development possible
2. Huge aftermarket supply of gears, bearings, cases, and tooling
3. Known geometry and packaging envelopes
4. Widespread familiarity among builders

Other axle families might ultimately be better hosts for a two-speed system. This is just the starting point.

Ben Trommater

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

3. High-Level Architecture

The two-speed function sits ahead of the differential ring gear, not after it.

What's inside the third member:

1. A conventional differential and ring gear set
2. An inline planetary gear set between the pinion input and the ring gear
3. A mechanical selector that switches between two modes: Direct Drive (High) and Reduction Drive (Low)

There's no neutral position in the third member. If something fails, it defaults to direct mechanical passthrough.

4. Gear Modes and Power Flow

4.1 High Range (Direct Drive)

In high range, the planetary set is mechanically locked into unity. The input shaft is rigidly coupled to the ring gear drive, so power flow mirrors a standard 9-inch third member. You don't pick up any rotating losses beyond bearings.

This is the default and fail-safe condition.

4.2 Low Range (Reduction Drive)

In low range, the planetary carrier drives the ring gear. The ring or sun gear gets mechanically held stationary - final configuration will determine which one.

I'm targeting reduction ratios in the 1.8:1 to 2.5:1 range. This ratio range is intentional. It's large enough to meaningfully change torque and speed behavior, but small enough that you can engage it without shock when speeds are matched.

Ben Trommater

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

5. Planetary Gear Set Rationale

A planetary gear set works here because it provides high torque density, coaxial packaging, symmetrical load distribution, and proven durability in axle and transmission applications.

The plan is to extend the planetary longitudinally to increase tooth engagement length, bearing spacing, and torsional stiffness. Strength comes from geometry and engagement length, not exotic materials.

6. Shift and Actuation Concept

The shift mechanism is fully mechanical, externally actuated, and control-agnostic.

The selector does two things depending on position: it locks the planetary into direct drive, or it locks the appropriate gear element to create reduction.

Engagement happens via dog clutches or splined sleeves. No friction clutches. No synchronizers.

Shifting is intended to happen at zero torque, or with controlled torque matching by the operator or controller upstream.

The shift mechanism is intentionally external and manual so the axle stays control-agnostic. Any future system can actuate it without needing to redesign the internals.

Ben Trommater

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

7. Failure Philosophy

The third member is designed to fail into direct drive. It should avoid neutral or partial engagement states, and it shouldn't rely on pins or pawls as primary torque-bearing elements.

All torque-carrying elements are gears, splines, or bearings. No single shear pin defines system integrity.

8. Serviceability and Rebuild

Design intent:

1. The third member can be removed and rebuilt on a bench
2. No proprietary tools required beyond standard differential service tools
3. Bearings, seals, and fasteners are off-the-shelf where possible
4. The planetary assembly is a subassembly that can be removed independently for inspection or replacement

9. Ratio Selection Philosophy

This is not a multi-speed transmission.

Two ratios are intentional. One optimized for launch, towing, crawling, or acceleration. One optimized for cruise and sustained speed.

When you pair this with high-torque combustion engines, electric motors, or dual-plant architectures, two axle ratios are enough to replace a lot of multi-gear drivetrains.

Ben Trommater

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

10. Intended Pairings

This third member is designed to work downstream of:

1. Forward/Neutral/Reverse modules
2. Torque converters or fluid couplers
3. Dual-input differentials
4. Divorced transfer cases
5. Electric motors or combustion engines

It doesn't assume any specific power plant.

11. What This Is Not

This isn't a transmission, a transfer case, a locking differential, or a complete drivetrain solution.

It's a modular torque multiplier at the axle.

12. Status and Next Steps

This document defines the conceptual layout, power flow, and mechanical intent.

It doesn't define final tooth counts, bearing sizes, housing geometry, or actuator design. Those are expected to emerge through prototype builds and iteration.

13. Closing

If this third member can't be built, tested, and broken by real mechanics, the broader system is irrelevant.

This is the first physical step.

Ben Trommater

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

The Two Speed Standard

A Framework for Mechanical Clarity, Serviceability, and Honest Torque Delivery

1. Why This Standard Exists

Modern vehicle drivetrains are increasingly difficult to understand, repair, or evaluate in isolation. Over time, mechanical function has been buried behind software layers, sealed assemblies, and tightly coupled systems that favor integration over clarity.

These choices weren't accidents. They're responses to real pressures: emissions regulations, efficiency targets, packaging constraints, manufacturing economics. But the side effects are here now and they're hard to ignore.

