Informal Mutual Aid Networks

Recognizing How Communities Actually Function

As expansion adults already rely on informal mutual aid networks for survival, formalizing these networks enough to count for verification without destroying their informal character could leverage existing community capacity.

Keisha, Marquita, and Denise live in the same public housing complex in Memphis. They've known each other for seven years, their children have grown up together, and they've developed a survival system that makes their lives possible.

Keisha works the early shift at a distribution center, leaving at 5 AM. Marquita watches Keisha's two kids until the school bus comes at 7:30, then heads to her own job at a nursing home. Denise works evenings at a hotel, so she picks up all three women's children from school and keeps them until Keisha gets home at 4 PM. On weekends, they rotate: one watches all the kids while the others pick up extra shifts or run errands. When Marquita's car broke down last month, Keisha drove her to work for two weeks. When Denise got behind on her electric bill, they pooled money to prevent shutoff.

This arrangement has no name, no organizational structure, no documentation. It exists because these three women figured out that survival alone was impossible and survival together was barely achievable. They don't think of what they do as "community service" or "caregiving" in any formal sense. They think of it as getting by.

Now Medicaid work requirements arrive, and suddenly the informal becomes a problem. Marquita needs to document "caregiving hours" for the time she watches Keisha's kids. Keisha needs verification of "community service" for the transportation help she provides. Denise needs attestation for the after-school care she provides. The help they give each other is real, it's substantial, it's what makes their work possible. But it exists entirely outside any system designed to recognize it.

The caseworker explains that they need letters from each other confirming hours of care provided. Marquita feels strange asking Keisha for a formal letter about something they've done casually for years. The request changes the relationship somehow, introducing bureaucratic formality into something that had always been organic. And what about accuracy? Marquita doesn't track hours. She watches the kids when Keisha needs her to. Some weeks that's fifteen hours. Some weeks it's five. She has no idea what the monthly total is.

The system asks these women to translate their survival into its categories. The translation may be impossible without losing something essential about how their community actually works.

The Informal Economy of Care

Low-income communities have always survived through mutual aid arrangements that formal systems neither see nor value. These arrangements constitute an informal economy of care that operates parallel to, and often substitutes for, the formal services that middle-class Americans access through markets and institutions.

Neighbor-to-neighbor support systems form the foundation of this informal economy. Someone with a car gives rides to someone without one. Someone who cooks well prepares extra meals for an elderly neighbor. Someone handy fixes things around the building for people who can't.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

Someone good with paperwork helps others fill out forms. These exchanges happen constantly, usually without money changing hands, creating webs of obligation and reciprocity that bind communities together.

Extended family networks extend this support across households. Grandmothers care for grandchildren while parents work. Aunts and uncles provide housing during transitions. Cousins share job leads and work contacts. Adult children check on elderly parents daily. These arrangements are so normalized that participants rarely recognize them as "caregiving" in the sense that formal systems define it. It's just what family does.

Church community mutual aid adds institutional structure to informal support. Congregation members help each other move, bring meals during illness, provide emergency financial assistance, and share resources through food pantries and clothing closets. These activities happen through church networks but often without formal church oversight. Two families in the same congregation help each other because they know each other from Sunday services, not because the church organized them to do so.

This is how communities actually function below formal service systems. ***When sociologists study low-income neighborhoods, they find dense networks of informal exchange that provide much of what residents need to survive.*** Food sharing, childcare sharing, transportation sharing, housing sharing, and countless other forms of mutual support flow through these networks continuously. The formal economy and formal services capture only a fraction of the resources and labor that sustain poor communities.

Work requirements interact with this informal economy in complex ways. ***Much of what expansion adults do to survive, the caregiving, the helping, the mutual support, could potentially count toward work requirement compliance if systems recognized it.*** But recognition requires documentation, and documentation requires formalizing relationships that work precisely because they remain informal.

The Documentation Paradox

Informal help resists formal documentation for reasons that go beyond inconvenience. The very act of documenting changes the nature of what is being documented, creating a paradox where verification requirements can destroy what they attempt to measure.

When Marquita asks Keisha to write a letter confirming caregiving hours, she introduces a transactional element into a relationship built on reciprocity and trust. The letter implies that Marquita's help needs external validation, that Keisha's word alone isn't sufficient, that their arrangement should be legible to outside authorities. This formalization can feel like a betrayal of the informal trust that made the arrangement work.

The social costs of requesting verification letters extend beyond awkwardness. What if the letter isn't accurate enough and creates problems? What if documenting the arrangement invites scrutiny of other aspects of their lives? What if the relationship changes once bureaucratic formality enters it? People in mutual aid relationships often prefer to remain invisible to formal systems because visibility has historically brought surveillance, judgment, and interference rather than support.

