The reading asserts that it is far-fetched that Agnostides fossils found in rocks in many areas around the world do not permit paleontologists to determine what Agnostides ate or how they treat. The lecturer, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the reasons proposed by the reading passage.

The author argues that Agnostides may have been strong and active predators who preyed on smaller animals, sometimes just six millimeters long. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that if they were predators, they would have needed large, developed eyes that could follow the pray. But the fossil recording could have shown that they have tiny and poorly eye sides. Also, fossils might have been shown that Agnostides don't have any sense to find their prey.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that they were the seafloor dweller, which have survived by scavenging dead organisms. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that the seafloor dwellers might have moved too slowly, but the Agnostides could have moved very fast. The fossil recording showed that they extended in a large distance, so they might have moved from one area to another area very fast.

Finally, it is stated in the article that the Agnostides were parasites that might have lived on primitive fish or larger arthropods. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that the parasites population was limited because too many parasites can kill off the host's organism. Fossils' recordings could have shown that the population of Agnostides was vast, and the Agnostides might have contained many species. Therefore, agnostics were not parasites with this great population.(275)(30 min)