Image versus Reality

"The creator economy has evolved much faster than our mechanisms for accountability"

A podcast created by Google's AI-Powered NotebookLM.
This transcript of the podcast was generated by Turboscribe.ai.

Preamble
This transcript is based on an AI-generated podcast created using Google's NotebookLM. NotebookLM was instructed to review materials documented by the watchdog website "thewhistleblower.ca"[1], including public records, public statements, court filings, regulatory materials, and other source documents identified or linked there.

The podcast should be understood as an AI-generated narrative summary and analysis, not as a source document. Although it captures many of the principal issues and themes, listeners and readers should verify all factual assertions against the underlying source materials. Court pleadings discussed in the podcast are allegations and requests for relief, not judicial findings, unless otherwise stated. Artificial Intelligence models may make errors and results must be subject to verification.

This transcript was generated using Turboscribe.ai and manually checked against the podcast audio. Where the podcast contains identifiable AI errors, transcription errors, or materially inaccurate wording, corrections are provided in the Footnotes. The Footnotes should be read together with the transcript.

Nothing in this transcript is legal, medical, charitable-status, or financial advice.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So, have you ever had a social media algorithm just serve you an absolute masterpiece of a post?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, I know exactly the kind you mean. The ones you can't look away from.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right, exactly. You're just casually scrolling on your phone. You know, maybe you're waiting in line for coffee, and suddenly you're just pulled into this perfect cinematic glimpse into someone else's beautiful life.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah, the perfectly curated lifestyle content.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah, you're looking at these majestic mountains, you know, wild horses running through the brush, and this family living this rugged, healing, completely free existence off the grid.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It's incredibly captivating.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It really is. But I want you to imagine taking that pristine photograph, right, that flawless digital masterpiece, and physically flipping it over.

---

[1] The watchdog website reviewed was https://thewhistleblower.ca/mlflr/. The podcast is an AI-generated synthesis of materials documented or linked there and should be checked against the underlying source materials.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Okay, I like this analogy.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Because on the front, yeah, you have the wild horses and the triumphant family survival story. But on the back…

[Speaker 2 Man]
The back is a very different picture.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Exactly. The back is covered in, like, corporate records, government correspondence, aggressive court litigation, and some very serious, unanswered questions about where millions of dollars in fundraising actually went.[2]

[Speaker 2 Man]
And that tension right there between the curated image and the documented reality, that is the core of our deep dive today. We are looking into the public footprint of Michael Lares and the Flying L Ranch, which is an operation located in British Columbia's Nemiah Valley.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right, in B.C. Yeah.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And the goal here is to put the highly emotional, incredibly effective public narrative that they've cultivated on their social media channels right up against the actual documentary and administrative record.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
We're basically looking at the space between what is posted online and what is filed in court.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. But before we get into the really wild details of this specific case, because there are so many twisting threads here...

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, yeah. It goes in directions you would not expect.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It really does. But we really need to establish how we are looking at this information first.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. We have a mountain of sources, but what are our actual ground rules for this investigation?

[Speaker 2 Man]
So, the ground rules are strictly limited to the public domain.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay.

[2] NotebookLM referred to "millions of dollars in fundraising", but the watchdog site does not state that. The watchdog site quotes dollar amounts only where figures are documented as having been stated by Michael Lares or otherwise appearing in the social-media and fundraising materials reviewed.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Every single piece of analysis we discuss today relies on publicly available corporate records, archived fundraising material, regulatory letters, and statements made publicly by the ranch itself.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
No secret insiders, just what anyone could find if they knew where to look.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. And as we navigate this, you, the listener, really need to keep a critical distinction in mind.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
What's that?

[Speaker 2 Man]
There is a massive difference between a documented fact, a regulator's formal conclusion, and a pleaded allegation.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. Because an allegation is just a claim.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. A pleaded allegation is just what a party is claiming in a lawsuit. It is not a judicial finding of truth.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So, our job is to separate the emotional story from the legal and structural reality.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Precisely.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Well, I think we have to start with the story itself. Because, you know, if I'm just scrolling past a video of a ranch, I'm not immediately pulling up my credit card to fund their operations.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. There has to be a hook.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Exactly. You have to understand why an audience becomes so willing to open their wallets over and over again. And it really seems to start with this incredibly potent, engineered trust.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It's foundational to the whole operation.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah. The Flying L Ranch presents this deeply personal origin story, uhm, about a family retreating to a remote valley to heal after a traumatic medical complication during a birth back in 2005.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And really, the foundation of their entire brand rests on that exact narrative of trauma and recovery.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which is very compelling.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is. Now, the medical details and the long-term consequences of that 2005 event have not been independently verified in the public records we reviewed.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
OK.

