forests by age groups will have to be revised. What is
obviously wrong with this argument is that the forests are
in the main, old. Annual per hectare increments of wood in
such forests amount to 0.8 to 1 cubic metre instead of the
3 to 4 cubic metres of increment under normal conditions of
forest management.

It is proposed to rectify this fault simply by
increasing the felling of mature stands. Here we have
another exceedingly simple and short-sighted solution to a
highly complex problem. It completely ignores the
geographic approach to the organization of forest use and
the necessity of utilising resources when they reach the
quality demanded by the economy.

Of course, under normal conditions of forest
management, stands of any age group should make up a
certain proportion of the area covered by forest, but by no
means the proportion indicated by Tararinov. His norm is
only realistic at felling ages in Class four, and there are
almost none of these. The number of mature stands is
greatly in excess of what is normal. It is precisely for
this reason that in the European part of the country a
utilisation norm (allowable cut) has been set which exceeds
the permissible norm for a normal forest by 45 to 50
million cubic metres. At the same time the number of
mature stands in the region is constantly diminishing and
is quite rapidly approaching the norm. In the process, the
allowable cut should also approximate to the norm. But in
Tatarinov's opinion, the opposite should apply: as the age
structure of the forests moves closer to the norm the
allowable cut should be increased and become more and more
wasteful.

Just as poorly validated is the claim concerning
the correspondence between the allowable cut and the size
of the annual increment. As is well known, the annual
increment is unevenly distributed throughout stands of
differing ages: it is minimal in mature and young stands