

A discussion on Spirit, Death, Afterlife, Consciousness, Freewill, Suffering, and the moral in Job's story

Omar Abur-Robb

Library: omr-mhmd.yolasite.com

omar.robb@yahoo.com

May 2023

1# Spirit and Death	2
2# The Afterlife.....	4
3# Consciousness	5
4# The Freewill	7
5# The issue of suffering	7
6# The moral in Job's story	13

1# Spirit and Death:

The ancient conclusion about the existence of the spirit is sound and valid. However, I think the ancient couldn't escape the Metaphoric Syndrome, and with this syndrome, they derived false properties for this spirit:

The ancient knew about death, because they experienced it constantly. Therefore, it is expected that they will try and understand this phenomenon. The first obvious logical conclusion is that death is not life. This is actually a direct linguistic deduction: we see living people, then we see dead people, and the difference is that the dead are not alive.

I assume that from this direct linguistic deduction, they concluded that "Living" requires two things: Body and Life. From this conclusion they derived that life could be regarded as an entity, and they called it Spirit, which means breath; as breathing is one of the major signs of being alive.

All of the above deductions are sound and valid (regardless whether they were right or wrong). However, I assume that the ancient couldn't escape the Metaphoric Syndrome, which is the tendency of the next generations to transform the metaphoric expressions of the elders to literal expressions.

So, the Spirit means breath, and by the Metaphoric Syndrome, the next generations started to view the Spirit as a transparent foggy (misty) entity. Also, exhales in winter can be seen as white smoke, therefore, I assume they thought that spirits could sometimes look as white foggy form.

These properties for the spirit were based on false deductions.

As our understanding of life has improved, then we are in a better position to present a new improved model about the Spirit and Death: We can describe living organisms as biological programmed machines. We (humans) are programmed machines with highly advanced sophisticated intelligence. Mammals (including humans) have 5 clear software that are managing the body:

- The DNA, which is responsible for transforming embryos into babies.
- The DNA, which manage the activities of the cell.
- The software that runs the sub-systems in the body (example: the digestive system).
- The software in the Cerebellum which coordinate between sub-systems.
- The software in the Brain which learn, act, and react to surrounding environments.

We will group these software into two:

- The Alpha programs: which are the first 4 software in the list.
- The Beta Software: which is the fifth software in the list.

The alpha programs are almost the same (more or less) for all mammals. For example, the program that manage the blood circulation in rats is almost the same as the one managing

it in elephants. The difference is probably in the configuration extra subroutines of the program due to the different size between rats and elephants.

However, the beta software in humans is very different than mammals. But in general, every mammal species has a different beta software than the others.

Now ... All properties of hardware and software can be applied on mammals: Death happens when the beta software is no longer running (i.e. shut-down). This could happen by a fatal malfunction in the beta software itself or by a fatal malfunction in the hardware. The hardware here represents the brain, the body in general, and the alpha programs.

But it should be recognized that a fatal malfunction in the hardware would immediately cause a fatal malfunction in the beta software. Therefore, Death is the shut-down of the beta software due to a fatal malfunction.

Any software that manage a machine would include the following:

- The basic codes.
- The customized configurations related to the machine.
- The added sub-programs customized for the machine.
- The day-to-day data.

Therefore, the beta software in all humans includes the basic codes. But every human would have different configurations which is manifested by attitudes and temperaments. Also, every human would have different added sub-programs which is manifested by skills and capabilities. Also, every human would have different day-to-day data.

So, we could present a possible new definition for the “Spirit”, which is the “beta software”. When this software shut-down, then death happens. Therefore, living mammals require two things: body and active “beta software”.

The difference between our body and the artificial machines is that when the beta software shut-down then the whole body will start to self-digest and decompose. This doesn't happen with artificial machines.

But someone might wonder: why can't we just freeze the body before death until we have a better technology to solve the fatal malfunctions?

