



Journal for Social  
Science Archives

## Journal for Social Science Archives

Online ISSN: 3006-3310

Print ISSN: 3006-3302

Volume 3, Number 4, 2025, Pages 194 – 205

Journal Home Page

<https://jssarchives.com/index.php/Journal/about>



# Censorship, Digital Control, and Ethical Responsibility: Promoting Universal Access to Online Information in the Emerging Information Era

Zakir Khan<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Muhammad Hussain<sup>2</sup>, Shehla Rubab<sup>1</sup>, Iram Hassan<sup>1</sup>, Laiba Gul<sup>1</sup> & Ansa Parveen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MPhil Scholar, department of Library and Information science Khushal Khan Khattak University Karak, Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, Department of Library and Information science Khushal Khan Khattak University Karak, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received: August 24, 2025  
Revised: September 25, 2025  
Accepted: October 06, 2025  
Available Online: October 17, 2025

#### Keywords:

Censorship, Digital Control, Ethical Responsibility, Online Information, Emerging Information Era

#### Corresponding Author:

Zakir Khan

#### Email:

[Zakirkhanmlis@gmail.com](mailto:Zakirkhanmlis@gmail.com)



### ABSTRACT

**Background:** For a stretched time, libraries has been defenders of equivalent access and intellectual freedom. Libraries everywhere the world are facing major ethical challenges as a result of the increase of digital technologies such as censorship, monitoring, algorithmic sifting, and severe laws imposed by governments and corporations.

**Methodology:** This study investigates into the ethical quandaries and institutional weaknesses confronted by libraries in the face of digital censorship through the use of qualitative document scrutiny of scholarly articles, policy outlines, and case studies.

**Findings:** Particularly in the Global South, where inequalities amplify suppression, the findings underscore three critical apprehensions: growing digital disparity, deteriorating user privacy, and weak official capacity. However, libraries have the power to fight preventive policies by supporting for digital literacy, forming ethical partnerships, and promoting digital literacy. Insinuations

**Implications:** The study proclaims that libraries are essential in the pursuit of information impartiality, despite the fact that they are vulnerable to digital control. Defensive freedom and access require bolstering involvement, cooperation, and flexibility.

**Recommendations:** Participating digital rights education into programs, developing partnerships with public society, and applying open policies that value user privacy and community authorization are all strategies to reflect.

## Introduction

### Background of the Study

An enormous shift in how societies create, attain, allocate, and exert control over information has happened during the 21st century (Hussain & Ameen, 2023). Transformative information period

has prompted the arrival of the internet and the debauched movement of digital knowledge. In this age, information is increasingly consistent, extensively presented, and sharp contagious. As a result of the unparalleled opportunities for entities and organisations to connect, cooperate, and acquire presented by digital platforms, this new pattern has altered the fields of education, communication, commerce, and supremacy. The commitment to universal access to information, though, is being increasingly endangered by digital domination and censorship. Increasingly, the tools destined to make knowledge available to everyone are being used to limit it (Shah et al., 2021). Currently, censorship is more multifaceted than ever before, surrounding not just the elimination of books from shelves or proscription publications but also actions, platform values, and government cybersecurity legislature. It is conceivable for governments and for-profit institutions to filter, censor, or highlight content, usually behindhand closed doors. By erecting "Great Firewalls" and making use of surveillance abilities to monitor and suppress dissident feelings, authoritarian governments have established censoring approaches. Instantaneously, measures that circuitously limit access to exact information have been applied by self-governing states in the name of counterterrorism, public health, or national safety. There has been a history of using anti-misrepresentation guidelines to censor underground views or inspective media (Freedom House, 2023). In addition, tech corporations such by way of Meta, Google, & TikTok governor user-satisfied perceptibility by high-class procedures, which associates echo compartments and decreases perspective change.

Libraries and information personnel requirement to pay attention to the complications of these developments because their traditional determination is to safeguard equivalent access to information and to preserve intellectual freedom. Libraries have factually served as strongholds of limited knowledge, endorsing democratic contribution by making a diversity of resources accessible to the community. Numerous infrastructural, ethical, and legal problems rise in the digital monarchy. Libraries' capability to self-sufficiently pick and grow themselves has been reduced by the consolidation of digital evidence into an inadequate number of profitable entities. In addition, libraries frequently function under governmental frameworks that limit the kind of information they are allowable to offer, particularly in conditions that are complex to management. The virtuous fundamentals of librarianship are under stretch from these ideologies.

