Rabbosai,

I would like to encourage you to please study this "Additional Sources" (with my interpretations and comments) for some advanced fascinating, controversial, and provocative ideas on the topic. There should be enough material to last the entire night especially if you go through the sources and study them carefully. Of course, for those who are unable to stay up all night, the rest of Shavuos is still a most appropriate time for Limud HaTorah!!

After Yom Tov, I will be glad to hear from you with your thoughts, questions, additional sources, etc.

We thank the following families for Dedicating and Sponsoring the All Night Shavuos Learning Program. May all the Torah Learning be a Zechus for them and their loved ones. Tizku LiMitzvos!!!
Dedication

Mark & Judy Frankel and Family dedicate The All Night Shavuos Learning Program LZ"N their dear son Yehuda – Moshe Yehuda ben Meir Eliyahu, Z"L. We are sure that he is enjoying a Lichtegte Gan Eden. May his Neshama have an Aliyah and may the family know of only Simchas going forward.

Main Sponsor

Avi & Sarita Grossman, LZ"N Sarita's Parents – Reb Ber Leib ben R' Yaakov Yitchak Pernikoff, Z"L (whose Yahrzeit is the 2nd day Shavous) & Nessa bas R 'Abba Zvi, Z"L (whose Yahrzeit is the 9th of Tammuz).

