THE CEDAR INSTITUTE
POSITION PAPER · MAY 2026

The Recognition Asymmetry

Cognitive Diversity in the Modern Economy and the Clinical Research Gap

Executive Summary

A converging body of corporate, academic, and capital-markets evidence demonstrates that neurodivergent cognitive styles — including autism, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and dyslexia — produce measurable competitive advantages in technology, finance, intelligence analysis, and increasingly in artificial intelligence. Major employers including SAP, Microsoft, JPMorgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, EY, and Hewlett Packard Enterprise have built dedicated hiring programs that report productivity, retention, and innovation outcomes materially above corporate baselines. The aggregate market capitalization of publicly traded technology companies led by individuals who have publicly identified as neurodivergent now approaches eight trillion dollars.

This recognition has not been matched by investment in the clinical research infrastructure serving the same population. Approximately eighty-five percent of autistic adults remain unemployed. Premature mortality from suicide is sharply elevated. Modern psychiatric trial design has, with rare exception, excluded neurodivergent participants from the studies most likely to produce treatments calibrated to their neurology.

The Cedar Institute names this divergence the Recognition Asymmetry: a population whose cognitive contributions are increasingly extracted by the modern economy, but whose mental health needs remain structurally under-resourced by the institutions responsible for clinical advancement. This paper documents the asymmetry and articulates the institutional case for sustained, peer-reviewed investment in clinical research designed for, and inclusive of, neurodivergent adults.

1. The Recognition Asymmetry

Two trends are unfolding simultaneously, with sharply different velocities.

The first is the maturation of labor-market and capital-markets recognition that neurodivergent cognitive styles confer measurable competitive advantage in domains central to the contemporary economy. This recognition is now codified in formal corporate hiring programs at the largest employers in technology, finance, and professional services; in the productivity and retention metrics those programs publish; and in the public disclosures of senior technology leaders whose firms represent some of the most valuable enterprises in global equity markets.

The second is a near-complete absence of corresponding investment in the clinical research infrastructure designed to serve neurodivergent adults. Employment outcomes outside the small cohort of inclusive technology employers remain structurally poor. Suicide mortality is elevated. Trial protocols continue to exclude or fail to recruit neurodivergent populations, leaving the evidence base for therapies most likely to be relevant to this population thin and outdated.

The Cedar Institute treats the gap between these two trends as the central problem in its field of work. Recognition without investment is not progress. It is extraction.

2. Origins: From the Clinical Periphery to the Technological Center

The contemporary recognition of neurodivergent cognitive contribution did not emerge from the clinical literature. It emerged from a parallel observation, decades old, that the cultural and operational environment of computer science and adjacent technical fields is structurally accommodating of autistic working preferences.

The argument was first articulated at scale by Steve Silberman in Wired magazine in December 2001. Silberman observed that the technical workforce of Silicon Valley exhibited features — high tolerance for unusual cognitive styles, valuation of technical depth over social fluency, comfort with rule-bound and pattern-based work — that made it a natural environment for individuals whose cognitive profiles fit the autism spectrum. Silberman expanded this observation into the cultural-historical analysis published as NeuroTribes in 2015.

A separate body of corporate and academic literature has since formalized the business case. The most cited articulation remains Robert D. Austin and Gary P. Pisano's 2017 Harvard Business Review essay, Neurodiversity as a Competitive Advantage, which documented the early generation of dedicated corporate hiring programs and synthesized their common operational architecture: noninterview assessment, workplace accommodation, structured onboarding, and managerial training.

The argument is no longer novel. It is now part of the operating logic of the largest employers in the global economy.

3. The Empirical Case: Productivity, Innovation, and Capital Markets

Three categories of evidence support the contemporary recognition.

Corporate hiring program outcomes.

SAP's Autism at Work program, launched in 2013, reports a retention rate of approximately ninety percent for neurodivergent hires, substantially in excess of corporate-average retention across the technology sector. JPMorgan Chase's Autism at Work program, launched in 2015, reported that neurodivergent hires completed task work approximately forty-eight percent faster than non-neurodivergent peers in matched roles. EY's Neuro-Diverse Centers of Excellence, established beginning in 2016, found that work quality, efficiency, and productivity were comparable between neurodivergent and neurotypical employees, while neurodivergent employees materially outperformed on innovation metrics. Microsoft's Autism Hiring Program (2015), Goldman Sachs's Neurodiversity Hiring Initiative (2019), Hewlett Packard Enterprise's cybersecurity program, Dell's Autism Hiring Program, and the Google Cloud Autism Career Program (2021) operate on substantially similar architectures and report directionally similar outcomes.