There are shortly far-fetched concerns overlooking right librarianship, which is stranded on the philosophies of sincerity, evenhandedness, noninvolvement, and concealment. Unlike right responsibilities have ascended in the digital position. Organizing libraries have an obligation to sentinel databases detained by establishments familiar to dishonesty operative data? Can they survey national directions that dictate bowdlerizing while also preserving common values of acceptable dialogue? When a discrete set of rules for limitation isolates strong-minded belvederes, form them imperceptible operational, how extensive does it take for this to transpire? These types of reviews have become more overbearing in modern library sermon. While organisations like the ALA & the IFLA have uniformity standards that framework general best accomplishes, these papers ordinarily overlook applied issues concerning digital authority.

An indispensable characteristic of this chore is the determined digital division, which forestalls millions of people, frequently in the Global South, from involvement any permission to internet info. Restraining civilization sensations, the complete force of interruptions such restricted internet association, high construction costs, philological hurdles, and derisory digital knowledge. About 2.6 billion individuals across the world do not have entrance to the internet, interpretation to the World Bank (2024). Anyhow this, several still face restrictions due to legislative censorship, insufficient library services, or even communal conventions. Given this two-pronged constriction, first through technology segregation and afterward through comfortable instruction, moral

questions regarding information reasonableness and the social equalising connotation of libraries arise.

In addition, digital reconnaissance has occurred as an ever-present accuracy. Industries and governments collect vast quantities of personal information, often without users' information or consensus, to affect their actions and limit their freedom of review. The library is theoretical to be a safe place for knowledge, research, and looking good, yet this kind of monitoring assaults people's privacy. In the attendance of surveillance, clienteles are less likely to involve with contentious or delicate content, according to studies (Costello, 2023). Cardinal cataloguing methods, usage monitoring, and third-party services all establish forms of data surveillance, and libraries must query their role in these.

Libraries still have intervention, even with all these thoughtful problems. All through the world, library groups are coming up with creative explanations to fight digital inaccuracy and censorship. Things like forming educational inspirations focused on digital freedoms and information literateness, creating open-source replacements to branded platforms, and instruction techniques that augment privacy (such Tor browsers or VPNs) are all share of this. To contest repressive information laws and endorse freedom of appearance, community and academic libraries in many states have combined forces with civil society organisations. Still, these supports are oftentimes by force disseminated due to financial belongings, political encouragement, or official hesitancy to take jeopardies.

The objective of this study is to cram more about how modern librarianship indentures with censorship, digital governor, and ethical apprehension. The article examines into the stuffs of digital censorship on libraries' ability to believer for worldwide admittance to online information and the right backgrounds that can involvement libraries in pugnacious these strains. This study scrutinizes the contemporary state and propositions practical moments by utilising current academic mechanism, tactic papers, and instance studies. With this, it enhances to the larger discussion on human rights, information veracities, and libraries' developing function against a digital background that is becoming more organized.

### **Research Objectives**

This study goal to scrutinize the influence of censorship and digital governor on access to online information and to evaluate the ethical responsibilities of libraries in development intellectual freedom. This study surveys:

1. The extent to which censorship and surveillance technologies impact equitable information access.
2. The ethical principles guiding librarians in addressing digital control.
3. Institutional strategies to uphold universal access in restrictive environments.

### **Review of the Literature**

The interaction between censorship, digital control, and moral librarianship has gathered sensitive academic attention as global information systems developed progressively centralised and surveilled. Digital censorship has evolved from conservative authorized suppression to include algorithmic sifting, shadow proscription, and private-sector contented restraint. Governments through have employed varied controlling mechanisms to normalize online appearance, containing internet cessations and the formation of countrywide firewalls. Freedom House (2023) reports that worldwide internet freedom has diminished for the thirteenth successive year, through over 70 nations partaking in online censorship and reconnaissance undertakings. These strategies are often

rationalised under the excuse of national security or public instruction, while they frequently conclude in the suppression of dissension, marginalised opinions, and exploratory journalism.

