

NEW YORK Amsterdam News

[New York Amsterdam News](#)

The New Black View

POSTED IN [OP-EDS](#)

OP-ED: Why Trump's Georgia election interference case should have gotten the Bragg treatment

by [ROBERT S. WEINER](#) and [OLIVIA ARDITO](#)

July 18, 2024



FILE - Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg gestures while speaking during a news conference Feb. 22, 2024, in New York. As he prepares to bring the first of Donald Trump's four criminal prosecutions to trial, Bragg finds himself at the center of a political firestorm. The upcoming trial, over hush money payments allegedly made by Trump during the 2016 election, will test Bragg's efforts to portray himself as apolitical in the face of relentless attacks from Trump and his supporters. The trial is scheduled to begin on Monday, April 15. (AP Photo/Frank Franklin II, File)

Donald Trump's [Georgia election interference case](#) should have gotten the Alvin Bragg treatment. Bragg "ran through the tape"—to use the track meet and road race analogy—and would not be delayed or denied. If Georgia prosecutors acted like Bragg, Trump would have actually sat on trial more than once.

On May 30, 2024, Donald Trump became the first U.S. president to be [convicted of a felony](#). In an unprecedented verdict, he was charged with 34 counts of falsifying business records to cover up hush-money payments to adult film star Stormy Daniels. This is the first of four trials for the former president, and the only one not related to his presidential activities. The other three trials involve electoral interference, anti-American resurrection, and careless handling of classified presidential information. These three trials have been indefinitely delayed, meaning that, despite their relation to presidential electoral fairness, they will not affect his campaign.

The great discrepancies in the efficiency of Trump's cases warrant the question of why N.Y. District Attorney Alvin Bragg was able to bring Trump's charges to trial and the other attorneys have not. Ultimately, it comes down to Bragg not tolerating Trump's blatant efforts to push his court appearances until after the fall election. If Georgia courts had the same no-nonsense attitude, Trump would have more felony convictions by now. Here's why.

To accomplish the goal of ensuring that justice is served before the next presidential election, Trump's Georgia election interference trial should have been prioritized above his other charges because D.A. Fani Willis has the most damning evidence against him: a recorded phone call of Trump pressuring Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger to "find" 11,780 votes so he could win the state of Georgia. Willis has a clip of Trump flagrantly asking Raffensperger to falsify the 2020 election.

Willis's case is strengthened by one of Trump's charges being a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization Act (RICO). RICO allows Willis to group all of Trump's crimes together by saying they help identify a "single corrupt enterprise." Willis also has eight Republicans who pretended to be state electors on her side under the protection of an immunity deal. Willis carefully crafted a strong case against the former president.

The Georgia case, like the classified documents and federal election interference cases, has been delayed indefinitely because Trump continues to object to minuscule, irrelevant details to avoid facing consequences for his actions. The actors involved in these three cases indulge in what *The Hill* describes as Trump's favorite tactic while in office and on trial: delay, delay, delay.

Trump first claimed that DA Willis's romantic relationship with a special prosecutor in her office should disqualify her from prosecuting the case. That situation was resolved in Willis's favor, but the case was delayed for the first time. Later, Trump filed a notice of appeal against this decision.

On June 5, the Georgia Appeals Court continued permitting his insolence and indefinitely halted the trial to review Willis's legitimacy on the case, yet again despite prior findings and the removal of her partner from the case. Considering how powerful Willis's case is, it's no wonder Trump has resorted to such desperate measures. His strategy is not only completely obvious, but incredibly childish and disrespectful to the American justice system.

Bragg stands out from the crowd because he has not tolerated Trump's immature behavior to avoid justice. When Trump tried to delay his hush-money trial by giving N.Y. state prosecutors around 140,000 irrelevant documents to review, Bragg called his bluff by saying the documents were a red herring and declaring that "enough is enough. These tactics by the defendant and defense counsel should be stopped." By putting his foot down, Bragg ensured that Trump actually sat trial in a relatively timely manner.

All relevant parties in his other three cases have neglected to act as boldly as Bragg and continue playing into Trump's games. This is especially true for the Georgia case. Because the Georgia court system continues to play into his foolish antics, Trump has thrown a temper tantrum, been rewarded for his bad behavior, and succeeded in his goal of having his criminal trials occur after the 2024 election. If Georgia courts had acted like New York's and prioritized justice, Trump would have been sitting on trial in Georgia by now and the decision would justly affect his presidential campaign.

A decision in the Georgia election interference case would definitely affect the campaign. Willis is undeniably doing important and fearless work by going after Trump in the first place, especially considering she is a young Black woman; Bragg is already being called a politically biased fame-seeker in the *Washington Post*. However, the Georgia court system should have given Trump the Bragg treatment to ensure the case would occur before November.

If Trump wins the presidency, it is safe to assume that he will block the cases from ever going further, and it would be extremely difficult for judicial systems to proceed with felony charges against an active president. [While most legal experts say that the president cannot self-pardon](#), it is highly probable that he would attempt to use friendly courts and justices to shift the laws in his favor.

With either outcome, justice fails to prevail.