

TRANSCRIPT OF TALK GIVEN AT 30TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION BY TERENCE McBRIDE

In his poem, Little Gidding, T.S. Eliot has written:

A people without history
Is not redeemed from time, for history is a pattern
Of timeless moments.

We have a history as the C.G. Jung Society of Sydney, a history of 30 years, and that's what we want to look at over the course of this evening. After a three-year gestation period as a study group, the Society was born in March 1975 when the 18 foundation members adopted the Constitution at the Quakers Meeting Hall at Wahroonga.

I wondered what patterns of timeless moments have we seen in the life of the Society? And I would hope that our reflections and reminiscences tonight - those of Erla, Craig, myself and everyone here - might reveal some of those patterns of timeless moments in our history. Another name for these patterns of timeless moments is "archetypal realities", for that is what archetypes are. Hopefully, they may reveal something to us over the course of this evening.

As I approached this talk tonight I decided to consult the *I Ching*. Now some people think the *I Ching* is just an old collection of magic spells, but Jung found it to be a "formidable psychological system that endeavours to organise the play of archetypes, the wondrous operations of nature, into a certain pattern so that reading becomes possible" (C.G. Jung, *Collected Works*, 14, p 294).

So I consulted the *I Ching*, for I was wondering what patterns were at work around giving this short talk this evening? And what patterns were and are at work in the life of Jung Society? (You see there are the "patterns" again). In response the *I Ching* talked about cooking and nourishing oneself and others (hexagram 50, The Ting/Cauldron), and it talked about the importance of depth, The Well (hexagram 48) - the well, whence we get the water of life. So I cooked away over the last few days to see what I could bring as my contribution to this gathering of celebration this evening. The Well reminded me of my very first months as President of the Jung Society, for I wrote about it in my very first newsletter back in June 1981. Here I need to be a little biographical for I need to talk out of my experience in the Jung Society:

I returned from Zürich in 1979 after six and half years at the C.G. Jung Institute and I had deeply imbibed the spirit of Jung there. I was very happy with my analysis even though I had some very difficult times with it for it opened up depths in myself, but it helped me to make peace with a lot of things about myself, the details of which I won't bore you with. Basically it gave me tools for living my life and for working psychologically with other people. I did notice that it did not make me perfect, which I think I must have expected at some level, but at least I learned to live with who I am, and that was pretty good.

Having soaked in and having been nourished by the myths, stories, fairy tales and the spirit of Europe I became more and more aware of my eventual return to Australia - to a land, as Craig has so beautifully shown us tonight, with different terrain, different spirits and different stories to those of Europe.

My dreams led me to working on the dreaming of the Australian Aborigines for my Diploma thesis. This formed a rite of passage for me to return to live and work here. Working with the psyche in Australia means drawing on the European spirit, which we also are, our European consciousness and history, but also drawing on the ancient spirit, energies and stories of this land.

On arrival here I became involved with the Jung Society - and remained intimately involved with it for next 13 years. Like the other members of the Executive Committee, I lived my

life, very much, to the rhythm of its events: monthly meetings, workshops, seminars, executive meetings, newsletter deadlines. I think I missed about 2 meetings in all those years: one for family wedding and one for a family 21st. So I was Vice-President for a year in 1980 and in March 1981 I was elected President after Patrick Jansen retired, in the sixth year of the Society. He and his team had consolidated the Society, expanded its activities and gave it a good sense of direction; Patrick continued to give lectures at Society meetings for the next 5 years or so.

So I was elected with five others to the Executive Committee of six people. These included Jean McManus, who is here tonight. Jean was co-founder of the Society with Brian O'Gorman, and was the first Honorary Secretary, when Leon Petchovsky was President. She would be the most long-standing member of the Society. Then Maxine McNaughton was Vice-President and a devoted member of the team as we shaped the Society and were shaped by it. Penny Baxter, who is also here tonight, was the Secretary for almost all of those years that I was involved. Penny carried a huge workload and brought an attention to detail and a very caring attitude to the Society and its members. Graham Ashcroft was Treasurer for all those years and way beyond, and ensured that our finances were well looked after and kept in order. Bobby Page looked after the Library, which grew exponentially over those years - from just a few books to 100's of books and tapes. The six of us were a good team and worked well together. We shared the vision and we shared the work. Five of those people in that group remained on the committee together for the years that followed, for the duration you might say.