[Speaker 2 Man]
But, you know, verification almost doesn't matter to the algorithm.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
No, the algorithm just wants engagement.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. What matters is the vulnerability. By putting that trauma front and center, the creator establishes an immediate emotional hook.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And they really double down on that hook with how they communicate, too. It's strikingly intimate.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, absolutely.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
You have Michael Lares constantly referring to his wife in posts as his, quote, “sexy bride”. You get this constant, unfiltered feeling access to the whole family. You know, Michael, Nicole, their daughter, Lara, their son, Dylan.

[Speaker 2 Man]
You feel like you know them.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Exactly. If I'm a follower, I don't feel like I'm watching a corporate marketing campaign. I feel like I've been invited to sit at their kitchen table.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And that kitchen table feeling, that's actually the result of two very specific psychological mechanics operating in tandem.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay. What are they?

[Speaker 2 Man]
The halo effect and parasocial trust.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
So the halo effect is a cognitive bias where our positive impression of a person in one area positively influences our opinion of them in other totally unrelated areas.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Like if they're good at one thing, they must be good at everything.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. So you see breathtaking scenery, you see a family seemingly devoted to rescuing animals, and your brain just naturally creates a halo of inherent goodness around them.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. Because they care for vulnerable horses, the viewer just subconsciously assumes they must also possess, like, rigorous financial transparency.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And strict legal compliance. Yeah.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
You know what this reminds me of?

[Speaker 2 Man]
What's that?

[Speaker 1 Woman]
In marketing, we have this tactic called emotional segmentation.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Okay. Break that down.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So if I launch a campaign that just says, you know, hey, please pay for my business overhead. Everyone ignores it. Nobody cares about overhead.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. Boring.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
But if I segment that emotion, right, if I show you a high-definition video of an emergency vet bill for a sweet horse named Oakley.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, wow. Yeah.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Or I ask for your help to track down a specific wild horse named Gus who is lost in the wilderness, you panic. You feel involved, and you donate.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It's incredibly effective.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It feels like they are applying Fortune 500 marketing tactics to a family vlog.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, they are. And the application of those tactics is exactly what builds that parasocial bond.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The creator shares intimate details, they use affectionate language, and they respond just enough to make the viewer feel like a personal friend.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Even though it's a completely one-sided relationship.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. And once that one-sided bond is solidified, the dynamic of accountability completely changes. Well, standard donor due diligence, like a follower politely asking for a receipt or an accounting of funds, is no longer viewed as a reasonable consumer request.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, I see. It's viewed as an attack.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes. It gets reframed as a disloyal, malicious attack on a suffering family.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So, I mean, there is a massive vulnerability in this parasocial trust model, right?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, for sure.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Because what happens when a physical, trackable item that the audience paid for never actually shows up on camera?

[Speaker 2 Man]
And this brings us to the tilt-squeeze.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yes. The $21,000 question of the tilt-squeeze. But before we get into the money, what actually is a tilt-squeeze?

[Speaker 2 Man]
So a tilt-squeeze is a large, highly specialized piece of hydraulic equipment.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Like a machine for the animals.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. It's used by veterinarians to safely restrain and physically tilt a large animal, like a horse, to perform medical procedures.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay, so it's big.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is a massive piece of heavy machinery, and it requires a significant capital investment.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And the ranch ran a huge fundraising campaign specifically to buy one, right?

[Speaker 2 Man]
They did.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The stated goal was around $53,000. And based on the ranch's own public reporting across various posts, they raised over $21,000 for this custom chute.[3]

[Speaker 2 Man]
That is a lot of money raised from regular people just chipping in.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah. But then the chute never appears.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. And the documentary record here provides a stark contrast to the fundraising campaign.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
What does the record say?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, correspondence from the manufacturer of this hydraulic equipment reveals that the completed chute was never actually collected by Flying L Ranch.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wait, they never picked it up?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Nope. The remaining balance was left unpaid, and Michael Lares eventually instructed the manufacturer to, quote, “sell that chute to someone else”.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wait, I need to make sure I'm understanding this correctly. They publicly raised over $21,000 for a specific piece of medical equipment.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Then they told the manufacturer to just sell the equipment to another buyer.

