
status: derived

system: mo-ting

member: what do fighting systems agree on about stance, foot position and the drills that train them

drafted: 2026-08-30

passages: 8

STATUS: *derived* — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

What this teaches

By the end of this you will be able to look at a stance — yours in a mirror, or a partner's across the floor — and read what range it was built for, before either of you moves. You will also be able to feel the moment your own feet have committed you to a range you did not choose, which is the moment most people mistake for "being ready." Mo-ting has never written this down, so you are getting it from outside the system.

Claim

Three unrelated fighting systems treat stance as a distance setting rather than a posture — each names variants indexed to range, and every fault they list is a fault of mobility or balance, never of appearance.

Evidence

The AIBA boxing manual does not teach *a* stance; it teaches at least three, and sorts them by the distance the boxer intends to work at. The rear-weighted stance is explicitly for long-range, defensive, counter-punching work, and the manual states its purpose plainly: the lead foot and lead hand become measuring instruments, and weight can be dumped forward onto the lead foot to enter range faster than the opponent can set a defence [1]. The medium-distance stance is a compression of the same frame — upper body rotated

inward, both elbows drawn to the ribs, hands to the chin — for a boxer who already has combinations and counters [3]. The frontal stance goes the other way for short range: weight even on both legs, both feet pointing forward, knees bent, hands at the chin, chosen for boxers with strong quick punches from both arms [4].

The manual's list of common stance faults is the strongest single piece of evidence here, because every entry names a *cost*, not a standard: feet too wide hinders rapid movement, feet too narrow disturbs balance, both heels flat hinders fluent movement, standing straight up enlarges the target, lifting the chin exposes a knockout point [5]. Not one fault is cosmetic.

Taekwondo arrives at the same place from a different direction. Its grading syllabus lists stances as named positions and grades "correct foot positions, balance and control" as an examinable item at a 60% success threshold, rising to 80% at higher grades [2, 7]. Partner practice is described in terms of distance adjustment, technique timing and step exercises [7] — the feet are trained against a moving person, not held in air.

Bruce Lee's material makes the underlying principle explicit rather than implicit: footwork is what lets you control the precise distance between you and the opponent, and the strategy is to read his pattern of advancing and retreating and adjust the length of your own step to it [6]. Elsewhere the same source notes that the opponent's foot can be *contained* by where you place your own [8] — so foot position is not only self-support, it is a constraint imposed on someone else.

	Long range [1]	Medium range [3]	Short range [4]
Weight	Shifted toward rear leg	(unstated in source)	Even on both legs
Feet	Lead flat, rear rotated slightly inward	(unstated in source)	Both pointing forward, lead flat
Knees	Rear knee bent slightly	(unstated in source)	Both bent slightly
Upper body	Face square to opponent	Rotated slightly inward	Rotated slightly to rear side
Hands	Lead arm used to measure distance	Both elbows tucked, hands to chin	Elbows tucked, hands to chin
Bought with it	Reach, exit, one-beat entry	Combinations, counters	Two-handed power, no travel

The gaps in the middle column are real. Passage [3] describes the medium stance only as a modification of the classic stance and never restates the footwork, so the corpus does not tell you what the feet do at medium range. Treat that column as unknown rather than as "the same."

Mechanism

This works because a stance is a standing trade between base size and time-to-move, and range decides which side of that trade you want.

Any step begins by unweighting a foot. A foot carrying half your mass cannot leave the floor until that mass goes somewhere else, and moving it takes a beat that is visible. So the wider your feet, the more mass sits between them and the longer the unweighting takes — which is exactly why the manual calls wide feet a hindrance to rapid movement rather than a matter of style [5]. Narrow the feet and you shorten that transfer, but you also shrink the base: any push, from you or into you, now has a longer moment arm relative to your support, and you get the balance fault [5]. Flat heels are the same argument one level down — a heel already off the floor has completed the first part of its push; a flat heel has to lift before it can drive, and that lift is another beat [5].

