African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration
ISSN: 2689-5102
Volume 8, Issue 1, 2025 (pp. 58-82)
www.abjournals.org

PROTECTING VULNERABLE POPULATIONS: INFORMED CONSENT, INDIGENOUS GATEKEEPERS OF DEITIES, AND ETHICAL RESEARCH PRACTICES

Aderonke Adegbite (Ph.D.)

Department of Private and Business Law, Lead City University, Ibadan.

Email: deronkeadegbite@gmail.com; Tel.: +2348034432735

Cite this article:

Adegbite, A. (2025), Protecting Vulnerable Populations: Informed Consent, Indigenous Gatekeepers of Deities, and Ethical Research Practices. African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration 8(1), 58-82. DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5

Manuscript History

Received: 29 Nov 2024

Accepted: 30 Jan 2025

Published: 4 Feb 2025

ABSTRACT: *The history of human subjects' research is fraught with instances of exploitation, particularly of vulnerable populations, under the guise of scientific progress. Notably, the Nazi experiments on prisoners during World War II and the U.S. Public Health Service Study of untreated syphilis in African American men in Macon County, Alabama (the Tuskegee syphilis study) stand out. These cases reflect a broader issue where vulnerable populations, unable to safeguard their interests, were exploited for others' benefit. Such abuses led to the establishment of ethical guidelines, codes of conduct, and regulations designed to protect human participants, especially those in vulnerable situations. Vulnerable populations in the course of research have hence been defined as communities or groups that face heightened risks of exploitation due to social, economic, environmental, or historical inequities. Among these are indigenous people who often bear the brunt of marginalisation. This work centres on Indigenous knowledge keepers, highlighting their resilience and invaluable contributions to preserving ancestral wisdom while addressing the unique challenges they face. This paper delves into the ethical principles guiding research, identifies vulnerable populations for research purposes, and instances where they can be breached. While other researchers have espoused issues on several groups of vulnerability, this researcher projects and focuses only on Indigenous gatekeepers of deities as vulnerable groups within Indigenous communities. They hold the responsibility of safeguarding spiritual practices, sacred knowledge, rituals, and sites associated with their deities or spiritual entities and whose cultural and spiritual properties can be appropriated or misused in research. The concept of informed consent is extended beyond individuals to encompass the protection of communities and their cultural heritage. , ensuring cultural integrity and safeguarding against exploitation in the research process. This research employs a qualitative approach, using a literature review, Laws and case studies to explore the ethical guidelines and historical instances of exploitation in human subjects' research. It examines contemporary research ethics, with a focus on informed consent and the role of indigenous gatekeepers of deities, to propose ethical, legal frameworks that protect both individuals and communities, particularly in research involving indigenous populations.*

KEYWORDS: Informed Consent, Indigenous Gatekeepers of Deities, Research Ethics, Vulnerable Population, Laws, Cultural Heritage.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5

INTRODUCTION

Indigenous gatekeepers of deities are individuals or groups within Indigenous communities who hold the responsibility of safeguarding spiritual practices, sacred knowledge, rituals, and sites associated with their deities or spiritual entities. These gatekeepers often serve as mediators between the community and the divine, ensuring that cultural and religious traditions are preserved and transmitted in accordance with long-standing customs. Their roles are deeply intertwined with their communities' spiritual and cultural identities, often rooted in oral traditions and ancestral knowledge (Grim, J. A. (Ed.)., 2001). These individuals, responsible for safeguarding sacred practices and deities, are at risk of exploitation, appropriation, and misrepresentation, often due to external research frameworks that fail to understand the intrinsic value of their cultures. Historically, vulnerable populations have been the focus of ethical concerns in research, but the unique vulnerability of indigenous gatekeepers of deities remains largely overlooked despite their crucial role in preserving cultural heritage. The concept of informed consent, a cornerstone in ethical research, becomes especially complex when dealing with indigenous gatekeepers of deities. While informed consent is designed to protect individuals by ensuring they understand and agree to the nature of the research, it becomes more complicated when sacred knowledge, deities, and rituals are involved. The act of seeking consent from a gatekeeper may imply cultural misunderstanding or misrepresentation, as these individuals are asked to share knowledge that is deeply embedded in their community's spiritual context. In many instances, gatekeepers are under pressure to provide this knowledge for material or social benefit without fully understanding the broader consequences.

The vulnerability of indigenous gatekeepers of deities is rooted in historical contexts of colonisation, exploitation, and cultural erasure. For centuries, indigenous peoples have faced the appropriation of their cultural identities and spiritual practices, often by outsiders claiming ownership or misrepresenting their traditions. This history has created a significant mistrust between indigenous communities and researchers. Gatekeepers, as protectors of sacred knowledge, are now tasked with balancing the need to preserve their traditions while facing increasing external demands for their cultural wisdom. These gatekeepers are not merely participants in research. They are the protectors of knowledge that often lies at the core of their communities' identity. This research seeks to explore the vulnerabilities faced by indigenous gatekeepers of deities in research contexts and the ethical challenges surrounding informed consent. While much of the existing literature addresses vulnerable populations in general, the specific risks faced by indigenous gatekeepers of deities are underexplored. This study will examine the power dynamics between gatekeepers and external researchers, focusing on how informed consent may not adequately address the cultural and spiritual dimensions of indigenous knowledge. It will also explore the commercialisation of indigenous traditions, where sacred knowledge is commodified without proper consent, further compounding the vulnerabilities of gatekeepers. The purpose of this research is to create a framework for ethical research practices that respect the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous communities. By addressing the complexities of informed consent in these contexts, the study aims to protect indigenous knowledge from exploitation and misrepresentation while ensuring that indigenous gatekeepers of deities are treated with the respect and dignity they deserve. This research will contribute to the development of more inclusive, culturally sensitive research guidelines, emphasising the need for indigenous perspectives to guide the ethical conduct of research involving their communities.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

i. Human Subjects Research

Human subjects' research involves the study of human beings as participants to collect data through various methods such as observation, surveys, experiments, or medical interventions. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). Ethical human subjects research aims to protect participants from harm, ensure their autonomy is respected, and provide them with adequate information for decision-making. Research involving human subjects has historically faced challenges, including exploitation and abuse, particularly during the early 20th century, which led to the development of ethical standards and frameworks for research, including the Nuremberg Code and the Declaration of Helsinki.

ii. Ethical Guidelines

Ethical guidelines in research are sets of principles that outline the moral obligations researchers must adhere to when conducting studies, ensuring respect for participants and upholding their rights and dignity. These guidelines include the need for informed consent, confidentiality, the right to withdraw, and fairness in selecting participants. Over the years, various documents such as the Nuremberg Code (1947) and the Belmont Report (1979) have shaped these ethical standards, responding to past unethical research practices like the Tuskegee Syphilis Study and Nazi human experiments. The ethical guidelines are also designed to ensure the well-being of vulnerable groups such as children, prisoners, and indigenous populations in research settings. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019)

iii. Informed Consent

Informed consent is a cornerstone of ethical research practices, requiring that participants are fully informed about the nature, purpose, risks, and potential benefits of the study before they agree to take part. It ensures that participants understand the scope of the research and voluntarily consent to their involvement without coercion. Informed consent is vital for protecting participants' autonomy and upholding their rights. In research involving vulnerable populations, the process must be carefully tailored to accommodate the capacity for understanding, especially in communities with lower literacy levels or language barriers. Informed consent not only protects individual rights but also strengthens the integrity of the research process. Faden, R. R., & Beauchamp, T. L. (1986)

iv. Vulnerable Populations

Vulnerable populations are groups that may face increased risks in research due to social, economic, political, or medical factors. These populations include children, the elderly, people with cognitive disabilities, economically disadvantaged individuals, and marginalised communities such as racial minorities or indigenous peoples. Vulnerable persons are individuals or groups who face an increased risk of harm, exploitation, or marginalisation due to various social, economic, cultural, or environmental factors. Scholars provide nuanced definitions to highlight the complexity of this concept. Turner (2020) describes vulnerability as a condition in which people are disproportionately exposed to risks while lacking sufficient means of defence or resilience against harm. Wilkes (2018) adds that vulnerability often stems from systemic exclusions and historical disadvantages, which limit an individual's ability to thrive within societal structures. Chambers (1989) offers a multidimensional perspective, viewing vulnerability as the combination of external exposure to harm and internal coping capacity. This dual understanding underscores how susceptibility to harm is compounded by the inability to recover from it. Similarly, Cardona (2004) emphasises the multifactorial nature of vulnerability, which arises from intersecting physical, economic, social, and environmental conditions. In cultural contexts, Kirmayer et al. (2009) focus on the unique vulnerabilities faced by custodians of indigenous traditions. They describe these individuals as being at heightened risk because of their dependence on community validation and the challenges of preserving sacred practices amidst societal changes. Smith (2012) highlights that vulnerability is exacerbated when individuals lack access to resources or support systems necessary to sustain their cultural roles. Nwachukwu (2019) extends this understanding by examining indigenous settings, where cultural custodians face pressures that threaten their relevance and significance within the community.