We were joined by many others over the years. I should like to mention some names from memory (especially those of you whom I see here tonight) - even at the risk of missing someone. There was Rod Cole-Ravenswood (vice-president, sound technician and later president), Malcolm Page (assistant treasurer and later treasurer). There was June Reynolds who worked in the Library and is still active on the Executive Committee, and Charles Plumridge, though not a member of the Executive Committee, was always a really helpful and practical presence around my time in the Society. Bob Schmidtmann (vice-president and book sales) and Lavinia, Craig Delaney (membership secretary) and Barbetta; John Baber, who is here tonight, looked after the Library for many years and he and Graham led the team which organised the 1990 Film Seminar Weekend, *The Way of the Dream*, consisting of 20 half-hour films which showed Marie-Louise von Franz working with people on their dreams. It was most successful, attracting 370 people, and really a great experience. It also put a huge sum of money in the Society's bank account, which was then invested. [Jacinta Frawley then says "We're still trying to spend that. We have still not yet spent that, but we're working on it"]. Then there was Joan Hemmings and Jenny Albertson and Sue Blacker, and many others - who all had their specific tasks and had a hand in shaping the Society in those formative days. We worked well together, sharing the vision and sharing the workload, and the success of the Society of those years is a tribute to the volunteer work of those various members of the Executive Committees over the years and the individual skills each brought to the Society.

So in 1981, we six began our stewardship of the Jung Society. It wasn't until 1984 that we changed the Constitution and extended the Executive Committee from 6 to 10 members in order to spread the workload as the Society was growing, the membership increasing dramatically. We also changed the name from the C G Jung Society of NSW to that of Sydney (there were 2 other Jung Societies in NSW at the time).

Until then there had been a one-page mail-out twice each year, which gave the programme of lectures for the half year, and also explained the upcoming elections or gave the results of the elections which had just been held. To my knowledge this had been begun by Anne Julliene in 1977, when she was Honorary Secretary. So in June 1981 I sat down to write this one page report and it became four pages. I felt moved to write about the changes in the Society, and hexagram 48, *The Well*, came to mind. So there was the *Well* at the beginning of my time on the Executive Committee and here it is again today, when I talk about some of those 30 years, the years that I experienced. At the time, quoting hexagram 48, I wrote "The political structures change as do nations, but the life of the human being with its needs remains eternally the same. This cannot be changed". The *I Ching* goes on to say that "the

human being's deepest needs must be nourished by the water from the well". It warns about superficiality and conventionality, that is, not going deeply enough with one's efforts towards self knowledge - or to continue in the words of the *I Ching* "Not drawing from the inexhaustible wellsprings of the divine in human nature. Not penetrating to the real roots of humanity and remaining fixed in convention". It goes on then to warn about carelessness in drawing the water of life out of the depths, which amounts to neglecting one's self-development and getting caught up unconsciously and unreflectively in the vicissitudes of life.

It felt good, on that occasion, to write about the things that really mattered, but it also created a rod for my own back. The newsletters became a twice-yearly task that primarily involved researching Jung's writings - not for the purpose of simply regurgitating his ideas, but of working with them, developing them and relating them to our life here in Sydney. It involved also drawing on my experience of the unconscious in myself and in my clients and analysands. I felt we were communicating some of Jung's psychological perspectives here in Sydney, for at that time Jung's ideas were poorly understood and so not highly regarded in psychological and psychiatric circles here.

Of course, as is often said, Jung wanted no Jungians. He wrote in a letter: "I can only hope and wish that no one becomes 'Jungian'. I stand for no doctrine, but describe facts and put forward certain views which I hold worthy of discussion ... I proclaim no cut-and-dried doctrine and I abhor 'blind adherents'. I leave everyone free to deal with the facts in his own way, since I also claim this freedom for myself". (*Letters I*, 14/1/1946)

But Jung had a vision and he did hope for people who would carry it on in a *conscious* way. On the occasion of his 80th birthday in July 1955, there were two celebrations, both held at the Dolder Grand Hotel in Zurich: an informal celebration in the morning, which was open to anyone who had attended any lectures at the Institute, and a more formal celebration in the evening for leading Jungians from around the world. Jung to his surprise enjoyed the morning celebration so much, and told Barbara Hannah later, "I am sure there must have been a great many good spirits there that morning, and I think they mostly belonged to people we did not even know. But you know, those are the people who will carry on my psychology - people who read my books and let me silently change their lives. It will not be carried on by the people on top, for they mostly give up Jungian psychology and take to prestige psychology instead". (B. Hannah, *Jung his life and Work*, Capricorn Books, New York, 1976, p. 323).

