

DISTINCTION OF SOCIAL AND PUBLIC RELATIONS IN SOCIETY

Darina Kovalova

Ph.D. in Public Administration, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology,
Dniprovskiy State Technical University, Ukraine

e-mail: darina.kovalova@gmail.com, orcid.org/0009-0000-9489-3237

Summary

Mastering of the “sociology” major by domestic students takes place in accordance with the curricula approved by the management of each university, taking into account the normative documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. Therefore, modern applicants (students) are initially inclined to functionalism and systemic theory in sociology, offering to study the works of the classics of sociology of the end of the 19th century – the beginning of the 20th century. However, the applicants will later learn about theoretical polyparadigmism in modern sociology and the possibility to choose not only classical concepts for the implementation of their scientific developments. This possibility was a consequence of the fact that changes were taking place in the paradigm of system theory. This influenced the evolution of sociological theorizing. Therefore, the above now affects the choice of applicants, post-graduate students and doctoral students of the basic concept for their sociological explorations, in order to avoid accusations of ignorance of modern sociological theory.

The situation, as a rule, has two contradictory sides. So, on the one hand, there are classical instructions or settings for scientists to carry out their cognitive procedures (for example, diagnosis, classification, stratification, typology, or systematization in general). On the other hand, alternative post-classical foundations have already been proposed, which are rather only outlined in most textbooks and textbooks on sociology, and therefore deserve in-depth study in order to reveal their diverse potential (heuristic, diagnostic, methodological, etc.).

Key words: ontologism, epistemology, societal, social, public, civil, substrate.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5649>

1. Introduction

It is recognized that the central task of modern science is the search for the foundations of the unity of the World, because the main essence of the scientific search is to develop the ability of scientists to connect disparate fragments of knowledge into a single picture, that is, to form complex knowledge. With any definition of science, there is always an indication in the paradigms that science belongs to such a level of organization of knowledge that among the important features of this level is reflection – the desire not so much for reproduction, reflection in the knowledge of reality, but the desire for conscious control over the course, form, conditions and principles of the process of cognition.

The first type of reflection, which practically reigned throughout the classical period of the development of science, is characterized by a focus on the object of knowledge and is called ontologism. The self-awareness of science moves around the dyad “knowledge – object”, and the subject of knowledge, since he is involved in the analysis, is considered only as an intermediary between the object and knowledge. Approximately from the middle of the 19th century, the direction of intra-scientific reflection began to change. The self-awareness of science is

concentrated around the dyad “subject – object”, which allows us to talk about the second type of reflection – epistemology.

If for ontologism the main question concerns how to achieve true knowledge about the object and what are the prerequisites for this result, then the main question for epistemology concerns the foundations, circumstances that strengthen the constructive power of knowledge.

Let us consider the above on the example of social relations as an object of first social, and later sociological knowledge.

The purpose of this work is to develop provisions that will later serve as a model for the systematization of certain components of the subject of sociology using the example of social relations as an integral component of this subject. The following tasks were set in the article: to outline the theoretical foundations of the study of social relations; to find out the meaning of the concepts of “social” and “public”; to explain the specifics of the aspects of being that are reflected in each concept.

2. Differences between two types of relations: public and social

According to ontologism, we will use the understanding of society as first an agglomerate, and later a system consisting of disparate elements connected to each other by a set of mutual connections. These heterogeneous elements include social groups, social institutions, social structure, etc. Actually, they have one common feature: they are a certain transformation of social relations, that is, they are an objectification, a reification of social relations, because this is how they acquire a fixed form and can be subject to direct empirical observation and study.

So, social relations, which is already evident from their very name, are the set of connections, relationships, contacts, mutual hopes, expectations and reactions to them that arise between people in the process of their cohabitation. This compatibility, cooperativeness, concentration of mutual living is the most characteristic feature of human existence. A person is primarily a public being, which is precisely what sociology is interested in. And although this does not exhaust all possible properties of a person, his worldview, biosocial factors, etc., sociology traditionally studies a person precisely from the side of his relations with other people, where he acquires certain social features. It also happens that a person loses certain traits under the pressure of social relations. In this case, we are talking about alienation or loss of previously acquired properties (*Chasov, 2016*).

