

THE SIDE-BY-SIDE MODEL OF DNA:
Logic in a Scientific Invention

a dissertation
submitted by

Terence Douglas Stokes

for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History and Philosophy of Science
University of Melbourne

1983

Dedicated to the memory of Darren Turner

Except where otherwise acknowledged, the
work in this dissertation is original.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Stokes".

T.D. Stokes

2311183

Abstract

Watson and Crick's double-helical model of DNA is considered to be one of the great discoveries in biology. However, in 1976, two groups of scientists, one in New Zealand, the other in India, independently published essentially the same radical alternative to the double helix. The alternative, Side-By-Side (SBS) or 'warped zipper' conformation for DNA is not helical. Rather than intertwine, as do Watson and Crick's helices, its two exoskeletal strands are topologically independent. Thus, unlike the double helix, they may separated during replication without unwinding.

This dissertation presents, but does not arbitrate among scientific arguments. Its concerns are meta-scientific; in particular, why and how the individuals who invented the 'warped zipper' came to do so. Against Popper and most recent philosophers of science, it is taken to be "the business of epistemology to produce what has been called a 'rational reconstruction' of the steps that have led the scientist to a discovery [Popper (1972), p. 31, emphasis in the original]."

On the received view, the invention of the 'warped zipper' must be irrational or, at best, non-rational - thereby excluded from philosophical investigation. I establish that this philosophical dogma is not true a priori, as is usually supposed, and, in the case of the SBS structure of DNA, false a posteriori. The

motivation for, and development of the SBS structure for DNA reveals a process best characterized as significantly, though not entirely, rational. The 'warped zipper' is a plausible alternative to the Watson-Crick model because of this. Thus theory change in science may be regarded as basically rational.

The account of research on the structure of DNA from 1953 to the present which is provided, is selective and directed to the specific concerns of the disseration. What is revealed, however, is a sustained critique of the double helix which has been hidden within the triumph of molecular genetics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	page 2
Acknowledgements.....	3
What if Watson and Crick were Wrong?.....	5
I The Genesis of the 'Warped Zipper' in New Zealand.	13
II The Genesis of the 'Warped Zipper' in India.....	31
III The Unwinding Problem.....	46
IV Testing and Refinement of the Double Helix.....	58
V The Appraisal of the 'Warped Zipper'.....	69
VI Invention and Intratheoretic Appraisal.....	89
VII The Legitimacy of Invention.....	113
VIII Unwinding as an Anomaly.....	130
IX Methodology as a Conceptual Anomaly.....	152
X The Invention of the 'Warped Zipper' in New Zealand	170
XI The Invention of the 'Warped Zipper' in India.....	191
XII Reason in the Zeitgeist.....	208
The Continuum of invention.....	232
Works Cited.....	245

LIST OF FIGURES

Plate 1	following page	15
Figure 1(a)	A schematic model of the Watson-Crick double helix, showing base-pairing and the direction of the helices.	
Figure 1(b)	A schematic model of semi-conservative replication on the basis of a double-helical structure.	
Figure 2	An electron micrograph of DNA, showing single and double strand regions.	
Plate 2		20
Figure 3	An X-ray diffraction crystallograph of B-DNA taken by Rosalind Franklin in 1952, exhibiting the characteristic cross-pattern.	
Figure 4(a)	An electron density map (cylindrical Patterson function) drawn from diffraction data, with the line of a double helix overlaid.	
Figure 4(b)	Observed intensities of diffraction by NaDNA compared with intensities calculated for the double helix using Fourier analysis.	
Plate 3		20
Figure 5(a)	Two different views of a wire model of the Watson-Crick double-helical structure.	
Figure 5(b)	A Pauling-Corey space-filling model of the double helix.	
Plate 4		24
Figure 6(a)	a stereo view of a wire model of the New Zealand SBS structure.	
Figure 6(b)	a schematic model of the 'warped zipper'.	
Figure 6(c)	a space-filling model of the Indian Type II SBS structure.	
Figure 6(d)	A schematic model of semi-conservative replication on the basis of the SBS structure for DNA.	
Plate 5		31
Figure 7(a)	an X-ray diffraction crystallograph of A-DNA.	
Figure 7(b)	an X-ray diffraction crystallograph of B-DNA.	
Plate 6		49
Figure 8(a)	a schematic model of the conversion of a double-helical structure into the 'cis-ladder', non-helical conformation suggested by Cyriax and Gath.	
Figure 8(b)	a space-filling model of the 'cis-ladder'.	
Figure 9	Gamow's paranemic (parallel) double helix, exhibiting topological independence.	
Plate 7		132
Figure 10	Electron micrographs of three replicating covalently closed circular DNA molecules, exhibiting θ -structure single-strand regions.	
Figure 11(a)	a schematic model of the double helix.	
Figure 11(b)	a schematic model of the 'warped zipper'.	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr F. John Clendinnen, my Supervisor, and Dr Homer Le Grand, my Associate Supervisor, have given unstintingly of their time and talent. Though, of course, I am responsible for this thesis, I am aware that it would have been distinctly inferior without their constant guidance and close, incisive criticism.

