The approach proposed by the statistician in addressing the discrimination issue in Google's image generation algorithm raises several significant shortcomings when examined through the lens of ethical data science principles.

Direct vs. Indirect Discrimination: The proposed solution aims to adjust the output based on demographic data, potentially leading to direct discrimination by explicitly considering race. It may reinforce stereotypes and marginalize certain groups. Moreover, indirect discrimination arises from the flawed assumption that demographic representation can be accurately inferred and utilized without considering the broader societal context.

Equality of Opportunity: By adjusting the probability of generating certain images based on demographic factors, the proposed solution may undermine equality of opportunity. It could perpetuate disparities by artificially constraining the visibility of certain groups, limiting their representation and opportunities in various contexts.

Systematicity and Group Fairness: The proposed solution lacks considerations for systematic biases inherent in the demographic data and its application. It fails to address how historical inequalities and systemic biases might be perpetuated or exacerbated through algorithmic decisions. Moreover, it may not ensure fairness across different groups, as the approach is primarily focused on statistical averages rather than individual experiences and contexts.

Human Decision Making vs. Algorithmic Fairness: While the solution attempts to emulate human intuition, it overlooks the complexity of human decision-making processes and the ethical considerations involved. Human judgments are influenced by biases and subjective interpretations, which may not align with principles of fairness and equity. Algorithmic fairness requires more than just mimicking human behavior; it necessitates rigorous assessment and mitigation of biases at every stage of the decision-making process.

Base Rate vs. Accuracy vs. Calibration-based Fairness: The proposed solution relies on simple probabilistic adjustments based on demographic data, without considering the broader implications of fairness metrics. It neglects the trade-offs between different fairness criteria, such as base rate fairness (ensuring similar error rates across groups), accuracy-based fairness (minimizing overall prediction errors), and calibration-based fairness (ensuring well-calibrated probabilities for different groups).

Bias Transforming: Rather than addressing biases inherent in the training data and algorithmic design, the proposed solution attempts to transform biases into statistical adjustments. However, this approach fails to mitigate the root causes of bias and may perpetuate existing inequalities by normalizing biased outcomes.

A more robust solution to address discrimination in image generation algorithms requires a holistic approach that considers the complexities of societal biases, individual experiences, and ethical principles. This entails incorporating diverse perspectives, continuous monitoring and auditing of algorithmic decisions, transparent decision-making processes, and proactive measures to alleviate biases at every stage of the algorithm lifecycle.