

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT  
ROUTING SLIP**

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1A	DCI		X		
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO		X		
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC		X		
11	IG		X		
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO		X		
15	VC/NIC				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
		SUSPENSE _____ Date			

Remarks

Executive Secretary

22 Dec 86

Date

STAT

Executive Registry

86- 5929x

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

December 18, 1986

MEMORANDUM TO ADMINISTRATION SPOKESMEN

FROM: TOM GIBSON *TG*  
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: Iran/Contra Issue

Attached are advocacy materials on the Iran/Contra affair for your information and use.

If the President's legacy of the last six years is to be sustained, your continued vocal and visible support in the New Year will be essential. It is not important or necessary to be knowledgeable on all aspects of the complicated Iran/Contra affair or even to speak with unanimity on the particulars of the issues involved. What is important is that we not falter in our support of the President or provide additional theater for the media with public disagreement on issues of secondary importance.

A subsequent package will contain additional materials, including speech inserts. If you have any questions on these materials, please contact the White House Office of Public Affairs.

DCI  
EXEC  
REG

*L-205-IR*

*CK - C-109-IR-IRAN*

## WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

December 18, 1986

### The Iran Issue -- Executive Summary

- o For six years, the American people have supported the President, have welcomed his leadership and prospered by it.
- o No one has challenged the President's motives in the Iran initiative. The President, as a leader, took risks commensurate with possible returns. Where implementation of the President's initiative fell short, the President acknowledges that mistakes were made.
- o In six years, the President and his supporters have compiled a remarkable record of achievement. Much remains to be done. Initiatives for the next two years will require unity.

### Contra Connection

- o The President categorically stated that he had not been informed of this activity.
- o Get the facts out -- The President has moved with unprecedented speed to organize an investigative effort:
  - 11/21 -- Ordered an Attorney General review;
  - 12/2 -- Urged the appointment of an Independent Counsel to look into possible violations of law; encouraged Congress to work efficiently and expeditiously in conducting their own inquiries.
  - 12/16 -- Urged Congressional Committees to grant limited "use" immunity to former NSC staffers John Poindexter and Oliver North in an effort to get the facts out to the American people quickly.
- o The President has made past and present personnel of his Administration available to the Congress to provide testimony.
- o Prevent Future Problems -- The President is determined to ensure that mistakes will not happen again:
  - 11/26 -- By Executive Order, created a distinguished bipartisan panel (Tower Commission) to review the future management and conduct of the NSC staff, and make recommendations for reforms;
  - 12/2 -- He named Frank Carlucci to head the NSC with authority to make necessary changes.

### Ongoing Concerns

- o In the event that additional information comes to light, such information will be weighed by the various investigating groups which will determine what is fact and render findings.
- o If persons have violated laws, they should be brought to justice in the courts. No one is above the law, and no one should be deprived of individual rights under the law -- including the right to protect oneself against self-incrimination.

## WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

December 18, 1986

### THE PRESIDENT & IRAN ISSUE

#### Leadership, Motives, and Risks

The Iran issue began with an assessment by the President that compelling reasons -- ending a bloody war, freeing American hostages, finding a long-term end to terrorism -- warranted the undertaking of a secret diplomatic initiative. The pros and cons of the initiative were fully discussed by the President's senior national security advisers.

- o There were great risks. The President, considering the advice, decided that the risks were commensurate with possible returns. History will judge the correctness of the President's decision.
- o Americans elect Presidents to lead. That is what the President has done since January 1981. There is a broad list of 6 years of accomplishments that reflect the benefit of a President willing to take risks. Examples:
  - The Economy -- Risk bold tax cutting initiatives to restart a stalled American economic engine. Result: Four years of economic growth and 12.3 million new jobs.
  - Achille Lauro -- Risk strained relations with friends to intercept terrorists. Result: International murderers brought to justice.
  - Grenada -- Risk the lives of American servicemen to liberate a country from Communist tyranny. Result: A people are set free and Soviets are denied another staging area in the Caribbean.

#### The President will Continue to Lead and Serve the American People

- o The leadership of President Reagan has fundamentally restored the stature of the Presidency in the American political system.
- o President Reagan's accomplishments since 1981 are manifold: Four years of economic growth; a government that works better; restored international stature for America; implemented a vigorous domestic agenda to fight crime, fight drug abuse, improve education, and salvage the Social Security System; promoted freedom and democracy in the world; and work for peace and provide for America's security.
- o The President has many key programs and issues remaining on his agenda. Initiatives for continued prosperity, responsible spending, and greater personal and national security for the American people lie ahead in 1987 and 1988.