Power dynamics in formalizing informal relationships become unavoidable when documentation is required. The person providing the letter has power over the person needing it. What happens if the relationship sours? What if one person wants to stop helping but the other

needs the documentation to continue? What if the letter-writer demands something in return for continued attestation? Formalization introduces leverage into relationships that functioned without it.

Documentation requirements can destroy what they measure by making informal arrangements less sustainable. If helping a neighbor means tracking hours, maintaining records, and providing formal verification, the help becomes burdensome in ways it wasn't before. The neighbor who casually watched kids while the parent ran errands might decline to continue if it means becoming part of someone's compliance documentation. The informal arrangement that worked precisely because it was informal may not survive being formalized.

Community Attestation Models

If informal mutual aid should count toward work requirements, how might verification work without destroying the informal character of these relationships?

Trusted community member verification offers one model. Rather than requiring attestation from the specific person receiving help, states could accept verification from trusted community members who can confirm that mutual aid arrangements exist. A longtime resident known to observe neighborhood dynamics might attest that someone provides regular caregiving support to neighbors. The attestation confirms the pattern without requiring the specific recipient to provide documentation.

Religious leader attestation provides similar function through institutional credibility. Pastors, priests, imams, and rabbis often have visibility into their congregants' lives that includes awareness of mutual aid relationships. A pastor who knows that a church member regularly provides transportation to elderly neighbors could attest to that activity without requiring each elderly neighbor to write verification letters. The religious leader's standing in the community provides credibility that individual attestations might lack.

Collective verification through multiple attestors could address concerns about single-source verification reliability. Rather than requiring one definitive letter, states might accept attestation from three community members each confirming partial knowledge. One neighbor confirms seeing someone regularly pick up another's children from school. Another confirms the same person often drives elderly residents to appointments. A third confirms awareness of caregiving arrangements. Together, these attestations establish a pattern without requiring comprehensive documentation from any single source.

Community organization umbrella coverage could aggregate informal mutual aid into organizational verification. A community center, housing authority, or neighborhood association might track mutual aid activities among its constituents and provide verification for participants. The organization doesn't organize the mutual aid; it simply observes and documents what community members already do for each other. This approach requires organizational capacity that not all communities have but leverages existing infrastructure where it exists.

CISE and Mutual Aid Convergence

Community Inclusive Social Enterprise models, explored in Article 8C, intersect with informal mutual aid in ways that could strengthen both. CISE creates compensated pathways for peer support that might formalize some mutual aid while preserving its essential character.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

The convergence works through recognizing that informal help has economic value. When Marquita watches Keisha's children, she provides something Keisha would otherwise have to purchase. When Keisha drives Marquita to work, she provides something with market value. These exchanges have worth even though no money changes hands. CISE approaches could potentially compensate this value, transforming invisible mutual aid into recognized, compensated activity.

Compensation for informal support changes the calculation for participants. Someone providing twenty hours weekly of caregiving to neighbors might decline to formalize it if formalization means only bureaucratic burden. But if formalization means compensation, perhaps through Medicaid waiver programs supporting community health workers or through state investment in peer navigation, the burden becomes worthwhile. The help doesn't change; the recognition and reward for it does.

The boundary between mutual aid and microenterprise matters for policy design. Pure mutual aid operates through reciprocity and social obligation rather than payment. Microenterprise operates through market exchange. Many activities sit somewhere between: help provided partly from relationship and partly for compensation, mixing economic and social motivations. Work requirement policy must decide whether to recognize only market activity, only formalized volunteering, or the full spectrum including informal mutual support.

When formalizing helps versus when it harms depends on what formalization means in practice. Light-touch recognition that accepts community attestation without demanding hour-by-hour documentation might strengthen mutual aid by validating its worth without burdening its practice. Heavy documentation requirements demanding detailed records, specific attestations, and audit trails might destroy mutual aid by making it too burdensome to continue. The policy design choice determines whether formalization supports or undermines community capacity.

State Recognition of Informal Support

For informal mutual aid to count toward work requirements, states must develop policy frameworks that accept forms of verification foreign to traditional compliance systems.

Policy frameworks accepting community verification require states to trust communities in ways bureaucracies often resist. Traditional verification demands documentation from authoritative sources: employers, educational institutions, healthcare providers. Community verification asks states to accept attestation from neighbors, religious leaders, and informal networks. This requires fundamentally different assumptions about who is credible and what counts as evidence.

Audit approaches appropriate for informal systems cannot replicate audit approaches designed for formal employment. Auditing an employer's payroll records is straightforward; the records exist or don't, and their accuracy is verifiable. Auditing community attestation of informal caregiving has no comparable verification pathway. Did Marquita actually watch Keisha's children for fifteen hours last week? No timesheet exists. No camera recorded it. Only the participants' word confirms what happened.