This work specifically projects and focuses on indigenous gatekeepers of deities as a uniquely vulnerable group. These individuals, such as priests, priestesses, and custodians, serve as stewards of sacred traditions and spiritual intermediaries within their communities. Their roles are integral to preserving cultural heritage, yet they are often marginalised or stigmatised due to societal changes and legal frameworks that challenge traditional practices. These vulnerabilities are amplified by diminishing community support, economic precarity, and external pressures to conform to modern human rights standards. By grounding the analysis in previous scholarly definitions, this work aims to present a comprehensive understanding of vulnerability while centring the experiences of indigenous gatekeepers of deities. Their challenges are emblematic of problems that vulnerable groups face due to their inability to give informed consent and susceptibility to coercion or undue influence. National Bioethics Advisory Commission. (2001).

v. Exploitation in Research

Research has been defined as a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalisable knowledge (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1991). It is the pursuit of understanding through the application of rigorous methodologies to collect and analyse data systematically (Babbie, 2020). It involves the process of systematically gathering, analysing, and interpreting data to answer questions, solve problems, or produce findings that inform practice, policy, or further inquiry (Adegbite A.E 2022) (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Research is also a scientific and systematic search for pertinent information on a specific topic, representing the art of scientific investigation (Kothari, 2004). It entails a systematic, controlled, empirical, and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among natural phenomena (Kerlinger, 1973). It involves a process of inquiry aimed at solving problems, answering questions, or developing new insights through a structured and methodical framework (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019). Since research relies on data, exploitation in research refers to situations where researchers take advantage of vulnerable individuals or groups for the benefit of the research or society at large, often violating ethical principles such as informed consent and respect for persons. The term is used to describe historical instances like the Tuskegee Syphilis Study and the Nazi medical experiments, where individuals were subjected to harmful or degrading research practices without their consent or awareness. These exploitative practices have had long-lasting impacts, leading to the establishment of stricter ethical frameworks and regulations in research. Gamble, V. N. (1997).

vi. Tuskegee Syphilis Study

The Tuskegee Syphilis Study was a notorious research project conducted by the U.S. Public Health Service between 1932 and 1972, in which African American men with syphilis were intentionally left untreated, even after penicillin was recognised as an effective treatment for the disease. The men, who were not informed about their diagnosis or the true nature of the study, were denied treatment to allow researchers to study the natural progression of the disease. The study was conducted without the men's informed consent, representing a clear violation of their rights. The unethical practices of this study played a key role in the development of modern research ethics, emphasising the importance of informed consent and transparency in research. Gamble, V. N. (2009).

vii. Nazi Experiments

During World War II, Nazi medical experiments on concentration camp prisoners involved horrific and brutal procedures, often conducted without consent and designed to explore the limits of human endurance and exploit racial and ethnic differences. These experiments included exposure to extreme temperatures, testing of unproven medical treatments, and forced sterilisations. The inhumanity of these experiments, which led to numerous deaths and lifelong suffering for many survivors, catalysed the establishment of international human rights and research ethics, including the Nuremberg Code, which outlined fundamental principles for ethical research.Annas, G. J., & Grodin, M. A. (1992).

viii. Cultural Heritage Protection

Cultural heritage protection refers to efforts to preserve and safeguard the intellectual, spiritual, and material aspects of a community's identity and traditions. This protection is particularly relevant in the context of indigenous communities, whose knowledge systems, rituals, and sacred practices may be vulnerable to exploitation or appropriation by outside researchers or commercial entities. In research, cultural heritage protection ensures that the integrity of indigenous traditions is respected and that any knowledge or materials collected are handled with the permission and oversight of the community. Smith, L. T. (1999).

ix. Research Ethics

Research ethics are the principles and standards that govern the conduct of research to ensure that it is conducted in a morally responsible manner. These principles include respect for participants' autonomy, ensuring non-maleficence (doing no harm), and promoting beneficence (doing good). Research ethics also encompass justice in the fair distribution of research benefits and risks. These ethical standards are enshrined in various guidelines, such as the Declaration of Helsinki. They are designed to prevent exploitation and harm while maintaining the scientific integrity of the research process. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2013).

x. Indigenous Perspectives

Indigenous perspectives refer to the unique worldviews, cultural values, and knowledge systems of indigenous peoples. These perspectives are often rooted in a deep connection to the land, ancestral practices, and spiritual beliefs. In the context of research, incorporating indigenous perspectives means respecting the sovereignty and autonomy of indigenous

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5

communities, recognising their cultural knowledge, and ensuring that their participation in research is ethical and beneficial. This approach contrasts with Western academic frameworks and requires a holistic, community-driven approach to research. Brayboy, B. M. J., & Deyhle, D. (2000).

xi. Ethical Frameworks

Ethical frameworks provide structured approaches for researchers to navigate moral challenges in their work, particularly in situations where the rights and dignity of participants must be balanced against scientific or societal goals. These frameworks help researchers make decisions that align with principles like autonomy, beneficence, justice, and non-maleficence. Ethical frameworks guide researchers in addressing dilemmas, ensuring that research is conducted responsibly and ethically, with respect for both individual and collective rights. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019).

xii. Indigenous Gatekeepers Of Deities

Indigenous gatekeepers of deities are individuals or groups within Indigenous communities who hold the responsibility of safeguarding spiritual practices, sacred knowledge, rituals, and sites associated with their deities or spiritual entities. These gatekeepers often serve as mediators between the community and the divine, ensuring that cultural and religious traditions are preserved and transmitted in accordance with long-standing customs. Their roles are deeply intertwined with their communities' spiritual and cultural identities, often rooted in oral traditions and ancestral knowledge. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities typically fulfil several important roles, which include the possession of intricate knowledge about myths, ceremonies, and practices related to their deities, often passed down through generations Golan, A. (2003). They lead or oversee rituals, festivals, and ceremonies to honour deities, ensuring that these practices are conducted in accordance with tradition. Often, they safeguard locations considered holy or significant to their deities, such as mountains, rivers, groves, or temples. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities teach younger generations about the community's spiritual practices, ensuring continuity of knowledge and respect for traditions. They are also referenced as spiritual intermediaries, facilitating communication or balance between the human world and the divine realm.

Deities, regarded as divine or supernatural beings, hold a central place in the spiritual and cultural frameworks of numerous societies worldwide. They represent forces of nature, ancestral spirits, or higher powers. Across these diverse cultures, individuals or groups serve as custodians or gatekeepers, ensuring the worship, rituals, and traditions associated with deities are preserved. The cultures discussed here are just a few examples among the many that emphasise the sacred roles of such custodians. These roles are vital for maintaining spiritual and cultural continuity in their communities Adegbite and Olusegun (2019).

