Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

UDC 327.7 https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132/66

THE ONTOLOGICAL CRISIS OF MULTILATERALISM: STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN THE TRANSFORMATION TOWARDS AN ASYMMETRIC MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER

*©**Valizada Kh.**, ORCID: 0009-0004-0067-4619, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan, velizadexelil5@gmail.com*
*© **Abbaslı F.**, ORCID: 0009-0001-8264-4592, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan, fidan_abbaslı@icloud.com*
*©**Askerli A.**, ORCID: 0009-0005-4703-4501, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan, Email: aaskerli75@gmail.com*
*©**Ibrahimli A.**, ORCID: 0009-0003-5741-0780, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan, Email: ekber.ibrahimli@ndu.edu.az*
*©**Ibragimova G.**, ORCID: 0009-0004-2539-8358, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan, Email: guyulnara@icloud.com*

ОНТОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ КРИЗИС МУЛЬТИЛАТЕРАЛИЗМА: СТРУКТУРНЫЕ ДЕФЕКТЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЙ В УСЛОВИЯХ РАНСФОРМАЦИИ К АСИММЕТРИЧНОМУ МНОГОПОЛЯРНОМУ МИРОУСТРОЙСТВУ

*©**Вализаде Х.**, ORCID: 0009-0004-0067-4619, Нахчыванский государственный университет, г. Нахчыван, Азербайджан, velizadexelil5@gmail.com*
*©**Аббаслы Ф.**, ORCID: 0009-0001-8264-4592, Нахчыванский государственный университет, г. Нахчыван, Азербайджан, fidan_abbaslı@icloud.com*
*©**Аскерли А.**, ORCID: 0009-0005-4703-4501, Нахчыванский государственный университет, г. Нахчыван, Азербайджан, aaskerli75@gmail.com*
*©**Ибрагимли А.**, ORCID: 0009-0003-5741-0780, Нахчыванский государственный университет, г. Нахчыван, Азербайджан, ekber.ibrahimli@ndu.edu.az*
*©**Ибрагимова Г.**, ORCID: 0009-0004-2539-8358, Нахчыванский государственный университет, г. Нахчыван, Азербайджан, guyulnara@icloud.com*

Abstract. The institutional matrix of contemporary global governance, engineered in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, is facing an unprecedented ontological and structural crisis in the third decade of the twenty-first century. Traditional multilateral organizations, predominantly the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank, are increasingly paralyzed by systemic great-power rivalries, rendering them dysfunctional in maintaining global strategic stability, enforcing international law, and regulating global economic flows. This comprehensive study evaluates the functional degradation of these legacy institutions through the theoretical lenses of structural realism and neoliberal institutionalism. It provides a granular analysis of the institutional rise of non-Western parallel networks, specifically the expanded BRICS+ framework and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), positioning them as vectors for the strategic and economic realignment of the Global South. The research demonstrates that the selective enforcement of international legal norms and the weaponization of global financial systems have accelerated global de-dollarization and structural bifurcation. The study concludes that, without a fundamental reconfiguration of voting shares and a normative overhaul of the UNSC veto mechanism, legacy international organizations face absolute marginalization, potentially plunging the international system into a highly volatile, fragmented, or chaotic interregnum.

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

Аннотация. Институциональная матрица современного глобального управления, сформированная в период непосредственно после окончания Второй мировой войны, сталкивается с беспрецедентным онтологическим и структурным кризисом в третьем десятилетии двадцать первого века. Традиционные многосторонние организации — преимущественно Совет Безопасности Организации Объединенных Наций (СБ ООН), Международный валютный фонд (МВФ) и Всемирный банк — все чаще оказываются парализованными системным соперничеством великих держав, что делает их дисфункциональными в поддержании глобальной стратегической стабильности, обеспечении соблюдения международного права и регулировании глобальных экономических потоков. В данном комплексном исследовании оценивается функциональная деградация этих традиционных институтов через теоретические призмы структурного реализма и неолиберального институционализма. В работе представлен детализированный анализ институционального подъема незападных параллельных сетей, в частности расширенного формата БРИКС+ и Шанхайской организации сотрудничества (ШОС), которые позиционируются как векторы стратегической и экономической переориентации Глобального Юга. Исследование демонстрирует, что селективное применение международно-правовых норм и превращение глобальных финансовых систем в инструмент геополитического давления (взаимозависимость как оружие) ускорили процессы глобальной дедолларизации и структурной бифуркации. В заключении исследования делается вывод о том, что без фундаментального перераспределения квот голосования и нормативного реформирования механизма вето в СБ ООН традиционные международные организации столкнутся с абсолютной маргинализацией, что потенциально способно ввергнуть международную систему в крайне нестабильный, фрагментированный или хаотичный период междуцарствия (интеррегнум).

