

Tacitus.me: Structuring Conflict, Surfacing Common Ground

A Framework for Email-Native Conflict Analysis and Narrative Mapping

Version 0.3 · Draft · November 2025 · Tacitus Resolution Technologies

>> Executive Summary

Modern organizations do not suffer from a lack of communication. They suffer from an excess of unstructured, emotionally charged, and misaligned communication that outpaces leaders' ability to make sense of it. Email, chat, and digital documents have become the main battlefield for high-stakes conflicts—HR crises, C-suite breakdowns, political polarization, and diplomatic stalemates.

Most technology in this space is built for the wrong game. At one end are cheap “mediation bots” for small consumer disputes. At the other are adversarial tools that help one side win—litigation AI, procurement agents, algorithmic negotiators. None of these are designed for what senior decision-makers actually need: a disciplined way to understand what is really going on and where common ground might exist.

Tacitus.me proposes a new category: an email-native, multi-agent conflict analysis engine. The core hypothesis is simple: modern conflict is a dual asymmetry problem—information asymmetry (who knows what) and narrative asymmetry (who gets to say what it means).

Tacitus.me is not a robot mediator or a decision-maker. It is an analytical co-pilot for the human in the loop. By plugging into existing email infrastructure, it ingests threads, deconstructs them into claims, evidence, narratives, interests, and constraints, and builds a structured conflict graph grounded in the organization's own policies and precedents via Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG). The result is a repeatable way to see conflicts clearly enough for human leaders to act wisely.

>> 1. The Resolution Deficit

Post-2020 enterprises, governments, and multilateral institutions are handling more conflicts, on more fronts, at higher emotional intensity. The system of record for almost all of this is still email. Threads collapse timelines, mix topics, and bury critical signals under CC chains and reply-all storms.

Tacitus calls this gap the Resolution Deficit: our ability to generate conflict scales with cloud storage; our ability to resolve it still runs on human memory and manual reading.

Most tools deployed against this problem are administrative (HR suites, case systems), adversarial (litigation AI, contract bots), or superficial AI (generic sentiment analysis). Tacitus.me is designed as a missing layer between communication and decision: a disciplined, always-on analyst that lives on top of existing channels, not a replacement workflow.

>> 2. Conflict as Asymmetry

Tacitus.me is built around a dual-lens model of conflict.

Information asymmetry asks: who knows what, and where are assumptions being made in place of facts? Tacitus extracts evidence and claims, flags mind-reading and untested inferences, and grounds analysis in explicit policies, contracts, and precedents via RAG.

Narrative asymmetry asks: who gets to tell the story, and what does the conflict mean for identity, status, and recognition? Tacitus treats narratives as first-class objects, extracting narrative

Tacitus.me :: Conflict Analysis Engine

```
+-----+
| email-native | multi-agent | RAG-grounded | human-in-loop |
+-----+
```

arcs, differentiating public-facing stories from private negotiating positions, and mapping which narratives collide and which can coexist.

Durable resolution requires addressing both. Tacitus builds a full map of facts, assumptions, and stories, then highlights where more disclosure would reduce confusion—and where naive transparency would likely inflame perceived unfairness. This is why a human remains in the loop by design.

>> 3. Inside the Tacitus Engine

At a high level, Tacitus.me turns noisy email threads into a structured conflict graph:

[Email Threads] -> [Parsing + Mining] -> [Conflict Graph] -> [RAG + Agents] -> [Briefs]

Email-native by design, Tacitus connects to Gmail, O365/Exchange, or IMAP/SMTP and treats threads and attachments as the primary data plane. No new portal; no lost context; security piggybacks on existing enterprise identity and encryption.

The Argument & Narrative Mining agent segments conversations into turns and voices, extracts claims, counter-claims, justifications, and narrative elements, and tags them with actors and issues. These populate a conflict ontology with entities such as Actors & Roles, Issues & Positions, Interests & Values, Narratives & Frames, Evidence & Claims, Constraints & Opportunities, and Options & Proposals.

On top of this graph, a RAG layer retrieves relevant internal documents and external references, allowing Tacitus to explain not just that something seems unfair, but how it interacts with specific clauses and past decisions. A small team of agents—intake, ontology mapper, argument miner, policy agent, common-ground synthesizer, risk & ethics, and briefing—critique and refine each other's outputs. No agent is permitted to communicate directly with parties; a human operator remains the final link.

>> 4. Example Scenarios

Tacitus.me is intentionally cross-domain.

- High-stakes HR investigations – Tacitus parses long harassment or retaliation threads, builds timelines of claims and responses, links behaviour to policy clauses and prior cases, and returns a structured brief with unresolved questions and suggested lines of inquiry.
- C-suite strategic misalignment – Tacitus reveals when executives are using different frames (cost–benefit vs. identity, short-term vs. long-term), surfaces overlapping interests (sustainable profitability, product quality, talent retention), and offers talking points to reframe the conversation around shared objectives.
- Diplomatic and peacebuilding contexts – Tacitus maps delegations' red lines, separates symbolic language from operative demands, retrieves analogous treaty language, and suggests candidate compromise formulations consistent with precedent and stated interests.

>> 5. Design Principles and Conclusion

Tacitus.me is guided by a few non-negotiable principles:

- Augmentation, not automation – humans own judgment, persuasion, and responsibility; Tacitus structures information and highlights options.
- Explainability by construction – each high-stakes output is grounded in retrieved documents and

Tacitus.me :: Conflict Analysis Engine

```
+-----+
| email-native | multi-agent | RAG-grounded | human-in-loop |
+-----+
```

identifiable graph elements; no opaque scores.

- Email-native security – sensitive data stays within enterprise-grade ecosystems with tenant isolation and role-based access.
- Pluralism and power awareness – the system is explicitly designed to surface narrative asymmetries and power imbalances rather than wash them out.
- Nerdy but usable – under the hood: graphs, multi-agent workflows, RAG; on the surface: clean briefs and maps a GC or political director can read in minutes.

Tacitus.me is not a chatbot, a legal weapon, or a synthetic mediator. It is a conflict analysis engine for people who must navigate complex, emotionally loaded disputes inside systems that were never designed for this volume and complexity of communication.

Tacitus.me :: Conflict is information and narrative asymmetry.
Handle information with care, and it can become a path to peace.