In Hindu traditions, temple priests and hereditary custodians play a significant role as gatekeepers for deities worshipped in sacred temples. The Gurukkal priests in Tamil Nadu, for instance, are responsible for performing and overseeing rituals for major deities, adhering strictly to ancient customs (Golan, 2003). These practices, rooted in one of the world's most ancient religious traditions, demonstrate how Hindu culture has institutionalised the roles of gatekeepers, ensuring that the connection between devotees and the divine remains intact. Shamans in Indigenous Siberian and South American tribes highlight another cultural perspective on spiritual gatekeeping. These spiritual leaders act as mediators between deities or spirits and their communities. According to Grim (2001), shamans not only conduct rituals and healings but also protect sacred knowledge integral to their community's spiritual identity. This tradition is one of many Indigenous practices worldwide where gatekeepers serve as bridges between the material and spiritual realms. In Tibetan and Andean cultures, sacred mountains are revered as deities, illustrating a different approach to divine veneration. Communities such as the Quechua in the Andes regard mountains, or Apus, as spiritual entities that protect the land and its people. Elders and spiritual leaders perform offerings to these mountains to maintain harmony and honour these deities (Anderson, 2014). Likewise, Tibetan Buddhists and Bon practitioners venerate sacred peaks, with monks and lamas performing rituals that connect the physical landscape to the spiritual world (Hughes, 1994). These practices, though distinct in origin, share a profound respect for nature as a manifestation of divinity.

Native American traditions further illustrate the diversity of cultures with spiritual gatekeepers. Many tribes recognise medicine people and elders as custodians of sacred ceremonies and rituals that honour their spiritual beings or deities. For example, in the Lakota tradition, the pipe carrier serves as a spiritual guide and protector of sacred knowledge, ensuring its transmission across generations (Posey, 1990). This role exemplifies the broader Indigenous practice of preserving spiritual wisdom through oral traditions and communal rituals. In Bali, the Pemangku priests are central to maintaining the balance between humans, nature, and the divine. Their rituals for deities, performed in temples and during festivals, reflect the deeply spiritual nature of Balinese culture (Smith, 2012). This cultural tradition, while distinct to Bali, shares commonalities with other cultures where the divine and natural worlds are intimately linked, highlighting the universal importance of spiritual gatekeepers. African traditional religions provide yet another lens through which to view the role of gatekeepers. For instance, in Yoruba culture, priests and priestesses serve as intermediaries for Orishas, divine spirits that guide and protect the community. These gatekeepers lead rituals, perform divinations, and initiate new members into religious practices, preserving a spiritual tradition rich in complexity and meaning (Rai, 2014). Similar roles can be found among Zulu spiritual leaders, who oversee ceremonies that honour ancestral deities, reinforcing cultural identity and connection to the divine.

These examples represent only a fraction of the world's cultures where spiritual gatekeepers play pivotal roles. From the sacred temples of India to the Andean mountains, from Siberian shamanic practices to African ancestral ceremonies, these traditions underscore the universality of humanity's connection to the divine. They also highlight the diversity in how different cultures honour and preserve their spiritual heritage, offering invaluable insights into the shared and unique aspects of global spirituality. In the course of research by scientists et al., the roles of indigenous Gatekeepers of Deities extend beyond merely managing research access; they are integral in ensuring that Indigenous knowledge and cultural practices are not misappropriated, misrepresented, or exploited by outsiders, particularly researchers. The gatekeeper’s function is deeply rooted in the community’s collective responsibility to protect their spiritual, cultural, and intellectual property. Smith 1999. This position often involves the careful mediation of research projects that seek to involve or represent Indigenous peoples. Gatekeepers are essential in the process of ethical research with Indigenous communities because they ensure that the community’s cultural integrity is maintained. This may involve setting parameters for what can be shared with outsiders, ensuring that consent is given in culturally appropriate ways, and making decisions about which knowledge should be protected.

Gatekeepers are also responsible for communicating the community's wishes to researchers and ensuring that Indigenous perspectives are respected throughout the research process. In this capacity, gatekeepers are not merely figureheads; they are active participants in decision-making and often hold considerable authority within their communities. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities also play a crucial role in ensuring that the principles of "informed consent" are respected and that cultural rights are not compromised for the sake of scientific progress. Their involvement in research projects helps ensure that any information shared with external parties is done with the full consent of the community and that the benefits of research are equitably shared. By protecting both individual and collective cultural knowledge, gatekeepers prevent the exploitation of Indigenous peoples, ensuring that their rights and traditions are honoured in academic and scientific endeavours. Chilisa, B. (2012).

Informed Consent as a Principle For Ethical Consideration

Informed Consent is a process by which a person voluntarily opts into a research study, and it can only take place after they have been fully informed of all that the study will entail and all that they will be required to do to become a participant, and are fully aware of what will happen to their data. Consent must be 'freely given, specific, informed and unambiguous'. Deborah S. (2024). According to Aderonke Adegbite (2022), informed Consent as an ethical requirement connotes that, human participants in any research are given adequate information about the research they are to participate in. This information should be given in a comprehensible manner, and all interactions should be conducted without duress, force, or inappropriate inducement. Basic information that should be in the consent form to be approved by the participants before the research begins includes:

i. The reasons, benefits, expected duration and procedures for the research.

ii. Potential risks, inconvenience, setbacks or adverse effects of the research.

iii. Participants have the right to refuse to participate and the liberty to withdraw when they wish to.

iv. The extent of information to be retrieved.

v. Interactions and the researcher's plan for confidentiality.

vi. Incentives for participation and plans for feedback and follow-ups.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of consent rests on the individual who initiates, directs, or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated without due process. Informed consent is one of the founding principles of research ethics. It is a systematic process of informing participants of the purpose, procedures, benefits, risks, and funding behind a research project to enable them to make an informed decision on whether or not to participate. The principle of informed consent requires researchers to obtain the consent of participants before they can participate in a research process. For consent to be informed, participants must understand properly the purpose of the research and what they are consenting to. Depending on the type of research being conducted and the methods used, consent may be given verbally or in writing.

Informed consent is a process in which individuals voluntarily agree to participate in research after being adequately informed of the nature of the study, the potential risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019). The process of obtaining informed consent is not simply a matter of acquiring a signed document but involves a thorough discussion to ensure that participants comprehend the information presented. This ensures that participants are making an informed and voluntary decision about their involvement in the research (Manson & O'Neill, 2007). Informed consent is especially important in protecting vulnerable populations because these individuals may be less able to understand complex medical or research-related information. Vulnerable groups may also be more susceptible to coercion or exploitation, which can undermine their ability to give true informed consent. As such, researchers have a heightened ethical obligation to ensure that participants are capable of understanding the consent process and that their decision to participate is made voluntarily, without undue influence or pressure (Miller & Brody, 2003).

THE ESSENCE, PROCESSES, AND CHALLENGES ASSOCIATED WITH INFORMED CONSENT

Informed consent is a foundational concept in research ethics, designed to ensure that participants are fully aware of the nature of the research they are involved in and agree to it voluntarily. The principle of informed consent is essential to respecting autonomy, ensuring ethical treatment, and protecting the rights of research participants. It has evolved through historical events, ethical debates, and legal developments, and it continues to play a crucial role in safeguarding participants in modern-day research. However, despite its importance, there are numerous challenges and complexities associated with the process, particularly when vulnerable populations, such as indigenous peoples or those in conflict zones, are involved. This essay will explore the essence of informed consent, the processes through which it is achieved, the challenges that researchers encounter, and how these issues are addressed in contemporary research practices.

a. The Essence of Informed Consent

The essence of informed consent lies in its ability to provide individuals with the necessary information to make an autonomous decision about whether or not to participate in a study. It encompasses the principle of respect for persons, one of the key ethical tenets in research (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019). Informed consent is not merely about obtaining a signature or verbal agreement; it is about ensuring that participants understand the potential risks and benefits of the research, as well as the nature and purpose of the study, in a way that is clear and accessible to them. This process must be voluntary and free from coercion, manipulation, or undue influence (Faden & Beauchamp, 1986).

The concept of informed consent is deeply rooted in the recognition of individual autonomy—the right to make decisions based on one’s own values and preferences. For research to be ethical, it is essential that participants are fully informed, meaning they understand the study's procedures, any potential risks or benefits, and the broader context of the research. This is particularly important in clinical trials, biomedical research, and studies involving vulnerable groups, where the risk of harm may be greater. The idea is to empower participants with knowledge, allowing them to make decisions that align with their own interests and welfare (Kass, 2001).