For additional information, call the White House Office of Public Affairs; 456-7170.

## **WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS**

### Contra Connection

According to the Attorney General's preliminary report, staff of the National Security Council, acting without the knowledge or consent of the President, may have undertaken to provide financial assistance to freedom fighters in Nicaragua. (In 1986, the President and a bipartisan majority in Congress supported \$100 million in U.S. aid to freedom fighters in Nicaragua, with the implementation of that effort defined by Congress.)

- o The President, upon learning of this matter, moved immediately to get the facts, beginning with an investigation by the Attorney General. Likewise, personnel actions were taken: Admiral Poindexter's resignation was accepted; Oliver North was dismissed.
- o A swift investigation by the Attorney General revealed the need for additional review by independent parties.
- o At this point in time, and until the Independent Counsel conducts an investigation, and renders its findings, discussion of any violation of U.S. law is premature.

### The President Wants the Facts Out -- Quickly and Forthrightly

- o The President was first advised of the "funds to the Contras" scheme on November 24 by the Attorney General. On November 25 the Congress and the media were briefed on the matter.
- o A week after learning of the Contra connection and upon the disclosure of additional information by the Attorney General, the President urged the Attorney General to seek the appointment of an Independent Counsel to investigate the possibility of illegal activity.
- o The President has met frequently with leaders of Congress, urged an orderly investigation, and pledged his support. On December 16, the President urged Congressional Committees to grant limited "use" immunity to former NSC staffers John Poindexter and Oliver North in an effort to get the facts out to the American people quickly.
- o The purpose of the investigations is to get the facts out on the table on the Iran/Contra transactions.

### The President Will Fix the Problem

- o By Executive Order, the President empaneled a distinguished bipartisan Special Review Board (Tower, Muskie, Scowcroft) to investigate the procedures of the National Security Council staff that permitted them excesses and improprieties.
- o Personnel actions were taken to address existing problems at the National Security Council -- Frank Carlucci was appointed to be the new National Security Advisor to the President.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

December 2, 1986

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT  
TO THE NATION

The Oval Office

12:00 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon. Since the outset of the controversy over our policy relating to Iran, I've done everything in my power to make all the facts concerning this matter known to the American people. I can appreciate why some of these things are difficult to comprehend, and you're entitled to have your questions answered. And that's why I've pledged to get to the bottom of this matter.

And I have said earlier that I would welcome the appointment of an independent counsel to look into allegations of illegality in the sale of arms to Iran and the use of funds from these sales to assist the forces opposing the Sandinista government in Nicaragua.

This morning, Attorney General Meese advised me of his decision that his investigation has turned up reasonable grounds to believe that further investigation by an independent counsel would be appropriate. Accordingly, consistent with his responsibilities under the Independent Counsel Act, I immediately urged him to apply to the court here in Washington for the appointment of an independent counsel.

Yesterday, I had my first meeting with the Special Review Board. That Review Board is made up of three men of unquestioned integrity and broad experience in foreign and national security policy. In the meeting with the Board, they promised me a tough, no-nonsense investigation, and I promised them the full cooperation of the White House staff and all agencies of the Executive Branch.

No area of the NSC staff's activities will be immune from review. And when the Board reports to me, I intend to make their conclusions and recommendations available to Congress and to the American people. With the appointment of an independent counsel, we will have in place a dual system for assuring a thorough review of all aspects of this matter.

If illegal acts were undertaken, those who did so will be brought to justice. If actions in implementing my policy were taken without my authorization, knowledge or concurrence, this would be exposed and appropriate corrective steps will be implemented.

I recognize fully the interest of Congress in this matter and the fact that in performing its important oversight and legislative role, Congress will want to inquire into what occurred. We will cooperate fully with these inquiries. I have already taken the unprecedented step of permitting two of my former National Security Advisers to testify before a committee of Congress.

These Congressional inquiries should continue. But I do believe Congress can carry out its duties in getting the facts without disrupting the orderly conduct of a vital part of this nation's government. Accordingly, I am urging the Congress to consider some mechanism that will consolidate its inquiries -- such a step has already been requested by several members of Congress. I support the idea.