Sponsors

Anonymous Family
Anonymous Family
Anonymous family (LZ"N יוסי שמואל בן נתן אברהם (June 13, 1967 - ה סיוון תשכז) and אסתר בת ישראל יצחק (June 1944 - 1944)
Rabbi Shmuel & Sury Bialik
Gavriel & Yaffa Gavrielov (L'Zechus Refuah Shelayma for all the Cholim in Klal Yisrael)
Rabbi Robert & Dafna Greenberg (LZ"N Roberts parents, Mordechai Aryeh ben Yitzchak Isaac z'l and Yenta bas Menachem Mendel HaKohen z'ld.)
Yehuda & Rivka Gitnik (commemorating the yartzeit of Rivka's father, Yisroel ben Yosef – Irving Posner, Z"L)
Rabbi Eliyahu & Faige Hartman
Jonathan & Gela Horn and Family  (In Memory of Morris and Hannah Goldstein, Moshe ben Alexander Zishe, Z"L and Channah bas Avraham, Z"L)
Sam & Maxine Kosofsky
Nitsan Lavie & Family  (l'ilui nishmos Mindel bas Mordechai , Z"L and Aharon ben David, Z"L.)
Sid & Diane Lichter  (I/H/O the Bat Mitzvah of their granddaughter, Aly, daughter of Ilana and Joseph Lichter & the Bat Mitzvah of their granddaughter, Chana Mindel, daughter of Rina and Yakov Lorch & for the zechus for a zivig hagun for Raizel bas Freidel Rivka & for the zechus for a zivig hagun for Miriam bas Freidel Rivka.)
Drs. Akiva & Tamar Perlman  (in the honor of our beloved community and our love for Torah.)
Josh & Mindy Rosenthal  (LZ"N Josh's father's yahrtzeit (Aharon ben Yehoshua Zelig, Z"L) which is right after Shavuos.)
Dr. Marc & Toby Singer
Arthur & Fern Sisser  (in honor of the graduation of their grandson Yosef Sullivan from MTA (Yeshiva University High School for Boys) and the Bat Mitzvahs of their granddaughters Sarah Leah Sullivan and Rebecca Sisser.)
Drs. Josh & Rachel Sisser  (I/H/O Josh's new job that he started this week at his own new company named Spartan Anesthesia . Lots of Hatzlacha!)
Rabbi Todd & Dr. Eve Sullivan  (In memory of Todd's grandfather Simcha ben Ezra, Z"L)
Shmuel & Dr. Meira Tyszler  (לזכר נשמות Shmuel's parents והוא נשמתו)  
Drs. Josh & Rachel Sisser  (I/H/O Meira's grandmother who was nifteres last week פייגע בת הרב בנימין זאב פרוידל בין בר שלמה אבר & בא"ר דוב בער)
Ben & Sarah Zanjirian  (commemorating the Yahrtzeits of Reb Tzvi Vegh (Sarah's father) Z"L's family who perished in Auschwitz on second day Shavous (Mother: Sarah bas Moshe Meshel, Sister: Tsiporah bas Avraham Yehuda, Brothers: Alter Shlomo ben Avraham Yehuda, Yaakov ben Avraham Yehuda & Meshel ben Avraham Yehuda), Z"L.
The Mogen Avraham on Shulchan Oruch (Orach Chaim 116) speaks about the permissibility of killing creatures on Shabbos if they pose a danger. Snakes and scorpions are permitted to be killed because they pose a risk to life and limb. However, he says, that those people who kill the “Shpin Blo” (a type of lizard or vermin) on Shabbos are doing an “Issur Gomur” and are Mechalel Shabbos because these creature are not to be considered dangerous. The Mogen Avraham continues to advise that people should cover their food to make sure that these creatures don't contaminate their food, but even if they do get into the food there is only a 1 in a thousand chance of danger to the lives of those who eat it. Therefore one is not allowed to be Mechalel Shabbos to kill them. The ratio of 1 in a thousand is used by the Mogen Avraham to describe a case that is not considered to be Pekuach Nefashos. While the use of such a number may be an approximation or a figure of speech, it gives us an idea of how to quantify these issues.
The Shulchan Oruch (Orach Chaim 330) Paskens that for the benefit of a Yoledes (a woman who is in the process of giving birth) we may be Mechalel Shabbos. She is considered a Choleh Sheyaish Bah Sakana – an ill person who is in danger. Nevertheless, the Halacha requires that everything that can be done with a Shinui (in an unusual way) must be done so. For example, if something must be carried through a Reshus HaRabim (public domain) for her it should be clipped to someone's hair and brought in for her – an unusual way of carrying, etc. The Mogen Avraham asks a question from the Shulchan Oruch's Psak (Orach Chaim 328,12) regarding the general rule of Choleh Sheyaish Bo Sakana. There, the Halacha is taught that there is no preference to do the normally forbidden things that are necessary to care for the Choleh with a Shinui (or to ask a Goy) in order to save his life. Everyone should do whatever it takes without delay to save the person in danger. (The Rama there comments that the prevalent custom is that if all things are equal it is still preferred to use a Shinui or a Goy if possible, the Taz disagrees and frowns upon that custom). So it appears that the Shulchan Oruch is contradicting himself. Regarding a regular Choleh Sheyaish Bo Sakana, he doesn't encourage a Shinui, but regarding a Yoledes he requires it. Why? (This question can also be asked on the Rambam who is the source for both of these Halachos.) To this, the Mogen Avraham responds (with an exact quote from the Magid Mishna – one of the most prominent Pirushim on the Rambam written by Rav Don Vidal Yom Tov De Tolouse in the 1300s at the end of the period of the Rishonim – who asks and answers this question on the Rambam Hilchos Shabbos, Perek 2) that a Yoledes' pain and physical stress is a natural thing and “not even 1 in a
thousand women die in childbirth” (see bold section). So, a special rule was instituted for a Yoledes requiring a Shinui (or the use of a Goy) whenever possible which is a bit stricter than a regular Choleh Sheyaish Bo Sakana. Once again the Mogen Avraham uses the ratio of 1 in a thousand, although, here we still consider the Yoledes to be a Choleh Sheyaish Bah Sakana, albeit to a lower level than others. Once again the ratio of 1 in a thousand may be an approximation or a figure of speech.

3.

