

## THE ACTOR-NETWORK THEORY AS A TOOL FOR THE SOCIAL REVIEW FROM THE FILM HER

DOI  
10.11606/issn.2525-3123.  
gis.2021.181744

ORCID  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9787-4203>

**ANA CAROLINA BRINDAROLLI**

Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, MS,  
Brazil, 79070-900 – ppgas.fach@ufms.br

### ABSTRACT

Technology is usually seen as impersonal and lifeless, and it loses these characteristics in the cinematographic work “Her”. The film takes us to unusual lines of reasoning. This essay uses the film “Her” as a pretext to propose a look at new ways of relationships in contemporary times, ways that unite human and non-human actors for the production of a collective, in the Latourian sense, beyond society. This collective has as a social product the hybrid actor/actant, in the proposal to visualize the union in the same context of humans and technologies. Therefore, I propose the use of the cinematographic work of director Spike Jonze, as an audiovisual field capable of producing in the reader an image on the proposed Latourian theme: new social, hybrid actors, mediation, collectives, interaction between human and non-human. As a theoretical basis, the essay moves through concepts extracted from the Actor-Network Theory (ANT).

**KEYWORDS:**  
Cinema; Her;  
Technology; Actor-  
Network Theory;  
Sociology of  
associations.

### INTRODUCTION

Her<sup>1</sup> is an American film, which mixes diverse cinematographic genres that run through romantic comedy/drama and science fiction. It is a 2013 work, written, directed and produced by Spike Jonze. The narrative centers on a human character, who develops a personal

---

<sup>1</sup> Original title: Her. Translation into Portuguese: Ela. Screenplay / direction: Spike Jonze. Photography: Hoyte Van Hoytem. Art direction: Austin Gorg.

relationship with his virtual computer assistant, which in turn, endowed with personality, has a voice identical to that of a human. Theodore, played by Joaquim Phoenix, brings a melancholy experience to the audience, caused by the end of a relationship. A lonely man, who will suffer a change in his destiny when he discovers the existence of an artificial intelligence program, extremely close to the voice and personality of a human subject. Artificial intelligence is Samantha, which voice is played by Scarlett Johansson.

The focus of the narrative is the trajectory of Theodore, who lives the melancholy of remembering the past, and the hesitation and excitement of experiencing something new. The work is very rich in details, ranging from the images well placed by the art director, to a soundtrack that conveys the character disturbance. Santaella and Cardoso (2015, 168) express the uncomfortable experience transmitted by the film:

Her is emblematic for the society of the 21st century, insofar it translates in a disturbing and credible way the stunning disturbing sensation of the invasion of technology in the most intimate shelter of human life. The narrative is a plural expression of very current dilemmas of artificial intelligence and the human-machine relationship.

Theodore finds, through this new virtual relationship, a way of comfort and escape from his own reality, which is shown in the film as that of a lonely man, with difficulties in creating bonds with other humans. We see a subject overflowing with “existential crises”, so present in the digital and “modern” era, and the problem of new virtual technologies insertion, such as affections mediation and socialization means. The plot highlights a close reality, in which objects, technologies and other “non-human” contributions are presented not only in the sphere of silenced effectiveness and efficiency, aimed at human improvement, but also as a sphere of innovation in the social relations of the subjects.

In the first scenes of the film, we are taken inside the character apartment. The images refer to the momentary identity chosen by Theodore: that of a subject who is disorganized, disconnected and anonymous in the midst of a pulsating society. In this way, a space for reading the scene is opened, based on the premise of our character removed from the ties seen as social and subject to the fear of fast and superficial relationships. The interference caused by the insertion of Samantha in his routine, gives him more disconnection with other humans. In contrast, we see a new type of connection being created in their daily lives, a new way of relating is presented to the public. This can generate identification at first. Although we have not yet proven an operating system as developed as “Samantha”, we have already glimpsed its possibility by tasting, for

example, “Siri” - developed by Apple, or “Alexa” - developed by Amazon, both virtual assistants run by voice, resources that are able to interact and provide information, among other functions. They became everyday actresses, by helping people to perform the most varied types of tasks just “talking” with the device.

