Message

From: MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[redacted]
Sent: 5/10/2016 10:15:57 PM
To: DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]
CC: MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]; WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]; SCHAUL, ANDREW [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]; DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]; QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000] [[redacted]@monsanto.com]
Subject: Re: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx

I concur with Sara and like the tone. Suggest a small add/edit to this bullet point:

Seeks to correct misinformation about our company and make sure that Monsanto's point of view or the views of our farmer customers are included in media coverage

Thanks,

Sam

Sent from my iPhone

On May 10, 2016, at 4:58 PM, "DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com> wrote:

> There may be some opportunities to tighten language, too.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2016 4:55 PM
> **To:** DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]
> **Cc:** WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000]; SCHAUL, ANDREW [AG/1000]; DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000]; MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000]; QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000]
> **Subject:** Re: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx
>
> Thanks, Christi. I like the tone. I'll review again more closely this evening and provide final back to this group.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On May 10, 2016, at 4:35 PM, DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000] <[redacted]@monsanto.com> wrote:
>
> > Sending full text for those working remotely—this also reflects Lee's changes.
> >
> > --
> >
> > Author: Sara Miller, Global Communications Lead
> >
> > **Peeling Back the Curtain on Peeling Back the Curtain**
> >
> > In my seven years as a corporate communications professional at Monsanto, I have had the pleasure of working with journalists from all over the world. I've treasured the experience. I value the opportunity to share our story and connect journalists with people who work for Monsanto, and the farmers that work tirelessly to feed our world.
> >
> > The vast majority of reporters have been fair, even-handed and committed to getting the story right – giving readers the opportunity to learn and to make judgments for

themselves. Some of those professional reporters have disagreed with us on key issues, but you would never know it from their coverage or what they posted on personal social media channels. That's because their main priority was to provide objective, factual information. We respect and appreciate that approach, and we continue to invest in building relationships with members of the media.

That's why an interview such as this one – given by former journalist Carey Gillam, is simply frustrating. She is a former reporter who left that career and became a paid employee of an anti-GMO activist organization, funded by the organic food industry. Ms. Gillam asserts that she came under pressure from our company about her coverage when she was still a journalist, and specifically that we would accuse her of being biased. Well, honestly, we did think she was biased. And we did have conversations with her editors. And we did check her facts. And we did scrutinize her intentions. The fact that she went directly from being a supposedly objective agriculture reporter to working at an anti-GMO organization suggests that our instincts were probably right.

Like most reporters, we work long-hours with reporters to share our perspective and help them get connected on the topics they're interested in. We, just like any other communications team at any other company, understand that reporters have a genuine interest in delivering a factual and balanced reports with multiple and diverse points of view. They don't want to get caught up in false balance or report on internet rumors. Most of the time this is our experience. And, where that's not been the case, we have asked media outlets to clarify or correct a misstatement or factual error. When those situations have occurred, media outlets are typically happy to make changes in pursuit of accuracy and in service to their audience.

Because Ms. Gillam is no longer a credentialed journalist, we are not in a position to respond to inquiries she makes as if she were a journalist. We understand she is now working for an organization that is interested in advocating for a very specific point of view. We respect her relentless tenacity to argue against science and the opportunities that it holds for farmers. We also disagree with this perspective.

However, we also believe in the work we do at Monsanto, including corporate communications. Equally important is the role the news media play in helping consumers learn more about us. We are absolutely committed to working with journalists. Every day, the Monsanto media relations team:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Provides journalists with accurate information
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Addresses tough questions about the challenges we are working to address
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Responds in a timely way to inquiries from news media outlets
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Encourages dialogue between journalists and Monsanto leadership
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Gives access to information and experts on a myriad of topics
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Seeks to make sure that Monsanto's point of view or those of our farmer customers are included in media coverage

It's unfortunate that any reporter would feel pressure from Monsanto to change their reporting style. But we also want to be clear: there are a lot of misleading claims out there about us and what we do, and we won't apologize for trying to change them or correct them. We champion a media landscape in which news outlets have access to company information and reliable sources, and where media have the freedom to write with journalistic hallmarks: fairness, accuracy and balance.

From: MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 4:12 PM
To: WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000]
Cc: SCHAUL, ANDREW [AG/1000]; DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]; DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000]; MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000]; QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000]
Subject: Re: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx

Thanks all for the feedback and various perspectives. While I agree we don't want to get into a tit for tat, I do think this warrants a response from us that speaks to the broader audience, other journalists we are trying to build relationships with and our own internal teams. Christi is cleaning up the draft to take out some of the very direct attacks against her and will recirculate.