"The Rebbe, Ovdek Avigdor, Acknowledges a Specific Case"
Rav Akiva Eiger in his Teshuvos (Mahadura Kama 60) discussed the definition of Sakanah for the purpose of Pikuach Nefesh. Rebbi’s opinion in the Tosefta (Mikvaos 8, 4) allows a woman who has a metal splinter or arrowhead embedded in her flesh to go to the Mikvah without removing it. It is not considered a Chatzitza (an inappropriate separation between her flesh and the water which would not be permitted in the Mikvah.) However, Rebbe continues, if she has a wooden splinter or arrowhead embedded in her flesh, she is forbidden to attend the Mikvah until she removes it. The Chachamim disagree and maintain that in both cases it is an improper Chatzitzah and she has to remove it before attending the Mikvah. The Rash (Rav Shimshon M'Shantz – who lived in the 1100s and was a Talmid of Rabbenu Tam and The Ri of Tosfos – one of the most prominent of the Rishonim to write a Pirush on Mishnayos) explains that according to Rebbe a metal splinter or arrowhead is more of a Sakanah to remove (because its removal may cause extensive bleeding) and therefore the woman would not be expected to remove it. However, in the case of a wooden splinter or arrowhead whose removal is less of a Sakanah (ostensibly because it wouldn't be likely to cause excessive bleeding) she is expected to remove it before attending the Mikvah. The implication of the Rash is that there is a Sakanah by wood also, just less than metal. (The Chachamim disagree and maintain that both cases do not constitute enough Sakanah to permit.) Rav Akiva Eiger wonders, in Rebbe's opinion, if there is a Safek Sakanah by wood, why would we make a distinction? Just because metal is a bigger Sakanah? Why not allow both cases? To this, he answers that really neither case is a real Sakanah even according to Rebbe. He says (see bold section) that even in the case of a metal splinter or arrowhead not more than 1 in a thousand people in such situations would get seriously harmed or die from this. (So for Pikuach Nefesh purposes, it doesn't reach the level to allow Chilul Shabbos, etc.) Nevertheless, Rebbe holds that since the removal of a metal splinter or arrowhead can cause her great pain and there is a
remote possibility that she can get seriously hurt by its removal, it is considered a Shaas HaDechak (a pressing situation) and therefore Rebbe considers it appropriate to find a leniency (that since she has no intention of removing it, it becomes like a permanent part of her body) to allow her to go to the Mikvah as is. As opposed to the removal of a wooden splinter or arrowhead that doesn't generate as much pain and has a lesser risk to life and limb upon its removal, she would not be permitted to attend the Mikvah until she removed it. It doesn't qualify as a Shaas HaDechak and no leniency is provided.

From this Teshuva we can see that Rav Akiva Eiger used the 1 in a thousand ratio to describe a level of risk that does not constitute Pikuach Nefesh. Although he does not mention the Mogen Avraham or the Magid Mishna, he seems to be following in the same derech.

4.

משנה בוררות סימן רמא כנ"ב

ובימים ההם, ובוֹג' – חבר חדשbrit ה العالمي של חסדים נקראים על של שבעה עשר 가지고 זריא הלוחור עושה יוחנן על ידי חלול שבת הבא ובנהו, ג ב שמה הרבר'ל. דכשויודע בהאי שיאב על ידי חילול שבת אסף זה בבהו, ג כ הרבר'ל. עפ' ז סומכים עכשוי שמסכנים ביצים יוחנן על ידי חלול שבת בדיל שאלו ייתו ייסר למסור על כך.

شيخא:

שלוח אגרות יושב עתרות חינוכיות חלון על עצרת בפשיעה אם דוחה ששבת מה שנשתפכי 디 אמא

כשحسبו התוב על עצרת בפשיעה דין אסףشت חלול שבת עליהם, ובהאי כתיב"א רואים מחנכן א"ז/א ר"ז דסוב"א דסוב"א דסוב"א דסוב"א. התו לעד"א להIterations על דלכל לא לכל נמי בשום מקום חלון בה, וגו מציון מפורש בבעה"מ ששבת דק
י“ח והובא בר“ יבניעב“א שמהתליר שוהא מ״שא איסר דדקגא מדלקיג מישו דמקוו
סככנא יוהו ו‘יימ קמי שבתא מיך ורחא בתניא לדוור את השבח פמינו שיאנו
לך דבר שומע בבגף פ“ס, משמיע בזא שאא לא היא פ“ו דזא שבת היא מותר והא
כשפשע באדנטה הסככנא ואדזא דזא שבת מ“יט אס蘇 תלפיל, ו“יטל רכ לומער זאמ
יליג פומח מיכ, יים קאמ הובשת לא דזא שבת, ונג לעניא דזא שבת אום נימא
בפשע איא דזא איב סאר תלולי בית קומ, ג‘לאחר, ג’דזאחלוכ בזא איא רمرك
ומאלאוימא מומרא בקכ אומפ דפשמע לכל הפירוטים איסר הפלג (לך ליפורש
הו“י’אפשר שלוהא דאורייטא), ז“כ איב אום פליג מים א’זא אסר תלולא א“ב
איא דזאולק ע”ל עריגת החלג ע”ל השקה. מ, יאמעט מי שחלוקעל בעה"מ.
בזה.