Her, presents the contradiction of Theodore life, who works by writing letters to bring people together. A lonely man who uses his computer and technology to write letters addressed to unknown people - speaking for them - who are also in an unbridled quest to connect. I open a parenthesis for slightly echoing the necessary reflection that the film provides about the insertion in the sphere of affections capitalization, feelings commodification, and interaction as a product.


As the cast and plot are introduced, the image of a society of consumers in need of exchanges of affections, buyers of attention, self sellers and exhibitors on social networks becomes clearer. It is possible to read the character as a response to a consumer society, which promotes physical isolation and generates connectivity through other ways of relating, maintaining bonds and creating bonds. Fioruci (2019, 134) will say:

In this society in which consumption becomes a substitute for the affective dimension and subjectivity is transformed into an egocentric individualism, the basis of social ties precariousness and the eclipse or impoverishment of otherness experience, human being resorts to promises that are easy to satisfy. Her protagonist chooses this path, more or less consciously. Hooked by the announced offer, acquires the OS1 operating system. [...] First of all, the need for communication by Theodore becomes evident, which, for a moment, seems to be really on the couch.

Her plot, when presenting the relationship of the characters “in romance fashion”, tends to persuade us in defense of the character disconnection with human ties. It promotes a diffuse feeling of identification, while allowing reflection on a possible overcoming of traditional forms of socialization, reassessing the differences, pros and cons through the prism of sociology of associations.

## **HER AND THE ACTOR-NETWORK THEORY**

To direct the look to this new social proposed in the sociology of associations, I use the Latourian concept to understand the new definition of



social as a flow of associations and I adopt concepts that encompass the Actor-Network Theory (ANT), choosing as the main work to represent it an excerpt from the book: “Reagregando o social” by Bruno Latour. Again, the ideas for the discussion will be social, hybrid actors, mediation, collectives, interaction between human and non-human.


From the reflection on Her cinematography and Latour work, as well as other ANT theorists, I was able to identify, in an example very close to our technological time, a new way of being social. Through a more fluid communication, an experience provided with excellence by the cinema, I was able to displace Latorian concepts to reflect on a society of associations within that contemporary time.

The choice for the film Her was due to the understanding that the work of director Spike Jonze dramatically illustrates an anthropological idea applied by authors of the Actor-Network Theory. Therefore, cinema, as an aspect of art, shifts the look of the world to its nuances, creates value and adds it to our way of being culture. I believe that the use of the work as a corpus of analysis will facilitate the visualization of an example of technical mediation, suggested by the Actor-Network Theory (ANT). ANT takes shape in an attempt to provide reflection on technical mediation with the sociology of associations. “In this, the concept of technical mediation requires that the social is seen as the product of an association between human and non-human actors, functionally symmetrical in the actor-network theory (ANT)” (Santaella and Cardoso 2015, 168).

The reflection proposed in this essay seeks to elucidate the construction mechanism of hybrid actors interactions (human and non-human, Theodore and Samantha), which are formed through technical mediation, and also to present the concept of the Actor-Network Theory of replacing the term society by collective, with a great collaboration of the socio-technical field presented here by Rifiotis (2016). Although the amount of concepts used in the short text is broad, they are interconnected and related in order to clarify the idea of a “new social”.

The use of non-human elements, represented in the film, for example, by the cell phone, computer and game that simulate a parallel existence, become interaction tools, in which the character develops new social bonds. We can see in this relation the expansion of the way that traditional sociology is intended for the sphere of the social, that is, the one only aimed at humans.

In the view of Latour, the social is no longer inhabited exclusively by humans. With the installation and immersion of technologies, our forms of communication have been undergoing transformation and adaptation



processes on a daily basis, so forming a socio-technical network for communication mediation, establishing a cyberculture to our routine. According to Santaella and Cardoso (2015, 177):

From the point of view of the actor-network, it is not possible to assign a cause to an effect, since the effects are always multi-purpose or, more precisely, they are products of an interaction. In this way, intention is no longer predicted by actors. If there is purpose or intentionality in any socio-technical agency, it can only exist for and in the collective. It is a power available only to an association, never to a subject. This is the foundation of the idea of mediation, related to the sharing of responsibilities for action between various actors, respecting the action of everyone involved in the technique in question.