This might not be a practical solution: we can freeze fresh bread to use it afterward, and the defrosted bread would look like fresh. But we cannot do the same with tomato, because as water expands with freezing, it will break the pulp fibers in the tomato, therefore, it will become mushy after defrosting. Mammals body would react the same as tomato in freezing.

Now ... we have introduced a possible meaning for the “Spirit”, which is the “Beta Software”. But I can provide another definition for it:

Every programmed machine would require a starting-kick to start. Engines are programmed machines (because the valves need to open and close according the pistons movement), and the program here is not electronic (at least for the old engines) but it is a mechanical program. But this engine will not start to run (i.e. be alive) without a starting-kick. And this starting-kick is needed in all artificial programmed machines, mechanical or electronic.

So, let us look at living cells: if we took the nucleus from the cell, then it is expected that the cell will die. So, let us take the nucleus out of the cell then let us return it back. Therefore, all the components of the cell are there, but the cell is not alive. So, how we could return life back to this cell?

To do so, I assume we need to give it the starting-kick that would force the parts in the cell to move in harmony with each other.

Now ... We have presented two meanings for the “Spirit”, why?

Because the ancient gave two functions to the “Spirit”: the first function is the hidden entity that is needed to be alive, and in this case, it is the “Beta Software”. The second function which is the process that will return life back to the dead body. This process is not just the “beta software”, but also many other things including the “starting-kick”.

2# The Afterlife:

Now ... people who believe in God would normally believe in the afterlife, but people who don't won't. But in order to make this article interesting for both believers and non-believers; then let us just assume for argument sake that God exists and there is going to be afterlife. So, the question here: how could we return back to life?

As a believer, I won't be able to say in certain how this going to happen, but I am exploring here the simplest possible way based on the arguments in the previous subject.

So, let us start the exploration:

We could assume that life and afterlife are governed with laws. Furthermore, I would assume that Servants of God (i.e. angels) are following these laws. Therefore, I am going here to concentrate on these Servants rather than God.

So, the Servants need to create a body equivalent to our body in this current life. They can do this by having a copy of our DNA, and theoretically, a body can be created from the DNA.

Now ... the Servants won't need a sample of the DNA; they just need the codes of the DNA; as the DNA is just a serious of codes.

So, this scenario would include a large library that contains the DNA codes for all humans, and the Servants would just need take a copy of these codes.

So, the body problem is solved as the body can be created (theoretically) from the DNA codes, and it would be unconscious with a temporary basic beta codes.

Next ... the Servants need to upload our beta software. Therefore, the Servants in our current life need to have periodic backups of our beta software.

Interestingly, we do the exact same things with our artificial machines: we backup our computers before or after important events, and we also backup our computers periodically.

So, in the library that I spoke about before: there is also an archive for all the backups of all humans.

So, there is the body here, and there is also a copy of the beta software (which includes the basic codes, the configuration, the sub-programs, and the day-to-day data). Therefore, the Servants would just need to upload the software to the body.

But this is not enough, because uploading the beta software doesn't mean that it will be immediately active. So, the Servants need to activate this software by the starting-kick, and with it ... we are back.

3# Consciousness:

This is a term that we might feel it is clear, but it is very hard to define. So, we know that we are conscious, and in conscious time we are quite sure that we are not dreaming. However, we might be in a dream and we feel that it is so real. One of the techniques that is used to create the lucid dreaming is to train yourself to ask this simple question in the dream: am I dreaming? And by the answer of this question you will realize if you are dreaming or not. This is how you might enter lucid dreaming (i.e. to be in a dream and being totally aware that you are in a dream). Unfortunately, this easier said than done: I only have been three times in lucid dreaming, and it was just by coincidence.

So ... it seems that we are wired to recognize if we are conscious or not.

Now ... the linguistic definition for conscious is "aware" and the linguistic definition for consciousness is "the state of being aware". But these are not the scientific and philosophical definitions that we are aiming for here. We want to understand how we are different than intelligent androids? and do cats have Consciousness?!

