Why does Mitt Romney “inspire such angry contempt” among my fellow conservatives? asked Michael Medved. They’ll tell you it’s because he’s “a gutless, unprincipled moderate,” but the real reason is more troubling. Romney just doesn’t reflect the “rage and paranoia” that have deformed the GOP since Barack Obama’s election. In 2008, the former Massachusetts governor won the support of Rush Limbaugh and almost every other talk-radio conservative; Laura Ingraham even called Romney “a conservative’s conservative.” Since then, Romney has only solidified his conservative credentials. So why the stubborn refusal to accept him as the party’s best candidate? It’s a matter of style: Romney is “cool and collected, reasonable and restrained,” while the Right wants a nominee who embodies its fury and disgust. After three years of Obama’s “self-inflicted grandiosity,” conservatives long for the political equivalent of Conan the Barbarian—an avenger who will lay waste to Obama and the liberal agenda once and for all. Obviously, Romney is no Conan; but if you’re looking for a president, isn’t a “pragmatic problem-solver” better than incoherent rage?

Young people are supposedly our most Web-literate citizens, said Clive Thompson. “But just how savvy are they?” Not very; They simply swallow whatever they find on Google. To study kids’ online-search skills, scientific researchers asked a group of students to look up answers to a series of questions. Not surprisingly, the kids relied on Web pages at the top of Google’s results list. When researchers switched the order of results, most students were easily tricked, and relied on the (falsely) top-ranked pages. Other studies have also shown that students really don’t bother trying to assess the credibility of information found online. Is an “article” a disguised advertisement? Was that profile of Ke$ha, or graffiti.”

How much privacy should Americans expect? asked Jonathan Turley. The answer to that question may determine whether the government will soon have the right to track you 24 hours a day, without a warrant. Under current law, the government needs a warrant to conduct any kind of surveillance that intrudes on a citizen’s “reasonable expectation of privacy.” But in a new case before the Supreme Court, the Obama administration last week argued that police should not be required to get a warrant to affix a GPS tracker to your car, to see if you’re involved in crimes; when driving, you really can’t expect any privacy, can you? It may sound Orwellian, but GPS tracking is just the next step in the rapid erosion of privacy that followed 9/11. Out of its concern for terrorism, the public has accepted airport pat-downs, surveillance of phone calls and emails, and constant monitoring by TV camera in public places and offices. In this brave new world, we think Big Brother makes us safer. So don’t be surprised when privacy disappears altogether. “The problem is not with the government but with us.”