[Speaker 2 Man]
That's what the correspondence shows.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
If the money didn't buy the tilt squeeze, where on earth did the $21,000 go?

[Speaker 2 Man]
And that remains the central, unresolved accounting question.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Unbelievable.

---

[3] US Dollars.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Because our review of the public footprint shows absolutely no verified public ledger accounting for those purpose-specific funds.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So it's just a black box.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Essentially. We are not concluding the money vanished into thin air, but there is no documentation showing it was refunded to the donors.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
There's nothing showing it was formally redirected to another project with donor consent, or even held in a restricted reserve account.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It really just highlights the danger of the informal creator economy, doesn't it? Like, a compelling video of a horse is not a financial ledger.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It absolutely is not.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And, I mean, if I'm a donor who chipped in $50 for that chute and I notice it's been months and I haven't seen a video of it being used, I'm going to ask about it in the comments.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Actually.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
But when people actually try to ask these basic transparency questions, they just get blocked. Or worse, the ranch publicly brands them as haters and turns the rest of the community against them.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, ejecting dissenting voices is a structural requirement for maintaining a parasocial ecosystem.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
You have to protect the halo.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. The influencer has to protect the halo.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah.

[Speaker 2 Man]
But blocking an inquiring follower on Instagram is relatively easy.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The real friction happens when this informal, self-policing economy collides with formal government regulation.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Because a regulator cannot be blocked.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which brings us to the BC Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch, or the GPEB.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yep.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I'm looking at their file number 138859. Why did a government gaming regulator suddenly care about a ranch in the Nemiah Valley?

[Speaker 2 Man]
The intervention occurred because the ranch crossed a very specific legal line regarding online raffles.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, right. The giveaways.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. They heavily promoted a July 1st stampede draw. And the prize was a trip to the ranch.[4]

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which sounds great on paper.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It does. Interestingly, the announced winner of that draw, a woman named Susan Barnes, apparently never even took the trip.[5]

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wait, she won but never went?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Apparently not. But, you know, the fulfillment of the prize wasn't actually the primary issue for the regulator. No, it was the structure of the contest itself.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay. Because if I'm listening to this right now, I'm probably thinking, like, come on, influencers do giveaways on social media every single day.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. Tag three friends to win.

---

[4] Draw date was July 1, 2024, the location was the Williams Lake Stampede, the prize was a free trip to the ranch.

[5] In Michael's prolific social-media posts, the watchdog was unable to find a public instance showing Susan Barnes visiting the ranch, or Michael talking about such a visit having occurred. This is an absence of identified public evidence, not proof that the trip did not occur.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah. Why did the gaming policy branch take this one so seriously?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, the legal distinction comes down to the mechanics of the criminal code.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The GPEB issued a cease and desist warning because the ranch's activities actually met the legal definition of an illegal lottery.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
A lottery?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. A lottery involves three specific elements. First, consideration, meaning participants pay money or give something of value to enter.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Second, chance, meaning the winner is selected through a randomized process.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And third, prize, meaning the winner receives something of value.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I see where this is going.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. If you combine those three elements without a government license, you are operating an illegal gambling enterprise.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And they were charging people to enter these draws without any kind of license.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. And operating unlicensed lotteries carries severe consequences.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I can imagine.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The regulator explicitly warned that these actions can result in administrative fines of up to $5,000 per offense.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wow.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And in severe cases, they can be prosecuted as criminal offenses.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
That is serious.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is. The underlying lesson here is that sincerity is not a legal defense.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
An influencer can truly believe the money is going to a righteous cause, like saving horses.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
But that internal justification does not exempt them from the Gaming Control Act.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So they have built this bulletproof trust with their audience, the followers believe in the horses, they believe in the family's survival, and they will attack anyone who questions the narrative.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
But here is where the story takes a turn that genuinely shocked me.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The pivot.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah. They take all of that goodwill, you know, cultivated around alpine mountains and rescue animals, and they leverage it into a completely different and honestly potentially dangerous arena.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. The pivot to promoting unverified medical devices really represents a fascinating monetization of that parasocial trust.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
We have to talk about the Vortice Disc.