Specialized intelligence and security applications.

The Israeli Defense Forces' Special Intelligence Unit 9900, responsible for the analysis of aerial and satellite imagery, operates a unit staffed primarily with personnel on the autism spectrum. The unit's documented advantage in pattern detection has been the proximate cause for several allied programs, including a cybersecurity initiative under development between Hewlett Packard Enterprise and the Australian Department of Defense.

Capital-markets disclosure.

Several of the most valuable publicly traded technology firms in the world are led by executives who have publicly identified themselves as neurodivergent. Microsoft co-founder Bill Gates, in 2025 interviews accompanying the publication of his memoir Source Code, stated that he would likely be diagnosed on the autism spectrum if he were assessed today, and characterized his cognitive style as a form of advantage rooted in hyperfocus and atypical information processing. Tesla and SpaceX chief executive Elon Musk publicly disclosed an Asperger's diagnosis in 2021. The aggregate market capitalization of public technology firms led by executives who have publicly identified as neurodivergent now approaches eight trillion dollars.

These three categories of evidence are not coextensive with a clinical claim. They are an economic and operational observation. They establish, at minimum, that the cognitive styles often identified as autistic, ADHD, or dyslexic are not deficits in the contemporary labor market. They are, at significant scale, advantages.

4. The Artificial Intelligence Era: Why the Pattern Is Accelerating

The features of the modern artificial intelligence economy are likely to intensify rather than attenuate this pattern.

Artificial intelligence research, alignment work, machine-learning interpretability, prompt engineering, training-data curation, model evaluation, and adversarial red-teaming all reward cognitive properties that overlap heavily with the strengths catalogued in the neurodiversity literature: sustained attention to abstract systems, comfort with rule-bound logic, comfort with pattern detection over time horizons that exceed the working memory of most analysts, tolerance for repetitive precision work, and a willingness to interrogate edge cases that other reviewers find tedious. Dyslexic narrative-construction strengths and ADHD lateral-thinking patterns map onto creative and ideation roles within the same technology stacks.

The corporate logic is straightforward. Firms competing for advantage in an AI-saturated economy require talent profiles whose distribution is heavily weighted toward the neurodivergent end of the cognitive spectrum. Firms whose hiring and management practices systematically exclude that talent will lose competitive position to those that do not.

This is not an argument that neurodivergent populations should be valued because they are economically useful. It is an observation that they are increasingly being valued for that reason — and that the institutional infrastructure responsible for their clinical care has not yet adapted to the implications.

5. The Inversion: Economic Recognition, Clinical Neglect

The same population whose cognitive contributions are increasingly recognized in the productive economy continues to experience three structural disadvantages of historic and continuing severity.

Employment.

Outside of the small and concentrated cohort of inclusive technology employers, employment outcomes for autistic adults remain catastrophic. Approximately eighty-five

percent of autistic adults are unemployed, compared to a general-population unemployment rate that has fluctuated near four percent in recent years. The headline-level corporate programs cited above are, in absolute terms, small. They have not yet produced a population-level shift in employment outcomes.

Mortality.

Suicide and premature mortality are substantially elevated in autistic adult populations relative to age-matched controls. The mortality differential persists across diagnostic subgroups and is robust to control for comorbid psychiatric diagnosis. The Hirvikoski population-register analysis published in the British Journal of Psychiatry in 2016 remains the most rigorous empirical anchor for this finding.

Clinical research exclusion.

The therapeutic literature most likely to produce treatments relevant to neurodivergent adults — including the modern resurgence of psychedelic-assisted therapy research — has, with rare exception, excluded autistic and otherwise neurodivergent participants from its trial populations. This exclusion has been operationally driven by trial-protocol convention rather than by clinical evidence that the relevant compounds are unsafe in neurodivergent participants. The result is a near-complete absence of controlled clinical evidence on which to base therapeutic recommendations for the population most economically visible in the modern technology workforce.

