Are Human Testes Badly Placed? A Pub Guide

The Anatomical Evidence That Humans Might Be Designed

Supplementary material for: Dating the Intelligent Pig - Part Three

---

The Basic Question

Why are human testicles external — dangling vulnerably in a sack — when they could be safely internal like most other reproductive organs?

Standard textbook answer: Sperm production requires temperatures 2-8°C below core body temperature (32-35°C vs. 37°C). External placement provides necessary cooling.

But does this explanation actually make sense?

Understanding the System

What Produces Semen?

Testes (External): - Produce sperm cells + testosterone - Require 74 days for sperm production - Contribute ~2-5% of ejaculate volume

Seminal Vesicles (Internal): - Produce ~70% of seminal fluid - Function perfectly at 37°C body temperature

Prostate Gland (Internal): - Produce ~25-30% of seminal fluid
- Function perfectly at 37°C body temperature

The immediate puzzle: If 95% of semen is produced internally at body temperature with no problems, why does the 2-5% component need special external cooling?

Problems With the Cooling Explanation

1. The Evolutionary Trade-Offs Are Terrible

External placement creates: - ✗ Extreme vulnerability to trauma (any male knows this) - ✗ Exposure to temperature extremes
- ✗ Risk of testicular torsion (twisting = tissue death) - ✗ Metabolic cost (body must actively thermoregulate external tissue) - ✗ Higher infection risk from external wounds

Question: If external placement is so costly, why didn't evolution select for less temperature-sensitive sperm production instead?

2. Better Solutions Exist in Nature

Other animals solved the "cooling problem" differently:

- **Marine mammals** (whales, dolphins): Internal testes with vascular cooling systems
- **Birds:** Internal testes functioning at 40-41°C (even hotter than human body temperature!)
- **Elephants:** Partially internal testes with specialized cooling

Question: If multiple species solved this without external vulnerability, why didn't humans use a more sophisticated solution?

3. The Temperature Sensitivity Itself Is Unexplained

This is circular reasoning: - **Q:** "Why are testes external?"
- **A:** "Because sperm production is temperature-sensitive." - **Q:** "Why is sperm production temperature-sensitive?"
- **A:** "Because testes evolved externally and adapted to that temperature."

Nobody asks: Why is human spermatogenesis so thermally fragile in the first place?

4. The Prostate Paradox

The critical observation:

Component	Volume	Temperature	Placement	Accessibility
Testes (sperm)	2-5%	32-35°C	External	Easy to remove
Seminal vesicles	70%	37°C	Internal	Surgery required
Prostate	25-30%	37°C	Internal	Surgery required

If cooling were the priority: Why isn't the entire system externalized? Or why not keep everything internal with vascular cooling like marine mammals?

What the anatomy actually optimizes for: Easy access to the fertility component while retaining sexual function hardware.

What Does External Placement Actually Enable?

Simple, Low-Risk Castration

Removing external testes achieves:

✓ **Eliminates fertility** (no sperm production)
✓ **Reduces testosterone** dramatically
✓ **Modifies behavior** (reduced aggression/libido)
✓ **Maintains work capacity**
✓ **Retains sexual function** (prostate + seminal vesicles remain)
✓ **Visual verification** (immediate status confirmation)
✓ **Minimal mortality risk** (no abdominal surgery)
✓ **Low skill requirement** (can be performed by non-physicians)

Compare to internal testes (like ovaries):

✗ Requires abdominal surgery
✗ Higher mortality risk (especially pre-modern medicine)
✗ Longer recovery time
✗ Higher skill requirement
✗ Difficult to verify status
✗ Risk of peritonitis, internal bleeding, adhesions

From a livestock management perspective: External testes are vastly superior for population control.

The Two Design Philosophies

Design A: Optimize Natural Reproduction

If this were the goal: - ✓ Protected internal placement (with vascular cooling) - ✓ Reduced vulnerability to trauma - ✓ Stable temperature environment
- ✓ Minimized injury risk

Design B: Optimize Reproductive Control

If this were the goal: - ✓ Easy access to fertility control - ✓ Simple procedure with low mortality - ✓ Visual verification of castration - ✓ Retention of sexual function after castration - ✓ Behavioral modification capability - ✓ Low skill threshold for the procedure

Which design do humans actually have?

Every feature of human male anatomy aligns with **Design B**.

Historical Context

The external placement has enabled:

- **Castrati singers:** Thousands of Italian boys castrated annually by the 1740s
- **Eunuch administrators:** Fertility eliminated, trusted around women, capable officials
- **Draft animals:** Oxen (castrated bulls) are calmer, easier to control, work better than intact males
- **Slave breeding:** American documentation uses livestock management language ("stockmen")
- **The Schubarth case (2019):** Modern testicle-based breeding remains simple, profitable technology

The veterinary parallel: Farmers have known for millennia that castration is simple, low-risk, and reliably prevents breeding. It's the accessibility that makes external testes valuable, not the thermoregulation.

The Medical Verdict

Is external testicular placement "enigmatic"?

Yes. The conventional thermoregulation explanation has significant gaps:

✓ Creates massive vulnerability for minimal apparent benefit
✓ Better alternatives demonstrated in nature
✓ Temperature sensitivity itself unexplained
✓ Only minor contributor externalized (2-5% vs. 95%)
✓ Creates functional split ideal for control (fertility vs. function)
✓ Optimizes for accessibility rather than protection

The anatomy you'd design for livestock management looks exactly like the anatomy humans have.

Whether that's coincidence, convergent evolution, or something else is left to the reader to determine.

Conclusion

The seminal vesicles produce 70% of ejaculate at body temperature with no problems. The prostate produces 25-30% internally with no issues. Only the sperm-producing component — contributing 2-5% of volume — requires external placement.

This isn't the anatomy of optimized reproduction.
This is the anatomy of optimized reproductive control.

The external testes enable simple, low-risk fertility control while retaining sexual function. The design makes sense if you're managing breeding populations — less sense if you're optimizing for natural reproductive success.

The thermoregulation explanation doesn't account for why the majority of the reproductive system works perfectly internally. The only component that "needs" external placement is the one that's most useful to externalize if you're controlling breeding.

The design philosophy behind our reproductive anatomy may tell us more about our origins than we're comfortable acknowledging.

For the full analysis: Dating the Intelligent Pig - Part Three