



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 18, 2024

Naked Power: Now Gov Wants to Regulate Our Clothes — in Climate’s Name

One generally unmentioned reason prices are so high is that government taxation and regulation increase businesses’ costs, which then are handed down to consumers. A prime example is a regulation dictating that not only must a herring fishing vessel have a federal monitor aboard, but that its owner also must pay the cost of the observer, which reportedly can be *\$710 a day* (this requirement is currently before the Supreme Court). And now there’s another example:



AlxeyPnferov/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The Emperor Has Your Clothes — in the crosshairs — and aims to regulate their makers and sellers, supposedly to combat “global warming.”

What’s more, this is apparently based on a lie that the fashion industry pollutes more than it does.

Per website [GlobalData](#):

[Washington state’s] fast fashion regulation bill[,] titled House Bill 2068, would mean large fashion retail sellers and fashion manufacturers would need to establish, track, and disclose progress towards due diligence and environmental performance targets from 1 January 2027.

If the targets are not [met] the Department of Ecology could issue penalties that would need to be deposited into a community benefit account.

The bill explained the expenditures from the account could be used for the purpose of implementing one or more environmental benefit projects that directly and verifiably benefit overburdened communities and vulnerable populations.

... The bill, which was sponsored by Washington State Representative Sharlett Mena, D-Tacoma[,] states that: “In terms of greenhouse gases, the fashion industry accounts for about 8-10% of global carbon emissions, more than both aviation and shipping combined.”

The bill would apply to manufacturers and sellers that earn “more than \$100 million globally and operate in Washington,” Northwest News Network [adds](#). Furthermore, California and New York lawmakers have proposed similar bills.

Now, this is where the passion kicks in. “This is terrible!” some will say. “Government intervention is needed! Others will get angry, saying this isn’t the government’s role or that the anthropogenic-climate-change thesis is invalid. In fact, emotions run so high that one can overlook a very basic question:

Where did this idea the fashion industry accounts for approximately 8-10 percent of global CO₂



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 18, 2024

emissions come from? Is it valid?

Certainly, everyone is repeating it, including the [notorious WEF](#). I began researching the stat's provenance online and found it cited time and again, axiomatically, with no source provided. But then I discovered that the research had already been done and the stat debunked — by the left-wing *New York Times* no less.

Calling it “The Biggest Fake News in Fashion,” writer Vanessa Friedman [stated in 2018](#) that she was untangling “the origins of a myth repeated so often that no one thought to question it.” In a nutshell, Friedman “followed a ponzi scheme-like trail of sources; Friedman would ask a source where they got the statistic, and most either couldn’t remember, or had heard the information from another person without ever getting the actual numbers from them,” website [Stitch related](#) in 2019, summarizing the *Times* investigation. “Someone most likely made up the statistic around 2008 when it first appeared, at which point laymen and experts alike accepted the fact without question.”

This is an old and tiresome story. For example, you might’ve heard years ago that Americans “use 500 million plastic straws daily.” This is inaccurate and originated with a nine-year-old’s [science project](#) (moreover, straws [account for only](#) 0.025 percent of the plastic waste in our oceans). More recently, ex-health official and Covid “point man” Dr. Anthony Fauci [admitted](#) that the six-foot social-distancing rule “just sort of appeared” and had no scientific basis. (Note: *The New American* pointed this out *early* in the pandemic.)

What’s more, the *Times* [wasn’t even the first](#) to debunk the fashion-polluter lie; this happened at least as early as 2017. That it nonetheless is being used to justify legislation, however, illustrates a problem with government.

Rep. Mena devoted effort to crafting a bill, but either A, didn’t even demonstrate the due diligence necessary to determine if the statistic central to her legislation was valid; or B, was willing to peddle a lie if it advanced her agenda. Note here that for me to uncover the truth involved *less than 10 minutes of research*.

In other words, the most charitable explanation is that Mena and her allies are ignorant due to laziness — and are willing to micromanage our lives based on that sloth-enabled ignorance.

For the record, the data [here](#) indicate that “manufacturing and construction” *of all kinds* account for no more than 20 percent of world CO₂ emissions. But then there’s a deeper question:

Even if fashion did produce 10 percent of the emissions, so what?

Something has to.

Be wary here of the Red Light Phenomenon. To wit: Someone justifies a new red light at a corner because it’s “the most dangerous intersection in the area.” The issue?

Even if it increases safety, now another corner is “the most dangerous intersection in the area.”

Erect a red light there, too?

Continuing this process long enough guarantees painfully slow traffic, with the attendant fuel waste, vehicle wear and tear, and lost productivity.

This doesn’t mean red lights are never necessary, only that there often are no solutions in life, only trade-offs. And a wise planner understands that there are dangers associated with trying too hard, and one-dimensionally, to eliminate dangers.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 18, 2024

Likewise, even if you consider CO₂ problematic, burdening an industry or sector with regulations has downsides; for one thing, it generally means higher consumer prices and increased poverty. Moreover, even if the regs have the desired effect, another industry is then “one of the biggest emitters.” When does the shackling of producers and creators end?

The answer is that the pseudo-elites don't care. Their goals aren't discovery of Truth and good policy, but involve power, pocketbook, and moral preening.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.