In closing, I want to state again that it is my policy to oppose terrorism throughout the world -- to punish those who support it and to make common cause with those who seek to suppress it. This has been my policy and will continue to be my policy.

If the investigative processes now set in motion are given an opportunity to work, all the facts concerning Iran and the transfer of funds to assist the anti-Sandinista forces will shortly be made public. Then the American people -- you -- will be the final arbiters of this controversy. You will have all the facts and will be able to judge for themselves -- yourselves.

I am pleased to announce today that I am appointing Frank Carlucci as Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. A former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Deputy Director of the CIA, and Ambassador to Portugal, Mr. Carlucci has the depth of experience in foreign affairs, defense, and intelligence matters that uniquely qualify him to serve as my National Security Adviser. The American people will be well-served by his tenure.

Thank you and God bless you.

END

12:04 P.M. EST

**PRESS RELEASE**

**THE VICE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY.**

FOR RELEASE

Wednesday, December 3, 1986

CONTACT: 202/456-6772

**REMARKS AS DELIVERED BY  
VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH  
AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE'S  
PUBLIC POLICY LUNCHEON  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1986**

Mr. President, at the outset of these remarks, let me just pay my respects to you and thank you for all you do for this wonderful institution, AEI, an institution for which I have so much respect. I'm delighted to see you. Bob Melott, too.

And, of course, I was invited sometime ago by Paul McCracken to come here, and I hope that you'll all be interested in the topic that Paul asked me to address: "Special Drawing Rights, the Snake and its Effect on Disintermediation."

I am delighted to be at this AEI forum. You couldn't have scheduled a better time to discuss public policy. A great many citizens currently are troubled about recent revelations, and I'm grateful for this chance to address some of those concerns of the American people.

There's been much criticism and confusion in recent weeks over the Administration's, our, policies regarding Iran. I understand the skepticism of the American people. The result, as you all know, according to these opinion surveys, is that the Administration's credibility has been hurt. This is especially painful to the President and to me as well. After all, we're in the White House because of the trust that the American people placed in us.

We must restore that trust and so today I'd like to discuss some of the basic concerns that the American people rightfully have about our policy toward Iran -- questions of why we tried to open channels, open channels with a regime that all of us Americans despise; questions of how we can have a policy of not sending arms to Iran and then seemingly do just the opposite; and questions about the operation of the National Security Council staff.

- more -



Let me start with a basic concern. Why did we open a dialogue with Iran?

Here was a country that deeply humiliated the United States by kidnapping our diplomats, burning our flag. We still have vivid memories of blindfolded Americans being paraded around our own Embassy in there in Tehran. There is in the hearts of the American people an understandable animosity -- a hatred really -- to Khomeini's Iran. I feel that way myself, to be very honest with you, and so does the President who has been vilified time and time again by Iran's radical leaders; we're told that most Iranians feel the same way about us, the country that they call the Great Satan.

So why have anything to do with them? I'm sorry I didn't bring a map, but if you look at a map, Iran is all that stands between the Soviets and the Gulf oil states. It's all that stands between the Soviets and a warm water port. Either a disintegrating Iran or an overly powerful Iran could threaten the stability of the entire Middle East, and especially those moderate Arab states -- our friends whose stability and independence are absolutely vital to the national security of the United States. We may not like the current Iranian regime, and I've said we don't, but it would be irresponsible to ignore its geopolitical and strategic importance.

That doesn't mean we should simply appease any Iranian regime. It does mean, however, that we can't ignore this looming transition that will soon take place in Iran. Khomeini will pass from the scene. A successor regime will take power, and we must be positioned to serve America's interests, and indeed the interests of the entire free world.

Apart from the strategic reasons, humanitarian concern about American hostages in Lebanon provided another reason to open a channel to Iran. The Iranians themselves are not holding our hostages, but we believe they have influence over those who do hold some of our hostages.

But let me add something very important. In spite of our bitter feelings toward Iran's leadership, we would've tried to begin a dialogue with Iran whether we had hostages in Lebanon or not. In fact, for three years prior to the first hostage kidnappings, this Administration attempted to find reliable -- hopefully moderate -- Iranian channels through which to conduct a responsible dialogue.