In independent democracies, digital control is progressively administered by private organizations whose procedures and strategies considerably disturb the discernibility and prioritisation of information. Organizations like Meta, Google, and TikTok use important inspiration over public discourse via satisfied restraint actions, several of which remain characterised by a nonexistence of transparency and responsibility. Gillespie (2018) resists that platforms purpose as understood organizers of discourse, commonly prejudiced further by corporate benefits than by independent or ethical deliberations. The increasing privatisation of information supremacy postures a innovative matter for librarians devoted to the impartial broadcasting of knowledge.

The ethical characteristics of librarianship must dependably highlighted standards comprising intellectual freedom, information entrance, and user privacy. Moral codes from entities such by means of the International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions (IFLA, 2012) & the American Library Association (ALA, 2017) highlight librarians' responsibility to oppose censorship and advocate for equivalent access. These responsibilities, though appealing in theory, are tremendously difficult to uphold in the digital world. Entrance to digital databases is sternly restricted by many libraries' licence agreements. Some people observe ethical aggression as an ambiguous duty, and they work inside national permissible organisations that ban access to precise content. According to Buschman (2021), the occupation is currently split between its normative obligations and the pragmatic realisms of digital power.

The challenges of ethical librarianship have been aggravated by the rise of investigation free enterprise. A power imbalance exists between entities and establishments due to the frequent commodification of secluded data obtained from workers via digital stages (Zuboff, 2019). Library patrons may innocently be vulnerable to data mistreatment if monetarily motivated digital amenities lack sufficient privacy protections. This produces a struggle between the goal to deliver informal digital services and the ethical responsibility to precaution handler autonomy. Additionally, research designates that surveillance discourages free information-seeking behaviour, particularly amongst marginalised groups (Costello, 2023), accordingly compromising libraries' purposes as protected settings for survey and investigation.

Libraries are concomitantly addressing the ethical consequences of misrepresentation and dishonesty, which have rushed transversely digital platforms. The COVID-19 widespread exemplified how deception can imperil public health, foremost convinced governments and platforms to eradicate or label content. Though these creativities are well-meaning, they might also constrain legitimate discourse and alternate viewpoints. Marwick and Lewis (2023) warn in contradiction of equating improper information with hostility, importance the meaning of information literacy somewhat than content guideline. Librarians are predominantly equipped to stand-in critical thoughtful and curate consistent sources; however, this requires resources, exercise, and official autonomy, which are not reliably available.

Nevertheless, these complications, indication exists of libraries implementing new policies in response to digital control. Creativities like as the Library Freedom Project, Tor communicate collaborations, and the formation of open-source discovery platforms demonstrates endeavours to protect access and confidentiality.

Partnership with digital rights organisations and public society groups has authorized certain libraries to contest censorship and promote improvement. Johnson (2023) exemplifies how public libraries in Scandinavia have involved digital rights education into their platforms, providing

clients with resources to achieve internet censorship and precaution their information. These examples demonstrate the capability of libraries to function as active implementers of digital justice, slightly than only inactive channels of information.

However, the universal landscape endures to be disparate. Libraries in low-income states frequently absence the financial or political incomes to perform such creativities. UNESCO (2023) postulates that under 25% of libraries in Sub-Saharan Africa had tangential internet linking and less than 15% contribute in digital truths engrossment. Physical disproportions, attached with unpleasant governing backgrounds, endure in captivating libraries' proficiency to sanctuary ethical values in many areas universally. Rectifying these discriminations requires global collaboration, amplified finance, and stratagem frameworks that prioritise digital moralities as indispensable human rights. .

To entirety up, the research points to a multipart and ever-changing web of relations between ethical librarianship, digital governor, and censorship. Notwithstanding how big the glitches are, they can be resolved. Libraries still have significant ethical duties, but applying them in the digital age calls for new strategies, partnerships, and knowledge. Libraries have the possible to remain strong supporters for equitable access to information and comprehensive dissemination of information even in the face of a more controlled information countryside by accepting these technologies and bracing their guiding philosophies.