[Speaker 2 Man]
We do.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Because from what I can see in the sources, it is literally a piece of plastic with a swirl pattern printed on it.

[Speaker 2 Man]
That's what it appears to be.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And the instructions say you are supposed to tape it to your body.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And Michael Lares is on the internet making astonishing medical claims about this plastic swirl.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, very specific claims.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
He publicly stated that the disc can, quote, “stop shingles in its tracks and reverse it within 24 hours if caught early”.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And promoting a piece of plastic as a cure for a viral nerve infection blurs the line between lifestyle influencing and practicing medicine without a license.[6]

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It has to, right?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. And the Vortice product itself actually carries a standard legal disclaimer stating it is not a medical device.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Of course it does.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yet the influencer is explicitly marketing it for serious, acute health conditions.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
But the mountains do not conduct clinical trials.

[Speaker 2 Man]
No, they don't.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Just because a guy looks rugged riding a horse does not mean you should take his advice on curing a viral infection.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
How does an audience that's primed for equine stewardship suddenly start buying shingles cures?

---

[6] NotebookLM’s reference to “practicing medicine without a license” should not be read as a legal conclusion. The watchdog site documents promotional health claims and product disclaimers; it does not identify any court or regulator finding that Lares practiced medicine without a licence.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It goes back to what we were talking about earlier. Trust functions as a transferable currency in the creator economy.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, a transferable currency.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. The audience has already bypassed their critical thinking filters because they trust Michael as a devoted family man and a steward of nature.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So they just carry that trust over.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes. When he shifts from talking about horses to promoting an unproven medical product, the audience doesn't evaluate the product. They evaluate the messenger.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The halo effect protects the medical claim.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And it isn't just a casual one-off brand deal either.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Not at all.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The sources show apparent insider-level coordination between the Lares family and this Vortice company.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah, the family actually produced instructional videos for the discs.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which is wild. Lara, Michael's daughter, who serves as the ranch's digital media manager, is clearly recognizable in these promotional videos by her tattoos.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yep.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And this hustle goes back years. Michael was on the Ben Greenfield Fitness podcast way back in 2016 promoting these kinds of unproven devices.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And he actually referenced his wife's intimate health issues as part of the sales pitch back then too.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wow. So it's deeply ingrained.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The longevity of that promotion indicates it is a core revenue strategy,[7] not a passing trend.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
But the most revealing aspect of this entire operation isn't how they sell.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
What is it?

[Speaker 2 Man]
It's how they react when the sales pitch is questioned.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Ah, yes.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Because we have the rustic, struggling family ranch on the front of the photograph, right?

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Yeah.

[Speaker 2 Man]
But on the back, we find a highly sophisticated, highly litigious corporate machine designed to crush scrutiny.[8]

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The legal posture is incredibly aggressive.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
When critics start pointing out the missing tilt squeeze or the illegal lotteries, they don't just get blocked anymore. They get lawyer letters.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Oh, yeah.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Michael Lares actually pinned a formal letter from the law firm, a McQuarrie Hunter LLP, to the company's Instagram page, publicly threatening critics.

[Speaker 2 Man]
So the strategy moved from community moderation to legal intimidation.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which is quite an escalation.

---

[7] NotebookLM inferred that the long-running promotion reflected a “core revenue strategy”. The source materials support the narrower point that Lares promoted related devices over a period of years; they do not establish revenue amounts or the degree to which such promotion formed part of his income.

[8] NotebookLM’s phrase “designed to crush scrutiny” should be understood as rhetoric, not as a finding of motive. The source materials document a pinned lawyer’s letter, blocking, public criticism of critics, and civil litigation; they do not establish a judicial finding about Lares’ purpose.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is. Michael Lares eventually filed a Notice of Civil Claim in the courts. That's file number 257137, where he alleged, quote, “conspiracy defamation against several individuals”.[9]

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I'm looking at this legal filing and it says conspiracy defamation.[10] That sounds incredibly intense.

[Speaker 2 Man]
That's a heavy phrase.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Does that mean a judge actually looked at the evidence and found these critics guilty of a conspiracy?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Not at all. And that is a critical distinction we have to make here.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay.