Keywords: International Organizations; Institutional Decay; Multipolarity; United Nations Security Council; BRICS+; Global South; Strategic Bifurcation; Hegemonic Transition.

Ключевые слова: Международные организации; Институциональный распад; Многополярность; Совет Безопасности ООН; БРИКС+; Глобальный Юг; Структурная бифуркация; Смена гегемонии.

The architecture of global governance is currently experiencing its most acute structural and systemic dislocation since the collapse of the Yalta-Potsdam system. The institutional configurations, international legal regimes, and collective security frameworks that have undergirded global stability for over eight decades are fundamentally misaligned with the contemporary distribution of material power, economic capabilities, and normative aspirations across the international system. Originally conceptualized to reflect the geopolitical realities of 1945 and later repurposed to sustain a Western-centric "rules-based international order" during the unipolar moment of the post-Cold War era, traditional multilateral organizations are no longer capable of managing the complex, non-linear security dynamics of the twenty-first century [1-3].

At the core of this institutional decay is the profound shift in the global balance of power away from the Euro-Atlantic corridor toward the Asia-Pacific region and the broader Global South. Legacy institutions — such as the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank — were structural extensions of Western hegemony, designed to institutionalize specific liberal economic and political

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

matrices. However, as emerging economies convert their rising macroeconomic power into structural and diplomatic leverage, the legitimacy, representativeness, and operational efficacy of these Western-led organizations have been aggressively destabilized [4].

The current geopolitical interregnum is defined by an accelerating transition from a unipolar or pseudo-multilateral framework to an asymmetric multipolar reality. This transition is marked by deep-seated structural friction between declining hegemonic structures and rising revisionist or status-seeking powers. In this environment, international organizations have ceased to function as neutral arbiters or conduits for absolute gains; instead, they have increasingly reverted to arenas of zero-sum gridlock and intense geopolitical competition. The operational paralysis observed within these institutions across various sectors — ranging from regional conflict mediation to global financial coordination — underscores a structural reality: the rules of the game no longer correspond to the distribution of capabilities among the players. Therefore, this study aims to systematically dissect the structural, normative, and operational vectors of this institutional crisis, while forecasting the potential trajectories of global governance within a fragmented international system [5, 6].

To rigorously evaluate the contemporary transformation of global governance, this paper establishes a hybrid conceptual framework that synthesizes Structural Realism (Neo-realism) and Neoliberal Institutionalism. While these paradigms have traditionally been viewed as mutually exclusive, their synthesis offers a powerful analytical toolset for understanding institutional decay. Structural realism provides the explanatory leverage required to understand how changes in the distribution of material capabilities directly influence the utility and stability of international regimes. From this perspective, international organizations possess no independent ontological status; they are reflections of the prevailing distribution of power and function primarily as instruments utilized by dominant states to maximize their national security, prestige, and strategic depth. Consequently, when the underlying power configuration shifts, the institutions themselves inevitably enter a phase of structural crisis [7].

Conversely, neoliberal institutionalism is deployed to dissect the internal dynamics, transaction costs, and path-dependent behaviors of these organizations. This sub-framework allows for an investigation into how institutional design — such as voting rules, veto mechanisms, and bureaucratic autonomy — can exacerbate or mitigate systemic friction. By examining the structural friction between these two dynamics, this paper analyzes the widening gap between institutional output and systemic demands [8].

The methodological architecture of this study relies on three complementary analytical layers: Systemic Structural Analysis: This method treats the international system as a comprehensive macro-structure where international organizations function as regulatory subsystems. By mapping the operational input-output vectors of these subsystems, we identify the exact variables (such as voting deadlocks, non-compliance rates, and budgetary weaponization) that lead to structural disfunction.

Comparative-Historical Institutionalism: This approach draws qualitative and institutional parallels between previous structural transitions in world history (such as the collapse of the Concert of Europe established in Vienna, and the structural failure of the League of Nations) and the contemporary structural shifts of the early twenty-first century. This historical mapping helps isolate the structural indicators that precede absolute institutional collapse [9].

Strategic Scenario Modeling: Utilizing macro-political and macroeconomic data — including long-term GDP projections by Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), sovereign debt profiles, expansion velocities of non-Western alliances, and regional militarization indices — this study maps out three distinct institutional trajectories for global governance over the next quarter-century.