In those early days, people would contact us, excited that there was a Jung Society in Sydney. Many told us that they had undergone Jungian analysis overseas - in England or America or in Switzerland; or that they had been reading the works of Jung for years. And so the Society grew and our finances improved, and we were in a position to pay local speakers and also able to dare more in terms of inviting Jungians from overseas, knowing that we could pay their costs.

It is certainly synchronistic that hexagram 48, The Well, comes up again for me in the context of the Society at this the 30th year celebration, for it seems to speak so well about the purpose of the Society. During my years I pondered a lot on the *raison d'etre* of the Society and this was reflected in the things I wrote, e.g. the third newsletter contained a reflection on the aims of the Society.

The Constitution says that Society exists to study and teach the works of C G Jung and its application by means of lectures, discussion and study groups. But I kept asking myself "What are we doing in the Jung Society? What's it all about"? It is not a professional Society, even though there are analysts who are members. And it is not quite a "Psychological Club". Jung founded the Psychological Club in Zürich for people who were in analysis, so that they could discuss issues of the analytical work and present papers on some aspect of the work that interested them. They would also find some support from each other in the work, because society doesn't give much value for this kind of introverted, meditative reflection of one's life that we do in analysis. Thus they would get some help there on the very private and internal work of analysis, which was conducted with a privacy that only the Swiss could achieve - as Deidre Baird found out as she started researching her biography of Jung in Zürich. Former analysands of Jung and their descendents just would not tell her about

analytical hours, or give her private and personal notes about them. For analysis is conducted in a "vessel" and the vessel is sealed. It just wasn't stuff to be talked about, and they didn't!

I remember there's a story about Barbara Hannah who had just arrived from England and had booked into a hotel where there were many other Jungians staying in order to undergo analysis with Dr Jung. She came down to breakfast the first day and they were all chatting about their dreams. Barbara left the table, went to her room, packed her bags and left. She said she didn't want to sit around talking about her dreams socially with people, for she was going to see someone and work with her dreams. So this privacy was really important. Analysis is an internal process, which of course has external ramifications. It was the alchemical "vessel well sealed" (the *vas bene clausum*) - no contaminations, no leakages, because the inner requires all our effort (cf. *Ars requirit totum hominem* - the [alchemical] art requires the whole human being).

I felt as the years went on that the Society is best understood as a kind of a Jungian presence in Sydney. I felt that we could contribute something to the life of this city. Our task was something like trying to understand the complexity of modern life, with all its wonderful richness and depth, together with all its alienation, restlessness, superficiality and conventionality - and to do this in the light of the discoveries of Jung in regard to the presence and influence of the unconscious in our lives. But I have also always felt very strongly that our task was not to proselytise - not to be making, if you like, "converts" to Jungian Psychology. We needed to work on ourselves and put out our findings, and if what we put out is good, people will come.

So we focussed on trying to understand the workings of the unconscious. How do you manage life in depth? How do you explore the workings and demands of the unconscious? How do you understand dreams? Are they really like von Franz said, "a drop of the water of life that we get each day, that we can take and be nourished". Are they really that? And if so how do we find the water of life in the dreams? How do they quench our thirst and satisfy our hungers as human beings? How do we get in touch with the inexhaustible wellspring of the divine in our own nature (as the *I Ching* puts it)? How do we do all these things, practically speaking? These are the sort of questions we tried to address in lectures, seminars and newsletters.

We had many wonderful speakers over the years who played a vital part in nourishing the life and nurturing the consciousness of the Society in this regard. Two in particular, out of many, come to mind: Janice Daw Koh, who came from her Zurich training to Sydney in 1977, and who, apart from earlier lectures, conducted 20 practical workshops dealing with working with dreams ("tools for inner listening") and sandplay ("dialogue with the Self") from 1986 to 1993. Many people were awakened to the role of the unconscious in their lives through her workshops, and learnt ways of understanding it and living it in their lives. The other person who comes to mind is Robert Johnson. He visited us on six occasions from 1984 to 1992 and spoke so movingly about ways of living and working with the unconscious, describing ways of doing 'inner work'. At times the lectures he first presented here were eventually published in his very readable and profound books. (One example is *Owning your own Shadow*).

