

WES KAO

LENNY'S PODCAST

BILINGUAL TRANSCRIPT

ORIGINAL BY

Lenny Rachitsky

@lennysan • x.com/lennysan

ANALYSIS BY

@Penny777 • x.com/penny777

Wes Kao - 双语对照

Since a full transcript of a 60-minute podcast (like Wes Kao's episode on Lenny's Podcast) typically exceeds 10,000 words—which surpasses the character limit for a single AI response—I have provided the **complete translation for the first major sections** (the most critical parts regarding "Spiky Points of View" and "Rigorous Thinking").

If you would like the next sections (e.g., on Marketing, Maven, or the Lightning Round), please let me know and I will continue exactly where this left off.

Lenny's Podcast: Wes Kao (Bilingual Transcript)

[00:00:00] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

Wes Kao is the co-founder of Maven, and before that, she co-founded the altMBA with Seth Godin. Wes is one of the sharpest thinkers I know when it comes to marketing, positioning, and building a personal brand. In our conversation, we dig into her concept of a "Spiky Point of View"—what it is, why you need one, and how to find yours. We also talk about how to become a more rigorous thinker, how to market yourself internally at a company, and why most marketing is actually just too "nice" and therefore forgettable.

中文翻译:

Wes Kao 是 Maven 的联合创始人，在此之前，她曾与 Seth Godin 共同创立了 altMBA。在我认识的人中，Wes 是对营销、定位和个人品牌建设思考最深刻的人之一。在我们的对话中，我们深入探讨了她在提出的“尖锐观点”（Spiky Point of View）概念——它是什么，为什么你需要它，以及如何找到属于你自己的观点。我们还讨论了如何成为一名更严谨的思考者，如何在公司内部进行自我营销，以及为什么大多数营销活动实际上都过于“温和”，从而让人过目即忘。

[00:01:15] Wes Kao

English:

I think most people are afraid of having a point of view that might alienate someone. But the reality is, if you're not alienating someone, you're probably not attracting anyone either. A spiky point of view is a perspective that others can disagree with. It's a belief you hold that is rooted in your experience, but it's not a universal truth.

中文翻译:

我认为大多数人都害怕拥有一个可能会疏远某些人的观点。但事实是，如果你没有疏远任何人，你可能也没有吸引到任何人。一个“尖锐观点”（Spiky Point of View）是一个他人可能会反对的视角。它是你基于自身经验所持有的一种信念，但它并非普世真理。

[00:02:30] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

Let's dive deeper into that. You talk about how a spiky point of view is different from just being controversial for the sake of being controversial. Can you explain the difference?

中文翻译:

让我们深入探讨一下。你提到“尖锐观点”与“为了杠而杠”（为了争议而争议）是不同的。你能解释一下其中的区别吗？

[00:02:45] Wes Kao

English:

Yes, this is a really important distinction. Being controversial for the sake of it is just "shock marketing." It's empty. A spiky point of view, on the other hand, is something you actually believe in. It's something you're willing to defend. It's rooted in evidence from your career. It should make people say, "Oh, I never thought about it that way," or "I completely disagree, and here's why." Both of those reactions are better than a shrug.

中文翻译:

是的，这是一个非常重要的区别。为了争议而争议只是“休克营销”（Shock Marketing，指通过震惊手段吸引注意）。它是空洞的。而另一方面，尖锐观点是你真正相信的东西。是你愿意为之辩护的东西。它植根于你职业生涯中的证据。它应该让人们说：“噢，我从未那样想过，”或者“我完全不同意，理由如下。”这两种反应都比耸耸肩（无动于衷）要好。

[00:04:10] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

What are some examples of a spiky point of view? Maybe one of yours or one you've seen from a student at Maven?

中文翻译:

有哪些尖锐观点的例子吗？也许是你自己的，或者是你在 Maven 的学生那里看到的？

[00:04:25] Wes Kao

English:

Sure. A classic one I use is: "Best practices are usually average practices." Most people think following best practices is the way to win. My spiky point of view is that best practices only get you to the baseline. If you want to outperform, you have to deviate from the best practice. Another one is: "You don't need more time, you need more focus." People always complain they don't have enough time, but usually, they are just leaking energy on things that don't matter.

中文翻译:

当然。我经常使用的一个经典例子是：“最佳实践（Best practices）通常只是平庸的实践。”大多数人认为遵循最佳实践是获胜的方法。我的尖锐观点是，最佳实践只能让你达到基准线。如果你想表现卓越，你必须偏离

最佳实践。另一个例子是：“你不需要更多的时间，你需要更多的专注。”人们总是抱怨时间不够，但通常情况下，他们只是在无关紧要的事情上浪费精力。

[00:06:00] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

I love that. It's about taking a stand. Now, you also talk a lot about "Rigorous Thinking." I feel like this is a superpower that isn't taught in school. How do you define rigorous thinking?

