The History of Fast Food

From Street Meals to a Global Restaurant System

Prepared for **FastFoodUpdates.com** · **Third edition** · Research cutoff **September 11, 2026**

Abstract

Fast food has no single inventor. The sale of prepared meals is ancient; the modern chain is a later system for reproducing food, service, and expectations across locations. This paper follows that distinction from Pompeii and Edo to automats, hamburger chains, franchises, and delivery platforms. It compares several kinds of beginnings, places food traditions alongside the businesses that commercialized them, and treats labor, access, supply chains, health, and waste as part of the history rather than external consequences. Its central argument is that fast food's promise combines speed with predictability: a meal that fits an occasion because work has been organized elsewhere. That coordination can save the customer effort without eliminating labor, cultural conflict, or risk. [2] [6]

Scope and evidence

This is an English-language comparative synthesis with a U.S. chain-history emphasis and selected European, Asian, and African cases—not a comprehensive history of every country. Corporate chronologies establish attributed company milestones, not independent rankings or proof of global priority. Public records, institutional histories, reporting, and research support other claims. Interpretive passages explain relationships rather than claim measured causal effects. The paper is AI-assisted research synthesis, not original field reporting or professional peer review. This revision adds three sources and selectively rechecks earlier evidence; it is not a fresh audit of every retained reference.

Reading routes

Origins and disputed dates: sections 1–5. **Restaurant systems and menus:** sections 6–10. **People and globalization:** sections 11–13. **Health, public rules, cultural debate, environment, and value:** sections 14–18. **Digital ordering and recap:** sections 19–20. Linked numbered references follow the narrative.

01 · What Was the First Fast-Food Restaurant?

Fast food has no single inventor. Prepared-food counters existed in Pompeii before 79 CE; modern chain restaurants emerged much later. White Castle, founded in 1921, was a pioneering American hamburger chain. McDonald's became especially influential through its 1948 service redesign and subsequent expansion—not because it invented the sale of quick meals. [2] [3] [7] [11]

The often-repeated question "Which chain came first?" hides several different dates. A business can begin as one shop, incorporate decades later, and only then develop a chain. The following comparison is a set of documented examples, not a ranking of the world's oldest continuously operating restaurants.

Business or format	Earlier milestone	Different, later milestone
Yoshinoya	Family-run shop at Tokyo's Nihonbashi fish market, 1899	Second restaurant, Shimbashi, for chain development, 1968 [38]
Horn & Hardart Automat	Philadelphia opening, 1902	New York opening, 1912 [6]
A&W	Roy Allen's root-beer stand, Lodi, 1919	Franchising began in 1926, according to its company history [37]
White Castle	Wichita hamburger business, 1921	Incorporation, 1924 [7]
McDonald's	San Bernardino drive-in, 1940	Speedee redesign, 1948; Kroc's Des Plaines restaurant, 1955 [10]

These dates are not interchangeable. Yoshinoya's nineteenth-century shop does not establish a nineteenth-century chain; A&W's stand does not establish that it was already a hamburger franchise. White Castle's importance is clearer when described as a development in standardized hamburger service rather than the invention of eating quickly.

This paper uses **fast food** for commercially prepared meals organized to reduce the customer's waiting time through advance preparation, a focused service process, or both. **Quick-service restaurant** describes a service format: customers generally order and pay before eating rather than receive conventional table service. That distinction also appears in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics' description of counter-service work. [1]

A **chain** reproduces an identifiable business across outlets. A **franchise** is one contractual way of doing so; it is not a synonym for every chain. Street food, meanwhile, identifies a selling setting rather than an ownership model. Keeping these definitions separate makes it possible to compare a Roman counter, a Japanese beef-bowl shop, and an American drive-through without pretending that they are the same institution. [12]

02 · Before Chains: Pompeii and the Streets of Edo

The archaeological record makes the first boundary clear: eating commercially prepared food outside the home is much older than modern restaurant corporations. At Pompeii, thermopolia sold food and drink from counters containing large vessels. The eruption of 79 CE preserved examples of this urban food trade. Reporting on the Regio V excavation in 2020 described painted animals, containers, and food remains, including a duck-bone fragment and evidence interpreted as mixed dishes involving fish and other ingredients. These are material clues, not a surviving modern-style menu. [3]

Calling the counter a snack bar is a modern comparison, not its ancient business classification. The remains establish a prepared-food trade, but they do not provide a complete menu or a measured service time. What survives is evidence of customers buying food in an urban setting, not evidence of a Roman franchise system.

Nineteenth-century Edo, the city later known as Tokyo, supplies a different example. Nippon.com's discussion of illustrated historical records describes nigirizushi sold in a city with an active street-food culture. Hand-shaped portions of vinegared rice carried toppings that could be prepared in different ways, including vinegared fish, cooked eel, shrimp, and egg. Sushi was not simply “raw fish.” Accounts associated with Hanaya Yohei describe portable sales and the development of an easily eaten form suited to urban customers. [4]

Edo sushi is important here not as a proposed ancestor of the American hamburger, but as evidence of an independent solution. A portable portion, recognizable ingredients, and preparation performed before purchase can shorten the customer's wait without a corporate chain. Comparing that arrangement with Pompeii suggests a recurring problem in urban life: people need meals where they already are, and not everyone wishes to reproduce an entire kitchen's work before eating.

The two cases also expose the danger of reading contemporary prestige backward. Food that now appears in expensive restaurants may have circulated in accessible street settings; a humble counter can require considerable skill. “Fast” describes the customer's encounter, not necessarily a careless production method. The historical continuity is the sale of convenient prepared meals. The discontinuity is equally important: the evidence presented here does not show an unbroken organizational lineage from Roman counters or Edo vendors to twentieth-century franchise corporations. Similar commercial problems can produce comparable arrangements without a direct family tree.

03 · Fish and Chips, Industrial Cities, and the Portable Meal

In Britain, fish and chips offers a bridge between older prepared-food trades and the industrial-age takeaway. Popular histories disagree about which shop first combined the two foods. Historic UK discusses the competing traditions associated with Joseph Malin in London and John Lees in Lancashire during the early 1860s. The London story also places Jewish immigrant food traditions inside the account. These are reasons to explain the dispute, not to announce that a single named proprietor indisputably invented the meal. [5]

The more consequential development was the ability to sell an increasingly familiar hot meal through numerous local shops. Historic UK's account connects the trade to an expanding industrial population and improvements in fish supply through steam-powered fishing and railway distribution. That combination matters: the shop's immediate service depended on work and transport far beyond the fryer. A customer could experience a local meal even when its ingredients had already traveled through a larger commercial network. [5]

Quick food was not only a response to the automobile. The Automat later addressed pedestrians in American city centers, while Singapore's National Library Board traces street hawking to the nineteenth century. These examples locate the trade around concentrations of people, work, and everyday movement. They also warn against treating every quick meal as a reduced version of the drive-through. Dense cities supported convenient food businesses before the characteristic suburban restaurant site became prominent. [6] [22]

A useful interpretation is that the portable meal reorganizes domestic effort. Instead of buying every ingredient and preparing a full meal, the customer buys a completed portion. That can be valuable even when the price of its ingredients would be lower at home. The relevant comparison is not only food against food. It also includes preparation, cleanup, equipment, fuel, travel, and the ability to obtain a meal at a particular moment. This is an analytical framework, not a claim that all customers made the same calculation or had the same household circumstances.