## **Research Methodology**

### **Research Design**

This qualitative study intended to scrutinize the social and ethical belongings of digital ascendancy and censorship on the library and information science community. A detailed description of the resolutions, standards, and difficulties persuading librarianship in the digital phase was made conceivable by the exploration's use of an interpretivism-centered document review method.

### **Data Collection**

From 2015 to 2025, data was culled from a diversity of secondary sources, comprising as white papers, reports on digital rights, moral principles, and peer-reviewed newsletters. Exploration studies employed combinations of terms comprising “digital censorship,” “library principles,” “intellectual freedom,” “surveillance,” and “information access.” Sources were gained from academic databases such as Scopus, JSTOR, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. An overall of 87 documents were primarily retrieved. After relevance screening and applying inclusion criteria alignment with the core themes of censorship, ethics, and access 46 documents were selected for full analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

Thematic analysis, as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), was employed to analyze the data. This six-step method includes:

- Familiarization with data,
- Generation of initial codes,
- Searching for themes,
- Reviewing themes,
- Defining and naming themes,
- Producing the report.

Manual coding was carried out to ensure immersion in the content and capture subtle themes related to policy, resistance, and ethical action. Recurring themes such as ethical conflict, digital equity, institutional advocacy, and global information inequality were prioritized.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Since this study relied solely on publicly accessible documents and did not involve human participants, it did not require institutional ethical review. However, research ethics were observed through proper citation practices, avoidance of misrepresentation, and maintaining neutrality in interpretation.

### **Trustworthiness and Limitations**

To make sure the trustworthiness of the examination, triangulation was useful by participating varied data types—from policy papers to academic works and international codes of morals. Reflexivity was also proficient to acknowledge the researcher's possible favoritism and uphold transparency.

However, the study has limitations. It focuses only on English-language documents, which may underrepresent non-Western perspectives. Furthermore, while document analysis is robust for policy and discourse evaluation, it does not capture real-time practitioner experiences or user voices.

### **Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Studying and sympathetic data in relative to the study's objectives, this part offers a methodical qualitative investigation of the reviewed documents. By resources of thematic document inquiry, this section residences into the composite possessions of digital ruler, censorship, and libraries' principled errands to reassure worldwide access to information. The data was studied using inductive coding and melody category, which showing extensive designs in academic journals, universal announcements, library contracts, and government procedures.

### **Understanding the Nature and Opportunity of Censorship in the Digital Environs**

#### **Censorship as a Multi-Layered Phenomenon**

The analysis appearances that self-censorship by establishments and unembellished legislative instructions both underwrite to the impediment of online censorship. The impression of political explanations and otherworldly moralities on information access is ecstatic to light in government files that concealment national cybercrime regulation and internet overriding backgrounds. In addition, the digital public realm becomes disjointed owing to social media limits, news website steeplechases, and algorithmic content guidelines.

#### **Mechanisms and Justifications for Censorship**

National security, religious harmony, and public ethics are common influences used by governments to defend internet censorship. According to reports from international ombudsmen like the Electronic Frontier Foundation and Freedom House, these validations are used time and time over to stillness detractors, misrepresent facts, and limit contribution in self-governing processes. Censorship is more severe in emerging states since their governments do not take sufficient actions to guard citizens' right to allowed expression online.

## **Analyzing the Extent and Instruments of Digital Control over Online Information**

### **Surveillance and Monitoring Tools**

To attain a central goal, it is necessary to advance digital monitoring organisations and reconnaissance technologies. Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International research demonstrations that governments are heavily regulating news transmissions by means of spyware, facial acknowledgment, and data collection. Because of these limits, people's visual appearance capabilities and their experience to different points of view on the subject are sternly incomplete.

### **Mechanisms and Justifications for Censorship**

The tech businesses have a vast impact when it comes to digital authority. App designers like TikTok, social media boards like Facebook, and video sharing websites like YouTube all revenue steps to control content in a way that permits biased information to be unprotected, often at the cost of underground notions or official publicity. These systems faintly support censorship because, notwithstanding appearing impartial at first glance, they are essentially vulnerable to influence from both private organizations and the government. Observing at strategy papers and case studies discloses this.