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5

b. The Processes of Informed Consent

The process of obtaining informed consent is not a one-time event but rather an ongoing dialogue between the researcher and the participant. The process generally includes several key stages: providing information, ensuring comprehension, and obtaining voluntary consent (World Health Organisation [WHO], 2009).

i. Providing Information

The first step in the informed consent process involves providing the participant with all the relevant information regarding the study. This includes the objectives, procedures, potential risks, and expected benefits of the research. Information should also be provided on the participant's right to withdraw from the study at any time, without consequence (Katz, 2015). The information should be presented in a format that is clear and understandable, and it may need to be tailored to the participant’s level of literacy, cultural background, and language preferences (Manson & O'Neill, 2007). This step is vital because it ensures that participants have a comprehensive understanding of the study they are consenting to. For instance, in clinical trials, participants must be made aware of potential side effects or risks that might be involved, while in social science research, participants must understand how their data will be used and whether their confidentiality will be protected.

ii. Ensuring Comprehension

After providing the necessary information, it is crucial to assess the participant's comprehension. This goes beyond reading and signing a consent form; it involves checking that the participant truly understands the content of the consent form and the implications of their participation. Research shows that people with limited education or those from vulnerable populations may struggle to understand complex medical or scientific terms, so it is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure clarity and understanding (Harris, 2014). Methods for ensuring comprehension can include follow-up questions, the use of visual aids or simplified language, and ensuring that the participant has an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers. In some cases, informed consent may require a more extensive process, especially for individuals with cognitive impairments or those who speak a different language. Researchers need to adapt their approach to suit the needs of participants, fostering an environment in which individuals feel comfortable expressing any doubts or concerns (Fisher, 2004).

iii. Obtaining Voluntary Consent

The final stage of the process involves obtaining voluntary consent from the participant. This is the legal and ethical acknowledgement that the participant agrees to take part in the study based on the information provided and their understanding of the research. Voluntary consent requires that participants are not coerced or unduly influenced, either directly or indirectly. There must be no pressure from researchers, family members, or other external entities that could undermine the participant’s decision (World Medical Association [WMA], 2013). This stage of the process is integral in ensuring that the research maintains its ethical integrity. The researcher must respect the participant’s decision, even if they choose not to participate, and there must be no repercussions or loss of benefits as a result of such a decision. Furthermore, informed consent is not a one-time act but an ongoing process. Participants should be reminded of their right to withdraw at any point without any consequences, and consent should be renewed periodically, especially if the research spans over long periods or evolves into a new phase (Gamble, 2009).

c. Challenges in the Informed Consent Process

While the process of obtaining informed consent is relatively straightforward in theory, there are many challenges in practice, particularly in research involving vulnerable populations or complex environments.

i. Vulnerability of Research Participants

One of the major challenges to informed consent is the vulnerability of research participants, which can significantly impact their ability to make fully autonomous decisions. Vulnerable populations, including children, individuals with cognitive impairments, prisoners, and indigenous peoples, often face unique obstacles in understanding or consenting to research. These groups may be subject to social, economic, or psychological pressures that compromise their ability to give truly voluntary consent (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). For example, research involving indigenous gatekeepers of deities may involve cultural misunderstandings or coercion, where gatekeepers are pressured into sharing sacred knowledge or deities under the pretext of providing benefits to their communities (Sundararajan, 2012). In these contexts, informed consent can be easily undermined by power imbalances, lack of resources, or limited access to information.

ii. Complex Ethical and Cultural Considerations

Informed consent is also complicated by the ethical and cultural considerations involved in certain research contexts. For example, in some indigenous cultures, sacred knowledge and spiritual practices are considered collective property of the community rather than individual ownership. Thus, informed consent cannot be solely obtained from a single individual but must involve consultation with community leaders or gatekeepers. This challenge highlights the need for research processes that are culturally sensitive and include community-based approaches to informed consent, where the rights of the entire group are respected (Kleinman, 2012).

iii. Language and Communication Barriers

Another significant challenge lies in the language and communication barriers between researchers and participants. In cases where participants do not speak the same language as the researchers or when complex scientific terms are involved, misunderstanding is more likely. Researchers must ensure that participants comprehend the information being provided, which may require translation services or simplified explanations. This is particularly important when research is conducted in diverse geographical locations or across cultures where language barriers may exist.

iv. Coercion and Undue Influence

Coercion and undue influence can also undermine the informed consent process. Researchers, particularly in contexts where they hold power over the participants (such as in clinical trials, military research, or social services), may inadvertently or deliberately apply pressure on participants to enrol in studies. This can lead to decisions that are not entirely voluntary, thus violating ethical principles (Miller & Brody, 2003).

Informed consent is a cornerstone of ethical research, ensuring that participants' autonomy, rights, and well-being are protected. However, the process of obtaining informed consent is far from simple, and it involves navigating a complex web of challenges, especially when vulnerable populations or diverse cultural contexts are involved. The ethical and procedural challenges of informed consent require that researchers not only provide clear and understandable information but also respect the autonomy of individuals and the cultural contexts in which they operate. As the field of research continues to evolve, it is crucial that the processes surrounding informed consent be continually revisited and improved to ensure that all participants are treated with dignity, respect, and fairness.

THE CONCEPT OF VULNERABILITY IN RELATION TO INFORMED CONSENT

Informed consent is a cornerstone of ethical research practices, designed to protect individuals' autonomy and ensure that they participate voluntarily in research. However, the concept of vulnerability complicates this framework, as certain individuals or groups may not have the capacity to make fully informed decisions due to various factors, such as social, economic, physical, or psychological disadvantages. The relationship between vulnerability and informed consent is critical because it highlights the challenges of ensuring ethical research practices in contexts where individuals may be at risk of exploitation or harm. This section explores the concept of vulnerability in relation to informed consent, drawing on key theories and the work of several scholars, including Beauchamp and Childress (2019), Faden and Beauchamp (1986), and others.

Defining Vulnerability

The term "vulnerability" refers to the susceptibility of an individual or group to harm, exploitation, or disadvantage Adegbite A.E.(2024). Vulnerability can be understood in multiple dimensions, such as physical, social, economic, psychological, or cultural. It is often associated with a lack of power, control, or resources to protect oneself from potential harm (Manson & O'Neill, 2007). The vulnerability of individuals can arise from various factors, including age, health status, socioeconomic status, cognitive ability, and social position. For example, vulnerable populations in research include children, the elderly, individuals with mental disabilities, economically disadvantaged individuals, refugees, and those from marginalised communities (Katz, 2015). Vulnerability is often considered a relative concept, meaning that it varies depending on the context. In some situations, an individual may be considered vulnerable due to their inability to understand the risks associated with participation in research, while in others, they may be vulnerable because of their limited access to resources or support networks (Faden & Beauchamp, 1986). The recognition of vulnerability in research participants is essential because it guides ethical considerations, particularly in obtaining informed consent Adegbite A.E,(2024).

THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN VULNERABILITY AND INFORMED CONSENT

The vulnerability of research participants complicates the process of obtaining genuine informed consent. Vulnerability can manifest in various ways that undermine a person's capacity to fully understand the implications of their participation in research. One of the most significant ways vulnerability affects informed consent is through diminished capacity to understand risks and benefits (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). For example, individuals with cognitive impairments, such as those with dementia or intellectual disabilities, may struggle to comprehend complex information about a study's potential risks, benefits, and purpose.

Similarly, people from marginalised communities may face barriers to understanding due to language, cultural differences, or limited access to education. Moreover, vulnerability can also manifest in a heightened risk of coercion. Coercion refers to situations where a person feels compelled to participate in research because of external pressures, such as financial incentives, a power imbalance, or societal expectations. For instance, low-income individuals or those in precarious social situations may feel pressured to participate in research as a means of obtaining financial support or medical care (Gamble, 2009). The presence of coercion undermines the principle of voluntary participation, which is central to informed consent.

Furthermore, vulnerable populations often lack access to sufficient information, support, or advocacy to make informed decisions about their participation in research (Katz, 2015). For example, indigenous communities may be unaware of how their participation in research could impact their cultural practices or the integrity of their traditional knowledge. In these situations, informed consent becomes particularly complex, as the gatekeepers of indigenous knowledge, such as community leaders or cultural custodians, may need to be consulted to ensure that consent is properly obtained on behalf of the entire community (Sundararajan, 2012).

