



Why a Scientist Believes in a Creator: The Question Everything Else Depends On

By Jeff Bayard, Virginia Christian Alliance

How cause and effect, modern cosmology, and Genesis 1:1 all point to the same answer

Something From Nothing?

You have never walked into a kitchen, found a hot meal on the table, and assumed nobody cooked it. You have never stumbled across a house in the woods and credited the wind and rain for assembling it board by board. You have never received a text message and concluded your phone randomly generated the words.

You know better. We all do.

Every single day, you operate on a principle so basic it barely feels like a principle at all. Effects have causes. Things that begin to exist require something sufficient to bring them into existence. Hot meals require cooks. Houses require builders. Messages require senders. This is not religion. This is not philosophy. This is the ordinary reasoning you use before your first cup of coffee.

So here is the question this article will answer — and it is the question everything else depends on: *If every effect requires a sufficient cause, what caused the universe itself to exist?* It is the question at the heart of why a scientist believes in a Creator — and why you should consider the evidence too.

The answer will determine what you believe about life, death, morality, meaning, and your own eternal destiny. And it turns out, the answer is not nearly as complicated as some would have you believe.

A Platform We Can All Stand On

Before we open a single Bible or quote a single theologian, let us agree on what everyone — Christian, atheist, agnostic, and undecided — already knows from everyday experience.

Cause and effect is not a theory. It is the foundation of all rational thought. Courts of law depend on it. Medical diagnosis depends on it. Engineering depends on it. If you tell a detective that the bullet wound just appeared for no reason, he will not take you seriously. If you tell an engineer that the bridge collapsed without a cause, she will keep investigating until she finds one.

The [late Bill Nowers](#), a longtime Virginia Christian Alliance advisor and retired Navy Captain, put it in terms anyone could follow. Rain is a cause, and wet ground is the effect. But we cannot reverse the reasoning — wet ground does not prove it rained, because someone might have watered the lawn. A tree branch swaying does not prove the wind is blowing, because a child's swing might be attached to it. A cause can prove an effect. An effect cannot prove a cause. (For more of Bill's reasoning, see his article [The Real Cause is God](#) here on VCA.)

This distinction matters enormously. When we get to the biggest question of all — *why does anything exist?* — we need to be honest about which direction the logic runs.

Here is what we can state plainly. In all of recorded human experience, nothing has ever come from nothing. Zero produces zero. Every effect we have ever observed has a cause sufficient to produce it. That is not a religious claim. That is an observation as old as human thought itself.

So let us hold that common ground firmly as we turn to the biggest effect of all — the existence of the universe.

The Best Case for the Big Bang

Intellectual honesty requires that we present the strongest version of the opposing view before we examine it. This is no place for straw men or cheap shots.

Proponents of the standard cosmological model — commonly called the Big Bang — argue that the universe began approximately 13.8 billion years ago. They say it emerged from an incomprehensibly dense, hot initial state and has been expanding ever since. This model is not mere speculation. It makes specific, testable predictions: the existence of cosmic microwave

background radiation, the observed ratio of hydrogen to helium, and the measurable expansion of space confirmed by redshift.

These predictions have been confirmed. The cosmic microwave background radiation, first detected in 1965, matched theoretical expectations with remarkable precision. The model's mathematical framework is elegant and internally consistent. Mainstream cosmologists have refined it over decades with increasingly sophisticated observations.

This deserves honest acknowledgment. The Big Bang model describes the expansion and development of the universe from a very early state with genuine explanatory power. Many brilliant men and women have devoted their careers to this work. Their mathematical and observational achievements are real.

But describing *what happened after* the universe began is not the same as explaining *why it began at all*. And that is the question the Big Bang cannot answer.

Where the Foundation Gives Way

If you accept that every effect requires a sufficient cause — and we just agreed that this is basic reasoning — then the most important question in all of science is not “How did the universe develop?” It is “What caused the universe to exist in the first place?”

Here the naturalistic account grows strangely quiet.

