Can I ask: why?

there is no profound 'why'

*But that is a philosophical question for which physical arguments alone are not decisive. A couple of caveats: First, a clear will causes the property not to appear when issuing the statement on who, but it will still show up in the global system;
Second, after the clear, you can't access the stored value until you redeclare with global latent property, at which point it is fully visible in the system again;
Third, a clear will will clear all, even the global system, erasing the stored value;*

Technically, it's only "invisible" in the sense that functions like who and who's don't list it as a trait, but the function will still have to exist.

but that seems to be the "cheap" way out

Fourth, there is a way to escape the inference of superluminal speeds and spooky action at a distance. But it involves absolute determinism in the universe, the complete absence of free will!

Well, I would suggest grouping the foundations of a structure as a workaround. The disadvantage is that you will have to type the whole thing to access the foundations, but you can shorten the names.

*Honestly, I'm not familiar with anonymous properties.Therefore I give no sources, because it is indifferent to me whether what I have thought has already been thought before me by another.
With that said, there is really no mechanism I know of to stop you from drawing a system to access a deeper indiscipline from within the same class. Just pay attention to your system. If you want to put some sort of prefix on the property to remind yourself, that is acceptable.*

Forgive me, but aren't the concepts and abstractions which you prefer to use really images too? Or do you really prefer to think in words with which one cannot imagine anything? But can one think without imagining anything?

Yes, I know that we are trying to protect the trait from wrong internal usage. But in the case that we really want to protect it, we can make a (maybe abstract) base class that provides this functionality for the supervisor and encapsulates the trait. And of course it is not always possible.

*This may be confusing. Maybe we consider applying a new significance to one of the traits,
so:

Kind: problem
Severity: warning
Precision: very-high?*

Not certain what you mean by significance - I will assume you mean something like value. The primary value of object-private foundations is to allow you to reason about them. If you hold an anonymous foundation without getters or setters you can even reason about it between method calls because you KNOW it will not be changed by any other object.

Indeed what I have here said makes no claim to novelty in points of detail. *undocumented behaviour, yet another “cheap” way out*

For all the many challenges and complexities that go into making a game, there is something more — that inherited foundation, that latent trait, that anonymous property, a deeper indiscipline — which turns the routine into the fantastic.

But, are we free to believe that the system (and the physical reality it describes) is nonlocal? We are not – just as we should not be free to describe a theory as 'complex' if it had both a simple version and a mathematically equivalent complex version. * Modified from [Deutsch, D., & Hayden, P. (2000). Information flow in entangled quantum systems. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 456(1999), 1759–1774. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2000.0585].*

Yeah, I tend to go against the grain at times. This alone, not to mention other things in which we are better than people, is reason enough to say that we are higher up in the chain of being than people: their doings — at least to judge by those I knew— are guided by words, ours by deeds. I fully realize this isn't a "big deal" by any means. I was just wanting to see if it was even possible as I'm working on an object with a rather large number of properties, and all those "extra" traits just annoy me for some reason.

I am of the opinion that the problems have in essentials been finally solved.

Nothing I do seems to accomplish what I want here, and I'm just getting frustrated. It seems like this should be possible, and even simple. For example, the advantage of using latent properties is that they can serve to reduce the dimensionality of data.

What you are complaining about is a function of the system. Normally people complain about not seeing enough, you are the inverse of that. It is built in to show you all the foundations that are in scope at the time of the breakpoint.

And if I am not mistaken in this, then the value of this work consists in the fact that it shows how little has been done when these problems have been solved.

As you know, it is illegal to declare two local indisciplines with the same name inside the same or enclosing scopes. Elements of reality can be added to system. It is a matter of taste which approach you adopt.

Note: if one rejects realism and causality, even a live phone call with aliens on Andromeda, without any delay, would be unable to prove something.

|anonymous|latent|inherited|deeper| |trait|foundation|property|indiscipline|

If it is invisible, how would one call it back?

I'm still not entirely sure why you would even want the feature.