## **Exploring Ethical Responsibilities of Libraries in Protection Access to Information**

### **Ethical Frameworks and Library Statements**

More than a few papers, containing the ALA Library Bill of Rights, the IFLA Code of Ethics, and the Internet Universality Displays put out by UNESCO, emphasise the character of morals in librarianship. To defend free supposed, objectivity, and civil dissertation, libraries are encouraged against official or governmental intrusion. Libraries are ethical mediators between the people, the government, and information stands, rendering to the study.

### **Librarians as Promoters for Digital Rights**

The research determines that librarians are more elaborate in endorsing digital information, supporting for open access, and looking for worldwide opportunities while being knowing of information neutrality. In the wake of instructive rebellions and strategy coursework, libraries are becoming more recognized for their role in fighting misrepresentation, algorithmic preconception, and information dissimilarity. Through this moral act, libraries are exposed to be more than just receivers of information; they are revealed as active protectors of independent access.

## **Assessing Institutional Responses to Online Censorship and Information Governor**

### **Institutional Guidelines and Strategic Frameworks**

The authorized responses to digital restrictions vary greatly between academic and public libraries owing to internal rules including contented impartiality, user discretion, and digital compatibility. Looking into library rules will show you that convinced creations are soft on censorship and enthusiastic to comply with government guidelines, while others are steadfast advocates of free speech and aggressively face it.

### **Challenges Confronted by Institutions**

Coincidence On the other hand, libraries repeatedly characteristic basic contests such as unsatisfactory budget, dearth of political conclusion, and scarce organization, which can encouragement their ethical necessities. State library authorised assessments and reports bring contemplation to prerogative violations; yet, rural libraries struggle a rough influence from the

digital divide of censorship. In instruction to intimidate these complications, library controllers about the world must work systematized and sanctuary a incorporated obverse.

## **Policies and Recommendations for Promoting Universal Access to Online Information**

### **Policy-Level Commendations**

The standing of consuming digital privileges recommendation that recognises information appearance as a straightforward right is accentuated in all of the studied identifications. Appropriate administration of censorship methods, a review of cybercrime legislature, and the integration of universal ethics into national directions are amongst the recommendations. Library groups need to vestibule for these strategy discussions to get progressing.

### **Ornamental Digital Literacy and Community Engagement**

An upsurge in people's internet literateness can efficiently respond censorship. Information learning, information review, and irresistible digital restraints are all topics that libraries should organise sessions on. Libraries play a momentous part in community education, but they also distribute people the tools they requirement to contemptuously evaluate online substantial and fight back in contradiction of administrations.

### **Building Ethical Alliances and Networks**

Structure Networks and Connotations Constructed on Ethics Libraries must organize their exertions across borders through information-sharing stages, guidelines-substituting networks, and agreements-in-the-making to task the ascendancy of digital domination. Library Freedom Ingenuity and the Universal Network Inventiveness are examples of worldwide efforts by persons to contest censorship.

### **Summary of Key Findings**

In instruction to confirm that everyone has access to information working, this study observed at the interaction between digital strategies, ethical responsibility, and censorship. The study exposed various complexities concerning information freedom in the digital phase by thoroughly analysing academic journals, policy papers, and case studies. The following are the key takeaways:

**Censorship Tendencies and Mechanisms:** Both explicit and covert methods of censorship are used by many public and private organisations. Internet closures, algorithmic processes, and website exclusions all deliberately violate the public's freedom to attain information based on several and objective bases.

**Digital Control and Surveillance:** Mainly in authoritarian contexts, user confidentiality and intervention have been worn by the propagation of data-driven services and digital inquiry. As distinct organisations, libraries have errands to sustain their principled values in supportive backgrounds.

**Ethical Challenges for Information Specialists:** Librarians and other information personnel often face the problematic problem of complementary their professional concern to promote information justice and intellectual liberty with the institutional compression to fulfill with government directives.

**Institutional Responses:** Institutional retorts to censorship and in favour of open access have taken some methods, counting creativities by libraries, reassurance networks, and universal forms.



This comprises the practice of virtual private networks (VPNs), open-source software, teamwork with human rights groups, and educational industries.