והז מעריק נבסה ד“ח אפסידים הרארשנם אל לי משמיאי מוטניקין אלא ברבעי
שהילاجتماع יאשדחינו עד תלול שבט, פורש, ישא תלול בשבתא יצטריך תלול עלייה
את השבח, ואמ כאסיא התפ, לפשמע אייא מתפילין שבתא היה בלאספור מזריאו כל“ע
לפשע קאמ רבירчив דפשמע בחרבת הסככנא שבתא ולא ילכל תלול עלייה שבתא. זאמ
מאיא קאמר ישא ביאי ליז תלול שבתא אלא ביאי דאסור אלא הי“ל למומר
שהילاجتماع ליז סככנא בשידאדו בשבתא ולא יכלו צולט. אלא דאיא שחלוקה מומרי תלול
שהב דלא פליג על משהה מצורפת בפ‘ מפטגי ממהותליר שבתא ע”ל ידליא איא שאמ
לושיע בו הרפסידים הרארשנם ולשםואל, כלכ מדאינה מוחר לעשות בזאוי כל מב
הנדרער א الجنسום איא, סייחוה סככנא בשבתא יצטריך תלול שבתא מדר(fileName)
פגוח מג, יים בפסיגה בפסינה פדュרינה, יולק מוחר לעשות בככ יוז יך מצ מזד
התיידות לא שמשו חסידים הרארשנם עד רביעי. א“כ מוכות ש“פ דזהה.
שחב איא שחריאי עליי בפשישעה, זוחא בור.

ומכ שבחת הריב“ל’ שחיותא ההנה“א שם /"א תרמ, /דינא ירזא בדעי שיחל לשת
איסר, זא יכ איסר תלוליג באניל ביינ איב, ג עלב אום התפילה וזו י“ב שחש
סככנא גב לדידייה יזא מוחר תלול שבתא, זא נפרש איסר גב תלול שבתא ובעב
וחפיליג מ“ש די מסמק, דיוה כייר אבר דהו אברטריא דלא מיסתבבר דרבני
יאסרו ב“נ מא שם התורות מוחר, גב אוליא אי כל ביב חכמי בלגון שיא לצליל
בפ“ג במקום שומור מ“ת. אלא דאיא שיא אי בית“ל אלא טליג תלוליג שחזא
זא בים איב, ג מדני התורות גכ אום סובר כש“ע שומור אוליא גכ ימי הזוחל
וזא בים איב, ג מדני התורות גכ אום סובר כש“ע שומור אוליא גכ ימי הזוחל
The Shulchan Oruch (Orach Chaim 248, 4) discusses an individual who wants to travel with a non-Jewish caravan through a desert (or other dangerous country.) The Shulchan Oruch forbids leaving on Wednesday, Thursday or Friday, because he will likely need to be Mechalel Shabbos. However, on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday he may leave even though he will likely have to be Mechalel Shabbos, because he doesn't have to plan for that far in advance. The first three days of the week are attached to the previous Shabbos and he doesn't have to plan yet for the upcoming
Shabbos. (Nevertheless, the Mishna Berurah says that it is obvious that he is not permitted to promise anyone verbally that he will be Mechalel Shabbos during the trip.) When emergent situations arise during the trip he may be Mechalel Shabbos if it is necessary to preserve life – Pikuach Nefesh. The Mogen Avraham quotes 2 Halachik opinions that disagree with the Shulchan Oruch (the Rivash 1300s Spain & Algiers and the MahaRi ibn Lev 1500s Solanika). They maintain that one can never travel with such a caravan if it is known for sure (or is most likely) that he will have to be Mechalel Shabbos. The Mogen Avraham and the Mishna Berurah seem to follow this strict opinion. The Mogen Avraham (see bold section) concludes with the following cryptic statement, “according to this (strict) opinion (that many people follow now) people who do travel with such caravans rely upon the practice of putting themselves in danger to avoid Chilul Shabbos.” The simple meaning of this line seems to say that if someone needs to travel with a caravan that will likely need to be Mechalel Shabbos to preserve life (such travel is forbidden to begin on any day of the week by the 2 strict Poskim mentioned in the Mogen Avraham) they can rectify the situation and have permission to join the caravan if they decide to risk their lives and not be Mechalel Shabbos at any time during the trip!!! WOW!!!

