Looking at code added in gna patch #5471 (debuting in 2.6):

```c
/* Potential defender found */
if (urgency == 0
    && uchoice.value.utype->defense_strength == 1) {
    /* FIXME: check other reqs (unit class?) */
    if (get_city_bonus(pcity, EFT_HP_REGEN) > 0) {
        /* unlikely */
        uchoice.want = MIN(49, danger);
    } else {
        uchoice.want = MIN(25, danger);
    }
} else {
    choice->want = danger; // ONE
}

uchoice.want += martial_value;

CITY_LOG(LOG_DEBUG, pcity, "m_a_c_d wants %s with desire " ADV_WANT_PRINTF,
    utype_rule_name(choice->value.utype),
    choice->want);    // TWO
```

I was led to this code by a crash in the debug message TWO, where 'choice' is all zeroes. I'm pretty sure this debug message is intended to refer to 'uchoice'.

Looking nearby at ONE, I think referring to choice->want is a bug too and this should be uchoice.want?

I'm guessing that this makes AI cities a bit less likely to build defenders when under threat; partly because uchoice doesn't have its want bumped, and partly because it's competing with whatever's in 'choice', which has had its want (erroneously) bumped further.
The S2_6 code is likely result of an rebasing error (when patch was ported from later branches to S2_6 and it didn't apply cleanly)
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