

DNA and molecular heredity

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did heredity become a molecular problem linking genes to a chemical substance and then to a structure capable of copying biological information?

Historical and evolutionary context

Mendelian heredity had established statistical regularities without identifying the material of genes. Chromosome studies connected heredity to cellular structures, while Hermann Staudinger's 1920 macromolecular programme helped legitimise the idea that very large molecules could have definite chemical structures. In 1944 Avery, MacLeod and McCarty identified a DNA fraction as the transforming principle in pneumococcus. Hershey and Chase's 1952 bacteriophage experiments strengthened the case that nucleic acid, rather than protein, carried hereditary information in that system. In 1953 X-ray diffraction, chemical constraints and molecular modelling converged on the double-helical structure of DNA.

What could communities know before this transition?

Geneticists could map traits, infer linkage and predict segregation. Cytology could associate chromosomes with heredity. The limitation was that “gene” remained operational and abstract: it predicted inheritance without specifying a molecular substrate or copying mechanism.

What changed?

DNA became experimentally implicated as hereditary material

Avery, MacLeod and McCarty's 1944 work connected transformation to a deoxyribonucleic-acid fraction. Hershey and Chase in 1952 used labelled phage components to separate the roles of viral protein and nucleic acid during infection.

Diffraction converted molecular order into spatial constraints

At King's College London, Rosalind Franklin and Raymond Gosling produced X-ray diffraction data that constrained DNA geometry, while Maurice Wilkins, Alec Stokes and Herbert Wilson published related structural evidence. These were not decorative images but quantitative measurements of molecular organisation.

The double helix linked structure to replication

Watson and Crick's 1953 model combined base pairing, chemical geometry and diffraction constraints into a double helix. Complementary pairing immediately suggested a copying mechanism, connecting molecular structure to the logic of heredity.

Why could this capability emerge?

The transition required classical genetics, microbiology, isotope tracing, X-ray crystallography, physical chemistry, macromolecular thinking and model building. It also required institutions where data, models and biological problems crossed disciplinary boundaries.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Molecular heredity enabled the genetic code, recombinant DNA, sequencing, molecular diagnostics, evolutionary genomics and biotechnology. It also created the capabilities that later made the 1975 Asilomar governance discussion possible.

New limits and risks

DNA sequence is not a complete specification of phenotype. Regulation, development, environment, epigenetic state and cellular context matter. Genomic technologies also create risks involving privacy, discrimination, ownership, ecological release and unequal access. Molecular explanation can become reductionist if it treats organisms as sequences alone.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Heredity became a **molecular information-and-structure system**. Statistical inheritance, chemical substance, physical structure and copying mechanism could now be studied within one experimental architecture.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

A “Watson and Crick discovered DNA” narrative is historically wrong. The chain included Mendelian genetics, chromosome theory, bacterial transformation, phage experiments, Chargaff's chemistry, Franklin and Gosling's diffraction work, Wilkins and colleagues, and many technicians. Questions about data access and credit, especially concerning Franklin, are part of the history rather than peripheral biography.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-052 Microscopy, cells and microorganisms
- INDIRECT ← PIO-066 Darwin, Wallace and common descent
- DIRECT ← PIO-068 Mendel and statistical regularity in heredity
- INDIRECT ← PIO-080 Quantum mechanics and the limits of classical description
- RETROSPECTIVE ← PIO-086 Research ethics, consent and the limits of permissible inquiry

References

1. Staudinger, H. “Über Polymerisation.” *Berichte der deutschen chemischen Gesellschaft (A and B Series)* 53(6), 1073–1085 (1920). DOI: 10.1002/cber.19200530627.
2. Avery, O. T., MacLeod, C. M. & McCarty, M. “Studies on the Chemical Nature of the Substance Inducing Transformation of Pneumococcal Types.” *Journal of Experimental Medicine* 79(2), 137–158 (1944). DOI: 10.1084/jem.79.2.137.
3. Hershey, A. D. & Chase, M. “Independent Functions of Viral Protein and Nucleic Acid in Growth of Bacteriophage.” *Journal of General Physiology* 36(1), 39–56 (1952). DOI: 10.1085/jgp.36.1.39.
4. Franklin, R. E. & Gosling, R. G. “Molecular Configuration in Sodium Thymonucleate.” *Nature* 171, 740–741 (1953). DOI: 10.1038/171740a0.
5. Watson, J. D. & Crick, F. H. C. “Molecular Structure of Nucleic Acids: A Structure for Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid.” *Nature* 171, 737–738 (1953). DOI: 10.1038/171737a0.