engine of generating business revenues has been shifted from tangibles to intangibles assets. Accordingly, accounting has long been recognized as problematical for knowledge management and its model is no longer sufficient. The accounting model has been invented over hundreds of years to measure and report investment in tangible assets (Lev, 2001). The dilemma of accounting against knowledge management is about theory to practice. New knowledge practices are being innovated every day, but new accounting rules are not yet established and frame worked (Mohammad, 2013b). Unfortunately, accounting theorists and researchers have been very slow to recognize this fact. Accounting by its status qua is a fairly industrial intellectual discipline and has yet to demonstrate the maturity of knowledge management. The accounting literatures reviewed with reference to knowledge management clearly shown that accountant's community debate has focused on three issues: lacks and critics associated with the accounting model; nature of accounting practices required to deal with knowledge initiatives; and the rigid reporting format of the financial statements. Accounting reporting power against knowledge management is full of controversy associated with necessities of knowledge initiatives. The arguments have centered on the reliability of accounting information, gap of market value with book value, knowledge income, future cash flows, and logic of accounting equation (Lev and Zarowin, 1999). These arguments are further supported by the call to reform accounting rules because of intangible assets. As such assets are now the revenue engine of knowledge management. The absence of those assets from the financial statements leaves investors with irrelevant information to make critical business decisions. Lev, 2016 further claims that lack of intangibles has probably led to the systematic undervaluation of business assets. As a result, insufficient investment in the core business assets has been made. The lack of accounting information for completeness and timeliness on Knowledge assets contributes to what can be titled "accounting asymmetry". The basic and most accepted truth is that the structural components of accounting with its recording philosophy and reporting mechanism have been established to match the requirements of the industrial management. The reality is that such model has been invented to calculate the cost of materials and wages. Thus, one of key critics against accounting model is a cost based and its calculations cope with the industrial management not the knowledge one. This reason in particular explains why the current format of financial statements does not disclose relevant and reliable information about knowledge initiatives. The nature of accounting theory especially logic in terms of assumptions, principles, and rules are primarily responsible for the ultimate absent of knowledge information. The problem of accounting against knowledge management is the huge uncertainty which produce volatility associated with risks and due to such fact; investments in intangibles are treated as expenses. In contrast, innovations in knowledge management are created primarily by investment in intangibles, when such investments are commercially successed; they are transformed into tangible assets creating more corporate value and growth (Lev, 2001). All these lacks incorporated in the practical body of accounting model cited accounting as inadequate for knowledge management. Further, globalization, fast-changing technologies, intensive investments in human resources, high accelerated research and development have doubled the crises of accounting with knowledge management and increased unreliability of accounting information (Goldfinger, 1997). This paper therefore goes beyond the extant literature