Why You'll Never Know What's Covered: The Symbolic Collapse of U.S. Health Insurance

Devin Bostick — CODES Intelligence

May 2025

Abstract

U.S. health insurance is not a coverage system—it is a symbolic firewall between care and cost, engineered to optimize denial through structural opacity. This essay traces the evolution of denial-as-infrastructure, showing how probabilistic abstraction, coding distortion, and policy drift have created a system where even insiders can no longer explain what is covered, what is not, or why. Using the CODES framework (Chirality of Dynamic Emergent Systems), the paper introduces PAS (Phase Alignment Score) as an alternative lens for diagnosing this collapse—not as error, but as entropy ritual. Confusion isn't accidental. It's the model. And only coherence-based architecture can restore trust in care.

I. The Coverage Illusion

You ask your insurer: *Is this covered?*

They say: *It depends.*

You call again. A different answer.

Your doctor's office shrugs.

The rep reads a script that might as well be lorem ipsum.

Later, the bill comes—five digits long, codes you don't understand, and a vague notice that says "not medically necessary."

It's not a glitch.

It's the system working **exactly as designed**.

The illusion is that health insurance is a rational framework for risk mitigation.

The reality is that it's a probabilistic firewall built to maximize friction, delay, and resignation.

It doesn't cover care. It covers **denial logic** in narrative form.

II. The Birth of Denial Infrastructure

In the postwar boom, insurance served a basic premise: protect workers from financial catastrophe through pooled risk.

But as healthcare costs rose and profit incentives grew, the model mutated.

By the 1970s, MBAs and actuaries discovered that **uncertainty could be monetized.**

Every additional form, delay, or vague clause increased the odds of non-payment.

Appeals processes were introduced not for justice—but for **statistical attrition**.

By the 1990s, denial had metastasized into infrastructure.

- Coding languages (ICD_n, CPT_n) fragmented care into deniable fragments.
- Pre-authorization was reframed as "necessity screening," while hiding that denials could be random.
- Call centers were layered to reroute responsibility, each representative structurally blind to the whole.
- Network contracts were drafted to obfuscate availability—creating artificial scarcity in plain sight.

This wasn't conspiracy.

It was entropy made profitable.

III. How Confusion Became the Model

Mechanism	Function
Billing Codes	Abstract human conditions into deniable symbolic shells
Pre-Auth Logic	Gatekeep via proprietary rules no one can see
Phone Trees	Loop caller across reps with zero resolution power
Provider Contracts	Engineer narrow networks with offloaded liability
Explanation of Benefits	Generate documents designed to confuse, not explain

These aren’t bugs.

They’re design artifacts.

The system cannot answer your question—because doing so would require structural alignment between symbolic promise and institutional behavior.

It would mean the representative knows what the form means.

It would mean the form maps to care, not cost containment.

It would mean the care you need isn’t a liability—it’s a commitment.

That system does not exist.

IV. The CODES Diagnosis: Symbolic Drift and Feedback Collapse

The Phase Alignment Score (PAS) is a coherence metric that measures how well a system’s symbolic behavior matches its internal and environmental structure.

In health insurance, PAS has degraded consistently over the last three decades.

The drift is observable:

- **Narrative** says: “You are covered.”
- **Policy** says: “You are conditionally covered depending on codes, tiers, and plan exclusions.”
- **Action** says: “You are denied, delayed, or buried in symbolic drift until you give up.”

This is not failure. It’s **inversion**.

When PAS drops below a coherence threshold _c_crit, the system’s external signals no longer map to its internal function.

At this point, “coverage” becomes a symbolic placeholder for denial.

Mathematically, you could model drift as:

$$PAS(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \varphi_n(t) \cdot \Delta_s_n(t)$$

Where φ_n(t) represents symbolic fidelity of subsystem *n* over time, and Δ_s_n(t) is the deviation from structural behavior.