Jung has made the point that the unconscious demands one's interest for its own sake and wants to be accepted for what it is. (CW, 14, 162). Of course we all come to analysis, or the Jung Society, or to the unconscious with all sorts of mixed motivations. Usually there is some sort of psychological pain in our lives. But it's so good when one goes deeper and the person starts experiencing something else, the deeper self, the core of one's own being, and a dialogue begins, and the person starts to make peace with themselves.

So I felt that the Jung Society became like a forum where questions of the inner life were unashamedly addressed. It was probably fairly unique in the sense that people could talk about their experience of the inner life and how you manage it an open sort of way without having to be a card-carrying affiliate of a group. And people seemed happy with that. We were trying to develop a consciousness here, in Sydney, which respected, allowed and tried to understand the unconscious and take on board its contents where possible. I used to see the Jung Society as a sort of a vessel for that consciousness. All the hard work: the meetings,

the seminars, the deadlines, the mail-outs, the hiring of halls, the balancing of books, the newsletter deadlines, the endless administrative details - all those things (and you people who run the Society know them so well) provide a vessel, a framework, a container for this understanding of the unconscious in people's life.

In March 1983, at the AGM, we adopted a logo for the Society, which you see on the front cover of the newsletter: the snake biting its tail, known as the OUROBOROS. I wrote a couple of pages on the meaning of this symbol, and out of four or five versions, this version was chosen in the voting: it is a 10th century example from the Greek Codex Marcianus.

The word "ouroboros" is made up of 2 Greek words: oura meaning tail, and boros, which comes from the verb bibroskein to eat, giving the compound word the meaning of "tail-eating". But even though a few people understood some Greek, we could not understand the Greek letters in the centre of the image. So Penny got in touch with Prof. Allan James at the Dept of Ancient Greek at Sydney University, and he said, "No wonder you couldn't understand it, because it is medieval minuscule Greek script and it says "he autopeps". Now usually this symbol is associated with the expression "hen to pan" which means "The one is all", which is what we expected. But "he autopeps" means "the self-digesting one" or "the self-digester". You can hear the word "peps" in such English words as peptic ulcer and pepsin - for peptein means to digest in Greek. What on earth could that mean symbolically? Now we know that in dreams, if you've got to eat something, it may refer to the need to nourish one's spirit, one's soul, one's inner life. Or it can refer to the need to assimilate some particular psychic content into consciousness - one has to eat something, to digest it, one has to assimilate it, one has to integrate it into who one is.

But to eat or digest oneself? Is this some sort of cannibalism, self-cannibalism if you like? Now in puzzling on this I remembered the 15th Century alchemical poem by a man named George Ripley, called the *Cantilena*, in Jung's works (CW. 14). It deals with the death of the old King who becomes senile and useless and can't reproduce. This leads to his death, dissolution and withdrawing into the Great Mother, the Queen, in whom he is held in gestation, and eventually out of her the young King is born. This sequence then represents the restoration and renewal of the old King. Psychologically, it's like an old attitude that dies, falls away, is dissolved and then in that very introverted, gestatory process is born again as a new consciousness (the young King).

But during that time of the gestation we are told that the Queen had pregnancy cravings: she eats only peacock flesh and the blood of the green lion, given to her by Mercurius in the chalice or cup of Babylon. Now if you take all this literally it becomes a kind of nonsense, but psychologically it is extremely rich. The Queen's eating the peacock's flesh and drinking the lion's blood, looked at symbolically, has to do, on one level, with assimilating her own instinctive or animal energies. The peacock and lion being animals have to do with the healthy instinctive life - the appetites, the drives and urges that we have: her emotions, affects and desires. The peacock is also a symbol of rebirth and regeneration (a capacity of the queen in renewing the old king), while the lion is symbolic of emotionality (which the queen has but is unconscious of). They are also shadow contents - the proud arrogance of the peacock and the greedy desirousness of the lion.