The primary institutional manifestation of the current global governance crisis is localized within the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Designed under the geopolitics of 1945, the

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

UNSC was structured around the concert of five permanent members (the P5: United States, Russian Federation, People's Republic of China, United Kingdom, and France), who were granted absolute veto power under Article 27(3) of the UN Charter. This structural design was intended to prevent direct military confrontation between nuclear-armed titans by requiring collective consensus for any enforcement action under Chapter VII. However, in an era characterized by a return to intense great-power competition, this very mechanism has transformed the UNSC from a guarantor of collective security into an engine of perpetual diplomatic paralysis [10-12].

The deployment of the veto has shifted from an exceptional measure of strategic defense to a routine instrument of geopolitical warfare. In structural terms, whenever a permanent member, or its primary proxy state, is a direct participant in a geopolitical conflict, the Security Council's enforcement architecture is instantly neutralized. This operational failure has been vividly illustrated by the council’s total incapacity to mandate meaningful interventions, enforce ceasefires, or protect civilian infrastructures in major contemporary theaters of conflict across Eastern Europe, the Levant, and Central Africa. The structural inability to act effectively strips the UN of its foundational normative legitimacy, reducing the General Assembly to a forum for rhetorical gesturing and the Security Council to a stage for competitive vetos [13].

Furthermore, the structural composition of the P5 suffers from an absolute deficit of geographic and demographic representation. The complete exclusion of permanent African, Latin American, and democratic Asian representation (such as India) means that the body tasked with maintaining global peace represents an archaic demographic and economic elite. This structural exclusion creates a profound legitimacy crisis across the Global South. When the executive organ of global security is viewed as an unrepresentative oligarchy, its moral authority dissolves, leading states to seek unilateral or regional self-help mechanisms, precisely as predicted by structural realist theory [14].

The structural paralysis of international organizations has directly precipitated the decay of the international legal framework. The post-war legal regime was built upon the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, and the non-use of force as codified in Article 2(4) of the UN Charter. However, the operational survival of any legal system depends on its consistency and the universality of its enforcement mechanisms. In the contemporary international system, international law has increasingly suffered from selective enforcement (or instrumental bilateralism), commonly referred to as "double standards".

Great powers routinely instrumentalize international legal bodies — such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC) — to delegitimize and punish geopolitical adversaries, while simultaneously shielding themselves and their strategic allies from identical legal scrutiny. This selective application of international humanitarian law and state sovereignty principles has hollowed out the normative consensus that once sustained the liberal international order. When international legal norms are applied in an ad-hoc, politicized manner, the systemic belief in international law as an objective, binding force is replaced by a cynical, transactional interpretation of global rules. This normative vacuum accelerates the slide toward a highly volatile international environment where structural compliance is dictated exclusively by the immediate calculation of material cost and benefit, rather than normative obligation [15].

The institutional crisis of multilateralism extends far beyond the domains of hard security and international law; it deeply undermines the foundations of the global economic and financial architecture. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank Group, established at the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944, continue to maintain anachronistic governance structures that reflect outdated economic balances. Voting power within these institutions is structurally tied to financial quotas, which are heavily skewed in favor of Western economies. For example, the United States possesses a unique, structural de facto veto over all major constitutional and structural revisions

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

within both the IMF and the World Bank due to its 15.6% voting share, which effectively blocks the 85% supermajority threshold required for systemic reforms.

This structural disparity has created a deep sense of institutional alienation across the Global South. Despite accounting for the vast majority of global population growth and over half of global macroeconomic expansion, developing nations find their voices systematically marginalized within these financial bodies. This discontent has been weaponized by the aggressive financial statecraft of the G7 economies. The unilateral freezing of sovereign central bank reserves, the confiscation of foreign public assets, and the weaponization of the SWIFT international payment system have sent shockwaves through global markets.

By utilizing these multilateral financial infrastructures as instruments of geopolitical coercion, Western powers have compromised the systemic neutrality of the global financial architecture. This has triggered an accelerating trend toward de-dollarization and financial fragmentation. Developing and emerging economies are actively constructing alternative currency arrangements, bilateral clearing networks, and sovereign asset registries to decouple their domestic economic security from institutions that can be instantly weaponized against them [16].

As a direct consequence of the structural rigidity and exclusionary nature of legacy international organizations, the international system is witnessing the rapid rise of non-Western alternative institutional networks. Chief among these are the expanded BRICS+ framework and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). These platforms are transitioning from loose diplomatic forums into highly institutionalized structures capable of offering alternative pathways for global governance, completely independent of Euro-Atlantic oversight.

