the probability distribution resulting from p sampling/testing (on the chosen pixels) permutations of the resulting data does not yield an good estimate of the probability of observing the effect in the study (evaluated on the chosen pixels) (i.e. with the permutation $\pi = id$).

@ decreasing type II error β: Assuming there is an effect (i.e. the alternate hypothesis is true) any modification that increases the probability of rejection the null hypothesis is decreasing β. So if we overestimate effects (as the method of Prof. E. Genius is suggesting), we decrease the type II error (assuming null hypo. wrong and alternate hypo true.).

addendum :- a)
(ii) might have the advantage of being easier to computed (than comparing the entire brain)
- we use pixel = voxel interchangeable in (i)

(i) a)

method	pros	cons
cluster-wise-permutation	no assumption on autocorrelation	slow/non-deterministic for given data
cluster-wise-RFT	assume squ. exp. decay of autocor.	fast/deterministic for given data

(ii)

method	pros	cons
clust-wise-permutation	Spatial effect size taken into account	arbitrary thresholding
voxel-wise-permutation	Spatial effect size not taken into account(	no arbitrary thresholding