Sara

Sent from my iPhone

On May 10, 2016, at 2:58 PM, WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000] <[redacted]@monsanto.com> wrote:

> I just don't like the idea of going tit for tat with her. She's annoying us, yes, but I think she does her best to bait us. She definitely does it on twitter by tagging us in tweets.
>
> Here's what I drafted back in March (reallllllllly rough) and shared with Cole. It's what Andy mentioned below—an op-ed type of piece of a j-school or major Communications publication or blogger. Opens our book on approach to media relations at a company with a few things to defend. We could even take some of the stuff Heather and I shared at Social Media.org for how we changed how we do crisis communications, or build off the GC 50 presentation on Zika.
>
> I just think going toe to toe with her is futile. Makes us feel good about ourselves. We should try an indirect approach to make ourselves appear as experts in the space, rather thatn going back and forth with a "journalist" who's a pain in the ass.
>
> Nick
>
> **Monsanto approach to media relations**
> With thousands of online outlets and bloggers joining traditional media outlets, there's more news coverage than ever of our company. When and where to draw the line on "who is a journalist and who isn't" can be a challenging task when you manage hundreds of media inquiries each year.

For our Media Relations team at Monsanto, here's our barometer to determine interaction with a journalist:
Are you fair?
Fair is subjective, of course, but after all is said and done, will you write an article or produce a video report that portrays all sides of a topic fairly?
We understand not every single article written about us will be positive and favorable. This is especially true in today's age of bloggers providing their opinions. Bias creeps into stories sometimes, and other times, it's right there in your face. Fairness is what we look for when we work with reporters.
Some reporters used to cover our business and have moved on to other communications positions.
One of those is Carey Gilliam. Ms. Gillam was a reporter at Reuters and covered our business for several years. She recently joined U.S. Right to Know, an organization aimed at lobbying the government for mandatory labeling laws, as a research associate. She recently penned an article for Civil Eats, "FDA to Start Testing for Glyphosate in Food," which contained several omissions of facts, and a statement at the end of the article: "Monsanto had no immediate comment."
As a result of her switch from journalist to research associate, we did not return Gilliam's calls. In our view, she is not a journalist.

From: SCHAUL, ANDREW [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 2:35 PM
To: MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]
Cc: DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]; WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000]; DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000]; MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000]; QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx

Apologies if I've missed other feedback from the group.

I have some data perspective and then a few thoughts:

Data:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->The link has been tweeted 226 times by influencers like Michael Pollan, Gary Ruskin, USRTK, Food Babe, Tom Colicchio (RT), Ralph Nader, Monica Eng and Organic Consumers Association, GM Watch, and Mercola
    - <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Monica Eng appears to be the only influential media person to have shared it https://twitter.com/monicaeng/status/730071573177110528
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]--> A little over half of this content is retweets and not original Tweets
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->This represents a small proportion of the Monsanto conversation on Twitter in this time period, nor has it

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Limitation: We can't see Facebook (HuffPo link says 1.7K likes)

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Keith Kloor engaged Michael Pollan with a quoted Tweet and link to another article https://twitter.com/keithkloor/status/730045823061479424

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Andrew Kniss engaged as well https://twitter.com/WyoWeeds/status/730086965505183744

I have a few thoughts on the approach:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->I think given the low volume and off-target influencers who have engaged online we might consider not launching this directly at Gillam in response to this blog

    - <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->I think this is exactly what she wants - and although our tone and approach is on voice, we can't expect her or Thacker to change in response to us. She and Thacker have taken common media relations tactics and framed them into an attack on her as a person and reporter and we can expect Thacker and her to do the same with this blog.

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Cole, Charla, and I discussed previously that this could be broadened, not directed at Gillam specifically, and placed at a J-School or somewhere to hit the journalism audience

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Of course third party content would be great as well

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->If this picks up steam or we see audiences of interest engaging I think we could revisit these thoughts

Summary: I think at this time we should avoid a direct response to Carey or Thacker pending changes in the data/conversation. I also think we should explore broadening the approach to hit journalism audience (media relations, false balance, responsible reporting) and I think if this could come from someone else that would be great.

