

RatifyThe1st.org Website Review

Website reviewed: RatifyThe1st.org

Review date: August 30, 2026

Researcher: PatriotPenny76

1. Overall position

RatifyThe1st.org is a direct Article the First ratification website. It presents the proposal as "The Missing Amendment" and describes ratification as "finishing the Constitution."

Its principal positions are:

- Article the First is a constitutional safeguard against oligarchy and distant representation.
- Eleven states previously ratified it.
- Connecticut should not presently be counted because its two chambers did not complete an agreed ratification.
- Twenty-seven additional states can finish the process.
- Congress and the president have no further approval role.
- Ratification would allegedly require approximately 6,771 representatives—about one for every 50,000 people.
- A larger House would reduce gerrymandering, campaign costs, special-interest influence, party dominance and federal spending.
- Citizens should contact state legislators, sign a petition and advocate for state ratification.
- Historical, legal and political questions are

presented on an open research page that accepts contributions through GitHub.

The Missing Amendment

2. Core-message chart



3. Alignment with ATFI

RatifyThe1st.org aligns strongly with ATFI in several areas:

- Article the First is the central subject.
- Ratification by 27 additional states is the goal.
- The proposal does not need to return to Congress.
- The president does not participate in state ratification.
- Eleven historical ratifications are recognized.
- Connecticut is not counted or relied upon.
- The Twenty-Seventh Amendment is used as evidence that a 1789 proposal without a deadline

can remain pending.

- Education and citizen involvement are encouraged.
- State legislators—not members of Congress—are the proper recipients of ratification requests.
- The site provides talking points, a petition and contact instructions.
- Research questions are presented openly and outside contributions are welcomed.
- The site recognizes that the wording and mathematical objection deserve further research.

Among the websites reviewed so far, RatifyThe1st.org has the strongest combination of ATFI's ratification goal and practical citizen action.

4. Central difference from ATFI

The most important difference is interpretation: RatifyThe1st.org says ratification would require approximately 6,771 representatives. ATFI separates completion of ratification from unresolved questions about the amendment's present-day implementation. RatifyThe1st.org reads the final clause as establishing a permanent minimum of one representative for every 50,000 people.

However, the transmitted language says:

"nor more than one Representative for every fifty thousand persons."

Read literally, that phrase limits the number of representatives. It does not require Congress to provide at least one representative for every 50,000 people.

ATFI's approach is to:

- teach the exact transmitted wording;
- explain the earlier “nor less than” version;
- explain the eight-to-ten-million paradox;
- distinguish historical intent from enacted text;
- complete the state ratification process; and
- avoid promising a precise House size until the implementation question has been responsibly studied.

5. Verification findings

The 6,771-member claim

The site says Article the First would expand the House to approximately 6,771 representatives. It arrives at this number by dividing the current population by 50,000. The arithmetic is straightforward, but the legal interpretation is reversed.

Under the transmitted phrase “nor more than one Representative for every fifty thousand,” population divided by 50,000 produces an approximate maximum, not a constitutionally required minimum.

At today’s population, the transmitted wording appears to allow Congress to select a House size between:

- at least 200 representatives; and
- no more than approximately 6,700 representatives.

Therefore:

Ratification would not automatically seat 6,771

representatives under the amendment's literal wording. This is the site's largest substantive error.

The mathematical paradox

The site recognizes that the wording change created a mathematical impossibility for certain population levels. Its research page also asks whether those population ranges are likely to recur.

ATFI has already resolved the basic mathematical point:

- Between eight and ten million people, the formula creates a maximum below the required minimum of 200.
- At today's much larger population, the proportional ceiling is well above 200.
- Therefore, the historical contradiction does not produce the same impossibility today.

The site correctly identifies the historical problem but does not incorporate that finding consistently into its promised 6,771-member result.

Kentucky's statehood number

The site says Kentucky joined the Union as the sixteenth state in June 1792.

Kentucky became the fifteenth state on June 1, 1792.

Tennessee became the sixteenth state in 1796.

The ratification calculation nevertheless remains:

- ten ratifications before Kentucky;
- Kentucky became the eleventh ratifying state;
- with fifteen states in the Union, twelve were needed;

- Article the First remained one state short.

Eleven historical ratifications

The site's final total of eleven historical ratifications agrees with ATFI's completed documentary research. It correctly identifies:

- ten ratifying states through 1791; and
- Kentucky as the eleventh in 1792.

ATFI's contribution is the publication of the original state records rather than reliance upon Wikipedia's compiled list.

Connecticut

The website's main page says Connecticut's two chambers deadlocked. Its research page discusses LaVergne's arguments but concludes that the chambers probably did not complete a legally effective ratification.

This aligns with ATFI's decision:

Do not count Connecticut and proceed with 27 additional states.

However, the site says primary Connecticut records remain difficult to locate. ATFI has already completed its Connecticut investigation and posted its findings. That ATFI research should be treated as established within our comparison.

Washington and the 1:30,000 ratio

The site says George Washington wanted Americans to

have at least fifteen times more representatives than they have today.

Washington supported changing the proposed constitutional ratio from one representative per 40,000 to one per 30,000 on September 17, 1787. That is documented.

However, his statement addressed the Constitution's initial representation provision. It does not conclusively establish that Washington demanded a perpetual House containing one representative for every 30,000 people.

