Robust critique stands on firm ground, is based on confirmed evidence and boldly claims to see something that others can’t see. Post-foundational critique is sceptical of its own foundation, mainly promoting critical reflexivity and emphasizing that others can probably see something else. The social study of critique asserts that critique is a necessary condition of possibility for institutions, since rule-following presupposes the possibility of disobeying the rule. Following these three iterations of critique, the question still remains – how we can know what the right thing to do is, and how could we ever agree on it? This is the burning question of translation that is even more compelling when we consider that the number of issues that permit relativist answers is diminishing in our time. This theoretical argument will be presented with the help of empirical examples.