

Joy Peterson

Research Paper Final

EXPO E - 42B

Professor Erin Routon

Border of Responsibility: Slow Violence in the Apparel Industry

Introduction: The Global North-South Divide

Between the border of the Global North and the Global South exists a transnational system of slow violence embodied by the fashion industry. Slow violence is defined by Rob Nixon as harm that occurs gradually and invisibly, disproportionately affecting marginalized populations. In the fashion industry, this manifests as labor exploitation, unsafe working conditions, and environmental degradation in developing countries representing the Global South, while consumers and corporations in the Global North often remain unaware of or detached.

Through this lens, I argue that the border itself does not simply separate nations, but also separates responsibility from consequence. This division allows corporations in the Global North to remain detached from the human suffering and environmental degradation occurring in the Global South, effectively erasing the visibility of the people and ecosystems they exploit. By examining the movement of labor, resources, and pollutants across this border, this research demonstrates how the global fashion industry relies on both the mobility and the invisibility of human and ecological bodies to sustain itself.

The fashion industry illustrates this phenomenon as it provides the only reliable income for many workers while simultaneously compromising their health and environment. As the world's second largest contributor to global pollution, it produces more than 100 billion garments each year with 184 billion pounds ending up in landfills annually. The waste produced is equivalent to a garbage truck depositing a full load every second (Igini, 2024). With more than 70% of clothing now made from polyester (a petroleum-based plastic), the stakes are higher than ever, as this cycle depletes critical resources while reinforcing labor exploitation and ecological degradation (Doolly, 2025).

The United States, as one of the top global consumers of clothing, plays a major role in sustaining this system. In terms of clothing exports, China and Bangladesh lead the global market, with Bangladesh specializing in low-cost, mass garment production that relies heavily on inexpensive labor (Kennemer, 2025). Using the United States to represent the Global North and Bangladesh the Global South, this research will examine the human, environmental, and economic costs of fashion production and consumption. Understanding these dynamics is essential to revealing how global capitalism depends on the invisibility and mobility of labor and resources, and why accountability and consumer awareness are critical for meaningful change.

Labor Exploitation

In Bangladesh, the textile and apparel industry plays a vital role in supporting the nation's economy. Ready-made garments (RMG) account for 84% of the country's total exports and employs over 4.5 million people, 60% being women. The industry contributes around 12% of Bangladesh's GDP and generates over \$35 billion annually. In 2023, export revenue rose by 14% in the first quarter alone, showing strong post-

pandemic recovery. Now, in 2025, Bangladesh is projected to surpass \$50 billion in textile and apparel exports by the end of the year and aims to reach \$456 billion by 2030 (Linder, 2025). For a developing country, these numbers are no small feat; garment workers truly are the backbone of the Bangladeshi economy.

The importance of this sector becomes even clearer when considering that vehicles transporting garments are granted the same clearance as ambulances. This is a strong indicator that the “health” of the nation is tied to the timely shipment of clothing (Siddiqi, et al. 2022). Yet, despite their essential role, these workers are simultaneously treated as expendable, a tension that underscores the slow violence woven into the global fashion industry.

When COVID-19 hit, the government issued executive orders for a nationwide lockdown while avoiding any mention of the garment export sector. Most garment workers fled to their home villages for safety and financial reasons. Days later, factory owners ordered these same workers to return immediately, threatening the loss of wages and employment. Fearing these consequences, many workers defied the lockdown and returned to work, despite the absence of public transportation, forcing many to walk hundreds of kilometers (Siddiqi, et al. 2022).

Within days of their return, the government abruptly ordered all factories to close, leaving thousands stranded again with no way to travel home. After returning to their villages a second time, workers were called back once more, only for factories to shut down again. By the end of March 2020, Euro-American buyers had canceled or postponed \$1.44 billion worth of Bangladeshi orders. Some retailers retained their

orders but demanded steep discounts on garments that had already been produced at some of the lowest prices in the world (Siddiqi, et al. 2022).