Repair has been replaced by replacement. Diagnosis has been replaced by software interpretation. Mechanical accountability has been distributed across opaque systems. Owners and builders have lost a common language to compare designs honestly.

The result isn't just complexity… it's unverifiable complexity.

The Two Speed Standard exists to define a space outside those failure modes. It doesn't try to undo modern engineering. It tries to reintroduce mechanical clarity as a first-order design constraint, right alongside strength, efficiency, and performance.

This standard exists because without one, there's no consistent way to ask whether a drivetrain is complicated because it has to be, or because nobody stopped it from getting that way.

Ben Trommater

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

2. What "Standard" Means Here

This document doesn't define a product, a certification, or a regulatory requirement.

The Two Speed Standard is a filter, not a prescription.

It provides a set of principles, a shared vocabulary, and a binary method for evaluating mechanical designs.

It doesn't dictate which axle family you should use, which power plant is preferred, which actuation method is superior, or which commercial path is valid.

A drivetrain component either aligns with the standard's principles or it doesn't. There's no partial compliance and no scoring curve.

3. Core Principles

These principles are non-negotiable. They're deliberately simple and hard to misinterpret.

3.1 Torque-Source Agnosticism

The drivetrain component must not assume where torque comes from.

If a power plant can deliver a wide, honest torque band, it belongs upstream of the drivetrain. Combustion engines, electric motors, hybrids, and future power plants must all be mechanically acceptable without redesigning the drivetrain component's core.

Ben Trommater

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

3.2 Control Agnosticism

Mechanical function must not depend on a specific control system.

Actuation can be manual, electrical, hydraulic, whatever, but the mechanical state has to remain valid and intelligible if control systems are removed, powered down, or replaced.

3.3 Mechanical Transparency

A drivetrain component must be understandable when it's stationary, disconnected, and unpowered.

If you can't reason about a component on a bench with basic tools and documentation, it fails this principle.

3.4 Modular Accountability

Each mechanical function must live in a discrete, isolatable module.

A failure needs a clear physical boundary. Multi-function components that obscure responsibility for motion, load, or failure violate this principle.

3.5 Fail-Safe Mechanical Behavior

In the absence of control input, the system must default to a mechanically stable state.

Catastrophic ambiguity isn't acceptable. Neutral, passthrough, or locked states must be intentional and predictable.

Ben Trommater

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

4. Mechanical Transparency Metrics (Optional Tools)

To support comparison without marketing distortion, this standard introduces some descriptive metrics. These metrics don't define quality. They define transparency.

Mechanical Transparency Coefficient (MTC): The number of discrete mechanical energy transformations required to deliver torque from input to output. Lower numbers mean fewer hidden states, fewer failure paths, and better mechanical legibility.

System Mechanical Transparency Coefficient (SMTC): Same concept applied to a complete drivetrain assembly.

Mechanical Transparency Index (MTI): An averaged, human-readable representation for comparative discussion. It gives builders and consumers a shared yardstick without obscuring the underlying math.

These metrics are descriptive, not prescriptive. Their presence is encouraged, not required.

5. Binary Qualification Questions

This section is the enforcement mechanism.

Each question must be answered yes or no. One "no" means the design doesn't meet the standard.

5.1 Mechanical Clarity

- ☐ Can the component be understood without software tools?
- ☐ Can its operating states be enumerated mechanically?
- ☐ Can torque paths be traced physically?

Ben Trommater

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

5.2 Serviceability

- ☐ Can the component be removed and serviced on a bench?
- ☐ Can wear components be replaced individually?
- ☐ Can service be performed without proprietary tooling?

5.3 Modularity

- ☐ Does the component perform a single primary function?
- ☐ Can it be removed without disabling unrelated systems?
- ☐ Does its failure boundary stop at its housing?

5.4 Control Independence

- ☐ Can the component function with manual actuation?
- ☐ Can control be changed without redesigning internals?
- ☐ Does loss of control default to a safe state?

5.5 Longevity Intent

- ☐ Is the component designed to be rebuilt?
- ☐ Are wear paths intentional and accessible?
- ☐ Is repair favored over replacement?

Ben Trommater

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

6. Application: Two-Speed Ford 9-Inch Third Member

The Two-Speed Ford 9-Inch Third Member is a reference implementation, not a mandate.

It was selected because the Ford 9-inch ecosystem is widely available, third-member modularity allows isolated development, aftermarket support enables rapid iteration, and integration risk is low for proof-of-concept work.

This choice doesn't imply superiority. Other axle families, including heavier-duty full-floating designs, may ultimately beat it in strength or longevity. The 9-inch is the starting point, not the destination.