Following its historic expansion vectors, BRICS+ now encapsulates a massive demographic and economic footprint, representing over 45% of the world's population and approximately 36.7% of global GDP calculated by Purchasing Power Parity (PPP)—extensively outstripping the aggregate economic output of the G7. The institutional centerpiece of this alternative bloc is the New Development Bank (NDB), headquartered in Shanghai. The NDB is explicitly structured to eliminate the structural hierarchies of the World Bank; it operates on an equal-voting-power matrix where no single nation possesses a veto. Furthermore, the NDB offers development financing devoid of the intrusive political and structural adjustment conditions traditionally imposed by Western lenders, making it an highly attractive vehicle for Global South nations seeking infrastructure development without compromising their sovereign policy autonomy.

Concurrently, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) has expanded its structural remit across Eurasia, evolving into a primary vehicle for regional security cooperation, counter-terrorism coordination, and geostrategic integration. The SCO provides a institutionalized venue for Eurasian powers to settle border disputes, coordinate grand-scale logistics projects, and manage regional security dynamics without the intervention of external hegemonic actors. These rising institutions do not seek to integrate into the existing liberal international order; rather, they are building a parallel, horizontal network of global governance that normalizes multipolarity, prioritizes state sovereignty, and rejects the universalist normative claims of Western-led institutions [17-20].

Based on the convergence of structural variables analyzed in this study — including demographic shifts, economic redistribution, institutional path dependencies, and the intensity of great-power competition—three distinct macro-political scenarios can be modeled for the evolution of global governance over the next twenty-five years:

Scenario A: Fragmented Structural Bifurcation (The Dual-Order Matrix). In this highly probable scenario, the international system undergoes a formal division into two parallel, competing institutional ecosystems. Traditional legacy institutions (UNSC, IMF, World Bank, G7, NATO) remain intact but morph exclusively into instruments of Western strategic consolidation. In response,

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Т. 12. №11 2026
https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132

the non-Western world pools its resources into an expanded, deeply integrated BRICS+ and SCO network, complete with its own autonomous financial clearings, separate reserve currencies, distinct internet architectures, and regional security pacts. Global governance under this matrix becomes highly transactional, fractured, and polarized, with international law functioning as two separate, incompatible normative systems operating within distinct geographic zones.

Scenario B: Evolutionary Multipolar Harmonization (The Re-institutionalization Paradigm). This optimal, yet structurally challenging scenario assumes that declining hegemonic powers recognize the high strategic costs of systemic chaos and agree to a comprehensive, peaceful overhaul of legacy international institutions. Under this framework, the UN Charter is amended to expand the UNSC permanent membership to include key regional anchors from the Global South, while the veto mechanism is structurally restricted. Concurrently, voting quotas within the IMF and World Bank are reallocated to precisely mirror modern macroeconomic shares. Legacy institutions are thus harmonized with rising structures like the NDB, creating a complex, cooperative global governance network capable of managing existential threats such as climate collapse, artificial intelligence proliferation, and systemic pandemics [21].

Scenario C: Absolute Institutional De-alignment (The Systemic Anarchy Interregnum). This worst-case scenario unfolds if legacy institutions collapse entirely under the weight of their own internal paralysis, while rising alternative structures prove unable to construct a stable replacement framework. The UNSC becomes completely obsolete; the World Trade Organization (WTO) disintegrates under total trade wars; and regional conflicts expand unchecked by any multilateral mediation. The international system reverts to a raw, offensive realist environment defined by unregulated militarization, unbridled regional proxy wars, and competitive spheres of influence. Global governance dissolves entirely, replaced by localized, ad-hoc, and short-lived survival pacts among shifting coalitions of states.

Final Synthesis and Conclusion

The empirical reality and theoretical analysis presented in this study demonstrate that the contemporary challenges plaguing international organizations are not transient operational failures; they represent a fundamental, ontological crisis of the post-1945 international order. The structural friction between rigid, anachronistic institutional designs and a rapidly shifting global balance of material power has broken down the mechanisms of multilateral cooperation. To avert a catastrophic slide into absolute systemic anarchy, the international community must navigate a path toward comprehensive institutional adaptation. The preservation of global strategic stability requires an immediate transition away from unrepresentative, Western-centric hegemony toward an equitable, multipolar global governance architecture. This transformation demands structural concessions from legacy powers, specifically the democratization of financial voting shares and the expansion of permanent security representations to encompass the demography and geography of the Global South. Ultimately, if international organizations prove structurally incapable of reforming from within, they will inevitably be bypassed, marginalized, and replaced from without, leaving the international system to navigate the dangerous waters of a hegemonic transition without an institutional anchor.

