



LETTERS

Astronaut Buzz Aldrin walks on the surface of the Moon in 1969.

Edited by Jennifer Sills

Moon missions spark the human imagination

J. Berg's Editorial "A child of Apollo" (19 July, p. 203) is spot on. Fifty years ago, my older brother and I watched the Apollo 11 mission from India, sharing a worldwide sense of pride. The legacy of Apollo continues, with technological and medical benefits (1). It has inspired a new generation to think big and take great risks. Fifty years later, I watched Chandrayaan-2, India's lunar exploration mission, from the United States, connected to my brother by the internet though thousands of miles apart. The latest Moon mission provides a cause for celebration.

The public's exposure to advances in science, medicine, and engineering continues on many fronts. Fifty years ago, it was a luxury for a country to perform space exploration; now a private Moon lander is the buzz (2). A society may survive on its earthly activities, but it thrives on the human imagination that has given us rockets, satellites, and a continued search for knowledge. The Chandrayaan-2 mission drives a change in India that was initiated by the Apollo mission so many years ago.

Space exploration spurs global creativity, including China's successful Chang'E-4 landing on the far side of Moon (3) and the bold

attempt of the Israeli spacecraft Beresheet (4). Science can transcend time and distance to unite people and nurture their imaginations. If agencies like the Indian Space Research Organisation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration worked together, along with China and private companies, another Moon journey would be possible. This is the time for the next generation to pursue their dreams.

Debomoy K. Lahiri

Department of Psychiatry and Department of Medical and Molecular Genetics, Stark Neuroscience Research Institute, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN 46202, USA. Email: dlahiri@iupui.edu

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. K. Fong, *Lancet* **394**, 205 (2019).
2. E. Gibney, *Nature* **566**, 434 (2019).
3. C. Li et al., *Nature* **569**, 378 (2019).
4. E. Gibney, *Nature* **568**, 286 (2019).

10.1126/science.aaz6067

Radiation is not a political tool

With the recent tensions between Japan, Korea, and surrounding countries, Korea has begun to raise questions about the safety of radiation doses in foods and at Olympic venues in Fukushima (1). However, these allegations are not based on scientific evidence; the international scientific community has already resolved

that radiation doses from the Fukushima nuclear accident in 2011 are limited (2, 3). The current doses in Fukushima residents from external exposures are comparable to or lower than exposures in other countries (4), and additional doses from internal exposures are also negligible (<0.01 mSv/y) (5). This concern about radiation exposure is not a problem of radiation safety but a matter of the trust and social norms that govern radiation risk perception and generate radiation anxiety (6, 7).

Public trust has still not fully recovered, even in Japan (8), where about 50% of the population still perceives a likelihood that the health of the next generation has been adversely affected (9), despite the current scientific consensus (2, 3). Radiation anxiety is a root cause of social division and can create stigma, discrimination, and conflicts in society (10). This type of social division can also be accelerated in conjunction with emotion-based information spread by social media (11).

Radiation issues must not be used as a political tool. Politicizing radiation issues divides the public into factions and unnecessarily increases the public perception of radiation risks among individuals and the public, ultimately worsening social misery. Sharing scientific findings and engaging in calm discussions will reassure people in relevant countries and across the globe.

Michio Murakami^{1*}, Atsushi Kumagai¹, Aleksandr N. Stojarov², Masaharu Tsubokura^{1,3}

¹Fukushima Medical University School of Medicine, Fukushima, Fukushima, 960-1295, Japan.

²Belarussian State Medical University, Minsk, 220116, Belarus. ³Minamisoma Municipal General Hospital, Minamisoma, Fukushima, 975-0033, Japan.

*Corresponding author. Email: michio@fmu.ac.jp

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. S. Denyer, "Radioactive sushi: Japan-South Korea spat extends to Olympic cuisine," *The Washington Post* (2019); www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/radioactive-sushi-japan-south-korea-spat-extends-to-olympic-cuisine/2019/08/23/3b4882d0-c483-11e9-8bf7-cde2d9e09055_story.html.
2. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, "Developments since the 2013 UNSCEAR report on the levels and effects of radiation exposure due to the nuclear accident following The Great East-Japan Earthquake and Tsunami: A 2017 white paper to guide the scientific committee's future programme of work" (New York, 2017).
3. International Atomic Energy Agency, "The Fukushima Daiichi accident" (Vienna, 2015).
4. N. Adachi et al., *J. Radiol. Prot.* **36**, 49 (2016).
5. K. Iwaoka, *Health Phys.* **111**, 471 (2016).
6. R. Morioka, *Soc. Sci. Med.* **107**, 105 (2014).
7. M. Murakami, J. Nakatani, T. Oki, *PLOS One* **11**, e0165594 (2016).
8. S. Denyer, "Eight years after Fukushima's meltdown, the land is recovering, but public trust is not," *The Washington Post* (2019); www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/eight-years-after-fukushimas-meltdown-the-land-is-recovering-but-public-trust-has-not/2019/02/19/0bb29756-255d-11e9-b5b4-1d18dfb7b084_story.html.

