Linux package does not work #1202

New issue

Closed

bluescreen303 opened on Jan 14

Archi Version

5.7.0

Operating System

NixOS 25.11 (linux 64bit)

Archi Plug-ins

No response

Description

I'm trying to install Archi. It used to be available through my operating system package manager, but no longer.
So I used the linux 64 bit package from https://www.archimatetool.com/download/ and followed the instructions to unpack and run the `Archi` program file. This gives me an error:

```
➜  Downloads tar xf Archi-Linux64-5.7.0.tgz
➜  Downloads cd Archi
➜  Archi ls -l
total 380
-rwxr-xr-x  1 mathijs users  90184 23 sep 10:08 Archi
-rw-r--r--  1 mathijs users    637 23 sep 10:08 Archi.ini
-rwxr-xr-x  1 mathijs users   1002 23 sep 10:08 Archi.sh
-rw-r--r--  1 mathijs users  58008 23 sep 10:08 artifacts.xml
drwxr-xr-x  4 mathijs users   4096 14 jan 10:48 configuration
drwxr-xr-x  2 mathijs users   4096 14 jan 10:48 docs
drwxr-xr-x 20 mathijs users   4096 14 jan 10:48 features
-rwxr-xr-x  1 mathijs users 183162 23 sep 10:08 icon.xpm
drwxr-xr-x  6 mathijs users   4096 14 jan 10:48 jre
drwxr-xr-x  5 mathijs users   4096 14 jan 10:48 p2
drwxr-xr-x 15 mathijs users  20480 14 jan 10:48 plugins
➜  Archi ./Archi
Could not start dynamically linked executable: ./Archi
NixOS cannot run dynamically linked executables intended for ger
linux environments out of the box. For more information, see:
https://nix.dev/permalink/stub-ld
```

Can you please provide a package that works on my 64bit linux? Or add Archi to the nixpkgs package repository?

Steps to reproduce

1. install Nixos 25.11 x86 64bit
2. download official Archi package
3. unpack
4. run `Archi` from the unpacked directory

Assignees
No one assigned

Labels
No labels

Type
No type

Projects
No projects

Milestone
No milestone

Relationships
None yet

Development
No branches or pull requests

Participants

Open in GitHub Copilot app

Phillipus on Jan 14 — Last edited by Phillipus — Member

Apparently, according to an AI I asked:

> NixOS deliberately does not support running dynamically linked ELF binaries that were compiled for "generic" Linux distributions (FHS layout, glibc from /lib64/ld-linux-x86-64.so.2, etc.). The official Archi Linux package is built in this traditional way and it expects the standard interpreter at a fixed path that doesn't exist on NixOS.

See also https://nix.dev/guides/faq#how-to-run-non-nix-executables

> Or add Archi to the nixpkgs package repository?

I don't have NixOS or know how to do this. I suggest you ask them to do it.

---

bluescreen303 on Jan 14 — Last edited by bluescreen303 — Author

I checked a bit more, because like I said, this worked fine for a long time, as Archi was in the nixpkgs repository.

But I found it was taken out recently: NixOS/nixpkgs#462964
They claim that upstream (that's probably you) don't want them to maintain Archi in nixpkgs for NixOS users.

So now I (and every other Archi user on NixOS) will need to patch things up myself to get the provided package working. To me, it makes far more sense if either you (the tool provider) or the nixpkgs/nixos maintainers provide a working solution for their users that does not require manual overrides and patching and scripting.

👍 1 👀 1

Phillipus on Jan 14 — Last edited by Phillipus — Member

> They claim that upstream (that's probably you) don't want them to maintain Archi in nixpkgs for NixOS users.

That's not exactly true.

What we said was that if third-parties are going to re-package Archi in an unsupported format then **they** will have to support it when issues arise. There have been cases where a user has reported an issue and I wasted a lot of time trying to reproduce it only to be later told "Oh I downloaded it from x" and the issue was caused by that.

The problem with these third-party re-packagers is that they expect the whole world to revolve around them and if the project dares to change the download location they throw a fit and make demands and throw insults. I will not tolerate that.

> So now I (and every other Archi user on NixOS) will need to patch things up myself to get the provided package working. To me, it makes far more sense if either you (the tool provider) or the nixpkgs/nixos maintainers provide a working solution for their users that does not require manual overrides and patching and scripting.

I do not have the time or capacity to support all types of OS. Nixos will have to provide full support for Archi if that's what users want. As Archi is free and open source software you and everyone else have many options to build and compile a distribution binary.

Phillipus closed this as completed on Jan 14

---

bluescreen303 on Jan 14 — Author

I understand your point about support. Especially if "packaging" becomes more than hooking things up to correct system libraries / runtime env.

But please understand that nixpkgs doesn't really re-package things in another format. It's basically a set of "recipes" that are invoked by nixos/nixpkgs users. It's basically just downloading and unpacking the package provided through the archi download page and supplying the right runtime environment so that libraries and the system dynamic linker can be found by the binary.
So it makes sense that some relatively stable/predictable URL scheme for fetching the package would be highly appreciated.

Sure, building everything from source is a valid option and one I will ask nixos/nixpkgs maintainers to pursue.
However, that doesn't change the support situation you describe. Both with a built-from-source package and with a minimally-patched/wrapped binary package, users may reach out to you *or* a distribution maintainer, depending on where they thing an issue lies. The only thing that helps with that is educating users / reporting where they got a package from.

👍 1

---

bluescreen303 on Jan 14 — Author

I also agree that throwing insults should not be tolerated of course.

However, I'm looking for a solution here. I understand that you (or any other software author for that matter) cannot support all possible distributions and platforms, it would be a waste of time. Which is why generally, distributions have maintainers who do the packaging and integration for that specific platform. Usually that's supposed to be minor integration work.

I don't know the details of whatever clash seems to have happened between those maintainers and yourself, but I would hope that it can be worked out instead of becoming a burden for your mutual users (like me).

Providing predictable URLs for pre-packaged downloads does not seem like an unreasonable ask. Telling distro maintainers: you have to support users that use your re-packaged versions (for matters that relate to integration, of course not for core functionality) is perfectly

reasonable as well. So I would love it if this can just be worked out how to reach those goals.

👍 1

Phillipus on Jan 14 — Member

> So it makes sense that some relatively stable/predictable URL scheme for fetching the package would be highly appreciated.

I will do that if it's possible. But note this - sometimes the download links will change. Recently my ISP was getting hammered leading to error 500 for extended periods. I had to change the link URLs.

But again with these packagers, this is a case of the tail wagging the dog.

As far as possible the links for Archi 5.7.0 will not change unless the site gets hammered and the links have to go to a mirror.

bluescreen303 on Jan 14 — Author

Sure, occasional link changes are a fact of life. Distro maintainers are used to working with that.
It's also quite common for distros to *always* use provided mirrors (some CDN, github releases, ...), if that's an option.

Thanks for your response. I will pursue this further with the nixpkgs maintainers to see if they can re-add what they took out.
I'm happy to hear that you are not hostile to repackaging/integrations in general, but want to prevent users from targeting you about issues arising because of the packaging.

archimatetool locked as spam and limited conversation to collaborators on Jan 31

archimatetool unlocked this conversation on Aug 10

Sign up for free **to join this conversation on GitHub.** Already have an account? Sign in to comment

Terms Privacy Security Status Community Docs Contact Manage cookies
Do not share my personal information

© 2026 GitHub, Inc.