Addressing Vulnerability in Informed Consent

To address the challenges posed by vulnerability in informed consent, several approaches can be employed to ensure that consent is ethically obtained and that vulnerable participants are protected. One of the key strategies is the provision of information in an accessible and understandable manner. Researchers should ensure that study materials are presented in clear language and, when necessary, offer translation services or culturally appropriate explanations (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). This is particularly important for research involving participants from diverse linguistic or cultural backgrounds. The goal is to facilitate understanding so that individuals can make well-informed decisions about their participation. Another important consideration is the role of surrogate decision-makers or guardians in situations where the participant is unable to provide consent independently. This is common in research involving children or individuals with cognitive impairments (Manson & O'Neill, 2007). In such cases, it is essential to ensure that the surrogate decision-maker fully understands the nature of the research and acts in the best interests of the participant. The involvement of gatekeepers, especially in indigenous communities, may also be necessary to obtain culturally appropriate consent (Sundararajan, 2012).

Furthermore, researchers must be vigilant about avoiding coercion or undue influence when recruiting vulnerable participants. For example, offering financial incentives to individuals from low-income backgrounds can inadvertently pressure them to participate, even if they do not fully understand the risks involved (Gamble, 2009). To mitigate this, researchers can ensure that incentives are not tied to coercive practices and that participants are given ample time and support to make their decisions independently.

The concept of vulnerability is central to the ethical practice of obtaining informed consent in research. Vulnerable individuals or groups may face challenges in understanding complex information, may be at risk of coercion, and may not have access to the resources or support needed to make fully informed decisions. As such, researchers have an ethical responsibility to adapt their consent processes to meet the needs of vulnerable participants, ensuring that consent is obtained voluntarily and that participants' rights and dignity are respected. By recognising and addressing vulnerability, researchers can help safeguard the autonomy and well-being of participants while promoting ethical standards in research. Informed consent is not merely a procedural requirement but a fundamental ethical obligation that ensures research is conducted with respect for all individuals, regardless of their vulnerability (Beauchamp & Childress, 2019; Faden & Beauchamp, 1986).

ETHICAL CHALLENGES IN RESEARCH INVOLVING INDIGENOUS GATEKEEPERS OF DEITIES

Indigenous gatekeepers of deities are custodians of profound cultural and spiritual heritage, preserving sacred knowledge, rituals, and traditions that embody their communities' identities. Despite their importance, these individuals and their knowledge systems have historically faced systemic exploitation by researchers, institutions, and corporations. This exploitation has taken various forms, including the misappropriation, commodification, and alteration of indigenous knowledge and practices without consent. Such actions have resulted in the erosion of cultural integrity and spiritual significance, leaving indigenous groups disenfranchised and disempowered in controlling their heritage (Nakata, 2007; Battiste, 2002). The misappropriation of traditional knowledge is one of the most pervasive forms of exploitation. Indigenous medicinal practices, spiritual rituals, and folklore have been extracted, documented, and commercialised without recognition or compensation to the originating communities. This undermines cultural autonomy and often distorts the context and meaning of these practices when they are removed from their indigenous frameworks (Smith, 1999). For instance, indigenous knowledge about healing plants has frequently been patented by pharmaceutical companies, generating significant profits while excluding indigenous peoples from sharing these benefits. Such practices highlight the systemic inequities that privilege external entities at the expense of indigenous communities (Battiste & Henderson, 2000).

Biopiracy represents another critical dimension of exploitation. The unauthorised use of indigenous genetic resources—such as medicinal plants—for commercial gain exemplifies the unethical extraction of indigenous intellectual property. Cases such as the patenting of neem and turmeric by corporations in the Global North underscore the exploitation of sacred and traditional knowledge (Shiva, 1997; Posey, 2002). These actions not only commodify resources that hold profound cultural and spiritual value but also deny indigenous communities the rights and benefits associated with their innovations. This form of exploitation is particularly harmful because it undermines the sovereignty of indigenous peoples over their natural resources and knowledge systems.

Archaeological and anthropological research has also played a significant role in exploiting indigenous gatekeepers. The excavation of burial sites, removal of sacred artefacts, and unauthorised documentation of rituals often occur without consultation or consent from the affected communities. These practices, while often justified under the guise of academic inquiry, result in profound cultural and spiritual harm. For example, indigenous burial sites have been desecrated and sacred objects displayed in museums, severing their connection to the communities to which they belong. Although legislation like the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in the United States has attempted to address these issues, many indigenous groups worldwide continue to struggle against the appropriation of their cultural heritage (Deloria, 1995; Tsosie, 2017). The challenges faced by indigenous gatekeepers are further exacerbated by the inadequacies of global intellectual property systems, which prioritise individual authorship and innovation over collective and intergenerational knowledge. This legal framework often leaves indigenous knowledge systems vulnerable to exploitation. Sacred symbols, rituals, and traditional practices are frequently commodified in industries such as fashion, wellness, and tourism, stripping them of their cultural significance (Brown, 2003; Comaroff & Comaroff, 2009). The commercialisation of these elements often perpetuates stereotypes and misrepresentations, further marginalising indigenous voices and perspectives.

INFORMED CONSENT IN RESEARCH WITH INDIGENOUS GATEKEEPERS OF DEITIES

Informed consent is a foundational principle in ethical research. It ensures that participants fully understand the purpose, methods, potential risks, and benefits of the research before agreeing to participate (Beauchamp & Childress, 2013). This principle is designed to protect individuals and communities from exploitation and harm. However, in the context of indigenous gatekeepers of deities, the application of informed consent becomes particularly complex due to the communal and spiritual dimensions of the knowledge involved. These complexities demand a more nuanced approach to consent, one that respects not only individual autonomy but also collective cultural integrity. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities occupy a unique position within their communities. They are entrusted with the stewardship of knowledge that is often considered sacred and inextricably linked to the identity and spirituality of the community. This creates significant ethical challenges in research contexts. Historically, many researchers have disregarded the cultural significance of indigenous knowledge systems, resulting in a history of appropriation and misrepresentation (Smith, 1999). Such actions have not only harmed the communities but also devalued the cultural richness that these knowledge systems embody, perpetuating a cycle of exploitation and misunderstanding.

One of the primary ethical concerns is the imbalance of power between researchers and indigenous communities. Researchers often come from external frameworks that prioritise empirical data over cultural sensitivity. This imbalance can result in the commodification of sacred knowledge, where it is extracted without regard for its spiritual and cultural significance (Chilisa, 2012). Additionally, this power dynamic often manifests in unequal negotiations, where gatekeepers might feel pressured to agree to terms they do not fully understand or support. The ethical concept of informed consent becomes vital in addressing this imbalance and safeguarding the interests of indigenous gatekeepers of deities by ensuring that their rights and agency are upheld throughout the research process.

Complexities of Informed Consent with Indigenous gatekeepers of deities

i. **Cultural Misunderstanding:** Seeking informed consent from indigenous gatekeepers of deities can inadvertently signal a lack of understanding or respect for their cultural practices. In many indigenous cultures, knowledge is not seen as an individual possession but as a communal asset (Battiste, 2002). Researchers must navigate the tension between respecting communal ownership and seeking individual consent. For instance, individual consent might be insufficient if the knowledge pertains to practices that require broader community approval. Missteps in this area can lead to cultural offences and potential disruptions of social harmony within the community.

ii. **Sacred Knowledge:** The knowledge held by gatekeepers often includes sacred rituals, deities, and practices that are not meant to be shared with outsiders. Requesting access to this knowledge can be perceived as a violation of cultural boundaries (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Researchers must be cautious about the type of knowledge they seek and ensure that their inquiries align with cultural protocols. This includes recognising that some knowledge is considered sacred and protected, not for external consumption or academic scrutiny. Misrepresentation of such knowledge in research outputs further exacerbates the harm to these communities.

iii. **Coercion and Pressure:** Indigenous gatekeepers of deities may face social or economic pressures to share their knowledge. They may feel obligated to participate in research due to promises of material benefits or fear of offending the researcher. This coercion undermines the voluntary nature of informed consent (Brayboy & Deyhle, 2000). Furthermore, researchers must be mindful of how they present their requests, ensuring that gatekeepers do not feel compelled to participate due to hierarchical or economic disparities.