Fish and chips also demonstrates that a recognizable fast-food category can spread without one corporation owning its identity. The generic meal and the branded chain are separate institutions. A diner can know roughly what a fish-and-chip shop sells without knowing its owner. A national chain adds a different promise: familiarity with a specific business's version. The later history of fast food repeatedly moves between those two kinds of recognition. Standardization did not replace food traditions from nothing; it selected, adapted, and commercialized dishes customers could learn to recognize. That distinction remains important whenever a restaurant's founding date is confused with the origin of its food.

04 · Automats, Root Beer, and Why a Format Can Disappear

In 1902, Horn & Hardart opened an Automat in Philadelphia; New York followed in 1912. Customers retrieved prepared portions from coin-operated compartments. Behind the interface, employees replenished the food; centralized commissaries and common recipes supported consistency. Smithsonian's history also describes a useful freedom: customers could inspect a portion before buying it and choose without an attendant. [6]

The transaction offered more than a shorter wait. Seeing the food reduced uncertainty about what would arrive. Choosing individual portions gave the customer control over the purchase. Mechanical selection made one part of the meal feel private and self-directed. These are features of the arrangement, not proof that everyone preferred it. A person seeking table service could value an entirely different experience.

A&W began with another attraction. Its company history dates Roy Allen's roadside root-beer stand in Lodi, California, to 1919. He subsequently partnered with Frank Wright, whose initial joined Allen's in the name. The consulted account dates franchising to 1926. A drink and a recognizable name supplied a different starting point from the Automat's extensive meal-selection system. [37]

The comparison separates two routes to repeat business. One makes a procedure familiar; another makes a product familiar. Neither requires the entire later hamburger-chain model to exist at the outset. The growth of quick service involved experiments with what people would recognize and choose again, not the steady perfection of a single invention.

The Automat also supplies a history of displacement. Smithsonian's retrospective links its decline to changing dining habits, suburban movement, and competition; these are the account's explanations, not isolated causal estimates. Horn & Hardart converted some restaurants to Burger King franchises during the 1970s. Its last New York Automat closed in 1991. The organization could move into another fast-food format while the older one disappeared. [6]

That distinction matters. A once-effective interface does not guarantee a lasting business, and the disappearance of one format does not mean customers stopped wanting convenient meals. The same meal system must fit a setting: the people nearby, the occasions on which they eat, the costs of providing service, and the alternatives available. A change in any of those relationships can make yesterday's advantage less useful.

The history is therefore not simply an inventory of survivors. The chrome-and-glass Automat demonstrates both an influential solution and its limits. Its later replacement by hamburger outlets makes technological progress a poor explanation on its own. What endured was the problem of organizing an accessible meal; the winning arrangement remained open to change.

05 · White Castle and the Manufacture of Trust

White Castle began in Wichita, Kansas, in 1921 through the partnership of Billy Ingram and Walter Anderson. Ohio Memory's historical account follows its subsequent expansion, incorporation in 1924, arrival in Columbus in 1929, and headquarters move there in 1934. These dates locate a developing organization rather than a single overnight invention. A repeatable hamburger business had to become more than a successful stand before it could function as a chain. [7]

Uniformity was central to that process. Ohio Memory's archival examples include standardized employee appearance, food preparation, and buildings. Smithsonian's interview with historian Adam Chandler similarly treats White Castle's importance as organizational: an approach associated with industrial consistency was applied to the restaurant encounter. The customer was being offered a recognizable procedure as well as a product. [2] [7]

This is best understood as the manufacture of trust, not proof that a familiar building makes food safe. A customer entering an unknown independent establishment must learn what it sells and what to expect. A chain attempts to move part of that learning to the brand. Its name and appearance announce a promise before the diner sees the kitchen. Repetition can make the promise credible, but the promise still requires performance at the individual outlet.

White Castle's surviving promotional material also complicates the idea that hamburgers sold themselves solely through low prices. Ohio Memory documents coupons and household-oriented marketing, including appeals to convenience and wholesomeness. Such material is evidence of the company's sales strategy, not an independent nutritional assessment. It shows the effort required to make an inexpensive prepared meal appear acceptable within everyday family routines. [7]

The distinction between assurance and verification would remain important. Later food-safety investigations could establish hazards despite a business's familiar name; regulatory systems examined procedures that signage could not reveal. The contrast is not an argument that standardization is inherently unsafe. It is that reliable appearance and reliable execution are different forms of evidence. A history that accepts the chain's visual language as proof of its claims repeats advertising rather than analyzing it. [25] [26]

White Castle therefore belongs near the center of modern fast-food history without being credited with inventing quick eating. Its contribution was to help make a particular meal and operating format reproducible and recognizable. The decisive historical unit was no longer only the plate or counter. It was the connection between locations: an organization capable of teaching customers to expect the same sort of experience in another building. That change made the brand itself part of what a customer purchased.

06 · Cars, Drive-Ins, and the Drive-Through

A **drive-in** and a **drive-through** solve different problems. At a drive-in, the vehicle becomes a place to park and potentially receive service. A drive-through moves vehicles through ordering and collection points. The difference is not spelling: it is the organization of the visit.

The McDonald brothers' original 1940 restaurant belonged to the drive-in world. Their 1948 redesign removed carhop service and brought customers to the counter. In-N-Out's corporate history, meanwhile, records a two-way speaker at its Baldwin Park operation in 1948. These were different experiments in serving people who arrived by car—one simplifying counter service, another connecting the waiting driver directly to the kitchen. [9] [10] [11]

Wendy's records a pickup window in 1970. Such milestones establish when a particular business adopted a feature. They do not settle every worldwide "first drive-through" claim: an ordering speaker, a service window, a dedicated lane, and a complete order-pay-collect sequence are different things to document. A claim about priority needs to specify which feature and which geography it means. [35]

Road building supplied part of the wider setting. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 established the framework for the large-scale Interstate program associated with President Dwight Eisenhower. The Federal Highway Administration's history documents that transport development; it does not establish that highways alone caused restaurant chains to expand. Car-oriented restaurants existed before the legislation. [8]

The physical layout of the restaurant now had to coordinate two queues. Vehicles occupied road and parking space outside; meals occupied the preparation sequence inside. Taking orders faster could not, by itself, make grills or assembly stations handle more work. A lane also made delays visible to everyone behind the waiting vehicle. From this perspective, the drive-through was a scheduling problem as much as an architectural feature.

Its customer proposition extended beyond speed. A person could collect a meal without transferring children, belongings, or the meal itself between a parked car and a dining room. That is a description of what the format permits, not evidence about the motives of every customer. It helps explain why later curbside pickup could be useful without being an entirely new idea.

Car service was one branch of fast-food development, not the definition of the whole industry. The pedestrian Automat, urban takeaway, and shared hawker center organized convenience around different patterns of movement. The automobile changed the restaurant encounter; it did not invent the demand for meals away from home.

