As opposed to the reading, the lecture claims that all the three theories have serious weaknesses.

To start with, the reading states that the agnostids may have been free-swimming predators. However, predators must have good eyes to gain vision, or they develop other sensitive organs. On the contrary, it is found that agnostids’ eyes are small and poorly developed, and there is no fossil to show they have other special sensory organs to sense their prey. By pointing out predators must have sharp vision or other sensitive organs ,while the fossils suggest the agnostids have neither of them, the lecture casts doubt on the first point of the reading.

Besides, the second theory of the reading is again crippled by the lecture with the fact that/of the large spreading area of adnostids. Seafloor dwellers move slowly, which means they cannot travel very far and stay localized in small geographic areas, so they are unlikely to move around and have many shelters, while the agnostids’ shelters spread a large area, so the agnostids move fast. Thus, the agnostids’ ability to move easily from one site to the other is unusual for seafloor dwellers.

Finally, although the reading asserts that the agnostids were parasites, it is still questioned by the lecture with the large population of agnostids. The lecture states that parasites have a small population because if it grows too large, the parasites will kill the host organisms. The fossils prove that the agnostids have a large population, which rules out the theory that they have been parasites.