ANDY SCHAUL
Monsanto Corporate Engagement
Fusion Center
[redacted] office
[redacted] cellular
[redacted]

From: MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 1:53 PM
To: SCHAUL, ANDREW [AG/1000]
Subject: Fwd: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx

Should have included you too.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>
> **Date:** May 10, 2016 at 12:04:50 PM CDT
> **To:** "MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>, "WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>, "DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>, "MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>, "QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000]" <[redacted]@monsanto.com>
> **Subject: RE: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx**
>
> My initial thoughts/comments are tracked in the attached.
>
> Christi

> **From:** MILLER, SARA E [AG/1000]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2016 11:27 AM
> **To:** WEBER, NICHOLAS R [AG/1000]; DUNCAN, MELISSA S [AG/1000]; MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000]; DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]; QUARLES, LEE [AG/1000]
> **Subject:** Fwd: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx
>
> I'm asking for just this small group's feedback on this potential post. Please let us know your thoughts. Again, idea is to address CG but also make sure we use it as an opportunity to speak to a broader audience letting them know her claims are inaccurate/it's not how we conduct ourselves.
>
> Thanks,
> Sara
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> > **From:** "Fields, Ken" <[redacted]@fleishman.com>
> > **Date:** May 10, 2016 at 11:18:59 AM CDT
> > **To:** "MILLER, SARA E (AG/1000)

([redacted]@monsanto.com)"
<[redacted]@monsanto.com>,
"DIXON, CHRISTI M [AG/1000]
([redacted]@monsanto.com)"
<[redacted]@monsanto.com>
Cc: "Dobson, JD"
<[redacted]@fleishman.com>
Subject: Response to Carey Gillam 5.10.16 DRAFT.docx

Hi,

Attached and below for those of you on phones is a quick response to Carey and the issues she raises.

Let me know what you think.

DRAFT
5.10.16

Peeling Back the Curtain on Peeling Back the Curtain

In my seven years at Monsanto, I have had the pleasure of working with all kinds of journalists. The vast majority of them have been fair, even-handed and committed to getting the story right – allowing readers to make judgments for themselves. I am sure some of those really good reporters disagreed with our company on key issues, but you would never know it from their coverage or what they posted on their own social media channels. That's because their first and only priority was to provide objective, factual information. We respect and appreciate that approach.

That's why an interview such as this one – given by former journalist Carey Gillam, is a little frustrating. She is a former reporter who left that career and became a paid employee of an anti-GMO activist group funded by the organic food industry. In the interview, Ms. Gillam asserts that she came under pressure from our company about her coverage when she was still a journalist, and specifically that we would accuse

her of being biased. Well, honestly, ee did think she was biased. And the fact that she went directly from being a supposedly objective ag reporter to being an anti-GMO activist suggests to me that we were probably right.

Like most reporters, we do expect news media coverage to be factual and balanced with multiple points of view. Most of the time it is. In a relatively few instances, we have asked media outlets to clarify or correct a misstatement or factual error. When those situations have occurred, media outlets are typically happy to make changes in pursuit of accuracy.

When she was a working reporter, Ms. Gillam would sometimes include factually inaccurate statements or non-supportable statements in her coverage. For example in this story she stated -- in reference to GMOs -- "...there are also many scientific studies showing links to human and animal health problems, and many indicating environmental damage related to GMO crops." To this day, I don't know what studies she is talking about, unless it is one that has been retracted and discredited by the larger scientific community. But, a reference to those unnamed studies seemed to make it into many of her stories. And, yes: we would occasionally point this point this out. I don't think that's any different than what anyone else would do.

Because Ms. Gillam is no longer a working journalist, we are not in a position to respond to inquiries she makes as if she were a journalist. We understand she is now working for an organization that is interested in advocating a point of view. We respect her new role – even though we may disagree with that organization on important issues. It's disappointing to us that she continues to confuse her current role as an advocate with her history as a reporter.

We believe in the work we do at Monsanto and the important role news media play in helping consumers learn more, so we are absolutely committed to working with journalists. Every day the Monsanto media relations team will:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Provide journalists with accurate information
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Address tough questions about the challenges we are working to address
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Respond in a timely way to inquiries from news media outlets
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Encourage dialogue between journalists and Monsanto leadership
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><!--[endif]-->Seek to make sure the point of view of Monsanto our customers is included in key media coverage

We're sorry Ms. Gillam feels like our company pressured her over her reporting. But we also want to be clear: there are a lot of misleading claims out there about GMOs, and we don't apologize for trying to change that. One of the reasons much of the general public is uncomfortable with GMOs, even though scientists overwhelmingly believe they are safe, ties back to sometimes misleading and inaccurate news coverage. These days, I think journalists generally do a pretty good job reporting on GMOs. But if Ms. Gillam ever decides to get back into journalism, I expect we might again find

ourselves asking her to correct items in her stories.