The Process of Obtaining Informed Consent from Gate Keepers of Cultures

Obtaining informed consent from indigenous gatekeepers of deities requires a culturally sensitive and community-centred approach. The following steps outline a process for achieving ethical and meaningful consent:

i. **Preliminary Engagement:** Researchers should begin by building relationships with the community. This involves spending time with community members, participating in cultural activities, and understanding the social and spiritual significance of the knowledge in question. This phase is crucial for establishing trust and demonstrating respect for the community's values (Chilisa, 2012). Such engagement fosters a collaborative environment where the community feels empowered to participate in the research process on their own terms.

ii. **Collaborative Research Design:** Researchers should collaborate with the community to design the research project. This includes identifying research questions, methods, and objectives that align with the community's priorities. Involving gatekeepers and other community members in the research design ensures that the project is relevant and respectful. By doing so, researchers signal their commitment to co-creating knowledge rather than merely extracting it.

iii. **Transparent Communication:** Researchers must provide clear and comprehensive information about the research. This includes explaining the purpose, methods, potential risks, and benefits in a language and format that is accessible to the gatekeepers and the community. Visual aids, storytelling, or interpreters may be necessary to ensure understanding. Transparency also involves discussing how the knowledge will be used, who will have access to it, and how the findings will be disseminated.

iv. **Cultural Protocols:** Researchers should adhere to cultural protocols when seeking consent. This may involve consulting with elders, tribal councils, or other community leaders before approaching gatekeepers. In some cases, collective consent from the community may be required in addition to individual consent from the gatekeeper. This step underscores the importance of respecting the social structures that govern knowledge sharing in indigenous communities.

v. **Voluntary Participation:** Gatekeepers must be given the freedom to decline participation without fear of reprisal or loss of benefits. Researchers should emphasise that participation is entirely voluntary and that gatekeepers have the right to withdraw at any time. It is essential to create an environment where gatekeepers feel secure in making decisions that align with their values and the interests of their community.

vi. **Ongoing Consent:** Informed consent is not a one-time event but an ongoing process. Researchers should periodically check in with gatekeepers to ensure they remain comfortable with their participation. Any changes to the research design should be communicated transparently, and renewed consent should be sought if necessary. This iterative approach reinforces the commitment to ethical engagement and respect for gatekeepers' agency.

vii. **Benefit Sharing:** Researchers should ensure that the community benefits from the research. This may include sharing findings, providing access to resources, or supporting community initiatives. Benefit-sharing arrangements should be discussed and agreed upon during the consent process. Such arrangements demonstrate a tangible commitment to reciprocity and respect for the community's contributions.

viii. **Ethical Review and Oversight:** Researchers should seek approval from both institutional review boards and community-based ethical review processes. These bodies can provide guidance on cultural sensitivity and help ensure that the research adheres to ethical standards. Dual oversight ensures accountability and promotes adherence to both academic and cultural ethical norms.

Several successful research projects highlight the importance of informed consent and community engagement. For example, the work of Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) emphasises the importance of decolonising research methodologies to prioritise indigenous perspectives. Similarly, the San Code of Research Ethics developed by the San peoples of Southern Africa provides a model for ethical engagement with indigenous communities (Schmidt & Campbell, 2017). These cases illustrate that when researchers respect cultural protocols and prioritise informed consent, they contribute to the empowerment and preservation of indigenous knowledge systems. Informed consent is a critical component of ethical research involving indigenous gatekeepers of deities. It serves as a safeguard against exploitation and ensures that research aligns with the values and priorities of indigenous communities. However, the process of obtaining informed consent must be approached with cultural sensitivity and respect for the communal and spiritual dimensions of indigenous knowledge. By adopting a community-centred approach and adhering to cultural protocols, researchers can build trust, foster collaboration, and contribute to the preservation of indigenous heritage. Furthermore, informed consent enables researchers to uphold the dignity and agency of gatekeepers, ensuring that their participation is not only voluntary but also mutually beneficial.

Regulations and Human Rights Laws Protecting Gatekeepers in Research Contexts

The history of human subjects' research is fraught with instances of exploitation, particularly of vulnerable populations, under the guise of scientific progress. Notably, the Nazi experiments on prisoners during World War II and the U.S. Public Health Service Study of untreated syphilis in African American men in Macon County, Alabama (the Tuskegee syphilis study) stand out as egregious violations. In these cases, individuals were denied treatment and subjected to harm without their knowledge or consent, highlighting systemic ethical failures. These abuses catalysed the development of international human rights laws and ethical guidelines aimed at protecting individuals, particularly vulnerable groups, in research settings. This part explores the intersection of human rights laws, ethical research principles, and the protection of indigenous gatekeepers of deities. It argues that ethical research must extend protections to encompass not only individuals but also communities and their cultural heritage. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities, who preserve cultural traditions and spiritual practices, represent a critical yet often overlooked vulnerable population. Their protection is vital to ensuring ethical research practices that respect cultural integrity and prevent exploitation.

To address these systemic injustices, a shift towards ethical research practices and decolonised methodologies is essential. Researchers must engage with indigenous communities in ways that respect their sovereignty, cultural autonomy, and intellectual property rights. Participatory research methods that emphasise informed consent, equitable benefit-sharing, and the co-creation of knowledge are vital to fostering trust and collaboration (Chilisa, 2012). Decolonising research frameworks, as advocated by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), challenge colonial legacies by centring indigenous voices and ensuring that research serves the interests of the communities involved. International frameworks such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) provide a roadmap for protecting indigenous knowledge systems and promoting their rights. UNDRIP emphasises the importance of obtaining free, prior, and informed consent for any activities that impact indigenous peoples and their resources (United Nations, 2007). By adhering to these principles, researchers and institutions can contribute to the preservation and revitalisation of indigenous knowledge systems. Respect and reciprocity must underpin all interactions with indigenous gatekeepers, ensuring that their cultural and spiritual heritage is not only protected but also celebrated and empowered.

In conclusion, the exploitation of indigenous gatekeepers of deities has had far-reaching consequences, from the commodification of sacred knowledge to the erosion of cultural identities. Addressing this legacy requires a concerted effort to adopt ethical research practices, uphold indigenous sovereignty, and challenge the systemic inequities that have historically marginalised these communities. By fostering a culture of respect, collaboration, and shared benefit, it is possible to support the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems and empower the gatekeepers who serve as their custodians.

At this juncture, the roles of Research ethics committees in institutional and scientific categories cannot be overlooked (Adegbite, A.E. 2022). They are central to ensuring ethical research practices, particularly in safeguarding indigenous gatekeepers of deities from exploitation. These committees act as guardians of ethical standards, tasked with evaluating research proposals to ensure that they comply with international and regional legal frameworks designed to protect indigenous knowledge and communities. They, hence, play a critical role in bridging the gap between researchers and indigenous peoples by enforcing the principles of respect, equity, and informed consent.

In addition to the generic provisions of UNDRIP, the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) sets a foundation for equitable benefit-sharing derived from the use of genetic resources. Research ethics committees are instrumental in operationalising this principle by mandating that researchers submit detailed plans outlining how benefits—whether financial or otherwise—will be shared with the indigenous communities involved. This includes ensuring that indigenous groups are active participants in decision-making processes. The Nagoya Protocol (2010), as a supplement to this convention, provides a robust framework for enforcing fair benefit-sharing. Ethics committees must require documented proof of prior informed consent (PIC) and mutually agreed terms (MAT) before granting approval for access to genetic resources, ensuring that indigenous peoples' rights are fully respected and protected. UNESCO's Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) emphasises the importance of community participation in protecting and promoting intangible cultural heritage. Ethics committees have a practical responsibility to ensure that research involving sacred practices, rituals, or symbols is conducted in partnership with indigenous communities. This includes requiring explicit consent for the documentation or use of cultural practices and ensuring that research outcomes contribute to the preservation and empowerment of these communities. Furthermore, committees must prioritise the co-creation of knowledge and uphold the dignity and autonomy of indigenous gatekeepers.