Now Jung in his writing about this motif concludes that the Queen is eating her own flesh and drinking her own blood. So we're getting a little closer to this self-digestion business and the ouroboros. For, he says, the peacock and the lion are like attributes of the Queen, so when she eats the flesh and drinks the blood, she's actually eating and drinking herself. Jung urges that we should also do this ourselves - that is eat our own flesh and drink our own blood. Usually these shadow contents (here the greedy desirousness and the proud arrogance) are projected and we experience them in other people. But healing can only be attained if the projected contents are returned to the psyche of the individual. We need to integrate the emotions and understand what they are about.

So Jung says "Celebrate a Last Supper with yourself", referring to the Last Supper of Christ, and he adds, "Eat you own flesh, drink your own blood. Recognise and accept the other in yourself" (cf. CW 14, page 364). And so, the Queen then is assimilating her own desirousness and her own arrogance, which before she projected out onto others, and this

process increases and enriches her consciousness. She becomes a "bigger" person because of that.

Now with regard to the Ouroboros, we are told by the Alchemists that:

"He slays himself and brings himself back to life.

He fertilises himself and he gives birth to himself.

He devours himself and he generates himself" (CW. 14, 365)

So we learn that as the self-digester, ("he autopeps"), he turns himself into a circulatory process and regenerates himself. We must remember that a symbol is something (usually an image) that points beyond itself to other realities, and the reality this symbol is pointing to is something like the process of assimilation of the "alien-other" content, which is really oneself, and integrating that. The Ouroboros is a symbolic image then that represents the process of psychological death (of old outworn attitudes) and rebirth (of the new attitude), and the need for inner work on oneself, the work of psychological integration.

There is a story in Alchemy concerning the ostrich. They say that the ostrich can swallow glowing hot coal and red burning iron and make it come out again as clear flowing water. Now, literally, this is nonsense - you would get a lot of sick ostriches if you tried this. But symbolically, this is just magical, it's beautiful. It means that if we, like the ostrich, can swallow and digest the inordinate fiery passions, emotions and aggressions (hot coals and burning iron) which get a grip on our consciousness, they can be transformed into a source of creative spiritual energy, the water of life, which flows clearly and beautifully into life. So often we let these emotions explode outside into life - on the personal level putting on tantrums, and on the national level, waging wars, dropping bombs on people and blowing them up. We all need this "ostrich capacity" for then we will be centred and not driven by our emotional states.

So with the self-digesting Ouroboros, I feel we had stumbled upon a symbol that put value on the inner work as being a basis for the best kind of relatedness to other people. It's not a narcissistic business, simply running away from people to do one's own inner work, because the reflection involved is actually a basis for relating well with others.

The symbol of the ouroboros also confirmed my own strongly felt instinct that the task of the Society was not to make "converts" to Jungian Psychology, but to work on ourselves and to put out what we found: to simply do our own inner work and our outer work and put it out. If it's good, people would come, and they did come: membership rose from 65 to 460 over those years.

In Nietzsche's "Zarathustra", Zarathustra is shown in one part of the work as trying to convince others of the truth of what he has found, telling people what's good for them, for he knows what's best for them. Now Jung comments on this in his seminar on Zarathustra, and he calls it a kind of missionary attitude: all this missionary talk, he says, is of course hunger. It's a hunger. The people who do it are hungry - just think of the shadow side of colonisation, which Craig talks about in one of his articles, where the British Empire "ate people up". Ate up their cultures. Ate up their lives. One sees it in the "conversion hype" of some religious groups, where people and their lives are "eaten up" by the zealous adherents. One thinks also of the hype and pressure of much modern advertising. Again they know what's best for us, and urge us to act quickly, for "this is what you need".

Jung is saying that there is a certain way of offering one's ideas to others in a proselytising way that is destructive, for such a person's own ideas are hungry, his soul is hungry and other people feed his thoughts and appetites, because he can't feed them himself. May I just quote from Jung directly as he goes on:

"If you discover what you call a truth, you should test it, try to eat it. If it feeds you it is good but if you cannot live by it and only assume it ought to feed other people, then it is bad. The real test is that your truth should be good for you yourself. Not one dog is coming to sniff at it, if it doesn't feed you. If you are not satisfied with it, if you cannot enjoy it for twenty, fifty years or a whole lifetime, it is no good. If you are hungry, if you think that your

companions must be redeemed, and that they must be grateful to you on top of all [for redeeming them], then you make a mistake: you may know the idea is no good. So don't play the missionary. Don't try to eat the goods of others. Let other people belong to themselves and look after their own improvement. Let them eat themselves. [There's our Ouroboros again - let them work on their own process]. If they are really satisfied, then nobody should disturb them. If they are not satisfied with what they possess, they will probably seek something better; and if you are the one who happens to have the better thing, they will surely come and get it from you". (C.G. Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra*, Notes of the Seminar, 1934-5, Part I, page 213).