If cats are aware of themselves, and consciousness is related (somehow) to awareness, then cats should have Consciousness.

As I said, Consciousness (from the scientific perspective) is a term that is very hard to define. So, I am just going to present my thoughts about it: I truly think that consciousness (or the major part of it) is just an intended fault in our design (which was installed by the Divine), which no engineer will dare to install in any machine. This fault is our moods, instincts, ambitions, and the ability to follow them against laws and

moralties. This is actually the main part in the freewill; which is the ability to follow mood over morality.

To clarify the terminology: The fault in our design is not a fault because it is intended in the design, and actually it is the main part of this design. But it could be regarded as a fault from our engineering perspective; because no engineer will specify it in machines.

So, with today's technology, we can install this fault in cars (for example). So, we can make cars that are moody with instincts (etc.):

So, let us design such a Car. Let the Steering and Break be performed mechanically (just to make us feel comfortable in reading and examining this example). Therefore, the driver has a direct control over the steering and break, but all other things are controlled electronically, so hitting the gas pedal will send a signal to the software in the Car, and the software will deal with it. So, everything in the Car will be controlled by the software except the steering and break.

Now ... we can install moodiness, instincts, and desires in the codes of this software. So, if the driver of this car is acting in an appropriate way, then s/he will find the Car reacting properly, otherwise, the Car might be a bit stubborn. Also, we can program the Car (via the software) to feel distress and pain, so if the driver slap the car, then this act will be registered in the Car memory as pain, and when the driver clean the Car and provide it with fuel, then this will be registered as pleasure. The Car can also be programmed to avoid pain and seek pleasure by using decision-making-processes that depend on set of criteria as principles, moods, instinct, etc. However, the priority in this set is not fixed but it depends on how the driver is/was acting with the Car, and it also depends on the surrounding environment.

Who is going to buy such a Car, who is going to ride this Car, and which country will allow this Car!

Some might think that our intelligent brain is the thing that make us Consciousness, but cats don't have our brain, but they seem that they have Consciousness, and the reason is that they have the same exact fault in their design (moods, instincts, desires, etc.).

Our brain has the ability to recognize solid and abstract entities, to analysis things to its main or prime components, to synthesize and group these components into different ways in order to innovate a solution for a problem. AI (artificial intelligence) is heading into that direction. But let us suppose that we have managed to design a software that have the same exact capability as our brain, then we would have a system that can present novel working solutions for our problems, but this is not Consciousness unless we installed our "fault" in this software, and I don't think any programmer would do such a thing.

Now ... Suffering can be regarded as the direct consequence of this fault, as this fault will cause internal and external competitions that would results in fierce struggles.

However, this fault is the best biological recipe for innovation and development. It seems to me that heaven decided that human suffering (which is caused by this fault) is an accepted cost for human innovations and developments. If you look at it, competitions and suffering were the main cause for innovation specially in the field of law and morality. Humans are moving toward more morality though the movement is very slow.

Androids with a software equal to our brain without the fault in our design are almost like angels who won't have the drive for continuous development. Our brain will allow us to innovate, but the drive and motivation for innovation is from this fault in our design.

My argument here is that this fault in our design is the source of our consciousness, and as I have said before, this consciousness could easily be installed into machines, but no engineer would dare to do so.

4# The Freewill:

So, based on our previous discussion, what is freewill?

To my understanding, freewill is our ability to choose from the available options. We are able (as biological programmed machines, with very advanced intelligence capabilities) to choose from the available options and even to try and increase the number of these options.

So, it is not actually a "free will", but it is a "free choosing" from a list of options. But we are unable to choose an option that is not available in the list. So, we cannot (at least in our current level of technology) to shift the orbit of Mars. This option is not yet in the list.

In general, we are able to choose according to many criteria as: our principles, laws, desires, instincts, mood, etc. As we have different hierarchy of criteria, therefore, we have struggles in the community and also between communities. These struggles are the main causes of suffering.