The standard model traces the history of the universe back to what physicists call a singularity. That is a point of virtually infinite density and temperature. But what caused the singularity? On this question, the model that explains so much about what came *after* has nothing to say about what came *before*. The math breaks down. The physics reaches a wall.

This is not a minor gap. This is the foundation.

Consider the [Borde-Guth-Vilenkin theorem](#). Three physicists — none of them creationists, none attempting to prove God's existence — demonstrated something remarkable. Any universe that has been, on average, expanding throughout its history must have an absolute beginning. Not a recycled beginning. Not an eternal oscillation. A beginning — a point before which the universe, and time itself, did not exist.

Alexander Vilenkin himself has stated plainly that cosmologists can no longer hide behind the idea of an eternal universe. The universe began. Something brought it into existence.

The Escape Hatches That Don't Work

So what options remain?

Some physicists propose a multiverse. Perhaps our universe is just one of countless universes, each with different properties. Ours happens to permit life by sheer probability. But notice what

has happened here. We began with observable science — measurements, predictions, confirmed data. Now we have moved to an untestable hypothesis about unobservable universes that can never be confirmed or denied by any experiment. This is not science. By any honest definition, it is philosophy. And it answers the question “What caused the universe?” by multiplying the number of things that need causes.

Others suggest that quantum fluctuations in a vacuum could produce a universe from “nothing.” But a quantum vacuum is not nothing. It is a sea of energy governed by physical laws. Where did the vacuum come from? Where did the laws come from? The question simply moves back one step without being answered.

Bill Nowers used to tell a story about a philosopher who claimed the earth rested on a great turtle. When asked what the turtle stood on, the philosopher replied, “It’s turtles all the way down.” He had a point. At least the turtle story had a foundation, even if it was absurd. The naturalistic account of origins, when pressed to its base, has no foundation at all. It offers only an infinite regress of unanswered questions, or a quiet admission that the ultimate cause is unknown.

But unknown is not the same as unknowable. And cause-and-effect reasoning, applied honestly, points somewhere very specific. Let us follow it.

Why a Scientist Believes in a Creator: What the Cause Must Look Like

If the universe — all matter, energy, space, and time — had an absolute beginning, then whatever caused it must be outside of matter, energy, space, and time. This is not a leap of faith. This is a logical requirement.

Think about what that means. The cause of the universe must be:

Self-existent — uncaused, depending on nothing outside itself for its existence. If the cause itself needed a cause, we are back to turtles all the way down.

Eternal — existing outside of time, since time itself began with the universe.

Immensely powerful — sufficient to bring all matter and energy into existence from nothing.

Rational — capable of producing a universe governed by consistent, intelligible laws that can be discovered by minds. An irrational cause does not produce a rational universe.

Personal — capable of choosing to create. An impersonal force that exists eternally would produce an eternal effect. The fact that the universe *began* at a specific point suggests a volitional act — a choice, a decision, a will.

This is not “God of the gaps” reasoning. We are not pointing to something science cannot explain and inserting God into the darkness. We are reasoning from what we *do* know — cause and effect, the absolute beginning of the universe, the nature of the effect — to the characteristics any sufficient cause must have.

And when you line up those characteristics — self-existent, eternal, powerful, rational, personal — you are not describing some vague philosophical abstraction. You are describing someone. And that someone has not left us guessing.

The God Who Was Already There

The Bible opens with a sentence that answers the question science cannot: *“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”* (Genesis 1:1).

Consider how precisely this matches what cause-and-effect reasoning demands. “In the beginning” — there was a beginning. Modern cosmology confirms this. “God” — not an impersonal force, not a random fluctuation, but a personal, self-existent being who depends on nothing outside Himself. “Created” — a volitional act, a deliberate choice, not an accident. “The heavens and the earth” — everything. All matter, all energy, all space, all time.

In one sentence, written thousands of years before modern cosmology, Scripture states what science has taken centuries to approach. The universe had a beginning, and a sufficient Cause stands behind it.