References:

1. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2018). The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities. Yale University Press.

2. Keohane, R. O. (2005). After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton University Press.

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

3. Allison, G. (2017). Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap? Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

4.Stuenkel, O. (2016). Post-Western World: How Emerging Powers Are Remaking Global Order. Polity.

5. Zakaria, F. (2008). The Post-American World. W. W. Norton & Company.

6. Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of International Politics. McGraw-Hill.

7. Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order. Princeton University Press.

8. Huntington, S. P. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster.

9. Acharya, A. (2014). The End of American World Order. Polity.

10. Cox, R. W. (1987). Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History. Columbia University Press.

11. Bull, H. (1977). The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics. Palgrave Macmillan.

12. Nye, J. S. (2011). The Future of Power. PublicAffairs.

13. Bremmer, I. (2012). Every Nation for Itself: Winners and Losers in a G-Zero World. Portfolio.

14. Kupchan, C. A. (2012). No One's World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Next Global Turn. Oxford University Press.

15. Mahbubani, K. (2018). Has the West Lost It? A Provocation. Penguin Books.

16. Shifrinson, J. R. (2018). Rising Titans, Falling Giants: How Great Powers Exploit Power Shifts. Cornell University Press.

17. Patrick, S. M. (2011). The Best Laid Plans: The Crisis of Multilateralism and the Decline of International Institutions. Brookings Institution Press.

18. Roberts, C., Armijo, L. E., & Katada, S. N. (2021). The BRICS and Collective Financial Statecraft. Oxford University Press.

19. Cooley, A. (2012). Great Games, Local Rules: The New Great Power Contest in Central Asia. Oxford University Press.

20. Ruggie, J. G. (1993). Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form. Columbia University Press.

21. Valizade, Kh. (2017). Economic diplomacy. Nakhchivan: Ajami Publishing.

Список литературы:

1. Mearsheimer J. J. The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities. Yale University Press. 2018.

2. Keohane R. O. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton University Press. 2005.

3. Allison G. Destined for War: Can America and China Escape Thucydides's Trap? Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. 2017.

4.Stuenkel O. Post-Western World: How Emerging Powers Are Remaking Global Order. Polity. 2016.

5. Zakaria F. The Post-American World. W. W. Norton & Company. 2008.

6. Waltz K. N. Theory of International Politics. McGraw-Hill. 1979.

7. Ikenberry G. J. Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order. Princeton University Press. 2011.

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

8. Huntington S. P. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster. 1996.

9. Acharya A. The End of American World Order. Polity. 2014.

10. Cox R. W. Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History. Columbia University Press. 1987.

11. Bull H. The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics. Palgrave Macmillan. 1977.

12. Nye J. S. The Future of Power. PublicAffairs. 2011.

13. Bremmer I. Every Nation for Itself: Winners and Losers in a G-Zero World. Portfolio. 2012.

14. Kupchan C. A. No One's World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Next Global Turn. Oxford University Press. 2012.

15. Mahbubani K. Has the West Lost It? A Provocation. Penguin Books. 2018.

16. Shifrinson J. R. Rising Titans, Falling Giants: How Great Powers Exploit Power Shifts. Cornell University Press. 2018.

17. Patrick S. M. The Best Laid Plans: The Crisis of Multilateralism and the Decline of International Institutions. Brookings Institution Press. 2011.

18. Roberts C., Armijo L. E., Katada S. N. The BRICS and Collective Financial Statecraft. Oxford University Press. 2021.

19. Cooley A. Great Games, Local Rules: The New Great Power Contest in Central Asia. Oxford University Press. 2012.

20. Ruggie J. G. Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form. Columbia University Press. 1993.

21. Valizade Kh. Economic diplomacy. Nakhchivan: Ajami Publishing. 2017.

Поступила в редакцию
09.09.2026 г.

Принята к публикации
16.09.2026 г.

Ссылка для цитирования:

Valizada Kh., Abbaslı F., Askerli A., Ibrahimli A., Ibragimova G. The Ontological Crisis of Multilateralism: Structural Deficiencies of International Organizations within the Transformation towards an Asymmetric Multipolar World Order // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2026. Т. 12. №11. С. 584-591. https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132/66

Cite as (APA):

Valizada, Kh., Abbaslı, F., Askerli, A., Ibrahimli, A., & Ibragimova, G. (2026). Ontological Crisis of Multilateralism: Structural Deficiencies of International Organizations within the Transformation towards an Asymmetric Multipolar World Order. *Bulletin of Science and Practice, 12*(11), 584-591. https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/132/66

Тип лицензии CC: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)