In domestic sociology, social relations are considered as relations between groups of people who occupy different social positions, take unequal participation in economic, political or spiritual life. In this case, the subjects (carriers, personifications, personifications) of social relations are mainly different communities of people (small or large groups, classes, nations, professional associations, etc.). This somewhat narrowed understanding of social relations largely comes from Marxist methodology, in which the dominant theme of social sciences is the problem of equality, interpreted as the equality of large social groups. However, individual individuals and small social groups are also subjects of social relations. And where exactly to start the analysis is already a problem of worldview and methodological choice.

First, a distinction should be made regarding two types of relationships: public and social.

«Public relations» as a term is often used by social scientists, but the question of their essence often remained outside the focus of theoretical analysis of public life. As noted by R. Kosolapov, “social scientists, unfortunately, do not often conduct detailed research in the field of the theory of public relations. Its problems – and it is not difficult to prove – are often

“absorbed” by numerous publications on management theory. The theory of public relations should once again take its place not at all in a separate section of social science, and even more so not in a local problem of the science of management” (*Kosolapov, 1977*).

In many works, the main attention of subjects is directed to the identification of varieties of public relations according to the main spheres of public life (as a rule, material and ideological relations), depending on the nature of the carrier and the used means of functioning (political, legal, ethical relations, etc.). Attention is mainly focused on establishing the diversity of public relations, their properties, subordination and interconnection. Discussion of the content, substantial characteristics of public relations remained outside the boundaries of theoretical research in domestic social philosophy.

In order to understand all the variety of interpretations of the concept of “social relations”, it is necessary to first clarify the relationship between the concepts of “public” and “social”, as well as the concepts of “public relations” and “social relations”. This will make it possible to understand the meaning that domestic philosophers put into the concept of “social relations”.

So, in order to better understand the meaning of the concept of “social” and its difference from the concept of “public”, let's make a small historical excursion. In the writings of K. Marx and F. Engels, when considering society, its processes and relations, they use two concepts – “public” (*gesellschaftlich*) and “social” (*soziale*). K. Marx and F. Engels used the concepts of “public” and “public relations” when they were talking about society as a whole, about the interaction of its spheres – economic, political, ideological; when it came to the essence of people's relations with each other, their attitude to the factors and conditions of their life, to their own position and role in society and to society as a whole, K. Marx and F. Engels used the concept of “social” (*soziale*) and, accordingly, talked about “social relations”.

K. Marx and F. Engels often equated the concept of “social” with the concept of “civil”. The last concept was related to their understanding of the interaction of people within specific social communities (family, class, etc.) and society as a whole.

Since, while developing the theory of society, K. Marx and F. Engels paid significant attention to the interaction of all aspects of its life activity – public relations, some Marxist scientists in the past began to identify the concepts of “public” and “social”; the concept of “civil society” gradually fell out of scientific use.

The situation is different in the countries of Western Europe and the USA, where empirical sociology has acquired a long and significant development. As a result, in French and English, the concept of “social”, being a derivative of the concept of “society”, was traditionally used in a narrow (empirical) sense, which caused known difficulties in marking phenomena and processes related to society as a whole. That is why the concept of “societal” (*societal*) was introduced at the stage of the development of sociology to characterize society as a whole, the entire system of public relations (economic, socio-political, etc.). The term “societal” (*societal*) was introduced by T. Parsons and belongs to those terms that are difficult to translate and which are sometimes ambiguously interpreted. As far as we know, this term was first used in domestic sociology by H. Osipov. Back in the second half of the 60s, when developing the project “social organization of an industrial enterprise”, he drew the attention of project participants to the meaning of this new term. H. Osipov interpreted it as society as a whole, or the whole society; in this sense, he uses it in the textbook on the basics of the general theory of sociology. This is probably the main interpretation of this term in Russian sociology. It is also supported by the translators of T. Parsons's book “The System of Modern Societies” (*Kovaleva, 1977*).