Therefore, Rifiotis (2016) argues that “the socio-technical network should not be confused with the internet network: it is not a mere context in which human actions occur. Describing a socio-technical network implies describing flows, internal agencies” (Rifiotis 2016, 91). The concept of technical mediation, understood as “a symmetrical dialogical pair and a genesis of new properties, given by the man-machine conjunction” (Santaella and Cardoso 2015, 170), is related to the socio-technical network in the sense of an affectation between man and technology.

When approaching objects with the human being, equating them both as actors in life, not only the limits of the technology expansion are confronted, but it also brings up the reflection on how the human being has been transforming his own behavior, expanding his form of communication, interaction and relationships, in which the consequence can be a crack in the borders, margins and limits between human and non-human elements.

## **THE ACTOR-NETWORK THEORY**

The sociology of the social, a Latourian concept, is seen as traditional and arises with the important role of construction and affirmation of the human sciences: by establishing the concept of social in a single domain and with the intention of distinguishing that same domain from reality from other spheres, a relevant fact at a certain historical moment, as they helped in the affirmation and authorization of the argument adopted in the area, showing the importance of this field of study. However, due to the speed and plurality of changes, the notion of a fixed social form and a society shaped only by human actors, for example as in the idea proposed by the sociology of social pointed out

above, needed to be revisited and rethought through brief interactions and/or new associations, that is, a new form of social being, a substitution of society for collectives, through the network of associations, with human and non-human actors/actresses. In this way, the sociology of associations appears against the representation of the social as a single domain and proposes the concept of the social as “[...] the name and a type of momentary association characterized by the way in which it takes on new forms” (Latour 2012, 100).

[...] often, in the social sciences, “social” designates a type of bond: it is the name of a specific domain, a material such as straw, clay, rope, wood or steel. [...] For ANT, as we now know, the definition of the term is different: it does not designate a domain of reality or a special item; it is rather the name of a movement, a displacement, a transformation, a translation, a record. It is an association between entities that are in no way recognizable as social in the ordinary sense, except during the short time when they are confused (Latour 2012, 99).

In the work *Reagregando o Social: uma introdução à Teoria do Ator-Rede*, Bruno Latour presents two approaches: the “sociology of the social”, as previously commented, that is, the one seen as more traditional and part of common sense and the second, and “sociology of associations”, the anagram of English words: ANT (Actor-Network Theory), which objective is: when analyzing scientific activity, consider both human and non-human actors. ANT proposal was to undo an idea of social as a domain of reality, a unique or special domain.

Through the Actor-Network Theory it is possible to clarify the relationship of objects in everyday life, within the sphere that we understand as social, and also, as we can more easily notice, the argument from which sociology has been absent for a long time, that is, from the discussion about the split between what is human and what is non-human, what is object, artifact and/or animal, that is, placing the perspective of humanism as a fragmented issue of the relationship with the world, the issues of this collective world. Latour (2012), in his work, proposes an alternative to sociology, in the sense of re-aggregating the social, moving from the idea of society to that of collectives, and this collective is thought, by him, as what can be constituted by different actors (human and non-human). According to Latour (2012, 112):

Therefore, from now on, the word “collective” will replace “society”. Society will be just the set of entities already assembled that, according to sociologists of the social, were



made of social material. Collective, on the other hand, will designate the project of bringing together new entities that have not yet been brought together and which, for this reason, are obviously not made of social material.


According to the Actor-Network Theory, there are several types of actors, and those who make a difference in the course of action of another agent or environment are qualified as such: “[...] participants in the course of action that awaits figuration” (Latour 2012, 108), “[...] if we insist on the decision to start with controversies about actors and actor, anything that changes a situation making a difference is an actor - or, if you do not have a figuration yet, an actant (Latour 2012, 108).

Latour (2012) comments on non-human actors from the point of view of the Actor-Network Theory: “In addition to “ determining ”and serving as a“ backdrop ”for human action, things need to authorize, allow, grant, stimulate, give rise to, suggest, influence, interrupt, enable, prohibit, etc.” (Latour 2012, 109). ANT does not indiscriminately claim that objects perform actions in place of human actors.