The immediate fallout was catastrophic as hundreds of factories closed overnight, and more than one million workers (out of four million) were left jobless. Although the government later allowed factories with on-site health facilities to remain open and allocated stimulus funds to the sector, it made no provisions to vaccinate garment workers despite treating them as essential (Siddiqi, et al. 2022). When the health of the nation is tied to its economy, the value of a body becomes directly linked to its ability to produce wealth. Under this logic, some workers must be allowed to die to “save” the economy. This paradox, of being both essential and expendable, exemplifies how the global supply chain relies on both the mobility and invisibility of bodies to sustain itself.

Despite this paradox, many workers participate in the garment industry voluntarily, as it remains their only pathway to economic independence. While the workforce comes from diverse backgrounds, many individuals migrate from rural villages. For most, a significant portion of their income is sent home to support family members, leaving little for their own quality of life (Dutta, & McGrath, 2025). Moreover, with the workforce predominately female in a traditionally Muslim society in a developing nation, gender hierarchies further reinforce the undervaluation of labor. Corporations and policymakers in the Global South even go as far as promoting women and girls as “ideal” for assembly line work, citing attributes such as nimble fingers, exceptional hand-eye coordination, and patience for repetitive tasks, thereby

highlighting how structural inequalities are leveraged to sustain an industry heavily reliant on cheap labor (Siddiqi, et al. 2022).

The typical garment worker earns around \$95 per month, which translates to about 30 cents an hour. For this wage, workers often labor 14-16 hours a day, seven days a week, frequently exceeding the previous legal limit of 60 hours per week. Even with exceeding the legal limit, many report that they cannot cover basic living expenses. Garment workers also report that they must meet hourly production targets, often 100+ garments per hour, and failure to do so results in threats, verbal abuse, and wage reduction (University of Nottingham Rights Lab, 2025). Surveys conducted by GoodWeave confirm these reports as they reveal that workers lack sufficient time to complete assigned tasks, face pressure to work overtime, and experience arbitrarily increasing targets, particularly in the days leading up to shipment deadlines. To ensure compliance, managers commonly reduce wages “at their will.” The toll of this labor under these conditions is tangible. Garment workers not only endure verbal abuse and constant wage threats but also display physical signs of strain, including accelerated aging, highlighting the human cost of meeting relentless production demands (University of Nottingham Rights Lab, 2025).

Many in the fashion industry describe these practices as modern-day slavery, a characterization that highlights the systematic exploitation underpinning the global apparel supply chain. These conditions exemplify slow violence: the harm inflicted on workers is gradual, cumulative and often invisible to the consumers and corporations benefiting from their labor. Though the physical and psychological costs are severe,

ranging from exhaustion to long-term health decline, they remain structurally hidden from the global market.

The exploitation extends further: child labor remains widespread. Bangladeshi law limits those under 18 to five working hours per day, yet GoodWeave found that 99% of surveyed minors were illegally employed under conditions violating this law. Children like adult workers, experience slow violence through long hours, hazardous exposure, low wages, abuse and the loss of valuable time that could otherwise be spent on education. More recently, the government increased of the legal maximum workweek to 72 hours, which only reinforces the system that keeps this harm in place (Admin, 2022). Layered onto the daily pressures of low pay, long hours, and unsafe conditions, these workers have very little room to protect their health or make choices for themselves, as their only options are earning little money in the garment industry or even less in another (Dutta & McGrath, 2025). It is in this context of persistent, invisible harm that they navigate the impossible balance between survival and well-being.

Environmental Degradation

Compounding the strain workers already face through exploitative labor conditions, indoor environments are frequently polluted, further accelerating their health decline (Rahman, et al. 2020). A study published in Environmental Health Insights compared 30 textile workers with 30 office workers using blood samples to assess the impact of indoor pollution on health and oxidative stress. All participants were nonsmokers and worked in the Dhaka division. Researchers measured noise levels, particulate matter (PM) and formaldehyde exposure. For reference, noise levels exceeding 45 dB during the day or 35 dB at night are associated with serious health

effects, while exposure above 90 dB is recognized as a significant source of oxidative stress. Particulate matter - particularly particles smaller than 10 micrometers - cannot be efficiently removed from the body and is linked to increased risks of cancer, lung and cardiovascular disease, and reduced life expectancy. Formaldehyde exposure irritates the skin, eyes, nose and throat, and high concentrations have been linked to certain cancers (Rahman, et al. 2020).

