Matthew E Setiadi
Dr. Pei Wang
Artificial General Intelligence
21 January 2026

Agreement and Disagreement on the Path to AGI
Based on Turing and the AGI Levels Framework

I. Introduction: Why AGI Is Hard to Talk About

AGI is something that will be achieved. The problem is not whether it will happen, but how people talk about it. AGI is a very broad term, and different people understand it differently. Because of this, discussions about AGI often become emotional, philosophical, or unclear.

The two readings, Turing's paper and the AGI Levels framework, are both trying to solve this confusion. Turing focuses on goals and behavior through the Imitation Game. The newer framework tries to define AGI using levels, performance, and autonomy. Reading both made me think more deeply about where AGI fits in human life and why humans feel uncomfortable about it.

II. What AGI Means to Me

To me, AGI is not about being human. It is about flexibility, learning, and the ability to handle new situations. That is why I believe AGI will happen. Technology keeps moving fast, and things that once felt impossible start to feel realistic very quickly.

Turing predicted that by around the year 2000, computers could fool humans in the Imitation Game about 30 percent of the time. At first, this sounds impossible. But when I think about how fast technology has developed, especially in recent years, it feels less unrealistic. Even if the timeline was wrong, the direction was not.

III. Agreement with Turing: Focus on Capability, Not Biology

I agree with Turing's idea that intelligence should be judged by what a machine can do, not how it is built. The Imitation Game avoids endless arguments about what thinking really is and instead focuses on observable behavior.

This idea made me curious about how AGI might actually affect human life. If machines can act intelligently in ways that matter, then intelligence may not be limited to biological systems. Turing's approach forces humans to question their own assumptions rather than dismiss machines immediately.

IV. Disagreement: Theological Argument and Human Superiority

One argument Turing discusses is that thinking comes from the soul, and only humans have souls, so machines cannot think. I disagree with using this argument against AGI.

I believe God is the Creator, but I do not think the soul should be part of this discussion. If we include the soul as a requirement for intelligence, then AGI becomes impossible by definition. That does not help us understand what is actually happening.

Turing points out that this argument is emotional. Humans want to believe they are necessarily superior. Especially intellectual people, who value thinking highly, want to protect this belief. I agree with this view. This fear is more about losing human superiority than about logic. Believing humans are special does not require denying the possibility of machine intelligence.

V. Disagreement: Mimicry and the Problem of a Moving Target

Turing's Imitation Game and later tests rely heavily on mimicry. A machine is considered intelligent if it can imitate human behavior well enough.

I disagree with mimicry as a long term standard. Humans are shaped by millions of years of evolution, biology, and culture. Machines do not grow up in this way. Even if machines can simulate randomness, they cannot truly replicate the human experience.

If machines are trained to mimic humans, they need context, experience, and learning through failure. But by the time they succeed, humans will already have changed. Human behavior is not fixed. Mimicry is trying to hit a target that keeps moving.

This makes me question why mimicry is the goal at all. Humans cannot even fully understand themselves. If machines become good at copying us, we will already be different.

VI. Need for Clear Definitions: Why the AGI Framework Matters

This is where I strongly agree with the AGI Levels framework. The authors argue that AGI must be clearly defined so we can talk about performance, autonomy, and risk. Without clear definitions, discussions about AGI become meaningless.

For the sake of humanity and AI, this clarity is necessary. Even if defining AGI feels restrictive, it helps us manage real consequences. This framework moves the conversation away from vague philosophy and toward responsibility.

VII. Learning, Flexibility, and Metacognition

The framework highlights learning and metacognition as critical for AGI. I agree with this. Before AGI can truly exist, it must know how to learn and know when it does not know something.

Flexibility does not mean being like one ideal human. Humans themselves are very different. A superhuman might be great at logic but weak emotionally or creatively. If AGI becomes too generalized, it may stop being human-like at all.

This makes me think AGI is not meant to replace humans. It is likely to become something different, shaped by a different path of development.

VIII. Autonomy, Risk, and Levels of AGI

I also agree with the idea of Levels of AGI, especially the separation between capability and autonomy. High capability does not automatically mean high autonomy.

The risks described at higher levels, especially AI as an Agent, are real. Misalignment and concentration of power are serious concerns. However, true autonomy requires learning through failure.

Humans are naturally built to fail and learn. If AGI is never allowed to fail, it cannot understand risk. The future of AGI may require training systems in controlled environments where failure is allowed and meaningful.

IX. Playing God and Responsibility

At this point, the idea of playing God becomes unavoidable. Creating autonomous systems means creating entities that can act independently and learn in ways we may not fully predict.

Knowing the risks is already an important step. Avoiding all risk is impossible. If AGI is going to exist, humans must take responsibility for guiding its development, not by forcing it to imitate us, but by understanding that it may grow differently.

X. Conclusion

Turing was right to focus on behavior and capability, but mimicry is not enough. Humans are too complex and always changing to be a stable benchmark. The AGI Levels framework improves this by providing structure, clarity, and a way to talk about risk.

AGI is not about building a better human. It is about creating something different. And if AGI happens, it will also change humanity itself. That is why clarity, responsibility, and humility matter more than imitation.