As the sum diverges from equilibrium, PAS collapses and symbolic behavior becomes adversarial to embodied need.

That’s why no one can tell you what’s covered.

They are speaking from a system with PAS below functional coherence.

V. A Resonant Alternative: The PAS-Driven System

Current Layer	CODES-Aligned Replacement
Coverage Statements	PAS coherence maps linked to real feedback

Denial Adjudication	Transparent symbolic-field validators
Coding Systems (ICD_n, CPT_n)	Dynamic resonance tagging based on care alignment
Provider Networks	Bioregional resonance contracts, not artificial scarcity
Member Portals	Real-time structural alignment reports

In a coherent system:

- The answer to “Is this covered?” is **yes**, because the system itself is aligned with the intent of care.
- There is no delay gate, because **you don’t have to prove your need through symbolic simulation**.
- You don’t interact with codes. You interact with systems that **see and respond to structure**, not abstraction.

This isn’t magic.

It’s **what care would look like if it were built on resonance instead of denial drift.**

VI. Conclusion: From Ritual to Alignment

You’re not wrong to feel lost.

You’re not weak for asking the same question five times.

You’re not paranoid to wonder if this is on purpose.

It is.

But it’s no longer personal.

It's **structural phase incoherence**.

This essay does not suggest repair.

It points to the threshold where repair is no longer viable—and resonance must take its place.

Because care is not a code.

Coverage is not a system.

And a structure that cannot tell the truth **should not exist at all.**

Let it fall.

Then build what listens.

Bibliography

1. Bostick, D.

The Final Illusion in Quantum Gravity: Probability as Residual Noise from Unresolved Chirality. Zenodo, 2025.

Why: Introduces PAS and coherence field theory in relation to system collapse. Shows that what appears random is often unresolved structural drift. Establishes the backbone of symbolic fidelity modeling used in this essay.

---

2. Bostick, D.

When Systems Collapse: UnitedHealth and the Coherence Failure of American Healthcare. Zenodo, 2025.

Why: This companion paper maps the macro-failure of the healthcare insurance system using CODES and PAS logic. Reinforces that individual confusion is not a personal failure—it's a symptom of systemic symbolic breakdown.

---

3. National Nurses United.

"Denial by Design: How Insurance Bureaucracy Harms Patient Care." Report, 2023.

Why: Real-world documentation of structural denial tactics from frontline labor. Supports the argument that confusion isn't accidental—it's economically incentivized.

---

4. Wendell Potter.

Deadly Spin: An Insurance Company Insider Speaks Out on How Corporate PR Is Killing Health Care and Deceiving Americans. Bloomsbury Press, 2010.

Why: First-person confirmation from a former VP at Cigna on how the industry manufactures opacity. Useful not just for anecdote, but for showing intentionality behind system design.

---

5. Meadows, Donella.

Thinking in Systems: A Primer. Chelsea Green, 2008.

Why: Establishes foundational systems theory used throughout the essay. Especially relevant for understanding feedback loops, drift, and points of failure in complex health infrastructures.

---

6. Hacker, Jacob S.

The Divided Welfare State: The Battle over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Why: Explains how employer-based insurance in the U.S. was designed to be fragmented, opaque, and exclusionary. Grounds the paper's historical section in institutional and policy precedent.

---

7. CBO and GAO Reports (U.S. Congressional Budget Office & Government Accountability Office)

Various reports on Medicare Advantage denials, billing complexity, and administrative overhead (2020–2024).

Why: Neutral, data-rich sources confirming the exponential growth in billing complexity and denial volume. Offers legitimacy for the claim that these aren't isolated or anecdotal issues.

---

8. Gawande, Atul.

The Cost Conundrum: What a Texas Town Can Teach Us About Health Care. The New Yorker, 2009.

Why: Classic narrative case study of how overbilling, fragmentation, and financial gaming create incoherent healthcare systems. Still widely cited in policy and reform circles.