5# The issue of suffering:

This subject has been associated with the existence of God, and the basic question here: If God exists then why he allows suffering on Earth?

However, this question hasn't been presented as an enquiry question, but as an argumentative one to show that God doesn't exist. But the answer "I don't know" is sufficient for this question, because this question cannot be transformed into solid logical statement. For example, let us transform this question to the following statement:

- If God does exist, then there will be no suffering on Earth
- There is suffering on Earth.
- Therefore, God doesn't exist.

The first term in this statement is weak and cannot be verified. Therefore, the inability to answer these types of questions doesn't make any argumentative difference.

Also, there were efforts to use the suffering verses in the theology to prove that God doesn't exist. But this approach has a clear paradox in it: In order to use theology to prove the non-existence of God, then we need first to prove the theology itself.

Also, there are some anthropomorphism arguments related to suffering, for example the following logical statement:

- A1. An able King who sees the suffering and doesn't act is careless.
- A2. God is the King of the universe.
- A3. There is a lot of suffering in the world.
- A4. Therefore, (by A1) God doesn't care.

But the validity of A4 is in question as it is based on anthropomorphism: We are applying the laws and concepts that are related to humans on God. But applying the laws of a closed system (our universe) to an external entity (God) might produce bizarre contradictions. Therefore, there are serious concerns about the validity of A4.

My argument here is that the issue of suffering cannot be used to argue about the existence of God or to argue about the properties of God, and the existence of God needs to be discussed using other different arguments.

But still we have a valid question: If God exists then why he allows suffering on Earth? But this question shouldn't be presented as an argumentative one, but as an enquiry one, and we will try here to answer this question or at least to have more awareness about it:

5.1# The laws of nature will not change. Therefore, if some people believed that God created the universe then they need to realize that God won't change the laws of the universe for them. Or in more precise statement: breaking the laws of the universe is the rare exception and not the norm.

This can clearly be understood in Quran 33:62, 35:43, 48:23. For example, let us see Quran 33:62 (Translated by quran.com):

That was Allah's way with those 'hypocrites' who have gone before. And you will find no change in Allah's way.

“Way” is the English translation of the Arabic word “Sunnah”. Sunnah means the way, which would include methods, processes, (etc.). For example: “the sunnah of the King” means the way that this King is doing things in the kingdom. Although “Laws and Dynamics” are probably new concepts, but still, they can be included within the word “Sunnah” because if I want to explain the meaning of “the sunnah of the universe” then it will be: the way things are done in the universe, which would include the laws and dynamics. Therefore, The following two lines have the same meaning in the current Arabic literatures:

The sunnah of God in the universe.

The sunnah of the universe.

It might be useful here to explain the meaning of the previous Quranic verse:

It seems that the leaders of the hypocrites (the people who say that they are Muslims, but they are not) were planning a serious scheme. The verses 33:60 to 33:62 issued a serious and final ultimatum to these leaders: either they will end their scheming all together or they will be gathered and executed. This message was loud and clear, and the scheming ended.

However, verse 33:62 is a general statement (the sunnah of God will not change) that is above the specificity of the subject. For example: I am warning my friend from trusting an individual who is known of being dishonest. So, I am telling my friend: don't trust him, schemers will always be schemers. Now, there is a specific subject here, but I ended it with a general statement that is above the specificity of the subject.

5.2# The suffering of people is not a direct act from God, but it is just a consequence of the laws of nature. Suffering is the outcome of how people deal and react to these laws. This can be explained by the following examples:

5.2.1# God gave the Israelites a proper set of laws. They follow it and later they formed a strong kingdom. However, many of the leaders and religious authorities started to abuse these laws for their own benefits. This put the seeds of hypocrisy and unjust inside the community. This normally will lead to serious internal struggles that will weaken the community, which will end up by either a civil war or a foreign entity comes in and take the country.