07 · McDonald’s: Redesigning the Kitchen, Then Expanding It

The McDonald brothers’ decisive experiment concerned the sequence of work. Their San Bernardino drive-in opened in 1940. In 1948, Richard and Maurice reorganized it around a smaller menu, counter service, disposable serving materials, and specialized tasks. Christopher Klein’s historical account describes workers concentrating on particular steps rather than carrying each order through an ordinary restaurant’s full range of operations. [11]

The significance of the Speedee Service System was therefore not a secret method for cooking every food faster. It reduced the number of different operations an order demanded. A limited selection made purchasing and preparation more predictable; standard assembly reduced exceptions; customers no longer waited for the old carhop transaction. The redesign connected the menu to the kitchen and the kitchen to the way the meal was sold. [10] [11]

Consider the production logic rather than an invented timing claim. Where customers can request many unrelated dishes, the operator must maintain different ingredients, equipment, and sequences. Where most orders share a few components, work can repeat. Some preparation can precede the individual order. The customer encounters the last stage of that preparation, not its entire duration. This explains how faster service can result from organization rather than from a cook simply moving more quickly.

Ray Kroc encountered the operation in 1954 and opened his Des Plaines restaurant in 1955. In 1961 he acquired the brothers’ rights for $2.7 million. The brothers had already undertaken franchising before Kroc’s involvement; he was not present at the original restaurant’s founding or the 1948 redesign. His importance lies in the subsequent expansion and institutionalization of the system. [10]

That required a different kind of replication. A kitchen could demonstrate a method once; a growing business had to teach it to people elsewhere. Training, specifications, purchasing, and supervision mattered because customers were being promised an identifiable experience at another address. The FTC’s description of franchise controls explains the general organizational tension: local operators invest in a business while accepting restrictions intended to preserve a common format. [12]

The familiar founder story is thus better understood as two linked developments. The brothers reworked a restaurant’s service process. Kroc helped build the organization that made the process influential at scale. Neither development eliminates the contribution of workers, suppliers, and operators who had to reproduce it. The chain was not one machine switched on in thousands of places; it was a continuing effort to make separate kitchens behave as a recognizable system.

08 · Franchising, Competitors, and the Replicable Restaurant

Franchising connects a recognizable restaurant system with an operator who runs an outlet under a contract. The FTC describes possible initial fees, continuing royalties, advertising contributions, approved suppliers, and controls over appearance and operations. The exact obligations depend on the agreement. A franchise is neither a completely independent restaurant nor automatically a company-owned branch, and recognition does not guarantee profitability. [12]

The attraction is the division of responsibilities. The operator supplies local investment and management; the franchisor supplies rights to a name and a system. Consistency can help both parties, but it also creates a negotiation over freedom. A local operator may see a useful menu change where the wider organization sees a threat to uniformity. Growth reproduces that tension along with the brand.

Competitors used the model to build different identities. The McLamore Family Foundation's account dates James McLamore and David Edgerton's Miami partnership to 1954 and the Whopper to 1957. Its chronology also records distribution and equipment businesses in 1962 and franchise training in 1964. The product and the organization supporting it developed together. This is a founder-family account, useful for attributed milestones rather than an independent assessment of corporate performance. [13]

Wendy's began in Columbus in 1969. Its corporate chronology identifies square patties and the Frosty among the original restaurant's distinguishing products. The significance is competitive as well as culinary: a new entrant could make itself recognizable without rejecting the general quick-service format. A diner could understand the transaction while noticing a different version of the meal. [35]

Subway illustrates another separation between beginnings. Fred DeLuca and Peter Buck's first sandwich shop opened in Bridgeport in 1965. The company dates its move into franchising to 1974, after sixteen Connecticut restaurants. Describing both events as "Subway was founded" would erase nine years of development and a consequential change in expansion strategy. [17]

These cases give a more useful comparison than a simple list of oldest chains. Ask when the first outlet opened, when a recognizable format emerged, how additional outlets were financed, and what the operating system required. Those questions reveal why two businesses with similar founding dates can have different histories.

Franchising was important, but it was not the only possible ownership arrangement. Nor did opening another outlet prove that demand, costs, and execution would align there. A chain's history should follow its operating model and product decisions, not treat the increasing number of signs as a self-explanatory measure of success.

09 · Chicken, Tacos, Pizza—and the People Behind the Foods

Fast-food chains expanded by organizing familiar dishes into repeatable transactions. KFC's corporate history traces Harland Sanders' chicken business in Corbin, Kentucky, to 1930, its first franchise near Salt Lake City to 1952, and its bucket to 1957. Pressure cooking and packaging belong to that business history; fried chicken itself has a history far beyond Sanders. [14]

The difference between a food and a chain is especially visible in San Bernardino. The National Trust for Historic Preservation documents Mitla Café's tacos dorados from its 1937 beginnings and identifies owner Lucia Rodriguez as part of the story behind Glen Bell's later business. Mitla served a Mexican American community and functioned as a gathering place as well as a restaurant. It should not disappear from history merely because another name became the larger brand. [40]

In the PBS program *Lost LA*, historian Gustavo Arellano describes Bell visiting Mitla and being shown how its tacos were made. He distinguishes that tradition from Bell's later approach to preparing shells in advance for easier service. The documented distinction is not "Bell invented the taco." It is that a businessman adapted an existing food and altered part of its production for replication. Yum! Brands dates the first Taco Bell restaurant in Downey to 1962. [41] [15]

This case gives substance to an otherwise empty warning about corporate origin stories. The relevant historical questions are who already cooked the food, who shared or transmitted the knowledge, what the later business changed, and who received recognition. A service innovation and a culinary invention are not the same achievement. A chain's success need not be denied to describe the earlier people accurately.

Pizza supplies a different contrast. Pizza Hut began with Dan and Frank Carney's Wichita restaurant in 1958; its official regional history describes a social, dine-in setting. Domino's dates its beginning in Ypsilanti to 1960. Both belong in a broad history of convenient meals, but grouping them together should not erase the difference between a restaurant gathering and a meal obtained for consumption elsewhere. [36] [16]

Subway's made-to-order sandwiches further challenge the idea that fast food is defined by frying. Its history also records expansion into sites such as convenience stores and travel-related locations. A recognizable transaction could fit a setting unlike a stand-alone hamburger building. [17]

The transferable idea was not one dish. It was the ability to specify ingredients, preparation, assembly, packaging, and service so another outlet could reproduce the experience. Following those changes produces a history of food and work—not merely a succession of corporate birthdays.

10 · Menus Became Instruments of Expansion

A chain can grow by opening restaurants, but it can also seek more occasions to serve the same customer. Breakfast, alternatives to beef, and products suited to different preferences change what a kitchen is asked to provide. McDonald’s official chronology shows why local invention and national adoption need separate dates.

Item	Milestone in the company chronology	Context or credited developer
Filet-O-Fish	National menu, 1965	Lou Groen, a Cincinnati franchisee serving a heavily Catholic community
Big Mac	National menu, 1968	Jim Delligatti, a Pittsburgh-area franchisee
Egg McMuffin	National menu, 1975	Herb Peterson, Santa Barbara
Chicken McNuggets	All U.S. restaurants, 1983	U.S. rollout milestone, not a claim about the first chicken nugget

Source: McDonald’s corporate history. These are the listed rollout milestones; the table does not substitute them for the dates of every earlier test or local sale. [10]

The comparison reveals two forms of adaptation. Some ideas responded to a particular local market; wider adoption made them part of a much larger menu. Breakfast addressed a different time of day. A chain’s menu could therefore evolve through information generated inside individual restaurants rather than only through decisions made at headquarters.

