

## **On Insects, Protection and Conservation Strategies**

Vratislav Richard E.M.J.-B. BEJSAK-COLLORADO-MANSFELD

The Wentworth Bldg., B.62; University of Sydney 2006; New South Wales  
e-mail: vratislav@bigfoot.com

A number of countries are today attempting to “protect nature”. They use different methods, with different results, but in most cases insect protection is a smokescreen to cover up for the devastation caused by themselves, and to find scapegoats, even insect collectors, to try and pass on the blame to.

Should insects be protected, and if so, what is the best way? Why do some governments persist with the tokenistic protection of insects? Are there conservation policies for insects that are of any real value? There are many interesting questions, and many answers are given. Some may have a degree of validity, while other reasons have no scientific validity at all. For example, simply because a particular species is large and attractive it may be perceived as being of value.

Many governments at present are showing better attitudes towards conserving nature by using different methods and different environmental laws to try to cover up or make up for the devastation of nature. On the other hand, other governments actually make it illegal to enter areas of forest that are being destroyed by logging activities, to prevent the gathering of scientific information on the biota being wiped out wholesale.

So what does the term “tokenistic” conservation mean? As an illustration, I will use the following imaginary scenario:

The Pampudella “Cuddly” is a small bear, which only eats wattle. I, as an imaginary government, can protect the species, as best as I can, but I will pass a death sentence