The interplay between personal liberty and public order is a fundamental challenge in ensuring democracy and a stable government. Some may argue that individual freedoms should take precedence over the federal government's need to maintain order, while others argue that public order is a necessary condition for ensuring democracy and a stable government. In the balance between personal liberty and public order, personal liberty is the more important factor in ensuring democracy and a stable government, even though public order is an essential component of such a system.

The Declaration of Independence was created to assert the American colonies' independence from Great Britain and explain why such an action was necessary. It serves as a crucial document that laid the groundwork for the United States' founding principles of democracy and individual liberty. The Declaration of Independence states that "all men are created equal" and possess "certain unalienable rights," which serves as important evidence for why personal liberty is more important than public order in ensuring democracy and stable government. The notion that individuals have inherent rights that cannot be taken away from the government is essential to the functioning of a democratic government that is held accountable to its citizens; otherwise, there would be no reciprocative responsibility between the government and its citizens, and the overall legitimacy of the government would drastically fall, causing its downfall. Furthermore, the pursuit of happiness amongst citizens is what causes civil societies to form. Authoritarian regimes in China and Russia do technically have representative democracies, but the oppressive restrictions on personal freedoms within those societies destroy civil society instead of uplifting them.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. wrote "Letter from Birmingham Jail" while imprisoned for being in a nonviolent protest in response to a group of white clergymen in Birmingham who criticized his tactics and urged him to end his civil rights demonstrations. In the letter, King argues that the pursuit of individual rights is necessary to foster a just society. He further argues that the pursuit of order at the expense of one's civil liberties ultimately undermines democracy. And this makes sense when one looks at the larger picture: if a citizen does not have the right to express dissent and protest peacefully, they are unable to hold their government accountable and remain at risk of being oppressed. Citizens need to be given the right (from their government) to express dissent with their government to begin with or else public disorder would happen if a despotic, corrupt government arose anyway.

Opposing viewpoints may claim that the provision of individual liberties that permits citizens to rally against their government is prone to causing public disorder and violence. And this is certainly true: Martin Luther King Jr. himself stated in his letter that violence and mayhem ultimately results from the government not implementing policies that the people have done direct action lobbying about. But that's exactly the point: if the government doesn't implement what the people want, then they're a tyrannical government, especially if it has to do with their civil liberties. It is not enough for a country's citizens to simply wait for justice to be granted, but that they take action to demand it, and (more importantly) possess the right to take action to begin with. A country that doesn't guarantee personal freedoms for its citizens is not a substantive democracy, it's a procedural democracy that has inherent risks of despotism and the loss of civil society for its citizens. It's just as the founding fathers said: citizens need the right to be able to protest their government, and if their voices aren't heard, to overthrow it.