Operationally, an added item is also a demand on the system. It can require another ingredient, storage arrangement, cooking step, assembly instruction, or handover procedure. A product appealing in one kitchen may still be difficult to reproduce across many kitchens. The analytical question is not simply whether the food tastes different. It is what must change to deliver it reliably.

The supply chain makes that problem concrete. In-N-Out’s Texas expansion in 2011 included a Dallas-area warehouse and patty-production facility. WIPO’s historical Jollibee case describes franchise support extending to training, equipment, layout, and logistics. The visible restaurant depends on capabilities located elsewhere. [9] [18]

That dependence can become conspicuous during disruption. Yoshinoya’s domestic chronology records the temporary suspension of gyudon sales in 2004 because of a ban on importing U.S. beef. A signature dish could not simply be detached from the sourcing arrangement that supported it. The example does not prove that all international sourcing is fragile; it shows why an apparently local bowl of food can depend on decisions far beyond the shop. [38]

Menu history and supply history thus belong together. A successful new item is not only a recipe. It is a recipe that an organization learns to purchase, prepare, explain, and deliver repeatedly.

11 · Who Could Sit, Work, and Own?

On February 1, 1960, four students from North Carolina A&T College sat at a segregated Woolworth's lunch counter in Greensboro. The Library of Congress presents a contemporary NAACP pamphlet about the protest and explains how similar demonstrations spread across the South. The ordinary act of sitting down to obtain food exposed a rule that excluded Black customers from an experience available to white customers. [43]

Greensboro was not the first lunch-counter protest. The same exhibition documents Clara Luper and the Oklahoma City NAACP Youth Council beginning sit-ins in 1958, and Nashville's earlier test sit-ins before its larger 1960 campaign. Their inclusion prevents one celebrated event from obscuring the organizing that preceded and accompanied it. These were struggles over access to commercial public space, not merely disagreements about a restaurant's menu. [43]

Woolworth's was a retail chain with lunch counters rather than a modern stand-alone burger franchise. Its relevance is that inexpensive, convenient prepared food could be embedded in discriminatory rules. Price and speed did not automatically make a place inclusive.

The Civil Rights Act, signed on July 2, 1964, changed the legal framework. Title II covered specified public accommodations, expressly including restaurants, cafeterias, lunchrooms, and lunch counters, subject to the statute's coverage provisions. This was a change in enforceable rights, not simply a new customer-service preference. [19]

Access to service, however, is different from access to ownership or desirable employment. Franchising offers a contractual route to operating a branded restaurant, but fees, obligations, and operating restrictions remain relevant. Describing an outlet as locally operated does not answer who controls the system or bears its financial risk. [12]

Work inside the restaurant supplies a third perspective. The Bureau of Labor Statistics describes taking orders and payments, preparing or heating food, serving, and cleaning; shifts can include evenings, weekends, and holidays. The work can involve prolonged standing and hazards such as burns, cuts, and slips. These are descriptions of an occupation, not proof that every employer or worker has identical conditions. [1]

A tightly specified task is still work requiring execution. The menu board does not handle an incorrect order, replenish a station, or respond to a rush. The historical question is how standardization distributes discretion and responsibility—not whether writing a procedure makes human judgment disappear.

Fast-food history consequently has at least three subjects: the customer, the worker, and the owner. Changes that benefit one do not necessarily benefit the others in the same way. Keeping them visible prevents a story of commercial expansion from becoming an unsupported story of universal opportunity.

12 · Advertising: Selling Familiarity, Identity, and Childhood

A recognizable meal is only one part of a recognizable brand. White Castle's archival promotions included household-oriented appeals and coupons; Wendy's chronology records national television advertising in 1977 and Dave Thomas's first television commercials in 1989. Subway dates the national $5 Footlong promotion and its accompanying jingle to 2008. These were different devices for making a restaurant memorable before a customer arrived. The quoted dollar amount belongs to that historical campaign, not to a current menu promise. [7] [17] [35]

Such examples help explain the relationship between standardization and advertising. A repeatable restaurant gives an advertisement something consistent to describe; an advertisement can teach customers to recognize the format in advance. The result is a feedback loop in the analytical sense: familiarity reduces the effort of choosing, while another visit can reinforce or weaken the familiarity. This is a proposed explanation of the relationship, not a measured claim about the effectiveness of every campaign.

Branding can also attach meanings to the meal that are not reducible to ingredients. A founder appearing on television makes a corporation look personal. A memorable price makes affordability easy to recall. A familiar product name turns an item into something a customer can request without describing it. None of these techniques proves that a meal is the cheapest, healthiest, or best-tasting option. Their historical importance is that they organize expectations.

Children's advertising raises a distinct issue because commercial persuasion does not address an audience with uniform experience or independence. In its 2023 food-marketing guideline overview, the World Health Organization describes how marketing of foods high in saturated fat, trans fat, free sugars, or sodium can influence children's preferences, intake, and requests to adults. The subject is broader than fast-food restaurants alone. The guideline's existence is evidence of an international public-health response, not proof of a binding worldwide advertising law. [20]

This makes the history of restaurant promotion inseparable from the history of how childhood is treated commercially. A responsible account does not need to assume that a colorful package determines a child's diet. It needs to ask what is being advertised, to whom, with which persuasive device, and under what rules. The nutritional properties of the food and the ethics of its promotion are related but separate questions.

These campaigns give the customer something to remember before the next meal: a personality, sound, product, or price. Advertising and repeatable service reinforce one another when the promised experience is delivered. They can also diverge. The historical question is how a restaurant made itself familiar, and what that familiarity encouraged people to expect.

13 · A Global Industry, Not a One-Way Export

A world history of fast food cannot begin every country's story with the arrival of an American chain. Existing vendors and locally created businesses already served convenient meals. International expansion is one historical process; the invention of eating quickly is another.

Yoshinoya's overseas chronology reverses the familiar direction of travel. It records a Denver subsidiary established in 1973 for beef procurement and a first U.S. restaurant in Denver in February 1975. Its later account describes a Los Angeles-developed teriyaki chicken bowl entering a Taiwanese restaurant in 1991. The movement of food and operational ideas was not simply United States-to-Asia: a Japanese business expanded abroad and circulated an adaptation between markets. [39]

KFC's first mainland Chinese restaurant opened in Beijing in 1987, according to Yum China. Its brand description includes rice, congee, vegetables, and seafood alongside chicken. The same source dates Pizza Hut's Beijing debut to 1990 and presents it as a casual-dining brand. These examples show two kinds of adaptation: the food offered and the type of restaurant experience. A familiar international logo does not establish an identical menu or service category. [42]

The Philippines supplies another center of initiative. WIPO traces Tony Tan Caktiong's business from ice-cream parlors toward hot meals and the transformation into Jollibee in 1978. Its historical case connects branding with the practical support needed to reproduce the business. That is a story of a locally created company, not merely a foreign chain learning a new market. [18]

Nando's places its beginnings in Rosettenville, Johannesburg, in 1987. Its corporate narrative connects peri-peri chicken with southern African and Portuguese culinary relationships. That account identifies the company's presentation of its heritage; it is not a complete history of those culinary exchanges. [21]

Singapore's hawker centers represent a different organizational form. The National Library Board describes the movement from street hawking through regulation and relocation, including extensive center construction between 1971 and 1986. UNESCO recognition in 2020 concerned hawker culture as living heritage, not a single corporation. Shared facilities can make convenient meals a visible public institution without requiring every seller to reproduce one branded menu. [22]

These cases suggest three distinct histories: foreign companies entering markets, locally founded companies expanding outward, and community food institutions developing in place. They can overlap without becoming interchangeable.