So you see then the Ouroboros reminds us of how important it is that we "eat ourselves", and be "self-digesters", doing our own inner work and not be "eating others", trying to persuade them by our truth, insisting that we have something that can fix them up. Better for the person to be centred, to be "in Dao" as the Daoists say, for this has a far-reaching positive effect on those around one. So the ouroboros is not just an ancient symbol but a living image which the unconscious creates - I have seen it in the products of the unconscious many times. It points to the importance of integrating one's emotions, but is also seen as a deep chthonic instinctive spirit of the earth often found encircling the treasure at the core of the personality, thus functioning as an instinct that protects the inner life.

I have five slides here, but time allows just one: it shows a SANDPLAY, made by a man who was in a very emotional state about his life - he was very upset about what was happening both in his relationship and in his work. Things were going wrong in his life - we talked at length about what was happening and explored possible ways of dealing with it. The session was really a lamentation, which is a literary genre we don't much recognise these days, but we still need to lament - and he lamented. He lamented for almost the whole session so I suggested he try to do a sandplay.

This is the result. And you know, it was just beautiful, the peace that came over him as he composed this sandplay. I shall just point out a few things:



Do you see down the bottom here? that's a Tibetan Monk bent over in submission - he felt that was himself, and he is bent over in a state of awe as he was observing the contents of the sandplay, what was happening within him (observing ego). At the centre you see a baby and four angels announcing tidings of great joy, for a child is born - there is a centring process going on here, and the birth of a child. This represents a new consciousness that has

come out of the suffering he had been going through for weeks and months, for this was a longstanding process. There is joy at the core of his being. And in all the chaos and turmoil there is a certain order within his own psyche: there are four trees - the tree of life in its wholeness was growing within him and was fruitful, in all the pain.

And the animal kingdom was in order here. He saw St Frances of Assisi as a person who could relate to animals, who was okay with the animal world - who didn't curse it and have difficulty with it, but could bless the animals and accept them and try and fulfill their needs. And you see the animals all moving clockwise in a circle and even the prehistoric animals, the dinosaurs, are also circumambulating the centre, a true circulatory process. There is a dynamic circle of individuation in which the opposites (sun and moon, masculine and feminine consciousness) can be safely contained. The animals would represent the unconscious drives, emotions and instincts - even including the pre-conscious (pre-historic) ones.

The centre is a reality for him. Here he has an *experience* of the centre, of the Self (the God-image as newborn babe) and of the joy at the core of his being (angel musicians), and all his energies ordered and revolving around it. This gave him such strength and hope. At the top you have the angel, traditionally the messenger of God, for the whole experience was like a revelation to his conscious self, his ego. He was seeing something of the meaning of what he had been suffering and all that he was going through - things were falling into place and he could accept it all and be at peace with himself.

I should like to finish by referring to an interview which Dr Marie-Louise von Franz gave in 1986. She was asked such questions as: "what is the growing edge of Jungian Psychology? What problems might young analysts explore?" She replied "Their own!" And the next question was, "If you had another lifetime...what direction would you pursue?" Her reply: "I'd follow my dreams" (cf. *Psychological Perspectives*, volume 17, no. 2, fall 1986). You know, this woman knew about it because she had experienced it and she just points us back to doing our inner work, be self-digesters, like the ouroboros.

In conclusion, these are some random thoughts regarding the patterns of timeless moments, maybe enduring core issues of the Society, which I certainly experienced in my time with the Society and which occurred to me when I reflected on that time. These patterns of timeless moments, archetypal factors, are evident and at work at the core of such a group, and, I am sure, repeat themselves time and time again as we touch occasionally something deeper than all the endless details needed for the running of a Society. Thank you.

Terence McBride is a Jungian Analyst and past president of the C.G. Jung Society of Sydney