States might approach informal activity audits through pattern verification rather than hour verification. Does the arrangement make sense given the participants' circumstances? Is there corroborating evidence that the relationship exists? Do multiple sources confirm awareness of mutual aid activities? Are the claimed hours plausible given other known facts about participants'

lives? This approach accepts that precision is impossible while still maintaining program integrity through reasonableness checks.

The philosophical question underlying state recognition is whether communities should be trusted. Work requirements reflect assumptions that individual compliance must be verified, that self-report is insufficient, that documentation from authoritative sources is necessary to prevent fraud. Extending recognition to informal mutual aid requires different assumptions: that communities know what their members do, that social networks provide accountability through reputation and relationship, that the fraud risk from accepting community attestation is acceptable given the alternative of excluding legitimate activity.

Some states will conclude that fraud risks from community verification are too high, that the administrative complexity of managing informal attestation is unsustainable, that work requirements should recognize only formally documented activity. Others will conclude that excluding informal mutual aid excludes precisely the work that makes low-income communities function, that verification systems must accommodate how people actually live, that trusting communities is necessary for work requirements to work.

The Value of What We Don't See

Keisha, Marquita, and Denise have kept each other employed for seven years through arrangements that no system recognizes. Their mutual support enables work that would otherwise be impossible. Without Marquita's early morning childcare, Keisha couldn't take the distribution center job with its 5 AM start time. Without Denise's after-school coverage, none of them could work jobs ending after 3 PM. Without Keisha's transportation help, Marquita couldn't get to the nursing home when her car broke down.

This mutual aid has economic value that formal systems could calculate if they cared to. It has social value in building community bonds that sustain residents through hardship. It has policy value in enabling employment that work requirements demand. But because it happens informally, outside organizational structures, without documentation, it remains invisible to systems designed to see only what fits their categories.

Work requirements create an opportunity to recognize what communities already do. States could design verification systems that see informal mutual aid as valuable contribution rather than suspicious activity requiring documentation. They could accept community attestation as credible evidence of support that would otherwise be unverifiable. They could trust that people living in interdependence with their neighbors know what their neighbors do.

Or states could maintain verification approaches designed for formal employment and organizational volunteering, effectively excluding informal mutual aid from work requirement compliance. This approach maintains administrative simplicity at the cost of ignoring how low-income communities actually survive.

The choice reflects deeper questions about what work requirements are meant to accomplish. If the goal is genuinely encouraging productive activity, then the productive activity that holds communities together should count. If the goal is maintaining bureaucratic control over benefit eligibility, then only bureaucratically legible activity will satisfy requirements. The design of verification systems reveals which goal actually drives policy regardless of what politicians say.

References

1. Stack, Carol. "All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community." Basic Books, 1974.
2. Edin, Kathryn, and Laura Lein. "Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low-Wage Work." Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.
3. Desmond, Matthew. "Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City." Crown Publishers, 2016.
4. Putnam, Robert. "Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community." Simon & Schuster, 2000.
5. Spade, Dean. "Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next)." Verso Books, 2020.
6. Nelson, Margaret. "The Social Economy of Single Motherhood: Raising Children in Rural America." Routledge, 2005.
7. Hays, Sharon. "Flat Broke with Children: Women in the Age of Welfare Reform." Oxford University Press, 2003.
8. Dominguez, Silvia, and Celeste Watkins. "Creating Networks for Survival and Mobility: Social Capital Among African-American and Latin-American Low-Income Mothers." Social Problems, vol. 50, no. 1, 2003.
9. Small, Mario Luis. "Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life." Oxford University Press, 2009.
10. Mazelis, Joan Maya. "Surviving Poverty: Creating Sustainable Ties Among the Poor." NYU Press, 2017.
11. Burton, Linda, et al. "The Role of Trust in Low-Income Mothers' Intimate Unions." Journal of Marriage and Family, vol. 71, no. 5, 2009.
12. Heflin, Colleen, and Mary Pattillo. "Poverty in the Family: Race, Siblings, and Socioeconomic Heterogeneity." Social Science Research, vol. 35, no. 4, 2006.
13. Offer, Shira. "The Burden of Reciprocity: Processes of Exclusion and Withdrawal from Personal Networks Among Low-Income Families." Current Sociology, vol. 60, no. 6, 2012.
14. Hansen, Karen. "Not-So-Nuclear Families: Class, Gender, and Networks of Care." Rutgers University Press, 2005.
15. Venkatesh, Sudhir. "Off the Books: The Underground Economy of the Urban Poor." Harvard University Press, 2006.