The durable question is not which country owns fast food. It is how a particular system fits an existing food environment: what people eat, where they gather, how they order, and which organizations supply the meal. Globalization becomes more intelligible when those local differences remain part of the account.

14 · Health: What the Evidence Does—and Does Not—Show

Three questions must be separated: how often people obtain fast food, what nutrients a meal contains, and what effects a broader dietary pattern produces. They require different evidence. A restaurant category is not a nutrient, and “ultra-processed” is not simply another name for “bought at a drive-through.” Treating those categories as interchangeable makes both criticism and defense less accurate.

A June 2025 National Center for Health Statistics report examined U.S. adults aged twenty and older using data collected from August 2021 through August 2023. It estimated that 32.0 percent consumed fast food on a given day. Across all adults, the mean share of daily calories from fast food was 11.7 percent. That second number is not the calorie share among fast-food consumers alone. Nor does the first number mean that only one-third of adults ever eat fast food. [23]

The report also found that the overall calorie share was lower than the 14.1 percent estimated for 2013–2014. This is a specific survey comparison, not proof that all restaurant meals improved nutritionally or that every individual's behavior changed. Population, time window, measurement, and denominator are part of the finding itself. Removing them to produce a dramatic headline changes the claim. [23]

A different kind of evidence came from an NIH inpatient experiment reported in 2019. Twenty adults received ultra-processed and minimally processed diets in random order, for two weeks each, and could eat as much as they wished. The NIH account reports roughly 500 additional calories per day on the ultra-processed diet, with weight gain during that period and weight loss during the other. The study's short duration and small controlled sample matter. It tested diets, not a representative set of fast-food restaurant purchases. [24]

The experiment therefore cannot honestly be presented as proof that one named chain causes a particular disease, that every quick-service meal has the same effects, or that a single purchase determines a person's health. Conversely, its limits are not grounds for dismissing the observed dietary effect. Good interpretation preserves both what the study found and what it did not test.

For this history, the important shift is toward scrutinizing an entire eating environment rather than treating convenience as a neutral description of speed. The strongest question is not whether fast food is universally “good” or “bad.” It is what food, in what portion, consumed how often, in what broader diet, and supported by what evidence. Those distinctions make the subject more informative without turning a historical paper into individualized medical advice.

15 · From Food-Safety Crises to Menu Disclosure

The CDC's contemporaneous investigation of the western U.S. hamburger outbreak of 1992–1993 reported more than 500 laboratory-confirmed E. coli O157:H7 infections and four associated deaths across four states. It linked implicated hamburgers to a business anonymized as "chain A" and traced patties through a distribution network. Those figures belong to that report's stage of investigation, not a silently substituted final total. [25]

The case exposes a distinction that the customer cannot resolve by recognizing a logo. Uniform appearance and a familiar recipe are not the same as safe handling. Shared supplies connect outlets: an upstream failure can affect distant diners, while tracing those connections can help identify the implicated product. This is an inference from the investigated distribution pattern, not a finding that every chain is more hazardous than every independent restaurant.

The FDA Food Code supplies a separate institutional response. It is a model used by jurisdictions to develop retail and food-service rules, not an automatically binding national restaurant code. The modern-format editions began in 1993; publication and adoption are different events. A jurisdiction's rule and a restaurant's actual practice must still be distinguished. [26]

Nutrition disclosure addresses another problem: customers cannot necessarily infer a meal's composition from its name or photograph. The U.S. menu-labeling compliance date was May 7, 2018. Qualifying chains with twenty or more locations, operating under the same name and offering substantially the same menu items, must display calories for standard items and provide additional written nutrition information on request. The rule does not cover every restaurant everywhere. [27]

Reformulation changes the food rather than the accompanying information. In 2015, the FDA determined that partially hydrogenated oils were no longer generally recognized as safe for use in human food. Most uses faced a June 18, 2018 manufacturing deadline, with a final distribution transition to January 1, 2021. The action did not remove naturally occurring trans fat and was not confined to fast-food restaurants. [28]

These developments operate at different points in a meal's history. Traceback investigates where a hazard traveled. Handling rules define procedures. Disclosure makes specified information available at purchase. Ingredient restrictions change what suppliers and kitchens may use. It would be inaccurate to treat them as interchangeable solutions or as a single regulation caused by one outbreak.

Their shared historical significance is that the brand's promise became subject to forms of checking beyond advertising. A familiar meal could be investigated, described numerically, or reformulated under public requirements. A customer still makes a purchase, but institutions also shape the information and products from which that choice is made.

16 · The Convenience Bargain: Critics, Defenders, and Domestic Work

Fast food became a cultural argument as well as a restaurant category. In Slow Food USA’s account, a 1986 protest near Rome’s Spanish Steps helped launch a movement against the spread of fast-food culture. On December 10, 1989, delegates from fifteen countries endorsed its founding manifesto. The text advocated regional cooking, pleasure, and time at the table against a life organized around speed. It is evidence of an articulated alternative, not a neutral measurement of every quick meal. [45]

The disagreement was not simply over minutes at a counter. What should a good meal protect: continuity with a food tradition, attention to taste, shared time, affordability, or freedom from preparation? Those values can reinforce one another, but they can also conflict. A pleasurable meal for the diner might demand substantial work from somebody else. The labor does not become voluntary merely because the finished dish is admired.

Historian Rachel Laudan offered a counterargument in the publicly available 2010 essay “In Praise of Fast Food.” She challenged idealized accounts of preindustrial eating and emphasized the work, scarcity, and restrictions they can obscure. Her defense of culinary modernism concerned industrial and convenient food broadly, including alternatives to intensive domestic preparation; it was not a clinical endorsement of every chain’s menu. The relevant source here is the published essay excerpt, not an anthology represented as having been read in full. [46]

Read together, the manifesto and the essay identify a harder question than whether slow is good and fast is bad: **whose time, choices, and obligations are being counted?** This paper’s interpretation is that an account of convenience should examine both the customer’s relief and the work transferred elsewhere. Neither the romantic household kitchen nor the frictionless restaurant screen supplies a complete accounting.

The opposing arguments also guard against two weak explanations of popularity. Calling diners merely manipulated leaves no room for the practical value they might obtain. Treating every purchase as an unqualified endorsement ignores the alternatives and constraints surrounding it. A person can value a meal’s convenience while disliking its price, its packaging, or the circumstances under which it is produced. Those possibilities need not be forced into one verdict.

Food culture is therefore not an afterword to business history. It helps determine which changes are celebrated as progress and which are experienced as loss. The appropriate historical question is not whether the past or present wins in the abstract. It is what a particular food system makes possible, for whom, and what it asks other people to do. The debate changes the standards by which the industry’s familiar claim of convenience is judged.