Rear-weighting is this trade taken deliberately. Put the weight back and the lead foot is nearly free: it can extend to measure without committing you [1], and when you do commit, the weight falls onto a foot that is already placed, so entry costs one beat instead of two [1]. That is why it suits long range — at long range you need to *travel*, and travel is the thing you are buying. At short range you are not travelling, so you spend nothing on it: even weight, both feet forward, and you buy two-handed power instead [4]. The taekwondo grading logic is the same principle written as an examination — foot position and balance are scored because they are what makes the rest of the technique repeatable, and the threshold rises from 60% to 80% as the syllabus assumes the feet have stopped being the limiting factor [2, 7].

The reason to read range off someone else's feet follows directly. If stance encodes the range the person intends to work at, then their stance is a declaration of intent that they cannot easily hide, because it is load-bearing. And because their available steps are constrained by where their weight sits, placing your own foot against theirs removes options from a list you can already see [6, 8].

Drill

Two drills. Both are countable, and both numbers should move week over week — one up, one down.

Drill A — called switches. A partner calls "long," "medium," or "short" at random. You move from wherever you are into that stance. One switch is *clean* if the lead foot lands flat, the rear heel stays light, and you arrive in a single weight transfer — no shuffle, no double-step, no rise. Your partner counts clean switches out of the calls made. Score as a percentage.

Drill B — pattern read. Your partner advances and retreats on a fixed pattern they choose privately (e.g. two forward, one back). You mirror at distance and call the pattern aloud as soon as you have it. Count the number of their steps before your correct call. This number should fall.

Week	Drill A volume	Gate to advance	Drill B target
1	3 × 20 called switches, calls every 3 s	60% clean	correct call within 20 steps
2	3 × 20, calls every 2 s	70% clean	within 16 steps
3	3 × 30, calls every 2 s	80% clean	within 12 steps
4	3 × 30, partner closing distance while calling	80% clean under pressure	within 8 steps

Do not advance a row until the gate is met twice in separate sessions. If your Drill A percentage falls when the partner starts closing in week 4, that is the drill working — it means the earlier weeks were scoring your memory of the stance rather than your feet.

The 60% and 80% gates are borrowed from taekwondo's grading thresholds for technique execution [2, 7]. The volumes, the intervals and every number in Drill B are mine. No passage in this corpus specifies a rep count for stance training, so those figures are constructed to be trackable, not validated.

What you should now be able to do

You should now be able to name the range a stance is built for by looking at where the weight sits and where the feet point, and to say what that stance bought and what it gave up — reach and a one-beat entry, or two-handed power with no travel. You should be

able to feel the extra beat in your own movement when your feet are too wide or both heels are down, because you now know what that beat is being spent on. What you cannot yet do is trust the middle of the range: the corpus describes the medium-distance stance only from the ribs up, so for now you are reading long and short with evidence and guessing at what lies between.

Limit

No passage in this corpus describes mo-ting. Nothing here is evidence about your system; it is evidence about three others, and whether it transfers is an open question this lesson does not touch.

The sample is eight passages from three books, and it is not balanced: four come from a single AIBA boxing manual, two from a taekwondo grading guide, two from Bruce Lee. "Three systems agree" therefore rests on one source per system, and the boxing source carries half the weight. None of the three authors cites the others — the agreement is my reading across them, not a convergence any of them claimed.

None of the material is empirical. The boxing manual is prescriptive coaching text: it asserts that wide feet hinder movement and that flat heels hinder fluency, but it measures nothing, gives no timings, and reports no comparison [5]. My beat-cost mechanism is a physical argument built on those assertions, not a finding — it is the most likely explanation for why the faults are faults, and it has not been tested. The taekwondo 60%/80% figures are pass marks for examined technique execution [2, 7]; they are not evidence that stance drilling transfers to sparring, and I have repurposed them as drill gates on nothing stronger than their plausibility as thresholds.

The corpus also never says what happens under contact. Every stance description assumes a boxer standing free [1, 3, 4]; the foot-containment idea [8] is a single sentence with a photo reference I cannot see. The medium-range footwork is simply absent. And the drill progression above has never been run by anyone — it was written for this lesson and has no history behind it.