Since I know several people worked long and hard on the parabola question, I thought I'd illustrate a solution that requires the least algebra. We will show that there are parabolic arcs in a circle that are longer than twice the diameter, but they do have to be narrow, and in no case does the excess length amount to even one part in a thousand!

Consider the simple parabola $y=x^{2}$. A portion of it is included inside the circle $x^{2}+(y-r)^{2}=r^{2}$, to which it is tangent at the origin. In fact, the coordinates $(x, y)$ of the points of intersection will satisfy both these equations, and hence also satsify $y+(y-r)^{2}=$ $r^{2}$, which simplifies to $y(1+y-2 r)=0$; thus the curves meet at the origin and, if $2 r-1>0$, at the two points having $y=2 r-1$ (whose $x$ coordinates we will write as $\pm a$, where $a=\sqrt{2 r-1}>0$ ). So the entirety of the parabola between the points $\left(-a, a^{2}\right)$ and $\left(+a, a^{2}\right)$ lies inside this circle of radius $r=\left(a^{2}+1\right) / 2$. Using Calculus (and symmetry) the length of that curve is twice the value of the integral

$$
I(a)=\int_{0}^{a} \sqrt{1+4 x^{2}} d x
$$

If we could show that for some value of $a$, the value of the $I(a)$ exceeds $a^{2}+1$, then the length of the curve would be more than $2\left(a^{2}+1\right)=4 r$; scaling the whole picture by a factor of $r$ would then give a parabolic arc of length larger than 4 inside a circle of radius 1. So the whole question comes down to asking when, if ever, we have $I(a)>a^{2}+1$.

At this point you have a choice: do you just want to prove the desired inequality, or do you want to learn more about the parabolas and their lengths?

For the first goal, we are nearly there already: obviously $\sqrt{1+4 x^{2}}$ is approximately $2 x$ for large values of $x$, and we even have an inequality in the direction we want: since $\sqrt{1+4 x^{2}}>2 x$, we deduce $I(a)>\int_{0}^{a} 2 x d x=a^{2}$. That's (obviously) not enough to show $I(a)>a^{2}+1$ but it's clear we are almost accurate enough in our estimate of the integral. I will show below that the next most-dominant term in an approximation for the integrand is $\sqrt{1+4 x^{2}} \approx 2 x+\frac{1}{4 x}$ but even though it's more accurate, the inequality works the other way this time. Still, if the integrand is approximately $2 x+\frac{1}{4 x}$ for large $x$, and larger than $2 x$ itserlf, then surely it will be larger than, say, $y=2 x+\frac{1}{8 x}$ if $x$ is large enough. Indeed, $4 x^{2}+1$ will be greater than $y^{2}=4 x^{2}+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{64 x^{2}}$ as long as $64 x^{2}>2$; for example this is true for every $x>0.2$. Thus for large $a$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(a) & =I(0.2)+\int_{0.2}^{a} \sqrt{1+4 x^{2}} d x>I(0.2)+\int_{0.2}^{a}\left(2 x+\frac{1}{8 x}\right) d x \\
& =I(0.2)+\left(a^{2}-0.04\right)+\frac{\log (a)}{8}-\frac{\log (0.2)}{8} \\
& =a^{2}+\frac{\log (a)}{8}+C
\end{aligned}
$$

for some constant $C$. Clearly this will exceed $a^{2}+1$ for sufficiently large $a$. (Simple estimates show $C=I(0.2)-0.04+\log (5) / 8>0.2-0.04+1 / 8>1 / 4$, so we will surely have $I(a)>a^{2}+1$ for $a>e^{6}$, for example.)

This solves the Putnam problem, which asked merely for the existence of such an $a$. We can be somewhat more precise and study what happens as the parameter $a$ varies.

We could begin by using a better approximation to our integrand. Writing $\sqrt{1+4 x^{2}}=$ $(2 x) \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{4 x^{2}}}$ and using the Maclaurin series $\sqrt{1+t}=1+(t / 2)-\left(t^{2} / 8\right)+\ldots$, we may approximate the integrand as $2 x+\frac{1}{4 x}-\frac{1}{64 x^{3}}+\ldots$, and then as in the previous paragraph we determine the rate of growth of $I(a)$ as being $a^{2}+\log (a) / 4+C$ for suitable constants $C$. We leave to the reader a careful analysis (using the remainder estimate for Taylor series). In fact, if $f(x)=x^{2}+\log (x) / 4$ then $I(a)>f(a)+\log (2) / 2+1 / 8$ for all $a$, with the difference approaching 0 as $a \rightarrow \infty$.

Alternatively, rather than using estimates for the integrand, we may evaluate the integral in closed form using standard Calculus techniques: it's

$$
\frac{a}{2} \sqrt{1+4 a^{2}}+\frac{1}{4} \log \left(2 a+\sqrt{1+4 a^{2}}\right)
$$

From here it is reasonable to use Taylor series to estimate $I(a)$ itself (rather than the integrand $\sqrt{1+4 x^{2}}$ ). Writing the first term as $a^{2} \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{4 a^{2}}}$, a Taylor-series estimate renders this as $a^{2}+\frac{1}{8}-\frac{1}{128 a^{2}}+\ldots$. Likewise the argument to the logarithm in the second term may be written as $4 a\left(1+\left(1 / 16 a^{2}\right)+\ldots\right)$; using the Taylor series for the logarithm then allows us to estimate the second term as $\log (4 a) / 4+\frac{1}{16 a^{2}}+\ldots$. In other words, we may obtain a Taylor series estimate for $I(a)-\left(a^{2}+\log (4 a) / 4\right)$ which begins $\frac{1}{8}+\frac{7}{128 a^{2}}+\ldots$. This is obviously positive for all large $a$, so that for all large $a$ we have $I(a)>a^{2}+\log (4 a) / 4$, and in particular for all large $a$ we will have $I(a)>a^{2}+1$.

In fact we should expect $I(a)>a^{2}+1$ as soon as $\log (4 a) / 4+1 / 8>1$ since the next term in the Taylor series has a positive coefficient. That inequality is equivalent to $a>(1 / 4) e^{7 / 2} \approx 8.279$, and indeed we find with some numerical work that $I(a)>a^{2}+1$ for all $a>8.275$.

Clearly, $I(a)-a^{2}$ is an increasing function, since its derivative $\sqrt{1+4 a^{2}}-2 a$ is positive. So once we have $I(a)>a^{2}+1$ for one value of $a$, the inequality also holds for all larger values of $a$. This if any of the parabolas is long enough, then all the "sharper" parabolas are long enough too!

The critical value $a=8.275$ corresponds to a circle of radius $r=\left(a^{2}+1\right) / 2=34.74$. When scaled to a circle of radius 1 , we then have parabolic arcs of length greater than 4 for all narrower parabolas than this one, although the scaled lengths decrease towards 4 again past $a=13.6815$ or so. (This corresponds to a circle of radius roughly 94.09 ; that scaled parabola has the largest possible length, approximately 4.0027.)

At this point I'm just having fun with the construction; I encourage you to do likewise, but I do stress that the original Putnam problem can be solved without such details!