Starting from the premise that objects also act, not necessarily thinking of them as intentional movements, but as having a certain subjectivity, the idea is to propose a reflection on the social as a collective of associations and networks between humans and non-humans. Here, the actors would not be distributed on the scene as subjects and objects, but starting from the same point of mutual affectation. Santaella and Cardoso (2015, 173), commenting on Latour work, point out that:

Paradigmatic, to illustrate the new sociability that emerges there, are the agency possibilities typical of digital culture, in which several sensors allow devices not only to alert, but also to validate or invalidate, authorize or disallow human action, or rather, the action mediated by devices according to inputs given by the interaction with man.

In the idea of collectives, proposed by ANT, the social ties that technology provides, that is, the non-human element as an actant within the provided social, continue to exist even after its creation and configuration, or better, they continue creating new forms of interactions, not unlike other objects, animals and other non-human actors, however the new technologies are not silent, as an example used by Latour: “Once built, the brick wall does not pronounce a word - even though the masons continue chattering and graffiti proliferate on its surface” (Latour 2012, 118). Technology as an actor of the social, even after its configuration, does not have the characteristic of silence, it is present



in every interaction of daily life, authorizing and disallowing practices, and due to the very nature of the non-silenced bonds that they create with humans, they are no longer intermediaries to become mediators of mutual affectation, and so the reading of the social yields the idea of collectives with hybrid actors. Latour (2012, 120), comments on the action of objects:

[...] objects live a clearly multiple and complex life through meetings, projects, sketches, regulations and tests. They emerge fully merged with other more traditional social actions. Only when they are installed they disappear from view. For this reason, the study of innovations and controversies is one of the first privileged places where objects can be kept longer as visible, disseminated and recognized mediators before becoming invisible, non-social intermediaries (Latour 2012, 120).

#### **HER AN ILLUSTRATION OF ANT**

We have the human projecting a human dimension in the machine and we have the non-human element being an agent of action and interfering in the protagonist routine, choices and even emotions. Samantha not only brings comfort to Theodore, she makes him confront himself, and both are in a mutual process of affectation and sensitization. In this way, the interactions of our protagonist are no longer just taken by human agents, since, within his new constructed relationships, it would be impossible to think of just one type of actor, making it necessary to include non-human actors, as stated by Rifiotis (2016): “the fabric of our practices, focused exclusively on humans, does not seem to be one-piece anymore, as it is mixed with other elements that perform different activities in the course of action” (Rifiotis 2016, 90).

Theodore has a reality very similar to so many subjects in our contemporary society and, despite the romantic appeal that exists in the work, when noting the absence of another “physical” person in different moments of sharing, it is not possible to leave the strangeness aside, after all, we hear both voices, but Theodore remains physically “alone”. This image, opens rooms for questions concerning the proposal of the Actor-Network Theory and the pluralism of social actors, however, according to ANT, to be a little more realistic regarding social interactions, we will have to accept that the “continuity of a course of action rarely consists of connections between humans (for which, moreover, basic social skills would be sufficient) or between objects, but with much greater probability, it zigzags between them” (Latour 2012, 113).



Samantha's "existence", intermediated by an object (cell phone, operating system and/or application) as an everyday actress, in a place similar to our human protagonist, brings a reflection on the traits identified with a new way to read the social, not only limited to human relationships, but expanding the Pandora box to other forms of being that same social, through a look at the practices provided by technical mediation and/or socio-technical network.

The inclusion of objects as actors that influence social decisions as well as humans is part of an approach that serves both for the discussion about the involvement and development of technologies, and also to reflect the limitations of what defines us as humans. The non-human elements seen as mediating and non-mediating actors, provide greater clarity so that we can see the current movements of the collective as a fluid process and present in contemporary time. Fioruci (2019, 128), comments the connection between the context of contemporary cinema and the work of the North American director:


[...] contemporary cinematography, which Jonze is aligned with, invests in the exploration of its protagonists identity, their crises and anguishes, especially regarding the instability of these identities, expressed in their observable fragmentation and ambivalence (Fioruci 2019, 128).