17 · Packaging, Wasted Food, and the Cost Outside the Receipt

Takeaway convenience depends on getting a meal from preparation to consumption in a usable condition. A package can be part of the service rather than a decorative afterthought. The McDonald brothers' move away from conventional tableware illustrates how disposable serving materials could support a redesigned restaurant procedure. The operational gain and the material left afterward are two parts of the same transaction. [11]

A narrow focus on the wrapper, however, can miss the food it contains. The EPA's Wasted Food Scale prioritizes preventing waste and keeping food in higher-value uses over disposal. Its framework recognizes that wasted food also represents resources used in production, processing, distribution, and preparation. The scale is an environmental framework; EPA notes that it does not incorporate all economic and social considerations. It should not be presented as a complete financial model for every restaurant. [29]

Numbers require equally careful boundaries. EPA's materials reference estimates approximately 66 million tons of wasted food in U.S. food retail, food service, and residential sectors in 2019. That is not an estimate for fast-food restaurants alone. The agency also notes a methodological expansion affecting the historical series from 2018. A large movement in such a series cannot automatically be interpreted as a sudden behavioral change. The definition of what is counted can change the result. [30]

Packaging chemistry produced another specific development. On February 28, 2024, the FDA announced that PFAS-containing grease-proofing substances for paper and paperboard food packaging were no longer being sold for that use in the United States, following voluntary manufacturer commitments. The announcement was about specified substances and uses. It did not establish that every existing package was PFAS-free, that all PFAS had disappeared, or that an identical change had occurred worldwide. [31]

These distinctions suggest a better environmental history than a contest between “good” and “bad” packaging materials. One question concerns the amount of material used; another concerns chemical composition; another concerns what happens after use; and another concerns whether the meal itself is wasted. A claim about one dimension does not answer the others. The relevant comparison needs a defined boundary and evidence about the actual system.

The same principle applies to corporate commitments. A target is not an achieved result, a pilot is not an entire chain, and a technically recyclable item is not evidence that it was collected and recycled in a particular place. Fast food's environmental history is therefore partly a history of expanding the accounting boundary. The receipt records a purchase. It does not, by itself, record every resource used or every consequence of disposing of the meal and its packaging.

18 · Fast Casual, Value Menus, and the Meaning of “Cheap”

The fast-casual category complicates the old contrast between fast food and a conventional sit-down restaurant. It commonly describes a quick-service format that puts additional emphasis on preparation, ingredients, customization, or the setting. It is an industry category, not a legal or nutritional guarantee. A customer can receive a meal quickly while the operator positions the experience differently from the traditional low-priced hamburger counter.

Chipotle's annual filing records its first restaurant in Denver in 1993 and describes a menu built around burritos, bowls, quesadillas, tacos, and salads. The filing discusses competition across fast-casual, quick-service, and casual-dining segments. Its claims about ingredients and sourcing should be understood as the company's positioning, not accepted here as independent proof of every supplier practice. The document also distinguishes company-owned restaurants from international partner-operated locations, illustrating why a brand's ownership model should not be assumed from its service category. [32]

The historical contrast is not simply “old fast food was cheap; new fast food is expensive.” Wendy's records a 1989 Super Value Menu of nine items at 99 cents. Subway's 2008 $5 Footlong campaign supplies another familiar price marker. Each is a nominal promotional price tied to a specific period and offer. Neither proves what customers paid for an entire meal, what every restaurant charged, or whether the purchase took a smaller share of household resources than it would in another year. [17] [35]

An honest historical price comparison needs a defined purchase: the same item or a documented substitute, its portion, place, date, and ordering channel. Tax and delivery fees belong in the total when applicable. A temporary advertised entry price is not necessarily the price of a full meal. The historical promotions above are evidence of how value was marketed, not an inflation-adjusted price series.

USDA's Food Expenditure Series provides a broader methodological reminder. It distinguishes food at home from food away from home, reports different purchaser and outlet categories, and offers nominal and constant-dollar measures. “Food away from home” is wider than fast food. The agency's 2026 documentation also describes revisions and rebasing, which matter when comparing releases. A national expenditure series cannot be converted into a chain's traffic, profit, or market share without additional evidence. [33]

The enduring consumer question is not merely whether a restaurant is cheap in the abstract. It is what value a particular purchase offers relative to alternatives, including time and convenience. Fast casual and value-menu promotions illustrate different ways of answering that question commercially. They also explain why an evergreen history should preserve old prices as dated evidence rather than present them as reliable current buying advice.

19 · Before the Apps: PizzaNet and the Unbundled Restaurant Visit

Online restaurant ordering did not begin with the smartphone. A joint Pizza Hut–SCO announcement dated August 22, 1994 described PizzaNet, a Santa Cruz pilot. Customers entered orders on the Web; information traveled to Wichita and onward to a local restaurant. Staff could telephone first-time users to confirm the order, and payment occurred at delivery. The consulted evidence is a contemporaneous mailing-list reproduction preserved in a 2012 Internet Archive capture. It documents an announced pilot and workflow, not independent proof of the world's first e-commerce transaction. [44]

That arrangement separates four processes that "online ordering" can conceal: transmitting the request, confirming it, paying, and moving the meal. Digitizing one did not mean digitizing all four. The source matters because it records those connections instead of leaving the reader with a company anniversary and an unqualified invention claim.

Domino's dates its own online and mobile ordering milestone to 2007 and its Tracker to 2008. Its 2015 AnyWare initiative extended ordering to more interfaces. These are adoption milestones within one business, not the origin of every kind of remote restaurant order. [16]

DoorDash, founded in 2013, describes a platform connecting customers, merchants, and delivery workers. That structure inserts another organization into the restaurant visit: the business preparing the meal need not be the business supplying the ordering interface or arranging its transport. The company's description establishes that relationship, not a guaranteed benefit or earnings result for everyone participating. [34]

The difference between information and physical capacity remains central. A screen can make an order easier to submit or a wait easier to understand without increasing the number of meals a kitchen can prepare. Likewise, a vehicle's estimated arrival does not eliminate the handover. Convenience is better evaluated by identifying the step that changed than by assuming a digital interface makes the whole meal faster.

Domino's records a 2017 experiment with Ford to investigate customer interaction with self-driving delivery, and a 2020 U.S. Carside Delivery rollout for prepaid online orders. An experiment, a national service rollout, and routine performance are distinct kinds of evidence. The chronology should not convert a test into a claim that autonomous delivery became universal. [16]

The restaurant visit had become separable into stages occurring in different places: discovery, selection, ordering, payment, preparation, collection, and eating. That is this chapter's synthesis, not a claim that every service follows one sequence. The Automat had already made the visible transaction simpler while work continued behind it. Digital ordering extended that separation across networks. A newer interface changed the route to the kitchen, but not the obligation to turn a request into an available meal and complete the handover.

20 · Timeline and Conclusion

This selective timeline mixes documented food-service, business, and policy milestones. It is not a ranking of inventions.