The website turns a documented historical statement into a broader modern conclusion.

"First" does not necessarily mean highest

The site says the Founders placed Article the First above freedom of speech, religion, arms and due process because it appeared first in the proposed list.

Article the First was indeed placed first, showing that representation was foundationally important. But sequence alone does not prove that every member of Congress considered it more important than every other proposed protection.

That is persuasive advocacy rather than a conclusively documented ranking.

State legislative procedure

The Take Action page correctly explains that:

- ratification occurs through state legislatures;
- the proposal does not return to Congress;

- the president does not sign it; and
- governors do not possess an Article V veto.

However, the statement that ratification always requires an ordinary majority in both chambers is too categorical. Each legislature operates under its own procedural rules, committee practices and parliamentary requirements.

Likewise, whether any individual legislator can introduce a resolution depends upon the state's rules.

Take Action

Action materials

The website makes a meaningful practical contribution by providing:

- a sample message for state legislators;
- an explanation of state versus federal responsibility;
- a Change.org petition;
- a subscription option;
- suggested public outreach;
- preliminary state-strategy discussion; and
- several memorable referral domains.

Its action page is more developed than those of the previously reviewed websites.

Open research

The open research page is another genuine strength. It identifies questions involving:

- the Twenty-Seventh Amendment precedent;
- amendment deadlines;
- legislative scalability;

- possible target states;
- the Wyoming Rule;
- international representation ratios;
- the Electoral College;
- Connecticut;
- the 1929 apportionment law; and
- the wording change.

The site also distinguishes some tentative conclusions from completed research and invites correction through GitHub. That collaborative structure aligns strongly with ATFI.

[Open Research](#)

Sources

The site provides numerous footnotes, but many claims rely on:

- Wikipedia;
- blogs;
- Thirty-Thousand.org;
- ArticleTheFirst.net;
- opinion articles; and
- informal correspondence.

These sources can identify research leads, but the strongest constitutional and historical conclusions should be supported by original congressional documents, state records, court decisions and official archives.

ATFI's documentary archive is therefore an important distinction.

Tone

The site's language is energetic and memorable, but occasionally becomes casual or combative. Examples include descriptions of representatives as "rich, corrupt, dusty, out-of-touch incumbents" and comments such as "Hooray!" and "Whoopsie!" That voice may attract attention, but it can also make neutral education and legislative outreach more difficult.

ATFI's voice is intentionally respectful, evidence-centered and welcoming to people and organizations with different interpretations.

Promised benefits

The site says ratification would:

- diminish the party duopoly;
- decrease big money;
- reduce government spending;
- weaken lobbying;
- reduce gerrymandering; and
- restore the republic.

These are potential effects of a substantially larger House, not guaranteed legal consequences of ratification—particularly because the amendment does not literally require the predicted 6,771-member House.

6. ATFI comparison chart

HOW THE WORK COMPARES RATIFYTHE1ST.ORG • ARTICLE THE FIRST INITIATIVE™ Closely aligned on ratification and citizen action—with differences in interpretation, evidence and tone		
COMPARISON POINT	RATIFYTHE1ST.ORG	ARTICLE THE FIRST INITIATIVE™
Primary focus	✓ Article the First ratification and a dramatically enlarged House	✓ Article the First exclusively, with education preceding ratification
Ratification objective	✓ Ratification by 27 additional state legislatures	✓ Ratification by 27 additional state legislatures
Eleven prior states	✓ Counts ten through 1791 and Kentucky as the eleventh in 1792	✓ Completed and published documentary research for all eleven states
Connecticut	✓ Concludes the chambers deadlocked; does not rely upon Connecticut	✓ Does not count or depend upon Connecticut; proceed with 27 states
Third-tier interpretation	• Reads 1:50,000 as a mandatory floor producing roughly 6,771 representatives	✓ Reads the actual wording before making a required House-size conclusion
Wording and paradox	• Acknowledges a transcription error and flags it for further legal research	✓ Explains the historical paradox and its different effect at today's population
Sources and records	• Numerous footnotes, but heavy reliance on Wikipedia, blogs and linked sites	✓ Prioritizes original congressional and state documents in a public archive
Practical action	✓ Talking points, legislator outreach, petition, subscription and state strategy	✓ Builds educational and practical state-by-state ratification materials
Collaborative research	✓ Open questions and editable pages invite contributions through GitHub	✓ Collaborative archive, classes, book studies, presentations and publications
Public tone	• Energetic, casual and sometimes combative or partisan-adjacent language	✓ Evidence-centered and respectful of other contributors and resources
The central distinction Both pursue 27 additional ratifications. RatifyThe1st.org prescribes a 6,771-member result; ATFI separates completion of ratification from unresolved questions of present-day implementation.		
✓ Central feature • • Discussed or approached differently		

7. Final classification

An active Article the First ratification website with open research, direct state-legislator outreach and the same 27-state objective as ATFI, but one that incorrectly treats the transmitted 1:50,000 language as a mandatory minimum producing approximately 6,771 representatives.

RatifyThe1st.org is closely aligned with ATFI in mission and practical action. Its most valuable contributions are its open research structure and direct citizen instructions. Its principal weakness is that much of its promised outcome depends upon reading “nor more than” as though it says “nor less than.”