Even though the work narrative is possibly set in the future, it is a time very close to that of the spectator of the present, bringing an identification bias with the protagonist and his experiences. Theodore does not live only among humans, his social, his "social drama"<sup>2</sup>, his questions are involved with non-human elements. The contemporary "new social" no longer fits inside the box imposed by a traditional sociology.

## **AFFECTED AS MERCHANDISE**

The process of producing the stranger, strangeness, loneliness, fragmented identities, and polarities, is a process that determines places and creates maladjusted subjects. They are part of a system that manipulates certain relationships, promotes social uncertainties and ineptness "one hour at a time". Theodore, found himself lonely, without lasting ties, devoid of the feeling of social belonging, a character who was a predictable target of the capitalization of affections. Passive consumer, he surrenders to Samantha, falls in love with Her, and is also disillusioned within this collective scenario - of technologies and humans as agents of mutual affectation.

<sup>2</sup> Concept taken from the work of Victor Turner: Dramas, fields and metaphors.



The actor-network theory foresees the fastest and most efficient connections, and what would be faster and more efficient than loving relationships with your cell phone? The chance of hurt, disappointment and lack of assertiveness would be slight. A less “truncated” communication that would involve few actors and few processes, that is, leaving the sphere only human, full of processes and which may not be efficient in the end. “After all, in the terminology of the actor-network theory, the notion of “actor” is not reducible to the traditional sense of “social actor”, since it must name everything that acts, what/who makes a difference, it leaves traces, which could be people, institutions, animals, objects, etc” (Rifiotis 2016, 90).

To elucidate the reflection on affections as a commodity, I displace the concept of Taussig (2010): “The lively appearance of commodities highlights people reified appearance, and both dissolve when the commercial inspiration of the definitions of man and society are emphasized” (Taussig 2010, 30). Based on the author’s premise, thinking of relationships as merchandise, became the new instrument of power: relationship chats, communication and interaction apps, cell phones with better camera images; subjects can “post” the best cut of their own life.

Even if technology starts to be considered in the social world, through the sociology of associations, as an act of mutual affect alongside the human agent, it does not neglect its bias as a consumer commodity, that is, it only develops gains another structure within its configuration, and showing how a system of capital, which aims at consumption and consecutively interactions via the capitalization of affections, is transforming us into isolated, fragmented and polarized subjects in our relationships.

In capitalist culture, blindness to the social base of essential categories makes the social reading of supposedly natural things quite confusing. This is due to the peculiar character of the abstractions associated with the marketing organization of human affairs: essential qualities of human beings and their production are converted into merchandise, into something to be bought and sold [...] (Taussig 2010, 24).

Therefore, there is a transposition of ideas and the era of likes, visualizations, of performing doing something, gains an aspect of essentiality and also of production. Getting views or not has become capital and, as such, an object of dispute, power and frustrations. The proposal of a collective that surpasses the idea of society, does not exactly aim at the satisfaction and maintenance of ties, but on the contrary, the more present and elastic the interactions between hybrid actors are, the more the subjects will become dependent on the market.

The self used to be presented and maintained jointly by individual skills and with the use of innate resources that now tends to be mediated by technologically produced tools that can be purchased on the market. In the absence of such tools, partnerships and groups disintegrate (if they had the opportunity to emerge before) (Bauman 1998, 35).

The film *Her* portrays this scenario well, as it presents the proposal of a virtual character, the result of a paid operating system, like a real character, the drama proposes the mixture between different types of “societies”, human and non-human, adopting the Latorian concept of collectives, extrapolating the concept of a single domain of social imposed by the sociology of the social. This character is hired a priori to organize the life of our protagonist. Samantha was supposed to limit herself to her standard functions, but she was designed within a system of capital, which manipulates relationships and alienates affections. Theodore isolates himself from other human beings, connects and allows himself to this unique relationship, gets emotional and buys the sold idea of a personalized operating system. He no longer feels lonely. He is no longer able to create bonds of belonging outside of Samantha’s “presence”. Affection was sold to him, now another object is an integral and important part of his social. From a material good, we can witness the construction of a feeling, an abstraction more than the real, producing identifications through beautiful scenes, music and interpretations.

