

But parents also objectify their own children often - perhaps this could be a connection (parent to Jax)
To Ana, the seraph says, "Not going to be much help in the strange, labyrinth, is he?"
Ana also objectifies Jax as a puzzle.
Jax is a being with signs of empathy - either true or imitating human behavior.
"He keeps us entertained," she says. "I'll bet he does. Send me a message if he ever learns to solve puzzles; I'll buy a copy." He sees that his entire team has assembled. "Well, off to our next mission. Good luck on yours."

"Good luck," says Jax. He waves as the seraph and his teammates take flight and dive in formation toward a distant valley. Ana's reminded of that encounter a few days later, when she's reading a discussion on the user-group forums:
"At our core, we are all 'imitating' empathy because we learned as children that other humans have the feelings & experiences that we do. Same goes for Jax."
From: Stuart Gust
Last night I played SoH with some people who take a Drayta on their missions, and while he wasn't much fun, he was definitely useful to have around. It made me wonder if it has to be one or the other. Those Sophonce digients aren't any better than ours. Couldn't our digients be both fun and useful?

So far, humans find digients either fun or useful. Mutually exclusive?
a form of use: entertainment or ease of life
From: Maria Zheng
Are you hoping to sell copies of yours? You think you can raise a better Andro?
"They want them to be human. If they aren't, they get lost."

Fun, ability, ownership at play. Also, morality of making copies is ambiguous.
"Do the copies have autonomy?"
Maria's referring to a Sophonce digient named Andro, trained by his owner, Bryce Talbot, to act as his personal assistant. Talbot demonstrated Andro to VirFriday, maker of appointment-management software, and got the company's executives interested. The deal fell through after the executives got demonstration copies; what Talbot hadn't realized was that Andro

copies made to demonstrate, then suspended?
major fungibility + ownership + instrumentality
- comparison of digients to products - but they are sentient beings

Already focus on whether digient will be "helpful" - instrumentality
human traits
characteristics
denial of autonomy
Seraph wants to purchase digient as a tool to solve puzzles. Ironic, given the intention when creating them.
Fungibility
Denial of subjectivity
- To make conscious pets -
More instrumental

These digients are conscious and as intellectually capable as certain children/humans, so what differentiates them besides their physical appearance? Is it morally right to program a sentient being to enjoy a task in order for it to "voluntarily" do work for you?

Can a comparison be made here between them and human children?
Another debate - is it better to let them choose to restore a checkpoint or to deny them that opportunity?

was, in his own way, as obsessive as Drayta. Like a dog forever loyal to its first owner, Andro wouldn't work for anyone else unless Talbot was there to give orders. VirFriday tried installing a sensory-input filter so each new Andro instantiation perceived his new owner's avatar and voice as Talbot's, but the disguise never worked for more than a couple of hours. Before long, all the executives had to shut down their forlorn Andros, who kept looking for the original Talbot.
As a result, Talbot wasn't able to sell the rights to Andro for anywhere near what he'd hoped. Instead, VirFriday bought the rights to Andro's specific genome and a complete archive of his checkpoints, and they've hired Talbot to work for them. He's part of a team that's restoring earlier checkpoints of Andro and retraining them, attempting to create a version that has the same personal-assistant skills and is also willing to accept a new owner.

This literally allows them to go back to an earlier version of themselves, but you retain the memories. Is restoring checkpoints like that?
No, I don't mean selling copies. I'm just thinking about Zaff doing work the way dogs guide the blind or sniff out drugs. My goal isn't to make money, but if there's something the digients can do that people are willing to pay for, it would prove to all the skeptics out there that digients aren't just for entertainment.
A whole 'nother morality debate. Is restoring checkpoints like that? Not memories. Is restoring checkpoints like that? Moral?

Objectified Instr.
Focus on objectification
So they are seen as entertainment, despite being sentient beings. All those moral quandaries raised.

From: Ana Alvarado
I just want to make sure we're clear about our motivations. It'd be terrific if our digients learned practical

Andro → androgyny/androgen
ambiguous gender
Sophonce: self-awareness w/ self-reflection & ability to think about ends thinking