Unsurprisingly, the study found that textile workers experienced significantly higher noise levels and were exposed to alarmingly high concentrations of particulate matter and formaldehyde. While some precautions, such as vitamins, masks, and earplugs, may help mitigate exposure, this form of harm remains largely unregulated by the government and unaccounted for by the brands sourcing from these facilities. As a result, the long-term health consequences borne by workers remains invisible within the global supply chain. Moreover, the indoor pollution garment workers endure represents only one dimension of a much broader environmental crisis.

Far more expansive than indoor exposure is the outdoor pollution generated by the garment industry, also known as environmental degradation. Garment workers not only endure strenuous labor and harmful indoor conditions, but they also live within the polluted landscapes their work produces. This degradation extends well beyond factory walls, harming local populations and surrounding ecosystems. Though the industry contributes locally to physical waste from material misuse and releases harmful gases and chemicals into the air, contributing to local smog, its most egregious impact lies in its immense water consumption and wastewater discharge.

To put this into perspective, producing one cotton T-shirt and a single pair of blue jeans requires approximately 2,600 gallons of water, which is enough to supply one person with 8 glasses of drinking water every day for 13 years (Sustainability, n.d.). In 2016 alone, Bangladesh's textile industry produced 1.8 million metric tons of fabric, generating roughly 57.3 billion gallons of wastewater (Hossain, et al. 2018). That volume of water could provide 22,000 people with 8 glasses of drinking water daily for 13 years, or fill the Empire State Building more than 1,100 times.

Given this scale of consumption, rapid groundwater depletion is inevitable. In Dhaka, groundwater levels have already dropped more than 200 feet over the past 50 years and continue to decline at an alarming rate (Hossain, et al. 2018). Compounding this depletion, most wastewater in Bangladesh is discharged untreated into surrounding rivers, contaminating surface water, killing aquatic ecosystems and seeping into an already diminishing freshwater supply. The wastewater discharged contains oil, grease, caustic soda, Glauber salt, ammonia, lead, heavy metals, and other toxic chemicals, most of which originate from textile dyes used in the apparel industry (Hossain, et al. 2018). The aquatic ecosystems they disrupt kill and drive off aquatic life, contributing to local famine and long-term environmental instability. Biodiversity loss is linked to extreme temperatures and pH fluctuations. Textile wastewater can reach temperatures as high as 149°F, raising the temperature of receiving water bodies and reducing oxygen levels. pH values below 4.5 or above 8.5 can be lethal to aquatic life, and textile wastewater has been recorded with pH levels ranging from 3.9 to 14 (Hossain, et al. 2018).

In the most severe cases, the three rivers Buriganga, Turag, and Balu, have already been declared biologically dead meaning that the rivers are unable to support life due to severe pollution and environmental degradation (Jazeera, 2019). All three rivers are located near the country's primary apparel manufacturing hubs: Dhaka, Chittagong, and Gazipur. Dhaka, the nation's capital and the epicenter of garment production, hosts a dense concentration of factories where all three rivers provide direct access to the industrial zones (Ahmed, 2025). The ecological collapse of these waterways highlights the direct link between apparel production and environmental degradation.

This evidence shows that the textile industry threatens both the quality and quantity of drinking water and food sources available to residents of Dhaka and the surrounding apparel manufacturing regions. However, the damage does not stop with access to freshwater and aquatic food sources for these communities. Untreated wastewater seeps into the soil, allowing toxins to enter the local food supply and contaminate crops. As these foods are transported to villages and markets across Bangladesh, pollution spreads beyond production sites, affecting populations far removed from apparel hubs. When absorbed by the human body, these toxins can cause bone disorders, cancer, kidney failure, neurological damage, gastrointestinal disease, memory problems, and developmental abnormalities, much of which emerges gradually over time (Islam, et al. 2023). This slow accumulation of harm makes the violence difficult to trace, even as its effects become increasingly widespread.