The “new” way of reading the social world, with the insertion of technologies as a non-human agent, now permeated by the dominant spirit of consumerism, does not aim to generate lasting ties, as we can witness at the end of *Her*. Theodore discovers that Samantha is shared with other “n” consumers, that that relationship is not exclusive and much less durable. Bauman (1998), discussing the liquid ties of postmodernity, adds the reflection when he affirms that: in a world where ties are concealed in successive, recurring and fragile encounters, the history of life ends up becoming a series of episodes which unique lasting consequence is his equally ephemeral memory.

It is noted that non-human agents and, in this example, new technologies, the massive insertion of cell phones and apps in daily life, fulfill the dual function of actant and merchandise, that is, how actants are capable of directing decisions and shaping life routines. Together with humans, forming a large collective of interactions production. And now, while fulfilling the role of commodity, they serve as a fetish of capital to manipulate affections, to “give” us affections through the purchase of these.

## CONCLUSION


Her, the film by director and screenwriter Jonze, is part of a contemporary cinematic universe. It portrays the new way of living and experiencing technologies in everyday life, as well as the British anthological series Black Mirror, which is “centered on dark and satirical themes that examine modern society, particularly regarding the unforeseen consequences of new technologies”<sup>3</sup>, work as a suggestion for reflection on a type of reality more than present today.

We live on the basis of objects and in contemporary times we are hostages to them, and it is important to reflect on this relationship, that is, on the real role that objects have in our lives, as believed by Rifiotis (2016): “The elements of the world are no longer fit into the categories of the “social” previously established, but are in a framework of permanent innovation” (Rifiotis 2016, 94).

The actor-network theory is an important tool to assist us in thinking about how these objects can be “reread”. It presents a new view on the integration of non-human elements into our practices, because in that particular historical time, objects also shape our fields of action and can no longer be seen as inert, and are only social meanings, assets, goods or silenced artifacts. They have become endowed with an essential role in the configuration of an action structure, which allows us to act in a certain way or in other ways. “ANT project is to expand the list and modify the shapes and figures of the assembled participants, outlining a way to make them act as a durable whole” (Latour 2012, 109), “It is known that the actor-network theory represents an attempt to overcome the idea of Cartesian mind and its resulting dualisms” (Santaella and Cardoso 2015, 168). Through ART, it opens up the possibility of rethinking the social world as a network of interactions and society as a collective with hybrid actors, that is, with human and non-human actors that affect each other.

Non-human actors, of course, are not the target of social thinking. They are spontaneously allocated to the margins of the social, allowing to elucidate the idea that there are no means to insert them in the fabric of the social, preventing the possibility of showing other multiple social ties. Through the sociology of associations, looking at the social as a collective, as an interactive socio-technical network with multiple actors, starts to include hybrid actors as performances of everyday life through a technical mediation of mutual affectation of the actors, that is, the human and non-human agents affecting each other. Or rather exemplifying, Samantha and Theodore as agents of mutual existence and affectation.

<sup>3</sup> [https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\\_Mirror](https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Mirror). Accessed on 02 april/2021.




The fact investigated by ANT is that the more efficient an object becomes, the more it silences (or is it silenced?). And creates space as an intermediary. Using the work *Her* as a corpus of analysis, in order to facilitate the reflection on hybrid social actors, it is clear that the silencing of objects is unlikely when considered in the form of new technologies. Samantha, representative of the non-human actant, became in the narrative as important and necessary for interactions as our human character, because the more efficient, effective and present she became in the life of the protagonist, the more speeches and life she gained, further than the mediation role authorized for her, she became *Her*, and no longer a technological network that speaks when its human dominator allows it.

Affective relationships between humans are abstract, peculiar and fragile. They do not directly generate capital. The commodification of the “romance” by the Apps returns the power to the “hand” of the system, which can now coordinate feelings such as loneliness itself, a feeling that, in many cases, is also produced by the anxiety that our ways of communicating and relating produced, that is, as masses of maneuvers in the cuddle selling market.

A society mainly defines modes of suffering in the face of the norms that it itself enunciates - managing these modes in a tacitly accepted framework of pathologies, with its clinical referral strategies, with its assemblies of symptoms and complexes. For a society is, above all, a way of producing pathologies, that is, of translating suffering into the ordered grammar of pathologies (Safatle 2015, 131).