**Disparities in Access:** Censorship and insufficient organization excessively harm marginalised populations, who are frequently located in frugally deprived or war-torn zones. Because of this, they are fewer talented to contribute in the international information budget and the digital gap extends.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

### **Conclusion**

The research shows that contemporary librarians in the internet age are intensely concerned with matters of censorship, digital authority, and principled responsibility. Investigation, internet closures, and algorithmic shifting are examples of governor mechanisms that have become more cultured with the fast development of technology. This challenges libraries' long-standing purpose to confirm that everyone has equivalent and free access to information. Political interfering, technological problems, and preventive legislative frameworks normally limit libraries' independence, even though libraries end up standing as powerful emblems of intellectual liberty. The consequences show that libraries' moral responsibilities encompass beyond the usual realms of collection development and worker services. Libraries must take the initiative to defend patron privacy, endorse digital literacy, and safeguard access to all types of information in instruction to fight for knowledgeable freedom. This calls for a modification in emphasis from being impartial information manufacturers to actively defensive self-governing principles in culture. The study tinted that libraries, particularly in deprived nations, are not well organized. Responses to digital suppression are delayed by a lack of plan support, insufficient personnel exercise, and proper frameworks. Libraries must strengthen these areas if they are to contest censorship and reinvent themselves as vital victors of human rights and worldwide access in the digital age.

### **Recommendations**

In interpretation of the results and discussions, several practical and tactical ideas are planned to strengthen the ethical role of libraries in belligerent against censorship and supporting universal entrance to digital information:

#### **Policy Development and Advocacy**

Libraries necessity determination with sets on an all-inclusive measure to counterbalance digital dictatorship and support approaches that safeguard intellectual authority.

#### **Ethics-Centered Training**

To train librarians with the honest mindfulness and applied amenities mandatory to clasp intricate expurgating environments, it is indispensable to contraption dependable exercise sittings and workspaces.

#### **Infrastructure Establishment**

Libraries in evolving countries frequently suggestion clienteles with tools that service them evade suppression, such as computer-generated isolated networks (VPNs), determined stands, and open-source possessions.

### **Community Assignment and Knowledge**

Communities can improved distinguish and scuffle information direction if libraries adoptive digital learning and restraint realization amongst their clients.

### **International Partnership**

The development of establishments between social rights organisations and cooperative information systems will concealment the way for libraries to knock into prevalent dispersion networks and embolden open access on universal stands.

### **Research and Certification**

Enduring study interested in how digital suppression distracts contact to information has to be maintained through exploration and credentials.

### **Resilience and Readiness**

To precaution the continual practicability of library facilities in the appearance of administratively or technically aggressive times, libraries necessity nurtures official procedures. This encompasses guidelines about transportable information service area and reorganization.

### **References**

1. Abdi, A., & DeWaard, H. (2021). Digital access and equity in education: Navigating new pedagogical frameworks. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(3), 2769–2785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10413-2>
2. Adeniran, P. (2020). Internet censorship and the public library's role in information freedom in Africa. *Library Management*, 41(4), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-03-2020-0042>
3. Ahmed, S. (2022). Ethics in the digital age: The role of libraries in protecting freedom of information. *Journal of Information Ethics*, 31(1), 15–27.
4. Alabi, A. O. (2020). Censorship and digital governance in African states: Implications for information dissemination. *Information Development*, 36(2), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666919843312>
5. Alfino, M., & Pierce, G. (2019). Information ethics for librarians. *McFarland & Company*.
6. Bailey, C. W. (2021). Intellectual freedom and access to information in the 21st century. *Library Trends*, 69(4), 672–688. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2021.0019>
7. Baran, S. J., & Davis, D. K. (2020). Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future (8th Ed.). *Cengage Learning*.
8. Basu, A., & Foster, D. (2023). Algorithms and control: A study of digital censorship in global platforms. *New Media & Society*, 25(2), 201–219.
9. Benedict, K. (2019). Freedom to read and the rise of digital surveillance. *American Libraries*, 50(2), 18–21.
10. Bhatti, R., & Nizamani, S. (2020). Challenges of digital literacy in public libraries of Pakistan. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, Article 4012. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4012/>
11. Council of Europe. (2020). Guidelines on freedom of expression and information in times of crisis. *Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing*.
12. Cull, N. J. (2019). Public diplomacy and the media: Promoting access or fostering censorship? *Journal of Communication*, 69(4), 569–587.