It has been said that the great civilization will never be conquered from without until it is destroyed from within (Will Durant). The suffering here came from the Israelites themselves playing unfairly with dynamics of the social system (which is part of the laws of nature).

5.2.2# The laws of nature produce some natural catastrophes. However, the true suffering comes from the actions and reactions of the people toward these catastrophes: if the people are really fair with empathy toward themselves then the people as a whole will be able to overcome these catastrophes. But if the people are unfair (except superficially) then this will result in a very serious suffering to many people.

5.3# Taking the previous point one step further, I can say that “suffering” is generally a natural consequence for the decisions that were made before.

Let us have the following examples:

5.3.1# Looking at example 5.2.1, the suffering of the Israelites came because the leaders and religious authorities of this community made private and selfish

decisions in the past, which started the vicious circle of many other selfish decisions, that ended by either civil wars or foreign occupations.

5.3.2# Looking at example 5.2.2, the reactions of unfairness in the community when facing a natural disaster is an attitude that was inherited from previous generations. This attitude didn't start in the community from nothing, but it was based on series of decisions in the community that ended up with this attitude. This attitude of unfairness is the real cause for suffering.

5.3.3# Suppose we are in community that is truly fair and just. Suppose there was wealthy family-based corporation, and the appointed members of this family have chosen Simon to be the head of this corporation as it seems that he got the right skills for the Job. But suppose Simon wasn't really that skillful, and with some very bad decisions that he made, the corporation went into bankruptcy and the family lost their money.

The question here ... what the community can do for them?

They can confiscate Simon's money, but it seems that Simon truly thought that his decisions were going to be fruitful and he lost his money as well. Also, if Simon was dishonest on these decisions then he would be severely punished for his dishonesty, for at least to warn others of this conduct. Also, The community could help the family, not because they were rich and became poor, but because they are poor. But other than that, the community cannot help them, and the suffering here came to the family from wrong decisions that were made before in their behalf.

5.3.4# Suppose you are in the jungle and you noticed a Cheetah that is hunting a Gazelle, and you are able to prevent the gazelle from being hunted and killed. What will you do?

If you saved the gazelle, then you probably caused the cubs of the cheetah to die in hunger. This is a tough call, and the advice that is always be given: Don't interfere with the natural dynamics of the Jungle, and just let the Jungle mange itself.

I would assume that the jungle contains true suffering, and sometimes one would wonder why God allowed this suffering!

However, let us look at this matter from a different angle, but before doing this, let me just clarify a misconception:

There is no clear and direct verse in the Quran that object to the idea that Elephants and Rats had a common ancestor millions of years ago. The only objection in the Quran with the scientific theory of evolution is related to humans, and humans are just one species among one billion. Therefore, the gap between the Quran and the theory of evolution is just

“one over billion”. But even this gap can be reduced to “one over trillion” (see article #57 in the library site).

Having said that, then we can agree that the Cheetahs and Gazelles did have a common ancestor millions of years ago, and this common ancestor was probably a grass eater. So, this common-ancestor did have babies, and one of them (A) was the ancestor of the Cheetahs and the other one (B) was the ancestor of the Gazelles.

However, “A” didn’t just start to hunt and eat meat. The process from “A” to Cheetahs took a long series of decisions and mutations. But decisions were deliberate while mutations were random. So, one of the ancestors of Cheetahs decided to taste meat from time to time, his decedents might have kept this norm, and suddenly few mutations supported it, and through a very slow step by step stages, we ended up with the Cheetahs.

My point here is that “A” (the one that started to depart from his siblings) didn’t just have a mutation, but there was (before the mutation or after it) a decision related to this departure.

So, my argument here is that Cheetahs are the outcome of a long series of decisions (with supported mutations) that was made by its ancestors.

Equally can be said for the Gazelles.

Now ... the outcome for any decision would include the benefits and consequences. A good decision is the one that has valuable benefits and harmless consequences.