PHOTO: NASA

9. K. Shirai, N. Yoshizawa, Y. Takebayashi, M. Murakami, *PLoS One* **14**, e0221561 (2019).
10. T. Sawano, Y. Nishikawa, A. Ozaki, C. Leppold, M. Tsubokura, *J. Rad. Res.* **59**, 381 (2018).
11. M. Tsubokura *et al.*, *PLoS One* **13**, e0203594 (2018).

10.1126/science.aaz3408

Salmon in clear and present danger

During the summer of 2019, record heat events caused thousands of adult Pacific salmon to die of heat stress while migrating to their spawning grounds throughout Alaska (1). These die-offs come as many rivers in western North America have started transitioning to a regime of lower summer flows and higher temperatures during the salmon migration and spawning season (2). This transition, driven by warmer air temperatures and reduced snow and ice, will increase in severity and pervasiveness during the next few decades (3). Marine heat waves are also increasing in frequency (4), causing poor marine survival of many salmon populations (5). The threat of climate change is here and demands action now.

Curtailling the rise of global air temperatures by reducing carbon emissions is vital for salmon conservation. Aside from emission reductions, we urge federal governments to prioritize climate change resilience in fisheries and environmental policy. This means protecting evolutionarily unique populations of salmon as well as diverse landscapes that naturally vary in hydrology (6, 7). It also means that the remaining hotspots of salmon productivity



Record heat has caused salmon to die from heat stress, putting populations at risk.

must be safeguarded against degradation.

One such region is the watersheds of Bristol Bay, Alaska, where the controversial Pebble Mine has been proposed (8). Bristol Bay supports the most abundant sockeye salmon populations in the world, with a wild salmon fishery that provides 12,000 jobs and generates \$1.5 billion annually (9) while providing food security for rural Alaskans. However, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recently overturned its previous conclusion that the mine would cause irreparable harm to this ecosystem (10); barring congressional intervention, the final permitting decision is expected from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in early 2020.

Habitat destruction has driven the collapse of wild salmon fisheries from California to Washington, where 93% of wild salmon abundance has been lost (11). Intact habitat confers resilience to environmental change; the Pebble Mine would erode resilience when it is needed most. The warming caused by global carbon emissions will continue to kill salmon (12) and will kill the jobs and food security that salmon provide if our governments do not give them a fighting chance.

Nicolas J. Muñoz^{1*}, John D. Reynolds¹, Jonathan W. Moore¹, Bryan D. Neff²

¹Earth to Ocean Research Group, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada. ²Department of Biology, Western University, London, ON, Canada. *Corresponding author. Email: nmunoz445@gmail.com

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. M. C. Martin, "Warm waters across Alaska cause salmon die-offs" *Juneau Empire* (2019); www.juneauempire.com/news/warm-waters-across-alaska-cause-salmon-die-offs/.
2. P. W. Mote, A. F. Hamlet, M. P. Clark, D. P. Lettenmaier, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.* **86**, 39 (2005).
3. S. U. Islam, S. J. Déry, A. T. Werner, *J. Hydrometeorol.* **18**, 473 (2017).
4. T. L. Frölicher, C. Laufkötter, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 650 (2018).
5. S. T. Lindley *et al.*, "What caused the Sacramento River fall Chinook stock collapse?" (Tech. Memo NMFS-SWFSC-447, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2009).
6. K. I. Ashley, in *Salmon 2100: The Future of Wild Pacific Salmon*, R. T. Lackey, D. H. Lach, S. L. Duncan, Eds. (AFS, 2006), chap. 4.
7. D. E. Schindler *et al.*, *Fisheries* **33**, 502 (2008).
8. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), "Pebble Project EIS" (USACE, 2019); www.pebbleprojecteis.com/.
9. G. Knapp, M. Guettabi, S. Goldsmith, "The economic importance of the Bristol Bay salmon industry" (Institute of Social and Economic Research, 2013; <https://iseralaska.org/publications/?id=1410>).
10. S. Bronstein, C. Devine, D. Griffin, A. Hackett, "EPA dropped salmon protection after Trump met with Alaska governor" *CNN* (2019); www.cnn.com/2019/08/09/us/epa-alaska-pebble-mine-salmon-invs/index.html.
11. T. Gresh, J. Lichatowich, P. Schoonmaker, *Fisheries* **25**, 15 (2000).
12. N. J. Muñoz, A. P. Farrell, J. W. Heath, B. D. Neff, *Nat. Clim. Change* **5**, 163 (2015).

10.1126/science.aaz3914

Science

Salmon in clear and present danger

Nicolas J. Muñoz, John D. Reynolds, Jonathan W. Moore and Bryan D. Neff

Science **366** (6465), 582.

DOI: 10.1126/science.aaz3914

ARTICLE TOOLS

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/366/6465/582>

PERMISSIONS

<http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.

Copyright © 2019 The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works