[Speaker 2 Man]
A notice of civil claim is merely a pleading.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is a document where a plaintiff writes down their allegations and what they hope to prove. It is not a judicial finding of fact.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, I see.

[Speaker 2 Man]
However, as a tactic, it is the devastatingly effective deterrent.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I mean, I would be terrified.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. If you are a donor wondering where your $50 went and you see the ranch suing other people for conspiracy, you are going to keep your questions to yourself.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The lawsuit basically acts as a shield for the brand.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Precisely.

---

[9] NotebookLM’s reference to “conspiracy defamation against several individuals” reflects Michael Lares’ public descriptions of the action as documented by the watchdog site. It is not a quotation from, and does not appear in, the Notice of Civil Claim itself. The Notice of Civil Claim should be consulted for the causes of action and allegations actually pleaded. No pleaded allegation should be treated as a judicial finding.

[10] As noted above, the phrase “conspiracy defamation” reflects Michael Lares’ public descriptions of the action as documented by the watchdog site. It is not wording from the Notice of Civil Claim itself.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
But the lawsuit that really made me stop and reread the sources is the Supreme Court of British Columbia petition.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes. File no. VLC-S-S 248901.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. Because this isn't about internet trolls or people asking questions in the comments. This is a massive internal corporate battle.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is. And the petition really shatters the illusion of the solitary family on the frontier.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It totally does.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It reveals the underlying corporate reality of Flying L Ranch Ltd., which is actually registered as a for-profit company.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
A for-profit company.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. And the court documents cite a man named Peter van der Heyden as a 50% shareholder and director of the company.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wait. I need you to back up and walk me through the mechanics of this because I want to make sure I'm understanding this right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Sure.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The public narrative is that they're crowdfunding for basic horse feed, right? Asking followers to donate the price of a cup of coffee to fix a broken tractor.[11]

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah, begging for veterinary funds.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. But simultaneously, this petition filed by Lares is seeking to legally compel van der Heyden to transfer his shares.

[Speaker 2 Man]
His shares plus a privately owned 80 acre adjacent parcel of land.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
For how much?

[11] The watchdog site identifies Michael's "cup of coffee" fundraising campaigns were to raise money to purchase the tilt squeeze - not to fix a broken tractor, as NotebookLM incorrectly stated.

[Speaker 2 Man]
For approximately $2 million Canadian dollars.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay. How is an operation that relies on GoFundMe to survive executing a $2 million corporate land buyout in the Supreme Court?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, the structural contradiction is glaring.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It makes no sense.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The mechanics of a $2 million buyout require massive capital leverage. And that completely contradicts the public narrative of daily financial desperation.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right. The audience is funding the emotional story of the struggling ranch while the corporate entity is engaging in multi-million dollar asset consolidation.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
That is just a jarring asymmetry. You are donating to save a horse, but you might actually be subsidizing a corporate land acquisition.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Which is why transparency is so important.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
And this brings us to June of 2026 and how the operation is attempting to evolve in the face of all this mounting public and regulatory scrutiny.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Right. On June 5th, 2026, Michael Lares announced the creation of two entirely new entities to handle their operations.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay. What are they?

[Speaker 2 Man]
The first is called the Flying L Equine Stewardship Society, which he publicly described as a Canadian charity. The second is Friends of Flying L Ranch, which is described as a USA non-profit.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So, wait. After all the GPEB warnings and the questions about the tilt squeeze, they are finally becoming a registered transparent charity.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, the terminology used in an Instagram announcement requires deep skepticism.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Ah.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Stating that a newly formed society is a Canadian charity does not automatically mean it has been granted official charitable tax status by the federal government.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Which requires an audit. Right.[12]

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yes, which involves rigorous auditing. Furthermore, the public filings for the US non-profit immediately raise red flags.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
What kind of red flags?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Michael Lares is listed as the incorporator, but the official filing uses his old bankruptcy address in North Carolina.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Not the physical address of the B.C. Ranch where the operations actually take place?

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Using a bankruptcy address for a brand new non-profit seems like a massive administrative red flag.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It certainly raises questions.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
If I'm trying to figure out if this new setup is legitimate, what should I be looking for?

[Speaker 2 Man]
The most effective analytical tool for this situation is what we call the separation test.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Okay, the separation test.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. It is entirely legal and common for a non-profit society to exist alongside a for-profit corporate entity.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
That happens all the time.