The simultaneity of these conditions — economic recognition, employment marginalization, mortality elevation, and clinical exclusion — is the Recognition Asymmetry.

6. Implications: A Research-Investment Asymmetry

The Recognition Asymmetry is not a moral observation. It is a research-investment observation.

The contemporary economy now extracts substantial cognitive value from neurodivergent populations. The institutions responsible for the clinical advancement of those populations have not adapted to the implications of that fact. Specifically:

- Clinical trial protocols continue to operate inclusion and exclusion criteria that systematically remove neurodivergent participants from the studies most likely to be relevant to them.
- Major federal and philanthropic funding bodies have not yet recalibrated their portfolios to reflect the prevalence and economic significance of neurodivergent populations.

- The pharmacological and therapeutic literature contains extremely limited controlled human evidence on the use of compounds that may be relevant — including, but not limited to, the second-generation psychedelic phenethylamines — in neurodivergent adults.

The Cedar Institute's research focus is the closure of this gap. The Institute funds, designs, and pursues clinical research into targeted compounds and therapeutic frameworks that may produce measurable benefit in adult neurodivergent populations, with the methodological standards required by peer reviewers and regulators in the relevant jurisdictions. The Institute does not advocate for the use of any specific compound. It funds the research required to answer the question.

The Recognition Asymmetry establishes that the population in question is not marginal. It is, in the clearest economic terms available, central. The clinical research infrastructure should reflect that fact.

7. Conclusion

The corporate, academic, and capital-markets case for neurodivergent cognitive value is now substantial, replicated across employers and sectors, and increasingly visible in the senior leadership of the largest companies in the global economy. The clinical research infrastructure required to serve the same population has not yet developed in proportion. The asymmetry between these two facts is not a temporary lag. It is a structural feature of how research investment is currently allocated.

The Cedar Institute exists to address that asymmetry. The work is long-horizon, methodologically conservative, and designed to produce evidence durable enough to inform regulatory and clinical practice. Sustained external partnership and investment in this work is the operational form that closing the Recognition Asymmetry takes.

References

1. Austin RD, Pisano GP. Neurodiversity as a Competitive Advantage. Harvard Business Review. 2017 May–Jun;95(3):96–103.
2. Silberman S. The Geek Syndrome. Wired. 2001 Dec 1.
3. Silberman S. NeuroTribes: The Legacy of Autism and the Future of Neurodiversity. New York: Avery; 2015.
4. Doyle N. Neurodiversity at work: a biopsychosocial model and the impact on working adults. British Medical Bulletin. 2020 Oct;135(1):108–125.
5. Hirvikoski T, Mittendorfer-Rutz E, Boman M, Larsson H, Lichtenstein P, Bölte S. Premature mortality in autism spectrum disorder. British Journal of Psychiatry. 2016 Mar;208(3):232–238.
6. Deloitte. A rising tide lifts all boats: Creating a better work environment for all by embracing neurodiversity. Deloitte Insights; 2022.
7. Gates B. Source Code: My Beginnings. New York: Knopf; 2025.
8. SAP SE. Autism at Work Program. Corporate disclosure; program inception 2013.
9. JPMorgan Chase. Autism at Work / Office of Disability Inclusion. Corporate disclosure; program inception 2015.
10. Microsoft Corporation. Microsoft Neurodiversity Hiring Program. Corporate disclosure; program inception 2015.
11. Goldman Sachs. Neurodiversity Hiring Initiative. Corporate disclosure; program inception 2019.
12. EY (Ernst & Young). Neuro-Diverse Centers of Excellence. Corporate disclosure; program inception 2016.
13. Hewlett Packard Enterprise. Dandelion Program / Australia Department of Defence cybersecurity initiative. Corporate disclosure.
14. Google Cloud. Autism Career Program. Corporate disclosure; program inception April 2021.

About The Cedar Institute

The Cedar Institute is a California nonprofit public benefit corporation. Federal 501(c)(3) tax-exempt determination is pending. The Institute funds and designs clinical research into targeted compounds and therapeutic frameworks for adult neurodivergent populations, with an initial focus on second-generation psychedelic phenethylamines. The Institute partners with academic research groups to conduct work to peer-review and regulatory standard.

thecedarinstitute.org · info@thecedarinstitute.org