In domestic science, the lack of a clear distinction between the concepts of “public” and “social” was to some extent due to some linguistic traditions that developed in the Russian language, because the concepts of “public” and “civil” were usually used. At the same time, the concept of “social” was considered as a synonym of the concept of “public”, and the concept of “civil” was attributed to legal science. Gradually, with the development of sociology, the concept of “social” acquired an independent meaning.

“Social” means nothing else than a certain characteristic that outlines and identifies the interaction of different societies of people, the way of this interaction. Each person in the process of life is the bearer of many characteristics, roles that manifest and identify a person. Each person performs many functions, rights, and duties in relation to each other. So, for example, let's take the category “student” close to students. This is one of the characteristics of a certain person. At first glance, it sounds generalized, abstract, but it can be a student of a “given” educational institution, an economic educational institution, a metropolitan educational institution, a prestigious educational institution (relative to all other educational institutions). In addition, a “student” for someone is a son or daughter, brother or sister, father or mother, younger or older, a representative of a certain nationality, an employee of a certain institution, an athlete, a fan, a specialist in a certain field, a member of a certain organization, etc. Thus, thanks to these roles, a person manifests himself in activities in relation to other people.

“Social” – from the Latin “socialis” – common, sociable, public; connected with society, public relations is the central category of sociology (*Tarasenko, 1998*). This term means a set of certain features of public relations, integrated by individuals or communities in the process of joint activity in specific conditions, which is manifested in their relationships, attitude to their place in society, phenomena and processes of social life (*Sirij, 2004*).

This concept serves to define the essence of social life, to reflect the specifics of the social form of the movement of matter. In a broad sense, social means everything that belongs to society in general, as opposed to natural. In a narrow sense, social means the side of public relations, as an integral part of society, because it concerns the relations of people to each other and to them in general. If we resort to a deep disclosure of these meanings, then it should be said that the social category reflects a special objective and subjective reality that is created by people directly through being in communities. This reality combines features, actions, deeds of people, relationships between them, things, norms, values, signs, symbols, meanings and their meanings.

In addition, the meaning of the concept of “public relations” requires clarification. In domestic socio-philosophical literature, the concept of “public relations”, despite the rather frequent reference to it, has not received a generally accepted definition. The interpretation of the concept of “public relations” was based on the main conclusions made by the domestic researcher M. Perfiliev from the Marxist approach to this problem. M. Perfiliev, for example, formulated it as follows: «Public relations are both objectified, inherited, and collective living, sensual activity of people, etc., which acts as a cooperation of many individuals in connection with their relationship to nature, to each other, or, in other words, with the development of the main features of the collective individual, first of all with the satisfaction of certain needs and the development of the acquired productive forces” (*Perfilev, 1973*).

So, public relations are, first of all, social-typical public relations. Moreover, at their core, public relations always express not single and accidental, but essential and necessary, socially typical connections of people. That is why the reproduction of public relations should be considered not as the reproduction of specific (unique) relations of “living individuals”, but as the reproduction of relations between the so-called “averaged individuals” – carriers of

socially typical traits, representatives of certain social communities, exponents of their properties. This approach assumes consideration of public relations in the form of a social structure, and, therefore, the reproduction of relations should be studied as a reproduction of the structure of society. Public relations, taken as a structural characteristic of society, act as a form, but also a way of joint activity of people (Kovaleva, 1977: 18-19).

The reproduction of the form assumes that not all public relations find expression in public relations, but, first of all, socially typical, objectively necessary interactions of people, characteristic ways of the form of social relations or “casts” of all concrete human relationships connections, interpersonal relations. Domestic researchers have singled out broad and narrow interpretations of the concept of “public relations”.

A broad interpretation of the concept of “public relations” allows to single out purely human relations from the system of all possible ones (for example, relations with animals). In this connection, the following characteristics of public relations appeared: relations that “make up the totality of the life of a given society”, or “a specific type of internal and external relations that create society as an organic whole system of various phenomena (social and non-social)”; “philosophical category to denote the entire “flow” of human life,» etc.