The Mishnah Berurah (see bold section) seems to be bothered by this unusual statement and he tempers it by adding the word “Ketsas”. Meaning to say that people today who need to take such a caravan will put themselves in a bit more danger than usual in order to avoid Chilul Shabbos. The Mishna Berurah concludes by saying that the purpose of this is, “so that their original decision to join the caravan won't retroactively be considered a violation of the Halacha.” So the Mishnah Berurah is not suggesting that people should avoid Chilul Shabbos for Pikuach Nefesh during the trip altogether, rather only in situations that are “Ketsas” – a small Pikuach Nefesh. In all other Pikuach Nefesh
situations, one may not accept the risk and put oneself in danger and therefore one is obligated to be Mechalel Shabbos to save his life, despite the fact that retroactively, they will have sinned by putting themselves in danger. It seems from the Mishna Berurah that it is someone's prerogative to accept more risk than usual in order to avoid an Avera. In our case, the traveler is in a situation of Pikuach Nefesh that allows Chilul Shabbos. However, if he indulges in that Heter, he will retroactively, be guilty of joining the caravan in the first place. So he chooses to take the risk and not be Mechalel Shabbos to avoid that sin. Quite a big Chidush. You may accept a little higher level of risk to life and limb (even if it reaches the level of Pikuach Nefesh and all Halachos (except for the three cardinal sins) are waived) in order to avoid a retroactive Aveira... Apparently there is a bit of discretion regarding the obligation not to put oneself at risk. There are situations that qualify as Pikuach Nefesh that one is still permitted to accept the risk if he chooses to do so (for a legitimate spiritual reason). Exactly how to quantify what is a “Ketsas” regarding risk is not defined by the Mishna Berurah so a Rav should be consulted.

Rav Moshe Feinstein (Orach Chaim 1, 127) has a slightly different take on the Mogen Avraham. A questioner asked whether a person who is negligent and places himself in danger is still allowed to be Mechalel Shabbos for the Pekuach Nefesh that he created with his negligence. The questioner tried to bring a proof from the Mogen Avraham. He understood the Mogen Avraham as follows. Since a traveler who joined the caravan is negligent towards Shabbos (according to the 2 strict opinions) therefore they need to bear the danger without being Mechalel Shabbos because for them the Heter of Pikuach Nefesh wouldn't apply. Rav Moshe rejects that explanation and proves his rejection from several sources. Then Rav Moshe addresses the Mogen Avraham (without quoting the Mishnah Berurah.) He says a big Yesod (fundamental
observation) regarding Pikuach Nefesh. It is not an objective decision. The threshold of what is or isn't Pikuach Nefesh depends upon each individual and his or her psychological makeup. There are people who are daredevils. They are happy and even thrive on taking risks. Many such people wouldn't think twice about spending a night alone in the wilderness without their caravan and then racing to catch up to them after Shabbos. For such people, it is forbidden to travel along with the caravan on Shabbos, because it doesn't reach the level of Pikuach Nefesh. Then there are plenty of people who are much more conservative with risk. Some are actually worrywarts and almost any risk is too much for them. For such people, it would be unthinkable to remain alone in the wilderness for a night and they may be Mechalel Shabbos to travel with the caravan because for them it is Pikuach Nefesh. Of course, there has to be some line that is drawn, but there is a considerable gray area where the definition of Pikuach Nefesh is subjective.

(I am reminded of a story that took place many years ago when I was the Rabbis of a Shul in a far off community. An elderly man (whom I had never met before) came to Shul one overcast Shabbos with an umbrella. After davening, I engaged him in conversation privately and towards the end of the conversation I mentioned that the Halacha does not permit the use of an umbrella on Shabbos. He responded, “of course I know that and he cited the source in the Halacha (which surprised me that he was so learned) and then he continued, “but I am permitted because it is Pikuach Nefesh”. When I asked him to explain, he said, ”I am an older gentleman and if it rains on me I might get sick with a cold. If I don't beat the cold, it could become pneumonia and I could die from it!” That, in my humble opinion, was taking it too far. Irrational fears don’t qualify as Pikuach Nefesh.)
With this thought Rav Moshe explains the Mogen Avraham. There are people who have a low threshold for fear of the unknown during travel. They would be permitted to be Mechalel Shabbos when they are traveling with a caravan because for them it reaches the level of Pikuach Nefesh. However, those same individuals are not allowed to join a caravan in the first place (according to the 2 strict opinions) because of the likely ultimate outcome of Chillul Shabbos. So, the Mogen Avraham teaches us that such an individual has an option. He can work on himself to “change” his threshold for fear. He can (maybe with therapy and other mental exercises or through sheer willpower) choose to tolerate a higher level of risk than he previously was able to tolerate. Now, says the Mogen Avraham, he is permitted to join such a caravan because he has changed his “risk profile” and no longer is likely to have to be Mechalel Shabbos.