All residents bear the consequences of the apparel industry in Bangladesh, but the true cost is felt most acutely by the poorest. Families who have lived along

riverbanks for generations, relying on the water for daily needs, report that their land is no longer viable for cultivation and that everyday life has become increasingly hazardous. Where they once had clean water for drinking, washing, and irrigation, they now experience rashes from contaminated soil and nausea from the overpowering stench of wastewater dumped into the rivers (Jazeera, 2019). With few alternatives available, these communities are forced to adapt to conditions they did not create, growing increasingly frustrated with the apparel industry and lack of meaningful government regulation. This harm persists with little accountability as public health is often overlooked in favor of economic growth in Bangladesh. As noted in the COVID-19 research, workers were treated as expendable to “save” the economy, and the same logic applies to communities exposed to industrial waste from the apparel sector. As the rivers and nearby communities bear the burden of industrial waste driven by global apparel demand, finished garments move outward, circulating in global markets largely detached from the environmental destruction they leave behind. In this way, the costs of production are obscured from the consumers who benefit emphasizing the disconnection between responsibility and consequence.

Structural Barriers and Corporate Practices

The most effective way to reduce environmental pollution is to restrict discharge at its source. Proper treatment and disposal of wastewater produced by textile facilities requires an effluent treatment plant (ETP), which provides a method for safely managing textile wastewater. Despite ETPs existence, Bangladesh faces significant barriers to owning and operating them correctly. Much of this barrier stems from weak government regulation and enforcement. Although Bangladeshi law requires factories

to install ETPs, it has largely failed to reduce environmental noncompliance. For many factories, noncompliance is far cheaper than properly operating an ETP as fines average 1,965,000 BDT, while the annual cost of running an ETP is around 13,350,000 BDT. Inspections on ETPs are conducted by the Department of Environment. However, the inspection schedule is predictable, allowing factories to temporarily activate their ETPs just before visits, creating the appearance of compliance without actually treating wastewater. Furthermore, data collected by the DoE is often incomplete, inaccurate, or inconsistently recorded and is rarely shared transparently, due in part to pressure from industry groups seeking to avoid interference with business operations (Sakamoto, et al., 2019). In practice, this means many ETPs remain non-operational despite government awareness, keeping the consequences hidden and the harm ongoing, exemplifying slow violence.

Another barrier Bangladesh faces regarding ETPs are import costs, an additional requirement imposed by foreign buyers. On top of the already high costs of installation and operation, factories are pressured to import foreign-made ETPs due to a lack of trust in Bangladeshi-made systems. Despite this skepticism, foreign buyers rely on assurances that their contractors have installed and are regularly operating ETPs, claiming that the systems are “regularly monitored.” In practice, continuous verification is impossible. Furthermore, larger factories that can afford ETPs often subcontract production to smaller factories without them, usually unknown to foreign buyers, leaving pollution largely unchecked (Sakamoto, et al., 2019). Together, these challenges leave textile and apparel factories with little incentive to protect the environment or the health of local communities.

Though Bangladesh produces garments for many foreign buyers, its top three importers are H&M, Inditex, and Primark, all of which import billions of dollars worth of garments annually (Guider, 2025). H&M, the largest buyer for decades, has maintained a production office in Bangladesh since 1983, averages over 2,042 shipments from the country per day, and imported \$2.59 billion worth of garments from Bangladesh in 2023-24 (Texile Focus, 2024). H&M primarily sells to Poland, Germany, and the United States (Rocco, 2025) and works with 916 suppliers across 41 countries publishing an extensive supplier list that include many located in Bangladesh's top apparel manufacturing hubs: Dhaka, Chittagong and Gazipur (H&M Group, 2025).