When evaluated against the standard:

1. The two-speed third member passes modular accountability
2. Manual external actuation preserves control agnosticism
3. Planetary reduction provides clear, inspectable torque paths
4. Bench serviceability is preserved by third-member architecture

Limitations are acknowledged: packaging constraints exist, ratio range is finite, and actuation refinement remains an open area. These limitations are acceptable within a reference implementation.

7. What This Standard Does Not Decide

The Two Speed Standard doesn't select winners among drivetrain component designs. It doesn't prevent proprietary or commercial development. It doesn't require open-source publication. It doesn't restrict innovation beyond its principles.

A design can exceed the standard, ignore it, or deliberately violate it. This document exists to make those choices explicit.

Ben Trommater

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

8. A Living Standard

This standard isn't complete.

It's expected to evolve through practical builds, documented failures, community challenge, and measured results.

No single author owns its future. The role of this document is to start the conversation with enough structure that it can survive disagreement.

The standard lives where its builders live. Its authority comes from use, not endorsement.

Closing

The Two Speed Standard exists to build a world where drivetrains can once again be judged by what they do, how they do it, and how honestly they reveal their behavior.

If a design meets the standard, it deserves consideration. If it doesn't, the reasons should be clear.

Everything that follows builds on this foundation.

Ben Trommater

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

An Exploratory Reference.
Not a specification.
Not a product.
Not a commitment.

1. Why This Document Exists

The *Two Speed Standard* defines rules. The Two Speed Third Member demonstrates a concrete starting point.

This document exists to explore what becomes possible once you take those two things seriously.

It doesn't define what must be built. It doesn't claim optimal solutions. It doesn't try to predict commercial outcomes.

Its purpose is to map the mechanical territory that opens up when drivetrain components are allowed to be modular, transparent, and torque agnostic.

These aren't finished architectures. They're thinking tools.

2. Reframing the Power Source

One of the first mental constraints you have to drop is the identity of the power source.

Engines and motors are usually discussed by fuel type, brand, or peak output. That framing hides the only characteristic that actually matters to the drivetrain: torque behavior.

For the purposes of this architecture, I'm calling power sources "torque plants."

A torque plant is defined by behavior, not ideology.

Ben Trommater

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

Relevant characteristics:

1. Width and shape of the usable torque band
2. Predictability of output
3. Ability to operate continuously
4. Compatibility with limited gear ratios
5. Durability relative to its role

Fuel type is secondary. Control method is secondary. Even peak power is secondary.

Once you adopt this framing, a lot of power sources that modern vehicles have excluded become viable again.

3. Baseline Architecture

Single Torque Plant, No Transmission

This is the simplest useful application of the system.

Architecture overview:

1. One torque plant
2. A Forward/Neutral/Reverse module
3. A torque isolation or fluid coupling module if required
4. A two-speed axle assembly
5. No conventional transmission

The torque plant can be diesel, gasoline, electric, or something else entirely. The only requirement is that it can deliver a usable torque band without constant ratio changes upstream.

This architecture intentionally moves ratio reduction downstream and eliminates the need for multi-speed transmissions.

Ben Trommater

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

4. Why This Feels Wrong at First

Modern vehicles train users and engineers to accept several assumptions:

1. High performance requires many gear ratios
2. Large engines are necessary to cover all use cases
3. Complexity is the cost of capability

This architecture breaks those assumptions.

The torque plant isn't responsible for covering every operating condition alone anymore. The axle isn't a passive endpoint. The drivetrain stops pretending that gear multiplication has to happen near the engine.

There's no magic here. The work is just being done in a different place.

5. Performance Reality

This architecture doesn't rely on peak numbers.

With appropriate ratios and cooling, it provides:

1. Strong low-speed pulling capability
2. Stable cruising at modern highway speeds
3. Fewer shift events
4. Predictable throttle response

The system performs well not because it's aggressive, but because it's rarely operating outside its comfort zone. It doesn't win by surprise. It wins by staying in range.

Ben Trommater

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

6. Psychological Impact

This matters more than it seems.

When a modern chassis performs expected tasks using visibly simpler mechanical systems, something breaks. Not a part, an assumption.

It becomes harder to argue that sealed complexity is inevitable. It becomes harder to defend replacement over repair. It becomes harder to claim that mechanical clarity is obsolete.

This architecture doesn't attack modern vehicles. It exposes the choices that shaped them.

7. Dual Torque Plant Architectures

Once the baseline system exists, adding a second torque plant becomes mechanically reasonable instead of exotic.