And more recently we've been receiving intelligence that pragmatic elements within Iran were beginning to appreciate certain sobering realities. To the east in Afghanistan, we estimate 115,000 Soviet troops are committing atrocities on

- more -

Iran's Islamic brothers. To the north, 26 Soviet divisions, right there on Iran's border for whatever opportunities might arise.

To the west, Iran is engaged in a war of unbelievably horrible human dimensions, war with Iraq -- 12-year old kids, 14-year old kids, pressed into service, and then ground up in combat. And at home, Iran is teetering on the economic brink right there in its own front yard, 40 percent unemployment rate. Many Iranian leaders understand that their own survival, and certainly the rebuilding of their economy, may depend on normalizing ties with their neighbors and with the Western world.

So, we for our reasons and certain elements in Iran for their reasons -- in spite of this mutual hatred -- began a tentative, probing dialogue -- which brings us to another question.

How can the United States Government have a policy against countries sending arms to Iran and then turn around and itself send arms? I know the American people simply do not understand this.

When we started talking to the Iranians, both sides were deeply suspicious of each other. And remain so, I might say. Those Iranians who were taking enormous personal risks by just talking to us felt that they needed a signal that their risks were worth it. We were told the signal they required, and we gave them that signal by selling a limited amount of arms -- about one-tenth of one percent of the arms that have supplied by other countries.

Likewise, we needed proof of Iranian seriousness. We required signs of a cessation of Iranian use of terrorism and help in gaining the release of our hostages in Lebanon. And we did see certain positive signs, we have seen them. They opposed, for example, the Pan American hijacking in Karachi and immediately after, they denied landing rights. They interceded with the TWA hijackers in Beirut. And, of course, three hostages once held in Lebanon by the Islamic Jihad are today with their families here in the United States of America.

And I, perhaps President Ford will agree with this, but when you are President, any American held captive against his will anywhere in the world is like your own son or daughter. I know that's the way our President feels about it. But you must remain true to your principles. And I can tell you the President is absolutely convinced that he did not swap arms for hostages.

Still the question remains of how the Administration could violate its own policy of not selling arms to Iran. Simple human

- more -

hope explains it perhaps better than anything else. The President hoped that we could open a channel that would serve the interests of the United States and of our allies in a variety of ways. Call it leadership; given 20-20 hindsight, call it a mistaken tactic if you want to; it was risky, but potentially of long-term value.

The shaping of the Iranian policy involved difficult choices. As complex as the public debate on the issue would be, the matter was further clouded by the way in which the President's goals were executed, specifically allegations about certain activities of the National Security Council staff.

Clearly mistakes were made.

Our policy of conducting a dialogue with Iran, which was legitimate and arguable, has become entangled with the separate matter of this NSC investigation.

A week ago Monday afternoon the President learned of possible improprieties. A week ago Monday. On Tuesday, he disclosed the problem to the public and instructed the Attorney General to go forward with a full investigation. On Wednesday, he created a bipartisan commission, outstanding individuals, to review the role of the NSC staff and make recommendations for the future. And just yesterday, he moved to appoint, have the court appoint an independent counsel to ensure a full accounting for any possible wrongdoing.

The President pledged full cooperation with the United States Congress, urging it to consolidate and expedite its inquiries. Yesterday he also named Frank Carlucci, a seasoned professional with broad experience, so well known to many people here, to serve as his national security advisor. Now this is fast action in anybody's book.

These are actions I fully support and which I believe the American people will judge commendable.

The President has moved swiftly, strongly, but let me add this. I'm convinced that he will take whatever additional steps may be necessary to get things back on track and get our foreign policy moving forward.

As the elected representatives of all the people, the President and the Vice President, he and I have a duty to preserve the public trust and uphold the laws of this country. We take that duty very, very seriously.

I'd like to say something about my role in all of this. I was aware of our Iran initiative and I support the President's

- more -

decision. I was not aware of and I oppose any diversion of funds, any ransom payments, or any circumvention of the will of the Congress, the law of the United States of America. As the various investigations proceed, I have this to say -- let the chips fall where they may. We want the truth. The President wants it. I want it. And the American people have a fundamental right to it.

And if the truth hurts, so be it. We've got to take our lumps and move ahead.

Politics do not matter; personalities do not matter; those who haven't served the President well don't matter. What matters is the United States of America.

And we musn't allow our foreign policy to become paralyzed by distraction.