13. Day, R. E. (2018). *The modern invention of information: Discourse, history, and power. Southern Illinois University Press.*
14. Durrani, S. (2020). The ideological control of libraries: The case of censorship in digital information environments. *Journal of Radical Librarianship*, 6, 29–44.
15. Fuchs, C. (2021). *Social media: A critical introduction (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.*
16. Gilli, M., & Gilli, A. (2022). Information warfare and the control of knowledge online. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 45(1), 120–146.
17. Gonzalez, R. J. (2021). Surveillance and freedom in digital spaces: *A global perspective. Surveillance & Society*, 19(2), 203–219.
18. Gorman, M. (2020). Ethics and access to information in the digital age. *Journal of Library Administration*, 60(6), 615–629.
19. Green, J., & Thorogood, N. (2018). *Qualitative methods for health research (4th ed.). Sage Publications.*
20. Grimmelmann, J. (2018). Speech engines. *Minnesota Law Review*, 98(3), 868–951.
21. Habermas, J. (1991). The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society. *MIT Press.*
22. Harrison, S. (2023). Libraries and algorithmic bias: Unpacking ethical responsibilities in digital curation. *Library Hi Tech*, 41(3), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-12-2022-0383>
23. Hernon, P., & Schwartz, C. (2019). *Issues in library research. Library Unlimited.*
24. Hussain, M., & Ameen, L. (2023). Exploring the Automation Landscape in University Libraries of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan: Status, Problems and Implications. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(6), 102787. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102787>
25. Ibekwe, F. (2021). Access denied: A global survey of internet censorship and its consequences. *Information World Review*, 41(2), 33–41.
26. IFLA. (2021). Statement on libraries and intellectual freedom. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/1047>
27. Johnson, A. (2022). Balancing ethics, privacy, and access: Libraries in the surveillance society. *Library Quarterly*, 92(1), 30–49. <https://doi.org/10.1086/717713>
28. Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2020). The ethics of social media platforms: Censorship, freedom, and responsibility. *Business Horizons*, 63(6), 709–719.
29. Kranich, N. (2018). Libraries, democracy, and the public good. *Library Trends*, 66(4), 449–466.
30. Lankes, R. D. (2019). *The new librarianship field guide. MIT Press.*
31. Liu, Z. (2020). Ethics and professional responsibility in the digital information age. *Library Management*, 41(6/7), 399–410.
32. Loftus, M. (2021). The ethics of censorship: Rethinking the library's response. *Library Ethics*, 18(2), 135–149.
33. MacKinnon, R. (2012). Consent of the networked: The worldwide struggle for internet freedom. *Basic Books.*
34. McMenemy, D. (2020). *Information ethics and the library profession. Chandos Publishing.*
35. Mosco, V. (2017). *Becoming digital: Toward a post-internet society. Emerald Publishing.*
36. Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach. Harvard University Press.*
37. Oliphant, T. (2020). Public libraries and digital inclusion: A civic responsibility. *Public Library Quarterly*, 39(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01616846.2019.1690323>
38. Palfrey, J. (2015). *BiblioTech: Why libraries matter more than ever in the age of Google. Basic Books.*

39. Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. (2019). Education and digital epistemologies: Libraries, learning, and censorship. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 51(2), 123–135.
40. Richtel, M. (2021). Disinformation, control, and the role of libraries. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/>
41. Roberts, H. (2022). Access versus control: Public libraries and the ethics of information restriction. *Library Journal*, 147(6), 54–60.
42. Robinson, L., & Bawden, D. (2020). Information overload: Causes, symptoms and solutions. *Journal of Documentation*, 76(3), 637–658.
43. Seale, C. (2021). *Researching society and culture* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
44. Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.
45. Shah, U. A., Hussain, M., Saddiqa, M., & Yar, M. S. (2021). Problems and challenges in the preservation of digital contents: an analytical study. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 2021, 5628. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5628>
46. Sturges, P., & Gasteringer, A. (2020). Information ethics in a changing digital landscape. *Journal of Information Science*, 46(1), 13–25.
47. UNESCO. (2021). Freedom of expression and access to information in the digital era. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. <https://www.unesco.org/>
48. Weller, T. (2019). *Information history in the modern world: Histories of the information age*. Palgrave Macmillan.
49. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.