Inditex, the parent company of Zara, Bershka, Pull & Bear, and Massimo Dutti, imported \$2.18 billion from Bangladesh in 2022-23, with Zara alone accounting for \$32 billion of Inditex's \$45.3 billion in net sales (Rocco, 2025b). Zara primarily sells to the United States, the United Kingdom, and Spain and sources from more than 250 factories in Bangladesh, though the company does not provide a full transparent list of specific suppliers (Inditex, 2025). Primark, the third largest buyer, imported \$1.12 billion from Bangladesh in 2022-23 and primarily sells to the United Kingdom, Europe, and the United States. As Primark projects continued growth, it also anticipates expanding its sourcing from Bangladesh (Guider, 2025). Other well-known brands sourcing from Bangladesh include Uniqlo, Gap, Levi Strauss & Co. VF Corporation, Adidas, Nike, Walmart, Target, TJX, Old Navy, Abercrombie & Fitch, American Eagle, Boohoo, Shein, and Kohl's.

In response to the exploitative labor practices and environmental conditions under which garment workers operate, foreign buyers such as H&M, Inditex, and

Primark participate in initiatives aimed at addressing these concerns, including ACT (Action, Collaboration, and Transformation) and the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh. ACT works to ensure living wages and fair working conditions through collaboration with unions and factories, allowing brands to plan orders more effectively (ACT, 2025). The Accord, established after the 2013 Rana Plaza Tragedy, focuses on fire, structural, and other safety hazards, requiring factories to address issues within set timeframes while holding brands accountable if they continue to source from factories where unsafe conditions persist (Accord, 2018).

Despite efforts by brands to address these conditions, initiatives can only go so far, as foreign buyers source from hundreds of factories and often fail to account for subcontracting to smaller factories beyond their oversight, making comprehensive monitoring nearly impossible. In Bangladesh, where government oversight is weak, deceptive practices are common, as factories have learned to prepare for audits in advance. Temporary activation of ETPs is only one tactic; others include concealing child labor on audit days, instructing injured workers to stay home, and presenting auditors with only the cleanest production floors. These deceptive practices make it extremely difficult for foreign buyers to obtain an accurate understanding of working conditions, keeping human and environmental costs largely invisible.

Consumer Awareness and Responsibility

Struggles with transparency extend beyond poor monitoring in Bangladesh; the global fashion industry also faces similar challenges, as its top priority - like that of Bangladesh's government - remains capital gain. Many brands do not disclose full supplier lists and rely on vague language to appear responsible without

fully committing. This is especially evident in greenwashing: a brand may claim to be “eco-friendly” for using recycled materials while ignoring water consumption, chemical use, transportation emission, and other environmental impacts across the supply chain. With no universal standard for “eco-friendly,” brands can use the term freely, even when practices fall short of true sustainability. Furthermore, labels often reflect the final stage of production making traceability difficult. For example, leather shoes labeled “Made in Italy” may only have been sewn there, while the leather was cut, dyed, and tanned in Bangladesh. The omission of these details allow brands to appear more ethical while keeping much of the harm out of sight, reinforcing the separation of responsibility from consequence.

These practices make it nearly impossible for the average consumer to know which brands are truly committed to ethical sourcing. While the information is available to those willing to research, most everyday consumers are unaware and have little time or incentive to investigate. Public awareness often only spikes after a major crisis, as with the Rana Plaza tragedy in 2013. Housing multiple factories producing for global brands, the Rana Plaza building fell due to unsafe, neglected conditions. The disaster exposed exploitative labor, inadequate wages, and a complete lack of safety regulations, permanently altering global perceptions of the fashion industry. The collapse killed over 1,100 garment workers and injured more than 2,500. Recovering bodies and rescuing survivors took weeks, and many survivors required surgical interventions such as amputations (International Labor Organization, 2023). The tragedy spurred the creation of the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh and led many brands to update ethical codes for stronger worker protections and

environmental measures. Yet, as this paper has shown, many critical issues still remain overlooked in the pursuit of profit by both the Bangladeshi government and the global fashion industry.

Since 2013, global demand for clothing has only increased, further accelerating environmental degradation and worsening public health impacts. Despite the negative trends, political developments in the Global North threaten to reverse progress. The current administration has shown little concern for environmental integrity and has imposed new tariffs on imports from Bangladesh (Tariff Check, 2025). While these tariffs target buyers, history suggests that brands may again pressure Bangladeshi factories to lower prices to offset costs, just as they did during COVID-19. If this occurs, the burden falls once more on garment workers, who face even lower wages and deteriorating working conditions, demonstrating how global systems continue to separate responsibility from consequence.