Typical configuration:

1. Primary torque plant for continuous operation
2. Secondary torque plant for transient demand
3. Dual-input differential or summing module
4. Two-speed axle remains unchanged

The important point is role separation. No plant is oversized. No plant is forced to operate outside its strengths.

Ben Trommater

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

8. Cooperative Energy Flow

In a dual-plant system, behavior is clearer when roles are explicit.

A steady torque plant might:

1. Maintain vehicle systems
2. Provide base propulsion
3. Operate at stable operating points
4. Charge onboard electrical systems

A responsive torque plant might:

1. Handle acceleration and passing
2. Absorb regenerative energy
3. Enable short-duration high output
4. Remain inactive when unnecessary

The plants don't compete. They don't replace one another. They cooperate mechanically.

9. Smaller Torque Plants Re-Enter the Conversation

When torque demand is shared, smaller plants become viable.

Examples include:

1. Small industrial diesels
2. Tractor-class three-cylinder engines
3. Inline-four or inline-six gasoline engines
4. Alternative fuel engines
5. Electric motors sized for transients

None of these plants need to cover the full envelope alone. The drivetrain stops demanding heroics from individual components.

Ben Trommater

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

10. Mixed Torque Plant Pairings

One of the more interesting outcomes is that mixed-plant systems become practical without extreme control complexity.

Possible pairings:

1. Diesel base load with gasoline peak support
2. Combustion base load with electric assist
3. Dual combustion plants with complementary characteristics

Historically, these combinations required complex transmissions and software coordination. Here, honest gearing and mechanical summation do most of the work.

11. Peripheral Modules as First-Class Components

This architecture depends on several modules that are usually treated as afterthoughts.

These include:

1. Dual-input differentials
2. Torque converters or fluid couplings
3. Forward/Neutral/Reverse gearboxes
4. Combined FNR and transfer modules
5. Divorced transfer cases

Each of these modules has to stand on its own under the Two Speed Standard. They're not accessories. They're architectural elements.

Ben Trommater

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

12. Transfer Cases and Directional Modules

Transfer cases deserve special attention.

They already contain torque splitting, directional control, neutral states, and mechanical isolation.

Whether divorced or integrated, they might naturally satisfy parts of the Forward/Neutral/Reverse function.

This document doesn't mandate integration or separation. It just recognizes that existing gearsets may serve multiple roles if evaluated honestly.

13. Why the Two-Speed Axle Remains the Keystone

All of these architectures rely on reducing downstream complexity.

The two-speed axle anchors the entire system, prevents uncontrolled upstream gear multiplication, preserves transparency, and simplifies power plant requirements.

You can change the plants. You can change the modules. But don't abandon the philosophy that ratio reduction belongs where it can be seen and serviced.

14. Relationship to the *Two Speed Standard*

Every architecture described here still has to answer every binary question in the standard.

If an idea fails the standard, it doesn't matter how clever it is.

The standard remains the governor, not the goal.

Ben Trommater

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

15. Closing

This document isn't a roadmap. It's a field notebook.

It exists to show that once you remove unnecessary constraints, drivetrain design becomes wider, not narrower.

Small torque plants cooperating mechanically change the problem space.

That's the opportunity.

Ben Trommater

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

Implied Futures, Speculative Architectures, and Open Questions Enabled by the *Two Speed Standard*

This document is intentionally incomplete.

It exists because once you have a framework, the most valuable thing isn't answers - it's better questions.

Everything before this paper defines rules, constraints, and reference implementations. This paper explores what might exist if you take those constraints seriously and then push them to their logical edge.

Nothing here is promised. Nothing here is optimized. Nothing here is defended.

This is where imagination gets to operate inside mechanical honesty.

1. Why This Paper Exists

The prior documents establish three things: a reason for the Two Speed Standard to exist, a concrete mechanical starting point, and a set of surrounding modules that make the system viable.

Once those pieces are in place, something weird happens.

The drivetrain stops feeling finished. Instead of converging toward a single solution, it starts branching outward into many plausible ones.

This paper captures those branches. Not to lock them in, but to keep them from being forgotten.

Ben Trommater

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

2. Releasing the Need to Be Right

Modern vehicle development is dominated by certainty. Certainty about fuel, certainty about control systems, certainty about what is "allowed" to work.

This work intentionally abandons that posture.

The architectures imagined here might fail. Some almost certainly will. That's not a flaw.

If the questions are strong enough, failure is productive.

The goal isn't to predict the future. The goal is to widen it.