---

[12] CRA determines whether to register an organization as a charity for purposes of issuing charitable tax receipts. Calling an entity a "Canadian charity" does not confer registered charity status. Registered charities are subject to public annual reporting requirements, but the watchdog site does not state that a CRA audit is required at the application stage.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It does. But the test is whether the non-profit actually has independent governance, a separate board of directors, and true separation of assets.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right, because if this new so-called charity just collects donor money and then turns around and uses those funds to lease land or rent facilities or buy management services from the for-profit Flying L Ranch Ltd.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Then donor money is still just subsidizing a private company's expenses.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It's literally just putting a fresh coat of paint on an old private fence.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The test has to be separation, not just new slogans.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The core question is; who owns the box? Who controls what enters and leaves the box? And can anyone independent look inside the box?

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Without verified transparency, clear accounting ledgers, and independent governance, slapping a non-profit label on the operation does not resolve any of the structural or historical questions.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It merely rebrands the collection method.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
So how do we even make sense of this entire ecosystem? I mean, we have unverified medical origin stories, 139 separate fundraising campaigns[13], a missing hydraulic tilt squeeze, illegal lotteries, plastic discs being sold as shingles cures, and a $2 million corporate lawsuit over land.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is a lot to process.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It feels overwhelming to even track.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Well, the difficulty in tracking it is actually a known phenomenon. It's called Brandolini's Law, often referred to as the Bullshit Asymmetry Principle.

---

[13] The watchdog site identifies 139 individual campaign postings or solicitations.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Oh, I've heard of this.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah. It posits that the amount of energy required to refute a misleading or incomplete claim is an order of magnitude larger than the energy required to produce it.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
That makes total sense. I mean, it takes Michael Lares 15 seconds to post an emotional, beautifully shot video of a limping horse with a link to PayPal. But it takes a researcher hours of digging through corporate registries, Supreme Court petitions, and freedom of information requests just to figure out who actually owns the dirt that the horse is standing on.

[Speaker 2 Man]
And that asymmetry is the weapon of the unregulated influencer.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Wow.

[Speaker 2 Man]
So, as a listener navigating this space, you really need to apply a practical test before you engage.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Definitely.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Before you donate to any influencer-driven cause, strip away the emotion. Demand to see a verified legal identity.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Right.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Demand to see a specific fundraising purpose, and more importantly, demand a completion accounting showing where the funds were actually spent.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Don't just take their word for it.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Exactly. Do not accept a non-profit label without verified charitable status.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
You have to look past the halo. You know, let's go back to that photograph we talked about at the very beginning of this deep dive.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah, let's flip it back over.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The front of the photo, you know, the stunning mountains, the wild horses, the emotional story of a family healing. It is beautiful.

[Speaker 2 Man]
It is.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It might even contain elements of profound sincerity and real love for those animals. But the back of the photo still matters.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Absolutely.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
The corporate ledgers, the regulatory warnings, the unfulfilled fundraising promises, the aggressive lawsuits. Those documents are just as real as the scenery.

[Speaker 2 Man]
The front of the photograph is designed to appeal to your empathy. The back of the photograph demands your critical thinking.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
I love that. So the next time your feed serves you a perfect cinematic image that pulls at your heartstrings and asks for your money, just pause for a second before you double tap that donation link.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Just a brief pause.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
Ask yourself what structure you are actually funding behind this story.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Because the creator economy has evolved much faster than our mechanisms for accountability. And that really leaves us with a profound question about the future of online giving.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It really does. I mean, when a social media influencer successfully builds a parasocial world so insular and so fiercely loyal that the audience polices itself against anyone who dares to ask a basic accounting question.

[Speaker 2 Man]
Yeah.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
How do we as a society regulate that gray area where personal lifestyle funding blurs completely into charitable solicitation?

[Speaker 2 Man]
A tough question.

[Speaker 1 Woman]
It is. Ultimately, when the lines between saving an animal and funding a corporate buyout[14] are this blurred, who is truly being rescued, the horses or the brand?

---

[14] This should be understood as a structural accountability question, not as a finding that donor funds were used to fund a corporate buyout. The source materials support asking how donations to a private, for-profit ranch operation were used, but do not establish that any particular donor funds were used for the $2,000,000 buyout proposed in the Petition.