Public relations in a narrow interpretation represent the relations of people to each other, because they are actually the relations of a collective person. This interpretation of public relations distinguishes them from the system of human relations.

3. The social nature of public (social relations)

The concepts of “social” and “social relations” have a common genesis, as they are always related to social communities, which are the subjects of public relations. Therefore, according to the carriers of social relations – social subjects, all types of public relations are social.

However, this understanding of social relations is not completely complete.

In society, economic, political, ideological, spiritual, ethical, aesthetic, organizational and other types of public relations are established between social subjects, according to the subjects of human activity.

All types of public (social – in a broad sense) relations are formed, formed and developed only on the basis of joint human activity, on the basis of the exchange of its results. Economic, political, spiritual and other relations, formed on these grounds and performing various functions in society, do not cease to be social (public) relations. In this sense, all types of public relations have a double essence: on the one hand, they do not cease to be specific, relatively independent relations, on the other hand, they all form part of the system of social relations in the broad sense (or public) relations. They can be called one way or another, depending on the criteria for separation.

If we consider them from the point of view of relations between social subjects, then they are social (public) relations. If social relations are considered from the point of view of their content, they are the essence of industrial, political, and spiritual relations, which are also called public relations.

In one perspective, they find some qualities for them, in another – others. Sometimes such a duality of types of public relations is fixed in phrases: socio-economic, socio-political, socio-spiritual relations.

From the point of view of social subjects, all types of public relations are social relations, from the point of view of the content of their connections and relations regarding objects – they

are either economic, or political, or spiritual relations. Therefore, social in a broad sense (or public) relations can be characterized as relations of social subjects regarding some subjects. Hence, any type of relationship is public or social in a broad sense.

Identifying the concept of “social relations” in a broad sense with the concept of “public relations”, it is necessary to always keep in mind that all types of public relations have a social nature. They are social (public) relations not because they are contrasted with “natural” ones, but precisely because they are social relations. In turn, public relations, while preserving their social nature, each time acquire a specific form depending on what they are about (that is, about certain social objects). “The latter can be the means of production and its products, or factors derived from public production, such as state power, norms of law and morality, aesthetic values, objects of religious worship, etc.»

On this basis, in national philosophy, public relations are divided into economic (regarding the means of production), political (regarding state power), legal (regarding legal laws), ethical (regarding public duty), spiritual (regarding spiritual activity) etc (*Frolov, 1997*).

The concept of “social relations” in a narrow or specific sense is used when it comes to the social sphere. In other words, specific relations arising according to a certain criterion between the main social subjects.

So, it can be noted that the concepts of “social relations” and “public relations” are often equated. But this is legitimate only when social relations are considered in a broad sense, contrasting them with relations with natural objects. Difficulties in the study of social relations are due to the fact that they are not static, rooted forms of social interaction, they are always interconnected with other types of relations that are mutually integrated, revealed through them.

Social relations are organically connected with all other types of public relations, forms and methods of social activity of people, communities, social interests, social needs, ideas about social justice or injustice, social equality or inequality, social homogeneity or heterogeneity, social activity or passivity, etc..

The study of social relations should be carried out in the broadest context of the entire way of life of people. This allows researchers to see, on the one hand, the origin of public changes, because they are generated by changes in the content, forms and conditions of life of social communities, and on the other hand, to determine how they affect the structure of the community, behavior and activities of people.

So, the supporters of the macrosociological approach seek to derive relations in their diversity, based on the understanding of society as a certain integrity, totality, which outlines the specific characteristics of all its components, while the supporters of the microsociological approach seek to understand the laws of building a “big” society, based primarily on those structural, functional and other dependencies that are observed within the immediate social environment of the individual.