The apostle John carries this further: *“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made”* (John 1:1–3). Here John identifies the Creator as the eternal Word — Jesus Christ — through whom all things were made. The First Cause has a name.

And the apostle Paul removes every excuse for ignorance: *“For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities — his eternal power and divine nature — have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse”* (Romans 1:20). Paul is saying that cause-and-effect reasoning, applied honestly to the created world, leaves no room for claiming the Creator cannot be known. The evidence is not hidden. It is everywhere.

The Virginia Christian Alliance holds firmly to the biblical account of creation as revealed in Genesis — [a six-day creation by the God who spoke the universe into existence](#). The debate between young-earth creationism and evolutionary timelines is important, and we will address it. But here, at the foundation, the question is simpler and more urgent: *Is there a Creator at all?* Cause and effect says yes. The universe’s absolute beginning says yes. And Genesis 1:1 tells us His name.

The Creator who made the universe is not a distant cosmic engineer who wound the clock and walked away. He is the God who made you in His image. He knows you by name. He entered His own creation in the person of Jesus Christ to redeem what sin had broken. The same power

that spoke galaxies into existence is the power that offers you forgiveness and eternal life. The First Cause is also the Redeemer — and He is calling.

What Will You Do With This?

Dear Christian: You do not need a PhD in astrophysics to see what is plainly in front of you. You use cause-and-effect reasoning every day of your life. You already know that nothing comes from nothing. The next time someone tells you the universe just appeared, or that science has disproved the need for a Creator, remember this: the very foundation of their argument has no foundation. They cannot explain why anything exists at all. You can. *“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”* Stand firm on that. Do not be intimidated by credentials when the logic is on your side.

And consider this: if this article made sense to you, it might make sense to the skeptic in your family. It might reach the coworker who thinks faith and reason are enemies. It might encourage the grandchild being told in a college lecture hall that science has made God unnecessary. Share it. Start a conversation. You do not have to win an argument — you just have to ask one honest question: *What caused the universe to exist?* Then let cause and effect do the work.

Dear skeptic, dear seeker: If you have read this far, something in you recognizes the logic. Every effect requires a sufficient cause. The universe had a beginning. Something — or Someone — is responsible. You do not have to check your intellect at the door to believe in a Creator. The evidence is not asking you to stop thinking. It is asking you to follow your own reasoning to its honest conclusion.

I would encourage you to read Genesis chapters 1 through 3 this week. Not as a religious duty, but as an honest inquiry. See if the God described there matches the First Cause that logic demands. And if you find that He does — do not be afraid of what that means. The Creator who made you is not your enemy. He is your hope.

The battle is real, but so is our God. *“The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands”* (Psalm 19:1). Every sunrise, every star, every law of physics operating with flawless precision — all of it is a signpost pointing to the One who made it all. Our calling is not to win arguments but to be faithful witnesses. And in the end, Christ will return and make all things right. Until then, we stand firm, speak truth, and trust the One who holds all things in His hands.

<https://vachristian.org/why-a-scientist-believes-in-a-creator-first-cause/>

For more from the Virginia Christian Alliance on biblical creation, visit our [Creationism archive](#).

For Further Study:

Borde, A., Guth, A., and Vilenkin, A. "Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions." *Physical Review Letters* 90 (2003).

<https://journals.aps.org/prl/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevLett.90.151301>

Vilenkin, Alexander. "The Beginning of the Universe." *Inference: International Review of Science*, 2021. <https://inference-review.com/article/the-beginning-of-the-universe>

Craig, William Lane. "The Kalam Cosmological Argument." *Reasonable Faith*.

<https://www.reasonablefaith.org/search/eyJyZXN1bHRfcGFnZSI6InNIYXJjaCI6ImtleXdvcmlRzIjoia2FsYW0iLCJzdWJtaXQiOiJHTyJ9>

Nowers, William E. "The Real Cause is God." *Virginia Christian Alliance*.

<https://vachristian.org/the-real-cause-is-god/>

For more from the Virginia Christian Alliance on biblical creation, visit our [Creationism archive](#).