3. Reimagining the Torque Plant Relationship

One of the first ideas that pops up once transmission complexity is removed: torque plants don't need to be heroic.

They don't need to cover every operating condition. They don't need to be oversized. They don't need to be alone.

This opens the door to combinations that normally get dismissed outright.

Ben Trommater

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

4. Dual Combustion Torque Plants

Imagine two inline-six engines feeding a shared mechanical output.

Not chained together. Not electronically synchronized. Not pretending to be one engine.

Each engine contributes torque honestly through a summing mechanism. Uneven output doesn't cause conflict - it causes load redistribution. The output shaft becomes the arbiter.

If demand rises, both engines work harder. If demand falls, both relax. If one lags, the other carries more load.

No engine backfeeds another unless the output stalls. If the output stalls, that's already a known mechanical condition with known solutions.

This isn't an inline-twelve pretending to be one engine. It's two engines cooperating mechanically.

Ben Trommater

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

5. Mixed Combustion Pairings

Now imagine pairing unlike engines.

A small diesel providing constant base torque paired with a gasoline engine handling transient demand.

Or a propane engine paired with a gasoline engine. A naturally aspirated engine paired with a boosted one.

The drivetrain doesn't care. It only sees torque.

These combinations are rarely explored not because they violate physics, but because existing architectures punish asymmetry. This architecture rewards it.

6. Electric as a Peer, Not a Replacement

Electric torque plants fit naturally here, but not as saviors. They're peers.

An electric motor doesn't need to replace combustion. It doesn't need to dominate the architecture.

It can exist purely to absorb transients, provide regenerative buffering, smooth load, and handle peak events.

In this role, electric torque becomes honest rather than performative. It stops carrying the entire narrative.

Ben Trommater

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

7. Minimalist Performance Vehicles

Imagine a modern truck chassis stripped of drivetrain theatrics.

A modest torque plant, no multi-speed transmission, a two-speed axle, mechanical transparency everywhere.

Performance emerges not from complexity, but from the absence of friction between intent and execution.

Acceleration feels immediate. Cruising feels calm. Load handling feels deliberate.

Not because the system is aggressive. Because it's rarely confused.

8. Utility Platforms Reimagined

Now think about smaller platforms. Compact trucks, utility vehicles, agricultural equipment, off-road platforms.

A lot of these machines already operate in narrow speed bands and wide torque demands.

They don't need twelve gears.

They need honesty.

Ben Trommater

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

9. Modular Power Stacking

Once the drivetrain is modular, power stacking becomes a design choice rather than a hack.

Add a second torque plant for a specific job. Remove it when it's unnecessary.

Seasonal configurations become possible. Application-specific builds become reasonable.

The vehicle stops being a monolith.

10. What This Is Not Trying to Do

This paper isn't trying to predict market adoption, compete with OEM design cycles, replace regulatory processes, or claim moral superiority.

It's not a manifesto.

It's an invitation.

Ben Trommater

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

11. The Questions That Matter

This is the handoff.

If this work continues, it should do so by answering these questions honestly.

Mechanical Questions

- [ ] Can multiple torque sources be summed mechanically without artificial synchronization? (I think a rear differential with independent lawnmower motors driving each wheel hub would be a great place to start looking for answers.)
- [ ] Where does load actually go when torque sources disagree?
- [ ] What failure modes are truly dangerous, and which are just unfamiliar?

Architectural Questions

- [ ] Where should ratio reduction live, and why?
- [ ] What functions belong upstream, and which belong downstream?
- [ ] Which modules deserve to be first-class citizens rather than accessories?

Human Questions

- [ ] Can a drivetrain be understood by someone without software access?
- [ ] Can it be repaired by someone without factory authorization?
- [ ] Does the system explain itself when it fails?

Ben Trommater

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

Longevity Questions

- ☐ Is the system designed to be rebuilt?
- ☐ Are wear paths intentional and visible?
- ☐ Does the architecture assume replacement or stewardship?

Cultural Questions

- ☐ Who benefits from this being complicated?
- ☐ Who benefits from it being simple?
- ☐ What assumptions are being protected by declaring something "not done that way"?

Future Questions

- ☐ What torque plants don't exist yet, but could?
- ☐ What combinations have never been tried because nothing could accept them?
- ☐ What happens when imagination is allowed inside constraints instead of outside them?

12. Passing the Torch

This document doesn't ask for permission. It doesn't ask for consensus.

It just leaves a trail.

If someone picks it up, they should do so because the questions bothered them enough to act.

That's how this continues.
Not by agreement.
By curiosity.

Ben Trommater

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