Regional instruments, such as the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights and the American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, further reinforce the rights of communities to control their cultural and spiritual heritage. Research ethics committees must contextualise these frameworks within their assessments, ensuring that projects respect regional legal protections. For example, they can mandate that researchers in Africa align their work with the collective cultural rights outlined in the African Charter. At the same time, those in the Americas adhere to the provisions safeguarding indigenous sovereignty as stipulated in the American Declaration.

To safeguard indigenous gatekeepers effectively, ethics committees must take proactive steps to prevent exploitation and ensure compliance with ethical standards. They should require transparent reporting, ongoing community engagement, and the inclusion of indigenous voices in research processes from inception to dissemination. Regular audits, independent reviews, and capacity-building initiatives can further strengthen their role. By enforcing international and regional laws, promoting equitable benefit-sharing, and prioritising the participation of indigenous communities, research ethics committees serve as pivotal gatekeepers of ethical research safety. This ensures that research not only avoids harm but also actively contributes to the preservation, empowerment, and recognition of indigenous knowledge systems and their custodians.

The integration of penalties and institutional oversight is also essential for ensuring the ethical conduct of research and protecting human subjects. Ethical frameworks such as the Nuremberg Code (1947), the Declaration of Helsinki (1964), and the Belmont Report (1979) provide foundational principles, but their effectiveness hinges on the enforcement mechanisms attached to them. Institutions such as research ethics committees, national regulatory bodies, and international organisations play a pivotal role in operationalising these principles by embedding penalties into their oversight processes. For example, the Nuremberg Code's emphasis on voluntary informed consent is enforced through institutional mandates that revoke licenses, impose fines, or initiate legal proceedings against researchers who violate these standards. The Declaration of Helsinki, with its focus on protecting vulnerable populations and maintaining a favourable risk-benefit ratio, is implemented by ethics committees that scrutinise research protocols and impose sanctions such as suspension of projects, withdrawal of funding, or public reporting of violations to deter misconduct. Similarly, the Belmont Report's principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice are reinforced through systematic monitoring of research activities, requiring researchers to secure informed consent, equitably recruit participants, and minimise risks. Penalties, including institutional censure or criminal charges, ensure compliance and deter future violations. To enhance these frameworks, institutions must establish transparent reporting systems, conduct regular audits, and empower ethics committees with the authority to enforce consequences. By integrating enforceable penalties with ethical guidelines, institutions create a robust safety net that not only holds researchers accountable but also fosters trust, equity, and integrity in the research process, ensuring that the rights and dignity of all participants—particularly vulnerable populations—are upheld.

EXPANDING THE CONCEPT OF INFORMED CONSENT TO PROTECT INDIGENOUS GATEKEEPERS OF DEITIES

Informed consent is a fundamental principle of ethical research, traditionally centred on the rights of individuals. However, research involving Indigenous communities necessitates a broader approach that recognises collective rights and respects their unique cultural, spiritual, and traditional knowledge systems. Expanding the concept of informed consent involves integrating mechanisms that ensure the voices of Indigenous gatekeepers of deities are central to the research process and its outcomes.

i. Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)

A key element in this expanded framework is the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). This concept emphasises that Indigenous communities must be fully informed about the research objectives, potential outcomes, and possible impacts before any consent is granted. FPIC ensures that decisions are made in alignment with the community's cultural values, priorities, and interests, enabling them to retain control over their resources and heritage (Doyle, 2015). This principle is not only an ethical imperative but also a requirement under international frameworks such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

ii. Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR)

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) offers a practical model for achieving equitable research partnerships with Indigenous communities. Unlike conventional research approaches, CBPR positions communities as co-creators of knowledge. This method values Indigenous expertise and local knowledge, fostering mutual respect and trust between researchers and communities. CBPR allows Indigenous gatekeepers of deities to define research priorities, ensuring the work aligns with their needs and aspirations (Israel et al., 2013).

iii. Respect for Cultural Protocols

Respecting cultural protocols is another essential dimension of ethical research involving Indigenous communities. These protocols may include adhering to practices that honour sacred sites, traditional ceremonies, and spiritual beliefs. Researchers must engage in active dialogue with community leaders to understand and comply with these protocols, ensuring that the research process does not infringe on cultural norms or exploit traditional knowledge (Smith, 2012).

Illustrative Case Studies of Ethical Research Practices

Numerous examples highlight how ethical principles can guide research involving Indigenous gatekeepers of deities. One notable initiative is the development of the San Code of Research Ethics by the San people of Southern Africa. This code provides clear guidelines for researchers, emphasising principles such as transparency, respect, and equitable benefit-sharing. It serves as a model for how Indigenous communities can assert control over research processes and outcomes (Chennells & Steenkamp, 2018). In Canada, collaborative archaeology projects illustrate the power of partnerships between Indigenous communities and researchers. These initiatives prioritise the management and protection of sacred sites, ensuring that archaeological work reflects cultural values and community-defined priorities. Such partnerships underscore the importance of co-management in preserving cultural heritage (Nicholas & Hollowell, 2007). Another significant example is the establishment of Traditional Knowledge Databases, such as the Traditional Knowledge Digital Library in India. These databases serve as a tool for documenting traditional knowledge, providing evidence of Indigenous ownership and helping prevent exploitation. They also facilitate equitable benefit-sharing agreements, ensuring that communities receive recognition and compensation for their contributions (Rai, 2014).

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN PROTECTING INDIGENOUS GATEKEEPERS OF DEITIES

Despite progress in recognising the rights of Indigenous gatekeepers of deities, significant challenges persist. One major issue is the lack of enforcement mechanisms for existing legal protections. While frameworks such as UNDRIP outline important principles, their implementation often remains weak, leaving communities vulnerable to exploitation. Strengthening legal systems and creating accountability measures are essential steps in addressing this gap. Power imbalances between researchers and Indigenous communities also pose a persistent challenge. Research institutions and funding bodies frequently wield disproportionate influence, making it difficult for Indigenous groups to assert their rights or negotiate equitable terms. Addressing these imbalances requires a fundamental shift in research ethics, including greater community involvement in decision-making processes and more equitable resource distribution (Tuhiwai Smith, 2012). The globalisation and commercialisation of cultural heritage present additional risks. As traditional knowledge and practices become commodified, there is an increasing danger of misappropriation and loss of authenticity. To mitigate these risks, robust intellectual property frameworks must be developed to protect Indigenous knowledge and ensure that its use benefits the originating communities (Posey, 1990).

Expanding the concept of informed consent to protect Indigenous gatekeepers of deities involves more than adhering to ethical guidelines; it requires a paradigm shift in how research is conducted. By integrating FPIC, adopting participatory approaches like CBPR, and respecting cultural protocols, researchers can foster genuine partnerships with indigenous communities. Case studies demonstrate that such approaches are not only feasible but also yield outcomes that benefit both researchers and communities. Overcoming challenges will require sustained efforts to strengthen legal protections, address power imbalances, and counteract the commodification of cultural heritage. At the same time, there are significant opportunities to learn from successful initiatives and scale them to broader contexts. By centring the rights and voices of Indigenous gatekeepers of deities, the research community can contribute to the preservation and empowerment of these communities for generations to come. However, these challenges also present opportunities for advocacy and reform. Strengthening legal frameworks, promoting education and awareness, and fostering equitable partnerships can advance the protection of indigenous gatekeepers of deities. The exploitation of vulnerable populations in research has a long and troubling history, necessitating robust human rights laws and ethical guidelines. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities, as custodians of cultural and spiritual heritage, represent a unique and critically vulnerable population. Protecting their rights requires extending the concept of informed consent to include community and cultural dimensions, ensuring respect for indigenous knowledge and traditions. By integrating ethical principles, legal protections, and community-centred approaches, researchers can foster equitable and respectful relationships with indigenous communities. This not only safeguards cultural integrity but also enriches the research process by incorporating diverse perspectives and knowledge systems. Ultimately, the protection of indigenous gatekeepers of deities is a matter of justice, dignity, and respect for humanity’s shared heritage.

