

**FW: Moscow Notes**

---

**From:** Mills, Cheryl D MillsCD@state.gov

RELEASE IN PART B6

**To:** Burns, William J BurnsWJ@state.gov; Steinberg, James B SteinbergJB@state.gov

**Subject:** FW: Moscow Notes

FYI

-----

From: Rose Gottemoeller [mailto:

Sent: Mon 2/9/2009 11:01 AM

To: Cheryl Mills

Subject: Moscow Notes

B6

Dear Cheryl:

I was in Moscow last week for an event sponsored by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

While there, I had several conversations relevant to our relationship with the Russians. I am sending you a few points from my trip report in case Secretary Clinton may be interested.

Thanks, and best wishes, Rose Gottemoeller

No priority of importance suggested by the following order:

- \* Everyone very positive about the team being put in place. "People we can work with" was the overall assessment.
- \* Definitely ready to launch a fresh beginning and see if we can get a positive momentum going.
- \* Seems there has been an interagency review going on regarding 1000 warheads as a Russian option. The interagency have agreed to it; "only President Medvedev's signature is required."
- \* Ready to work with us on the denuclearization proposal of Kissinger, et. al., including practical measures to move in that direction.
- \* However, if the situation remains unclear regarding the missile defense deployments in Europe and NATO expansion to Ukraine and Georgia, then some linkage to projects of high priority to us both, including the START follow-on, may occur.
- \* Great concern was expressed that we are not getting started quickly enough; I was repeatedly asked when we could start talking START follow-on, and was constantly pinged for hints of the U.S. position. I kept repeating that I was in Moscow on NAS business and had no official standing; any comments I made were my personal and informal opinion.
- \* In light of the preceding, doubts that we could be ready with anything in time for a presidential summit meeting in the May timeframe.
- \* Welcoming attitude toward talking about missile defenses and the offense-defense relationship, including in a broad framework of "strategic stability" talks; also no allergy to talking about the theater missile defense project in the NATO-Russian Council.
- \* Didn't talk much about the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE), but I commented that there was a difference of opinion in Washington about whether the Russians wanted to preserve CFE or not. The answer was a resounding "yes, we want to preserve it" although we didn't talk about CFE in what form. I did ask, "including in the General Staff and MOD?" and the answer was still "yes."