From this Teshuva we learn that Rav Moshe holds that within reason, risk is not a one-size-fits-all but rather to a certain extent is a subjective issue and different people may be allowed to accept upon themselves different levels of risk. Fascinating!

It is possible that this idea was the intention of the Mishna Berurah when he allowed “Ketsas” Pikuach Nefesh. Maybe he meant that for some people, who are more risk-takers, it no longer is considered Pikuach Nefesh while for others, who are low risk-takers, it still might be considered Pikuach Nefesh...
5. תשובות לטקסטים מחוונים אי-יש סימנים

סימן זה

בעניין גדרים בש퍿 פקד"נ והדולה שבית, לבני פקד"נ בדמניה ש_minute
הלאים בתנ"ך וכתב

הدورaste לציוד לנוכח למקמים לפי מקום, גוכסאי, י$ למקות ולהקהל הפרשנ
ולפי זה לזכות ממלכתי השארים כל מהרי למקいて כי עיזם כל שוק ושוק שלמה הפרשנ
לפיו גוכסאי סקיל כל הרבייב שברוחו בעינו כפסבד מ"מ דבדיס י"ת הקים서비스 מימיום יפיו
הדני הפיקות טפש והחריgef ממד השנמאוו והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה
והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה. חלף לуниית, זכות י$ ליגודים עם בדיני פיקות כיפי,
והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה, חלף לуниית, זכות י$ ליגודים עם בדיני פיקות כיפי,
והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה, חלף לуниית, זכות י$ ליגודים עם בדיני פיקות כיפי,
והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה, חלף לуниית, זכות י$ ליגודים עם בדיני פיקות כיפי,
והם מפיקים בכל חמי מדסמה, חלף לуниית, זכות י$ ליגודים עם בדיני פיקות כיפי,
The Chazon Ish (Teshuvos 48) adds an additional variable to the equation. What level of Bitachon B'Hashem (Trust in Hashem) do you have? He issued an advisory during the early years of the Yishuv before the State of Israel was established regarding responding to an air raid siren on Shabbos. He said that the general public should be told that it is a situation of Pikuach Nefesh and if necessary they may be Mechalel Shabbos to get to safety. They should be advised to try and violate only DiRabbonon (Rabbinic) laws of Shabbos if at all possible. But if necessary they should violate Torah Laws as well. However, since there is no actual emergency in front of our eyes, (there is only a very small chance that any one person will be hit during this air raid) if someone has a high level of Bitachon B'Hashem and he wants to be Machmir and not violate any Torah laws even if it increases his risk he may do so. The Chazon Ish does not think that such a person even with a high level of Bitachon B'Hashem should avoid violating DiRabbonon laws of Shabbos during the air raid (because the Rabbonon waived all of their laws in such circumstances.) He also says that it is not appropriate for such an individual to refrain from helping others during the air raid (and therefore he should violate Torah laws if necessary to help others), nevertheless, if the Torah violations can be done by others it is preferred. He concludes that extinguishing the Shabbos candles (in case an enemy pilot might notice the tiny amount of light that might escape from the closed blinds and target the city) is a far fetched concern and it should not be done on Shabbos.

So we have a fascinating addition to the discussion from the Chazon Ish. Different people may have different thresholds regarding Pikuach Nefesh depending on how much they Trust in
Hashem. Someone with a high level of Bitachon B'Hashem is permitted to take a higher risk than others without such a high level. And such an individual, who due to his Bitachon B'Hashem is permitted and encouraged to accept a higher risk upon himself to avoid Chilul Shabbos (and therefore it is not considered Pikuach Nefesh for him) nevertheless, needs to care for others of lower levels of Bitachon B'Hashem for whom it is Pikuach Nefesh and he has to be Mechalel Shabbos for them.