There is a certain disagreement among sociologists regarding the place of public relations in the general structure of the social system. The famous Belgian sociologist A. Jean in the work “Social system: Essays of a general theory” (*Brussels, 1970*) considers them, along with social groups, the simplest or basic social formations (formations). This is where sociology comes from when starting its own research. In this consideration, social relations have the meaning of a social fact, the existence of which is obvious, directly accessible to perception and observation. However, the immediacy of perception and fixation is not entirely obvious here. After all, public relations are not given to us in direct observation. They acquire this meaning only in an objectified or reified form: when they appear in human contacts, communication, actions, deeds, positions, assessments, etc. The same can be said about all other connections

and relations of the outside world. Physics, chemistry, biology, and other natural sciences also fix and describe them through an external object-material expression. If physics establishes a relationship between force, mass, and acceleration, it means that whenever a mass acts with a certain acceleration, it produces a force. It is the action of the force that is the confirmation that there is a certain established relationship or connection between it, mass and acceleration. The existence of relations here directly follows from the existence of these three constituent elements. We can say the same about public relations. Their presence follows from the existence of all components of the social system: individuals, groups, social structures, social institutions, etc. Relations are a form of manifestation and connection of these constituent parts of the public whole. However, even earlier than the mentioned A. Jean, one of the founders of modern functional sociology, a well-known French sociologist of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, insisted on this. E. Durkheim. Indeed, public relations are a fact that can be observed in a reified or objectified form: human actions, collective behavior, historical movement as a whole. Regarding an individual, as E. Durkheim emphasized, they have the meaning of a separately existing social reality: they are objective, exert a certain pressure on the direction of his actions and deeds, are constantly repeated and restored (reproduced), act as an average statistical value or a certain social norm, precede his activities and others (*Dyurkgejm, 2004*).

As for the primacy of public relations over group activity, the situation is more complicated here. Sometimes the appearance of a social group is a sufficient reason for generating new relations (for example, with already existing groups). Sometimes it is the other way around: the formation of a new group looks like a certain objectification, the realization of already existing public relations (for example, the formation of a certain commercial structure or a political party in response to a specific social need). Therefore, it can be said that there is a rather complex dialectical relationship between public relations and other components of social anatomy: they act as opposites that complement and negate each other.

There are sociologists who believe that public relations should be included in the social structure as a certain fact that is naturally inherent to it (the social structure). This point of view is defended by the modern Belgian sociologist N. Delruel-Vosswinkel in her work "Introduction to General Sociology" (*Brussels, 1987*). Thanks to the concepts of social relations, social roles and social status, we get, in her opinion, the opportunity to characterize the social structure. Therefore, she defines public relations as a network of inter-individual and supra-individual connections and relationships that connect an individual with a group or groups among themselves. They are interpreted as a product of human activity and at the same time as a source of this activity. However, N. Delruel-Vosswinkel insists that public relations are not something external to an individual or group, but are connected to them by an organic bond; is their offspring and at the same time a prerequisite for existence. For a comprehensive description of public relations, she uses such a figurative expression that in the Ukrainian language would be like "yeast", "leaven". We propose an academic term – substrate. So, from this point of view, public relations can be considered as the substrate of society itself, that is, the building material from which the historical movement molds certain social forms: social structure, social institutions, types of culture and civilization.

We should take into account another disagreement that exists between sociologists in the interpretation of public relations, agreeing basically that public relations exist where and to the extent that individuals, social groups or other communities of people exist, some sociologists tend to their excessive objectification, others to excessive subjectivization. Thus, the French sociologist E. Dupreel in his work "General Sociology" (*Paris, 1948*) believed that the very presence of individuals, social groups or other communities creates a social connection. From

this point of view, it follows that the objective existence of human associations precedes the establishment of a certain social bond. The German sociologist M. Weber in his work “Economy and Society”, on the contrary, believed that public relations are established where an individual or a group takes into account the existence of “others” (individuals, groups, communities or social institutions) in their activities, positions or motives of behavior). They (“others”) must be included in the subjective content of the activity in order for a social connection to be established.