There can be no denying that our credibility has been damaged by this entire episode and its aftermath.

We have a critical role to play internationally and I intend to help the President tackle the challenges that lie before us in the last two years of this Administration: Putting U.S.-Soviet relations on a new footing; pursuing a breakthrough in arms reduction; building on the potential that I saw so clearly just this past summer for making new strides for peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors; working to end apartheid and creating a more hopeful future for all Africans; solidifying the remarkable changes taking place in Asia; combatting international terrorism in close conjunction with our allies; and, of course, fostering the development of democracy in Central America.

And let me add, the freedom of the people of Central America should not, must not, be held hostage to actions unrelated to them. This nation's support of those who are fighting for democracy in Nicaragua should stand on its own merits, not hang upon events related to Iran. The Marxist-Leninist regime in Managua must not benefit from the errors of some people in Washington, D.C.

Our Administration has a duty to follow a foreign policy that reflects the values of its citizens. This sounds simple; and yet it is often, as so many of you here know, a very complex matter. It's not easy translating general values into specific foreign policy programs. And this is why there's always so much internal debate over our nation's role in world affairs -- from Iran to arms reduction.

- more -

The Reagan Administration has two years left in which to pursue our particular vision of how America's foreign policy should fit America's values. There's one thing, however, on which critics and supporters would agree -- U.S. foreign policy must move forward. The U.S. has obligations as leaders of the free world. It has opportunities and responsibilities unmatched by any other country to bring stability to the world. †

And we must move forward with the trust of the American people. To the extent that that trust has been damaged it must be repaired, and only the truth can repair that. Our government rules not by force or intimidation, but by earning the confidence and respect of the American people.

Our duty must be to uphold that confidence and restore that respect.

Sometimes true bipartisanship is called for and, in my view, now is such a time. And I have been very pleased that Republicans and Democrats alike have pledged to help get the facts out and move on.

A storm is now raging, but when the full truth is known -- and it will be; and when the American people come to understand that this strong and honest President moves swiftly to correct what might have been wrong, then a forgiving American people -- in spite of their misgivings about Iran and weapons and diverted funds -- will say, "Our President told the truth. He took action. Let's go forward together."

† † †

*Patrick J. Buchanan*

## No One Gave the Order To Abandon Reagan's Ship

Of all the lurid features in the bizarre tapestry of "Contragate," perhaps most revealing is the behavior of the Republican Party establishment, which owes all it has and all it is to Ronald Wilson Reagan. With a few honorable exceptions—J. Strom Thurmond and Ted Stevens come to mind—the whole damn pack has headed for the tall grass.

What a classic portrait in ingratitude!

Men who are Chairman This and Senator That only because of Ronald Reagan are today conditioning their future support of this embattled president upon their nonnegotiable demand that he sack some of his oldest and closest friends.

Only one month ago, this 75-year-old president was traveling the nation as no other president before him, fighting to save the Senate for these selfsame incumbent Republicans, throwing his arm around men—some of whom had cut-and-run on him in every major engagement he has fought since he came to the White House.

Is this how they repay the leader who has done more for the Republican Party than any American since Theodore Roosevelt, who brought us back from Watergate to become the party of vision and opportunity, the party of Middle America and the young—when all the pundits were saying we were finished for a generation?

If elemental loyalty cannot convince these Republicans to stand up and speak out for Ronald Reagan, what about basic self-interest?

Do these Republicans truly think the investigative engines of a hostile Congress and the artillery of an Adversary Press are all being wheeled again into position—simply "to get at the truth"? Do they seriously believe these pious declamations from the Democratic left that "we must not have another failed presidency"? Do they not recognize that the target here is not Donald Regan, but Ronald Reagan—that what liberalism and the left have in mind is the second ruination of a Republican presidency within a generation?

"This is the most fun we've had since Watergate," Ben Bradlee, editor of *The Washington Post*, is reported as saying. Bradlee is echoed by op-ed page columnist, Michael Kinsley: "The fall of Reagan is a laughing matter. The only irritating aspect of the otherwise delightful collapse of the Reagan administration is the widespread insistence that we must all be poker-faced about it."

"People in my position have been known to run for cover," declares Republican Sen. Rudy Boschwitz in one of the great understatements of the episode.