This idea is found in the GR”A on the Posuk we say every Shabbos and Yom Tov during davening:

יהי חסדך ה עלינו כי נ呼和浩特ו

Simply translated as “May your Kindness, Hashem, be bestowed upon us because we have relied upon you.” The GR”A sees an important Yesod in this Posuk. Hashem's kindness to us is delivered in the same measure that we trust in him (Midah Kneged Midah). A person with a high level of Bitachon B'Hashem can rely more on Hashem to take care of him than a person with less Bitachon B'Hashem. The words "כאשר יחלנו לך" are to be interpreted as “to the same degree that we have relied upon You”. Hence, what might be too dangerous for an individual with a low level of Bitachon B'Hashem might be an acceptable level of risk for someone with a high level of Bitachon B'Hashem. He has a higher degree of Hashem's kindness which he may rely upon!
דהי לשוב ולחזור אל אחרים קטנה וגדולה, שלישית: "מימתי!"
In a Sefer named Pe'er Hador the Talmidim of the Chazon Ish are quoted regarding many of his opinions. Here they discuss this issue. The Chazon Ish quoted as having told over the following story. In Lodz Poland, there was a factory that employed about 500 Yidden. There was a proposal to force the workers to work on Shabbos or they would lose their jobs. A Rabbinical meeting was called in Grodno to discuss this matter. One of the Rabbonim present was the saintly Chofetz Chaim. The consensus of many present was that a statement needs to be issued making it clear that all the Jewish workers were obligated to risk their livelihood and avoid Chilul Shabbos. Their thinking was that if the Rabbis don't come out forcefully with a statement, the workers may succumb to the Yetzer Hora and continue working at the factory even on Shabbos. The Chofetz Chaim refused to sign such a letter! He said, “hundreds of families without any source of sustenance to feed their children, that can be Pikuach Nefesh” we can't issue a blanket statement for all. The Chazon Ish concluded by asking his Talmidim, “if the Chofetz Chaim was one of those workers, do you think he would have worked on Shabbos?” Of course not! He would have had Bitachon B'Hashem that Hashem would take care of him and his family. Nevertheless, for simple factory workers who might have had a very low level of Bitachon B'Hashem it might have reached the level of Pikuach Nefesh!

In another story a family member of the Chazon Ish asked about his wife who had a baby in a local hospital where there was a lenient level of Kashrus. The family normally held a higher level of Kashrus. The family member wanted to know, what is she allowed to eat there while she is recovering from childbirth? (Apparently, the family was unable to bring in outside food, maybe because it was Shabbos.) The Chazon Ish told him that she can eat everything except the meat. The questioner then asked, “maybe she should only eat the soup and not the vegetables” (ostensibly because the vegetables might contain insects or may not have had Terumos and Maasros separated in the strictest fashion, etc.)
To this, the Chazon Ish responded, “OK if you want to be Machmir you may do so”. The relative persisted. “I only want to know what the Torah expects of us.” I am not looking to be Machmir on my wife unnecessarily. What is the actual Halacha? The Chazon Ish told him that how one responds to Pikuach Nefesh depends upon the Bitachon B'Hashem of each individual. When you offered to be Machmir I approved because you have a right to have more Bitachon B'Hashem and do less Hishtadlus (human activities to bring about the successful outcome). However, the Halacha does not demand that you keep to such a standard. He then comparted doing Hishtadlus to paying a debt. You must do it but it is not your favorite thing to do. And if it is at all legally, ethically and morally possible, you try to avoid repaying debt as much as possible. So too with Hishtadlus, Hashem commanded us to do it, but if we do less and have more Bitachon B'Hashem all the better.
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משהפיינשטיין
Our final source is possibly the most interesting one. Rav Moshe Feinstein (Igros Moshe, Choshen Mishpat 1, 104) was asked if one is permitted to become a professional ballplayer despite the small risk that it entails. The questioner did not define which sport he wanted to play, but he did say that it had a rate of 1 in several thousand for death or serious injury. (I would guess that he was referring to football or hockey which in my humble opinion are more dangerous than baseball and basketball). In any event, the question was whether it is permitted to take such a risk for himself and for the other players whom he might hurt or even kill? (This is a classical case of the Gadlus of Rav Moshe. He didn't judge the questioner and chastise him for engaging in the frivolous activity and lifestyle of ballplaying instead of learning Torah or doing a traditionally safe Parnassah. Instead, he understood that, "different strokes for different folks", and even ballplayers need Halachik guidance for their pursuits. It has been told over that there were boxers and other unconventional Yidden who Rav Moshe was able to bring close to Yiddishkeit by this attitude.)