Fortunately, there is still hope, particularly among Millennials and Gen Z, who demonstrate greater concern for the global supply chain when properly informed. In a 2022 survey of 92 respondents, majority of who were Millennials and Gen Z, 90% expressed concern about climate change's impact on future generations, 70% said they were willing to fight for a cause they believe in, and 94.8% said they would learn to shop more sustainably if the information were available. Other polls found that 83% of respondents were unaware that clothing production accounts for roughly 20% of industrial water pollution equivalent to about two million Olympic-sized swimming pools annually (Peterson, 2022). When participants were informed about the water required to produce a single cotton t-shirt and pair of jeans, as well as the harsh

conditions faced by many garment workers, often described as modern-day slavery, all reported being concerned (University of Nottingham Rights Lab, 2025).

Despite the positivity in many consumers' willingness to learn and make better choices, they often lack accessible education on the issue, experiencing the industry only from the point of purchase and never seeing the labor or environmental harm behind their garments. The divide between the Global North and South represents this invisibility, allowing exploited bodies to sustain global capitalism. Despite efforts by major brands to alleviate some of the mental, physical, and environmental stress faced by garment workers, their current measures are insufficient.

Pathways to Change

Immediate steps brands can take to enhance their efforts include increasing funds allocated to the developing countries they source from by investing in more local environmental projects such as river cleanups and funding the proper operation of ETPs. Rather than assessing environmental compliance through predictable audits, brands can assess compliance by conducting a series of scientific tests on local rivers (International Growth Centre, 2025). For labor exploitation, brands can carry out more frequent and unpredictable audits and offer longer-term contracts with higher wages, allowing factories to give garment workers more consistent pay and the ability to plan for the future.

Immediate steps that consumers can take include thrifting, thoughtful purchasing, and participating in proper recycling or upcycling initiatives at the end of their garments' life. As consumers become more informed and intentional with their purchases, brands will be compelled to respond to this new demand. As brands

respond, governments (who benefit from the capital generated by these brands) are likely to follow this shift, creating a ladder of responsibility toward a more ethical and sustainable fashion industry. One of the biggest setbacks for consumers is a lack of education on these issues, but real change begins with awareness. This research serves as a critical tool to educate consumers about the hidden labor and environmental costs behind clothing production. With this knowledge, informed consumers can mobilize and push for ethical brand practices and proactive policy change. Together, consumers can pressure businesses and policymakers to close the divide that allows slow violence to persist in the fashion industry, offering a path toward a global fashion supply chain that truly supports both people and the planet.

References

1. Accord. (2018). *The Bangladesh Accord on fire and Building Safety*. <https://bangladeshaccord.org/>
2. ACT. (2025). *Action, collaboration, transformation*. <https://actonlivingwages.com/>
3. Admin, M. (2022). *Excess work hours among garment workers in Bangladesh, part one*. Microfinance Opportunities. <https://www.microfinanceopportunities.org/mfo-news/news/excess-work-hours-among-garment-workers-in-bangladesh-part-one/>
4. Ahmed, M. (2025). *Bangladesh's top 10 garment manufacturing destinations*. Textile Student. <https://www.textilestudent.com/bangladeshs-top-10-garment-manufacturing-destinations/>
5. Decathlon Sustainability. (n.d.). *Why does it take so much water to make a cloth?* <https://sustainability.decathlon.com/why-does-it-take-so-much-water-to-make-a-cloth>
6. Doolly. (2025). *Polyester: 70% of clothing's petroleum-carcinogen crisis*. <https://www.doolly.com/blog/polyester-70-of-clothings-petroleum-carcinogen-crisis>
7. Dutta, M., & McGrath, S. (2025). Life Stories of Garment Workers in India: Toward a Labor-Centric Labor Regimes Framework. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 115(3), 603–619. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2024.2435933>
8. Guider, T. (2025). *Top 10 global buyers of Bangladeshi garments in 2024 - who's sourcing what?* Textile Guider. <https://texguider.blogspot.com/2025/08/top-buyers-bangladeshi-garments-2025.html>
9. H&M. (2024). *Annual and sustainability report 2024*. <https://hmgroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/HM-Group-Annual-and-sustainability-report-2024.pdf>

