This experiment seeks to analyze the affects that source cues and arguments affect public support for the 2015 Iran Nuclear Deal. Source cues can be defined as any person or group that a statement or belief is attached to, in order to shift support for that statement or belief. Research by Dr. James Druckman has shown that source cues based on trustworthy or those based on identity, are more effective than those seen as untrustworthy or unidentifiable. Meanwhile, past research done by Dr. Chris Haynes on arguments has found that arguments based on humanistic reasons tend to be ineffective when shifting public opinion on immigration. Previous research is still lacking on how these methods of framing affect public support for foreign policy. Given recent political crises have drawn public interest towards this area of policy, such as with the American withdrawal from the Iran Nuclear Deal, the opportunity arose to properly analyze it. A national online survey experiment was conducted to see how using President Trump's name as a source cue, shifted the percentage of support for the Iran Nuclear Deal among our participants, as well as how it shifts the percentage of support among our two main moderators, Democrats and Trump Supporters. We also tested a *diplomacy argument* to see how using this argument shifted support among our participants, as well as our moderators. As for using Trump as a source cue, there were no general effects on the percentage of support for the Iran Nuclear Deal among those that receive the manipulation, and those that do not. However, significant changes occur when we expose the manipulation to the two main moderators. The percentage of support for the Iran Nuclear Deal among Democrats shifts down when Trump supports the Deal. Meanwhile, the percentage of support for the Deal among Democrats shifts up when Trump opposes the Deal. As for Trump Supporters, the percentage of support for the Deal among Trump Supporters shifts up when Trump supports the Deal. Meanwhile, the percentage of support for the Deal among Trump Supporters shifts down when Trump opposes the Deal. As for the diplomacy argument, there were no general effects on the percentage of support for the Iran Deal among those that do not receive the manipulation, and those that do. However, our two moderators experience significant changes in their percentage of support. Democrats that are exposed to our manipulation shift up in their percentage of support, compared to those not receiving the manipulation. On the contrary, Trump Supporters that are exposed to the manipulation shift down in their percentage of support, compared to those not receiving the manipulation. It is hoped that this study will inform political activists, as well as those involved in politics, about how using Trump's name as a source cue and the diplomacy argument can affect how the public views and forms opinions on the Iran Nuclear Deal, as well as other such issues related to foreign policy.