

EDITORIAL

EXPANDING INTERESTS OF THE AMERICAN MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION

A. D. HESS*

The bylaws of our American Mosquito Control Association provide for a broad field of interest of our members. Section 1 of Article II states that the purpose of the Association is "to promote research on and control of mosquitoes and related subjects in the broadest sense. . . ." The following brief summary of the results of a recent survey indicate that the interests of our members fit this broad pattern.

Members of the Association can roughly be divided into those primarily concerned with the technical aspects and those primarily concerned with the practical or operational aspects of mosquito control, though there is, of course, some overlapping. As an indication of the interests of the technical group, a check was made of 165 members of AMCA who are listed in Volume II (Biological Sciences) of the 9th edition of *American Men of Science*. Two-thirds of these were trained as entomologists, 10 percent having specialized in medical entomology, and 6 percent were M.D.'s. It can be assumed from the fact that they are members of AMCA that all of these individuals have some interest in mosquitoes; however, only 10 percent listed mosquitoes as their primary field of interest. In contrast, 43 percent indicated a primary interest in arthropods of public health importance (including medical entomology) as defined above. These outnumbered those with primary interests in all other fields of entomology combined (37 percent). This is strong evidence that a major segment of the technical members of our Association are interested in arthropod vectors in general rather than merely in mosquitoes.

In order to obtain an idea of the breadth of interest of those actually engaged in

mosquito control operations, a questionnaire was sent out to 161 mosquito abatement agencies located throughout the United States. Fifty-one replies were received from 13 states as follows: California 15; Florida 7; Illinois 4; Massachusetts 2; Minnesota 1; New Jersey 6; North Dakota 2; Pennsylvania 2; Oregon 4; South Carolina 1; Texas 2; Utah 3; and Washington 2. It was surprising to find that over half of these (55 percent) were already engaged in other vector control activities in addition to mosquito control. About three-fourths of this activity was concerned with fly control, including general sanitation and refuse disposal. Other activities included the control of biting Diptera (*Culicoides*, *Leptoconops*, and *Simuliidae*); non-biting Diptera (midges, phantom midges, ephydriids, etc.); ticks, mites, and chiggers; spiders, earwigs; household pests; rodents; and weeds.

Eighty-one percent of those replying stated that mosquito abatement agencies should be engaged in other vector control activities in addition to mosquito control. Two-thirds of these indicated that they should do fly control. Biting and non-biting flies; fleas; ticks, mites, and chiggers; household pests and "all arthropods of public health importance" were among the other vectors which various mosquito control agencies felt should be included. Of the minority which indicated they should not take on additional vector control activities, several gave as their reason the lack of adequate funds and personnel. Some individuals stated that they should be prepared to carry out any additional vector control which the public demanded and would support financially.

We believe that this broad field of interest of both the technical and operational members of our Association is a healthy one and should be encouraged.

* From the Communicable Disease Center, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Greeley, Colorado.