Isaac Asimov posited Three Laws of Robotics to keep robots from hurting humans.

Social suite, a set of consepts such as love, friendship, cooperation and teaching, didn't change even though there are many invention of technologies like internet and so on, but in case of invention of AI made to look and behave like us, it will change not only how we communicate with them but also how we communicate with other human beings.

The author(Nicholas A. Christakis) did a experiment. In the experiment, there are two cases. In one case, robots acted making occasional errors, stating that robots also make mistakes. In the control group, robots just acted normally (with robots which only made bland statements). As a result, in the former circumstance, people got more relaxed about their mistakes and conversational than the latter case.

In another, virtual experiment, the author divided 4,000 human subjects into groups of about 20, and assigned each individual “friends” within the group; these friendships formed a social network. The task assigned to the group was each person had to choose one of three colors, but no individual’s color could match that of his or her assigned friends within the social network. Unknown to them, some groups contained a few bots that have the same setting as the previous experiment. Like the previous experiment, the groups that have said bots outperformed those who don’t have one. What’s more, the effect also affect the group that are not directly connected to the bots but at not at the same degree. Bots help humans help themselves.

Hybrid systems (systems with human and robot social interactions), with appropriate AIs humans improve relating to each other. To back this, the political scientist Kevin Munger directed specific kinds of bots to remind people who send racist remarks to other people in the Internet that they are humans too, which lead to a decline in usage of racist speech.

Contrary to these the experiments, they can also make people less productive and less ethical. [*In a experiment with selfish robots, where the humans were given money in a game where if they donate the money to their neighbor the money donated will be doubled. Humans were cooperating and donating to their neighbors till the selfish robots stopped to donate, in turn humans also stopped donating as well.]* The notion of selflessness and sacrificial nature for the community easily broke down by the interjection of robots is concerning.

There’s already real life example which is 5.7 million Twitter users in the run-up to the 2016 US presidential election trolling and malicious Russian accounts-including ones operated by bots-were regularly retweeted in a similar manner to other, unmalicious accounts, influencing conservative users particularly. Bots took advantage of social suites like teaching and cooperation to affect people indirectly polarizing the country’s electorate.

There are other social effects of simple types of AI such as children bark rude comments at digital assistants such Alexa and Siri, that can make the children treat other people the same, or that kids’ relationships with artificially intelligent machines will interfere with, or even preempt, human relationships. MIT expert Sherry Turkle told The Atlantic’s Alexis C. Madrigal recently that children with AI interactions might not be able to acquire empathic connections.

As digital assistants become ubiquitous, some people began treating as sentient beings, writing in these pages last year, Judith Shulevitz described how some people treat them as confidants, or even as friends and therapists, This brings the question: if we grow more comfortable talking intimately to our devices, what happens to our human marriages and friendships？As AI permeates our lives, we must confront the possibility that it will stunt our emotions and inhibit deep human connections, (leaving our relationships with one another less reciprocal, or shallower, or more narcissistic).All of this could end up transforming human society in unintended ways that we need to reckon with a polity.

Anthropologist at De Montfort University in the UK, Kathleen Richardson, robots can dehumanize and could lead to retreat from real intimacy. We might even progress from treating robots as instruments for sexual gratification to treating other people that way. Other observers like David Levy said that having robot as sex toys is a good thing. Sex robots won’t be susceptible to sexually transmitted diseases or unwanted pregnancies, and they could provide opportunities for shame-free experimentation and practice. Levy believes that sex with robots will come to be seen as ethical, perhaps in some cases expected.

While driver-less car which is very near to us have many good things such as preventing accidents, it can deprive us of an occasion to exercise the abilities which are cooperation and social coordination, could lead to their degradation in cooperation and social coordination skills.Self-driving cars will take not only the driving duties but also the moral judgments (like which human to hit during an inevitable collision), and affect other humans indirectly. For example, it might decrease the attentiveness of drivers and increase likelihood of accidents when they change from self-driving lanes to human-driving lanes. Or it might just improve human performance of people who drive with autonomous vehicles. In either case, it would be reckless to release new kinds of AI without taking such social externalities into account beforehand. We must apply the same effort and ingenuity that we apply to the hardware and software that make self-driving cars possible to managing AI’s potential ripple effects on those outside the car.

In 1985 Issac Asimov added another law to the list of laws of robotics, to prevent harming humanity. But had problems defining harms, stating “A human being is a concrete object,” he later wrote. “Injury to a person can be estimated and judged. Humanity is an abstraction.” (Which means, defining humanity is difficult and thus teaching a machine what harm means is also difficult.)

Just like why normal rules, laws and demands for democratic oversight are needed between human to human interaction. Similar rules and laws are needed when AI comes into picture of human-to-human interaction. As the effects of these interactions are really broad and far reaching, some systematic method to deal with this is necessary.

Already, a diverse group of researchers and practitioners *(computer scientists, engineers, zoologists, and social scientists, among others)* are coming together to develop the field of “machine behavior,” to improve our technical and theoretical understanding of how a machine interacts with humans, as the scientists don’t see them as man-made objects but as new class of social actors.

As AI becomes more wide spread and sentient, we need to have a better way to differentiate that is just not normal and the behavior that is really dangerous to us (sky net). The most concerning thing being the factors that affect the foundation on which humanity have survived till now.

The Enlightenment philosopher Thomas Hobbes argued that humans needed a collective agreement to keep us from being disorganized and cruel. On the contrary, without the need for government etc. humans are genetically equipped with “social suites” to live more peacefully and communally before the arrival of AI.

As humans don’t have time to evolve to deal with the changes that arrive along with AI. We need to, take steps, to form another social contract (a relationship with machines and not humans) to live with AI in a peaceful manner.