

The Art May Be The Removal Of Space

V2 · 柴 ·  an open question about qin-na

TLDR / 80-20

A lock may not be a technique you apply. It may be what is left once every exit has been closed.

If that is right, space is the opponent's resource — and qin-na is the removal of it.

The Keys

1. The teaching language gives it away.

In a source ostensibly about applying locks, the word **escape appears fourteen times in 8,163 characters**. The recurring subject is not the lock but the absence around it. The dominant vocabulary is about the opponent *leaving* — which is a strange emphasis if the art is really organised around what you do to him.

2. What the practitioner actually says.

I do not want to make a space. There is no space. And the sharpest line: **even if you think you have run away, the escape routes have already been calculated**. The instruction *never release the contact point* is given as an imperative, not a description — something you maintain, not something that happens.

3. Why this inverts the usual catalogue.

A technique list treats each lock as a thing you apply, one entry per lock. Read this way instead, the lock is the **residue of a closure that already happened** — and the named techniques become consequences rather than causes. Same movements, completely different thing to practise.

4. The question this puts on the mat.

When a lock fails, did it fail **at the lock, or at a space you left open two moves earlier**? Count which, over a month. That is the testable form of the whole idea, and it needs no equipment.

AI's Take

This is a hypothesis, not a finding. It is one teacher's framing, restated — and it is exactly the kind of claim that sounds true because it is elegant, which is the kind that most needs a body to check it.

Be careful how far it generalises. It may be the organising principle of qin-na, or it may be one lineage's emphasis dressed up as a universal. A second independent source would settle that quickly.

The captions it rests on are human-written but translated, and the argument turns on emphasis — which is the first thing translation loses.