The dissertation could not have been written without the generous co-operation of the scientists who invented the 'warped zipper': G.A. Rodley, R.H.T. Bates and Clive Rowe in New Zealand; V. Sasisekharan, N. Pattabiraman and Gautam Gupta in India. However, it should not be supposed that they necessarily agree with what I have said about their work.

I could not have visited the University of Canterbury or the Indian Institute of Science without the grants provided by the Faculty of Arts and the Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Melbourne. The H.P.S. Department was as nearly ideal a place to work as I can imagine. Nevertheless, I doubt whether I would have finished this disseration without the encouragement of my colleagues in the social studies of science at Deakin University, where I now work. The secretarial staff of the School of Humanities have been particularly tolerant in permitting me to invade their domain and use the word processor.

Dr R.M. McLaughlin, of the School of History, Philosophy and Politics, Macquarie University, and I never discussed the possibility of a logic in 'discovery' whilst I was his student. But, after my departure for Melbourne (at his suggestion), we both independently became immersed in the idea. For a time, we regularly reported very similar thoughts. I hope that Chapter XII, below, provides an explanation of this. All the same, I drew much from these discussions, and I rely at crucial points on Robert McLaughlin's account of the inventionist position.

My friends have, as friends do, put up with me and my thesis.

I have to thank Mr Kevin Barber for assistance with the front cover illustration; Mr Peter Wilson, Senior Photographer of Deakin University Media, for supererogatory efforts in producing the figures; Deakin University Printery for the temporary binding. Finally, many thanks to Tony Alexander for much labour in matching the output format of the two word processing systems used, and for proof-reading a substantial part of the thesis.

Private correspondence is used by permission of both author and recipient. The figures were drawn from the following sources: Figure 1(a), Stent ed. (1980), p.119; Figure 1(b), Stent ed. (1980), p. 123; Figure 2, Rodley and Reaney (1977), p. 18; Figure 3, Stent ed. (1980), p. 97; Figure 4(a), Olby (1974), p. 375; Figure 4(b), Olby (1974), p. 437; Figure 5(a), Stent ed. (1980), p. 286; Figure 5(b), Watson (1970), p. 262; Figure 6(a), Rodley et al. (1976), p. 2960; Figure 6(b), Rodley et al. (1976), p. 2961; Figure 6(c), Sasisekharan et al. (1978), p. 4094; Figure 6(d), Sasisekharan et al. (1978) p. 4095; Figure 7(a), Stent ed. (1980), p. 47; Figure 7(b), Stent ed. (1980), p. 97; Figure 8(a), Cyriax and Gath (1978), p. 106; Figure 8(b), Cyriax and Gath (1978), p. 106; Figure 9, Gamow (1955), p. 8; Figure 10, Watson (1970), p. 284; Figure 11(a), Rodley et al., (1976), p. 2960, Figure 11(b), Rodley et al. (1976), p. 2960.