In the lecture, the professor casts doubt on the reading passage’s idea that the nests found inside the fossilized trees were not created by bees. The professor asserts that the arguments used in the reading are not convincing.

To begin with, according to the reading passage, no fossil remains of actual bees have been found that date to 200 million years ago. The professor argues that no bee remains that are 200 million years old doesn’t mean that bees didn’t exist at that time. He says maybe bees couldn’t be preserved as fossils at that time. Since there were almost no trees producing the right kind of resin, a sticky liquid produced by trees, the bees could not be preserved.

On top of that, the reading passage states that flowering plants were in absence 200 million years ago. On the contrary, the professor claims that it’s quite possible that bees existed before flowering plants appeared on Earth. The professor points out that early bees might have been feeding on non-flowering plants that preceded flowering plants during evolutionary history. Later when flowering plants evolved, bees may have adapted to feeding on them. And this new relationship between bees and flowering plants have remained stable ever since.

Lastly, the professor rebuts the reading’s point that the fossilized structures lack some of the finer details of bees’ nests such as the chambers lacking caps by stating that there’s chemical evidence that supports the theory that bees built the chambers. The professor points out that when the fossilized chambers were chemically analyzed, it turned out that they contain the same kind of waterproofing