So, we can apply this into the wildlife:

The benefits that came from the decisions of the ancestors of the Gazelles: the food is always there, they multiply quickly, they are numerous in numbers, etc. The consequences: they are always running for their life from predators.

The benefits that came from the decisions of the ancestors of the Cheetahs: they are strong, they have little predators stronger than them, they are fast, etc. The consequences: they could always be hungry and normally they die hungry, they have vicious competition between themselves and also between other predators, etc.

The suffering in the jungle didn’t come directly from God, but it came from the laws of nature as consequences for decisions that were taken before.

5.4# However, it seems that God does support people, but within the laws of nature. And I think this is understandable: People when praying and asking God, they don’t normally ask for things that break the laws of nature, but they ask for insights, support and good luck. These all can be given without breaking any laws.

However, I think many of these gifts (insights, support and good luck) are provided without a direct act from God:

It has been observed that the subconscious mind is powerful, and if it was directed properly then it can help in achieving our objectives. There are many techniques that help to direct the subconscious mind (as autosuggestions). However, praying can do the same thing in directing the subconscious mind. Therefore, many gifts that came from praying were actually coming from the laws of nature.

[It should be noted here that the term subconscious is a philosophical term that doesn't have a scientific reality, but it is a very useful term as it can be used to generate effective techniques to support the mind and body]

Nonetheless, I still think that God does support people directly from within the laws of nature, and it is not bad to think that incidents that we call them "extreme luck" could be examples of such support.

However, I know for certain (based on my metaphysical beliefs) that God exists, and he designed the laws of nature, and I truly don't care much if the support of God came from these designed laws or it came directly from God.

5.5# As we have mentioned before, it seems that the laws of nature have been designed in a way that uses suffering as a motivation for developments and innovations. Therefore, it seems that the Designer decided that suffering is an accepted cost for these developments. This is tough and hard, but it isn't my call, and it isn't my decision. However, we are equipped (I hope) with the mental abilities and determinations to overcome suffering while keeping the developments running. Looking at the history of humans, they are moving in this direction but very slowly.

5.6# So, my argument in these previous points is that suffering in general is not based on a direct act from God, but it is based on the people playing unfairly with dynamics of nature and being unfair with each other in reacting to natural catastrophes. So, in a nutshell, the true reason of the suffering of people is the unfairness of people for each other. This unfairness evolved within the communities via series of decisions that was made through the previous years.

It is clear in most theologies that the son is not charged in the court with the sin of the father, and the son is innocent from the sin of the father. This is issued by most theologies and by all fair laws. But from the laws of nature, the suffering of the current generation is a consequence of the sin, mistakes and bad decisions that have been made in this current generation and the generations before.

The best way for the current generation to manage and overcome suffering would be through acknowledging the problem and acknowledging the series of causes and effects, understanding the laws of nature (specially the social laws) and to deal with them in harmony. But all of this require true fairness and empathy from the people, which might be difficult to materialize.

6# The moral in Job's story:

One of the main stories that is used to discuss suffering by believers and non-believers is the story of Job. Job was mentioned briefly in the Quran, and therefore, I will depend on the story mentioned in the Old Testament (OT). However, the story in the OT has two parts:

- The non-earthly narratives: God discussing with Satan, and Satan suggesting examining the faithfulness of Job, and God granted this suggestion, and Satan caused serious suffering to Job, etc.
- The earthy narratives: which says that Job lost his family and his work, etc.

But how did the authors of this story know about the non-earthly narratives! Even Moses probably didn't know anything that happened above earth. So, how these authors knew! The idea here is that the non-earthly narratives seem to be just a fabrication, and it never happened.

However, in the Quran, there are two verses related to Job in this regard:

Verse-A: In Quran 21:83 (Translated by quran.com):

And 'remember' when Job cried out to his Lord, "I have been touched with adversity, and You are the Most Merciful of the merciful."