So, this is supposedly an external and formal discrepancy. In fact, these approaches complement each other. Only some emphasize the influence, even pressure, that the presence of “others” exerts on individual or collective behavior. “Others” in this case act as a certain social force, and social ties and relationships act as its (social force) carriers. Social power is somewhat similar to the forces of nature: it directs people's behavior, accelerates or slows down social activity, looks like inducement, influence, suggestion (symbolic pressure), persuasion or exchange of goods, services or information. M. Weber and his supporters emphasize the subjective content of social relations, their meaning for the person who acts in a certain social situation. It is about experiencing, realizing or taking into account the position of “others” in one's own actions and deeds. Therefore, public relations are considered here, rather, as real or symbolic mediators, transmitters, transporters of culture, information, social experience or internal subjective states of individuals and groups.

In view of this, another important question arises: about the difference between actual public relations and psychological connections and relationships. It is clear that in reality they are closely and organically intertwined and can be separated only in abstraction. But there are two sciences – sociology and social psychology, each of which studies its own aspect of public relations. From the point of view of sociology, this difference is as follows. In actual social relations, the psychological aspect does not dominate, it exists, rather, as a background. The coercive or binding moment prevails here. Actually, the social connection is predetermined, pre-situational, determined by the structure of specific roles: employer – worker, parents – children, seller – buyer and others. It has primarily a functional purpose, where people act, rather, as social roles, representatives of certain social groups or statuses. The fact that these relationships are also emotionally experienced is of secondary importance. In psychological relationships, it is the opposite: the sensory-emotional effect dominates, becomes independent, self-important (for example, in relationships between lovers or marriage partners).

Public relations include a variety of relations: spatial contacts, psychological connections, social interaction, social actions, social dependencies, social connection. Each of these concepts has its own specific and specific meaning. Spatial contact means the collision of social partners in social space: from mutual perception or observation to the most meaningful and interested interaction, which may be based on the desire for equivalent exchange, communication, establishing a power relationship, etc. Social contact can be called such interaction of social partners, as a result of which they seek to establish a more stable mutual exchange of values, services or information. Social interaction involves a systematic, permanent set of sustainable actions, which is regulated by certain rules, conventions, or clearly defined mutual expectations. Social action is a system of actions and relationships based on the desire to change the attitudes, behavior, needs, and aspirations of a partner. Here, social relations clearly move into the sphere of power, as they involve a certain concession, retreat, change of position or compromise. It is quite clear that social dependence can mean such a situation when certain intentions have been realized and partners have taken different positions (statuses) in the space of social relations: accidental or permanent, voluntary or forced, initiative or induced dependence has appeared between them.

Usually, all these terms could be used in a slightly different sequence. Ya. Szchepanskyi does this, in particular. He chose the most general category for this class of phenomena, “social connection” (not « public relations”). Therefore, it has a somewhat different terminological and substantive sequence of presentation. In particular, he considered public relations only as a moment of social connection, while in our case social connection is a moment of public relations. This disagreement, however, is not of a fundamental nature. Of particular importance here is the previous agreement and convention of the community of sociologists. In our opinion, many of them tend to share the approach we have outlined. Note, however, that the main thing here is the understanding of the essence of public relations (connection), their multiplicity and internal contradiction, since different phenomena are defined by the same concept: both the opposite gaze of two young people in public transport, and the slavish dependence of one person on another.

In order to give more detailed answers in the course of solving the tasks of this work, it is necessary to determine the criteria for the classification of public relations according to certain characteristics.

In order to understand all the variety of interpretations of the concept of “social relations”, we first clarified the relationship between the concepts of “public” and “social”, as well as the concepts of “public relations” and “social relations”.

So, the term “social” means a set of certain features of public relations, integrated by individuals or communities in the process of joint activity in specific conditions, which is manifested in their relationships, attitude to their place in society, phenomena and processes of social life.

For example, K. Marx and F. Engels, when considering society, its processes and relations, use two concepts – “public” (*gesellschaftlich*) and “social” (*soziale*). They used the concepts of “social” and “social relations” when it came to the essence of people's relations with each other, their attitude to the factors and conditions of their life, their own position and role in society and society as a whole.