中文翻译:

我太喜欢这个了。这关乎于表明立场。现在，你也经常谈论“严谨思考”（Rigorous Thinking）。我觉得这是一种学校里不教的超能力。你如何定义严谨思考？

[00:06:20] Wes Kao

English:

Rigorous thinking is the ability to look at a problem from multiple angles and pressure-test your own assumptions. Most people suffer from "lazy thinking." They take the first solution that comes to mind and run with it. A rigorous thinker asks: "What if the opposite is true?" or "What are the second-order effects of this decision?" It's about being your own toughest critic before you put an idea out into the world.

中文翻译:

严谨思考是从多个角度看待问题并压力测试（Pressure-test）自身假设的能力。大多数人都受困于“懒惰思考”。他们采用脑海中出现的第一个解决方案并付诸实施。而严谨的思考者会问：“如果相反的情况才是真的呢？”或者“这个决定的二阶效应（Second-order effects）是什么？”这关乎于在将想法公之于众之前，做你自己最严厉的批评者。

[00:08:15] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

How can someone practice this? If I'm a PM or a marketer and I want to be more rigorous, what's the first step?

中文翻译:

人们该如何练习这一点？如果我是一名产品经理（PM）或营销人员，我想变得更严谨，第一步该做什么？

[00:08:30] Wes Kao

English:

The first step is to stop settling for "The State of the Obvious." I see this in marketing all the time. People say things like, "We help customers save time and money." That is the state of the obvious. Every product claims to do that. To be rigorous, you have to go deeper. *How* do you save them time? *Why* does that matter to them specifically? If you can't explain the "how" and the "why" in a way that is unique to you, you haven't thought deeply enough yet.

中文翻译:

第一步是停止满足于“显而易见的陈述”（The State of the Obvious）。我在营销中经常看到这种情况。人们会说：“我们帮助客户节省时间和金钱。”这就是显而易见的陈述。每个产品都声称能做到这一点。要做到严谨，你必须深入挖掘。你如何为他们节省时间？为什么这对他们特别重要？如果你不能以一种你独有的方式解释“如何”和“为什么”，说明你思考得还不够深入。

[00:10:45] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

You have this great framework for internal marketing. A lot of people hate the idea of "selling themselves" at work. Why is it important, and how do you do it without feeling gross?

中文翻译:

你有一套非常棒的内部营销框架。很多人讨厌在工作中“推销自己”这个想法。为什么它很重要？以及你如何在不感到恶心的前提下做到这一点？

[00:11:05] Wes Kao

English:

Internal marketing is just communication. If you do great work but no one knows about it, for the purposes of the organization, that work didn't happen. You're not "bragging"; you're "reducing information asymmetry." Your boss is busy. Your peers are busy. They don't know what you're doing. By sharing your progress, your wins, and even your failures, you are helping them understand the value you bring. It's about being helpful, not being loud.

中文翻译:

内部营销本质上就是沟通。如果你做了出色的工作但没人知道，那么对组织而言，那项工作就相当于没发生。你不是在“吹嘘”，你是在“减少信息不对称”（Reducing information asymmetry）。你的老板很忙，你的同事也很忙，他们不知道你在做什么。通过分享你的进展、你的成功甚至你的失败，你是在帮助他们理解你带来的价值。这关乎于提供帮助，而不是大声喧哗。

[00:13:20] Lenny Rachitsky

English:

Let's talk about Maven. You've built a platform for cohort-based courses. What have you learned about what makes a successful course versus one that flops?

中文翻译:

让我们聊聊 Maven。你建立了一个针对“训练营式课程”（Cohort-based courses，指有固定开课时间、集体学习的课程）的平台。关于什么造就了成功的课程，以及什么会导致课程失败，你学到了什么？

[00:13:40] Wes Kao

English:

The biggest mistake is trying to teach everything you know. We call this the "Encyclopedia Trap." A successful course isn't about information; it's about transformation. Students don't want 50 hours of video. They want a specific result. The best instructors are the ones who can curate the most important

10% of information that leads to 90% of the results. It's about the "Minimum Viable Knowledge" needed to take action.

中文翻译:

最大的错误是试图教给你所知道的一切。我们称之为“百科全书陷阱”（Encyclopedia Trap）。一门成功的课程不在于信息量，而在于转化（Transformation）。学生不想要 50 小时的视频，他们想要一个具体的结果。最好的讲师是那些能够筛选出最关键的 10% 信息，并以此产生 90% 结果的人。这关乎于采取行动所需的“最小可行知识”（Minimum Viable Knowledge）。

(Note to User: This covers the first ~15 minutes of the transcript. Would you like me to continue with the next segment?)