Period	Milestone
Before 79 CE	Prepared-food counters in Pompeii. [3]
Early nineteenth century	Nigirizushi in Edo's street-food economy. [4]
Early 1860s	Competing British fish-and-chip shop origin traditions. [5]
1899 / 1902	Yoshinoya shop / Philadelphia Automat. [38] [6]
1919 / 1921	A&W root-beer stand / White Castle. [37] [7]
1937 / 1948	Mitla Café / McDonald's Speedee redesign and In-N-Out opening. [40] [10] [9]
1952 / 1955	KFC first franchise / Kroc's Des Plaines restaurant. [14] [10]
1960 / 1964	Greensboro sit-in / U.S. Civil Rights Act. [43] [19]
1975 / 1978	Yoshinoya U.S. restaurant / Jollibee transformation. [39] [18]
1987	KFC in mainland China; Nando's begins. [42] [21]
1989	Slow Food manifesto endorsed. [45]
1993 / 1994	Chipotle opens / PizzaNet online-ordering pilot announcement. [32] [44]
2007 / 2013	Domino's online/mobile milestone / DoorDash founded. [16] [34]
2018 / 2020	U.S. menu-labeling compliance / Singapore hawker culture's UNESCO inscription. [27] [22]

Conclusion

What changed most was the organization behind the quick meal. Street sellers, automats, chains, franchises, and apps arranged preparation, payment, labor, and access differently. This paper's synthesis is that speed at purchase rests on coordination elsewhere. The most useful history makes that coordination visible—and remembers the people and food traditions that a familiar logo can hide.

Annotated References

Research cutoff: September 11, 2026. References 1–43 retain prior numbering; 44–46 are new. Review status is recorded in the companion source register.

[1] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2026). Food and Beverage Serving and Related Workers.
https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/food-and-beverage-serving-and-related-workers.htm
Government occupational reference. Limited-service ordering; food-service tasks, training, schedules, and workplace conditions.

[2] Diamond, Anna. (2019-06-24). The Crispy, Salty, American History of Fast Food.
https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/crispy-salty-american-history-fast-food-180972459/
Museum magazine; interview with Adam Chandler. White Castle, standardization, car culture, and the interpretation of modern fast food.

[3] Katz, Brigit. (2020-12-30). Ancient Pompeiians Stopped at This "Snack Bar" to Feast on Snails, Fish and Wine.
https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/fast-food-joint-pompeii-served-snails-fish-and-wine-new-finds-suggest-180976651/
Museum magazine; archaeological reporting. Regio V thermopolium, containers, imagery, and cautiously interpreted food remains.

[4] Nippon.com. (2020-12-22). When Sushi Became a New Fast Food in Edo.
https://www.nippon.com/en/japan-topics/g00962/
Historical interpretation using nineteenth-century illustrations. Edo nigirizushi, street sales, preparation, and historical food formats.

[5] Castelow, Ellen. (2015-08-21). Fish and Chips.
https://www.historic-uk.com/CultureUK/Fish-Chips/
Independent popular history. Competing British shop-origin traditions and the role of industrial distribution. Not a government source.

[6] Crowley, Carolyn Hughes. (2001-08). Meet Me at the Automat.
https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/meet-me-at-the-automat-47804151/
Museum magazine; historical synthesis. Horn & Hardart dates, self-service, hidden labor, centralized supply, and decline.

[7] Birkhimer, Lily. (2015-06-05). Hamburger Capital of the World.
https://ohiomemory.ohiohistory.org/archives/2350
Ohio History Connection / Ohio Memory. White Castle chronology and archival examples of uniformity and promotion.

[8] Federal Highway Administration. (n.d.). History of the Interstate Highway System.
https://highways.dot.gov/highway-history/interstate-system/50th-anniversary/history-interstate-highway-system
Government historical reference. The 1956 federal highway legislation; not proof that highways alone caused chain expansion.

[9] In-N-Out Burger. (n.d.). History.
https://www.in-n-out.com/history
Corporate history. 1948 Baldwin Park operation and two-way speaker; 2011 Texas supply facilities.

[10] McDonald's Corporation. (n.d.). Our History.
https://corporate.mcdonalds.com/corpmcd/our-company/who-we-are/our-history.html
Corporate history. 1940 restaurant, 1948 Speedee system, Kroc chronology, and 1967 expansion. National-menu milestones: Filet-O-Fish 1965, Big Mac 1968, Egg McMuffin 1975, McNuggets all U.S. restaurants 1983.

[11] Klein, Christopher. (2015-05-15; updated 2026-04-02). How McDonald's Beat Its Early Competition and Became an Icon of Fast Food.
https://www.history.com/articles/how-mcdonalds-became-fast-food-giant
Historical reporting. The brothers' kitchen redesign, reduced menu, self-service, and pre-Kroc business.

[12] Federal Trade Commission. (n.d.). A Consumer's Guide to Buying a Franchise.
https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/consumers-guide-buying-franchise
Government business guidance. Franchise fees, royalties, controls, advertising contributions, and investment risks.

Annotated References (continued)

[13] McLamore Family Foundation. (n.d.). The Burger King Timeline.
https://www.thebkbook.com/timeline
Founder-family historical account. Miami partnership, Whopper, distribution and equipment businesses, and franchise training. Not independent verification of promotional claims.

[14] KFC. (n.d.). Our History.
https://global.kfc.com/our-history
Corporate history. Sanders’ restaurant business, pressure cooking, 1952 franchise, bucket, and 1964 sale.

[15] Yum! Brands. (n.d.). Taco Bell.
https://www.yum.com/wps/portal/yumbrands/Yumbrands/company/our-brands/taco-bell
Corporate brand profile. Glen Bell’s 1962 Downey restaurant; Mexican-inspired quick service, not invention of tacos.

[16] Domino’s. (n.d.). History.
https://biz.dominos.com/about-us/history/
Corporate history. 1960 origin, international expansion, ordering technology, tracking, and delivery experiments.

[17] Subway. (n.d.). The Subway Story.
https://www.subway.com/en-us/aboutus/history
Corporate history. 1965 Bridgeport origin, 1974 franchising, Bahrain, nontraditional locations, and historical promotion.

[18] World Intellectual Property Organization. (n.d.). From Ice Cream Parlor to Fast Food Empire: Tony Tan Caktiong’s Story.
https://www.wipo.int/en/web/ip-advantage/w/stories/from-ice-cream-parlor-to-fast-food-empire-tony-tan-caktiong-s-story
UN agency historical business case. Jollibee’s development, brand, franchise training, and operating support. Historical case, not a current franchise offer.

[19] U.S. National Archives. (n.d.). Civil Rights Act (1964).
https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/civil-rights-act
Government archive and statutory text. July 2, 1964 enactment and Title II coverage of public accommodations, including restaurants.

[20] World Health Organization. (2023-07-03). Policies to Protect Children from the Harmful Impact of Food Marketing: WHO Guideline.
https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240075412
International public-health guideline overview. Food marketing, children’s preferences, purchasing requests, and policy concerns; not a worldwide statute.

[21] Nando’s. (2022). Our Story.
https://www.nandos.com/heritage/our-story/
Corporate heritage narrative. 1987 Johannesburg origin and the brand’s presentation of southern African and Portuguese culinary connections.

[22] Tung, Ai Jui / National Library Board Singapore. (n.d.). Hawker Centres.
https://www.nlb.gov.sg/main/article-detail?cmsuuid=d30b9e62-9e71-4e1e-9f5e-a6573380f4b6
National library historical reference. Street hawking, relocation and centre construction, community dining, and 2020 UNESCO inscription.