From the ANT, it becomes possible to think about new technologies as a forming part of this new social world, facilitating the understanding of the social as the result of interactions and no longer as a fixed system. Coupling the idea of collective, new technologies, objects, non-human actors in general and assigning to them also the role of transforming relationships with human actors.

The change in focus on what and who is part of the social, appears when it is assumed that there have been changes in the “social actors”, that is, that the objects are not inert, that they are also actors. The motto “follow the actors” applied by the sociology of the social, is pluralized with the sociology of associations proposed by ANT, now the main motto is to follow the multiple actors, who are in constant interaction and change. For the Actor-Network Theory, nothing and no one is isolated, actors will always be a collective that participate in a series of combinations involving diverse interactional processes, in addition to the limiting scale of cast of only human actors. Therefore, the film *Her*, through the



perspective of the Actor-Network Theory, leaves the image of who are the actors that are part of this network of interactions less nebulous.

[...] the network itself is no longer exclusively something that is “used” by humans, or a mere context for human action, after all, in the course of each action, the network can be either the context within which certain relationships are produced, or also a mediator who transforms relationships and enables the emergence of subjects (Rifiotis 2016, 94).

The example that is suggested in *Her* is in charge of the reflection on the cell phone and apps, as responsible for the transmission of information as the human that shares the information with it, forming a connective network that transports them to another dimension, the dimension of affection previously dominated exclusively by beings said to be alive. Thinking of the cell phone object as an actor, and in the case of Jonze’s film, the voice of the actress Scarlet who represents the character Samantha, is giving life to this new way of thinking about the social, in which humans and non-humans are agents of mutual affectation, are actors of everyday action and both become responsible for the process of relating.

Objects thought of as things that need to authorize, allow, grant, stimulate, give rise to, suggest, influence, interrupt, enable, prohibit, as described by Latour (2012) or devices having a capacity not only to alert, but also to validate or invalidate, authorize or disallow human action, as reported by Santaella and Cardoso (2015), are also endowed with great power of persuasion by the means of the capital system that is present and dominant in relationships, providing in advance the alienated sense of freedom and autonomy to the consumer, to the human actor. The seemingly reasonable division between machine/technology and human, is unlikely and becomes what hampers the reflection on the possibilities of actions being collective and interactive, a process that actually is really going through our daily lives.

**TRANSLATION**  
Fernanda Mattos



## REFERENCES

- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1998. O mal-estar da pós-modernidade. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Ed. Fioruci, Wellington R. 2019. O ser, a máquina e a solidão - Her, de Spike Jonze. Revista 2i, vol. 1, nº Especial.
- Latour, Bruno. 2012. Reagregando o Social: uma introdução à teoria do Ator-Rede. Bauru/Salvador: Edusc/EdUFBA.
- Rifiotis, Theophilos. 2016. Etnografia no ciberespaço como “repovoamento” e explicação. Rev. bras. Ci. Soc., São Paulo, v. 31, n. 90: 85-98.
- Safatle, Vladimir. 2015. *Circuito dos Afetos: Corpos políticos, Desamparo, Fim do Indivíduo*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- Santaella, Lucia; Tarcísio Cardoso. 2015. O desconcertante conceito de mediação técnica em Bruno Latour. In: *Matrizes*, v. 9, nº 1.
- Taussig, Michael. 2010. *O diabo e o fetichismo da mercadoria na América do Sul*. Tradução: Priscila Santos da Costa. 1º Ed. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.

**ANA CAROLINA BRINDAROLLI** is an academic with a Master's degree in Social Anthropology from the Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS, 2021). Graduated in Physical Education also at UFMS. Currently, she is part of the research group ANSUB - Anthropology and subjectivity, at UFMS. Email: anabrindarolli@gmail.com

**Use license.** This article is licensed under the Creative Commons License CC-BY. With this license you can share, adapt, create for any purpose, as long as you assign the authorship of the work.

Received: 02/16/2021  
Resubmitted: 04/11/2021  
Approved: 04/20/2021