Verse-B: In Quran 38:41 (Translated by quran.com):

And remember Our servant Job, when he cried out to his Lord, "Satan has afflicted me with distress and suffering."

But the word "Satan" in the previous translation is wrong. The Arabic word is "Shaytan", and the meaning of it in Arabic: "All fiercely rebellious of the jinn, humans and animals". Therefore, a wild beast or a harmful Bacteria can be regarded as Shaytan. So, the word Shaytan doesn't necessarily mean the Devil (Iblis), but the meaning would be derived from the context.

Furthermore, "Satan" in Hebrew means "the objector", which can be for good or bad. Therefore, "Satan" is not the same as "Shaytan".

So, we have here two options:

Option-1: The adversity in verse-A caused by the Shaytan. Therefore, the meaning of Shaytan here could be the Devil.

Option-2: The Shaytan in verse-B is the "adversity" in verse-A, therefore, Shaytan here is not related to the Devil.

However, in Quran 4:76 (Translated by quran.com):

... Satan's schemes are ever weak.

Also, The Arabic word for “Satan” here is Shaytan. From the context of this verse, we can conclude that the Shaytan here is the Devil (Iblis). As the schemes of the Devil is weak, therefore, we can conclude that Option-1 is unlikely. Therefore, it is highly-likely that the Shaytan in verse-B is the “adversity” in verse-A. My point here is that the interpretation of Job’s verses in the Quran doesn’t likely suggest that the suffering of Job was caused by the Devil (Iblis).

So, here is the breakdown of the earthy-narratives of the OT for the story of Job:

6.1# Job believed in God.

6.2# Job went into series of sufferings.

6.3# Job didn’t lose faith with God. This kept Job holding himself. Therefore, this series of suffering didn’t cause Job to become addicted to alcohol or drugs, he didn’t leave home in despair, and he didn’t commit suicide. But he managed to hold himself. This hold was the direct result of having faith.

6.4# This series of sufferings have ended.

6.5# It has been said that: the hit that doesn’t break the bones will make you stronger. Passing through this cloud of suffering in one piece made him stronger and more resilient, and he manage to recover and gain back what he lost.

#####

This is the abstract of the story (without the Non-earthy narratives in the OT) from the start to the end. This story didn’t break the laws of nature, and we can see similar themes of this story almost every day. I think there is a movie with a similar true theme that was acted by Will Smith (The Pursuit of Happiness). However, we can say that the story of Job is the first story of its kind in history.

Similar stories happen also to atheists, and if we asked them how they passed through these clouds of sufferings, their answers would be that they believed in something (self, love, hope, etc), and this belief hold them from breaking.

I don’t think that the earthy-narratives about Job in the OT or the Quran give clear indications that having faith in God will definitely allow you to pass safely through the cloud of suffering. But if there was just a tiny chance to be able to pass through this cloud, then it is very vital to be able to hold yourself from breaking. Believing in something noble that is larger than yourself can hold you during the time of suffering. Believing in God do exactly the same thing with probably extra benefits.

But still, some people do have faith in God and go through the cloud of suffering in hope, but they might not succeed. Nonetheless, failing while holding yourself is much more decent than making some unfortunate extreme irreversible decisions that some individuals might do as to commit suicide or to runaway via substance addictions.

It should be clear here that illness is not a decision, and it is probable that Job was depressed, as this is a natural behavior for humans in such circumstances. But he managed to hold himself while passing through this cloud of suffering, and this is the significance of this story.

Having said all the above, I do acknowledge that there might be some extreme cases that are completely beyond any individual to handle, therefore, we might understand these individuals' irreversible decisions. These are extreme cases that I am not discussing here. But from the general perspective, it is much better for the people to hold themselves while passing through the cloud of suffering than to make a sudden unfortunate irreversible decision.

So, the earthy-narratives of the story of Job are really useful and inspiring, and the moral and significance of this story: If Job and others have passed through the clouds of suffering without breaking down, then I should be able to do the same.