10. Hossain, L., Sarker, S.K., & Khan M.S. (2018). Evaluation of present and future wastewater impacts of textile dyeing industries in Bangladesh. *Environmental Development*, 26, 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2018.03.005>
11. Inditex. (2025). *Inditex Group Annual Report*. <https://db.srnay.com/storage/v1/object/public/document-pdfs/e7fc4fa3-4a84-4482-9ef0-9098fe6813da.pdf>
12. International Growth Centre. (2025). *Can multinational buyers help curb river pollution in Bangladesh?* <https://www.theigc.org/blogs/bangladesh-garment-industry-river-pollution>
13. *International Labor Organization*. (2023). *The Rana Plaza Disaster ten years on: What has changed?* InfoStories. <https://webapps.ilo.org/infostories/en-GB/Stories/Country-Focus/rana-plaza#compensation-challenges>
14. Igini, M. (2024). *10 concerning fast fashion waste statistics*. Earth.org. <https://earth.org/statistics-about-fast-fashion-waste/>
15. Islam, T., Repon, M. R., Islam, T., Sarwar, Z., & Rahman, M. M. (2023). Impact of textile dyes on health and ecosystem: a review of structure, causes, and potential solutions. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research International*, 30(4), 9207–9242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-24398-3>
16. Jazeera, A. (2019). *Bangladesh's garment factories pollute rivers, affecting residents' health (Video)*. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ypO7nMd2ko>
17. Kennemer, J. (2025). *The top 12 countries for clothing, garment, and apparel manufacturing*. Cosmo Sourcing. <https://www.cosmosourcing.com/blog/the-top-12-countries-for-clothing-garment-and-apparel-manufacturing>

18. Linder, J. (2025). *Bangladesh textile industry statistics*. Gitnux. <https://gitnux.org/bangladesh-textile-industry-statistics/>
19. Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press
20. Peterson, J. (2022). The conscious coach project (Unpublished Survey). Savannah College of Art and Design.
21. Rahman, T., Faisal, A.R.M., Khanam, T., & Shekhar H.U. (2020). Recurrent indoor environmental pollution and its impact on health and oxidative stress of the textile workers in Bangladesh. *Environmental Health Insights*, 14, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178630220938393>
22. Rocco, B. (2025). *Net sales of the H&M Group by selected country worldwide 2024*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/964217/net-sales-of-the-h-and-m-group-worldwide-by-country/>
23. Rocco, B. (2025b). *Sales share of the Inditex Group by format worldwide 2024*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/268825/contribution-of-sales-of-the-inditex-group-worldwide-by-format/>
24. Sakamoto, M., Ahmed, T., Begum, S., & Huq, H. (2019). Water pollution and the textile industry in Bangladesh: Flawed corporate practices or restrictive opportunities? *Sustainability*, 11(7), 1951. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11071951>
25. Siddiqi, D.M., & Ashraf, H. (2022). Pandemics politics: Class, gender and stigmatized labor in Bangladesh's garment industry. *New Diversities*, 24(1). https://newdiversities.mmg.mpg.de/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/2022_24-01_04_SiddiqiAshraf-1.pdf

26. Tariff Check. (2025). *Bangladesh tariff rate 20%*. <https://tariffcheck.org/countries/bangladesh>
27. Textile Focus. (2024). *The top 10 foreign companies purchasing Bangladeshi garments*. <https://textilefocus.com/the-top-10-foreign-companies-purchasing-bangladeshi-garments/>
28. University of Nottingham Rights Lab. (2025). *Modern slavery and child labour in Bangladesh's garment sector: Documenting risks and informing solutions*. GoodWeave. <https://goodweave.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/Modern-Slavery-and-Child-Labour-in-the-RMG-Sector-of-Bangladesh-Report.pdf>