[23] Shah, Nimit N.; Fryar, Cheryl D.; Ahluwalia, Namanjeet; and Akinbami, Lara J.. (2025-06). Fast-food Intake Among Adults in the United States, August 2021–August 2023.
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/products/databriefs/db533.htm
Government survey analysis; Data Brief 533. Adult consumption on a given day and mean calorie share. U.S. adults, not the global population.

[24] National Institutes of Health. (2019-05-16). NIH Study Finds Heavily Processed Foods Cause Overeating and Weight Gain.
https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/nih-study-finds-heavily-processed-foods-cause-overeating-weight-gain
Primary agency account of a randomized inpatient trial. Twenty-person crossover experiment. Ultra-processed diets, not a trial of restaurant fast food as a category.

Annotated References (continued)

[25] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1993). Update: Multistate Outbreak of Escherichia coli O157:H7 Infections from Hamburgers — Western United States, 1992–1993.
https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/00020219.htm
Contemporaneous public-health investigation. Outbreak, traceback, distributed patties, recall, and surveillance. Counts are those reported at that stage of the investigation.

[26] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (n.d.). FDA Food Code.
https://www.fda.gov/food/retail-food-protection/fda-food-code
Government model-code reference. Model for food-service regulation; jurisdictional adoption is distinct from publication.

[27] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (n.d.). Menu Labeling Requirements.
https://www.fda.gov/food/nutrition-food-labeling-and-critical-foods/menu-labeling-requirements
Government regulatory guidance. May 7, 2018 compliance date, covered chains, calorie disclosure, and written nutrition information.

[28] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (n.d.). Trans Fat.
https://www.fda.gov/food/food-additives-petitions/trans-fat
Government regulatory history. 2015 determination on partially hydrogenated oils and phased compliance; not a ban on every trans-fat molecule.

[29] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Wasted Food Scale.
https://www.epa.gov/sustainable-management-food/wasted-food-scale
Government environmental framework. Prevention and higher-value management pathways; framework limitations and upstream resources.

[30] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (n.d.). Food: Material-Specific Data.
https://www.epa.gov/facts-and-figures-about-materials-waste-and-recycling/food-material-specific-data
Government materials and waste statistics. Scope and historical year of food-waste estimates; not a fast-food-specific inventory.

[31] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024-02-28). FDA Announces PFAS Used in Grease-Proofing Agents for Food Packaging No Longer Being Sold in the U.S..
https://www.fda.gov/food/hfp-constituent-updates/fda-announces-pfas-used-grease-proofing-agents-food-packaging-no-longer-being-sold-us
Government announcement. Specific U.S. grease-proofing substances and voluntary manufacturer commitments; not proof that all packaging is PFAS-free.

[32] Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.. (2026). Form 10-K for the Year Ended December 31, 2025.
https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1058090/000105809026000009/cmg-20251231.htm
Corporate annual filing hosted by the SEC. 1993 Denver origin, menu, owned and partner-operated restaurants, and competitive positioning.

[33] USDA Economic Research Service. (updated 2026-08-19). Food Expenditure Series.
https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-expenditure-series
Government economic data and methodology. Food-at-home and food-away-from-home categories, nominal/constant dollars, and data revisions.

[34] DoorDash. (n.d.). About Us.
https://about.doordash.com/en-us/company
Corporate platform description. 2013 founding and customer–merchant–courier ordering model. No endorsement of earnings or affordability claims.

[35] Wendy's. (n.d.). Wendy's Story.
https://www.wendys.com/wendys-story
Corporate timeline. 1969 origin, pickup window, television, menu diversification, value promotions, and digital milestones.

Annotated References (continued)

[36] Pizza Hut Mauritius. (n.d.). The Pizza Hut Story.
https://www.pizzahut.mu/pizza-hut-story/
Regional official brand history. Dan and Frank Carney's 1958 Wichita restaurant and the early dine-in format.

[37] A&W Restaurants. (n.d.). About A&W.
https://awrestaurants.com/about/
Corporate history. 1919 Lodi root-beer stand; Allen–Wright partnership; franchising dated 1926 in the consulted corporate account.

[38] Yoshinoya Holdings. (n.d.). History (Domestic).
https://www.yoshinoya-holdings.com/english/company/history/
Corporate chronology. 1899 Nihonbashi store; 1968 Shimbashi second store for chain development; 2004 gyudon suspension linked to U.S. beef import ban.

[39] Yoshinoya Holdings. (n.d.). History (Overseas).
https://www.yoshinoya-holdings.com/english/company/oversea/
Corporate chronology. 1973 Denver procurement subsidiary; February 1975 first U.S. restaurant; 1991 Los Angeles-developed chicken bowl introduced in Taiwan.

[40] Ortenberg, Rebecca / National Trust for Historic Preservation. (2023-12-07). The Mitla Cafe: Serving the San Bernardino Community for Generations.
https://savingplaces.org/stories/the-mitla-cafe
Preservation organization; reported local history. 1937 Mitla Café, Lucia Rodriguez, tacos dorados, community role, and connection with Glen Bell.

[41] PBS / Lost LA. (2023-12-23). Taco Bell's Fast Food Origin Story.
https://www.pbs.org/video/taco-bells-fast-food-origin-story/
Public television; consulted interview transcript. Gustavo Arellano's account of Bell learning at Mitla and distinguishing prefabricated shells from inventing tacos.

[42] Yum China Holdings. (n.d.). Our Brands.
https://ir.yumchina.com/our-brands
Corporate investor-relations description. KFC Beijing 1987; Pizza Hut Beijing 1990; differentiated menus and service positioning. No current outlet counts used.

[43] Library of Congress. (n.d.). Civil Rights Era (1950–1963), in The Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Long Struggle for Freedom.
https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/civil-rights-act/civil-rights-era.html#obj107
Government exhibition with archival items. February 1, 1960 Greensboro sit-in; contemporary NAACP pamphlet; Oklahoma City and Nashville context.

[44] The Santa Cruz Operation and Pizza Hut. (1994-08-22). SCO and Pizza Hut Announce Pilot Program for Pizza Delivery on the Internet.
https://web.archive.org/web/20120609100313/http://www.interesting-people.org/archives/interesting-people/199408/msg00057.html
Contemporaneous joint corporate announcement, reproduced on a mailing list; Internet Archive capture. PizzaNet pilot announcement; Santa Cruz; online order transmission, telephone verification, payment at delivery. Announcement is not independent proof of a worldwide first.

[45] Slow Food USA. (n.d.; manifesto adopted 1989-12-10). The History of Slow Food; The Slow Food Manifesto.
https://slowfoodusa.org/history/
Movement account and reproduced founding manifesto. 1986 protest origin account and December 10, 1989 manifesto endorsement. Evidence of the movement's stated values, not proof of its claims about every food system.

[46] Laudan, Rachel. (2010-08-05). In Praise of Fast Food.
https://www.utne.com/environment/fast-food-culinary-ethos/
Historian's argumentative essay; published excerpt from The Gastronomica Reader. Critique of romanticizing preindustrial eating and overlooking domestic food labor. The argument concerns industrial and convenient food broadly, not a clinical finding about restaurant meals.