The reading asserts the theory of how the agnostids might have lived and behaved or what they might have ate, considering their fossils. The lecturer, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the reasons proposed by the reading passage.

First, the author argues that the agnostids may have been free-swimming predators like other arthropods, that hunted small animals in the sea. Conversely, the lecturer brings up if other arthropods were hunters in open oceans it was because that they enjoyed large developed eyes, which helped them to prey on other species, while agnostids might have had poorly developed eyes and even they were blind; moreover, there is no other evidences in their fossils to support that they have other special sensory to help them for hunting other species.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that they might have dwelled on the seafloor like the primitive arthropods. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that typically those kinds of dwelled animals did not have the ability to move fast and far in oceans, and they often stay in localized areas rather than spreading to new ones. So they occupied small geographic areas where they originated from. However, agnostids species occupied different geographic areas, and they could move through them, proving that they were able to move pretty fast, and it was unusual for seafloor dwellers.

Finally, the reading asserts that maybe the agnostids were parasites, and they lived on and feed off larger organisms. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue duo to the fact that, the population of parasites are not too much, and they are certainly limited because if their population were too much they could have killed other species. However, regarding the agnostids' fossils the population of them were too much, so theses evidences can rule out the theory that they could be parasites.
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