Also, K. Marx and F. Engels used the concept of “public” and, accordingly, talked about “public relations” when it came to society as a whole, about the interaction of its spheres – economic, political, ideological.

Social relations can be different: random or deterministic, momentary or lasting, short or long. Sociology examines the entire set of public relations, but pays more attention to those that have a stable and long-term character. Usually, not only those relations determined by the objective social position of the interacting parties are taken into account, but also those formed by the subjective definition of the partner and the situation. Therefore, in the future, we will call social relations primarily a defined stable system of relations, which includes two or more partners (be it individual individuals, social groups, institutions or communities of people), a certain intermediary link (object, value, interest, position, attitude), which is the “platform” of this interaction, as well as a certain set of duties, forced unilateral or mutual obligations or standardized functions performed by partners in relation to each other.

4. Conclusions

Considering social relations, we can note that most often we can find two interpretations of the meaning of this concept.

Public relations are fundamentally different from the biological relationships of animals. Social relations are a necessary attribute of society, a condition, a prerequisite, and a result of

people's harmonious life. A person in his public relations is society. In this context, the concept of "public" is used in a broad sense as a synonym for "social relations" and "social", and the concept of "social" is equated with the concept of "public". This is the so-called broad interpretation of the term "social". In this sense, the term "social" covers everything that can be attributed to the social world, as opposed to the natural world. While "social" understand both economic and political processes, and the entire field of spiritual life. "Social" is contrasted with "natural", "natural" also when it comes to the relationship of social and biological beginnings in a person" (Chasov, 2017).

It is public relations that make society a complete and social organism, and a person a social being. The development of public relations means the development of society and man as social phenomena. Society and man can develop successfully only under the condition of the development of public relations at the same time.

Thus, the essential feature of social (public) relations is that they, one way or another, are in development, because movement is an integral attribute of any form of matter. It is obvious that the main factor in the development of social relations is the people themselves. And although each generation finds certain patterns of social relations, in the process of joint life activities they are changed and supplemented, and therefore passed on to the next generation in other, modified forms.

So, social relations in a broad sense are all kinds of relations in society between individuals and social communities. Where social communities are formed, social (public) relations arise and function. And, conversely, where social (public) relations arise and function, social communities (classes, social groups, parties, organizations, etc.) and relations between them always arise and reproduce.

References

1. Chasov D., Sorokina L., Havrylin S. (2017). "Aspects of distance learning for engineering sciences". *Effective Development of Teachers' Skills in the Area of ICT and E-learning. Katowice – Cieszyn*. P. 319–331.
2. Chasov D. (2016). "Determining the equation of surface of additional blade of a screw conveyor". *Eastern-European Journal of Enterprise Technologies* #5. P. 10-14.
3. Dyurkgejm E. (2004). *Ob obshestve. Sociologiya: Hrestomatiya dlya studentov vseh specialnostej. Vladivostok*. [in Ukrainian]
4. Kovaleva M. (1977). *K russkomu izdaniyu. T. Parsons. Sistema sovremennyh obshestv. M.: Nauka*. [in Russian]
5. Kosolapov R. (1977). *Sovershenstvovanie obshestvennyh otnoshenij v usloviyah razvitogo socializma. M.: Nauka*. [in Russian]
6. Perfilev M, Orlova L. (1973). *Socialnye otnosheniya. L.: Nauka*. [in Russian]
7. Sirij Ye. (2004). *Sociologiya: zagalna teoriya, istoriya rozvitku, specialni ta galuzevi teoriyi: Navch. posibnik. K.: ATIKA*. [in Ukrainian]
8. Tarasenko V. (1998). *Socialni vidnosini. Sociologiya: Korotkij enciklopedichnij slovník. K.: Ukr. centr duhovn. Kulturi*. [in Ukrainian]
9. Frolov S. (1997). *Sociologiya. M.: Logos*. [in Russian]