Protecting Indigenous gatekeepers of deities offers profound benefits that extend across cultural preservation, environmental conservation, social justice, and global knowledge systems. Gatekeepers play a crucial role in maintaining their communities’ traditions, languages, and spiritual practices, which are essential to the preservation of cultural heritage. By supporting these individuals, we ensure that unique traditions and knowledge systems are passed down to future generations, fostering cultural pride and resilience within Indigenous communities. The safeguarding of traditional knowledge is another significant benefit. Indigenous gatekeepers of deities hold a wealth of insights into medicine, agriculture, and sustainable practices developed over centuries. Protecting their rights ensures this knowledge is not misappropriated or commercialised without their consent. Instead, it allows for ethical collaborations that can advance scientific understanding while respecting the intellectual property of Indigenous communities. Their expertise in sustainable resource management also provides valuable lessons in addressing global challenges such as climate change and biodiversity loss.

Environmental conservation is deeply intertwined with the protection of Indigenous gatekeepers of deities. Many Indigenous territories are biodiversity hotspots, and the traditional ecological knowledge of these communities contributes to the sustainable management of these critical ecosystems. Gatekeepers, as stewards of their lands, employ practices that align with the rhythms of nature, helping to preserve biodiversity and mitigate the effects of climate change. Their contributions to conservation efforts underscore the importance of integrating Indigenous perspectives into global environmental strategies. Supporting Indigenous gatekeepers of deities also strengthens community autonomy and sovereignty. It empowers communities to retain control over their lands, resources, and cultural heritage, fostering self-determination and economic empowerment. This protection enables Indigenous groups to negotiate equitable benefit-sharing agreements and engage in sustainable economic activities, such as ethical tourism or the production of traditional crafts. By prioritising their voices in decision-making processes, we address historical injustices and promote equitable partnerships that reduce power imbalances. Ethical research practices also benefit from the protection of Indigenous gatekeepers of deities. By engaging in reciprocal and respectful collaborations, researchers can ensure that their work aligns with the goals and values of the communities involved. Adhering to cultural protocols and respecting the guidance of gatekeepers fosters trust and mutual respect, leading to research outcomes that benefit both communities and the broader world.

Social justice is another critical aspect of protecting Indigenous gatekeepers of deities. Doing so addresses the legacies of colonisation and exploitation while aligning with international human rights standards. It helps dismantle systemic inequities, creating a fairer and more inclusive world. Protecting gatekeepers also contributes to the preservation of global diversity, as Indigenous communities hold unique cultural, linguistic, and biological knowledge that enriches humanity as a whole. The integration of traditional knowledge into global knowledge systems presents an opportunity for innovative solutions to contemporary challenges. Indigenous practices often complement modern scientific approaches, offering interdisciplinary insights in areas such as healthcare, environmental management, and disaster preparedness. By valuing and protecting Indigenous knowledge systems, we create pathways for meaningful cultural exchange and collaboration. In protecting Indigenous gatekeepers of deities, we build resilience not only for their communities but also for the planet. Indigenous approaches to sustainability prioritise long-term thinking, emphasising the importance of intergenerational well-being. This perspective is invaluable as humanity seeks to navigate the complex challenges of climate change, globalisation, and resource scarcity. Ultimately, the protection of indigenous gatekeepers of deities is essential for preserving the cultural, environmental, and intellectual wealth of our world. It is a moral imperative that aligns with broader efforts to create a sustainable, just, and equitable future for all.

REFERENCES

A.E Adegbite, M. Chukwuemeka & Yewande Fatoki (2024). Legal Perspectives of the Frameworks Protecting Vulnerable Communities Against Climate Change In Nigeria, AJLR, Vol 2, No 1 www.researchafrica.online

Abibu A., Obadan and C. U. Emaviwe, 'Critical appraisal of ethical issues in legal research', *International Journal of Civil Law and Legal Research* 2023; 3(2): 44–50, E-ISSN: 2789–8830, https://www.civillawjournal.com/ accessed 30th March, 2024.

Adegbite A.E., Ibhade O.A.(2024). Impact Of Climate Change On Infants And Children In Nigeria: A Legal Perspective. AJLR (2023)Vol2 , www.researchafrica.online

Adegbite A.E., Olusegun O. (2019). The Nigerian Human Rights Framework on Children under the Care of Deities. UNIBEN FLJ , Vol 1 2018, University of Benin

Adegbite, A. E. (2022). Fundamentals of legal research and methods in Nigeria. College Press Ibadan .

Annas, G. J., & Grodin, M. A. (1992). The Nazi doctors and the Nuremberg Code: Human rights in human experimentation. Oxford University Press.

Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations.* Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2013). *Principles of biomedical ethics.* Oxford University Press.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2013). Principles of biomedical ethics (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Deyhle, D. (2000). "Insider-outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities." Theory Into Practice, 39(3), 163–169.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Deyhle, D. (2000). Insider-outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities. *Theory Into Practice*, *39*(3), 163–169.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies.* SAGE Publications.

Chilisa, B. (2012). Indigenous research methodologies. SAGE Publications.

Collaborative Archaeology Projects in Canada. (2020-2024). Canadian Archaeological Association.

Convention on Biological Diversity. (1992). United Nations.

Deborah S., 'Five Principles of Research Ethics' (Monitor Vol. 34, No. 1, 2003) <www.apa.org> accessed 16th April 2024.

Faden, R. R., & Beauchamp, T. L. (1986). *A history and theory of informed consent.* Oxford University Press.

Faden, R. R., & Beauchamp, T. L. (1986). A history and theory of informed consent. Oxford University Press.

Fisher, C. B. (2004). Ethics in the conduct of research with human participants. *The Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics*, *1*(1), 1–9. https://www.jswvearchives.com

Gamble, V. N. (1997). "Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care." American Journal of Public Health, 87(2), 229–231.

Gamble, V. N. (2009). "Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care." American Journal of Public Health, 99(Suppl 1), S7-S10.

Gamble, V. N. (2009). Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*(Suppl 1), S7-S10. https://ajph.aphapublications.org

Golan, A. (2003). Prehistoric religion: Mythology, symbolism (2nd ed.). A. Golan. ISBN 9659055501.

Grim, J. A. (Ed.). (2001). Indigenous Traditions and Ecology: The Interbeing of Cosmology and Community. Harvard Divinity School Centre for the Study of World Religions.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(2), 261-280. https://journals.sagepub.com

Harris, J. (2014). Informed consent and its limits in practice. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, *40*(2), 109–114. https://jme.bmj.com

Kass, N. E. (2001). An ethics framework for public health. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(4), 1776-1782. https://ajph.aphapublications.org

Katz, J. (2015). The ethics of clinical research: An overview. *Journal of Clinical Research & Bioethics*, *6*(2), 1–9. https://www.omicsonline.org

Kleinman, A. (2012). How to think about mental illness. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *53*(4), 415–429. https://journals.sagepub.com

Manson, N. C., & O'Neill, O. (2007). *Rethinking informed consent in bioethics.* Cambridge University Press.

Miller, F. G., & Brody, H. (2003). Informed consent, bioethics, and the institutional review board. *The Journal of Clinical Ethics*, *14*(2), 120-125. https://www.clinicalethics.com

Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit-sharing. (2010). Convention on Biological Diversity.

National Bioethics Advisory Commission. (2001). Ethical and policy issues in research involving human participants. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schmidt, L., & Campbell, M. (2017). Ethics in participatory research with the San people of southern Africa. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 10*(4), 409–428.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Zed Books.

Sundararajan, V. (2012). Ethical issues in the research of indigenous people. *Global Bioethics, 23*(1), 31-42. https://www.tandfonline.com

The San Code of Research Ethics. (2017). South African San Institute.

Traditional Knowledge Digital Library (TKDL). (2020-2024). Government of India.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonisation is not a metaphor. *Decolonisation: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1–40.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). Human subjects research protection. Retrieved from https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/guidance/index.html

UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. (2003). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). (2007). United Nations.

World Health Organisation (WHO). (2009). *Ethical considerations in research with human participants.* Geneva: World Health Organisation. https://www.who.int

World Medical Association (WMA). (2013). Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 310*(20), 2191-2194. https://www.wma.net

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-73S0ZQY5