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[Palestinian Islamic Jihad](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/palestinian-islamic-jihad-movement/) is, as its name suggests, an organization committed to jihad — against Israel most urgently, though not exclusively. So when the U.N. Security Council on Friday passed a resolution condemning Israel, [PIJ](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/palestinian-islamic-jihad-movement/) spokesman Dawood Shihab was pleased. He called it a “victory.” He wasn’t wrong.

Nor was Fawzy Barhoum, a spokesman for [Hamas](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/hamas/), another organization openly committed to Israel’s extermination, as well as to “a jihadi revolution” that will be a “prelude to the establishment of the future Islamic caliphate.” He called the resolution an “important evolution in international positions.” He expressed [Hamas](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/hamas/)‘ “appreciation.”

Most deserving of their gratitude is [Barack Obama](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/barack-obama/) who decided to spend his last days in office playing golf in Hawaii and throwing America’s most reliable ally to the wolves at the [U.N.](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/united-nations/), an organization that exhibits passivity when it comes to the ongoing carnage in Syria, the genocide of Christians, Yazidis and other minorities in the broader Middle East, the conflict in Yemen, failing states — the list goes on and on.

The [U.N.](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/united-nations/) does, however, expend considerable energy railing against the world’s only Jewish state, a tiny democratic nation on the front lines of the war against radical Islam, a war the West is fighting in only the most desultory fashion. This year alone, the U.N. General Assembly passed 20 resolutions censuring Israel, compared to one against Iran and none against Saudi Arabia, Cuba, Venezuela and China. With assistance from President [Obama](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/barack-obama/), who instructed his ambassador not to veto Resolution 2334, the Security Council has now piled on as well.

For decades, Democrats and Republicans have agreed that it would be “unwise” to give the Security Council the responsibility “to attempt to resolve the core issues that divide Israelis and Palestinians.” Those words were spoken by Susan Rice, [Mr. Obama](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/barack-obama/)’s first ambassador to the [U.N.](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/united-nations/), when, following his instructions in 2011, she blocked a similar resolution. But back then [Mr. Obama](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/barack-obama/) still had one more presidential election to win so antagonizing Israel’s supporters may have seemed ill-advised.

Perhaps that’s unfair. Perhaps [Mr. Obama](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/barack-obama/) sincerely believes that a two-state solution could be achieved if only Israel would withdraw from the “occupied territories.” If so, he’s ignoring both history and experience. Start with the fact that Arab, Muslim and Palestinian leaders first rejected a two-state solution back in 1948 — almost a generation before Israelis took possession of the West Bank and Gaza.