Rav Moshe quotes the Gemara at the end of Bava Metzia (112) (see Rabbi D. Lichtenstein's Article) that explicitly permits a worker to be hired to climb to the top of a tree to pick its fruit, despite the danger. The Gemara implies that more leniencies are allowed within the Halachos of avoiding risks if one accepts those risks for the purpose of Parnassah. It is possible that the climbing of a tall and dangerous tree would be forbidden for someone who is doing it for recreation, however, to earn a living and sustain one's family additional risk is permitted within reason. Ballplaying for Parnassah is therefore permitted. Interesting that Rav Moshe does not explicitly permit ballplaying for recreation. However, it is my opinion that recreational ballplaying is much less risky than professional ballplaying and that it usually doesn't reach the level of prohibited activity due to the risks involved.
Rav Moshe continues to permit the risk that one takes that he might hurt or kill others. Just like there is an Avera not to hurt or kill others, so too there is an Avera not to hurt or kill yourself. If the rules are somewhat relaxed for Parnassah, and you are allowed to take a heightened risk of hurting or killing yourself, then they are relaxed for the risk that you take of potentially hurting or killing the other players playing the game. Another, proof of this concept is the fact that the Torah permits a rancher to hire someone to climb the tree and pick the fruit despite the risk he is taking. Obviously, if the risk is permitted for the tree climber then the rancher who hired him has done nothing wrong. If the worker gets hurt, the rancher is not Halachikly guilty of putting him at risk. Similarly, if the ballplayer is permitted for his Parnassah to play despite the risks, then he doesn't have to worry about the other players and the risks that he might have brought upon them.

Rav Moshe, however, does make a very interesting distinction. You are only allowed to place another person at risk if he agrees (explicitly or implicitly) to accept such a risk. A ballplayer doesn't have to worry about a fellow ballplayer getting hurt through his actions because all the ballplayers have accepted the risks by virtue of their joining the teams and showing up on the field. (One can add that a baseball player doesn't have to worry about hitting a foul ball or home run into the stands and killing or maiming a fan since the fans accept that risk by virtue of their attendance at the stadium.) However, Rav Moshe explains, if there is a person who never agreed to accept a risk, you have no right to place him at a higher level of risk than usual since he never agreed or accepted such a risk. An example might be if there is a walkway underneath a tree, it might be forbidden for a worker to climb the tree even for his Parnassah, because he is putting the pedestrians below at risk if he falls upon them. Similarly, consider a race car driver who drives with excessive speed on a race track. Since his fellow race car drivers, track
worker, and the fans accept the risk by attending, he is permitted (within reason) to take such a risk for his Parnassah. However, say he's driving on the open highway and assume he is traveling recklessly at an excessive speed (even if it is not officially illegal) for the purpose of his Parnassah, he still is not permitted to put other drivers in danger, because they never agreed to accept that level of risk. They assumed when they entered the highway that all the drivers on the highway will drive without putting their fellow motorists at such a high level of risk. This should give us pause when we think of today's risks. There are some young and healthy people who are not too scared about catching COVID-19. And let us assume that the activity that they want to do is within reason (say it is for their Parnassah, etc.) Nevertheless, they need to think about other people who they might be putting in danger – older people, those who are in high-risk categories, etc. Even if they are permitted to take the risk for themselves, are they permitted to put others at risk???

Rav Moshe concludes that after he completed writing this Teshuva someone showed him the Teshuva from the Noda B'Yehuda (Yoreh Dayah 10, see Rabbi D. Lichtenstein's Article) about hunting, which comes to the same conclusion that one is permitted to accept a higher level of risk when he is engaging in Parnassah pursuits.

May Hashem have Rachmanus upon us and reduce the risks of this terrible Machlah so that we can all return to normal life very soon.