In recent years, Republican candidates have taken to prattling at election time about their devotion to "family values." But among the first of those values is family loyalty. And when a mob

shows up in the yard, howling that the head of the household be produced, the sons do not force the Old Man to sit down at a table and write up a list of his "mistakes." You start firing from the upper floors.

But we are a nation of laws, and Col. Oliver North broke the law, comes the Republican retort. Surely, we cannot condone that.

But we don't know that Ollie North broke the law.

What we do know is that those Americans who, a century ago, ran escaped slaves up the Underground Railroad to Canada—they broke the law. We do know that Franklin Roosevelt, who secretly ordered American destroyers to hunt down Ger-

---

*"Is this how they repay the leader who has done more for the Republican Party than any American since Theodore Roosevelt, who brought us back from Watergate?"*

man submarines in the North Atlantic and to relay the information to the British fleet—he broke the law. And those Americans who ran guns to Palestine in 1947 and 1948—they broke the law. And they are considered now—and they consider themselves—to be heroes. And Ollie North is a hero, the Billy Mitchell of his generation, a man who saw further than others and took risks to his own career, because he knew that in helping that peasant army in Nicaragua, he was buying time for his own distracted and indifferent countrymen—hold "the fort alone, till those who are half blind are half ready."

Ollie North is now disparaged as a "cowboy," a rogue, a "soldier of fortune" by our Lords Temporal on the Hill and our Lords Spiritual in the press. Well, the day the United States ceases to produce soldiers of the kidney and spleen and heart and soul of Oliver North is the day this country enters on its irreversible decline. The president was right. Ollie North is an American hero; and I am proud to know him as a friend.

---

*The writer is White House communications director.*

N.Y. TIMES: 11-26-86

## *Sister of U.S. Hostage in Lebanon Praises Reagan for His 'Courage'*

By WILLIAM G. BLAIR

A sister of an American captive in Lebanon, long a critic of Administration policy on the hostage issue, has written a letter to President Reagan in support of his Iran initiative and expressed "a deep sense of shame" that she had not spoken out sooner.

Peggy Say, sister of Terry A. Anderson, the 39-year-old captive chief Middle East correspondent of The Associated Press, wrote the embattled President that his "example of strength and courage in the face of criticism and censure prompted me to stand up and be counted as one more person that believes you pursued the right and just course."

Mrs. Say, reached by telephone at her home in Batavia, N.Y., said none of yesterday's developments, including the resignation of the President's national security adviser, Vice Adm. John M. Poindexter, had changed her mind.

"'Arms for Hostages' is a gross oversimplification of what has gone into this initiative but the next time somebody asks me if I want my brother back under those circumstances, instead of taking the cowardly way out and saying 'No comment,' my answer will be 'You're damn right I do!'" Mrs. Say, who is 45 years old, said in her letter to Mr. Reagan.

Mr. Anderson, who was abducted in Beirut in March 1985 by Islamic Holy War, a pro-Iranian Shiite Moslem group, is one of two American hostages still being held in Lebanon. Three others have been released since the secret Reagan Administration initiative began in September 1985. Still another is believed to be dead.

Mrs. Say, who has frequently prodded the Reagan Administration to do

more about winning the release of the hostages, said yesterday that she "felt differently" about the Iran initiative and had sent both open and private letters to President Reagan on Monday after "watching him struggle" at his news conference last week.

The open letter, she said, was sent to the newspaper USA Today, which printed it yesterday. The private letter, which she said was "essentially the same but slightly shorter and more personal," was sent to the White House.

"I know that I will be subjected to a great deal of criticism" for the letter, Mrs. Say said yesterday, "but I feel a tremendous sense of relief that I did the right thing and that I did what Terry would have wanted me to do."

After opening with an expression of her "support and deepest gratitude for the risks" the President assumed in dealing with Iran, Mrs. Say's letter said: "I apologize for not speaking out in strong support sooner, and feel a deep sense of shame at trying to evade the controversy surrounding this initiative."

"Like hundreds of thousands of others, in pleas, letters, and petitions, I urged you to do whatever needed to be done to gain the freedom of these men," Mrs. Say said. "I believe that you chose the course that you determined would be most effective in both the short and long term."

"If your initiative leads to reconciliation with Iran as a prelude to a peace plan in the Middle East, then all of the suffering will have been worthwhile," Mrs. Say said, adding that "it is not up to us to determine the method, it is up to us to support the goal."