

and reaches a maximum in middle-aged stands. Therefore, when felling at the age of technical maturity it is unacceptable to measure the size of the allowable cut by the mean annual increment, and going over to felling at the age of quantitative maturity is only justified when there is secondary conversion of an absolute majority of the wood being extracted. It does not provide a basis for obtaining sawtimber and other high-grade assortments. It is precisely for this reason that outside the USSR, even though they are using increment as an index of yield, it is not the main index, but the overall one. Moreover, they consistently place the yield substantially below the mean increment.

Tatarinov is correct in pointing out that the conditions of growth of the forests in the European Urals zone are better than in Siberia, however the requirement which is based on this to take into consideration the demand for timber when determining the yield of a forest is absurd. The allowable cut cannot and must not vary as a function of demand or its absence. The quality of the growing conditions of the forests of necessity affects the size of the allowable cut. The higher the quality, the greater the stock of mature stands per hectare. Moreover, the age of felling is also determined as a function of the conditions of growth of the forest: the higher the quality, the more rapidly they approach technical maturity.

Tatarinov's attitude to Group 1 Forests is also characteristic. He makes the bold statement that these forests "do not confer material benefits on the economy." Consequently, the preservation of water, air, wildlife and human health, the productivity of farmlands and livestock, and traffic capacity of the roads, the climate of the most densely populated areas of the country, the fisheries